

**THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
BAHÇEŞEHİR UNIVERSITY**

**THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
FILM AND TV**

**CHARACTERS AND NARRATION IN ERTEM
EĞİLMEZ'S FILMS**

Master's Thesis

MUSTAFA FURKAN ÖZREN

Supervisor: ASSOC. PROF. SAVAŞ ARSLAN

İSTANBUL, 2013

**THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
BAHCESEHIR UNIVERSITY**

**THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
FILM AND TV**

Name of the thesis: Characters and narration in Ertem Eđilmez's films
Name/Last Name of the Student: Mustafa Furkan Özren
Date of the Defense of Thesis: 13.06.2013

The thesis has been approved by the Graduate School of Social Science.

Assist. Prof. Burak KÜNTAY
Graduate School Director

I certify that this thesis meets all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Asist. Prof. Kaya Özkaracalar
Program Coordinator

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and we find it fully adequate in scope, quality and content, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Examining Committee Members

Signature

Thesis Supervisor
Assoc. Prof. Savaş ARSLAN

Member
Assist. Prof. Nilay ULUSOY

Member
Prof. Cem PEKMAN

ABSTRACT

CHARACTERS AND NARRATION IN ERTEM EĞİLMEZ'S FILMS

Mustafa Furkan Özren

Cinema and Tv

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Savaş Arslan

June 2013, 121 pg.

Narrative studies had come into being through the influence of linguistics and semiology to analyze narrative as a structure. Ertem Eğilmez' films made important contributions to Turkish cinema and were analyzed looking through the lens of the possibilities of narrative studies in this thesis. Character is one of the elements of the narrative. The aim of this thesis is to analyze Ertem Eğilmez's films as narrative in all of its elements but especially through his characters and the development process of these characters. I also consider Yeşilçam which define the parameters of his cinema. The narratives themselves are also influenced by Yeşilçam. In this sense the characters and the narratives of Yeşilçam are also the subjects of this thesis. The aim of these analyses is to show the roots of this subject.

Keywords: Narrative, Character, Yeşilçam, Ertem Eğilmez, Stereotypes

ÖZET

ERTEM EĞİLMEZ FİLMLERİNDE KARAKTERLER VE ANLATIM

Mustafa Furkan Özren

Sinema ve Tv

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Savaş Arslan

Haziran 2013, 121 sf.

Anlatı bilimi dilbilim ve gösterge bilimin etkisiyle anlatıları bir yapı olarak incelemek amacıyla ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu tezde Türk sinemasına önemli katkılar yapmış bir yönetmen olan Ertem Eğilmez'in filmleri anlatı biliminin sağladığı teorik çerçeve üzerinden incelenmiştir. Karakter anlatının unsurlarından bir tanesidir. Tezin amacı, Ertem Eğilmez'in filmlerini bir anlatı olarak tüm unsurlarıyla fakat özellikle de karakterleri ve bu karakterlerin Ertem Eğilmez filmografisindeki gelişimi ile incelenmektir. Ertem Eğilmez filmografisinde karakterleri incelemek dediğimiz zaman, bu filmlerin içinde yer aldığı Yeşilçam'a, hatta Yeşilçam'ı da etkileyen anlatılara da değinmek gerekiyor. Bu anlamda tezin bir bölümü Yeşilçam'da anlatıların ve karakterlerin nasıl kullanıldığını inceliyor. Bu incelemelerin amacı Ertem Eğilmez in filmlerinin yapısal analizini yaparken hangi temel üzerinden hareket edildiğini ortaya koymaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Anlatı, Karakter, Yeşilçam, Ertem Eğilmez, Tipler

CONTENTS

TABLES.....	ix
1.INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. NARRATIVE.....	5
2.1 DEFINITION.....	5
2.2 NARRATOLOGY.....	10
2.3 LINGUISTIC, SEMIOLOGY AND NARRATIVE THEORY.....	12
3. CHARACTER AND NARRATIVE.....	17
3.1 STORY AND DISCOURSE DISTINCTION.....	17
3.2 STORY.....	21
3.2.1 Existents (Settings and Characters).....	22
3.2.2 Character.....	24
3.2.2.1 Choosing a character.....	25
3.2.2.2 The methods for construct a character.....	29
3.2.3 Time.....	34
3.2.3.1 Order.....	35

3.2.3.2 Duration.....	35
3.2.3.3 Frequency.....	36
3.2.3.4 Reader's interpretation and time.....	36
3.2.4 Events.....	38
3.2.5 How Does the Narrative Interact With a Reader.....	40
3.2.5.1 The reader's situation.....	40
3.2.5.2 Verisimilitude.....	41
3.2.5.3 Intertextuality.....	42
3.2.5.4 Naturalization.....	44
3.3 DISCOURSE.....	46
3.3.1 Agents of Discourse.....	47
3.3.2 Narrative Voice.....	49
3.3.3 Point of View.....	51
3.3.4 Stream of Consciousness.....	53
3.3.5 Interior Monologue.....	53
4. CHARACTER AND YEŞİLÇAM.....	55
4.1. NARRATIVE AND STORY IN YEŞİLÇAM.....	55
4.1.1 Traditional Narratives and Storytelling.....	56
4.1.1.1 Narratives and storytelling in traditional Turkish theatre....	
.....	56

4.1.1.2 Narratives and storytelling in traditional Turkish literature	61
4.1.2 Narrative and Story Structure in Yeşilçam.....	64
4.1.2.1 What is melodramatic modality?.....	65
4.1.2.2 How does melodramatic modality appear in Yeşilçam?.....	67
4.2 CHARACTER IN YEŞİLÇAM.....	71
4.2.1 The Roots of the Characters of Yeşilçam.....	71
4.2.1.1 Characters in the traditional Turkish theatre.....	71
4.2.1.2 Characters in Turkish literature.....	73
4.2.2 Stereotypical Characters of Yeşilçam.....	75
5. CHARACTERS IN ERTEM EĞİLMEZ'S FILMS.....	79
5.1 ANALYSIS OF THE CHARACTERS IN ERTEM EĞİLMEZ'S FILMS..	79
5.2 <i>SÜRTÜK</i> (THE STREET WALKER): IDEAL MELODRAMATIC STRUCTURE OF THE YEŞİLÇAM.....	82
5.3 <i>BİR MİLLET UYANIYOR</i> (A NATION IS AWAKING): A MELODRAMATIC HISTORICAL EPIC.....	86
5.4 <i>SEV KARDEŞİM</i> : HOME BRINGS THE FAMILY TOGETHER.....	89
5.5 <i>OH OLSUN</i> (TOUGH CHEESE!): CLASS CONFLICT.....	94
5.6 <i>CANIM KARDEŞİM</i> (MY DEAR BROTHER): AN EXCEPTIONAL DRAMA IN ERTEM EĞİLMEZ'S FILMOGRAPHY.....	97
5.7 <i>MAVİ BONCUK</i> (THE BLUE BEAD): THE CHARACTERS OF THE	

FILM AND THEIR SCREEN PERSONAS.....	100
5.8 SÜT KARDEŞLER (THE MILK SIBLINGS): THE THEATRE-IN-THE-ROUND IN ERTEM EĞİLMEZ FILMS.....	104
6.CONCLUSION.....	111
REFERENCES.....	115

TABLES

Table 4.1: The characters of the <i>tuluat</i> , <i>commedia dell'Arte</i> , and <i>theatre-in-the-round</i>	72
Table 5.1: The genres of the Eğilmez films that I will analyse.....	80
Table 5.2: The features of the characters in <i>Sürtük</i>	84
Table 5.3: The features of the characters in <i>Bir Millet Uyanıyor</i>	88
Table 5.4: The features of the characters in <i>Sev Kardeşim</i>	92
Table 5.5: The features of the characters in <i>Oh Olsun</i>	95
Table 5.6: The features of the characters in <i>Canım Kardeşim</i>	99
Table 5.7: The features of the characters in <i>Mavi Boncuk</i>	102
Table 5.8: The features of the characters in <i>Süt Kardeşler</i>	106
Table 5.9: Comparison the characters of theatre-in-the-round, <i>the tuluat</i> , and <i>Süt Kardeşler</i>	108
Table 5.10: Various analysis and features about Ertem Eğilmez's films	110

1. INTRODUCTION

I was born in 1985. As a primary school child, I started to see Yeşilçam films on television. Those were the first years of private television channels in Turkey. In those early years of broadcasting, television channels were predominantly taking advantage of the long legacy of Yeşilçam films. Even as a child, I could notice the nostalgic features of those Yeşilçam films. According to Yeşilçam films, “those were the days” when true love still existed, money was not absolute power and no matter what condition your family was in it was sacred in the world (especially, lower -class and middle-class families). So as a little child, after watching those films, I was full of moral feelings about love, life, friendship, money and family. After two decades when I was thinking about those films, I realized that most of them were made by Ertem Eğilmez. Before starting my master’s thesis, I had this idea to analyze the reasons behind this phenomenon in Ertem Eğilmez’s films. Why did I have so many scenes from Ertem Eğilmez’s films in mind when I thought about Yeşilçam films? How was he different from the other directors of Yeşilçam? At first glance, I thought his characters were formed from his narration and storytelling, so that is why I decided to analyze his films starting with his characters.

In my thesis I will make structural analyses of the characters and other narrative elements of Ertem Eğilmez's films. Still, when we say structural analyses, what kind of structure do we mean? What is the structure? In this sense, structure means the narrative. It consists of two main components, one is the story, the second is the discourse. Story has time, space, events and also, characters. My main topic is the story's participants. Briefly this means: what has been told in the narrative? On the other hand, the discourse has its own participants such as the agents of the discourse, narrative voice, point of view and so on. Discourse is the answer to how the narrative is manifested. Turkish films are a part of this structure, too. To analyze Ertem Eğilmez’s films we first have to consider them as Yeşilçam (Turkish cinema) film. In this sense,

when we approach the films of Yeşilçam structurally, we will find the answers to those questions.

What are the features that determine the structural characteristic of Yeşilçam? How do they appear situation in respect to the reader, this is known as verisimilitude. According to this concept, the reader (in our case, it is the audience) has interpreted the narratives with his/her experiences from life and other narratives. As a result, verisimilitude and intertextuality are the key words to understanding the evolutionary process of the elements of the narratives of Yeşilçam film and Ertem Eğilmez's work in Ertem Eğilmez's films? The answers that I will give to these questions are also the reasons why I want to analyze Ertem Eğilmez's films. Now I will try to explain my aim behind choosing this thesis subject in detail. In my thesis, I will try to show how Eğilmez changed stereotypical characters and other clichéd elements of Yeşilçam's narratives. I believe this process of change actually evolves and develops. It happened within Eğilmez's own films and it also influenced other Yeşilçam films too. Related with this, I can say that there is an intertextuality between Eğilmez's own filmography and also other Yeşilçam films. Narrative theorists also use a special concept to explain this.

I mentioned that Yeşilçam had benefitted from those clichéd uses. What are those concepts? What influenced Yeşilçam and had become cliché according to continual use? We can also consider those concepts as the key words of my thesis, for example, stereotypical characters and masterplots. I will focus on the meanings of those concepts in detail. I will explain their interaction too. Stereotype is one kind of clichéd character. Masterplot is the core of the story. Yeşilçam uses those basic story types. These forms also give a characteristic shape to Yeşilçam. In this sense, it also constitutes the narration method of Yeşilçam.

When speaking about narration methods of Yeşilçam, do we have to consider melodrama's situation? Melodrama is generally defined as a genre. It was used in

different art forms. On the other hand, melodrama is also a narration method, which can influence every kind of film and every kind of genre as well. We can define melodrama as a narration method that depends on exaggeration, stereotypical characters and masterplots. In this sense, all those are related with each other. Yeşilçam continued using these concepts that mostly depended on clichés. In this sense, the characteristic structure of these genres serve this narration.

Another factor which determines the characteristic structure of Yeşilçam are traditional Turkish narratives. These traditional narratives also depend on stereotypical characters and plotlines. Traditional Turkish narratives affected Yeşilçam and Eğilmez's films as well in various aspects. Related with this issue, I will briefly mention how those narratives affected Yeşilçam films. And where this interaction happened and on which of the elements of narratives. Traditional Turkish narratives developed under the influence of Western narratives; it can be seen in Turkish theatre and in Turkish literature. Yeşilçam was influenced by these traditional narratives. Other Turkish art forms that I will write about in my thesis and Yeşilçam used common concepts, they had faced similar problems and they had found similar solutions to these problems.

In writing my thesis, I will follow a specific order to present the relationships between different concepts, and to make them understandable. Accordingly, I will start my first chapter with the meaning of narrative. After, I will explain narratology, the branch of study that deals with narratives. How did it develop according to the ideas of scholars. And I will finish my first chapter with explanations of semiology and linguistics which are the sources of narrative theory. In the second chapter, I will deal with the components of narrative. Basically, there are two main components: story and discourse. These two have the other elements of narrative within themselves. For example, a story has characters, spaces, time and the events. In this chapter, I will also find an answer to how an author can control a reader's experiences and the idea of common knowledge. According to scholars, verisimilitude, intertextuality and naturalization are the concepts that explain the interaction between whole narratives. It

is also related to how an author controls a reader's response. I prefer to extend the character's sub-section which is related to my main subject so I can give detailed explanations. As one of narrative's components, my discourse section will include brief explanations of agents of the discourse, narrative voice, point of view, interior monologue and stream of consciousness. My third chapter will deal that how Yeşilçam used narratives and characters. I will try to define the characteristic features of Yeşilçam's narratives and characters. First of all, I will focus on the narratives and the storytelling of Yeşilçam. What kind of a story structure did Yeşilçam use? I will mention the sources of Yeşilçam. Related with this, I will focus on the traditional narratives of Turkish theatre and literature. After, I will analyse its stereotypical characters. Where do they come from? How did they appear in Yeşilçam? Basically, Yeşilçam used exaggerated characters that came from the characters of traditional Turkish narratives, which had lots of stereotypical and excessive features. In the fourth chapter, I will apply those analyses to Eğilmez's cinema. I will choose seven films from different periods of his filmography. I will analyse the storytelling methods and characters in those films. In this way, we can see the development of his stories and characters. The methods used within Yeşilçam are also necessary to understand Eğilmez's films. Eğilmez used the clichéd forms of Yeşilçam in his films such as stereotypical characters and basic story types. However, the difference in Eğilmez's work was that he could control these clichéd forms according to his requirements. Analyses of the films that belong to different periods of his filmography will show the development of the various elements of his films.

I noticed that an analysis according to narrative theory is not common in the study of Yeşilçam. That is the reason why I want to adopt a theoretical perspective to Ertem Eğilmez's films and more generally, to Yeşilçam. I did see that Turkish scholars commonly used melodrama when analyzing Yeşilçam. So, I will take advantage of their work in this sense. I also did not notice much work on Ertem Eğilmez's films in Turkish film studies, except a very few examples. In this sense, I hope my work can help resolve some of the lack in this field.

2. NARRATIVE

The first chapter of my thesis deals with narratives. First of all, I will focus on the meaning of narrative in the first section. I will analyze the definitions of narrative, given by scholars who work in this discipline. My second section is about narratology. Narratology is the name of the discipline of narrative theory. I will focus on the analyses of scholars in the field of narratology. Besides these analyses, I will deal with its historical development and its location within a theoretical framework. The last section of the chapter regarding narrative is about semiology, linguistics and their affect on narratives. I will discuss the importance of their interrelationship, because narratology is also a sub-discipline of linguistics.

2.1 DEFINITION

In this section I will discuss the roots of the narrative, and its different meanings (for example, its everyday meaning and its scientific meaning). I will investigate narrative's borders and I will continue with arguments about narrative's definitions. What kind of definitions do scholars use in their works?

Narrative also has a meaning within its everyday usage, beyond the artistic form. We are using narratives in our lives, when we express ourselves, when we communicate with other people. H. Porter Abbott says, (2002 pg.1) "*We make narratives many times a day, every day of our lives. And we start doing so almost from the moment we begin putting words together. As soon as we follow a subject with a verb, there is a good chance we are engaged in narrative discourse.*" If we consider the historical development of narrative, narrative theorists have based the theoretical aspect of narrative studies on Aristotle's 'Poetics'. However the existence of narrative in its everyday meaning is almost as old as the history of humanity. (For example, we can

consider ancient animal figures on the walls of some caves as belonging to narrative tradition.) Still, the narrative I will examine in my work will be the literary type of narrative which has a specific set of rules. Monika Fludernik defines this type of narrative related to the novel or short story. (2006 pg. 1) *"When we speak about narrative today, we inevitably associate it with the literary type of narrative, the novel or the short story. The word narrative, however, is related to the verb narrate. Narrative is all around us, not just in the novel or in historical writing."* Therefore, in this sense, the literary type of narrative has some definitive components that work together in harmony. It consists of these components.

Looking from the aspect of narrative's everyday meaning, we can even follow the traces of narrative when speaking of the existence of human beings. Today anyone who wants to explain his/her existence either makes use of some kind religious beliefs or through the use of some scientific theory like "The Big Bang". Whatever he or she believes, he/she uses these ideas to explain himself/herself with one kind of narration. We can think that narrative is a result of our own will to express ourselves. That it is a result of our senses; our bodies are designed like this. We are limited to our senses. We want to convey the beauty of the smell of the rose. We notice that it is red with our eyes. And our finger may be cut when we try to pick it, because of its thorn. In other words, using narrative is an imperative thing for us. H. Porter Abbott states (2002 pg. 3) *"...it is hard to believe that the appetite for narrative is something we learn rather than something that is built into us through our genes."* The actions of our body cause narratives, but the main thing is, we evaluate those actions with our brains. Our experiences as human beings which have remained with us until our present time bring forth common knowledge. Narratives also belong to common knowledge. Therefore, that is how narrative presents us with new things which we had not experienced before from its great library. It is one of our fundamental requirements as a human being.

Another dilemma emerges around narrative's borders. The question is what kind of things should be counted as narrative? For example, can a melodic song be a narrative?

Or is a song that contains a story a narrative? What obstacles are presented by a scientific essay or a written court decision that will allow (or not allow us) to accept them as a narrative? If we say that a timeline is necessary for narratives, how would we evaluate a painting or a photograph as a narrative? In this regard, if we take cinema that consists of photographs as a narrative, can we say that every record taken with a camera is a narrative? For example, would be able to find a narrative from a security camera in a supermarket or on a highway. Would a conversation between two person on the internet. Can we accept these things as a narrative?

Roland Barthes' (1975, pg. 237) definition of the forms of narrative can guide us in terms of an explanation:

There are countless forms of narrative in the world. First of all, there is a prodigious variety of genres, each of which branches out into a variety of media, as if all substances could be relied upon to accommodate man's stories. Among the vehicles of narrative are articulated language, whether oral or written, pictures, still or moving, gestures, and an ordered mixture of all those substances; narrative is present in myth, legend, fables, tales, short stories, epics, history, tragedy, drama (suspense drama), comedy, pantomime, paintings (in Santa Ursula by Carpaccio, for instance), stained-glass windows, movies, local news, conversation. Moreover, in this infinite variety of forms, it is present at all times, in all places, in all societies; indeed narrative starts with the very history of mankind; there is not, there has never been anywhere, any people without narrative; all classes, all human groups, have their stories, and very often those stories enjoyed by men of different and even opposite cultural backgrounds: ¹ narrative remains largely unconcerned with good or bad literature. Like life itself, it is there, international, transhistorical, transcultural.

The answers to the questions I posed regarding the borders of narrative can depend on the angle from which we look at it. Also, we can add other sorts of questions. It is a relative subject. Maybe the very question to be asked while analysing narrative is what are we looking at? On which kind of narrative should we base our analysis? As I mentioned before, narrative has a fundamental and everyday meaning that comes from the basic communication of people. In this regard, choosing a field to concentrate on can make the definition clearer and it is a certain step forward. Using other theorists' classifications and definitions can be considered another step.

Seymour Chatman makes a distinction in narrative between visual form, auditory form and both used together. For example, cinema has both visual and audible features. In

this sense, every medium has multiple manifestations of narrative and as such requires analysis using more than one method.

Chatman (1978, pg. 30) explains this situation as:

The sense modality in which narrative operates may be either visual or auditory or both. In the visual category are nonverbal narratives (painting, sculpture, ballet, pure or "unbubbled" comic strips, mime, etc.), plus written texts. In the auditory category are bardic chants, musical narratives, radio plays, and other oral performances. But this distinction conceals an important commonality between written and oral texts. All written texts are realizable orally; they are not being performed but could be at any moment. That is, they are innately susceptible of performance.

Sometimes those mediums can mix the methods they manifest narratives like visual, auditory and written. When this occurs, it gets harder to reach an exact definition of narrative. And even the common occurrences of narratives can become ambiguous sometimes. Seymour Chatman (1978, pg. 26) counts those manifestation methods under the heading of discourse. He calls them the substance of expression. But as the type of mediums increase, the definition of narrative also changes as a result.

Narrative can exist in different types of disciplines, but the narrative type that I want to analyze is related with the literary type and its sub-branches, theatrical and cinematic narratives. As I have pointed out Monica Fludernik (2006 pg.1) calls it a literary type of narrative. This kind of reduction will be useful to clarify what kind of discipline our topic is related to and what kind of argument we should use in our analysis.

Narratology is the discipline that deals with narrative theories. Even as a scientific definition, it is also hard to define what narrative is. Monika Fludernik says (2006, pg.8) "*As is the case with all fields of study, narratology first has to define its area of research. For this reason, every narrative theory establishes a definition of narrative at some point* " Almost every scholar has a different definition of narrative. Marie Laura Ryan reached this conclusion when she searched for a definition of narrative after analysing other scholars' definitions. (2007 pg. 24) "*All of these characterizations provide useful insights, but none offers a complete and self-sufficient definition of*

narrative, because they depend too much on implicit elements. It is admittedly debatable to what extent definitions should rely on implications." So how do scholars define narrative? As I noted before, every of them has a different point of view about the same concept.

It is hard to contain every feature of narrative in one definition. But I will present some of them by different scholars as examples. According to David Bordwell (2008 pg. 75) narrative is a *"chain of events in cause effect relationship occurring in time and space."* Seymour Chatman (1978, pg. 19) insists on an important distinction in the definition, he says that narrative has necessary components, the first part is the story which consists of chain of events (actions, happenings) plus the existents (characters, setting) and the second part is the discourse, the way the narrative is expressed or how the content is communicated. H. Porter Abbott (2002 pg.16) summarizes Chatman's ideas. *"...narrative is the representation of events, consisting of story and narrative discourse, story is an event or sequence of events (the action), and narrative discourse is those events as represented."* Monika Fludernik (2006, pg. 6) defends another criterion for narrative, that a narrative should have *"a human or human-like (anthromorphic) protagonist at the centre."* On the other hand, Mieke Bal makes her own classification about the definition of narrative, according to her, narrative consists of three connected layers; the text, the story, and the fabula.

Bal, M. (1997, pg. 5)

"A narrative text is a text in which an agent relates ('tells') a story in a particular medium, such as language, imagery, sound, buildings, or a combination thereof. A story is a fabula that is presented in a certain manner. A fabula is a series of logically and cronologically related events that are caused or experienced by actors. An event is the transition from one state to another state. Actors are agents that perform actions. They are not necessarily human. To act is defined here as to cause or to experience an event."

As can be seen, they all approach the definition from a different aspect. Even if they shared a lot of similar ideas, all scholars have their own methods of analysis.

I mentioned narrative's meaning both in an everyday way and its scientific one in this section, but I especially I wanted to examine the different approaches and definitions around narrative. My aim was to show the common features of narratives. Now, we can draw a clear picture in our minds about its scientific meaning. As a summary of all that I mentioned we can list the basic features of the narrative as:

- The interrelation between story and discourse that forms the narrative.
- A chain of events that is continuing with causality.
- Certain spaces and a timeline in which the action is set.
- Existents, the subjects that are moving under the directions of authors.

2.2 NARRATOLOGY

Narratology is the name of the discipline in which the study of narrative is contained. However, narratology is a new term, scholars who have dealt with narratology, have shown a tendency to restrict narrative's definition. This is concerned with the clarification of the field of narrative theory. In this section I will deal with the different definitions provided by scholars regarding narratology. I will analyze the process of its historical development. And I will point to the placement of narratology as a discipline.

Why is a theory of narrative necessary? Why was it established? According to Jonathan Culler, (1997 pg. 83) narrative theory might reveal why we have implicit instincts about creating stories.

The theory of narrative might, then, be conceived as an attempt to spell out, to make explicit, this narrative competence, just as linguistics is an attempt to make explicit linguistic competence: what speakers of a language unconsciously know in knowing a language. Theory here can be conceived as a setting forth of an intuitive cultural knowledge or understanding.

Narratology is a term that defines the discipline of narrative theory. As one indicator about where it is located in a theoretical framework, almost all the scholars accept that it comes along with study of linguistics and semiology, as Monika Fludernik states (2006

pg. 9) "Narratology has traditionally been a sub-discipline of the study of literature and also has particularly close ties to poetics, the theory of genre, and to the semiotics, or semiology, of literature." However, the larger tendency regarding the issue of finding a source and its roots, has developed alongside modern theories about language. According to Monika Fludernik, Saussure's ideas about language were very influential. (2006 pg.8) "*The methods of narrative theory are inspired by modern linguistics, which demonstrates through a synchronic analysis of the language system (Saussure's langue).*"

Narratology developed especially through the contributions of French structuralist theories which were influenced by the theories about language of Ferdinand de Saussure.

Culler J. (1997 pg.124)

Structuralism usually designates a group of primarily French thinkers who, in the 1950s and 1960s, influenced by Ferdinand de Saussure's theory of language, applied concepts from structural linguistics to the study of social and cultural phenomena. Structuralism developed first in anthropology (Claude Lévi-Strauss), then in literary and cultural studies (Roman Jakobson, Roland Barthes, Gérard Genette), psychoanalysis (Jacques Lacan), intellectual history (Michel Foucault), and Marxist theory (Louis Althusser). Although these thinkers never formed a school as such, it was under the label 'structuralism' that their work was imported and read in England, the United States, and elsewhere in the late 1960s and 1970s.

In literary studies structuralism promotes a poetics interested in the conventions that make literary works possible; it seeks not to produce new interpretations of works but to understand how they can have the meanings and effects that they do.

Vladimir Propp's "Morphology of the Folktale" (1928) was accepted as a fundamental source of inspiration, according to all the theorists who decided to work on narratives after it.

Chatman, S. (1978, pg. 15,16)

The Russian formalist tradition, especially the work of Vladimir Propp, emphasized simple narratives: folk tales, ¹ myths, romans poliders. But modern narrative fiction entails additional complexities of structure. The rigid homogeneity of plot and simplicity of characterization found in the Russian fairy tale are obviously not typical of many modern narratives. Still, much can be learned from these investigations, particularly about the theory of plot and the necessity of separating narrative structure from any of its mere manifestations, linguistic or otherwise. Certain disadvantages must also be considered, particularly classificatory reductivism. On balance, what constitutes a viable and modern narrative theory? ²

When we examine the source of the distinction between story and discourse, we find an ancient starting point. And it shows us the strong roots of this method of analysis. Seymour Chatman says, (1978, pg. 19) "*For Aristotle, the imitation of actions in the real world, praxis, was seen as forming an argument, logos, from which were selected (and possibly rearranged) the units that formed the plot, mythos.*" After Aristotle's distinction, lots of definitions appeared regarding the same distinction in literary criticism. They all have tried to define the same distinction. As the process of analysing the study of narratives developed the use of Aristotle's argument became part of that tradition. This shows us the essential importance of this method of analysis.

H. Porter Abbott (2007, pg. 41) also points at this situation ,

"..Russian Formalists, who, in the 1920s, introduced the distinction of fabula (story) and sjuzhet (its rendering). Tzvetan Todorov gave these terms their rough equivalents in French, histoire and discours, and Gerard Genette greatly elaborated the distinction in his landmark narratological reading of Proust's A la recherche du temps perdu.³ From there, thanks in part to Seymour Chatman's foundational work, the corresponding distinction of story and discourse made its way into English where it is now widely deployed."

The distinction between story and discourse, which modern theory of literature uses, was developed within the context of these variations of the previous usages. As a result of the development process of narratology, we notice that narratologists are mostly influenced by the ideas of Saussure. Besides, as I mentioned in this section, narratologists commonly used the distinction of story and discourse, in their analyses. We can see this situation in Russian formalist's ideas, French structuralist's ideas, and in the others who succeed them.

2.3 LINGUISTICS, SEMIOLOGY AND NARRATIVE THEORY

Studies which dealt with the narrative inevitably influenced by Saussure's ideas about semiology and linguistics. Because of the important influence of language on the studies of narrative theories. I will briefly mention studies of linguistic, semiologys, and their relationship with narratives. Also, I will use Ferdinand Saussure's ideas to clarify this relationship. As I mentioned before, the theory of narrative is a sub-branch of the theories of linguistics and semiology.

Dudley Andrew (1984 pg. 75) says,

The history of linguistics is most clearly marked by a dramatic shift from the study of linguistic origins and linguistic change to the study of universal laws and the fundamental structures of language competence. Instead of the specific cultural differences between languages, the striking similarity among all languages became after Saussure, the central phenomenon to be explained... Although history may shape the form of any particular language to some degree, the laws of language itself will impose their ineluctable logic on all activities called "human."

The theorists who have been working on narrative studies are mostly inspired and influenced by Saussure's ideas. According to Ferdinand Saussure (2011 pg. 68) language is the most powerful and systematic semiological system.

Signs that are wholly arbitrary realize better than the others the ideal of the semiological process; that is why language, the most complex and universal of all systems of expression, is also the most characteristic; in this sense linguistics can become the master-pattern for all branches of semiology although language is only one particular semiological system.

In my opinion, searching for the linguistic roots of narratives only through letters and words and their ordering in a systematic manner will not be enough. Besides, these semiological systems came into existence with the influence of different social, cultural and various other kinds of conditions. As Saussure expressed, (2011 pg. 67) *'I can simply say: the linguistic sign is arbitrary.'* The relationship between language and narrative is based on something much deeper. Human thoughts are shaped through the structure of language. Accordingly, people understand each other by means of the continuity of previous experiences through language. But we should definitely consider how people rely on their system of perception? Language is inevitable, even for inprimitive tribes. Language is inevitable for humans in the same way narratives are. For narrative, the importance of the language comes from the fact that the narrative is transmitted with linguistic codes. However, it can be perceived as an illusion when we say visual narratives don't use language. This would not be a correct approach at all. Even visual narratives consist of the classic conditions of language. To be more precise, all narratives are constructed by the effect of semiologic signals on perception in the human mind. The contradiction is caused by the mimetic and diegetic narrative distinction. David Bordwell (1985 pg. 3) Related to this, a question emerges: Could

narratives exist before language? One assumption is that people could share some kind of narrative by imitating nature, before language had been discovered. But the problem stems from our essential human nature, humans first considered what they perceived, with their minds. According to this logic, whether the source of perception is visual, oral or sensual, it is related to the general codes in their minds that everyone can perceive. So we can consider this a common perception structure because the codes that we humans perceive are the same. This common perception structure reflects both the semiological base of human sharing and the reason for the creation of language. It is obviously a collective process.

According to Saussure (2011 pg. 66), letters and the sounds that represent the letters contain some meaning. These meanings trigger our perception psychologically. An object will continue to live even if it is not there because it has been fixed with language, and in this way it will continue to live in an ideal state. The object has already been shown. Saussure uses some symbolic words to explain this situation. These explanatory symbolic notions affected the whole theory of linguistics and semiology, as well as the other related branches.

Ferdinand Saussure (2011 pg. 67) says,

I propose to retain the word sign (signe) to designate the whole and to replace concept and sound-image respectively by signified (signifié) and signifier (signifiant); the last two terms have the advantage of indicating the opposition that separates them from each other and from the whole of which they are parts. As regards sign, if I am satisfied with it, this is simply because I do not know of any word to replace it, the ordinary language suggesting no other.

Taken as a subject, the influence of linguistic studies on narrative is caused by this leading and determinant role. How are the letters signified by the signifiers? How has the story been told in the narrative by its discourse? H. Porter Abbott states that the (2007 pg. 41) " *Story was first analytically set off from the manner of its rendering in the wake of Saussure's distinction in linguistics between the signified and signifier.*" Narratives come into being as a result of relationships between humans. They create their relationships through language. The main particles of narrative are related with language. As I said before linguistic structure originates from the structure of human

mind. Ferdinand Saussure states, (2011 pg. 23) "*The concrete object of linguistic science is the social product deposited in the brain of each individual, i.e. language.*" But the problem is that consciousness needs to meet the object in physical way for a reaction to occur. Interpretation follows this, and interpretation is totally a process idealization in this sense. Because nature is temporal, it keeps changing and changing. Language is a part of this changing process and it is almost like a living organism. According to Saussure (2011 pg. 23) the written form and the spoken form of language contains some different meanings. "*Language and writing are two distinct systems of signs; the second exists for the sole purpose of representing the first.*" When the oral form is transmitted to written text, a lack of meaning may appear. According to him, it can even be seen in daily life. He shows this changing process using examples of the different written and oral forms of the same words in different periods. These examples prove that language changes with time and that it is a living object.

Narratives also have living and flexible features too. Marie-Laure Ryan says that (2007 pg. 24) "*Narrative is about temporality of existence*" when she is trying to find the common features of narrative's definition. Narratives appear as a result of human interrelations in this temporal structure. Humans give names to the objects, idealize them and in this way, they build collective knowledge. The word "ideal" has a Platonic meaning in here. It has a meaning as a result of human beings' common decisions; their common will that these are the facts in a physical sense as a result of their common perceptions. They believe that these truly exist. The important thing is the commonality in their thoughts according to their perceptions. In exceptional cases, there can be some problems about some people's perceptions because of their disabilities involving their means of perception, but this does not change the common thoughts of all people's perceptions. Common perceptions provide common interpretations and common interpretations provide the name of objects given by human beings. This is the process of semiologic transmission by human beings.

Narratives also use this structure and they are constructed in this direction. Hayden White says, (1987, pg.1) "*Far from being a problem, then, narrative might well be considered a solution to a problem of general human concern, namely, the problem of how to translate knowing into telling.*" After creating interpretations humans can use narratives, they can narrate. The root of the word narrative comes from Latin "gnarus" ("knowing") and "narro" ("telling"). And even in old Sanskrit the root is similar from "gna" ("know"). White, H. (1987, pg.215) Even this linguistic connection represents the relationship of the process of human understanding and narratives in a semiologic way.

In this section, I endeavored to reveal the linguistic and semiological roots of narratives. How do narratives use the structure of linguistics within itself? Lots of narratologists used Ferdinand Saussure's ideas to answer this question. Even structuralists base their narrative theories directly on linguistics. So I focused on Saussure's ideas in this section. And I showed briefly how narrative constructs itself through linguistics and semiology.

The roots of narratives are numerous, but it has been accepted as a sub-discipline of literary theory. Narratology has developed in this direction. Also, it has been influenced by semiology and linguistic. As I explained in this chapter, it is hard to define narrative briefly. It has lots of features even for its academic meaning. So I endeavored to summarize different definitions of different scholars about narrative. Then, I analysed the academic development process of narrative studies. Finally, I created a section concerning linguistics and semiology, and their relationship with narrative to reveal their influence on narratives.

3. CHARACTER AND NARRATIVE

In this chapter I am going to analyse the elements of narrative. Basically, we can separate narrative into two parts; the story and the discourse. In the first section, I will focus on their relation to each other. How do they work together? What are their functions in the narrative? After, I will make separate sections detailing the story and the discourse. Of course, both of them are crucial for narrative. I will try to give brief explanations of the elements that are found in the story and the discourse. Character is the main topic of my thesis. It is also an element of the story. I will take advantage of Chatman's distinction about the elements of narrative. So according to this, the narrative has a story, a story has characters. I am going to create a longer sub-section regarding characters as opposed to the other elements of story. In this way, I will construct the theoretical perspective for my analysis.

3.1 STORY AND DISCOURSE DISTINCTION

In this section I will focus on the meanings of the two components of narrative; the story and the discourse. First of all, I will try to show their definitions regarding the discipline of narratology. Because, they also have other meanings, even if these different usages may create confusion. The view drawn by theorists is enough to understand the different kinds of concepts that come from with the different meanings the words represent. Because consequently, they depend on similar roots. They affect and are affected by each other.

Basically a story is, what is told in a narrative and a discourse is, how each has been told. Every step of a narrative, like every sentence of a novel, every brush stroke of a painting or every frame of a movie, the story and its discourse are bound to each other

in a special way, and this characteristic relationship constitutes the narrative. Seymour Chatman believes, (1978, pg.31) *"What is communicated is story, the formal content element of narrative; and it is communicated by discourse, the formal expression element."* Discourse affects story and each completes the other. They have a continuing relationship with each other. The construction of a narrative follows this structure.

In everyday usage, people use the word 'story' instead of narrative. In this sense, story represents the meaning of narrative for ordinary people. But in an academic way, the story is the content element of the narrative. In that regard, narrative is a less well-known word, because of the traditional usage of the word 'story'. Monika Fludernik also points to this meaning of the word 'story'. (2006, pg, 5) *"Traditionally, a story is understood as a sequence of events that has a beginning, a middle and an end. It normally creates suspense as a result of complications in the middle part that are cleared up when these conflicts are resolved at the end of the work."* As we see from this definition of the story, it almost looks like it has all the features of a narrative. With this kind of explanation we cannot understand the roles of the content element (story) and the expression element (discourse). We cannot understand how they work and how they form the narrative. We need the contribution of the concept 'discourse' to understand scientific functioning of the story in narrative clearly.

Monika Fludernik (2006 pg. 8) says about the function of discourse,

It should be noted that, for many narratologists, the story level is a kind of langue or system, whereas the narrative discourse (i.e. the narrative text as we encounter it in the arrangement of sentences and paragraphs that we are reading) can be interpreted as parole (manifestation).

The crucial thing is that discourse most of the time changes the structure of narrative. It is the author's way of expressing the perspective of himself/herself. In a general way, we see how in art history, we can notice artistic 'movements'. Every movement represents some specific ideas that caused new points of view. It is like the latest fashion, an *avant garde* in the related art form or in narratives (in general).

As I mentioned in chapter one, narratives are as old as the existence of humanity. Human beings use narratives as a result of their daily lives in order to express themselves, sometimes even just to put a verb after the subject. This situation leads us to the conclusion that these stories (and bear with me as in this paragraph I rather to prefer the word 'story' instead of 'narrative' because it is more common usage, and along with the evocation as I noted in the first paragraph) depend on history, and they are as old as humanity. This means a lot of stories have consisted of complete clichés. We are not able to progress, to repeatedly tell same stories that we assume to be new. But this situation is understandable because most of them have been forgotten, they have not been recorded, sometimes we do not even notice their existence. So, we keep telling 'new' ones. Especially the stories that take shape around certain themes like love, longing, separation, heroism, reunion, love of nature, revenge, etc. They are common themes for all humans, beyond cultural codes. Although the structure of languages, geographies, political movements make them separate, and take them far away, we can see that we all they share common stories, and we are still sharing them with each other. Of course, I do not ignore the fact that stories can change from culture to culture, but I am pointing to their similar features and roots. In this aspect, the question of, how the is narrative told has an important role, this is called the discourse. Author awareness that human beings are always telling the same stories, push the authors. There is a struggle to produce a unique narrative, and this shows itself especially in its discourse. They try to find new ways to tell the same story. It is an effort they make to create changing on the level of representation. They focus on the adjustment of the discourse's elements. So the discourse has continually been changing in parallel to modern requirements. It the most up to date feature for a narrative. This does not mean that stories are not renewed, but the crucial thing that makes a narrative modern is the discourse. It is always changing and developing.

Now I will explain discourse's modern features with examples from cinema. Cinema as a young form of art has opened ways to create new gambits. Even if commercial pressures created obstacles for these developments, the corner stones of the history of cinema consist of these experimental movements around discourse. Film makers wanted

to obtain the effect of "almost the real", making adjustments within the discourse. And editing gives them lots of possibilities to change the way the discourse is manifested.

We can take Pudovkin's ideas that reflect the power of cinematic elements to lead an audience's thoughts through discourse. It suggests a manipulative approach, and that reflects the formalist features of Soviet Russian Cinema.

Vsevolod Pudovkin (1970, pg 70)

The lens of the camera replaces the eye of the observer, and the changes of angle of the camera directed now on one person, now on another, now on one detail, now on another must be subject to the same conditions as those of the eyes of the observer. The film technician, in order to secure the greatest clarity, emphasis, and vividness, shoots the scene in separate pieces and, joining them and showing them, directs the attention of the spectator to the separate elements, compelling him to see as the attentive observer saw. From the above is clear the manner in which editing can even work upon the emotions. Imagine to yourself the excited observer of some rapidly developing scene.

This was the goal of the experimental research of Soviet filmmakers at the beginning of 20th century. They tried to discover new discourses for cinema using formalist settings. Those attempts reveal themselves especially in editing. They tried to link short plans and they made quick edits to create a strong impact on the audience's (reader's) minds. They attributed critical values to editing. With the capabilities of editing, they tried to insert the audience into the action.

Formalist directors used a quick montage to establish an influence on audience. But let's look at this from a different aspect. Inserting the audience into the narration through these artificial methods can also break an audience's connection to the movie. If the audience finds the narration unnatural, they will not be able to continue concentrating on the film. I will try to explain this situation by using a different approach. The opposite example of fast editing, are found in the ideas of André Bazin (1967, pg. 35) "*That depth of focus brings the spectator into a relation with the image closer to that which he enjoys with reality.*". In his arguments, he obviously defends that staging in depth and in long takes creates an effect on the thoughts of the audience so they really feel as if they were in the scene. According to this approach, those long takes give the

audience a familiar feeling or an impression that is like their daily life experiences. In his way, he says that long shots are more similar to the way we view in our daily lives. And it is a useful method to create verisimilitude.

According to André Bazin (1967, pg. 36)

That it implies, consequently, both a more active mental attitude on the part of the spectator and a more positive contribution on his part to the action in progress. While analytical montage only calls for him to follow his guide, to let his attention follow along smoothly with that of the director who will choose what he should see, here he is called upon to exercise at least a minimum of personal choice. It is from his attention and his will that the meaning of the image in part derives.

Basically, the attempts that are related with the discourse of cinema can show us discourse's relative nature from person to person. Each tries to reach same aim through completely different methods involving the mode of discourse. Because of this reason, discourse can make the narrative much more personal and modern.

The academic use of story and discourse are different from their everyday meanings. In fact, without defining their meaning it is hard to explain what the narrative is. So this section tries to remove the confusions around those concepts. I gave the definition of story and discourse. Also I endeavored to explain the relationship between story and discourse in this section. How do they work together? How do they constitute the narrative? Now I will continue with their elements.

3.2 STORY

After defining the story and its relationship to discourse, I will explore a story's participants in this section. What is necessary for a story? Seymour Chatman (1978, pg.19) divides it into two part: events and existents. For him, events have actions and happenings and existents have characters and settings. Also, we need timeline for our events and a space to link our existents together. As I noted before my basic aim will be to explore characters within narratives. However, I need to locate place of the character and show its relationship to other elements of narrative.

3.2.2 Existents (Settings and Characters)

In this sub-section, I will continue with a story's element namely the existents. The existents include the character(s) and the setting(s). However because of my priorities within my thesis I will make a special sub-section for the characters. In this sub-section I am going to analyse similarities and differences between the settings and the characters and to clarify character's position in narrative. We can say that they are the objects of the story world. Uri Margolin says, (2007, pg. 71) *"Once a story world is established, one needs to map out its inhabitants by answering the questions who/what exists in this world, and in what mode."* So I would like to mention how we can distinguish a character as an existent in this sub-section. But I also supply brief definitions about settings, existents and of course the concept of "space".

I want to continue with Chatman's distinction about existents (1978, pg. 18). We can also use the word "space" instead of existents. Space also helps the reader identify with a narratives. With the figuration of space, a reader can position himself/herself into the narrative. Chatman explains narrative space in this way, (1978, pg. 138) *"Abstract narrative space contains, in clear polarity, a figure and a ground. Just as we can distinguish, in a painted portrait, the person from the background against which he or she is posed, so we can distinguish the character from the setting in a story"*. So we need a figure and a ground. In this sense, the character represents the figure, the setting(s) represent the ground. If we return to Uri Morgolin's question in the first paragraph, the answer of 'who' would be the character, and answer of 'what' would be the setting(s). We can take space as an empty and infinite place. The author puts the objects in it, in order to show what is in his/her imagination, therefore the narrative space has been constructed by the author.

Every objects that is in the space except characters, constitutes the settings. According to Seymour Chatman (1978, pg.138) *"The setting 'sets the character off' in the usual figurative sense of expression; it is the place and collection of objects 'against which' his actions and passions appropriately emerge."* A question emerges between characters and settings, what kinds of things can be accepted as a character, which ones

as a setting? How can we distinguish characters and settings? In the narrative chapter, I quoted Monika Fludernik who said that (2006 pg. 6) narrative needs "...human or human-like (antropomorphic) protagonist at the centre." Should we count every human figure that narrative has a character? Can there be other characters that are not humans, things like inorganic objects, trees or animals? At this point, we should consider some norms. Seymour Chatman (1978, pg.139) suggests three norms; these are biology, identity and importance. Even if these norms do not necessarily work in all cases. The most effective norm is importance. A character should carry importance within the story. Importance about character means; if we take this specific character from story, we lose important things about narrative. From a biological perspective, we take it for granted to accept animals as characters instead of humans because of the great influence of fables such as Jean de La Fontaine and other authors. Also in the genre of fantasy, lots of things can be counted as characters. Of course, this is not limited to the genre of fantasy. These kinds of examples also can appear in mythology or science fictions as well as other genres. Science fiction can be an extreme, thought good example in this regard. Can we say that *the computer H.A.L.* in Stanley Kubrick's *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968) is not a character? Almost everything is constructed around this computer in the movie. We can extend this explanation with many more examples. Like the creatures *Ents* from Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* (1954). They are the shepherds of the forest but they look like trees. They have the shape of ordinary trees. But without a doubt, they are the crucial characters of the novel. How about an ordinary tree that is seen in the movie version of *Lord of the rings-Two Towers* (2002)? Can we accept the trees of Fangorn Forest as characters? Of course, we cannot accept them; they should be viewed as a setting. But Fangorn Forest as a whole plays a crucial role in this narrative. What should we say about this then? In general, this argument covers a grey area. The reason for this is we cannot count perfect norms to deal with this issue. Despite this, every norm give us a view point.

Another crucial point emerges about the narrative space's fictional situation. In the fictional world of narratives, of course, we do not have to consider the real measurements of dimensions or how they would be in the real world. The author constructs those places parallel to his/her intentions or what his/her narrative requires.

However, he/she has to consider the big picture in the end; it is related to a reader's perception that is shaped as a result of their experiences from daily life. An author can be free to send his/her character miles away in five seconds, but he/she should explain this situation in a reasonable way, otherwise, the narrative loses its plausibility. And plausibility is the thing that provides to link between narrative and the reader.

As a result, after defining existents in the story, now we have a clear picture of where the character is in the narrative. So existents include both settings and characters. I endeavored to give the differences between those two concepts. I also tried to explain which hypothetical borders, separate them. I expounded on what kind of norms we can use; Is it a character or setting? But in the end they both serve the narration together. The author puts his/her characters and their background into a space. So, space is also one of the important things that shape who the character is. And, as I am to mention in next sub-section, it is a method through which character is constructed too.

2.2.3 Character

How should we define character? The answer to this question will be my first aim in this sub-section. After that, I will search for criteria behind the selection of the characters by authors. Then I will talk about some key concepts related with characters like, masterplots, stereotypes and like that. At the end of this sub-section, I will show different methods for character construction for different mediums.

I gave some definitions in the last sub-section about characters, now I will give another brief, but clear, definition in Uri Margolin's words, (2007 pg.66) "*In the widest sense, 'character' designates any entity, individual or collective normally human or human-like – introduced in a work of narrative fiction...*, Character can be succinctly defined as a story world participant." Uri Margolin (2007 pg.71) offers two main conditions, namely, "*identity and survival (continuity, sameness)*" for something to be counted as a character in the fictional world of narratives. To clarify "what is character" in narratives, we need to have these kinds of norms. I mentioned the same dilemma in a previous sub-section (the differences of settings and characters). Norms reflect every scholar's

personal viewpoint; they take shape as a result of a scholar's works so we should take a view of those norms along with where they stand to form a complete picture.

Narrative has a story and a story has characters but there are arguments that still stand about the elements that narrative contains. According to one assumption, should we give prominence to any elements of narrative more than any of the other ones?

According to Robert Mc Kee (1997 pg.100)

Plot or character? Which is more important? This debate is as old as the art. Aristotle weighed each side and concluded that story is primary, character secondary. His view held sway until, with the evolution of the novel, the pendulum of opinion swung the other way. By the nineteenth century many held that structure is merely an appliance designed to display personality, that what the reader wants is fascinating, complex characters. Today both sides continue debate without a verdict. The reason for hung jury is simple: The argument is specious.

Actually, it is hard to separate narratives' elements and take them just as one piece, because every element in the narrative depends on the other elements and they construct the narrative together. Robert Mc Kee says (1997, pg.8) "*Content (setting, characters, ideas) and form (selection and arrangement of events) require, inspire, and mutually influence one another.*" But the thing that appears is sometimes one of them is put forward by the creator of the narrative. As I said, it can be the story, it can also be character. It can be other elements of the narrative too. I want to mention an example from the film by the director Christopher Nolan. He put discourse in a primary place in his film *Memento* (2001) and he told the story from the end to the beginning, to create a strong impact on the audience, and it reflects his main character's amnesia. Even though some elements stand out much more in the narrative as a result, the narrative is a coherent whole and every element of the narrative supports the others.

3.2.3.1 Choosing a character

When we analyse a character of a narrative, the crucial thing to realize is how the character is designed by the author for the narrative. In other words, what is the exact reason the characters appears in the narrative? From this aspect, the features of the character are brought forward. What are these features? What are these used for? How

can an author construct his/her characters in the narrative? Answers that we give to these questions show us the functional role of the character in the narrative.

Uri Margolin says (2007, pg. 68)

While authors can assign their characters any properties they wish, in practice the properties authors assign to their characters are governed by some principle(s) of selection, ranging from lifelikeness (verisimilitude) to an ideological, thematic, aesthetic, or purely inter-literary one, e.g., parody of an earlier text and its characters.

When the author selects and designs his/her character for the narrative, one of the factors that the author is affected by is the question; did this character exist before? Was it used before in previous narratives? What are the author's options in this sense? 1-) The author can create a unique character that has never existed before specially for his/her narrative. There have been lots of authors who have created unique characters. It is also one way to create successful and unique narratives. As Uri Margolin posits, (2007, pg.79) "... in which case one acknowledges encountering a new, hitherto unfamiliar kind of character, which does not match any stereotype in the reader's extant knowledge base. Many innovative writers often seek to create precisely this kind of character'' 2-) On the other hand, an author can use characters from other narratives directly. We can see these kinds of characters especially in TV series, serial movies, and in some serial novels. 3-) Another way is that the author can construct characters using aspects of the characters from other narratives which were created in the past. This should not be considered a direct usage of other characters; but we can view it as a kind of utilisation. Utilising the influence of these characters works on readers and uses common knowledge as well. Some fixed meanings are created from exact usages. Common knowledge is full of this information, these codes. This situation causes a necessary awareness. These are the rules that no one can avoid when playing the game. But, there are exceptions where those norms can be broken. And it lets us discover unique kind of characters, like the first option that I mentioned in the first paragraph. However this is a kind of intertextuality and it is not only limited to characters, it is also valid uses in other elements of narrative.

According to Uri Margolin (2007, pg.78)

Once a certain number of properties have been accumulated, they often activate a general knowledge structure stored in long-term memory under which these properties can be subsumed, structured, and integrated into a character model.....The character models in question include schemas and stereotypes pertaining to both world knowledge and to the literary encyclopedia, i.e., knowledge about the structure and evolution of the literary system itself. Once a fit between data and category has been established, categorization takes place, and the reader may now proceed top down, integrating all the information available to this point, filling in the mental model, formulating expectations and explaining stored information, for example by relating an individual's action to intentions, beliefs, or dispositions associated with this category.

As I frequently mention in this work, this situation points to the formation of stereotypes. The author of the narrative can create these kinds of characters consciously or he/she can construct these kinds of characters unconsciously as a result the influence of common knowledge. From this point, a reader's situation is brought the fore, a reader has a lot of previous experience with narratives and now he or she encounters new one. Uri Margolin (2007, pg.70) asks some questions about this reflex of the reader, "*Can the reader carry over the description of a literary figure from one text to another? Can we unite the descriptions of the same-named character in different texts by the same author or by different ones in order to get the complete story of X?*" In this sense, the author should consider that the reader has a kind of reflex that makes links between different narratives which have similar and/or the same characters. So the choosing of a character for a narrative causes an interaction between the author's will and reader's experiences and expectations. This situation causes an interaction which allows fictional characters to be close to living and/or real characters.

If we go back to the author's choice in creating characters for his/her new narrative, we may also find some clichés. There are concepts we can use to analyse these clichés. Masterplot is one of these concepts. Masterplots are the core of stories. Masterplots impact the mind of society as a consequence of the stories that are told. As a result of constant use they have turned into a kind of phenomena, like proverbs and idioms. They do not represent values just for one society; they can spread and grow roots and can affect other societies as well. These masterplots even play crucial roles in people's daily lives and habits.

Stereotype is another concept that can define those clichés. Especially it is used to defined cliché characters. In this regard when readers meets stereotypic characters they set up some similarities and relations among themselves and these stereotypic characters. H. Porter Abbott (2002, pg.42) gives an example from the tale *Cinderella*. I will give another example that is familiar for a Turkish reader, when a Turkish reader sees a desperate and hopeless love story, he/she can easily remembers the story of *Leyla and Mecnun*. This story is based on the Arabic legend and the writer Fuzuli wrote about this legend in the format of a story that is called a *mesnevi*. (1535). These hopeless and unfortunate characters also remind us of the whole masterplot of this same story, and we can think the opposite is truen as well. H. Porter Abbott says, (2002, pg. 45) "*A masterplot comes equipped with types. When a type does not come to life in a narrative and we see the character only as a formula for character, we call it a stereotype.*"

Chatman believes the power of those concepts comes from the notion of verisimilitude, (1978, pg.95) "*In short, the characterization of plot into macrostructures and typologies depends upon an understanding of cultural codes and their interplay with literary and artistic codes and codes of ordinary life. It relies heavily on verisimilitude.*" I will mention verisimilitude and the other concepts which are related to this subject in details, in the reader's situation sub-section.

I want to mention E. M. Forster's distinction about character, to make the position of the stereotype clearer. It is a similar distinction, which shows stereotypes function as a character. He divides character into 'flat' and 'round'.

Forster, E.M. (1985, pg. 67)

Flat characters were called "humorous" in the seventeenth century, and are sometimes called types, and sometimes caricatures. In their purest form, they are constructed round a single idea or quality: when there is more than one factor in them, we get the beginning of the curve towards the round.

H. Porter Abbott, (2002, pg. 126) also follows this distinction, he says that round characters "*...have varying degrees of depth and complexity...*" He also says (2002, pg. 127) "*the complexity of round characters seems closer to the way people really are.*"

and his inferences about flat characters are (2002, pg. 126) "...frequently found in comedy, satire, and melodrama, flat characters are limited to a narrow range of predictable behaviours." So flat characters are almost a kind of stereotype, if we compare this to stereotypes, they almost represent the same thing. However "flat character" is a concept which is particular narrative studies. On the other hand, stereotypes also contain representative features of society and it is a much more common concept than the concept of 'flat character' in general.

3.2.3.2 The methods for constructing a character

One of the important features that determine character is the physical appearance of the character. Uri Margolin states, (2007, pg. 77) "*In literary contexts physical features of an individual's appearance, gestures, mannerism, dress, and natural and human made environment are indicators for inferences about his or her mental and moral features.*" For example, a pair of glasses affects the features ascribed to the character. When we see a character in blue coveralls and a screw wrench in his hand, we start to make assumptions about his job and his life, we think that he is a repairman or worker.

Another way of constructing a character is showing the character in certain places which have been constructed with some very specific details. Gerald Prince says, (1982, pg. 33) "*In such narratives, the place of narration sometimes functions thematically, structurally, or as a characterization device.*" We can get information from the places the character is. I mentioned previously that in narratology those places are called settings. So those settings which surround a character are one way to construct a character. It can be a crowded street, a lonely cottage in the forest or a cold meeting room in an office. With these kinds of details, we can easily understand a character's inner emotions and behaviours.

Events can reflect some features about a character too. The reactions that a character has towards events and the events that a character creates can include a lot of details about

the character. Events are the representative forms of a character's behaviours. For example, the angry and exaggerated reaction of a woman towards the girl who talks to her mobile phone in a bus can give us some information about the woman's character.

Dialogue is another source that gives us information about characters. Dialogue is the verbal form that shows characters' relationship with other characters. Also, interior monologues, stream of consciousness's, even the choice of narration level can be used as a method of constructing a character.

According to Uri Margolin (2007, pg. 72)

For the purposes of literary analysis it is useful to group the kinds of properties a character can possess into several dimensions: physical; behavioural (action-related) and communicative; and mental, with the latter being further subdivided into perceptual, emotive, volitional, and cognitive.

Character is the main object an author creates in the narrative. But the other components of narrative also have an influence on characters. So we should think of narrative as a complete device along with all its components.

I will continue with character construction in cinema. Substantially, cinema is a visual art form. If we remember Aristotle's distinction, cinema widely uses mimetic methods. (1967, pg.13) It has the possibility to "show" anything that it has to. It is necessary for the process of constructing character as well.

Seymour Chatman says (1978, pg. 106,107)

Finally, the cinema cannot describe in the strict sense of the word, that is, arrest the action. It can only "let be seen." There are tricks for doing that, close-ups, certain camera movements, and so on. But these are hardly descriptions in the normal sense of the word. Filmmakers may use a narrator's "voice-over"; but they find this effect inartistic, and generally limit it to introductions. Too much overt verbal description suggests a lack of faith in the medium, the kind that Doris Lessing would deplore. So the cinema must seek out obvious visual symbolic props.

Actors and actresses are the main vehicles for creating a character in cinema. Other methods of constructing a character follow different choices, like a character's actions.

William Guynn says, (2011, pg. 42,43)

...author defines characters through the decisions they make and the actions they take. We come to understand characters through their behaviour, particularly in the cinema, the most "behaviourist" of narrative forms, where we have limited direct access to the characters' inner emotions and thought processes.

A character's relationship with other characters, especially through dialogue provides a film's verbal features, which means it is linguistic, and it is evidence that shows cinema is a hybrid narrative form. We also see the spaces that surround characters, etc. and this comes after the choice of an actor/actresses. But, we should take note that making these distinctions about these methods are just an assumption for making our analysis, a character is what is being created through all of this.

When we think about constructing a character from the perspective of cinema the choice of an actor or actress plays a decisive role. Especially if we think about the actors' or actresses' past roles in other films. These have a lot of meaning as a subject of a narrative by themselves. These meanings are determined as a result of a consensus between the audience's demands and the creator's aims. So in cinema, filmmaker and audience attribute some meaning to these physical bodies. It means something that we can call 'screen persona'. The choice of an actor and actress and their screen persona are important ways that a filmmaker constructs a character. In cinema this process is called casting. The basic criterion is suitability for casting. Does the physical appearance, acting ability, voice of the actor or actress embody the requirements of that character? In this sense can it serve the narrative?

Now that we have attributed the importance of a character's physical appearance, I want to cite more evidence about why their physical appearance is important. This is related with the continuity of their physical appearances.

Uri Margolin states (2007, pg.75)

How much can a character change and still remain the same individual?..., ...Normally, characters will identify themselves from the inside (the mental dimension), so that as long as they preserve their memory of past experiences they will think of themselves as the same continuing individual, even if their body is radically transformed. This applies, for example, to all metamorphosis stories from Ovid to Kafka. Their world mates, on the other hand, are limited to judgment on the basis of physical, behavioural, and communicative features, so that a radical change along these lines will lead to the denial of individual continuity/sameness.

So how can we change the physical appearance of a character through the possibilities of cinema? Make up, costumes, special effects are some methods that are used to aid this change. Recently new computer technologies in cinema have opened new ways to

construct characters with digital images. For example, animation was accepted as a genre within cinema, in the beginning of this genre, animation was made by two dimensional drawings, but with time it has developed through inventions and innovations. Today it is possible to create a complete animated film that depends only on computer generated images. Even in those films using animation as a form of narrative, their stories depend on creative character constructions. Reality that is reconstructed using the contributions of technology is another way of imitating life. Those animators also cannot avoid acting methods. They have to imitate the movements of a real body or to mimics the notion of a real face. However, animations have extended our imagination about characters, just as fables once did. Readers can accept an animal, a robot or an inorganic thing as a character without surprise, no matter what changed in relation to those animated characters. The perception process of the viewer does not change. We cannot change the atomic particles of our visual codes. This is similar to the relationship with between the signs within of linguistics and literature. So in the end, all these changes depend on the relationship of sender and receiver, their mutual experience by means of their perception. Whether as a result of a stroke of a paint brush or as a result of a computer generated image, the physical meanings of the characters can change but they will definitely be perceived as alive.

We can use literature as an example in regards to constructing a character, it happens with the possibilities of linguistics like everything in literature as well. The author can describe his/her characters as long as he/she wants in literature. This can be seen as a result of literature's unique ability to create a relationship between story time and narration time. However, other mediums display similar possibilities; literature is the most suitable medium of all, to make these descriptions about characters.

A handicap of literature is, this cannot be shown visually. Regarding this, I should mention that this situation turns out to be an advantage, because each reader experiences and identifies with the story world in literature with a sense of special subjectivity. The reader personally contributes a lot to the spaces and characters of the narrative with his/her imagination.

According to Seymour Chatman (1978, pg.101)

Existents and their space, if "seen" at all, are seen in the imagination, transformed from words into mental projections. There is no "standard vision" of existents as there is in the movies. While reading the book, each person creates his own mental image of Wuthering Heights. But in William Wyler's screen adaptation, its appearance is determined for all of us. It is in this sense that verbal story-space is said to be abstract. Not non-existent, but a mental construct rather than an analogon.

This process is a special feature of literature. Vague descriptions of the things from the author make the impression on the reader much stronger because, this provokes the reader's imagination.

The author constructs his/her characters using the smallest particles (signs) of the languages according to the influence of cultural codes. So the relationship of the signs and the words create another meanings and this constitutes literature.

Peter Lamarque says (1996, pg 7)

On this view, characters are invented or stipulated by a human mind, and generated in particular cultural and historical circumstances through the use of language, following certain literary-artistic conventions. They are ultimately semiotic constructs or creatures of the word, and it is the socially and culturally defined act of fictional storytelling that constitutes and defines them.

Every sign and every relationship between signs has the capacity to produce new meanings, and every one of them has cultural influence. This is the area of "telling" in narration.

After defining what is meant by character. I pointed to a character's position in narrative. Then I focused on the which kind of important criteria an author decides to implement when he/she is choosing his/her characters. Of course, there are a lot of reasons behind this process of choosing. In this sense some key points stand out like the interaction around all narratives, stereotypes, masterplots etc. They form the skeletal structure of my thesis about character within narrative. Stereotyping is common for all humanbeings, even if it is done in a negative way. However we cannot refrain, from using it. We are consciously forming everything through physical appearances in our first interactions. Obviously, this makes a strong impression. So everyone approaches the characters of the narrative in this way. It is possible, but hard to break the

conditioning of the approach known as common stereotyping. And it has a direct relationship to the author's and the reader's cultural and social background. This is why I want to write about these concepts in detail. And at the end, in the last part of the sub-section "character", I spoke about the methods of character construction in general and within different mediums.

3.2.4 Time

I will write about the basic concepts and workings of narrative time in this sub-section. First of all, narrative time is a fictional thing and the author uses it according to his/her needs. I will write about how methods of narrative time can be rendered. After I will talk about the ways narrative time is used to create different interactions on reader.

Within a narrative, time occurs in two different forms. One is related with narrative's story, the period of time the events are supposed to have taken place. The other one is related to the narrative's discourse or how the author wants to tell those events and in which order and in what length. In this regard, the author has the possibility of arranging both story time and discourse time. That means time in narrative is a fictional element. Seymour Chatman says, (1978, pg. 62) *"There is reading-time and there is plot-time, or, as I prefer to distinguish them, discourse-time the time it takes to peruse the discourse and story-time, the duration of the purported events of the narrative."*

Narratologists have tried to find suitable methods to analyse narrative's time. Because of its fictional features, time is open to different uses in narrative. Gerard Genette defined three essential methods for this type of analysis.

Genette, G. (1980, pg. 35)

"...connections between the temporal order of succession of the events in the story and the pseudo-temporal order of their arrangement in the narrative, which will be the subject of the first chapter; connections between the variable duration of these events or story sections and the pseudo-duration (in fact, length of text) of their telling in the narrative connections, thus, of speed which will be the subject of the second chapter; finally, connections of frequency, that is (to limit myself to an approximate formulation), relations between the repetitive capacities of the story and those of the narrative, relations to which the third chapter will be devoted. "

Genette's distinction affected almost every scholar who works on narrative studies. We can count the methods he describes like this: order, duration and frequency. Teresa Bridgeman (2007, pg. 54) summarized them as *"The first relates to the order of events; the second concerns how long events or scenes last; and the third concerns how often an event occurs."* So I will now speak about them under separate headings.

3.2.4.1 Order

The author of the narrative does not have to chronologise events. He/she is free to relay them in an irregular order. Gerald Prince says, (1982, pg. 48) *"Events can be recounted in the order of their occurrence or in a different order."* It is a choice of narrative's discourse, but this choice affects story time too. Let us consider a story that depends on three events, chronologically (A), (B) and (C). The author can tell the story in this way (B), (A) and (C) and this is related to the author's choice. In cinema especially directors change the order of the narrative through the possibilities offered through editing. Also techniques like flash forward or flashbacks are common and these techniques are also related to the narrative's order. Logic lies in the author's intention. Perhaps he/she intends to create suspense or the air of mystery. As a result, the author chooses the given order of events for the reader.

3.2.4.2 Duration

Duration emerges from the relationship between story time and discourse time. Seymour Chatman says, (1978, pg.67) *"Duration concerns the relation of the time it takes to read out the narrative to the time the story-events themselves lasted."* The given time of discourse and story do not have to be equal and fit each other. Monika Fludernik says that they are not isochronic lots of time. (2006, pg. 32) And there are some other uses of time related with its duration.

According to Teresa Bridgeman (2007, pg. 58)

"The main categories suggested by narratologists are descriptive pause (maximum textual space, zero story time), slow-down or stretch (textual space greater than story time), scene (textual space equal to story time), summary (textual space less than story time), and ellipsis (zero textual space, variable story time)."

An author can use these methods in order to further his/her narrative needs. William Guynn says that; (2011, pg. 45) Sometimes the author does not show all the events, and hides them until the right time comes. It is a way of creating maximum impact on the readers. This feature is also related with narrative's rhythm. We can say that it is one of the adjustment tools for a narrative's tempo.

3.2.4.3 Frequency

An author can repeat the same story events, several times. There may be a specific reason or purpose for this. The number of times an event is narrated can influence the reader's interpretation of a narrative. Teresa Bridgeman says (2007, pg. 59) "*Repetition involves more than one occurrence at the level of discourse of a single story event, while iteration involves the single telling of multiple events.*" For example in William Faulkner's (1929) novel *The Sound and the Fury*, Faulkner repeats the same story from the viewpoint of different characters to reflect their different inner thoughts about the same events. It can be used for different reasons. So, like the example of *The Sound and the Fury* repetition can be a suitable tool for relativity. Another example of this can be seen in Akira Kurosawa's film *Rashomon* (1950). He tells the same story from the viewpoints of different witnesses in the trial in order to emphasize the relativity of thoughts and the hard nature of our judgements.

3.2.4.4 Reader's interpretation and time

Another important issue regarding narrative time is its affects. I endeavored to show the relationship between the reader's experiences and the structure of narrative. Time is another tool that plays a crucial role within this relation. As a result of the temporality structure of time, human beings can interpret events within their own minds. As Teresa

Bridgeman states, (2007, pg. 56) "...time becomes subject to personal experience, perceptions, and memories." Every event that a human perceives collects in a human being's mind. These constitute memories. So narrative time also has a direct relationship and interaction with a reader's memories. It has influencing power on the reader.

There are some special concepts for directing the interpretations of the reader's interpretation. I want to mention Meir Sternberg's selection below and his thoughts on how time can be used as an effective method to awaken readers' attention. He points to three concepts: suspense, curiosity and surprise.

According to him (2001, pg. 117)

Suspense arises from rival scenarios about the future: from the discrepancy between what the telling lets us readers know about the happening (e.g., a conflict) at any moment and what still lies ahead, ambiguous because yet unresolved in the world. Its fellow universals rather involve manipulations of the past, which the tale communicates in a sequence discontinuous with the happening. Perceptibly so, for curiosity: knowing that we do not know, we go forward with our mind on the gapped antecedents, trying to infer (bridge, compose) them in retrospect. For surprise, however, the narrative first unobtrusively gaps or twists its chronology, then unexpectedly discloses to us our misreading and enforces a corrective rereading in late re-cognition. The three accordingly cover among them the workings that distinguish narrative from everything else, because they exhaust the possibilities of communicating action: of aligning its natural early-to-late development with its openness to untimely, crooked disclosure.

These feelings come to us as a consequence of time tricks, repetitions, gaps, order, etc. Also, those concepts are considered to be methods of manipulation. In this sense, they are suitable methods for narratives. Because in a very basic way narratives depend on having an effect on the reader.

As a result, the author has to use narrative time economically, for narrative's rhythm. If we talk about narrative time, we should consider both story time and discourse time. To understand the story, we need a timeline for events. On the other hand, discourse time makes the narrative and its story much more plausible for reader because of the intention and forethought of the author.

3.2.5 Events

Events of the narrative have to gather together in an exact order. This order and the relationship of the events give its meaning to narrative. The order and the relationship between events should be explainable as a causal whole. This sub-section will first examine this causal relationship then, the meaningful order of the events in narrative. Events have a certain degree of importance in narratives, so I will continue with this line of analysis and categorization for the topic of events.

Events are one of the crucial elements of narrative. Basically, events answer the question of what happened in the story. Seymour Chatman (1978, pg. 44) divides the events into two part, according to how they occur within the narrative; actions and happenings. Actions are brought about by the characters. Action means what characters do. Happenings on the other hand are brought by things other than characters such as settings. In this sense, according to Seymour Chatman (1978, pg. 45) characters can be affected by and through happenings. They are not the subjects of happenings. They are in a passive position in regards to happenings.

Events are related to each other. Even if the way they relate can change, they are connected to each other through causality. According to Seymour Chatman (1978, pg. 45) Causality gives the meaning and links all the events. *"Their sequence, runs the traditional argument, is not simply linear but causative. The causation may be overt, that is, explicit, or covert, implicit."* Even events that look independent from each other should be considered to be a part of a meaningful whole, following the author's creativity. As a result, they determine the perceptions of the reader according to the author's wish. So, this is a kind of implicit causality as Chatman has explained.

In the end of Wong Kar Wai's film, *In the Mood for Love* (2000), there is a non-related scene from a documentary about the political situation of Cambodia. This scene has no

direct relation to the movie, but somehow it fits this film's mood. This can be seen as an extreme example of implicit causality. Chatman also says that modern authors change the concept of causality in this sense. (1978, pg. 47) And with the contributions of those authors, now we have a different flavour of causality. However these days breaking the strict idea of causality, seems like reaching a new kind of discourse, so this also means a new narrative experience. And modern readers are ready for this new sort of experience because of their many past experiences about narratives. They also want to try new things.

Another important distinction appears about classification of the events which is in regards to their importance. In this regard, different scholars gave different names for almost the same types of distinctions. For example for the essential and crucial events of the story Roland Barthes (1975, pg. 248) uses "*nuclei*", Seymour Chatman (1985, pg. 53) uses "*kernels*", and H. Porter Abbott (2002, pg. 20) uses "*constituent events*". Existence of these kinds of events are crucial for the story. Without these kinds of events, we cannot talk about the same story as we had previously. In this regard, they cannot be removed from story without changing the structure and the meaning of the story. H. Porter Abbott says (2002, pg. 20) "*They are the turning points, the events that drive the story forward and that lead to other events.*" On the other hand, there are the events that are not crucial for narrative logic. For Barthes they are "*catalyzers*", for Chatman they are "*satellites*" and for Abbott they are "*supplementary events*". When these kinds of events are removed from the story, the narrative logic does not break but there can be lack in the richness of the story. As Seymour Chatman says (1978, pg. 54) "*...its omission will, of course, impoverish the narrative aesthetically.*" Of course these kinds analyses are made as a result of assumptions, so there are no clear borders between, the important events and the other type of events..

As a result, no author uses events that do not in some way serve what the author wants to tell. Narrative has to have coherence. The author designs the narrative according to a purpose. The existence of the events in the narrative and their relationship to each other

are considered following this purpose. In this sense; causality is something basic in narrative logic.

3.2.6 How Does the Narrative Makes Interact With a Reader

In this part I will try to focus on the effect of a narrative on an audience, reader or whomever is on the other side of the narrative and also the conditions that bring about these effects. I will use certain concepts to analyse these relationships. Narrative theorists to use these concepts to reveal their ideas and analyses about narrative. They are intertextuality, verisimilitude and naturalization. Even though, these concepts seem independent from each other narrative theorist used them together along with their interactions with each other. I will analyse these concepts together as well and will try to show the similarities and differences between among them.

3.2.6.1 The reader's situation

What should be mentioned about the contribution of these concepts are the past experiences of the reader. The readers use their past experiences when they are faced with a new narrative. They evaluate those narratives considering their experiences with other narratives. So, I will approach this chapter by analysing the factors that determine the reactions of the reader. The narrative habits of the reader play a crucial role when considering new narratives. So they can both implicitly and explicitly use previous materials and make comments on it without extra information. They put these meanings together the author of the narrative wanted. They fill in the blanks by using their previous and present (i.e. the related narrative) information about narratives. As a result a reader's reaction is also affected by the production process and it shows us how this interaction between narrative and reader works.

3.2.6.2 Verisimilitude

Verisimilitude is an imitative reality which is accepted as real through common sense according to people's common thoughts and their interactions as a result of their experiences of daily life. This comes as a result of people's common historical, social, and cultural backgrounds. You cannot find verisimilitude in nature itself, but you can see it in the world of imitations and reproductions. It is the re-use of something, but this re-use should have features that are consistent and familiar for everyone. When the imitation looks like the things that are accepted in common knowledge, it means that verisimilitude has been established. Chatman defines this concept 'Platonic' because of the ideal projections of reality. He says that "*Verisimilitude concerns not the accidentally real, but the essentially ideal*". The sources of verisimilitude depend on common knowledge. These sources are related to the daily lives of human beings and their experiences.

If considering verisimilitude in a narrative, it should reflect familiar things for readers from their lives. Verisimilitude helps to construct the plausibility of a narrative. Plausibility is necessary for narrative; otherwise, the author cannot establish motivation. From this concept, an author can open the practical path to transmit his/her ideas. This is why authors find this a suitable way to create their narratives. Authors construct the structures of narratives using certain elements and they put gaps in this structure on purpose, because they design it considering a reader's reactions. A reader starts to fill in those gaps using old experiences from life and previous narratives. Using verisimilitude in narrative is also related to the construction of the narrative coherence. It gains narrative substantiality and in this way it has a functional role in establishing a relationship between author and reader.

Verisimilitude also carries the features of intertextuality within itself. It does not matter that intertextuality is an interactive concept about whole texts. Verisimilitude has a wide variety of sources beyond this and can contain everything in life. Chatman reflects on

verisimilitude's wide projection in his book. (1978, pg. 50) "*According to the structuralists, the norm for verisimilitude is established by previous texts, not only actual discourses, but the 'texts' of appropriate behaviour in the society at large. Verisimilitude is an 'effect of corpus' or of 'intertextuality' (hence intersubjectivity).*"

3.2.6.3 Intertextuality

Intertextuality is a concept that is like an invisible interaction between whole texts. It can appear various ways. But mainly the mutual relationship of author and reader cause intertextuality. Other uses of intertextuality depend on this relationship. If we talk about this situation in regards to narratives, when an author puts something from other narratives into his/her narrative, or if the reader benefits from different texts in his/her process of reading, these situations cause the process known as intertextuality.

According to Michael Worton and Judith Still, (1990, pg 1.)

The theory of intertextuality insists that a text... cannot exist as a hermetic or self-sufficient hole, and so does not function as a closed system. This is for two reasons. First the writer is a reader of texts (in the broadest sense) before s/he is a creator of texts, and therefore the work of art is inevitably shot through with references, quotations and influences of every kind... Secondly, a text is available only through some process of reading; what is produced at the moment of reading is due to the cross-fertilization of the packaged textual material (say, a book) by all the texts which the reader brings to it.

If we take cinema as an example, the previous movies that the actors or actresses acted in, the actors or actresses physical appearance or their make up, the costumes that they wear, also their star personas and the technological features of the cameras and the other materials, all the cinematic elements that have an ability to produce or reproduce links between previous narratives can cause this activation and on the audience's (readers') minds. This concept highlights an important way to approach the history of cinema. The most important difference between cinema and literature in regards to the concept of intertextuality, are the materials used. Cinema uses various kinds of materials to show something to the viewer in order to showcase the author's intentions. But in literature the only materials that are used are letters, words and linguistic signs. Cinema uses

other materials, other elements that the medium itself demands. A director may use the same cinematographer for all of his/her other films. He/she also has to choose some actors and actresses from within this society. If we approach cinema from this side it cinema gets closer to an industry. The materials which cinema has to use affects the intertextuality operates within it.

Another problem that emerges here is in, what is settled in collective knowledge. Can we say that it is same for each individual? Do they have the same knowledge? If we approach this argument according to this aspect, is what is "understood" from the narrative by the reader what the creator wanted to convey. The amount of narratives will be equal to the number of readers who have read these narratives. Through we can also assume that the same reader can experience the same narrative different times and by bringing with him or herself different knowledge of world. Then we can also assume that this amount will greatly increase. In this sense, we can say that the amount of narrative is equal to number of reading. According to this definition, the idea that narrative consists of what the author wants to tell cannot hold. Obviously those who think this way also ignore the fact that every narrative contains some definitive materials. So there can be many common features in a reader's mind about the same narrative. This is what we call common knowledge and it causes intertextuality as a result of experiencing the narrative. But the dilemma it creates is understandable. Because, intertextuality can also exist without the author's will in it, in other words, without the author's intention. Therefore we can ask this question. Did the author construct this structure creating this interaction on purpose or is it just a result of coincidence? But even if it came to be in an unconscious way, the result will be the same for the reader and obviously, it will be inevitable. Of course, the reader can use other texts when he/she is dealing a new narrative that comes about in spite of the author's intention. It is not a clear process and we cannot deal with it easily. Most of the time, when it does appear, it appears on an unconscious level.

3.2.6.4 Naturalization

Let me begin this section with some definitions. To naturalize means "2. *To adopt (something foreign) into general use.*"¹ Naturalistic means, on the other hand "1. *derived from or closely imitating real life or nature.*"² In order to these definitions, We can define naturalization as changing something that is foreign, into something that has a general use and is accepted in society including common ideas. On the other hand when we check the dictionary we notice that the different meanings about naturalization. However the meaning that theorists use to reveal their ideas about narratology, and also the meaning I will use explaining the arguments in this part is going to be the one employing the adoptive process.

Naturalization is a relativity concept. Chatman states (1978, pg. 49) "*What constitutes 'reality' or 'likelihood' is a strictly cultural phenomenon, though authors of narrative fiction make it 'natural' But of course the 'natural' changes from one society to another, and from one era to another in the same society.*" Naturalization can change society to society and culture to culture if we are talking about a certain viewpoint of a certain society. This viewpoint always wants to see things that are natural to them. This is related to their habits, their culture etc. But a viewpoint is a living thing and it can be change with the contribution of foreign things. However, to want to make it natural is a kind of reflex. Members of this certain society criticise foreign things because of their cultural background. This background has its own cultural codes, which has shaped their knowledge.

Roland Barthes states, (1973, pg.18)

The statement is made in a collective and anonymous voice originating in traditional human experience. Thus, the unit has been formed by a gnomic code, and this code is one of the numerous codes of knowledge or wisdom to which the text continually refers; we shall call them in a very general way cultural codes (even though, of course, all codes are cultural), or rather, since they afford the discourse a basis in scientific or moral authority, we shall call them reference codes.

¹ -Definition of Naturalize <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/naturalization> [accessed 27 November 2012].

² -Definition of Naturalistic. <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/naturalistic> [accessed 27 November 2012].

After defining of naturalization, the main question is what is the relationship between naturalization and narrative? How does naturalization appear in narrative?

Chatman answers this question (1978, pg. 49)

Why should a theory of narrative structure require a discussion of the naturalization of narrative events to facts and to probabilities in the real world? Because the well-formedness of a narrative (that is, what makes it a narrative, good or bad, and not some other kind of text) depends on such questions.

As I said before we should think these concepts, verisimilitude and intertextuality together. Because, they are related to a reader's past experiences. I have endeavored to show the factors that determine the reader's past experiences. Briefly their experiences about life and other narratives shape their knowledge. Their judgements take shape from this cultural interaction. Without doubt, readers always search for plausible narratives. That is because the use of naturalization makes a narrative plausible for readers. The conditions of plausibility depend on how the reader constructs the structure of the narrative to sync with the reader's experience. This aim can also come in conflict with its author's intentions. An author always wants to make his/her story unique, but a narrative also has to be natural for the reader.

When we think of naturalization from the reader's point of view, identification takes an important place when he/she is involved with the narrative. A reader wants to feel like a part of the narrative. Point of view and narrative voice is also related with this identification. As an example, readers reflexively think that characters of narrative are also alive within the fiction world, as a result of its plausibility. Especially in the cinema, narration models have developed in this direction. Those attempts that are related to invisible or plausible narrations are also related to naturalization, they serve to naturalize narrative for the readers. That's how an author can use every kind of story, even non-realistic or fantastic ones in his/her narratives.

Chatman claims, (1978, pg. 51,52)

After all, the only requirement is plausibility. Improbable actions are permissible as long as they are accounted for or "motivated" in some way. Hence general commentary served to normalize difficult moments in classical fiction. No matter how ludicrous or arbitrary the explanation itself, the fact that it was proffered was enough to satisfy the need for decorous plausibility.

This occurs even in genres of cinema that have their own codes, and are accepted reality in the reader's mind, or in collective mind. So, as a result, naturalization does not mean that to it makes something as if it were natural. It is much closer to make something close to the world's standards of something that already exists, to create something that appears generally in the real world and in the world of whole narratives.

As a result, we can say that even if the methods can be changed according to the possibilities of the story and the discourse of a narrative, the crucial thing is in preparing the right structure that shows useful ambience that is familiar to an audience's experience.

3.3 DISCOURSE

As I have pointed before, discourse is the way the story is told when the author constructs his/her narrative. In Seymour Chatman's (1978, pg. 9) words "...'*discourse*' is the means through which the story is transmitted." Now, I will detail the ways an author chooses, to tell his/her story.

If we take discourse as a transmission process as Chatman suggests, then what does the story transmit and between which persons? How are those persons defined and analysed by narratologists? An author is the person who creates the narrative; a reader is the person who is the narrative addresses. After that, whose voice do we hear in our narrative and to whom is he/she talking to in this narrative? The answer to the first question is the narrator and the second answer is the narratee. Also the terms 'implied author' and 'implied reader' are special fictional personalities, which have been created by scholars, for analysing the narrative. So, in the first sub-section I will define those personalities in the narrative. After this sub-section, I will try to clarify the kinds of adjustments an author is able to use while he/she is constructing "the way" for his/her story. And also I will write about the reasons that lie behind those choices. I will follow

common concepts like narrative voice, point of view and like. I will also mention some key concepts about discourse under those sub-sections as well.

3.3.1 Agents of Discourse

The real author is the creator of the narrative text. He/she also creates the implied author and the narrator. A real author is a human being; he/she would be outside of the narrative text.

The real reader is a human being, too, who interprets the narrative text for himself/herself according to his/her experience with narrative that has been produced by a real author. A real reader also stands outside of the narrative. He/she is not a fictional concept. A real reader is related to his/her society. He/she carries the cultural, linguistic and social features of his/her society. So the interpretation process of the reader is also related with real reader's background and his/her past experiences.

The narrator is the person who narrates the story in the narrative. Generally a lot of narratives have one narrator, but, of course, in the same narrative there can also be more than one narrator. A narrator can be a person from outside the story that we called heterodiegetic narrator. And its opposite, can be a character of the story; known as a homodiegetic narrator. Distance between the narrator and the story world is an important decision that the author decides. If a narrator tells a story about his/her childhood in the narrative, the author has to consider the distance of the narrator's viewpoint. I have pointed out that a narrator can be inside or outside of the story world but without doubt it has to be inside the narrative. Actually, a narrator is a fictional concept that depends on narrative. Another feature of the narrator that we should consider the narrator's reliability. The behaviours, thoughts and opinions of the narrator can be seen as wrong, and these can mislead the reader. This is another option or choice

for an author when creating the structure as he/she needs. I will continue my comments about the narrator when I speak about narrative voice.

The narratee is whom the story addresses, what is told by narrator is told to the narratee narratee. In other words, the narrator tells his/her story to the narratee. The narratee can be a part of the story world or he/she can be someone from, outside of the story. But importantly it cannot be outside of the narrative. For as Monika Fludernik states (2006, pg. 23) "*The narratee is the intrafictional addressee of the narrator's discourse.*" For example let's take a letter that is written by narrator to his/her lover. In this situation the lover of the narrator is the narratee.

The implied author occurs because sometimes, an author wants to avoid expressing himself/herself while he/she is writing his/her book. Some of the reasons for this behaviour can be related to an author's situation. Maybe the author is considering his/her relationship with his/her family or friends. Maybe he/she cares about society's views. As a result of various kinds of thoughts, an author constructs an alternate author figure that speaks for the author how he/she wants to express himself/herself. This is how he/she wants to be seen by his/her reader. Comparing an author's different narratives can be an effective way to understand the different implied authors that the author has created, may be intentionally or not. Chatman says (1978, pg.148) an implied author does not have a direct voice in the narrative like the narrator. "*It instructs us silently, through the design of the whole, with all the voices, by all the means it has chosen to let us learn.*"

The implied reader is also an imaginary product of construction like the implied author. An author prepares some points of his/her narrative for exactly this type of reader. An author addresses this kind of reader. Fludernik says (2006 pg. 23) in this sense a real reader may or may not identify himself/herself in the same way of projected reader.

According to Monika Fludernik (2006, pg. 26)

Thus it can be said that many of Dickens's novels embody a very bourgeois world view, in spite of containing a good deal of social criticism. In point of fact, these texts tend to uphold the Victorian work ethic and condone the Victorian mystification of sexuality. The implied reader will be a contemporary agreeing with those views, a role into which the actual reader may or may not slip.

As a result the implied reader is also a hypothetical element that is produced by the author. Normally an author designs this with an expectation of reader response. An author assumes that the reader will take on this role but in point of fact they may not.

3.3.2 Narrative Voice

The narrative voice is the voice of the narrator. It is one of the basic methods of expression in the narrative. Abbott says (2002 pg. 64) if we ask a question of who it is we hear in narrative, the answer is the narrative voice. After answering this question, we can now analyse the features of this voice. Because, there are some different uses of narrative voice in the narrative, although there are various reasons behind these choices.

The first distinction is about, which voice we are hearing. A voice can be in the first person and in the third person. Both of them are familiar to readers because their use in daily life. After a lot of experience with narratives, readers got used to hearing both of these voices. Also authors can write in the second person, but I have only come across a few examples and scholars have also mentioned this regarding that type of narrative. It is not commonly used. It is also important for us to evaluate the information within narrative to determine the person who is the narrator and what their relationship is with the narrative. Abbott, states (2002 pg. 66) "*...because this let us know just how she injects into the narration her own needs and desires and limitations, and whether we should fully trust the information we are getting.*" Different uses of the narrative voice are also accepted by the reader. If they didn't, it would be hard for them to understand the narrative for them. How does an author know all those things in the third person, all of those intentions, thoughts or other information? So it is becomes obvious that there is

an acceptance of this situation because the reader has an experience with this method of voice in narratives. In this way, the reader can establish identification according to narrative voice. The voice does not sound weird to him/her.

Narratologists point to another distinction, homodiegetic and heterodiegetic narrative voice. According to Gerard Genette (1980, pg. 249) in homodiegetic narrative voice the narrator is also a part of the story world. In heterodiegetic narrative voice, the narrator speaks from outside the story world, but he/she describes the story in detail. This is seen especially when the author uses an omniscient narrative voice. As I have pointed out before a narrator's distance to the story is important for discourse.

Another crucial point appears about narrator's reliability. As Roger Fowler says (2006, pg. 149) *"The narrator or narrators in a novel may be made puzzled, unreliable or misleading."* Narratologists called this an unreliable narrator. This term was coined by Wayne C. Booth in 1961. (1983) The aim behind this choice are various an author may want to surprise the reader, Also an author can use this for creating suspense or to elicit curiosity. For example in William Faulkner's (1929) novel *The Sound and the Fury* we witness different narrative voices in different parts. The characters of this novel tell to us the same events according to their thoughts. Also in Akira Kurosawa's *Rashoman* (1950) different characters narrate the same story according how they viewed it during trial. We watch the different stories about one fact. So we also hear same event from complainant's side, indictee's side and witness's side. If the indictee is guilty identifying with his story causes a contradictory feeling for the audience. But the director also plans for this situation with forethought because after the other testimonies, it is hard to identify with the murderer's narrative voice. Fludernik says (2006 pg.27) *"In specific circumstances a narrator will lose credibility because s/he violates valid social norms in word or deed"* The author knows that identification will establish this kind of irritating feeling. So, inevitably the nature of the narrative comes from catching the reader with this kind of identification as seen from our example. If the author breaks our

identification as with the example of the murderer, this situation will also have a big impact on reader, this affect comes from that contradiction.

Voice can shift from one character to another or from the viewpoint of the narrator to any character's voice. Narratologists call this situation "free indirect style". Authors use this kind of style especially shifting from narrator voice to another character's voice. Abbott states (2002 pg. 64) *"...this kind of shift can also be done indirectly by filtering a character's voice through the third person narrator. It can be done freely, that is, without any quotation marks or other indicators like the usual "she thought/she said."* So as we can understand from its name, it has a free style. This is one of the options an author can use.

Voice over is a special term also used in cinema. It is a kind of narrative voice. It can be third person or first person but generally film makers use it to convey omniscient narration. Abbott says (2002, pg. 72) *"The term 'voice-over' itself indicates that the sound of the voice must share the sensory arena with the visual."*

Narrative voice and point of view can be easily mixed with each other. Even though there are some similarities around the two concepts, they are different concepts. Narrative voice, as I analyse in this chapter basically is a strong expressive device in narrative, but point of view is a notion that is related with someone's perspective. Now, I will continue explaining this concept.

3.3.3 Point Of View

There can be lots of meanings attributed to point of view. However, scholars have tried to make the definition for narrative simpler. Briefly, we can follow its meaning if there is a point of view, there has to be a position behind it, generally this position is represented by a humanbeing. It is related with the kind of background he/she has or

how he/she views what is occurring? And of course, there has to be a way he/she is thinking or where he/she is looking at? Chatman (1978, pg.151) also noticed that it is hard to gather the meanings of the types of points of view's meanings together but at least he was able to divide point of view in three different styles; literal, figurative and transferred. (1978, pg.151) Literal means the perception of someone on something. Figurative means that it uses someone's ideology or a conceptual system. Transferred means that it involves the character's interests, welfare, profit etc. Point of view can be easily mixed with narrative voice, but they are different concepts. However sometimes they can be used together.

According to Chatman, (1978, pg.153)

Point of view is the physical place or ideological situation or practical life-orientation to which narrative events stand in relation. Voice, on the contrary, refers to the speech or other overt means through which events and existents are communicated to the audience. Point of view does not mean expression; it only means the perspective in terms of which the expression is made.

Point of view can be used for different kind of things in narratives. For example, sometimes an author can use it to restrict our information, to prepare us for a surprise. In Alfred Hitchcock's *Vertigo* (1958) our leading character *John* secretly follows his friend's wife because his friend wants him to follow her. We started to follow her from his view point, up until they come to an old church tower, where she commits suicide. At least, we assume she commits a suicide because John's point of view is limited by the director. Actually he did not even follow the real wife of his friend. The story was designed by his friend because he plans to kill his rich wife. He gives role of the witness to the character *John*, because he knows that John has a vertigo and cannot go up the stairs in the church tower. When *John* sees that someone is falling from the tower, he thinks that she is the same women that he is following. Even we think what *John* thinks, because the director limited our point of view. He tricked us in the same way his friend tricked *John*. Only at the end of the story, when we have all the information, we are able to understand what happened.

Focalization is another key concept in discourse, Abbott says (2002 pg. 66) "*It refers specifically to the lens through which we see characters and events in the narrative.*"

Frequently, the narrator is our focalizer. Just as we hear her voice, we often see the action through her eyes. " But sometimes other characters can be narrative's focalizers, too. Authors can use other character's thoughts, impressions for these purposes. Especially in films these kinds of focalizers are used to heighten the emotions. We assume that if we see someone falling to the ground and the director shows us a terrified face and a loud crashing sound we think that a body fell down to the ground. We do this even without seeing the real event. We think that it happened. We see it from someone's point of view and that character became our focalizer. So narrative voice and point of view are concepts these complete each other. And they are devices of manifestation.

3.3.4 Stream Of Consciousness

Stream of consciousness is a representation method that reveals the inner's thoughts and feelings of the characters in narrative. Roger Fowler states (2006, pg. 224) "*A technique which seeks to record the flow of impressions passing through a character's mind.*" William James (2007, pg. 109) was the first person who named this concept as a phrase in 1890. Monika Fludernik (2006, pg 150) points out that, it is a kind of a "*simulation of associative mental process*" and according to her authors use different techniques to create stream of consciousness like "*interior monologue*", "*free indirect thoughts*" and "*psycho narration*". Stream of consciousness is a free adaptive technique, which is affected by personal ideas so in a sense, every author has his/her own style of using it.

3.3.5 Interior Monologue

Interior monologue is a kind of stream of consciousness. It is a free direct form for representing the consciousness of the character. Fludernik says (2006, pg. 155) "*...the representation of the mental processes of a character in direct speech (sentences with finite verbs in the present tense and referring to the person whose monologue it is in the first person....*"

In this section I endeavoured to analyse methods of understanding discourse. Basically, discourse represents the answer of the question, 'how?' How does the narration appear? I spoke about the ways how it appears in narrative. The other things that define the positioning of the discourse are the agents of the narrative. I made a sub-section for those agents of the narrative. The agents are the answer of the question that the narrative transmits from who to whom, and the answer clarifies the working area of discourse. After this subsection I focused on the adjustments methods of discourse in narrative.

4. CHARACTER AND YEŞİLÇAM

After dealing with narrative using a theoretical perspective, now I will analyse narrative's situation in Yeşilçam. In this way we can understand the character's position in Yeşilçam's narratives. I previously showed character's position in the narrative. Now, I will start with the narrative and the story in Yeşilçam as my first section. In this section, I will begin by analysing the factors that influence Yeşilçam, including traditional Turkish theatre and Turkish literature etc. I will focus on the structure of the narratives of Yeşilçam. After clarifying narratives of the Yeşilçam, I will analyze the characters of Yeşilçam in my second section. In that second section, my first aim will be answering the question of what kind of characters are in Yeşilçam? First of all we have to consider the sources of the characters of Yeşilçam to answer this question. In the second chapter I will delve deeply and analyse the kinds of characters an author use in his/her narrative. In Yeşilçam stereotypes are play a crucial role for constructing a character. We can say that a great majority of Yeşilçam films used stereotypic characters. So my second aim will be focusing on the stereotypes of Yeşilçam.

4.1. NARRATIVE AND STORY IN YEŞİLÇAM

If we examine the sources of Yeşilçam on one side we notice the traditional Turkish narratives, and on the other side we notice that after its invention film production became a global endeavour. Yeşilçam made a synthesis of all the sources that it needed. In this sense Yeşilçam has various types of sources. Yeşilçam as a narrative developed and changed as a following other narratives, and here I mean to say like every kind of narrative. I pointed out before that this development is a temporal process. However, the generalizations I will use are about finding the common features of the Yeşilçam films. Turkish cinema also has exceptional films as well. Although, behind those generalizations, I will try to summarize the evolution and development process of those narratives in historical perspective with the main lines. So, in the section after analysing

the sources of Yeşilçam, I will focus on the common features of the structure of Yeşilçam's films.

4.1.1 Traditional Narratives and Storytelling

I will explain the relationship and interactions between traditional Turkish narratives and their successors in this sub-chapter. Plus, I will continue with their influence on Yeşilçam. As a traditional narrative form, I will briefly mention about the meanings of Turkish shadow play or *Karagöz*, the theatre-in-the-round and *meddah*, which is a kind of storytelling tradition. Their development process is an important issue for my argument because along with their history/inheritance, and also the influence of Westernization, new art forms started to appear in nineteenth century, like *tuluat* (Turkish improvisational theatre), This theatrical form is also a good example regarding the mixture of two different approaches. We have other hybrid forms like *tuluat* which developed according under the influence of different sources, like the Turkish novel and Turkish cinema. I will try to analyse the similarities in their development process. Although they were different art forms, they struggled with similar problems. Their development process took place alongside the modernization period of Turkish society and culture. In this way it will be easy to understand, what kind of traditional narratives influenced Turkish cinema.

4.1.1.1 Narratives and storytelling in traditional Turkish theatre

Now, I will briefly mention the traditional forms of Turkish theatre. These include shadow play, theatre-in-the-round, *tuluat* and *meddah*. I will mention their interactive relationships. The consequences of this interactivity are also visible in Yeşilçam too. The theatre affected Yeşilçam in many ways, but especially in the beginning of Yeşilçam this relationship is much more than simple influence. The producers of

Yeşilçam of that period made films using the mentality of theatre so at the end of this sub-section I will point out the important influence of theatre on Yeşilçam.

Shadow theatre is a two-dimensional art form. It depends on the reflection of colourful figures that are made from the skin of the camel which move on a white screen, through the help of the puppeteer and lighting. Metin And says that, this screen is a white translucent sheet generally made of cotton. It is stretched on a frame like a painter's canvas. The artist directs the characters with the help of a stick. He also gives his voice to the characters. (1999, pg. 41) Turkish shadow play or in other words, *karagöz* depends on two main male character; *Karagöz* and *Hacivat*. Generally, the artist was not working with a scripted play. So, he was improvising. *Karagöz* also influenced other Turkish traditional narratives. In this sense, And (1999, pg.51) remarks that, "Eventually live actors and puppeteers tried to imitate shadow theatre."

Meddah is a storyteller; it is also a traditional, oral performing art form. A *meddah* tells various kinds of stories to an audience. Metin And writes that according to the kind of the story and the storyteller's talent as well, he could arouse the audience different kinds of emotions like enthusiasm, sadness, curiosity or pity, etc. Meddah is a good example of the mimesis (taklid) tradition as well. (2004 pg. 32) And states, (1999 pg.37) "*He represents many different types of people by imitating peculiarities of dialect and person*" Metin And adds that as an art form, *meddah* depends on oral storytelling and that separates it from the traditional dramatic performance art forms like theatre-in-the-round and shadow play. However it also has dramatic features like, mimesis (taklid), dialogues and personalisation. (2004, pg.31)

Theatre-in-the-round is another sub-branch of traditional Turkish theatre. Metin And says that even though we have a lot of information from various sources, we do not know the exact founding or time period for theatre-in-the-round. (1985, pg.337) Theatre-in-the-round carries many features of the Turkish shadow play. And points to

these similarities like characters, repertoires, storytelling methods and their structure. Theatre-in-the-round also has two leading characters like shadow play. (2004, pg.49) In theatre-in-the-round their names are *Kavuklu* and *Pişekar*. And points out that whole structure of this show depends on the conflict between *Kavuklu* and *Pişekar*. (2004, pg.53)

Tuluat (Turkish improvisational theatre) is a sub-branch of Turkish theatre that came into being through the legacy of theatre-in-the-round and the influence of the Westernisation together. So, it has some features of both Western theatre and Turkish traditional theatre. Özdemir Nutku says that according to the magazine *Hayal*; *tuluat* theatre dates back to 1875. It was founded by Küçük İsmail Efendi and his three friends. (1999, pg.90) Nutku says (1999, pg.91) "*tuluat theatre influenced by theatre-in-the-round and western theatre, especially comedia dell' Arte in the beginning and with time it developed its character within itself.*" Nutku points out that the repertoire of the *tuluat* is quite different from theatre-in-the-round, *tuluat* especially used the adaptations of Western literature and theatre. (1999, pg.91)

Nutku, Ö., (1999, pg.91)

Tuluat theatre plays constituted the misinterpreted texts of the Western literature. Well-known works of the Western theatre were turned into the bare skeletons of incidents, hollow, and they were given into the hands of the actors and actresses, and the characters lines were left to the intelligence, ability and skill of the actors and actresses. Therefore, plays appeared to be non-compliant with the originals.

Therefore, we can say that *tuluat* also has the improvisational character of Turkish theatre. So, which parts of *tuluat* depend on the theatre-in-the-round and which parts are taken from Western theatre? Çetin Sarıkartal mentions that the *tuluat* used Western staging, décor, costume design, and also the plots of Western plays were also adopted. Theatre-in-the-round showed plays on a round stage where the audience and the players were together. (2003, pg.87) However, *tuluat* had plays on a separate stage away from the audience. Metin And also says that because of the Western influence on *tuluat*, the thought process about the relationship between player and audience changed. In theatre-in-the-round, players do not need to hide from the audience, after their performance, but according to the Western idea, this breaks the illusion of reality, because everything is

prepared to allow the audience to feel that everything on the stage had really happened. (2004, pg. 56) And *tuluat* also tried to imitate those features of Western theatre that can be used for creating that illusion like lightning, set decoration, costumes, etc.

Every art form has developed through intercultural relationships. In this sense, if we go back to the roots of shadow play or theatre-in-the-round we can see a history of interaction between different cultures. Still, after such a long period of use, they had come to carry the characteristic of Turkish society and culture. And they had evolved into a unique form. The development of *tuluat* stems from the nineteenth century, so we have a lot of information about its sources. We can say that, *tuluat* had come into being as a result of direct influence. In this sense, its development is parallel to Yeşilçam, both of them depended on different kinds of adaptations from Western examples, and they had mixed those adaptations with their own traditions. Even if they are different art forms, and they almost have a century of time difference between them, they share similar themes and stories. They, found common solutions to solve their problems. That model of *tuluat* comes to the fore in my analysis of Yeşilçam. Çetin Sarıkartal (2003, pg.87) says that we can notice the structural traces of *tuluat* in Yeşilçam "*Many characteristics of narrative construction, types of characters, use of music and comic sequences had their parallel in popular cinema, especially in melodrama .*" His emphasis on melodrama is crucial because as a genre of cinema, melodrama has a lot of common features with traditional Turkish narratives. Therefore, it is one of the reasons why melodramas are so common in Yeşilçam and it is also the answer to why melodrama plays crucial role in analysing Yeşilçam. I will deal with melodrama's influence on Yeşilçam in next sub-section.

Another sign of theatre's influence on Yeşilçam was in early period of Yeşilçam. If we analyse those films, we will come to the conclusion that they had taken a lot of their features from the sector of theatre. Sarıkartal (2003, pg.87) says that, "*Theatrical performance was influential in the emergence of early film production in Turkey.*"

Therefore, this situation is not only particular to Turkish cinema, the situation also similar in the films of other countries.

H. Porter Abbott says (2002, pg.114)

In this area of gaps, cinema revolutionized narrative in the theatre, releasing mimesis (performed narrative) from clock time and reconnecting with the narrative fluidity of prose narrative. This came as a surprise. The earliest feature-length films were little more than filmed theatre. But they quickly evolved.

However the influence of theatre continues for a long period in Yeşilçam. Turkish cinema historian Nijat Özön divides Turkish cinema into four historical periods; the first period is 1914-1922 and marks the beginning period, the second part is the theatre/filmmakers period from 1922 to 1939, the third is the transition between theatre/filmmakers to cinema makers (1939-1950), and the last period is the cinema makers period (1950-1960). (2003, pg.22) As we can see from the periodization, theatre was a large influence on Turkish cinema whereas if we examine other cinemas during the same periods, around the world we notice lots of director that are identified with cinema. So, this situation was special to the Yeşilçam. Until the 1950s, one director plays a dominant role in the film producing sector of Turkey, his name is Muhsin Ertuğrul. He came from a theatre background. He was an actor as well as a director of theatre. Özön says that Muhsin Ertuğrul ruled Turkish cinema by himself for seventeen years and he adds that because of the directors that Ertuğrul nurtured, a negative theatrical influence, continued in cinema for a long time. (2003, pg.68) In addition, we should consider the coincidence that, his reign continued until the first years of the multi-party system in Turkey. So he had dominated the cinema sector using his theatre knowledge during the time of the single-party regime, which means he had enormous influence over almost three decades.

In this sub-section I endeavored to summarize traditional Turkish theatre forms and how they influenced on Yeşilçam. In the last part, we can even see the dominant influence of theatre especially in the first few decades of Yeşilçam. Still we can understand better how the traditional Turkish theatre influenced Yeşilçam when we analyse the characters and the stories of Yeşilçam structurally.

4.1.1.2 Narratives and storytelling in Turkish literature

I want to mention a similar interaction between the Turkish novel and Yeşilçam. I will use Berna Moran's ideas about Turkish novels. And his conclusions about the Turkish novel consist of both Western novels and the traditional Turkish stories. Because this conclusion also represents a similar situation in regards to Yeşilçam.

Showing the influence of Westernization on the Turkish novel after its development process had happened in the late Ottoman and early Republic period. Berna Moran, (1991, pg.9) says the first Turkish novel authors complained about the structures and subjects of traditional Turkish stories. They found them unrealistic and weak. Still when they were writing their novel they could not take themselves from the inheritance of traditional methods of Turkish literature. So, even if they underestimated the traditional ways of storytelling, they made a Turkish-style syntheses between Western novels and the traditional stories of their own culture, and with time the Turkish novel developed and found its own characteristics. In this sense, I will continue analysing the Turkish novel and I will also use Berna Moran's analyses of the Turkish novel. According to him, our first novel authors were imitating Western novels. (1991, pg.23) Still within this process, those novel authors used older structures that belonged to traditional Turkish stories especially romances. Moran says that a conflict arose because these novel authors had criticised the traditional stories of lovers. (1991, pg.21) Still they continued to use those stories about lovers (aşık hikayeleri) which take the form of romance, as the basic structure of their novels. Moran says that in his book he prefers to use the word 'romance' as a love story, it does not represent the medieval European chevalier novels, as in its classical meaning. He says that those romances had idealized love stories of a fantasy world, which also had happy endings meaning the reunion of the lovers either in life or by their death. They are entertaining tales. Their stories are formed around similar plotlines and characters. (1991, pg.23) So those authors could not take themselves away from constructing their novels on those skeleton structures of romances. This structure was founded as a result of a common feeling within humanity.

That is why foreign novel authors also use similar stories as well. They also construct their novels on romance formulas. In this sense, it is not specifically just a Turkish example. Accordingly, we should discuss what is the border between romance and the novel? Moran says that novels have more realistic narration. However, romances are generally about fantastic stories. And novels are close to people's daily lives and romances are close to tales or fantasy worlds. (1991, pg.24) Cevdet Kudret's explanations follow the same line of thought of Moran about the beginning period of the Turkish novel. Kudret says that all the *Tanzimat* novels have events that really happened or that could happen, they do not have fantastic events. (1971, pg.23) In this sense, we notice the influence of the Western novel. Still Kudret adds that those novels are usually constructed around romantic and tragic events (1971, pg.23). This shows that they were still using the themes of the traditional Turkish romances. According to those scholars, the choice between realism and romanticism plays a decisive role in that period of Turkish novel. Ahmet Hami Tanpınar mentions that Nâbizâde Nâzım and Sezai Bey were the authors that wanted to make the Turkish novel much more realistic. Still even these authors were influenced by sad themes, which make their novels romantic. Tanpınar adds that those themes are misery, abandoned women, the cheated-on girl (in regards to her hopes) and the tuberculosis patient. These themes were influenced by the bad examples of western novel. (1997, pg. 232) As a result, even the authors of that period who did not want to use the features that belonged to romance, were not able to succeed. Savaş Arslan claims that the word 'romance' that Moran used, can be transferred into the word 'melodrama'. (2005, pg.51) In other words, the thing that romance symbolized in literature, melodrama has the same function within cinema, especially for our view of Yeşilçam. I will return to this similarity.

I mentioned that first Turkish novel authors imitated Western novels. The first Turkish novel authors wanted to construct their novels on an idea as Western authors did. And therefore, they focused their main arguments on 'Westernization'. Moran points out that, the Westernization process was the biggest issue in Turkish novel, when he analyzed the late Ottoman and early Turkish Republic period, which means the first few decades of the history of the Turkish novel history. (1991, pg.19) Moran adds that the

Westernization process also defined the function, the founding and the stereotypes of the Turkish novels considerably. (1991, pg.19) Arslan points out that, the position of those novels authors of standing against the Westernization process, was a kind of target for them. (2005, pg.45) Arslan says these were 'thesis novels', he says that those authors were trying to transmit their intellectual aims or intentions via those novels. (2005, pg.54) According to the dictionary Merriam-Webster, 'thesis novel' means; "*a novel that advances, illustrates, or defends a thesis*".³ Generally, the thesis was about resisting some influences of the West and rejecting them, or it was about the opposite which meant supporting the Western influence. So almost every novel of this period had those kinds of aims related to the author's ideas about Westernization influence. They were writing using a Western medium (the novel). They were imitating their features. Although, they were also underestimating Turkish traditional ways of storytelling. However, Arslan says that, those Turkish authors used the melodramatic features of traditional Turkish narratives when they were trying to prove their thesis. (2005, pg.45) Arslan adds that they were using exaggeration and when they do this they themselves got close to what they themselves criticized. (2005, pg.54) So, those novels were full of the author's projects and ideas regarding the modernization and Westernization that happened in the Ottoman Empire and in the process that followed during the development of the Turkish Republic as well. Still those authors could not resist using the traditional narrative methods that belonged to their culture and society. According to Arslan, those novels had stereotypic characters that were representing the Western features and Eastern features. (2005, pg.56) They were exaggerating the features of those characters to affect the audience. Exaggeration brought out those melodramatic features. This was the essential conflict between their aim and the end result. All these arguments about plotlines of romances, stereotypes and the other things about traditional ways of storytelling are also necessary when looking at Yeşilçam films. Almost same problematic repeats itself in Yeşilçam.

³ -Definition of thesis novel. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/thesis%20novel> [accessed 20.05.2013]

One of the dominant factors that constitute Yeşilçam's structure is the Turkish traditional narrative experience. Briefly, the information and analyses of the Turkish novel and traditional Turkish theatre also reflect the roots of Yeşilçam also how these influenced Yeşilçam. As a result, if we look at the historical background of narrative and storytelling in Turkey, we reach similar conclusions about theatre, literature and cinema as well. They all experienced similar problems. The crucial thing about these narratives is they took shape in order to satisfy the audience's taste and demand. Now that I have analysed the traditional narratives and storytelling that affected Yeşilçam, now I will continue with the structure of Yeşilçam's films.

4.1.2 Narrative and Story Structure in Yeşilçam

In this section, I will focus the features of the films of Yeşilçam. I summarized before the sources of Yeşilçam as Western novels, Western cinema and traditional Turkish narratives like Turkish theatre, Turkish literature and others. Now I will write about how Yeşilçam used them. The structure of Yeşilçam films depends on the melodramatic modality. First of all, I will explain what this concept is and why it was suitable for Yeşilçam. What is its relationship with the sources of Yeşilçam? How did the structure of Yeşilçam narratives develop? After, I will mention how melodramatic modality appears in Yeşilçam films.

We notice the structure of Yeşilçam on a large scale depends on adaptation, if we consider various kinds of sources. Dudley Andrew offers three different types of adaptation; borrowing, intersecting and transforming (1984, pg.98). Yeşilçam uses all of these in different places. Savaş Arslan explains the foreign adaptations into Yeşilçam by the concept of "Turkification".

According to Arslan (2011, pg.82)

...Turkification amasses protocols of imitation, adaptation, translation and transformation. In the case of Yeşilçam, Turkification accommodates a range of relations to Western cinemas, from Hollywood to art cinema and auteur

films. There is not a single dream West, nor is there a single Western cinema. With these issues at hand, Yeşilçam's Turkification marks various practices, ranging from facile to complex, of translating, transforming and rendering Western cinemas.

Consequently, Yeşilçam is the combination of those specialities from Western cinema and the traditional Turkish narratives. For example, Berna Moran gives the plot-line of the old Turkish stories about lovers. He describes them as a romance when he analyses early Turkish novels. 1- The birth of the love story between a young boy and a young girl, 2- The separation of the young couple by evil forces, 3- Their struggle for their reunion, 4- The end with either marriage or death. (1991, pg.24) This is a common plot-line of many Yeşilçam films. Although, according to Nilgün Abisel, Yeşilçam producers also added some melodramatic features from Western films especially from Hollywood in addition to Berna Moran ideas. (1994, pg.93) Now I will analyse in detail the melodramatic modality and its role in Yeşilçam.

4.1.2.1 What is melodramatic modality?

As I analyse Yeşilçam in this thesis, I will mention the concept of melodramatic modality many times. Now, it is time to explain this. Barry Langford says that according to many film scholars: (2005, pg.31) "*melodrama is a 'mode' or 'tendency' that has been taken up at different times and with different formal and stylistic characteristics...*" in different kind of art forms and genres. Thomas Elsaesser defines it (1987, pg.43) "*... as a specific cinematic mode of expression...*" As we can see from these explanations, melodrama is something beyond genre.

Linda Williams also shares this opinion (1998, pg.42)

Melodrama is the fundamental mode of popular American moving pictures. It is not a specific genre like the western or horror film; it is not a 'deviation' of the classical realist narrative; it cannot be located primarily in woman's films, 'weepies', or family melodramas though it includes them.

As a mode, melodrama influenced every kind of narrative in many and unexpected ways. The power of it lies behind this reason. It is also the reason why melodrama is so

common in every time period and has continued to survive. Melodrama has a great influencing power, it can influence every kind of genre. Savaş Arslan says that most of the time when we use the word melodramatic as an adjective related to a narrative the other features of that narrative are more dominant than melodrama. (2005, pg.13) According to Linda Williams, melodrama is a basic requirement of films. It gives audiences what they want. (1998, pg.51) "*...melodrama as a modality of narrative with a high quotient of pathos and action to which we need to attend if we are to confront the most fundamental appeal of movies.*" In this sense, pathos and action summarize melodrama's ingredients.

If we return to Yeşilçam, the melodramatic mode is a fundamental mode for it as well especially when we think of its use in Hollywood. Melodramatic features invade almost the whole of Yeşilçam films as a modality. It influenced even comedies, epic films and others. Sometimes, it occurs on a low level, but usually the effect is felt very deeply and even structurally. Nijat Özön says that filmmakers use melodrama as a genre, but most of the time they use it as a narration method. He adds that melodramatic usage causes a cartoon look at reality. (1995, pg. 146) Özön rigorously criticised the filmmakers of Yeşilçam, because filmmakers had used the melodramatic mode to impress the audience with cheap tricks when they could not express themselves with the methods of reality. (1995, pg.146)

So according to Özön melodrama means a mode, which uses the basest methods, like extraordinary situations, extraordinary coincidences, and stereotypical characters. It gives moral advices using those cheap methods. (1995, pg.142) There have been many analyses which points to the structure of the melodrama in that it tries to give moral lessons through cheap methods. This is a mission that is ascribed to melodrama. Linda Williams summarizes this mission by saying that, (1998, pg.61) "*In a post sacred world, melodrama represents one of the most significant, and deeply symptomatic, ways we negotiate moral feeling.*" According to Arslan, the development process of melodrama in Turkish films relates with the modernization process of Turkey. He adds that modernization appears in the lifestyles of the people of Turkey as a result of social

and economic reforms and with the influence of individualism and Westernization. These new lifestyles changed people's old beliefs and spiritual habits in regards to morality. Melodrama served as a device that created new norms of morality for people. (2005, pg.65) In Yeşilçam, the people mean the audience. So, melodrama is a modern concept, although it evaluates the traditional values through itself and it combines those values with modern ones. This combination is also valid for Turkish society and Yeşilçam as well. Melodrama is also an effective means of mixing the famous clashing or meeting or whatever we can call it, of modern and traditional.

4.1.2.2 How does melodramatic modality appear in Yeşilçam?

Yeşilçam as a popular domestic cinema used the melodramatic modality as a common structure. We can see the traces of this modality in epics, dramas, romances and even the comedies of Yeşilçam. If we consider the main features of Yeşilçam we can see the influence of the melodramatic modality behind it. For example, we see it in the conflict between good and evil, the moral cues that it carries, the characters that act with exaggeration, masterplots, etc.

The possibilities inherent with the melodramatic modality make the identification between the character and the audience much easier. According to Abisel, identification is the essential aim of the popular films of the Yeşilçam. Because it is a device that legitimizes ideological discourses. (1994, pg.204) This comment is also in the same vein with Laura Mulvey's assertion that, "*The cinema offers a number of possible pleasures.*" Still, she explains the identification process with the fascination of the male gaze in her article. We can think about the ideological discourse as the suggestions that melodramas tried to give. Accordingly, we are able to give any message as we want. Identification serves our ideological message. How does identification work using the melodramatic way in the narratives? It is expected that the audience identify themselves with the good character. According to William Guynn, (2011, pg.44) the scriptwriter

"...solicits audience's identification with the protagonists... The scriptwriter places characters in situations of danger or reversals of fortune that generate empathy and anguish in the spectator." In this sense, the good character represents the audience, in another sense, it represents "the self". The villain represents "the other". The audience feels pain as long as the good character suffers, but when the film has ended with a happy ending and the good character has beaten the evil forces, the emotions of the audience change; suffering turns into victory and pleasure. This is an essential method to satisfy the audience. The film producers were using this tool to work on the audiences' feeling. The film producers of Yeşilçam exaggerated the level of the struggle of the hero. This exaggeration is part of its melodramatic make up. Also, a similar situation is valid for the evil character. While he is successful, the audience feels disturbed. They perceive this situation with disgust. Audience expectation is for the divine punishment of the antagonist, the evil character of the story. This becomes a ritual of moral satisfaction for audience. Peter Brooks (1976, pg.54) says that, "*Morality is ultimately in the nature of affect, and strong emotion is in the realm of morality: for good and evil are moral feelings.*" So good and bad are constructed as moral choices for the identification process. Yeşilçam depends on this identification structure and it uses this structure to create a catharsis for the audience. According to Andre Bazin, (1967, pg.100) catharsis is used by film producers in a psychoanalytic way. He describe this process as an "*...intoxication of an illusory intimacy with the hero.*" He adds that, "*Incontestably, there is in the pleasure derived from cinema and the novel a self-satisfaction, a concession to solitude, a sort of betrayal of action by a refusal of social responsibility.*" In this sense, Yeşilçam did not try to reach perfect narration, it tried to reach a narration which is close to "self", the subject of the identification process, in the verisimilitude narration that belongs to the audience.

The notion of "self" represents the person who the audiences are identified. However, if we take this "self" from the structure of Yeşilçam's aspect that depends on adaptations and imitations, or another word "Turkification", we can reach a contradictory conclusion. This conclusion is related with the sense of guilt that is coming from owning something that isn't yours. E. B. Eğrik (2010, pg.265) explains a similar feeling

belonging to the Turkish audience as frustration that originated from the habits, experiences and expectations of the audience's collective memories. Yeşilçam converts those feelings of frustration and guilt into fictional material, which is also an experience that causes pain and suffering. Accordingly, Yeşilçam makes its own judgment about morality through its own values and point of view.

Alienation stands on the opposite side of this process. "*Alienation is the process whereby people become foreign to the world they are living in.*"⁴ It is one of the effective tools of catharsis that is established through the possibilities of the melodramatic modality in Yeşilçam's narratives. It is almost a mechanism of confession, even put the blame on the antagonist. In this sense the alienated one can be modernity, villains, richness, power, corrupted urban life, etc. The tale forms the origin of Yeşilçam that had used the melodramatic modality and is now what legitimizes those situations that appear with exaggeration. Because, this structure recovers the audience. It gives them hope. The formula of the blessing of the values that belongs to "the self" lies behind the suitable masterplots of Yeşilçam which include: recovery, getting rich, being cleared, being forgiven, etc. They are the masterplots and the themes of Yeşilçam which keep repeating. They are also interesting themes because of their capacity to contain suspense and surprise.

As a result Yeşilçam depends on exaggeration like many of the traditional Turkish narratives before Yeşilçam. In that sense, the melodramatic modality provides a suitable narration mode for Yeşilçam. That is why Yeşilçam's films have many melodramatic features in themselves. The questions about exaggeration lie behind the structure of melodrama. If the melodramatic exaggeration level is not reasonable in the narrative, the causality of the narrative starts to dissolve. For example, if the chain of events does not change the personality of the character and this character keeps showing the features that come with stereotyping, at this point the narration turn into a mode of manipulative.

⁴-Definition of Alienation <http://www.marxists.org/glossary/terms/a/l.htm> [accessed 10.06.2013]

This manipulation does not mean that audience will not like it, but obviously, it damages the structure of the narrative. The exaggeration level is also related with the conflict between good and evil. This conflict has a central role in melodramas. However, the answer of how this conflict appears, changes the narrative that is using melodrama as a modality. The power of melodrama comes from the exaggerated narration of the features of the good and evil characters. Still, the exaggeration level is related to the audience's profile. When we say Turkish cinema this expression restricts our point of view around a national border, because it reaches a different type of audience. Accordingly, the level of use of melodramatic features in Yeşilçam has national borders. So we have to explain those borders through an audience's habits. Consequently, the influencing power of the melodrama, in another sense, the exaggeration related with its addressee, including: the audience's education level, their social status, their experiences in life. There is an invisible ratio between the exaggeration and the composition of the audience. It shows how much a narrative can include exaggerated melodramatic features in itself and the narrative's influencing power according to its melodramatic features.

4.2 CHARACTER IN YEŞİLÇAM

I mentioned the sources of the Yeşilçam films in previous sections. I previously analysed narratives and storytelling. Now, I will focus on the sources that have influenced the characters of the Yeşilçam. My thesis is getting close to the crux of its argument, the character as a story's participant. And of course, the story is a component of the narrative. In this chapter, I will first mention the roots of Yeşilçam. After, I will focus on the features of Yeşilçam's characters. As a summary, we can say that most of the films of Yeşilçam have stereotypic characters and those stereotypes are a structural feature of Yeşilçam films. My second section's title will be the stereotypic characters of the Yeşilçam.

4.2.1 The Roots of the Characters of Yeşilçam

In the first sub-section I will analyse the characters of traditional Turkish theatre and I will compare them with the characters of Yeşilçam. After, in the second sub-section, I will examine the influence of the traditional characters of Turkish literature on Yeşilçam. In this way, I will adopt the same method of analysis to characters of Yeşilçam that I have used before when I was analysing the relationship between traditional narratives and Yeşilçam.

4.2.1.1 Characters in the traditional Turkish theatre

The basic and important forms of traditional Turkish theatre are shadow play, theatre-in-the-round, and *tuluat* (Turkish improvisational theatre). All of them have stereotypical characters which makes this a common feature for all of them. One of the reasons why they always use stereotypes is that they all depend on the improvisational storytelling tradition. Generally, they are not following a scripted scenario, so we do not see dramatic character development in those art forms.

Turkish shadow play depends on two male principal characters, *Hacivat* and *Karagöz*, and their dialogues around each other. According to Metin And (1999, pg. 46) shadow play depends on "...the contrast between *Hacivat's* formal, superficial knowledge and *Karagöz's* common sense and occasional lack of understanding." This contrast is a basic structure for shadow play and we can also see same contrast in theatre-in-the-round too, between *Kavuklu* and *Pişekar*. M. And says, (1999, pg.32) "*Pişekar* has the function of aiding his counterpart to use his wits and his counterpart *Kavuklu* makes the jokes, and this is how a dialogue develops." The other characters of both shadow play and theatre-in-the-round depend on simple stereotyping.

According to And, (1999, pg.31) it happens as a result of the tradition of mimicry (*taklid*).

...those roles which are rich in comic values are professionals, provincials, colonials and foreigners. Also some teratological types such as dwarves, stammerers, hunchbacks, or mentally defectives such as opium addicts and the neighborhood idiot. Their weaknesses and characteristics are stressed and stereotyped by imitation.

I mentioned that *tuluat* (Turkish improvisational theatre) developed as a mixture of Western theatre and theatre-in-the-round. Nutku says that the creators of *tuluat* had especially been influenced by *commedia dell'Arte* which is a kind of Western improvisary theatre. (1999, pg.91) He adds that (1999, pg.91) "*The characters of the Turkish Tuluat theatre are not as many as in Ortaoyunu*" According to Nutku *tuluat* has five main characters. (1999, pg.91) Nutku claims that both of theatre-in-the-round, *tuluat* and *commedia dell'Arte* have similar stereotypical characters. However, he shows the different features among them. I will show the names of the similar characters of different forms for comparison.

According to Nutku's article (1999, pg.91)

Table 4.1: The characters of the *tuluat*, *commedia dell'Arte*, and theatre-in-the-round

	<i>Tuluat</i>	<i>Commedia dell'Arte</i>	Theatre-in-the-round
<i>The main old character</i>	<i>Tirit</i>	<i>Pantolone</i>	<i>Pişekar</i>
<i>The servant</i>	<i>İbiş</i>	<i>Zanni /Arlecchino</i>	<i>Kavuklu</i>
<i>The tyrant</i>	<i>Tiran</i>	<i>Pulchinella, Capitano</i>	<i>Tussuz, Külhanbeyi</i>
<i>Male lover</i>	<i>Sirar</i>	<i>Innamorato</i>	<i>Çelebi</i>
<i>Female lover</i>	<i>The girl</i>	<i>Innamorato</i>	<i>Zenne</i>

Metin And counts the common features of traditional Turkish theatre's characters as follows: they consist of stabilized and unchangeable generalizations, in every

performance they repeat themselves. They have the exact same reactions and the exact same behaviours for the exact same situations; their identities have been erased, they do not have a past life or a future life; events do not affect their characters; they do not get old; certain features are exaggerated in each character; their physical appearance defines their characters and behaviours. They do not present the illusion that they are real dramas. (1985, pg. 457)

We can easily notice the similar features between the characters of traditional Turkish theatre and the characters of Yeşilçam. The stereotypical characters of Yeşilçam's comedies have come from those roots. We can say that they are a kind of adaptation from the characters of shadow play and theatre-in-the-round, but in Yeşilçam they have evolved through the medium. The features of the traditional characters also represent the tastes of the audience. As a result of the basic verisimilitude process, Yeşilçam's audiences (which were the grandchildren of the traditional Turkish theatre's audience) demanded similar characters to those they were used to. According to them, even during the high period of Yeşilçam, those were the characters they thought were the characters of their society and also they were the characters from their previous experiences with the old narratives.

4.2.1.2 Characters in Turkish literature

I have written about the literal roots of Yeşilçam from the aspect of narrative. I followed Berna Moran's ideas about the Turkish novel and traditional Turkish stories about lovers. Now, I will reflect those analyses onto characters in this sub-section.

In the traditional stories about lovers (*aşık hikayeleri*), characters are designed stereotypically as well. Especially those romances that consist of a couple who fall in love with each other and a villain who then tries to break up their relationship. This triangle, that consists of the hero, the heroine and the villain is a general cliché for every

story. Still, many romances are constructed with exaggerated features about their good and/or bad behaviours. This is a typical feature for the characters of these romances. Moran describes them as white or black or, good or bad. (1991, pg.23) Kudret also points to this feature, according to him, most of the time the characters of the novels are one sided, and they are just good or just bad. At the end of the movie, good characters are rewarded and bad characters are punished. (1971, pg.25) Almost the whole story's aim is of the couple trying to get back together and the aim of the villain is trying to break up their relationship. This had been a cliché plot-line for both the Turkish novel and Yeşilçam. Moran criticises these stereotypical characters of romance, saying that the characters of romance are different from real persons in life which have both good and bad behaviours. Still, the characters of romance also have completely good behaviours or completely bad behaviours. This makes them unreal. It cheapens the value of the moral problem. (1991, pg.31) That is also the reason why they are critiqued.

In the first novels of Turkish literature, authors had begun by imitating Western novels. According to Moran, even if the authors of those novels criticised traditional stories about lovers and the clichéd traditional structures, they were still using them. (1991, pg.21) Moran says that our first novel authors were imitating French novels and using the stereotypes of traditional stories about lovers and *meddah* stories instead of the cliché characters of Western novels because the differences of social circumstances between the West and Turkish society. (1991, pg.35) So they draw their characters into the circumstances of their time and spaces. And they were dealing with the problems of their time about constructing a character. In that aspect, we have to consider that those novels started to be written almost one century before Yeşilçam films. Accordingly, Yeşilçam follows their character construction methods.

4.2.2 Stereotypical Characters of Yeşilçam

I gave the meaning of stereotype and its function in narrative in previous sections. Now I will try to demonstrate how it appears in Yeşilçam. What kind of analyses and ideas appeared in Turkish film studies about stereotypes in Yeşilçam. Defining the the positioning of stereotyping in a narrative's character will be another aim of this subsection. I mentioned E. M. Forster's concepts of flat characters and round characters before. I will also argue the relationship of these concepts and the stereotypes. Then, I will reveal the relationship of stereotypes with other concepts like masterplots, genres and how they have influenced the film modals of Yeşilçam. And the essential aim of this section will be to answer the question of why stereotypes were so common in Yeşilçam.

Almost every Turkish film scholar has pointed out the distinction of stereotypes and characters when they analyzed Yeşilçam films. Instead of stereotype, the word *tip* (type) is more common in Turkish film studies about Yeşilçam. Using of types by Yeşilçam producers was a term criticized even this feature of Yeşilçam was not held in high esteem by numerous Turkish film scholars. Nijat Özön is one of the film scholars who critiqued the use of stereotypes. He also makes a distinction between characters and stereotypes. He says that in the melodramas, we see stereotypes instead of the characters.(1995, pg.143) Özön made this distinction in the year 1959, but it still continues. For example, Nebat Yağız underlines this separation. According to Yağız, types consist of exaggeration and cartoonlike features of the people who live in society. She underlined the representative features of the types. Types represent the features of society along with exaggerated qualities. According to her, types do not have inner thoughts or psychologies. They cannot be a living person, in the real world. (2009, pg.9) Abisel also agrees with this comment about stereotypes in Yeşilçam. In popular domestic films, the information about the past of the characters and the details of the characters' identity are not given. They have only been represented through clichés like good or bad and rich and poor. (1994, pg.194) In my case, dividing the characters of the narrative into two parts is a problematic issue. Stereotyping is not an alternative way of

creating character. A stereotype is a special kind of character. An author can make his/her character a stereotype. There is no real distinction when a character is used as a stereotype. However, I also agree with the criteria that explains what makes a character a stereotype. So exaggeration and cartoonlike representative features of society and distinct physical appearance can turn a character into a stereotype. However, they continue to be the characters of the narrative. In this sense, we can say that stereotyping is a process. There can be different levels of stereotyping. Roughly speaking, exaggeration makes the level higher. But we cannot say that more stereotyping makes the narrative weak. If we talk about how to use stereotypes in a negative or positive way related with the power of the narration, we have to take in those stereotypes through the coherence of the narrative.

I previously explained the meanings of E. M. Forster's flat and round characters. If comparing stereotypes and flat characters of E. M. Forster, they almost represent the same thing, but flat is a concept that specialized for narrative studies. However, the stereotype also has similar, but different areas of use. Still, even in narrative studies, the stereotype is a much more common concept. Flat and round can still be successful distinctions to understand character's role in narrative. In regards to their usage, both have their own advantages. For instance, round characters are more unique. They have their own individual appearances. On the other hand, one of the important advantages of using flat characters is its influence on the star system. Stereotypes caused fixed screen personas and this affected the development of the star system. In the high period of Yeşilçam, it was an industry that was carried by stars. At the time of Yeşilçam, almost every actor and actress was fixed with some specific stereotype. Abisel says that the movie actors, especially the stars, had a certain appearance. (1994, pg.191) Abisel gives some example of those who were identified with those stereotypes: Lale Belkıs represented the rich and villainous woman, Muadelet Tibet represented the good mother, Mualla Sürer represented the witchy neighbour, Atıf Kaptan represented the cruel and rich man, Turgut Özatay represented the bad guy, and so on. (1994, pg.193) And those selections were decisive for the audience's expectations. (1994, pg.193) As a result of the identification process of the audience with those stereotypes, audiences demanded those very stars.

P. Abbott (2002, pg.126) points out that melodrama is a genre where we can see lots of flat characters or in other words, stereotypes. The use of stereotypes is very common in Turkish traditional narratives and in Yeşilçam as well. A distinctive feature of Yeşilçam films, especially many of the mainstream ones, use melodramatic features. The structure of Yeşilçam films that I mentioned use stereotypes as supplementary elements of their narratives and character construction. If we talk about Yeşilçam, this combination always comes together through the melodramatic modality and stereotypes. We can also consider them as the legacy of traditional narratives in Yeşilçam too. Related to this, Metin And says that we can encounter the stereotypes in *mimus, commedia dell'Arte*, melodramas, *tuluat*, and the genre of western in cinema (1985, pg.457) I guess And also points to the western as a genre because of its fixed iconography, the stereotypes through their fixed characters come as a result of this structure. Still, we can extend this idea to the genre in general. According to Christine Gledhill, (2000, pg.223) "*Each genre represented a body of rules and expectations, shared by filmmaker and audience, which governed its particular generic 'world' and by which any new entrant was constructed and operated.*" She adds that they brings their (2000, pg.223) "*...dramatis personae, iconography, locations and plot possibilities*" with themselves. In this sense almost every genre brings their own stereotypes too.

Another key point about stereotype is its relationship to masterplots. Abbott observes, (2002, pg. 45) "*When we see a stereotype in a narrative, we see something so fixed and predictable that it seems prefabricated. Masterplots can be rendered stereotypically as well.*" The mainstream studio films of the Golden Period of Yeşilçam were also constructed around a few important masterplots. And every masterplot comes with its own values and notions. At that time of Yeşilçam, a lot of films that were filmed using the similar masterplots.

As a result, melodramas, masterplots and stereotypes were complementary terms. Their relations to each other deeply affected Yeşilçam. We can even say that those relationships and combinations represent the structure of Yeşilçam's films. I also mentioned how melodramatic structure and traditional Turkish narratives were behind the use of stereotypes in Yeşilçam. Counting another important contribution of

stereotypic characters to Yeşilçam was the star system. Audience demanded stars, and producers considered those demands. Almost every actor and actress had a persona fixed to a stereotype in the audience's mind. Also, the dominant analyses regarding stereotypes in Turkish film studies related with its use. With time, the stereotypes of Turkish films evolved to round characters, and so we can see various kinds of characters. However there is not a complete transition from stereotypes to round characters. We can briefly define these as the hybrid characters of Yeşilçam. In my view, there are lots of hybrid characters in Ertem Eğılmez 's films, so I will examine this evolution process in Eğılmez's films in next chapter.

5. CHARACTERS IN ERTEM EĞİLMEZ'S FILMS

5.1 ANALYSIS OF THE CHARACTERS IN ERTEM EĞİLMEZ'S FILMS

Before analysing the characters of Ertem Eğilmez's films, I briefly want to mention again the theoretical aspect that I pointed to in my thesis and the concepts that I will use. Yeşilçam films have melodramatic features, which also brought exaggerated narration and exaggerated characters. From this aspect, we should consider Ertem Eğilmez as a Yeşilçam director.

Stereotypic characters are one of the distinctive features of Yeşilçam, they are also a consequence of a melodramatic modality. In a sense, these stereotypic characters mean a kind of 'ready-form' character for presentation to the audience. A genre, a stereotype, a masterplot reflect this familiar structure for audience. Because of those stereotypic characters, identification of the audience happens very fast. Those stereotypic characters determine the development of the star system too. Also they are iconographic elements that are helping the constitution of the structure of genres. For example, Boris Karloff for horror, Humphrey Bogart for film noir, Charles Chaplin for comedy, also had become iconographic elements of those genres. In this sense, those actors can be even said to determine the definition of each of these genres. Those actors or actresses playing those icons depended on a creative construction process. The basic feature of a character in cinema is the physical appearance of that character. Accordingly, the first condition to create a stereotype is a distinctive and characteristic physical appearance. The physical appearance of the stereotypes trigger the emotions of the audience. In that aspect, a stereotype could be scary, funny, innocent, handsome, beautiful, and so on.

I mentioned that most of the time, stereotypes are found with some masterplots in my last chapter. I also mentioned the stereotypes and masterplots of Yeşilçam and why they were constructed. In this chapter, I will examine the use of stereotypes and masterplots

in Eđilmez's films. Specifically, how he used those elements of the narrative according to his narration. I can briefly say that Eđilmez changed the elements of his films according to his stories, or even, the kind of genre that he wanted to make. So his choices of characters are related with the structure of his films.

Before analysing his films, I want to make a general comment about his cinema and his characters. Eđilmez's career starts with comedies and it continues with melodramas. Neziĥ Erdođan defines him as "*a director of stereotypical melodramas*". However, the melodramatic modality influences the other films he makes in different genres as well, like *Bir Millet Uyanyor* (1966), which is an epic film or *Canım Kardeřim* (1973), which is a drama. Especially after 1972, he makes romantic comedies, which are a combination of melodramas and comedies. Scognamillo defines those films of Eđilmez as "emotional comedy", when he comments on the films of Adile Nařit. (2010, pg.279) According to Serpil Kirel, the golden age of these "emotional comedies" are in the years 1963-1965. (2005, pg.266) Eđilmez continues with this genre in the seventies, too. I will show the films of Eđilmez that I will analyse and the genre they belong to in the table 5.1.

Table 5.1: The genres of Eđilmez's films that I will analyse

	ADVENTURE	COMEDY
ACTION	<i>Bir Millet Uyanyor</i>	<i>Süt Kardeřler</i>
ROMANCE	<i>Sürtük</i>	<i>Sev Kardeřim, Oh Olsun, Mavi Boncuk</i>
DRAMA	<i>Canım Kardeřim</i>	

Fast editing and narration that depends on music are the common features of all of Eđilmez films. Also, different Eđilmez's films present a very similar story world. It is necessary for the characters and the spaces. Also, the events in his films depend on similar conflicts. However, the crucial thing that determines his films' story worlds are his actors and their appearance in his different films. The large cast of his films are also a characteristic of his cinema. According to Agah Özgüç, appearance of the characters in Eđilmez's films is quite different. His characters do not appear alone. His characters

are not constructed on one person; it depends on many of them. Özgüç also defines this situation as Eğılmez's *école*. (1993, pg.48) The large cast of Eğılmez's films is made up of stereotypic characters. This offers the effect of verisimilitude on an audience regarding their identification with the story world. Eğılmez's talent in creating stereotypic characters also affects his actors' screen personas. Eğılmez discovered many actors or changed famous actors' careers through the stereotypical characters he designed for them. If we consider the actors that he worked with such as Münir Özkul, Şener Şen, Zeki Alasya, Metin Akpınar, Tarık Akan, Kemal Sunal, Halit Akçatepe, İlyas Salman, Adile Naşit, Ayşen Gruda, Kartal Tibet, Hülya Koçyiğit, Türkan Şoray, we can clearly notice his influence. Of course, a lot of these actors were famous before his films, but he constructed precise stereotypic characters for them, which fits their physical appearances and which also creates verisimilitude for the audience. He developed the features of his characters, film by film. This is very close to Uri Margolin's comments that I mentioned in Chapter Two. (2007, pg.70) "*Can the reader carry over the description of a literary figure from one text to another? Can we unite the descriptions of the same-named character in different texts by the same author or by different ones in order to get the complete story of X?*" Actually, we should think about every character Eğılmez creates from that aspect. So, this is one of the ways he created a lot of unique stereotypic characters through different actors.

Another characteristic feature of Eğılmez's films is related to the use of space. The large cast of Eğılmez's films gather together in the same house and they play characters of the family who live in this house. In this sense, family is an important motif of Eğılmez's films. According to Abisel, the family is a suitable ambience to re-produce and legitimize all the ideological discourses in its own universe as a core unit of the society. (1994, pg.190) This comment also reminds us of Peter Brooks' comments about the potential of the family situation to reflect an ideology. (2002, pg.47) This large cast constitutes the large family and they live in this crowded situation in a traditional and old *maison*.

Now, I will extend my analyses to Ertem Eđilmez's films. I will try to pick different films that belong to different genres or that use different subject matter. Also, I will pick a special topic for each, like the home that I mentioned as a special place, the conflict between social classes, or the influence of the melodramatic modality. However, the basic aim of these analyses will be to explain the features of Eđilmez's characters in detail. In every section, I will try to find some significant masterplots and to make the stereotypic characters' functions clear. As a result, this is a structural analysis, so I will consider elements of the narratives, and I will point out its plots, events, characters and spaces.

5.2 SÜRTÜK (THE STREET WALKER): IDEAL MELODRAMATIC STRUCTURE OF THE YEŞİLÇAM

Sürtük (1965) is Ertem Eđilmez's second feature film as a director. And, it is a good example of Yeşilçam. *Sürtük* carries representative features of a lot of Yeşilçam films within it. First of all, it is a story of unfortunate lovers. It is a rebirth story. It also has the classic triangle structure of Yeşilçam; the hero, the heroine and the villain. Those characters are drawn in a stereotypic way. *Sürtük* is adapted from various sources. Mahmut Yesari's novel *Sürtük* is one of them. According to Scognamillo it also takes advantage of the story structure of Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion* (2010, pg.353) In this sense, it is a combination of different masterplots. These stereotypes and masterplots are rendered in a melodramatic way in *Sürtük* are like other Yeşilçam films or in other words, Yeşilçam's melodramatic tales. As a melodrama, *Sürtük* suggests a certain moral view as well.

Sürtük tells the story of a poor street singer; her name is *Naciye* (Türkan Şoray). She becomes an important singer with the support of *Ekrem* (Ekrem Bora) who has lots of nightclubs. *Ekrem* tries to transform *Naciye* into an educated and talented singer. He approaches her as a kind of project, but as time passes by he falls in love with her. However *Naciye* has an affair with her music teacher *Cüneyt* (Cüneyt Arkın), who is

working as a pianist in one of *Ekrem's* nightclubs. When *Ekrem* hears about this relationship he goes crazy. He tries to break up their relationship. He does not let them work even in other nightclubs in Istanbul. Still, he does not succeed. In the end, *Naciye* and *Cüneyt* find a job in a nightclub in another city. Because of this, *Ekrem* threatens *Cüneyt's* life when speaking to *Naciye*. *Naciye* understands that she has no other option and she accept *Ekrem's* offer in order to save *Cüneyt's* life. After this, she rejects *Cüneyt*. She lies to *Cüneyt* that she does not love him anymore. They break up. At the end of the film, *Ekrem* understands that *Naciye* will never really love him and she will always belong to *Cüneyt* in her heart. So *Ekrem* arranges *Naciye* and *Cüneyt's* reunion and he succeeds.

I said this story combines lots of sources and also it is a combination of different masterplots. *Sürtük* is the ordinary, reversal-of-fortune story of *Naciye*, but Eğilmez brings *Ekrem's* role forward and he shows *Naciye's* transformation as *Ekrem's* project. In this sense, the 'Pygmalion' masterplot is brought to the fore. According to this masterplot, *Ekrem* tries to make a great singer of *Naciye*, but he does not control his feelings towards her and at the end, he loses his creation. He says to *Naciye* (1965) " *You can go but you cannot escape because I made you, your name, your art, your fame even your beauty, all those things belong to me, they are mine.*" From *Naciye's* point of view, we can also define this story as a rebirth story. In this sense, the story has also a kind of 'Cinderella' masterplot. It shows us the transformation of a street singer into a famous singer. When *Ekrem* forces *Naciye* to marry him, it is a sign of another masterplot, which is 'and now you must marry me' ⁵ Also, *Ekrem's* mental 'transformation' is important because at the end of the film, he becomes mature and he makes the right choice.

⁵ -Information about the masterplot 'now you must marry me' [accessed 10.06.2013]

<http://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/AndNowYouMustMarryMe>

Table 5.2: The features of the characters in *Sürtük*

<i>Sürtük</i>	Male Protagonist <i>Cüneyt</i>	Female Protagonist <i>Naciye</i>	Male Protagonist <i>Ekrem</i>
Personality	Moral, Good, Calm, Decent	Good, Local, Pure, Warm, Likable	Immoral, Cruel, Swearer, Aggressive
Physical appearance	Handsome, Pretty face	Black hair, Gazelle-eyes, Slob,	Cold face, Harsh features
Family, Economic Situation	No family, A poor man	No family, A poor girl	No family, A rich man
Job	Piano teacher	Street singer to a famous singer	Nightclub owner

Naciye: She is the female protagonist of *Sürtük*. In the beginning of the film *Naciye* is a street singer. She is a likeable character, but she has behaviours that belong to the lower class; she speaks with slang words, she bites her nails, she chews her gum with exaggeration and she seems like a slob. However, even with all these negative features, she gains everyone's sympathy easily. The essential reason for this is the actress, Türkan Şoray's stardom. I spoke about how the physical appearance of the actor is crucial to the construction of the character. If we talk about Türkan Şoray's face, the features of her face seem to be drawn distinctly, especially her big eyes, which are like the characters from Disney's cartoons and this gives her a characteristic screen persona. Her characteristic face also symbolised the local Turkish woman for audience. According to Fatih Özgüven, (1989, pg.41) "...for the Turkish audiences who have undergone complex changes, migrating from villages to the cities in large numbers, but still trying to retain the memory of a certain ideal of imagined beauty, the cinematic icon could only be the gazelle-eyed Türkan Şoray." Because of this they can identify themselves with her. Accordingly, the transformation of her character in the film means that a local woman, a woman like one of us, succeeds. This is a key point in understanding the way to the audience's pleasure. In this sense, Eğilmez uses her face. Her expressions give meaning to what Eğilmez wants to express in the most effective way. So that is the reason why he uses so many close-ups to increase the level of Türkan Şoray's effect on the audience. In the film, *Naciye*'s face represents moral features such as the hometown girl, purity and warm-heartedness. Özgüven says that (1989, pg.41) *Naciye* "...claims a unique innocence, with a talent for provoking the protective feelings of her man and staying pure in the most unfavourable conditions. She succeeds without seeming

ridiculous or unbelievable." We see this situation also in the story, as she struggles those positive features are always with her, and when she wins, it means that a girl like us can succeed.

Ekrem: He is the male antagonist of *Sürtük*. The film opens with a scene that shows us *Ekrem's* cruelty. He and his friends beat the employees of a nightclub and *Ekrem* forces the owner to sell the nightclub to him using violence. So, he has obtained all his nightclubs with money and cruelty. Ekrem Bora who plays *Ekrem* is an important actor who is identified with villainous characters because of his senseless and cold face. According to Özgüven, (1987, pg.37) "*Bora, in particular played the first of a line of obstinate, sexually aggressive rebel types who flourished in the films of the late 1950s and early 1960s.*" When he sees *Naciye*, he understands that she can be a famous singer. He sees her as a kind of project and he tries to transform this sloppy, low-class girl into a glamorous lady. And, he falls in love with her. His cruel behaviour does not seem unreasonable, because he wants to be strong and powerful. He uses cruelty as the only way he knows to obtain success. However, because of his unrequited love of *Naciye*, he understands that he cannot have everything with power and money. So, he transforms and applies self-sacrifice because of her love. This choice also is part of the dramatic power of the narration, and makes the action seem reasonable.

Cüneyt: He is the male protagonist of *Sürtük*. He is a piano player. *Ekrem* asks him to teach *Naciye* how to sing. When they start to work together, they fall in love with each other. In this role, *Cüneyt* is a pure-hearted, calm and decent character. He only reacts when he is humiliated by *Ekrem*. However, he does not want to use violence against him. It is weird to see *Cüneyt* Arkin like this, after seeing his career as a tough-national action hero. While *Naciye* defends him and makes sacrifices for him, these behaviours put *Cüneyt* in a passive position in regards to *Naciye*.

As a result we can find lots of features of the melodramatic modality in this story; a reversal of fortune, the triangle of the hero, the heroine and the villain, a conflict between different social classes and a self-sacrificing woman figure. However, Eđilmez uses those clichés along with causality. He does not let it disrupt the narrative's coherence. The relationship between the events and the behaviours of the characters are reasonable. The exaggeration or, in other words, 'the excess' does not damage the narrative's structure. I am taking his second film *Sürtük* as a starting point. I will continue by examining the development of his characters and his narration.

5.3 *BİR MİLLET UYANIYOR* (A NATION IS AWAKENING): A MELODRAMATIC HISTORICAL EPIC

Bir Millet Uyanıyor (1966) is an historical epic film, it tells a story of resistance during the period of the Turkish national independence war. A group of veteran soldiers decide to fight the Greek occupation in Western Anatolia, and also against the rules of the Ottoman Empire. They symbolise the civil resistance of the Anatolian people. This film draws a picture of the Turkish independence war through the agency of those characters. This situation is established with the support of the melodramatic modality. So, in this section I will examine how melodrama provided a way to talk about an ideology from the point of view of certain individuals. I want to analyse this Eđilmez film with the contribution of this feature to the melodrama. Also, I will analyse the masterplots and the stereotypes of this film.

Bir Millet Uyanıyor is the story of *Captain Davut* (Kartal Tibet) and his veteran soldiers fighting against occupation by the enemies' troops. *Captain Davut* is a war hero. He has a plan to fight the Greek army which is trying to occupy his country. According to his plan, he tries to gather the veteran soldiers who remain from his troop. There are just seven people: *Ömer from Biga* (Hayati Hamzaođlu), *Dark Bilal* (Ahmet Danyal Topatan), *Sergeant Tilki* (Münir Özkul), *Huge Ahmet* (Erol Taş), *Mute Rıza* (İhsan

Yüce) and *Lieutenant Faruk* (Tugay Toksöz). In the beginning, we see how *Captain Davut* reaches them and how they gather together again. After gathering, they share their plans with the people of the town. However, the people and the major do not support them because they do not want to do anything against the orders of the Ottoman Sultan. After this, they decide to start their fight from a village that has a strategic role for the Greek army. The people of this village have abandoned their village, but some of them are still there. They also join *Captain Davut's* plan. In the village, they receive news that their ammunition, which they have hidden on a farm, was taken by the Greek forces. *Captain Davut* decides on a night operation go to this farm and fight against the Greek soldiers. In this operation, they kill Greek soldiers and they reach their ammunition. After this event, the Greek army attacks the town using a large number of soldiers. No matter what *Captain Davut* and his soldiers do to defend the village at the beginning, they must surrender because the Greek commander threatens them and the lives of a large number of refugees. *Captain Davut* and his friends are put on trial in Greek military court and they are sentenced to death. Still, their day of execution also represents a beginning for the battle of civil independence.

Bir Millet Uyanyor has a symbolic narration: it uses the possibilities of the melodramatic mode on a personalised level. According to Thomas Elsaesser, (2002, pg.47) "...melodramatic effects can successfully shift explicit political themes onto a personalised plane." If we search the masterplots and the exaggerated characters of this film, we can notice this influence more clearly. Because, this symbolic narration also shows itself in the masterplots of this film. *Bir Millet Uyanyor* is designed around the masterplot of "As long as there is one man"⁶, so this one man is a character that carries many symbolic features. This one man is represented by *Captain Davut* and also by his fellow soldiers in the film. They are the few soldiers who remained alive from their troop as a result of long and deadly wars. On the other hand, excess is shown through the members of the Greek army; they are depicted as cruel, rapists and dishonourable

⁶ -Information about the masterplot 'as long as there is one man' [accessed 10.06.2013]

<http://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/AsLongAsThereIsOneMan>

villains. This shows us the one-sided ideological narration behind the film. Still, this ideological approach is a general feature for a lot of war films.

Table 5.3: The features of the characters in *Bir Millet Uyanyor*

<i>Bir Millet Uyanyor</i>	Male Protagonist <i>Captain Davut</i>	Female Protagonist <i>All the women of the nation</i>	Male Protagonist <i>Greek Soldiers</i>
Personality	Moral, Good, War Hero, Aggressive	Good, Local, Pure, Warm, Likable	Immoral, Cruel, Rapist, Dishonourable
Physical appearances	Handsome, Harsh features	-	-
Family, Economic Situation	No family, A poor man	-	-
Job	A Captain, Veteran war hero	-	Soldiers

Captain Davut: (Kartal Tibet) He is the main character of the film. *Captain Davut* is depicted as a national war hero. If we consider the roles that Kartal Tibet played before, he is identified with Turkish national heroes like *Tarkan* and *Karaođlan (The Dark Boy)*. *Captain Davut* is a tough guy when fighting against the enemy, but he is merciful toward his friends and his people. We can see the melodramatic influence in the nationalist discourses of *Captain Davut*. He warns his friends who complain about their own personal bad experiences because of the war. He gives moral lessons to the Ottoman major, the imam of the village and the Greek commanders. *Captain Davut* says that "*we will continue to fight till our last man, till our last drop of our blood*". Of course, these are symbolic dialogues, which represent the ideological position of the film.

Dark Bilal (Ahmet Danyal Topatan): The Greek soldiers burn *Dark Bilal's* house and his village. They tie his hands and they rape his daughter in front of him. His character represents the innocent and humiliated victims of the war.

Big Ahmet (Erol Taş): *Ahmet* lost one of his arms in the previous war. When *Captain Davut's* soldiers ask him to fight, he blames them and he does not want to go war with them again. Still, after his wife's and his mother's warnings, he changes his mind and decides to fight with them using his one arm. In this sense, he sacrifices his arm for his nation, and also, the family sacrifices him as well.

Mute Rıza (İhsan Yüce): He is a mute man. He has lost the power of speech because of his his wartime experience while he was imprisoned by the enemy's army.

As a result we can see the exaggerated characters in the film. They are used to create an effect on the audience. On the other hand, the love stories that are usually the main thing in melodramas are represented in this film with some lack of feeling which has been lost because of the war, or according to the political discourse of the film, because of the enemy. These examples are the consequence of the melodramatic influence on an historical-war film.

5.4 SEV KARDEŞİM: HOME BRINGS THE FAMILY TOGETHER

Sev Kardeşim (1972) is an adaptation of George S. Kaufman's play (1936) *You Can't Take It With You*. The story of the film depends on the conflict between a poor girl and a rich boy. The boy's rich father wants to buy the poor girl's house to build a factory. The home uses as an important metaphor in the film. As an adaptation, the film borrows its main plot, the main events and also the theme of home from *You Can't Take It With You*. However, Eğılmez adds some domestic features to this Western story, and he makes a combination. Eğılmez also continues to use the idea of home as a metaphor. After this film, the home plays an essential role in his filmography. So I will analyse how he uses this home as a space in his films. Eğılmez ascribes to this house some

characteristic values. After giving a summary of the film, I will analyse the use of this home as a characteristic space in Eđilmez's filmography.

Cemal alıřkan (Hulusi Kentmen) is a very rich factory owner who needs to buy one last house in the neighbourhood to build his new factory. On the other hand, *Mesut Gler* (Mnir zkul), the owner of that house, does not want to sell his house for any price. He lives in this house with his family that has many interesting members, like a blind brother in love (Nejdet Yakın), a drunken and mad brother *Maksut Gler* (Turgut Boralı), a deaf sister *Mesude* (Adile Nařıt), a stammering nephew Ali (Halit Akatepe) and of course, his young and beautiful daughter *Alev* (Hlyya Koyiđit). This house means a lot to him and is full of memories, especially of his dead wife. Also, he wants to protect the other poor residents of the neighbourhood who are still in their houses. *Cemal*, the factory owner, has a young son *Ferit* (Tarık Akan) who works with him as a manager. Also, poor *Mesut's* daughter, *Alev*, works in *Cemal's* factory. As a result of pressure by her friends *Alev* decides to meet *Ferit*, the handsome son of her boss. In the beginning, he is not interested in her but with time, he starts to love her too and he decides to marry her. Still, when he tells his family, they object to this idea because of *Alev's* family's social and economic situation, but when *Cemal* hears that the only house he wants for his factory belongs to *Alev's* father, he decides to support this relationship until he buys the house. However, as a result of some events his intentions are revealed and all of them understand that he was just pretending to support the young lovers, but really just wanted to own the house. Because of this, *Alev* flees the city, *Mesut* sells his house to *Cemal* in anger. Still, *Cemal* reconsiders his decision and feels regret about what he did. *Cemal* gives the house back. The film has a happy ending.

Eđilmez designs a weird but happy and helpful poor family. On the other hand, he depicts a materialistic and snobby family. Even we understand this situation from the names given to the characters; it is also a good example about how they have been stereotyped. *Cemal's* surname is *alıřkan*, it means hardworking, however, *Mesut's* surname is *Gler*, which means smiles. We can see the typical excessive approach of Yeřilam in the characters and in the storytelling too. Eđilmez tries to construct an

emotional effect by using different views of poverty. Still, he balances this pathetic situation with humour. Mesut always points out that even if they do not have much money, they have each other and they have a sense of humour. So, this is the reason they always feel happy. This is a classic formula used by Eđilmez and Yeřilçam as well.

According to Kılıçbay and Onaran (2003, pg.236)

Class difference between lovers is a typical melodramatic mode in Turkish film; classes constitute boundaries for love and they delay, interrupt or inhibit happiness. In these melodramas, upper classes are typically portrayed by means of negative conventions (immorality, decadence, ruthlessness), while various positive qualities are attributed to the members of lower classes (innocence, altruism, humanism).

In this film, Eđilmez surrounds this 'happy' family with their house. And after, he puts the house in the middle of the conflict. This choice is decisive even in the classic romantic relationship of the young couple. After this film, Eđilmez continues to use the same 'happy home' phenomenon. In *Mavi Boncuk* (1974) a group of bachelors live in this kind of house together, like a family, without a specific reason. In *Salak Milyoner* (1974), four peasants who are also brothers, demolish an old couple's house in İstanbul while they search for a treasure. This treasure-searching process is depicted with irony. Film by film, the home represents some specific values, like belonging, pride, peace, fidelity, family, and memories, etc. Eđilmez constructs the emotional storytelling structure in order to use those values in this way, those values are identified with Eđilmez's cinema; they also influence and shape Yeřilçam in general. On the other hand, these films show that the home is designed as a kind of stage where the characters enact their plays. For example, in *Süit Kardeşler* (1976) almost every character shows their performance in the home. It is also found in *Şabanođlu Şaban* (1977). Even in the series of *Hababam Sınıfı*, we can easily consider the school as a kind of big home, with a mother figure *Mother Hafize* (Adile Naşit) she is the nurturing worker of the school, and a father figure *Hodja Mahmut* (Münir Özkul) who is the vice principal of the school. We can find lots of connections regarding the home phenomenon in Eđilmez's films. I will finish my analysis with one last example, in *Gülen Gözler* (1977) every event and every character is designed and related to the home. The father is scared to give in marriage one of his daughters (he also has four more), to the crazy pilot *Vecihi*, who flies on the top of their home causing small quakes. The father says that "*He will demolish the house on us*". However, the crazy pilot *Vecihi* saves their home from a

kind of hypothecate. And at the end of the film, he really does demolish one of the walls of the house. And, of course, using the unforgettable soap bubble motif, that bubble like their hopes about their sweet home and happy future. We can say these things show Eğılmez's kind of humour, but I see a strong relationship between the characters, the events and the settings that are constructed by Eğılmez and his crew.

Table 5.4: The features of the characters in *Sev Kardeşim*

<i>Sev Kardeşim</i>	Male Protagonist <i>Ferit Çalışkan</i>	Female Protagonist <i>Alev Güler</i>	Male Protagonist <i>Cemal Çalışkan</i>	Mentor <i>Mesut Güler</i>
Personality	Good, Moral	Good, Pure, Warm, Likable	Greedy, Authoritative, Harsh	Moral, Bighearted, Stubborn
Physical appearances	Handsome, Young, Long dark brown hair	Beautiful, Pretty face	Old man, White hair, Long white mustache,	Old man, Slim body, Sympathetic face
Family, Economic Situation	The only son of the rich family	Daughter of the poor man, She lost her mother	Father of the rich family, Upper class	Father of the poor family, Lower class
Job	Manager in the factory	Worker in the factory	Owner of the factory	Worker in the factory.

Cemal Çalışkan (Hulusi Kentmen): He is depicted as a greedy, rich man. Hulusi Kentmen's face is identified with this rich man, who can get angry, but essentially, plays golden-hearted, father roles. He is one of the unforgettable, stereotypical faces of Yeşilçam. According to Vecdi Sayar's interview Ertem Eğılmez thoughts about flat characters or stereotypes are part of his direction. He says that it is very hard to sketch a supporting character in one and half an hours, so that is why he prefers stereotypes for those roles. And he adds that it is easy to write a golden-hearted father role for Hulusi Kentmen, who is a well-known Yeşilçam actor, and who is also well known for his performances as a sympathetic father. (1984, pg.37)

Mesut Güler: (Münir Özkul) He is the father of poor family. Münir Özkul has played almost the same role in many of Eğılmez's films. He is the symbolic face of the moral

values, which Yeşilçam tried to present. Film by film, Eğilmez discovered his face and he tried to ascribe those positive meanings to it. I mentioned the blessing of the lower class as one of the narration methods of Yeşilçam. In Eğilmez's films, Münir Özkul always plays the poor, but the good one. On the other hand, he always plays the patriarchal father figure who is also likeable and acceptable. He tries to look after his children and he also tries to understand their problems. So, generally he acts the part of the insightful, golden hearted and proud father figure.

Alev Güler (Hülya Koçyiğit): She is the young factory girl who falls in love with the son of her boss. She has an innocent, beautiful and pretty face. In this sense, she has the face made for identification. Through viewing the beauty of her face, we are able to identify ourselves with this 'weird' family. Her face gives us, a real feeling about her hopes and in her love affair with a boy from the upper class. This situation also reminds us the stereotypical story of *Cinderella*. Even in the Frank Capra's adaptation of *You Can't Take It With You* (1938), when the heroine goes to away from her home after trial scene, a newspaper publishes the headline "*Cindrella Flees the city*". Related with her role, Koçyiğit says that Sarıkartal (2003, pg.87) "*In melodramas, I was demanded to act in a specific way and I was expected to represent a certain type of character.*" And she continues by complaining about her young, beautiful and innocent ideal-woman stereotype.

Ferit Çalışkan (Tarık Akan): He is the handsome son of the rich factory owner. I will analyse this character in others film too. All these characters are very similar to each other, which points to his stereotype (except for his character *Murat* in *Canım Kardeşim* (1973)). I will also analyse that character too.

As a result, *Sev Kardeşim* (1972) is a typical example where we see Yeşilçam's characteristic features, the influence of traditional narratives, the stereotypical characters, an adaptation from a Western play, the conflict between a rich and poor

family and a love story between a young girl and boy. Still, beyond all these features one of them is in the foreground and that is the usage of the house as the main subject of the conflict. N. Coş, E. Ayça (1974, pg.21) Eğılmez points out this choice too; he says that house issue was the essential point of the conflict and its specific focus in *Sev Kardeşim*. On the other hand, the blind, drunken, deaf and stammering characters remind us traditional Turkish narratives. N. Coş, E. Ayça (1974, pg.21) Eğılmez mentions that even though they took this story from an American play, with the contribution of these characters and the changes in the story they were able to *Turkify* this film. So in his view, the translation/adaptation was successful and it looked like a Turkish story as well.

5.5 OH OLSUN (TOUGH CHEESE!): CLASS CONFLICT

I mentioned before that class conflict is a crucial theme for a lot of Yeşilçam film. In this section, I will analyse those reasons. *Oh Olsun* (1973) is a romance between two young couples that belong to different economic classes. The film has both comic and melodramatic features like other Eğılmez films. In the previous analysis, I mentioned that the conflict is constructed around the poor family's house, but in *Oh Olsun*, it is constructed around the factory that rich father owns. The father of the poor family and his daughter also work in this factory. These particular spaces, like house or factory, raise the potential of the conflict. Both films use almost the same characters (with different names), but the same actors so I am including a table about these similar characters, though I will not write an in-depth analysis about them.

Oh Olsun is a transformational story of *Fehmi Haznedar* (Hulusi Kentmen) who is a rich factory owner. He also has three son with whom he is heavy handed. He tries to raise them using pressure. However, they do not follow their father's rules, but only pretend they follow. *Fazıl Haznedar* (Kemal Sunal) is the oldest and the stupid one, he works as a manager in his father's factory. *Ferit Haznedar* (Tarık Akan) is the middle

one, he is a handsome and womanizing boy. He pretends to go to university, but he hangs out with girls instead. *Ferdi Haznedar* (Halit Akçatepe) is the youngest one, he goes to high school. He is lazy but he pretends that he is hardworking. They lie to their father about their lives. When *Fehmi Haznedar* discovers this, he punishes them by making them work in his factory as ordinary workers. Meanwhile, *Master Burhan* (Münir Özkul) works in the same factory with his daughter *Alev* (Hale Soygazi) and he is the father of a poor family. The workers of the factory think about going on strike, but *Master Burhan* says to them that if they strike, the factory will go bankrupt. This changes their minds for a while. *Ferit* and *Alev* meet in the factory and they start to love each other. They decide to get married, but they cannot tell this to their parents. As they continue their relationship, they notice that *Alev* is pregnant. They decide to hide *Alev* on the top floor of *Ferit's* house until *Alev* delivers their baby. *Alev* tells her family that she has to go to Germany to work. They succeed with this plan until after the baby is born. *Alev* hears that *Ferit* is now engaged to a girl, but she does not know that this is a result of *Ferit's* father's pressure. *Alev* leaves him and goes back to her parents' house with her child. Everyone hears about this situation including *Fehmi Haznedar* and *Master Burhan* too. *Fehmi Haznedar* blames *Master Burhan* for this and they fight. *Fehmi Haznedar* fires *Master Burhan* from the factory. When the workers hear this, they decide to support *Master Burhan* and they go on strike. *Ferit* and his brothers support the strike too against their father. *Fehmi Haznedar* is in a hopeless position, he forgives his son and accepts the workers' demands, and he gives the factory to his sons.

Table 5.5: The features of the characters in *Oh Olsun*

<i>Oh Olsun</i>	Male Protagonist <i>Ferit Haznedar</i>	Female Protagonist <i>Alev</i>	Male Protagonist <i>Fehmi Haznedar</i>	Mentor <i>Master Burhan</i>
Personality	Good, Womaniser to loyal husband	Good, Pure, Cheater, Likable	Greedy, Tyranniser, Patriarchal	Moral, Bighearted, Forgiver
Physical appearances	Handsome, Young, Long dark brown hair	Young, Blonde, Poor girl but elegant beauty	Old man, White hair, Long white moustache,	Old man, Slim body, Sympathetic face
Family, Economic Situation	One of the three sons in a rich family	Daughter of the poor man, Mother of a new born	Father of the rich family, Upper class	Father of the poor family, Lower class
Job	Student to worker in his father's factory	Worker in the factory	Owner of the factory	Worker in the factory.

After summarizing the plot of *Oh Olsun*, I want to return to the class conflict issue. Why it is so common in Yeşilçam? I want to start with an example from *Yalancı Yarım* (1973) which is also an Ertem Eğilmez film. It uses almost the same conflict between a rich boy and a poor girl. When the poor father of the girl discovers his daughter's platonic love for a rich boy, he wants to give her advice using an old story. In this story, a poor girl falls in love to the son of the sultan. From then on, she cannot be happy again. According to her father, this affair is a dangerous adventure. However, according to her this is a fairy tale and love does not care about class. The connection between traditional stories and Yeşilçam about class conflict is crucial. The thought of moving up the social ladder is a universal theme for narratives. And obviously, it is an dream for many people. Still, in the films of Yeşilçam, we can talk about the 'addiction' of this theme. The theme of social conflict is a usual theme of traditional stories between lovers, so in this sense, we are again reminded how the melodramas of Yeşilçam succeed those stories. *Oh Olsun* follows this structure too, but the use of the factory is highlighted and place becomes a significant part of the conflict. The place gives its characteristics to this conflict. So Eğilmez designs this space as using verisimilitude, which comes with characteristic features like strikes, rights of the labours, etc. It is like the design of a stereotypic character. Because this is a simple way to present verisimilitude to the audience.

Consequently, class conflict is a common theme for Yeşilçam and Ertem Eğilmez as well. However, film by film he arranges carefully the material of this conflict. In this film, it is the factory. This choice provides the film a coherent structure. The causality of the events are also reasonable through these specific choices. Eğilmez adds the classic love story of a young couple that shows their reunion in this structure.

5.6 CANIM KARDEŞİM (MY DEAR BROTHER): AN EXCEPTIONAL DRAMA IN ERTEM EĞİLMEZ'S FILMOGRAPHY

I want to mention the different features of *Canım Kardeşim* (1973) in this section. Why Eğilmez made this exceptional film and why he did not continue to make this kind of film? Then, I want to analyse the storytelling and the characters of *Canım Kardeşim*. The big difference in this film is it has no heroine. Accordingly, there was no love story between a young boy and a girl. It tells a story about two poor, young tramps, *Murat* (Tarık Akan) and *Halit* (Halit Akçatepe) and the little brother of *Murat*, *Kahraman* (Kahraman Kırıl). We see the conflict between social classes in this film too. Still, the conflict was told according to *Kahraman's* dream to have a television in his house. Television was a new technology during that period in Turkey, and for a poor family it was a very expensive thing to buy. This motif was used as the main and powerful conflict of the film.

Canım Kardeşim begins with scenes containing information about *Murat* (Tarık Akan) and *Halit* (Halit Akçatepe). They are stealing fruit. They are hanging out in the streets without a reason. *Tarık* lives with his father and his little brother, *Kahraman* (Kahraman Kırıl). *Halit* is their neighbour and he has no family. They live in a shanty that is in a poor neighbourhood. His father complains about *Tarık* because he is not working. The only job he has is cheating people and stealing from them with *Halit*. *Tarık's* father falls asleep while he is smoking and he dies because of the fire. After his father dies, *Tarık* feels the responsibility for *Kahraman* fall on his shoulders. *Kahraman* goes to primary school and the only thing that he wants to have in his life is a new television in their home. Then, they learn unexpectedly that *Kahraman* has leukemia. After they find out, *Tarık* and *Halit* try to do everything to make *Kahraman* happy. And *Tarık* gives him a promise that he will buy a television for him. However, *Tarık* and *Halit* have no money to buy a television for him. So they decide to steal a television. When they go to their house with the television they have stolen, they notice that it is too late and *Kahraman* has died.

I mentioned the distinction between realistic narratives and romantic narratives. Melodrama succeeds that of romantic narration. It has exaggerated features. Still, realistic drama tries to give a picture of ordinary life. In cinema, Italian neo-realistic films are a representative example of this narration. We can see similar approach in *Canım Kardeşim*. In Engin Ayça's and Nezih Coş's interview with Ertem Eğilmez, Eğilmez says that, he used this narration from the influence of French New Wave. (1974, pg.24) However, Pekman and Ilgaz point out that the film looks like Italian Neo-realism, especially the scenes that show the life of the poor neighbourhood in realistic detail. (2010, pg.127) Eğilmez gives us those scenes with a taste of documentary. Consequently, the narration of *Canım Kardeşim* is quite different than other Eğilmez films. We can also see the difference in its story. As I mentioned before, there was no heroine in this film and there was no love story. This means a completely different structure than my previous analyses. However, the conflict remains, but the sides of the conflict are different. According to Cem Pekman, *Canım Kardeşim* gives us the story of a child who cannot obtain the television instead of the classic love story between a young boy and girl, this is an indication of the search for a different storytelling method. (2010, pg.31)

This film is designed around the transformation of Tarık's mind. Tarık is a sloppy man, but he feels responsibility for his brother. He feels that he has to make a sacrifice. Eğilmez says that he designs Tarık as a tramp and he shows him stealing. And that reduces the effect when he steals the television for his brother. In this way, he has not shown that he makes a sacrifice. (Sayar, V., 1984, pg.38) However, Eğilmez made this comment after the failure of the film at the box office. I think the same reason makes this film realistic and powerful. Another choice would have resulted in an unreasonable transformation process. Because the real conflict appears when Tarık feels responsibility for his brother. He does not seem happy and confident like the previous times, when he steals the television he feels desperate and insecure. Because he knows he will lose his brother.

Table 5.6: The features of the characters in *Canım Kardeşim*

<i>Canım Kardeşim</i>	Male Protagonist <i>Murat</i>	Female Protagonist <i>Television (Symbolic)</i>	Male Protagonist <i>Kahraman</i>	Supporting role <i>Mehmet</i>
Personality	Cheater, Slobman to self-sacrificing man	Underrecognized, Modern	Innocent, Pure	Self-seeker, Immoral
Physical appearances	Handsome, A tramp is dressed in tatters	Technological device	Young, Pretty face, Leukaemia patient	Sly smile, Middle aged man
Family, Economic Situation	Bad example for his little brother, The son of a poor man	It requires money	Little brother and little son of the poor family	The richest man of the poor neighbourhood
Job	Unemployment	-	Primary school student	Blood dealer

Murat (Tarık Akan): This character is a perfect example of my analyses of Eğılmez's films. It shows how Eğılmez breaks the cliché usage of stereotypes. My general observation about Eğılmez's films is that with the support of a strong causality in the story, the bad influence of stereotypes disappears. Before this film he had given the stereotypical role to Tarık Akan. He played the rich, handsome, womanizing young man until this film. Özgüven (1989 pg.37) says that those were the baby-face-over-a-turtle-neck-sweater days of Tarık Akan. He adds that but in *Canım Kardeşim* "...he was not only a boyish and cloyingly charming heart throb..." So in *Canım Kardeşim*, he is a poor tramp. He is depicted as a thief and a sloppy man. This is something different from his ordinary stereotype. With the support of Forster's concepts, if we say that he had always played flat characters in his career, this time his character is round.

Kahraman (Kahraman Kırıl): Kahraman is a primary school child. He has lost his mother. He lives with his quiet, old father and his big brother in this poor house. He represents the innocent face of future inside this hopeless environment. However, this hope is ruined with the news that he has leukemia. In this sense, Kahraman Kırıl's innocent and warm-hearted face plays an important role in constructing the effect of hopefulness.

Halit (Halit Akçatepe): He is the friend of Murat. He is also a poor tramp. In regards to this character the filmmaker preferred Pekcan Koşar's ⁷ voice instead of Halit Akçatepe's voice. I believe it is related to constructing a more dramatic character. Normally, Halit Akçatepe's voice is identified with comic roles. So, they tried to solve this problem with the possibilities of dubbing.

Mehmet (Metin Akpınar): His character is a supporting character. He sells people's blood to hospitals. His character is designed to exaggerate the dramatic situation of the child who has leukemia. He is an exaggerated self-seeking character who earns his life from people's blood.

5.7 MAVİ BONCUK (THE BLUE BEAD): THE CHARACTERS OF THE FILM WITH THEIR SCREEN PERSONAS

Mavi Boncuk (1974) is an array of characters that Eğılmez had already used in his films. This time they gather together in a "big and old house" which I have explained previously and is also one of Eğılmez's artificial designs. This house is a special space where his characters appear. *Mavi Boncuk* presents us with six leading men in one house. Basically, *Mavi Boncuk* is a film that represents the summary of the stereotypical characters that Eğılmez had developed as a result of many tries. Star image is also important in Eğılmez's constructions of his characters. Still the most significant feature of *Mavi Boncuk* regarding stardom is that its heroine Emel Sayın appears in this film as herself. This brings her real stardom into this film. So this makes the other actors' stardom come to the fore in the storytelling of *Mavi Boncuk* as well. This is a felicitous way to bring verisimilitude to the audience's thoughts.

⁷ -Information about Pekcan Koşar <http://sinematurk.com/kisi/2727-pekcan-kosar/>
[accessed 07.06.2013]

The film begins in the nightclub where *Emel Sayın* (Emel Sayın) performs. A group of men that belong to the lower class appears in a restaurant and we can understand their station in life from their clothes. They misunderstand the prices on the menu because of some confusion. They are shocked when they see the bill. They cannot pay it and they are violently thrown out of the nightclub by the owner (Feridun Çölgeçen) and his men. So, they decide to take revenge and they plan to kidnap Emel Sayın and demand a ransom for her. However, after kidnapping *Emel Sayın*, a friendly relationship begins to develop between them. When they take the ransom *Emel Sayın* does not want to go back. They anaesthetize her again and they bring her to a desolate place. In the beginning, Emel Sayın thought that they were just pretending to be kind to her for money, but afterwards they send the money back to her. *Mavi Boncuk* finishes with their reunion, but it has an unclear ending regarding the relationship between *Emel* and *Necmi*.

The conflict appears between Emel Sayın's stardom and the men's illusions about this image in their minds. For example, in the dining room scene when they are eating together, *Süleyman* says: "*It's weird. How come the famous Emel Sayın would come and sit our table?*" This is a summary of the conflict on which the film depends. So the film poses the question of what would happen if *Emel Sayın*, a famous singer, would stay in the same house with a group of lower-class men. Throughout the story, we are witnessing how *Emel Sayın* (as an inaccessible star) is a kind and gracious person who mingles with the ordinary people. This is the opposite of the typical story of the rise of a poor girl to a famous star. We can say that the film uses the *Snow White* masterplot about a princess who lives with seven dwarfs. Emel Sayın is the Snow White in this film. She is cooking for the residents, teaches one of them reading and writing and even helps them repair their car's motor. So, it is a princess story like *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* (1937). In the beginning, those poor guys yearn for and admire Emel Sayın, but with time, Emel Sayın feels the same things for them. The film transforms Emel Sayın's stardom into someone who is just an ordinary person. This is the 'blessing project' of lower- or middle-class life. Yeşilçam and Eğilmez design this structure to contain this fancy. The melodramatic excess of this film lies in Emel Sayın's attachment

to the men, even falling in love with one of them. Also, the obstacle that appears in this situation comes about because of the difference between a rich-famous singer and a poor-unemployed young man.

Table 5.7: The features of the characters in *Mavi Boncuk*

<i>Mavi Boncuk</i>	Male Protagonist <i>The Handsome Necmi</i>	Female Protagonist <i>Emel Sayın (herself)</i>	Male Antagonist <i>The Owner of the Nightclub</i>	Mentor <i>Father Yaşar</i>	Supporting Role <i>Governor Cafer</i>
Personality	Moral, Passive, Romantic,	Warm, Likeable, Good, Moral	Cruel, Cold, Acquisitive	Reputable, Calm, Moral	Pure, Stupid
Physical appearances	Handsome, Tall, Pretty face with long hair	Blonde	Old, Bold, Cold face	Old, Slim body, Sympathetic face	Bewildered face
Family, Economic Situation	A son of a lower class man, No mother	Upper class girl	Upper class	The father of Necmi, Oldest one at home	The friend of the others, Lower class
Job	Black marketeer	Famous singer	The Boss of the Nightclub	Black marketeer	Black marketeer

Emel Sayın: She is the beautiful heroine of this film. She has blonde hair and a pretty face. As a real person, Emel Sayın is both a famous singer and an actress. Ertem Eğilmez uses her as an object of desire in this film. In this sense, the similarities between *Sürtük* (1965) and *Mavi Boncuk* are interesting. Both of them start with a singing scene, but in *Sürtük*, Naciye is at the beginning of her career and in *Mavi Boncuk*, Emel Sayın is already a famous singer. In both films, Eğilmez tries to design his heroines as an object of desire, so he uses many close-ups. He uses these close-ups especially when they are singing, because singing is also the manifestation of their love. In the dining room scene Emel Sayın sings the song *Bak yeşil, yeşil*, which means look for me with your green eyes when she admiringly stares at Necmi's (Tarık Akan) green eyes. (It also reminds us of almost the same scene from *Sürtük*) We can understand their attraction from their looks to each other. There is an implied declaration of love. Still, the film does not underline their love affair, it is a vague affair.

The Handsome/Necmi (The Handsome): Tarık Akan acts the role of The Handsome. He is the son of Father Yaşar. Just from his name we understand how stereotyping is at work. They do not even call him by his real name, and they use an adjective as a nickname. We only hear his real name when his father calls him. Of course, The Handsome should be the heroine's sweetheart. So we witness their affair and they are the young lovers of this film. Still, The Handsome is not presented to us as the only hero. He shares the leading role with the other characters. I mentioned the values that Tarık Akan's face represents, so I will not repeat them in here.

Sugar Kamil (Zeki Alasya): He is a sympathetic character played by Zeki Alasya. He had acted in the previous film of Eğilmez. He has a short-fat body with a round-sweet face, but his face also represents authoritarian features too. He appeared in Eğilmez's *Tatlı Dillim* (1972) as the coach of a basketball team. We can define his performance as he tries to appear rough, but he seems funny instead. His physical appearance also gives us a feeling of the rural, a hometown feeling.

Süleyman (Metin Akpınar): He is the cousin of The Handsome. Metin Akpınar is the actor who plays Süleyman. He has a fleshy body with a wide face. Still, the features of his face are thin, especially his characteristic nose and eyebrows. This situation gives his face a cunning expression. However, Süleyman is kindly and likeable. And Metin Akpınar uses his flexible facial expressions to make his face look bewildered. He looks like he does not know anything. His surprised-looking face makes Süleyman sympathetic.

I will not analyse Halit Akçatepe's performance as Mıstık, also Kemal Sunal as Governor Cafer, and Münir Özkul as Father Yaşar, because they are almost the same stereotypical characters that I have explained before.

Essentially, Eđilmez's way of telling these stories forms a tale structure and this is what he intends to do. He wants to appeal to the public by benefiting from the illusion of cinema. For that matter, the story of *Mavi Boncuk* is very suitable for the overall blueprint of this structure. *Mavi Boncuk* has a coherent and mature fully-formed structure that reflects Eđilmez's style. It carries a lot of features of his previous films. And it also offers a lot to his following films in a structural sense.

5.8 SÜT KARDEŞLER (THE MILK SIBLINGS): THE THEATRE-IN-THE-ROUND IN ERTEM EĐİLMEZ FILMS

If we talk about Eđilmez's masterpieces *Süt Kardeşler* (1976) is one of them. It tells an accidental marriage story in Ottoman's İstanbul in the beginning of nineteenth century. It is also the beginning period of cinema, but in the Ottoman Empire, it was not common. However, the public was familiar with different art forms, like traditional theatre-in-the-round and shadow play or *tuluat*. I mentioned these art forms and I analysed their influence on cinema in Turkey. The influence of those traditional art forms in *Süt Kardeşler* is crucial because according to Vecdi Sayar's interview, Eđilmez says that he tried to use the theatre-in-the-round in *Süt Kardeşler*. (1984, pg.37) Eđilmez wanted to use the methods of the pre-cinema period in Turkey and also use the characteristic narration of that period as well. So he used the structural features of this tradition directly within his own narration that has the characteristics of his own iconography, like characters, spaces and storytelling methods. For example, "the house" that he always uses to gather his stereotypical characters that he creates himself. Another distinctive feature of *Süt Kardeşler* is that it is a comedy that hasn't any melodramatic features in it. Still it uses excesses, especially in the comic scenes with the support of the stereotypical characters.

Süt Kardeşler is a comedy about a series of unfortunate events that depends on a misunderstanding in an Ottoman family. *Şaban* (Kemal Sunal) is the main character of this film. He works on a boat as a marine who belongs to the Ottoman naval forces. *Ramazan* (Halit Akçatepe) is Şaban's close friend; he works as a marine too. He always plays tricks on Şaban. *Captain Hüsametdin* (Şener Şen) is the head of their ship and their commander. He is a harsh man. After approaching the port of İstanbul, Şaban receives a letter and a picture of a girl from his wet nurse *Melek* (Adile Naşit). He cannot read it so he asks *Ramazan*. *Ramazan* reads the letter, which has an invitation offering Şaban to stay with her in her home and it is written in the letter that the girl in the picture is the daughter of his wet nurse. The girl's name is *Afife* (Jale Altuğ). When they take leave for a few free days in the city, Şaban wants to go his wet nurse's home, but *Ramazan* begs to go because he says to Şaban that he has fallen in love with the girl in the photo. Şaban accepts his offer and they change their permission slips. When *Ramazan* goes to Şaban's wet nurse's home, he says he is Şaban and he learns that *Afife* is already married. However, *Captain Hüseyin* comes to the home, because he is Melek's brother. When he enters the house he sees *Afife* and her fake cousin *Ramazan* hugging each other, so *Captain Hüseyin* misunderstands this and he thinks *Ramazan* is *Afife*'s husband, whose name is *Bayram*. *Melek* accept this misunderstanding because she is afraid of her brother's anger regarding the hug. Still, their plan does not work because the real *Bayram* (Ergin Orbey) and the real *Şaban* also show up.

In *Süt Kardeşler* the influence of the traditional characters of Turkish theatre becomes more significant. We can match the characters of the film to the characters of traditional theatre. However, we cannot surely attribute one exact character to Şaban from shadow play or theatre-in-the-round, because in this film the roles are separated into different characters. Sometimes, Şaban shows the features of the *Karagöz* from shadow play, but sometimes he shows the features of *Hacivat* as well. This is also true for the other characters. For example, this happens between *Ramazan* and *Commander Hüsametdin*, between *Bayram* and *Ramazan* and/or between *Şaban* and *Ramazan*. The structural features of traditional theatre adopted by *Süt Kardeşler*, is especially significant in the dialogues of the characters.

Table 5.8: The features of the characters in *Süt Kardeşler*

<i>Süt Kardeşler</i>	Male Protagonist <i>Şaban</i>	Female Protagonist <i>Bihter</i>	Male Antagonist <i>Commander Hüsamettin</i>	Supporting Role <i>Ramazan</i>	Supporting Role <i>Melek</i>
Personality	Stupid, Half-wit, Romantic,	Warm, Elegant	Stately, Angry	Vigilant, Unreliable	Good, Liar, Easy-going
Physical appearances	Bewildered face, Long-thin body	Blonde, Beautiful	Middle aged, Hawk-eyed, White hair	Short body, Pretty face with small eyes	Short-round body, Round-sweet face
Family, Economic Situation	Foster child.	Neighbour girl	Uncle of the house	A friend of the male protagonist	Mother, Wet nurse, No husband Wealthy
Job	Marine	House wife	<i>Commander</i>	Marine	House wife

Şaban (Kemal Sunal): He is a half-witted character and we can see easily traces of him in traditional Turkish theatre. He tries to be a self-seeker but he is not, he is a simpleton. His performance depends on this contrast. However, in this film his character has more canny features than in the previous films where Eğilmez had cast (Kemal Sunal) him. In those films, he was a complete blithering idiot such as his performance in *Oh Olsun* (1973), *Köyden İndim Şehire* (1974) and *Mavi Boncuk* (1974). However, we cannot say this for the character Şaban of *Hababam Sınıfı* (1957), this film was adapted from Rıfat Ilgaz's famous novel. The first appearance of the character Şaban was in Eğilmez's *Hababam Sınıfı* (1974). Accordingly, Eğilmez built whole scenarios around the character of Şaban and preferred using the same name. Şaban in *Süt Kardeşler* also has similar features to Şaban in *Hababam Sınıfı*. However, in *Hababam Sınıfı* he is meaner and more secretly cunning. Agah Özgüç explains Kemal Sunal's performance as the character of Şaban; he looks stupid, but there lies an amazing cleverness behind this physical appearance. In other words, he is one of the vigilantes who just looks stupid.(1993, pg.49). In Eğilmez's filmography, it is very interesting that different films belong to different genres, but still have many similar, even the same, characters. Related to this, in examining the filmography of Eğilmez we see the similar and

different ways he used Kemal Sunal as an actor from *Tatlı Dillim* (1972) (it is the first appearances in cinema) to *Süt Kardeşler*. In every film, Eğilmez adds or removes some features to be able to construct the perfect stereotypical characters that he needs.

Ramazan: He is a more vigilant character than Şaban. Ramazan always cheated him easily. He also knows how to read and write. Halit Akçatepe's short body and his pretty face with small eyes makes this character convincing, but at the same time uncanny. Along with the character of Şaban they are a good pair, the features of their characters complete and compliment each other, creating funny moments.

Captain Hüsamettin (Şener Şen): He is a harsh captain in the Ottoman naval forces. His profession supports this impression as well. The narration presents him as a stately man; he is shouting at his soldiers and the members of his family. Everyone is scared of him. Still, he has a secret fear. He afraid of the *Gulyabani*, which is presented as a kind of creature that is controlled by transcendental powers. He tries to seem a brave man in front of his family, but we understand from his behaviour that he is secretly a coward. This opposition makes him character funny. As an actor, Şener Şen represents the different feelings of *Captain Hüsamettin* successfully. So, the transition between different feelings does not make him seem unreal. Şener Şen's characters are various in Eğilmez films and even the other films that Eğilmez's film company, Arzu Film Company, made. In those films, he is an actor beyond all clichés and stereotypes of Yeşilçam. Even after the Eğilmez period, he continued with his various performances. Still in *Süt Kardeşler* and in *Şabanoğlu Şaban* and *Tosun Paşa*, he plays a similar stereotypical character. According to Scognamillo, this character is designed to be a kind of anti-thesis or anti-character of the main character. (2010, pg.389) This situation is also a result of the influence of the characters of traditional Turkish theatre in Eğilmez's films.

Melek (Adile Naşit): Melek was Şaban’s wet nurse. In the film, she has no husband and she lives in her house with her daughter and her servants. So, she is the person responsible for this Ottoman house. Still, when her brother comes to her house, she is afraid of his reactions like everyone else. She also takes responsibility and tells him lies so as to manage the unexpected events. Above all *Melek*, is a mother figure who feels responsible for others. This situation is also common in Eğılmez’s films. Adile Naşit was the mother figure of the house that I analysed in Eğılmez films. She makes sacrifices for her child. She tried to manage her husband’s faults. In this sense, the physical appearance of Adile Naşit is very important. She has a short-fat body with a pretty face. Her big cheeks and her big eyes that have no eyebrows have a strong capacity to transmit the strong and cheerful energy of Adile Naşit. According to Scognamillo, Adile Naşit can act a woman who is both urban and rural, naturally. He adds that she can play the kind-hearted, pure, funny and sometimes, bitchy woman characters both. (2010, pg.279)

Table 5.9: Comparison the characters of theatre-in-the-round, *the tuluat*, and *Süt Kardeşler*

	<i>Tuluat</i>	Theatre-in-the-Round	<i>Süt Kardeşler</i>
The main old character	<i>Tirit</i>	<i>Pişekar</i>	Şaban
The servant	<i>İbiş</i>	<i>Kavuklu</i>	Ramazan
The tyrant	<i>Tiran</i>	<i>Tussuz, Külhanbeyi</i>	<i>Commander Hüsamettin</i>
Male lover	<i>Sirar</i>	<i>Çelebi</i>	-
Female lover	<i>The girl</i>	<i>Zenne</i>	Bihter

I mentioned the influence of traditional theatre in Yeşilçam, which have many common features including structural ones. If we analyse *Süt Kardeşler*, the dialogues especially are inspired by traditional Turkish theatre. Eğılmez also uses the characters and the elements of traditional Turkish theatre as a theme and as a motif in *Süt Kardeşler*. However, Eğılmez adds inspiration from traditional Turkish theatre into his narrative coherently. He does not let these features come to the fore more than the storytelling.

This is also normal regarding these two different art forms that have different structures. This choice does not interfere with the integrity of the content of the film.

In this chapter, I analysed seven different films made by Ertem Eğilmez. In every section, I discussed a different topic. Almost every one of them had analyses about the characters of those films, which is also my main subject matter. I did not want to repeat one similar stereotypical character of one actor/actress several times, so I wrote about the different characters of the same actor/actress in one section, but with a detailed analysis. In this way, it is clearer to see the development of their stereotypical characters. I tried to analyse the other elements of the narrative as well. In every section, I tried to show the masterplots of the story on which those films depends. I think we can see that the choices in the elements of the narrative are also decisive in the storytelling and the kind of genre that Eğilmez wanted to use, which had mutual influence over each other.

Table 5.10: Various analysis and features about Ertem Eğilmez's films

	Sürtük	Bir Millet Uyanıyor	Sev Kardeşim	Oh Olsun	Canım Kardeşim	Mavi Boncuk	Süt Kardeşler
The triangle of the hero, the heroine and the villain	<i>Cüneyt, Naciye, Ekrem</i>	-	<i>Ferit, Alev, Cemal</i>	<i>Ferit, Alev, Fehmi</i>	-	-	-
Masterplots	<i>Pygmalion, Cinderella, Now you must marry me</i>	<i>As long as there is one man</i>	<i>Cinderella,</i>	<i>Cinderella,</i>	-	<i>Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs</i>	<i>Stupid one always wins</i>
Disabled Characters	-	<i>Big Ahmet, Mute Rıza</i>	<i>Deaf Mesude, Blind Uncle</i>	-	-	-	<i>Mute housemate Emine</i>
Stupid or freakish characters	-	<i>Sergeant Tilki</i>	<i>Crazy and alcoholic Maksut Güler</i>	<i>Fazıl Haznedar</i>	<i>The passenger</i>	<i>Governor Cafer</i>	<i>Şaban</i>
Villain who became a good character in the end	<i>Ekrem</i>	-	<i>Cemal Çalışkan</i>	<i>Fehmi Haznedar</i>	-	-	-
Young-handsome leading role as a male lover	<i>Cüneyt (Cüneyt Arkin)</i>	-	<i>Ferit (Tarık Akan)</i>	<i>Ferit (Tarık Akan)</i>	<i>Murat (Tarık Akan)</i>	<i>Necmi (Tarık Akan)</i>	-
Young-beautiful leading role as a female lover	<i>Naciye (Türkan Şoray)</i>	-	<i>Alev (Hülya Koçyiğit)</i>	<i>Alev (Hale Soygazi)</i>	-	<i>Emel (Emel Sayın)</i>	<i>Bihter (Hale Soygazi)</i>
Münir Özkul	-	<i>Sergeant Tilki</i>	<i>Mesut Güler</i>	<i>Master Burhan</i>	-	<i>Father Yaşar</i>	-
Adile Naşit	-	-	<i>Mesude</i>	<i>The Mother of Ferit</i>	<i>The Teacher</i>	<i>Adile</i>	<i>Melek</i>
Halit Akçatepe	-	-	<i>Ali</i>	<i>Ferdi</i>	<i>Halit</i>	<i>Mustık</i>	<i>Ramazan</i>
Metin Akpınar	-	-	-	<i>The Doctor Metin</i>	<i>Blood dealer Mehmet</i>	<i>Süleyman</i>	-
Kemal Sunal	-	-	-	<i>Fazıl Haznedar</i>	<i>The passenger</i>	<i>Governor Cafer</i>	<i>Şaban</i>
Tarık Akan			<i>Ferit</i>	<i>Ferit</i>	<i>Murat</i>	<i>Necmi</i>	

6. CONCLUSION

What was so special about Ertem Eđilmez films that made me want to go deeper and understand and analyze them? I tried to answer this question in my thesis. Briefly, the things that were the determining characteristics of Ertem Eđilmez's cinema was that his films have their own iconography and story world. He has constructed his films using the features that belong to other popular Yeđilçam films. Character plays a decisive role in the structure of his films. Eđilmez transforms the characters that belong to Yeđilçam into his own unique characters. Still, those characters continue to transform in his filmography. This development process involving the constructing of characters continued film by film. Eđilmez used his characters as active elements, which also determined the other elements of his films.

The effective influence of characters on the other elements of the film also determined the theoretical aspect that I used in my analysis. In this sense, I chose narrative theory, which makes the character a structural element of the narrative. How can a character be decisive in a narrative? In order to answer this question I had to establish the elements of narrative and the location of the character within this structure. Accordingly, I applied the methods of narrative studies. A narrative consists of two essential components: the story and the discourse. The story is the content element, and the discourse is the formal element of the narrative. Both of them complete each other. Still, character is an element of the story. Story also contains other elements like time, space and events. A good narrative consists of the causal and coherent relationship of all those elements. Briefly, in this thesis I evaluated the films of Ertem Eđilmez according to this theoretical perspective.

In this study, I claimed that the films of Eđilmez have unique characters and narration. I came to this conclusion by comparing Eđilmez's films with other Yeđilçam films. I

analyzed the basic structure of Yeşilçam films for comparison. First of all, Yeşilçam continues along the lines of traditional Turkish narratives. I mentioned that one of the thematic legacies of traditional Turkish narratives influenced Yeşilçam's films through one genre and at the same time, one narration method: the melodrama. Melodrama occupied Yeşilçam films as a narration method even in different genres. The most significant feature of this narration method is excess. It is necessary for both story and character. We can see the same exaggerated narration in traditional Turkish narratives. As an example, traditional stories about lovers, which is a form of romance also has this exaggerated narration method. In this sense, those stories represent the roots of the exaggerated narration of Yeşilçam. Melodramas continue this legacy within Yeşilçam. Yeşilçam continues using similar plotlines that appear to be similar to traditional Turkish narratives. These plotlines repeat themselves in Yeşilçam and they become a clichéd narration method. The connection between traditional narratives and Yeşilçam is also an indicator of the audience's familiarity with these clichéd forms. Basic story types (masterplots) represent verisimilitude to an audience. Another feature that demonstrates this connection is the stereotypical characters of traditional Turkish theatre (*tuluat*, the theatre-in-the-round). Yeşilçam used similar characters frequently while adapting them to its own structure. These kinds of stereotypical characters influenced every kind of Yeşilçam film; still they are especially of note in comedies.

I analyzed the stereotypical characters and basic story types of Yeşilçam according to the concepts that are frequently used by narrative theorists like masterplot and stereotype. I endeavored to find the masterplots and the stereotypes in the films of Ertem Eğilmez. Also, I pointed out the differences between other Yeşilçam films and Eğilmez's cinema. However, it is also of note that he was one of the directors who determined the meaning of Yeşilçam films. In this sense, his differences should be considered personal contributions to Yeşilçam films. What are the features of Eğilmez's films? Primarily, Eğilmez designed his films as a form of tale, like the traditional romances of Turkish literature. The principal purpose of Eğilmez's films is to please the audience. The stories are designed in a similar way -- the good people always win, the rich and poor always reach consensus at the end and so on. This is a formula for a

society that is predominantly constituted of middle-class and lower-class people. When Eđilmez constructs the surrealistic structure of his films, he takes care to use familiar stories and characters according to the audience's desires. This explains the use of basic story types and stereotypical characters. These clichéd forms also represent verisimilitude to the audience. Audiences identify themselves with the contribution of those virtual forms because they know those forms from their own life experience or from previous narratives. In this sense, the evolution of character construction continues along because of this condition. Every element of Eđilmez's films evolve and develop film by film. So every element of his films are also connected with previous examples intertextually. We have to consider every masterplot and stereotype in his films under this aspect. Eđilmez tries to unite the features of the characters of traditional narratives and Yeđilçam films within his work. This is also the method of constructing a character which is familiar for the audience.

Another feature of Eđilmez's films shows itself in the genres he uses. As I mentioned in this thesis, melodrama and comedy are the predominate genres in Yeđilçam, which also reflect the basic story structures and the character construction methods of traditional Turkish narratives. Eđilmez combines these genres in every different story, especially after the beginning of the seventies, he had his own unique narration style. I tried to give evidence of this in my thesis with different analyses regarding the evolution of his storytelling, characters, spaces and so on.

Eđilmez constructed unique stereotypical characters. What kind of methods did Eđilmez use when he was constructing his characters? He commonly used a young handsome male lover as the hero and young beautiful female lover as the heroine in his films. In this sense, he designs characters who have features of the characters of traditional stories of lovers and previous Yeđilçam films. He constructs a villain to complete the triangle of hero, heroine and villain. Still, Eđilmez does not have a villain in every film. Sometimes, he showcases different threats targeting the hero and the heroine and these include social conflict, money and the like. Most of the time, his

villains do not fit the stereotypical villain characters of Yeşilçam. Every villain in Eğılmez's films that I analyzed became good characters at the end of the film (at least they make a sacrifice and they act like a more mature person). We also see a lot of disabled, freakish and/or stupid characters in Ertem Eğılmez's films, these are also part of the legacy of traditional Turkish narratives, especially traditional Turkish theatre. These descriptives commonly appear because of the physical features of the characters. Eğılmez is successful in designing stereotypical characters with those features that already belong to the actors/actresses. If the features of the actors/actresses look stereotypically stupid, he tries to design a stereotypical stupid character for this actor/actress . If the actor/actress is handsome or beautiful, he constructs suitable stereotypical characters for those players. This situation shows itself in the casting of his films. He often worked with same cast. Most of the actors/actresses that belong to this cast owe their screen personas to the character constructions of Ertem Eğılmez.

In Eğılmez's films, the characters are decisive to the film structure. However, they are just an element of the narrative. Characters constitute a whole within other elements of the narrative. The power of Eğılmez's films comes from combining the elements of the narrative in a coherent and causal whole. So, causality of the elements of Eğılmez's films is decisive. I took seven films from different period of his filmography and studied them deeply. I analysed how he evaluated the stories, the characters, and the other elements of his films. This evolution process gives us the narration of his cinema. I especially tried to show the features of the characters that he constructed and the storytelling methods that he had designed with his crew.

I analyzed a director who reflects the characteristic structure of Yeşilçam well. When I was analyzing his films, I felt that I got close to the core of Yeşilçam. I found the stereotypical characters and the masterplots of his films showed that his cinema gives us all a lot of clues about the relationship between traditional Turkish narratives and Yeşilçam. He gives us practical definitions about the theoretic connections to traditional narratives. It would be good to see more analyses of Yeşilçam through the films of Eğılmez in the future.

REFERENCES

BOOKS

Abbott, H. P., 2002, *The Cambridge introduction to narrative*, UK: Cambridge University Press

Abbott, H. P., 2007, Story, plot, and narration, David Herman (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to narrative*, 6th. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, pp. 39-52

Abisel, N., 1994, *Türk sineması üzerine yazılar*, [Writings on Turkish cinema] Ankara: İmge Kitabevi

And, M., 1985, Geleneksel türk tiyatrosu köylü ve halk tiyatrosu gelenekleri [Traditional Turkish theatre: traditions of peasant and people's theaters] İstanbul : İnkilap kitabevi

And, M., 1999, Traditional performances in Turkey, (ed.) Livanelioğlu, S., Özhan, M., *The traditional Turkish theater*, Ankara: Ministry of Culture Publications, pp. 07-52

And, M., 2004, *Başlangıcından 1983'e Türk tiyatro tarihi*, [From beginning to 1983 a history of Turkish theatre] İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Andrew D., 1984, *Concepts in film theory*, New York: Oxford University Press

Aristotle, 1967, *Poetics*, trans. Gerald F. Else, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press

Arslan, S., 2005, *Melodram*, İstanbul: L&M Yayınları

Arslan, S., 2011, *Cinema in Turkey*, New York: Oxford University Press

Bal, M., 1997, *Narratology, introduction to the theory of narrative*, second edition, Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated

Bazin, A., 1967, *What is cinema*, Hugh Gray (trans.), Berkley: University of California Press

- Barthes, R., 1973, *S/Z*. Richard Miller (trans.), United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing, 1990
- Barthes, R., 1975, An introduction to the structural analysis of narrative, Lionel Duisit (trans.), *New literary history, vol. 6, No. 2, On narrative and narratives (Winter, 1975)*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press
- Booth, W. C., 1983, *The rhetoric of fiction* [1961], Chicago/London, Chicago university press
- Bordwell, D., 1985, *Narration in the fiction film*, USA: The University of Wisconsin Press
- Bridgeman, T., 2007, Time and space, David Herman (ed.), *The cambridge companion to narrative*, 6th. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, pp. 52-66
- Brooks, P., 1976, *The melodramatic imagination: Balzac, Henry James, melodrama, and the mode of excess*, New Haven: Yale University Press
- Chatman, S., 1978, *Story and discourse: narrative structure in fiction and film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press
- Culler, J., 1997, *Literary theory, a very short introduction* New York: Oxford University Press
- Eğrik, E. B., 2010, Umut fakirin ekmeği: Ertem Eğilmez filmlerinde iktidar, sınıf ve statü, [Hope is the bread of poor: power, class and status in the Eğilmez's films], (ed.) Pekman, C., *Filim bir adam: Ertem Eğilmez* [A film man: Ertem Eğilmez] İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, pp. 233-266
- Elsaesser, T., 1987, Tales and sound and fury: observations on the family melodrama, [1972], (ed.) Gledhill, C., *Home is where the heart is: studies in melodrama and the woman's film*, London: British Film Institute Publishing, pp. 43-69
- Erdoğan, N., 2002, *Mute bodies, disembodied voices: notes on sound in Turkish popular cinema*, *Screen* 43 (3), pp. 233-249
- Faulkner, W., 1990, *The sound and the fury* [1929], New York: Vintage

- Fludernik, M., 2006, *An introduction to narratology*, Patricia Häusler-Greenfield and Monika Fludernik (trans.), New York: Routledge
- Forster, E. M., 1985, *Aspects of the novel*, [1927], New York: Hartcourt Brace
- Fowler, R., 2006, (ed.) *The routledge dictionary of literary terms (Based on a dictionary of modern critical terms [1973])*, London and New York: Routledge
- Genette, G., 1980, *Narrative discourse. an essay in method*, Jane E. Lewin (trans.), New York: Cornell University Press
- Gledhill, C., 2000, Rethinking genre, (ed.) Gledhill, C., Williams, L., *Reinventing film studies*, London: Arnold, pp. 221-243
- Guynn, W., 2011, The stages of the film production process, William Guynn (ed.) *The routledge companion to film history*, New York: Routledge, pp. 39-63
- Ilgaz, A., Pekman, C., 2010, Ertem Eğilmez sinemasında teknik meseleler, [Technical issues in Ertem Eğilmez cinema] (ed.) Pekman, C., *Filim bir adam: Ertem Eğilmez* [A film man: Ertem Eğilmez] İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, pp. 233-266
- James, W., 2007, *The principles of psychology, Vol:1*, [1890], New York: Cosimo
- Kılıçbay, B. ve E. O. İncirlioğlu, 2003, *Interrupted happiness: class boundaries in Turkish melodram*, Ephemera: Critical Dialogues on Organization, 3 (3), pp. 236-249
- Kırel, S., 2005, Yeşilçam öykü sineması, [Yeşilçam: the cinema of the story], İstanbul: Babil Yayınları
- Kudret, C., 1971, *Türk edebiyatında hikaye ve roman: 1859-1959* [The novel and the story in Turkish literature: 1859-1959], Ankara: Bilgi Basımevi
- Langford, B., 2005, *Film genre Hollywood and beyond*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Lamarque, P. 1996, *Fictional Points of View*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press
- Margolin, U, 2007, Character, David Herman (ed.), *The cambridge companion to narrative*, 6th. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, pp. 66-80

- Moran, B., 1991, Türk romanına eleştirel bir bakış 1 [A critical look at the Turkish novel 1]. 4th ed. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları
- Mulvey, L. 1999, Visual pleasure and narrative cinema, [1975], (Ed.) Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen, *Film theory and criticism : introductory readings*, New York: Oxford Universtiy Press, pp.833-844
- Nutku, Ö., 1999, The genre brought about by reform: tuluat theatre, (ed.) Livanelioğlu, S., Özhan, M., *The traditional Turkish theater*, Ankara:Ministry of Culture Publications, pp. 89-94
- Özgüven, F., 1989, Male and female in yeşilçam: Archetypes endorsed by mutual agreement of audience and player, (ed.) Christine Woodhead *Turkish cinema: an introduction*, London: University of London, SOAS Turkish Area Study Group Publications
- Özgüç, A., 1993, 100 filmde başlangıcından günümüze Türk sineması, [Turkish cinema from its beginning till present in 100 film], İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi
- Özön, N., 1995a, *Karagözden sinemaya, Türk sineması ve sorunları 1* [Turkish cinema and its problems from karagöz to cinema 1], Ankara: Kitle Yayınları
- Özön, N., 2003, *Türk sinema tarihi [1962]* [A history of Turkish cinema], Ankara: Antalya Kültür Sanat Vakfı Yayınları
- Pekman, C., 2010, *Filim bir adam: Ertem Eğilmez* [A film man: Ertem Eğilmez], *Filim bir adam: Ertem Eğilmez* [A film man:Ertem Eğilmez] İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, pp.1-66
- Prince, G., 1982, *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Propp, V., 1968, *Morphology of the Folktale*, Laurence Scott. 2nd ed. (trans.) Austin: University of Texas Press
- Pudovkin, V.I., 1970, *Film technique and film acting*. Ivor Montagu (trans. and ed.), New York: Grove Press

Ryan, M. L., 2007, Toward a definition of narrative, David Herman (ed.), *The cambridge companion to narrative*, 6th. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, pp. 22-39

Saussure F., 2011, *Course in general linguistics*, Wade Baskin (trans.), Perry Meisel, Haun Saussy (ed.), New York: Colombia University Press

Sarikartal, Ç., 2003, *Voice of contraction: melodrama, star system, and a Turkish female sta's excessive response to the patriarchal order*, *Performance Research* 8(1), pp. 83-93

Sternberg, M., 2001, How narrativity makes a difference, *narrative vol. 9, no. 2, contemporary narratology*, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, pp. 115-122

Scognamillo, G., 2010, *Türk sinema tarihi*, [A history of Turkish cinema], 3rd ed. İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi

Tanpınar, A. H. 1997, *19. asır Türk edebiyatı tarihi*, [19th century of Turkish history of literature] 8th edition, İstanbul: Çağlayan Kitabevi

Tolkien, J. R. R., 2004, *The Lord of the Rings: 50th Anniversary, One Vol. Edition* [1954], London: Harper Collins

White, H., 1987, *The Content of the form: narrative discourse and historical representation*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press

Williams, L., 1998, *Melodrama revisited*, (ed.) Nick Brown, *Refiguring american film genres: theory and history*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 42-89

Worton, M., Still, J., 1990, Introduction, Michael Worton and Judith Still (ed.) *Intertextuality: Theories and practices* Manchester: Manchester University Press

Yağız, N., 2009, *Türk sinemasında karakter ve tipler: Türk sinemasının Türk toplumuna bakışı: 1950-1975 dönemi* . [Characters and stereotypes in Turkish cinema: regard of the Turkish cinema to Turkish society: 1950-1975 period] İstanbul:İşaret Yayınları

PERIODICALS

Ayça, E., Coş, N., 1973, *Ertem Eğilmez'le konuşma*, [A conversation with Ertem Eğilmez], *Yedinci Sanat*, 12

Sayar, V., 1984, Ertem eğilmez'le "namuslu bir söyleşi", [A modest interview with Ertem Eğilmez] *Video Sinema*, 10

OTHER SOURCES

-Definition of Naturalize. <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/naturalization> [accessed 27 November 2012].

-Definition of Naturalistic. <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/naturalistic> [accessed 27 November 2012].

-Definition of thesis novel. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/thesis%20novel> [accessed 20.05.2013]

-Definition of Alienation <http://www.marxists.org/glossary/terms/a/l.htm> [accessed 10.06.2013]

-Information about Pekcan Koşar <http://sinematurk.com/kisi/2727-pekcan-kosar/> [accessed 07.06.2013]

-Information about the masterplot 'now you must marry me'
<http://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/AndNowYouMustMarryMe>
[accessed 10.06.2013]

-Information about the masterplot 'as long as there is one man'
<http://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/AsLongAsThereIsOneMan>
[accessed 10.06.2013]