THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

BAHCESEHIR UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

FILM AND TELEVISION PROGRAM

TRADITIONAL *AUTEURISM* AND RECENT CINEMA OF TURKEY: IS YAVUZ TURGUL AN *AUTEUR*?

Master's Thesis

BAŞAK DEMİRAY

Thesis Supervisor: ASSOC. PROF. DR. SAVAŞ ARSLAN

İSTANBUL, 2012

THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
BAHCESEHIR UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
FILM AND TELEVISION PROGRAM

Name of the thesis: Traditional *Auteurism* and Recent Cinema of Turkey: Is Yavuz Turgul an *Auteur*?
Name/Last Name of the Student: Başak Demiray
Date of the Defense of Thesis: 04.04.2012

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

Assist. Prof. Dr. Burak KÜNTAY
Graduate School Director

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

Assist. Prof. Dr. 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 Comittee Members	Signature
Thesis Supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Savaş ARSLAN	----------
Member Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cem PEKMAN	----------
Member Assist. Prof. Dr. Nilay ULUSOY	----------

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I should express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Savaş Arslan for his guidance, advice, criticism, encouragements and insight throughout my masters study.

Next to him, I should state my gratitute to my tutors Prof. Dr. Zeynep Tül Akbal, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Selim Eyüboğlu, Assist. Prof. Dr. Kaya Özkaracalar, and Bora Egemen whose courses I have enjoyed during my masters education.

I thank very much to the respectful members of the Examining Committee, namely Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cem Pekman and Assist. Prof. Dr. Nilay Ulusoy. They were right in their criticisms and generous in their encouragements.

I should thank to Göksel and Demiray families, particularly to my mother İnciser Göksel and my mother in law Elmas Engin Demiray. Also, my friends Ceyda Demir, Pınar Durdu, Berna Unutmaz, as well as our baby-sitter Türkan Öztürk, have been very concerned with me and provided me with psychological support and encouragement. Among them, I have to thank Nadide Seyhun especially for her invaluable contribution in the redaction and editing process of this work. I also thank to Emily Coolidge for her professional support with regard to the copy-editings of my thesis.

İstanbul, 2012 Başak Demiray

ABSTRACT

TRADITIONAL *AUTEURISM* AND RECENT CINEMA OF TURKEY: IS YAVUZ TURGUL AN *AUTEUR*?

Başak Demiray

Film and Television Program

Thesis Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Savaş ARSLAN

April 2012, 181 pages

Over the course of the discipline's history, there have been many debates on the status of the "cinema". From the beginning, cinema was subjected to a high-art prejudice of literary tradition since it addresses the masses and is broadly considered 'simple' entertainment. The prevailing belief of filmmakers and cinema-writers up to the 1950s was that both the 'quality' and art-status of cinema were supposed to be provided by the film's content. *Auteurism* was born in France in resistance to such a belief, developing in parallel lines in America and Britain. Rather than being grounded in a full-fledged 'theory', *auteurism* has been simply defined as an approach to distinguish some directors (inherent even in Hollywood) from the anonymous others by their distinctive and consistent 'styles' recognized through their *oeuvres*. Throughout the history of cinema, the original French *auteurism* has passed through certain transformations; and from these transformations several kinds of *auteurism* have emerged. However, in this study, the concept of the *auteurism* will be preserved in its "traditional" sense, as an anchoring point to allow this study to explicate the conception and the perception of the *auteur* in the history of Turkish cinema, and then to declare Yavuz Turgul as an *auteur* in the "traditional" sense of the term. Hence, this study will be comprised of a theoretical and historical review of the development and transformation of the *auteurism* in the West with the intention of clarifying the "traditional" sense of *auteurism*, followed by a historical analysis of the development of *auteurism* in Turkey, and concluding with a discussion of how Yavuz Turgul has been perceived through the *auteurisms* developed in the period of "New Turkish Cinema" and designating Yavuz Turgul an *auteur* through the data will be reached after the analysis of his *oeuvre* from the 'traditional auteurist' perspective. The data will include the repeated techniques and motifs which will be suggested as the components of Turgul's distinctive and consistent style providing him an *auteur* status.

Keywords: Traditional *Auteurism*, Yavuz Turgul, Style, Art Cinema, Commercial Cinema

ÖZET

GELENEKSEL *AUTEURİZM* VE YAKIN DÖNEM TÜRK SİNEMASI: YAVUZ TURGUL *AUTEUR* MÜDÜR?

Başak Demiray

Sinema - Televizyon Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Savaş ARSLAN

Nisan 2012, 181 sayfa

Sinema tarihi boyunca sinemanın sanatsal değeri sıkça tartışılmıştır. Sinema kitlelere hitap ediyor olmasından ve eğlence amacı taşımasından dolayı yüksek-sanatların dışında tutulmuştur. 1950'lere kadar film yapanların ve sinema yazarlarının gözünde, sinemaya sanatsal değer verecek olan şeyin filmlerin 'içeriği' olacağı düşünülmüştür. Fransa'da *Auteurism* tam da bu anlayışa karşı ortaya çıkmış; Amerika ve İngiltere'de de benzer bir çizgide gelişme sergilemiştir. Aslında, *Auteurism* dört başı mamur bir kuram ortaya koymak yerine, basitçe bazı yönetmenleri (Hollywood'da çalışanları bile kapsayacak bir biçimde) yapıtlarında sergiledikleri özgün stilleri sayesinde diğer yönetmenlerden ayırmaya dönük bir yaklaşım olarak tanımlanır. Sinema tarihi içerisinde, Fransız *auteurist* yaklaşımı belirli dönüşümler geçirmiş; sonuçta birbirinden farklı *auteurist* anlayışlar ortaya çıkmıştır. Lakin bu çalışmada, *auteurizm* kavramının ilksel, "geleneksel" anlamı temel alınacaktır. "Geleneksel *auteurizm*" anlayışı temelinde, Türk sinema tarihinde *auteur* kavramının nasıl anlaşıldığı ve kavrandığı sorgulanacak; ardından da, yönetmen Yavuz Turgul'un geleneksel anlamda bir *auteur* olduğu iddia edilecektir. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışma üç ana bölümden oluşacaktır: İlkin, Batı'da *auteurizm*'in gelişim ve dönüşümünün kuramsal ve tarihsel bir incelemesi ve bu yolla *auteurizm*'in "geleneksel" anlamının açığa çıkarılması; ikinci olarak, Türkiye'de *auteurizm*'in serüveninin "geleneksel *auteurizm*" anlayışı çerçevesinden değerlendirilmesi; son olarak, "Yeni Türk Sineması" döneminde ortaya çıkan *auteurist* yaklaşımlar çerçevesinde Yavuz Turgul'un nasıl alımlandığını tartışmak, külliyatının bir çözümlemesini yapmak ve çözümleme sonucunda ulaşılacak veriler ışığında onun geleneksel anlamda bir *auteur* olduğu iddiasını dile getirmek. Bu iddiayı dile getirirken, Turgul'a *auteur* statüsünü atfetmemizi sağlayacak, yani onun ayrıksı ve tutarlı stiline ayna tutacak olan öğeler, filmlerinde kullandığı tekrar eden teknikler ve motifler olacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Geleneksel *Auteurizm*, Yavuz Turgul, Stil, Sanat Sineması, Ticari Sinema

To my Mehmets

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

"Her yiğidin bir yoğurt yiyişi vardır/ Each man has his own way of eating yoghurt*"*
"Her elin soğan doğrayışı farklıdır/ Each hand has its own way of slicing onions*"*
(Turkish proverbs)

As an assistant director, I have had a chance to closely examine several directors' methods of making films and witness their decision-making processes. As a junior assistant in my beginning years, I often asked myself, especially at the moments of crisis, how I would have handled the problem if I had been in the director's shoes. My answers always pointed out the necessity having a director who is able to master the *mise-en-scéne*. In my beginning years, I was observing the process of making films and the director's role therein. I only once worked under the authority of a supervisor whose decisions and choices were more definite in the process of the making of the film than the director's; thanks to this experience, I was able to see how the same text could be interpreted differently by the director and the supervisor. The film that I am writing about was a television serial named *Biz Size Aşık Olduk /* We All Fell in Love with All of You (2002) and the supervisor of the film was Yavuz Turgul.

Turgul's method of supervising was quite interesting for me since he sent open letters to the location while the whole crew was on set for the shooting of the film. Every week, after each part of the serial was broadcast, letters containing Turgul's comments and feedback about the performances of all departments, the actors and actresses and also about the director were circulated among the crew members. Turgul's authority was not seen but felt in every moment, even after work hours. As a junior assistant director, my encounter with such a figure had an undeniable effect on my vision of a filmmaking activity and I have since wondered how Turgul's, way of making his own films might be different from the role he plays when working as a supervisor for television serials that depend on rating shares.

Since my time working under his supervision, Turgul has made large-scale films[1] using scripts he wrote himself and reached large audiences. In the meantime I have been promoted to the rank of a senior assistant, worked with several directors (including a foreign one) and gained enough experience to compare and contrast the directors I have assisted in making films, leading me to put film directors into two groups: the ordinary ones and the ones that have distinctive styles.

In the following years of my career as an assistant director, I attended a masters program in the field of cinema, during which I found that the abovementioned categorization overlaps with the birth of the concept of *auteurism* in cinema studies. Hence, this study was born in consequence of my recognition of this overlap and my desire to study the director whose supervising authority not only left a big impression on me, but who also made my favorite childhood film, *Muhsin Bey* (1986). Even though I could not get a chance to assist Turgul in the feature films he directed, thanks to this study, I will have a chance to examine his style through analysis of his films.

Examining Turgul's style is essential in this study since I have chosen the concept of traditional *auteurism* as an anchoring point. I will preserve the traditional auteurist sense (as it was born in France) throughout this study to argue its emphasis on the necessity of a distinctive and consistent style (signature or fingerprint) to call a director an *auteur* through the analysis of his *oeuvre* (even including studio productions of different genre). In this way, I will have preserved traditional auteurist attitude, which does not exclude the commercial aspects of filmmaking, and emphasized the possibility of *auteurs* in Turkish cinema who have made films with commercial concerns as well as the individuals within Yeşilçam and New Turkish cinema eras. In this manner, I will also have examined Turgul as the popular director of the films he made in Yeşilçam cinema and the director of the box-office hits in New Turkish cinema.

[1] Yavuz Turgul has made two films since 2002: *Gönül Yarası* /Lovelorn (2005) and *Av Mevsimi*/Hunting Season (2010).

In a nutshell, this thesis is designed to develop the following argument: the concept of traditional *auteurism*, as it has been originally elaborated by Western academic and intellectual circles, rarely excludes the possibility of calling directors who make commercial films *auteurs*. Rather, the concept of *auteur* refers to directors having distinctive and consistent styles, regardless of whether they make "commercial" or "art" films. In this vein, Yavuz Turgul, in so far as he has a distinctive and consistent style of making commercial films, should be considered an *auteur*.

Soon after I decided on the foregoing subject and wrote the first chapter, a book named *Yavuz Turgul Sinemasını Keşfetmek*/Discovering the Cinema of Yavuz Turgul (2011) was published. Although it is the most comprehensive study to date on Turgul, it differs from my study in that it includes articles which focus on Turgul's past experiences as a scriptwriter at Arzu Film company, consistent themes in some of his films, his ability to direct actors, his use of heroic characters in some films, his use of night clubs, employment of poetry and painting as the sources of inspiration, and his status as an *auteur*-star. In light of this, my study will focus exclusively on Turgul's style, which will be derived from an analysis of his total *oeuvre*.

To this end, chapter two will provide a theoretical and historical review of the birth and development of *auteurism* in the cinematic context. This review will take its departure from the essential emphasis of French *auteurism* on the necessity of distinctive directorial styles confer *auteur* status. At the beginning of the chapter two, I will explain the literary origin of the concept of *auteur* and continue with an explanation of the conception of *auteur* in cinema. Then, I will provide an overview of the forerunners of the birth of *auteurism* in France and elaborate on the development of the concept in its social, political, philosophical and historical contexts, particularly through François Truffaut's article "A Certain Tendency of French Cinema" (1954), André Bazin's article "La Politique des *Auteurs/Auteur* Policy" (1957) and, more broadly speaking, the work produced in the French New Wave movement (1959). Having established the French conceptualization of *auteurism*, I will examine its conception and perception in the American and British

contexts. In the context of America, I will focus on Andrew Sarris's "Notes on the *Auteur* Theory 1962", in which Sarris translates Bazin's "La Politique des *Auteurs/Auteur* Policy" as 'the *auteur* theory' and sets his own criteria for designating a director an *auteur*. Following its American conception, the conception of *auteurism* in Britain will emphasize the influence of French structuralist ideas on the emergence of *auteur*-structuralism, which discounts the individual *auteur*'s capability to create meaning and suggests that structures determine whole meanings in a film. To clarify the concept of '*auteur*-structuralism', I will focus on Peter Wollen's *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema* (1969; 1972; 1998) and critique his definition of *auteur* by emphasizing the incompatibility between the concept of *auteur* and the structuralist paradigm.

Having emphasized *auteur*-structuralism's discount of an individual *auteur*, I will go on to examine *auteurism* from the perspectives of three other approaches which also discount the individual *auteur* as the unique creator of his films: historical materialism, post-structuralism, and the approach that insists on the collaborative nature of the medium. The historical materialist view defines film (1) as a commodity production and (2) a film of 'meanings' with ideological and political effectivity. In this sense, I will elaborate John Ellis's (1975) study on the directors of Ealing studios in Britain and the articles of later *Cahiers* critics (1969) which categorized films (especially Hollywood productions) in relation to their perceived political effectivity. Following the historical materialist approach and its weakening of the role of the *auteur*, I will examine the post-structuralist approach through two significant articles: Roland Barthes's "The Death of the Author" (1967) and Michel Foucault's "Who is an Author?" (1969). In light of Barthes's and Foucault's articles, the effect of post-structuralism will be elaborated on two grounds in the context of cinema: the death of the *auteur* (as the creative source of the meaning in the film) and the birth of the reader (the spectator during whose act of viewing the meaning of the film emerges). In the last step of examining the approaches that discount the individual *auteur* as the unique creator of his films, I will elaborate the approach that insists on the collaborative nature of the medium. In concluding the chapter, I will first emphasize the development of a new kind of *auteurism* that has its roots in 1970s' marketing strategies of

American cinema industry and elaborate Timothy Corrigan's emphasis of the resurgence of *auteurism* in the mid-1970s, 1980s and especially in the 1990s as a commercial strategy for organizing audience reception. Then, I will interpret the perception of *auteurism* in our globalized age through using Thomas Elsaesser's explanation of the contemporary *auteurs* in relation to 'world cinema' and through the effects of digital filmmaking and media on the perception of contemporary *auteurism*. Having completed a historical and theoretical review of the concept, I finally will provide a definition of 'traditional *auteurism*' which will be the anchoring point in the following chapters of this study.

In the third chapter, I will use the perspective of traditional *auteurism* to examine the conception and perception of *auteurism* in particular periods and through particular directors in Turkish cinema. I will first elaborate non-auteurist approaches to Muhsin Ertuğrul, who, although broadly considered theatrical and not original, is nevertheless considered the founder of Turkish cinema in some circles. Then, I will examine the period of 1950-1970, the golden age of Turkish cinema, during which new production companies gathered on *Yeşilçam* Street and raised in amount. Using Nijat Özön's periodization (cited in Savaş Arslan, 2011, p.24), I dub this period 'the period of cinema-makers' since Özön's emphasis of the artistry of the period's directors working in *Yeşilçam* overlaps with the French traditional auteurists' concerns to elevate the status of a director to an artist even working in Hollywood studio system. In the following, I will examine the auteurist and non-auteurist approaches to three directors of this period: Ömer Lütfi Akad, Metin Erksan, and Osman F. Seden. In some circles Akad is considered an *auteur* that consistently employs the theme of 'modernization' through the minimalist narration he prefers in his films; Erksan is considered by some circles an *auteur* whose unique style derives from his education on history of art and the themes he consistently employs in his social-realist films; and Seden is not generally considered an *auteur* but has been considered the most professional director of the period since his films maintain the same style in their cinematography and editing despite their so-called 'unremarkable' contents.

Having discussed the period of cinema-makers and its three directors, I will examine the auteurist and non-auteurist approaches to Yılmaz Güney independent of any periodization since he is considered by some circles to be the originator of a new period himself in 1970. Güney will have a place in chapter three since he is considered an *auteur* through a couple of his social-realist films, two of which he did not direct. Following this, I will examine the period of 1980-1990, considered the period of '*Auteur* Cinema', using Gönül Dönmez-Colin's periodization (Gönül Dönmez-Colin, 2008, p.56) since she points out a different conception of *auteurism*. For a better understanding of the period, I will give consider Thomas Elsaesser's definition of '*auteur* cinema' in comparison with traditional *auteurism*. I will also give place to Ömer Kavur, who is considered to be the most idiosyncratic director of the period and designated an *auteur* due to his distinctive style and aesthetics – especially recognized in his employment of locations – coming to the fore over the themes depicted in his films.

Having examined the period of '*Auteur* Cinema' and one of its directors, I will conclude the chapter with an interpretation of contemporary *auteurism* in relation to the period of 'New Turkish Cinema' (broadly accepted to have started in the 1990s and which continues to today). This period is distinguished from classic Yeşilçam because it developed independently, through the efforts of individual directors both in popular and art branches of Turkish cinema. Having interpreted the period, I will examine five representatives who have been designated recent *auteurs* of Turkish cinema and won acclaim in both national and international cinema circles. In this manner, for a better understanding of the traditional *auteurism*, Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Zeki Demirkubuz, Yeşim Ustaoğlu, Reha Erdem and Fatih Akın will be elaborated through different auteurist approaches.

Having elaborated the approaches to abovementioned directors in comparison with the traditional *auteurist* perspective, I will conclude chapter three with the argument that, in contrast with the existing *auteurism* before the 1990s, *auteurism* in the period of 'New Turkish Cinema' – as traditional *auteurism* demands – has put the necessary emphasis on consistency of 'style' in recent *auteurs*' films; however, recent *auteurism* seems like a

fusion of different auteurist perspectives, which somehow comes closer to the concept of authorship in art cinema, while traditional *auteurism* defends the possibility of consistent styles in popular cinema.

In this direction, in chapter four, I will first explain Yavuz Turgul's place in Turkish cinema as the director of popular films, and then review auteurist and non-auteurist approaches to Turgul, keeping in mind the perspective of traditional *auteurism*. I will then analyze Turgul's *oeuvre* using David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson's method, through which I will first determine the organizational structure in his films and then identify the salient techniques he uses and explain the functions of the techniques illustrated by/with specific instances from his films. I will also emphasize the recurring motifs Turgul employs in his films in order to configure the organizational structure. Having analyzed his *oeuvre*, I will conclude chapter four with a list of repeated techniques and a table of recurring motifs which establish Turgul's distinctive and consistent style. In addition, by taking my departure from the analysis I will make on his *oeuvre* I will finally emphasize that Turgul can be considered as a noteworthy director of Turkish cinema, not only for the content, but also for the consistent style in his films.

In the final chapter, I will summarize the path followed to find the answer to my question "Is Yavuz Turgul an *Auteur*?" to conclude that Yavuz Turgul's ability to preserve the consistency of his style despite having made popular films allows him to be considered an *auteur* in the traditional sense.

2. AUTEURISM

Auteurism has functioned on two basic levels in film studies: to argue for the artistic legitimacy of cinema, and to attribute the status of unique (God-like) artistry to the filmmaker who works in a collaborative process especially in Hollywood system. From its birth in 1950s' France, *auteurism* was accorded different meanings for different conjunctures. At first, it seemed as if it was attacking the conventions but in many ways it progressed in a traditional (romantic) sense, causing many debates - most of which are still unsolved. *Auteurism*, as James Naremore points out, "formed canons and fixed names of people we should study" (quoted in Cook 2007, p. 476).

In light of the canons *auteurism* formed, and with its progress in almost seven decades, I will first focus on the concept of the 'author' for a better understanding of *auteur* in the cinematic context. Then, I will elaborate on both the birth of the concepts *auteur* and *auteurism* in France. Having established the French *auteurism*, I will examine the synchronic "transplantation"[2] of *auteurism*, first in the context of America and then, with the birth of auteur-structuralism, in the context of Britain. Thus the path which auteur-structuralism opened to discount the 'individual' *auteur* as the unique source of meaning will be examined by visiting historical materialism and post-structuralism. The effect of post-structuralism will be elaborated on two grounds: the death of the *auteur* and the birth of the reader, followed by an argument against the perspective of collaboration, which also discounts the 'individual' *auteur* and emphasizes the collective nature of filmmaking activity. Having established the theoretical debates around the term *auteur,* I will analyze the uses made of *auteurism* as a marketing strategy since 1970s, allowing me to conclude with an interpretation of the perception of *auteurism* in our globalized age.

[2] Stephen Crofts (1998, p. 311), in his article "Authorship and Hollywood", employs the term 'transplantation' to explain how Andrew Sarris transferred "La Politique des Auteurs" to the United States.

2.1 THE ORIGIN OF THE CONCEPT OF "AUTEUR": THE AUTHOR

Since literature is considered a high art from the elitist perspective of romantic tradition, cinema as the "seventh art" deployed literary concepts in its struggle to be accepted as a new art form. Writing, plot, narrative, genre, character are all now considered fundamental to the cinematic constitution. As Robert Stam (2000, p. 85) points out, "cinema as the 'seventh art' implicitly granted film artists the same status as writers and painters." That is, the film artist is thought to make films in the same way the writer creates books.

The 'writing' activity of the film artist occurs in two ways. The first is in the meaning of 'writing' the script of the film, while the second is a metaphorical meaning: 'writing on a pelicule' - i.e. recording the moving images on a negative film by means of a film camera. Orson Welles (quoted in Cook 2007, p. 402), one of the milestones of the abovementioned ways of 'writing' activity in cinema practice, defines 'film' in literary terms as "a band of celluloid like the blank sheet on which you write a poem. A film is what you write on the screen."

In fact, this tendency to explain the art of cinema through the use of literary terms can easily be seen initially in the naming endeavors of the medium. As Stam (2000, p. 23) rightly stated, "many of the names for the cinema include some variant on 'graph' (Greek 'writing' or 'transcription') [i.e. biograph, animatographe, chronophotographe, scenarograph, cinematographe] and thus anticipate later tropes of filmic authorship and *écriture*[3]."

[3] Écriture, in French, means "writing". As Robert Stam (2000, p. 86) emphasizes, "in the postwar period, film discourse, like literary discourse, became oriented around a constellation of concepts such as *écriture*, writing, and textuality. This graphological trope dominated the period, from Astruc's 'camera-stylo' to Metz's later discussion of 'cinema and *écriture*' in *Language and Cinema* (1971)."

Likewise, Alexandre Astruc, in his famous 1948 article "Birth of a New Avant-Garde: The Camera-Pen (La Camera-Stylo)", equates a film artist with a writer[4] by conceiving of the camera as a pen with which to write "a world view, a philosophy of life" (Cook 2007, p. 390). Astruc's article, in its relationship with the activity of metaphorical 'writing', emphasizes the creativity of an individual artist and his unique style to record his personal vision of life on a pelicule.

In such a context, "La Camera-Stylo", as an acknowledged epoch-making article of *auteurism*, greatly implicates the concept of the "author / *auteur*". At this point, it should be mentioned that even though it is the French form of a literary term 'author', *auteur* has a specific meaning in contemporary film studies, that of 'cinematic-author' who can be recognized through his handwriting or signature (style) available on the pelicule. Hence, in order to understand the concept of '*auteur*', it is worth looking into the origin of the word 'author'.

Donovan, Fjellestad and Lunden (2008, p. 2) claim that the origin of "author" is the Latin "*auctor*", which is derived from the verb *augere*, "to increase, augment, strengthen that which is already in existence […] to exalt, embellish, enrich." They emphasize that in Roman times "*auctor*" had multiple meanings: "cause, creator, author, inventor, producer, father, founder, teacher, and composer" (Donovan, Fjellestad and Lunden 2008, p. 3). They also pointed out that the Greek word which corresponds to "author" is *authentes* – which comes from "autos + entes" and literally means "he who himself accomplishes, in other words, a doer, a master" (Donovan, Fjellestad and Lunden 2008, p. 3).

Today, by its narrow definition, an "author" is the originator of a written work. Yet, in a broad/modern sense, having its roots in the eighteenth century's Romantic notion, the 'author' "is seen as both an exemplary human and somehow above or beyond the human, as literally and figuratively outstanding […] after all, ahead of his time, avant-garde" (Bennett

[4] Dudley Andrew (1976, p. 176) uses "novelist" instead. He defines the film artist who uses his camera to write as "letting his style be dictated by the exigencies of his material and his personal attitude toward that material."

2005, p. 60). In the foregoing definition, Bennett emphasizes that the "author" is not only a human, but a consecrated entity, in the words of Donovan, Fjellestad and Lunden (2008, p. 7), a "Godlike figure". The Oxford English Dictionary's definition includes a similar exaltation of the author (Bennett 2005, p. 7):

> *an individual (singular) who is responsible for or who originates, who writes or composes a (literary) text and who is thereby considered as an inventor or founder and who is associated with the inventor or founder of all of nature, with God (with God-the-father), and is thought to have certain ownership rights over the text as well as a certain authority over its interpretation.*

If the author is a "Godlike figure", the emphasis should then also be put on his controlling mechanism over the entire creation process. He, as an autonomous individual, with his omnipotence, creates a unique/original work and knows what his work means.

Since the modern sense of the author developed in the Romantic era which Bakhtin (quoted in Bennett 2005, p. 56) defined by emphasizing the prevailing attitude as "the point [of Romantic sense] is not to surpass others in art, but to surpass art itself [which is to surpass artist at the same time]", the author is seen as much more than a flesh-and-blood artist. In Bennett's words the author is "above or beyond" (i.e. surpassing) the artist (ibid). Indeed, from the Romantic point of view, numerous artists produced art-works in the history of art, but only the ones with a distinctive style were granted celebrity as "authors."

At this point it becomes clear that cinema struggled to be accepted as an art form, so as to get rid of the literary high art prejudice against its being mass culture production. To succeed in this struggle, cinema needed particular author-figures to elevate itself to the point of being considered a high art category like literature. Films have directors (i.e. film artists since the cinema is accepted as the seventh art) but only a few of them deserve to be considered an "author / *auteur*".

2.2 WHO IS AN *AUTEUR* IN CINEMA?

When it comes to the question of determining who is an *auteur* in cinema it is essential to first explain who is a director. "A film director is a person who directs the actors and film crew in filmmaking. They control a film's artistic and dramatic aspects, while guiding the technical crew and actors."[5] As can be seen from this definition, the necessity of the directing, controlling and guiding skills of a person is emphasized, but it has to be pointed out that in the case of '*auteur*', the priority is put on the individual's creative talents, rather than his directing skills. To be more clear in explaining what kind of creative talents a director should have, first it is needed to be focused on two ways of 'writing' that I emphasized at the beginning. 'Writing' a script concerns the theme/content and 'writing' on a pelicule concerns the style/form. In fact, both theme and style are the basic concepts we are obliged to analyse in order to understand the qualities required for a director to be called an *auteur*.

The initial debates over whether or not cinema is a 'high art' stimulated another debate concerning the status of the director as an 'artist'. Since the inception of film studies, it has been asserted that there should be a creative power, i.e. a consecrated individual – implying an 'artist' but called variously a photoplay master, filmmaker, filmwright, director, author, author-director, camera-pen, cinematic-author or *auteur* – involved in the filmmaking activity. In 1915, Vachel Lindsay (quoted in Stam 2000, pp. 32-33) in his book *The Art of the Moving Picture* predicts what will be later called an *auteur* by arguing that "we will some day distinguish the different photoplay masters as we now delight in the separate tang of O. Henry and Mark Twain."

Although the French filmmaker Jean Epstein, in his 1921 article "Le Cinema et les lettres modernes", first applied the term *auteur* to the director (Stam 2000, p. 33), François Truffaut is widely considered to have used it first in his 1954 article "A Certain Tendency

[5] See (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Film_director)

of French Cinema". The term has been broadly used in film studies, film criticism and film history since Truffaut's article became a milestone in the birth of *auteurism* and *auteur* theory. By designating the term *auteur* to a particular kind of director, Truffaut emphasized him as not only a film artist but as above or beyond the film artist.

The difference between the 'director' and the '*auteur'* is revealed in analysing the persistence of style and theme in the corpus of his films. Quests for the concept of *auteur* have now been going on for decades. As Lapsey and Westlake (1988, p. 127) suppose, there are 'authors' (*auteurs*) on one side and there are the "anonymous mass of directors" on the other. Every film has a director but every director is not the 'authority' of the film he directs because a film must be the bearer of its director's "signature"[6] and amalgamation of individual style, world view, spiritual insight, proficiency of his own craft and other artistic talents for music, poetry, painting, prose that determine the director's choices and decisions. While of course every director makes decisions and choices, we can not talk about any 'authority' existing in a corpus of any given director's films when there is no coherence of style and theme in the director's *ouevre.*

Up to this point I have focused on the requirements of individuality and persistence in style and theme in designating a director an *auteur*. However, there are also social, political, ideological, technical and economic determinants that affect the choices and the decisions of the *auteur*. At this point, the notion of an '*auteur*' as an 'authority' and as the 'unique creator' of his film leads many debates. James Naremore (2005, p. 22) accepts that "authors are 'written' by a series of historical, social and cultural determinants" and emphasizes that "the concept of the 'author' is needed to be understood dialectically with an awareness of the complicated, dynamic relationship between institutions, artists and particular circumstances." Naremore pays special attention to the choices of authors (*auteurs*), acknowledging that they are made depending on particular conditions. Lapsey and Westlake (1988, p. 107) give another example of the ability to protect authorial function and the 'authority' under various conditions, by reminding us that "the '*auteurists*' invoked

[6] Ed Buscombe uses "personal thumbprint" to mean 'signature' (quoted in Goss 2009, p. 44).

some artists like Mozart and Michaelangelo, whose works had also been subject to institutional constraints," and also point out the Hollywood directors, who undeniably display a persistence of style and theme in their films.

All of this begins to indicate that there are various determinants which effect or restrict the individuality of *auteurs*. However, an *auteur* is 'above or beyond' the artist who accords external effects/determinations/constraints to his own work by his own style or who is being partially accorded to them by not giving up and by protecting his own autonomy in its acceptable limitations. The autonomy of an artist, "relative"[7] or not, can be protected in any circumstance only by the artist. The artist can never be totally imprisoned by rules, by ideologies, by genres, because creativity occurs in human minds and nobody can control it. In Stam's words (2000, p. 84), "real talent will 'out' no matter what the circumstances." An *auteur* may sometimes seem to have completely surrendered to his conditions or fully absorbed by them, but he always inscribes something individual in all of his works. The recognizable consistency in his films of his style and themes under any condition make him the 'authority' of his *oeuvre*.

I have explained the *auteur* as an individual who provides a unity in the style and themes of his films. He is the unique authority in the film-making process, controlling every step of production, and leading them by his choices and decisions. However, for a better understanding of the development of the concept of *auteur,* it should first be elaborated in its historical flux. Before discussing the birth of the *auteur,* I should start with the forerunners of the concept which Stephen Crofts (1998, p. 312) has termed as "proto-auteurism".

[7] Relative-autonomy is Louis Althusser's notion to emphasize the effects of the ideological and economic constraints on any autonomous entity. See Lapsey and Westlake's study (1988) on Authorship.

2.3 PROTO-AUTEURISM (1920S-1950S)

Beginning in the 1920s, proto-auteurist era (i.e. previous era of *auteurism*) should be elaborated among the instances of film reviewing and film criticism focused on the legitimacy of the status of the film as an art form especially in France, Britain and the Soviet Union. Stephen Crofts (1998, p. 312) emphasizes the significance of the foregoing countries in the proto-auteurist era in relation to the dominance of art film production and/or exhibition sectors and their strong aesthetic discourses. In this manner, Crofts (1998, p. 312) contrasts the characteristics of European filmmaking with those of Hollywood, in which producer and "producer-unit modes of production" were effective between 1930s and mid-1950s functioning against public acknowledgement of the creativity of a director.

As was emphasized at the beginning, the attempts to characterize cinema as the "seventh art" were made in the shadow of glorified, 'high-art' literature. The artist status had been conveyed in the cases of Sergei Eisenstein and D. W. Griffth, since they "had compared their own cinematic techniques to the literary devices of writers like Flaubert and Dickens" (Stam 2000, p. 85).

Stephen Crofts (1998) points out four instances from proto-auteurist era (early 1920s-1950) as the forerunners of *auteurism*. Two of them are significant to this study. The first one is Louis Delluc's (1922-3) analyses of David W. Griffith, Charlie Chaplin and Thomas H. Ince. Crofts (1998, p. 312) claims that Delluc's analyses "foreshadow [the question of] auteurism", yet they reveal "recognizable constants of style and world-view across the Works of the directors concerned". The second is André Bazin's ideas written in a French student newspaper (1943). Crofts (1998, p. 313) quotes from student Bazin's ideas as, "each film requires of the critic an individual judgement concerning its authorship."

In addition to the foregoing instances, Robert Stam (2000, p. 83) points a novelist and a filmmaker Alexandre Astruc who "prepared the way for auteurism" with his 1948 essay "Birth of a New Avant-Garde: The Camera-Pen" as it is stated at the beginning. According

to Stam (2000, p. 85), the French cinema journal *Cahiers du cinema*, beginning from its first 1951 issue, became a "key organ" for *auteurism* as well.

The *Cahiers* critics, popularly referred to as 'young Turks'[8] – Jean-Luc Godard, Jacques Rivette, Eric Rohmer, Claude Chabrol, François Truffaut, themselves directors– resisted the status-quo of directors in France who adapted their scripts from the classics of French literature, and formulated the principles of *auteurism* in their articles since the first published *Cahiers* issue. In light of the proto- auteurist era, the causalities lying behind the *auteurism* will be elaborated under a new title.

2.4 *AUTEURISM* IN FRANCE

Auteurism was born in postwar France where "the social fragmentation and isolation of the left led to reconstruction and stabilization formulated in individual rather than political or collective terms" (Cook 2007, p. 390). In this climate, individual directors had a chance to make films in small groups thanks to the lightweight 16 mm cameras which were developed by the Americans during World War II. Timothy Corrigan (quoted in Bennett 2005, p. 106) inserts another post-war reason for the birth of *auteurism*: "the industry's need to generate an artistic (specifically Romantic) aura" when it was in danger of domination by the new mass media of TV. After the war, French intellectuals and cinephiles also had a chance to see previously unavailable Hollywood films at the *cinémathéque* in Paris. The confrontation with "the American popular maverick cinema of Orson Welles, Nicholas Ray, Robert Aldrich" and the American films of Alfred Hitchcock and Fritz Lang made *Cahiers* critics resistant to the prevailing "tradition of quality" in French Cinema (Stam 2000, p. 84).

[8] The term "Young Turks" has come to signify any groups or individuals inside an organization who are progressive and seek prominence and power. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Young_Turks)

In this post-war climate, Jean Paul Sartre's existentialism made a contribution to the recognition of individuality and individual directors as well. In 1948, André Bazin wrote two essays - "Ontology of the Photographic Image" and "Myth of Total Cinema" – which were concurrent with Jean Paul Sartre's significant essay "Existentialism is a Humanism". Robert Stam (2000, p. 83), quoting James Naremore, draws attention to Bazin's existentialist vocabulary which is "fond of words like 'freedom', 'fate' and 'authenticity'". This vocabulary influenced Bazin's young colleagues, most notably François Truffaut.

In this manner, François Truffaut wrote "A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema" (1954) in *Cahiers,* in which he focused on the issue of [*mise-en-scéne*[9]][10] – what is put in the scene – to attack the "tradition of quality" which "turned the classics of French literature into predictably well-furnished, well-spoken, and stylistically formulaic films" (Stam 2000, p. 84). He manifested consecrated *auteurs* as "men of cinema", challenging the metteurs-en-scéne[11] who, in his own words, "are and wish to be responsible for the scenarios and dialogues they illustrate" (Truffaut 2000, p. 61). Essentially, Truffaut made explicit comparisons between metteur-en-scéne/*auteur*, illustrator/creator, theme/style, formulaic/unique, archaic/new, and literary/cinematic, and put forward the concept of *auteur* as the solution for the problem of subordination of the film to a literary text. For him, "the new film would resemble the person who made it, not so much through autobiographical content but rather through the style" (Stam 2000, p. 84).

In the French context of *Cahiers*, "A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema" (1954) was "mythologized as inventing *auteurism* and giving *Cahiers du cinema* a sense of direction it previously lacked" (Crofts 1998, p. 313). By the necessity (emphasized in Truffaut's

[9] James Naremore (2005, p. 11) states, "*mise-en-scéne* was strongly emphasized by Alexandre Astruc in 'La Camera-Stylo'" to explain how the styles of individual directors differ from each other depending on their abilities to locate the *mise-en-scéne* "in every gesture of characters, in every line of dialogue and in camera movements."

[10] Pam Cook defines *mise-en-scéne* as "the staging of events for the camera, but can also be used loosely to mean the formal organisation of the finished film, the 'style' in which film-makers express their personal concerns." (Cook 2007, p. 398). In Fereydoun Hoveyda's words, it is "through which everything on the screen is expressed." (Crofts 1998, p. 313).

[11] Stephen Crofts (1998, p. 313) defines it as a "mere manufacturer."

article) of the birth of *auteurism* versus the dominant tradition, the "Young Turks" cared a great deal about the personal factor in artistic creation and they "initiated a new policy of interviewing admired directors between 1954-1957" (Stam 2000, p. 85). They interviewed not only the European directors like Renoir, Bunuel, Rosselini, Visconti, Ophuls, but also with some from Hollywood: Hawks, Minnelli, Welles, Ray and Hitchcock. They argued, "intrinsically strong directors [i.e. *auteurs*] will exhibit over the years a recognizable stylistic and thematic personality, even when they work in Hollywood studios" (Stam 2000, p. 85).

According to Virginia Wexman, the aim of the "Young Turks" was "to elevate the films of a few directors [including themselves] to the status of 'high art'" (quoted in Bennett 2005, p. 104). At this point, what James Naremore draws attention to is relevant to Wexman's view. Naremore (2005, p. 10) claims that *auteurism* "served as a kind of banner" for these young cinephile filmmakers to get a chance, first to publicize their early works, then to make their own individual films by resisting the prevailing tradition. In this way, they would have a chance to foreground their names as the upcoming *auteurs.* If their films could have been elevated to the status of high art, then they would be 'above or beyond' the artist as well.

As it is argued above, Young Turks were influenced by Alexandre Astruc's[12] ideas about the director's own style of 'writing on a pelicule' – i.e. the ability of mastering the *mise-en-scéne*. They were also influenced by André Bazin, the editor and one of the founders of *Cahiers du cinema*. He, as Naremore (2005, p. 12) suggests, had a significant influence on "philosophical underpinnings of *Cahiers*" with his historical knowledge of the cinema and the arts, his ability to take Hollywood genres and techniques seriously and his ability to understand how style gives rise to meaning. His early writings (1943) that were published in a student newspaper invoked the *auteur* while emphasizing "the director as invariably unique creator" (Crofts 1998, p. 313).

[12] Dudley Andrew (1976, p. 176) defines Alexandre Astruc as the "follower"of André Bazin.

In this manner, by sharing Bazin's basic idea of the necessity of the 'individual' directors, François Truffaut and his young colleagues exalted the few individual 'men of cinema' to "cult"[13] status (Stam 2000, p. 88). At this point, Bazin differed from Young Turks; as Naremore (2005, p. 12) states, "he chastised his younger colleagues for their habit of falling into uncritical hero worship". At the same time, Bazin criticized the idea of cultish *auteur* that seemed as if he was not part of the society or history. For Bazin the crucial principle concerning cinema was to reflect 'real life' as purely as possible, and thus he resisted his young colleagues' idea of *auteur* as the unique source of meaning. In his view, 'real life' involves various interior meanings itself and the film-maker, as Cook (2007, p. 390) states, "should act as a passive recorder [to let the interior meaning rise by itself] of the real world rather than manipulator of it".

Such debates surrounding the criteria for designating a director as an *auteur* started among *Cahiers* critics with discussing on Astruc's "The Camera-Pen", and continued with Truffaut's "A Certain Tendency of French Cinema". These two articles prepared a way for André Bazin's 1957 article "La Politique des *auteurs*/*Auteur* Policy". In the article, as Stam (2000, p. 85) points out, Bazin emphasized the 'personal factor' – which is permanent and progressing from one work to the next – as a criterion of reference in an artistic creation of *auteur*. In addition to 'personal factor', as Cook (2007, p. 390) states, Bazin also took into account the "historical moment of production" as another criterion. In "La Politique des *auteurs*/*Auteur* Policy", he put emphasis on the necessity of integrating sociological, technological and historical approaches with *auteurism*. Such an emphasis suggests that Bazin was good at creating empathy towards some talented individual directors – especially from Hollywood – and naming them as *auteurs* even though their autonomy could be seen as limited in terms of certain social, political, economical, technical, industrial constraints. In this manner, in the case of Hollywood, he defined some directors as the "genius of the

[13] Stam (2000, p. 88) states that, Bazin, in his 1957 article "La Politique des *auteurs*", "warned against any aesthetic 'cult of personality' which would erect favored directors into infallible masters."

system".[14] The crucial point in this expression is the fact that he did not define those directors as 'godlike geniuses' apart from 'real life'. Rather, he emphasized that they were talented directors existing in the restrictive circumstances of Hollywood system. Due to such realistic attitudes, "La Politique des *Auteurs / Auteur* Policy" distances Bazin from romantic *auteurist* 'Young Turks'.

It is significant that, with the influence of these ideas of Bazin and the debates surrounding his article, upcoming *auteurs* took their lightweight cameras into the streets and shot their experimental films, giving rise to a new cinema movement named *Nouvelle Vogue*, or New Wave (1959-1965). It should also be emphasized that a preceding cinema movement "Italian Neorealismo," which Bazin admired, also had a big impact on the birth of New Wave cinema.

New Wave directors had a chance to express their own concerns on filmmaking through low-budget experimental films. They were interested both in the great Hollywood directors and in the low-budget American B-movie directors. They paid attention to B-movies, since, as Cook states, "they wanted to experiment with new cinematic forms in opposition to established genres and stereotypes" (2007, p. 405). In this manner, Stam (2000, p. 92) claims that *auteurism* may be thought to have "rescued entire genres – the thriller, the western, the horror film – from high-art prejudice."

It actually seems that Bazin's existentialism (i.e. an existentialism which is, unlike the existentialism of Young Turks, sensitive to social-historical contexts) played an important role in the development of *auteurism*, in removing the barrier between art films and Hollywood by resisting the high-art prejudice of literature, and in the experimental filmmaking practices of young directors which caused a new cinema movement. Despite the fact that this movement failed in box-office, a few directors were able to continue

[14] Robert Stam (2000, p. 91) explains "genius of the system" as "the capacity of a well-financed and talent-filled industrial machine to turn out high-quality films."

filmmaking. Today, they are worldwide-known *auteurs* like François Truffaut and Jean-Luc Godard.

Hence, *auteurism* initally arose as a product of existentialist individualism in France. In the words of Robert Stam (2000, p. 87), such *auteurism* was "a product of the conjunction of cinephilia and a romantic strain of existentialism." French *auteurism* then has been influential over the cinematic traditions of other countries. In particular, it influenced American cinema. The following section will elaborate on how its effects were felt in American film criticism, film studies and filmmaking.

2.5 *AUTEURISM* IN AMERICA

In post-war years, the rise of *auteurism* in France was concurrent with the decline of Hollywood studios. Major production companies lost their control over exhibition, allowing European art films to make inroads in America. Hollywood started to sell old movies to television, making it possible to reach and reassess the early works of important directors. In addition, small-scale production opportunities arose by means of the accessibility of technical equipments and lightweight 16mm cameras.

The foregoing development drew the attention of some American film critics, as Pam Cook points out, "towards re-evaluating Hollywood films as worthy of critical consideration, and towards using the director as a criterion of value (rather than the stars, the screenwriter or the producer)" (2007, p. 410). On the other hand, some actively opposed Hollywood and thought that the 'quality' productions which concern serious social issues deserved to be criticized.

Andrew Sarris, one of the former critics, had columns in some magazines such as *The Village Voice* and *Film Culture* in the late 1950s and early 1960s. His criticism was established upon an attitude resisting (the prevailing tendency of latter critics) to social-

realism. Sarris, like Truffaut, resisted to the idea of 'quality' cinema in favor of 'popular cinema'. He preferred to deal with form – i.e. director's mastering ability of *mise-en-scéne* – rather than the serious social content. He also gave importance to the re-evaluation of high-art prejudiced Hollywood films. With such similar ideas in mind, he had a chance to interact with the "New Wave" movement through its directors and films at the Cannes Film Festival in 1961. During the year of 1962, in Paris, he watched old Hollywood films at the *Cinémathéque*. He became the editor of the English version of *Cahiers du cinema* published in London and New York (Cook 2007, 410).

Andrew Sarris was the most noteworthy critic in the context of the transplantation of *auteurism* into American criticism. He translated "La Politique des *auteurs*" as "the *auteur* theory" in his article "Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962".[15] Since he was a university teacher, he might have used the word 'theory' with an academic perspective, but the general belief in film studies and criticism is that his work was a mistranslation. Stephen Crofts (1998, p. 311) emphasizes that it should be translated as "the principle of / polemic for authors." Moreover, Pam Cook (2007, p. 410) thinks that "it might be better called a rationalisation" rather than a 'theory'.

Apart from its mistranslation "Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962" caused many other debates, beginning with the criteria for being designated an *auteur* director. Sarris (2000, p. 69), sets three criteria to designate a director as *auteur*: (1) technical competence; (2) distinguishable personality; and (3) interior meaning. Brian Michael Goss (2009, pp. 46-47) defines these three criterions as "a model of 'concentric circles' that circumscribe the *auteur*" and finds Sarris nebulous about what he aims to emphasize by 'interior meaning'. In the words of Sarris (2000, p. 69), it is "*élan* of the soul" of the *auteur* and the soul is "that intangible difference between one personality and other."

[15] Sarris kept '*auteur*' untranslated. He explains: "'*auteur*' means 'author', and should be so translated when the reference is to literary personalities. […] 'Author' is neither adequate nor accurate as a translation into English mainly because of the inherent literary bias of the Anglo-American cultural Establishment." (quoted in Hollows, Hutchings and Jancovich 2000, p. 49).

Robert Stam (2000, p. 89) points out that, another American critic, namely Pauline Kael, debunked Sarris's criteria in her 1963 article "Circles and Squares." In the article, Goss (2009, p. 48) claims that "[Kael] characterizes the *élan* […] as presenting apologetica for 'the frustrations of a man (sic)' […] 'working against the given material' typically due to commercial studio constraint." Kael seems to have made a sharp comment which designates the "irrelevant" attempt of auteurists to find *auteurs* within the restrictive conditions of Hollywood system, and to elevate the status of Hollywood films from mass production to art.

At this point, as Pam Cook (2007, p. 410) emphasizes, Sarris's purpose in "Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962" was to convey his anti-sociological conviction that "it is impossible to deny the importance of history in understanding any work of art, it is equally important not to reduce the work to its condition of production." Sarris defended the contribution of personal concerns in the filmmaking process as the other part of the argument against sociological criticism which defines film as a pure reflection of 'reality' without human manipulation. To this extent, as Cook (2007, p. 410) points out, "he took issue with André Bazin as well as with contemporary American film criticism."

The other controversial aspect of Sarris's article was its nationalist attitude. Sarris over-emphasized the superiority of American cinema and of Hollywood directors by categorizing them in his pantheon lists. He overtly declares that "I now regard the *auteur* theory primarily as a critical device for recording the history of American cinema, the only cinema in the world worth exploring in depth" (quoted in Cook 2007, p. 410). Despite the fact that its critical language was considered very subjective, and it was seen as being a far from fully-fletched 'theory', "Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962" shifted attention from sociological 'what' to artistically 'how'. As Brian Michael Goss (2009, p. 50) notes, "Richard Corliss characterizes Sarris' interventions as a 'thoughtful and well-timed challenge' to social realist criticism that previously prevailed as reigning critical paradigm."

Andrew Sarris was the most influential figure of *auteurism* in America, and an important instance of Anglo-American film criticism. In this manner, it is also necessary to elaborate *auteurism* in Britain which gained a broad sense via the film magazine *Movie* in the same year as the publication of "Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962" in *Film Culture*.

2.6 *AUTEURISM* IN BRITAIN

Movie, as the main British *auteurist* film magazine, was first published in 1962. It has concerns similar to its French and American counterparts, primarily resisting the prevailing criticism traditions of preceding film magazines *Sequence* and *Sight and Sound*, which both tended to dismiss Hollywood as unworthy of serious criticism and to laud European art cinema as a cinema of personal vision and unified worldview.

In Britain, literary criticism traditions, which took into consideration the social and moral aspects of art, had been dominant since before the 1960s. In addition to this, industrial modes of mass production that centred on entertainment were also denied by the critical elite. Some critics of this tradition who wrote for *Sequence* and *Sight and Sound*, such as Lindsay Anderson, Karel Reisz and Tony Richardson, were filmmakers as well. They were also the co-founders of the "Free Cinema" movement in Britain, in parallel with the French "New Wave" and independently made some personal documentaries with 16mm lightweight cameras. At first sight, this movement seems similar to the French "New Wave", but there were two crucial differences. First, concerning the evaluation of Hollywood films and directors, – members of 'Free Cinema' did not believe in the possibility of individual statements in Hollywood; the second difference concerns the concepts they prioritized. In the context of "Free Cinema", the quality of films is believed to be derived from their themes. The aim of this movement was to make serious social-issue films independently, without the contribution of British studio-system. In fact, the movement was born to emphasize the need for 'personal vision' to solve the problem of mediocrity in the existing British cinema by making theme-based social realist films.

At this point, with the effects of "New Wave" and of the English version of *Cahiers du cinema* which was published in London, *Movie* embraced French *auteurism*. As Pam Cook (2007, p. 420) states, *Movie* critics – such as Ian Cameron, Mark Shivas, Robin Wood, Victor Perkins, Peter Wollen – "pointed to the climate of critical opinion that ignored questions of form and demanded 'quality' pictures with serious social themes, and to the lack of British *auteurs* with their own personal style", and prioritized detailed analysis of mise-en-scéne (i.e. style) as a critical approach.[16] Yet, in *Movie* critics' point of view, meaning occurs in the formal organization of the film; cinema as a visual art should be interpreted through the unique styles of individual *auteurs.*

It is generally accepted that *Movie* critics made some contributions to French *auteurism*. Warren Buckland (2008, p. 81) defines them as more moderate critics than *Cahiers* critics, claiming that "they recognized that even *auteurs* can make bad films and that the metteur-en-scéne can, occasionally at least, make a good film." In this manner, *Movie* critics argued, as Lapsey and Westlake (1988, p. 107) suppose, "by taking a script written by someone else – [as metteur-en-scéne does] – and by imposing his directorial style, an *auteur* makes the film his own." Lapsey and Westlake also draw attention to the distinctive *mise-en-scéne* analyzes of Robin Wood and Victor Perkins and value them as "different in their attention to textuality from anything that had preceded them and would not be surpassed […] until the shot-by-shot semiotic analyzes of the post-1968 structuralist" (ibid).

In addition to these contributions to *auteurism*, Pam Cook (2007, p. 420) draws attention to *Movie*'s other contribution to film education by its critics who were teachers in schools and universities, and aimed to establish film as a serious academic subject. In this manner, Peter Wollen, one of the writers of *Movie* and a theorist as well, provided a significant intervention to *auteurism* by offering the new approach 'auteur-structuralism' which gave

[16] Pam Cook (2007, p. 424) claims that *Movie* critics' concept of *mise-en-scéne* was broader than *Cahiers* critics'. The *mise-en-scéne* analysis in *Movie* critics' perspective is "based on a deductive method whereby detailed description of films is seen to be the basis for criticism, […] a practical activity rather than as a theoretical project."

auteurism an intellectual and theoretical ground and facilitated its study in film schools. With all this, 'Auteur-structuralism' is now accepted as the turning point that gave *auteurism* enough energy to survive to modern day. This will be the issue elaborated in what follows.

2.7 AUTEUR-STRUCTURALISM

It is an interesting correlation that *auteurism* was born in France and it was transplanted to Britain essentially via the film magazine *Movie* in 1962. When *Movie* first appeared, it was the time of the publication of French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss's most notable work *La Pensée sauvage* / *The Savage Mind* in Paris. During the mid-1960s, thanks to Lévi-Strauss's work, a 'structuralist controversy' emerged among the left-wing intellectuals in the universities of Paris that reverberated in British intellectual life and specifically in the works of the British Film Institute's Education department in the late 1960s. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith and Peter Wollen were the members of this department and the critics of *Movie* as well.

Geoffrey Nowell-Smith's book on Luchino Visconti (1967), as Stephen Crofts (1998, p. 315) claims, "was virtually the first instance of auteur-structuralism." In addition, Pam Cook points out that, Nowell-Smith's book was an early writing of auteur-structuralism, it did not attract sufficient attention in broad sense. On the other hand, Peter Wollen's *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema* (1969; 1972; 1998) was accepted broadly as the main significant work on auteur-structuralism and as an "intervention" to "overly impressionistic earlier auteurist writings" (Hollows, Hutchings and Jancovich 2000, p. 49).

Wollen formulated his "auteur-structuralism" on the basis of the classic structuralism of Claude Lévi-Strauss, which was inspired by Saussurean[17] linguistics, especially by the

[17] Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) who founded the sicience of "semiology" and constituted the founding figure for European structuralism and for much of film semiotics. (Stam 2000, p. 104)

work of phonologist Roman Jacobson. Jacobson proposed, as Lapsey and Westlake (1988, p. 108) point out, that "underlying the immense variety of sounds in natural languages is a small number of binary phonological oppositions." By taking his departure from this idea, Lévi-Strauss constructs his structuralism upon the idea of "binary oppositions" which are inherent not only in languages but also in all human culture. He supposes that there is a universal (unifying) structure - which locates in human minds unconsciously and independently from time and place - and it works, as Lapsey and Westlake state, in a way depending on "a system of mental constraints operating according to binary oppositional features" (ibid). By making such a rationalisation, Strauss attacks the idea of 'individuality', since human minds operate according to a universal structure constructed upon the notion of binarism. The basic idea articulated by structuralism is that individuals do not make binary oppositions constructing the linguistic structures, but receive them as pre-given materials. That is, they are passive bearers of the structures rather than active agents.

This is the main handicap of auteur-structuralism when it is thought that *auteurism* is constructed upon nothing more than the idea of 'individuality'. By yoking *auteurism* with structuralism, the attempt of Wollen-like theorists to bring about a theoretical (scientific) aspect to *auteurism* so as to provide serious analytical attention to film and to advance film studies into universities ultimately fails.[18] For this reason, Brian Henderson, whose work Pam Cook (2007, p. 454) defines as "the prelude to criticism of structuralism itself", attacked Peter Wollen for this incompatibility of '*auteurism*' and 'structuralism' in the context of their positionings of the 'subject'. In opposition to the auteurist conception of 'subject' as the producer of unique or distinctive meaning, Henderson points out that "the structuralism of Lévi Strauss and others is founded upon the interchangeability of subjects in the production of meaning" (quoted in Cook 2007, p. 454).

---

[18] Yoking auteurism with structuralism seems like a lasting effort since Andrew Sarris's attempt to translate "La Politique des auteurs" as *auteur* 'theory'.

Taking his departure from these and other objections to his theory, Peter Wollen wrote a Postscript to the 1972 revised edition of *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema*. In this edition, he distanced himself from traditionalism, emphasizing instead, as Lapsey and Westlake (1988, p. 111) write, "not on expression of the artistic vision, but on 'the unconscious, unintended meaning [that] can be decoded in the film, usually to the surprise of the individual involved'." In this manner, he reformulated the *auteur* as an "unconscious catalyst" in contrast with the *auteur* in control of structuring activity.

In this way, Wollen presented a conception of the *auteur* as functioning in Lévi-Strauss's 'collective unconscious', which assumes that human minds function according to a universal structure rather than as autonomous entities. Brian Henderson pointed out that in the 1972 edition, Wollen constructed the *auteur* as "the necessarily unconscious catalyst to the materials he works with rather than having the script act as catalyst to his own creative imagination, consciously or unconsciously" (quoted in Lapsey and Westlake 1988, p. 111). By Wollen's definition of *auteur* as the "unconscious catalyst", Henderson implies that, the *auteur* distances himself from the status of empirical *auteur* and comes closer to the constructed one, because in Wollen's approach, when an action is done unconsciously, there is no given (specific) 'intention'. On the contrary, there is only a concealed 'intention' within the directorial structure to be revealed by an analyzer.

Brian Henderson also drew attention to another point concerning the new edition: that by defining the *auteur* as an 'unconscious catalyst to the materials he works' Wollen took the other factors (such as stars, studio, producer, cameraman) into consideration in the context of production of the meaning. At this point, Henderson took notice of the 'context' in which the *auteur* functioned as a 'catalyst' which "can be read as one element in the play of assemblage of different elements that makes up the film text(s)" (Cook 2007, p. 454). In light of this, the *auteur* tended to cease being 'the primary or the dominant' figure instead coming closer to being constructed through the analysis of his relationship with the other

elements. Such an interpretation invokes the historical materialist approach[19] as *auteurism*'s next encounter. This approach will be elaborated at the moment in this study, because it is the last point where the *auteur* still exists, at least as a passive element in the process of film-making – unaware of his future death.

2.8 *AUTEURISM* FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

In an attempt to emphasize combinations and contexts in which the authorial talent was largely determined, due to the impetus provided by the post-1968 political climate and by the resurgence of Marxism, historical materialists (i.e. to some extent, the later generation of *Cahiers* writers)[20], as Lapsey and Westlake (1988, p. 112) point out, paid attention to two constellations of production: (1) film as a 'commodity' and (2) film of 'meanings' with ideological and political effectivity.

According to historical materialists, when a film is defined as a commodity production, the *auteur* becomes a determined figure who necessarily works within the constraints of the production process and within existing conventions. In the context of industrial production, the *auteur* cannot be privileged as the autonomous or the unique source of meaning. In line with this, the films also cannot be seen as the unique creations of the cultish *auteurs*.

For a better understanding of a "historical-materialist conception" in which "the author [*auteur*] has of necessity to work within existing industrial and institutional frameworks" Stephen Crofts (1998, p. 320) points to Robert Lapsey and Michael Westlake's (1988) observation (in their chapter on Authorship) on Bordwell, Staiger and Thompson's book

[19] This approach was counter to the ahistorical idealism of Lévi-Strauss since it was constructed upon the idealized unifying (universal) structural system that located in human minds, unbounded by time and history.

[20] As Barry Keith Grant states (2008, p. 212) "by the end of the 1960s *Cahiers* had become a more politically oriented magazine than before. In a previous issue published in 1969, two members of the new editorial board, Jean Comolli and Jean-Louis Narboni, sought to categorize Hollywood films in terms of their relation to ideology. […] their categories minimized the importance of the director in film analysis." In addition to Grant's explanation, these categories will be detailed in the second part of the title of 'historical materialism'.

titled *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style & Mode of Production to 1960* (1985). They argue that, from 1917-1960, the films made in Hollywood should be acknowledged as commodity productions which have an impersonal and classical (homogenous) style depending on the narrative unity, continuity, realism, invisible editing and identification. As Lapsey and Westlake (1988, p. 117) state, Bordwell, Staiger and Thompson explained the period in terms of material determinants and thereby decentred the authorial role of the possible *auteurs*, elaborating the conditions of production which demand the maximum effort from all workers – including the director – so as to benefit from money and time.

John Ellis (1975) attempted to prove the historical materialist thesis not only in the case of Hollywood, but also in the case of British Studio System. Ellis proposed that films are essentially conditioned by three determinants: (1) the existing technology of cinema; (2) the organization of production itself; (3) the aesthetic and other beliefs of those controlling production (Lapsey and Westlake 1988, pp. 114-116). According to Lapsey and Westlake, Ellis's study (which concerned the films made in Ealing Studios in Britain) showed how particular forms of technology were deployed in the studio, how the production was organized within particular lines and how filmmakers were required to make certain decisions depending on economic, technological and ideological effects. In addition, as Cook points out, Ellis, in his 1975 study, emphasized the impact of the head producer Michael Balcon, who had final control over the 'creative elite' – consisting of producers, directors and scriptwriters – and the technicians (Cook 2007, p. 438).

On the other hand, Ellis also acknowledged that some directors of 'Ealing' (notably Robert Hammer, and to some extent Alexander Mackendrick) had methods of working and personal concerns which differed from the conventions of the studio. Thus, these directors were also categorized as the "oppositional 'Ealing'" by Charles Barr (1999) (Cook 2007, p. 439). Through the works of Ellis and Barr, as Pam Cook (2007, p. 442) points out, it was shown "how *auteurs* such as Robert Hammer and Alexander Mackendrick emerged from specific conditions of production."

The abovementioned constellation of production, i.e. film as 'commodity', is detailed in relation to the conditions of studio systems. At this point, even though the historical materialist approach puts the *auteur* as a determined (passive) figure (worker), the tendency to find distinctive *auteurs* in any given condition and the belief that the real talent accords himself to the restrictions like a chameleon are expressed in the foregoing works. In answer to this, Lapsey and Westlake suggest Louis Althusser's notion of 'relative autonomy'[21] to legitimize such tendencies and beliefs. Relative autonomy emphasizes that the conditions can not determine the creative 'individual' totally but only relatively. In Lapsey and Westlake's (1988, p. 115) words, "'relative autonomy' would allow both the specificity of a distinctive authorial signifying practice and that of the social formation to be respected." However, they immediately add that Althusser's notion was called into question by the some critics (notably Hindess and Hirst, and to some extent Bordwell, Staiger and Thompson)[22] to theorize films "as the products of particular conjunctures" not of the relative (unstable) ones (ibid).

The second constellation of production to which 'historical materialism' paid attention was the film as a bearer and medium of ideology, and it was Hollywood again which was used to explore this matter. Historical materialists emphasized the impossibility of individual statements on the part of the *auteur* since Hollywood served as both the producer and the bearer of the dominant ideology. Hollywood also was seen as the main industrial system purveying cultural imperialism all over the world by "seducing the audience into losing itself" in a "vulgar illusionism" (Cook 2007, p. 450; Lapsey and Westlake 1988, p. 118).

After the events of May 1968, as James Naremore (2005, p. 19) states, later *Cahiers* critics Pierre Narboni and Jean-Louis Comolli were "suspicious of Hollywood entertainment" and

[21] In fact, 'relative autonomy', as Pam Cook (2007, p. 446) puts it, was an attempt of Althusser to "establish relative autonomy of ideology from the economic base of society, taking issue with the orthodox Marxist view that cultural artifacts were directly determined by economic factors on the grounds that such a view ignored the way in which the different elements of the social formation interact to affect one another at any given moment."

[22] Lapsey and Westlake (1988, p. 118) claim that Bordwell, Staiger and Thompson were, in practice, closer to the approach of Hindess and Hirst, who tended to specify the conditions of existence of contingent practices.

its ideological aspects. They wrote a manifesto in *Cahiers du cinema*'s editorial "Cinema/Ideology/Criticism" which "marked a turn away from *auteurism*" (ibid). A series of articles on cinema, ideology and politics were published in *Cahiers* as a new project of politicised film criticism. In this manner, Narboni and Comolli (1969) argued that:

> *what the camera registers in fact is the vague, unformulated, untheorized, unthought-out world of the dominant ideology…reproducing things not as they really are but as they appear when refracted through ideology. This includes every stage in the process of production: subject, 'styles', forms, meanings, narrative traditions; all underline the general, ideological discourse.* (quoted in Stam 2000, p. 140)

Through this approach, the *auteur* was also constructed as the figure of the general ideological discourse. On the contrary, although *Cahiers* seemed, as Pam Cook (2007, p. 450) states, as "dissatisfied with its early auteurist work" by the effect of its politicized new face, the later *Cahiers* critics only changed its method for a while with respect to looking for *auteurs* in Hollywood.

In light with their new method for evaluating films, as Stephen Crofts (1998, p. 316) points, the later *Cahiers* critics proposed rating films from 'A' to 'G', "in terms of their perceived political effectivity in circulating or challenging dominant ideologies." Most interestingly, the category 'E' included films which at first glance seemed to belong to the dominant ideology, but when analyzed in depth, had aspects which could indeed be considered "running counter to the dominant ideological formations" (Lapsey and Westlake 1988, p. 120).

For example, John Ford's "*Young Mr. Lincoln*" (1939) was put into category 'E' by the later *Cahiers* critics. According to Pam Cook (2007, p. 450), the analysis of this film revealed "the importance of the authorial sub-code[23] […] to the process of internal criticism." While looking for the ideological determinants in these categorized films,

[23] Pam Cook (2007, p. 461), referring to Wollen, defines authorial sub-code as "one of many codes that made up the films and that could be objectively defined by reference to the films in question."

Cahiers critics did not give up attributing to the *auteur* the insertion of ideological implications or of hiding them, especially in Hollywood productions. In addition, *Cahiers*' politicized approach also allowed for the possibility of progressive *auteurs* (that criticize the conventions by which they also make their films) to be detected in Hollywood – for instance, Douglas Sirk[24] was accepted as a prominent progressive *auteur*. In the same period, as Pam Cook (2007, p. 450) notes, "*auteur* criticism in the UK began to look at the films of certain Hollywood directors in terms of the way they resisted dominant ideology, laying bare its operations."

To sum up, historical materialism aimed to decentre the role of the *auteur* in the process of making films as 'commodity' productions and as producers of 'ideology', but this approach generally met counter examples of auteurists. In any case, debates on the issues of determination continue to this day, and thus, although the role of the *auteur* was weakened by historical materialism, it was able to survive until post-structuralism took hold.

2.9 POST-STRUCTURALISM: THE DEATH OF THE *AUTEUR*

Saussurean linguistics, the initial inspiration for auteur-structuralism[25] in the field of film studies, continued to be a key scientific approach for analyzing films in a post-structuralist period and in the mid-1970s. However, there was a crucial difference between auteur-structuralism and the post-structuralist approach concerning the status of the *auteur*. While the former defended the existence of the *auteur* as the structuring entity – responsible for his conscious or unconscious choices in the creation of meaning in the film – and the role of the authorial-code among all the other codes, the latter denied the *auteur* as the creative

[24] Douglas Sirk, as described by Paul Willemen, was the director who attempted to "criticize the system that gave him the means to make films." Willemen also pointed out that Sirk had subverted the conventions of Hollywood especially by "frequent use of the techniques Bertolt Brecht had pioneered" (quoted in Lapsey and Westlake 1988, p. 118).

[25] As is argued above, auteur-structuralism suggested a semi-auteurist and semi-structuralist perspective. However, this was problematic principally because the issue of 'individuality' remains inconceivable from such a hybrid perspective.

source of the meaning in the film and instead gave birth to the 'reader' and emphasized the act of reading as the realm from which meaning emerges. As Naremore (2005, p. 19) points out, in the agency of post-structuralism, "the author became a kind of epiphenomenon – an ideological or historical construction – […] with the open-ended process of textuality, which seemed to belong to the reader, or to nobody in particular."

The French semiotician and literary theorist Roland Barthes's essay "The Death of the Author" (1967), began the demise of *auteur* in film studies. As Andrew Bennett (2000, p. 14) notes, the title of Barthes's work is "an allusion to Friedrich Nietzsche's late nineteenth-century declaration of the 'death of the God'." He attempts to kill the God-like author which he sees as an oppressive and controlling figure, and "seeks to move authority away from the author […] the fount of all knowledge and meaning, towards the system of language, the textual codes that produce effects of meaning" (Bennett 2000, p. 13). According to Barthes, 'meaning' is produced within language and the systems of signification. He declares, as Lapsey and Westlake (1988, p. 123) point out, "it is language which speaks, not the author." Pam Cook (2007, p. 474) also adds that, by his declaration of the death of the author, Barthes, in addition to the birth of the reader, permits another birth, i.e. that of textuality. At this point, concerning Barthes' emphasis on textuality, Andrew Bennett (2000, pp. 15-16) emphasizes that "Barthes's text is intertextual" which has no originator and which is "a tissue of past citations" – these citations are "unconscious or automatic quotations given without quotation- marks." If meaning is produced within language, then, according to Barthes, all origins should be called into question, including the author (*auteur*).

According to Lapsey and Westlake (1988), Roland Barthes' principal proponent in film theory is Stephen Heath, who translated his works and brought them into Anglophone film theory. Heath (1973) used Barthes's approach to attack the humanism of the traditional *auteurism*, with reference to Althusser's anti-humanism which, as Stephen Crofts (1998, p. 319) points out, "refused to see subjects as given, unified beings but rather as constructed and positioned by ideology." In light of this, Heath claims that the notion of authorship (i.e.

the notion of *auteur*) is ideologically constructed and prevents the spectator (reader) from thinking about a film's political functioning. In the same manner, Pam Cook (2007, p. 461) puts *auteur* study as "an ideological project that attempts to unify and systematize." At this point, by taking his departure from Barthes' statement, "a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination," Heath denigrates the ideologically constructed *auteur* and reintroduces the author as a mere effect of the text (Lapsey and Westlake 1988, p. 124).

The other work which drags the author (*auteur*) from grace is French philosopher Michel Foucault's essay "What is an Author" (1969). It was Foucault's attention to the relations among discourses, power and subjects which led him work on the notion of authorship. Foucault, as Naremore (2005, p. 19) states, "deconstructed the authorial 'function', showing its relationship to early Christian exegesis, to the rationalist episteme of bourgeois society, and to legal or property rights." According to Lapsey and Westlake (1988, p. 125), Foucault suggested that the proposition, the author as God was dead was in line with the philosophical move away from the idea of 'originating subject'. However, as Andrew Bennett (2000, p. 21) indicates, Foucault was suspicious of the Barthes' notion of the 'death of the author', believing that arguments like Barthes' which "challenge an author's privileged position will in fact tend to work to preserve that privilege." For this reason, Foucault preferred to have a 'disappeared' author rather than a dead author.

Barthes' and Foucault's work might be deployed to explicate the connection among the activity of literary writing, filmic writing (in a metaphorical sense, on a pelicule, by camera) and the status of the 'writer' – that is, the connection argued for at the beginning of this chapter. For Barthes, "writing is a negative space into which the subject 'slips away' and where 'all identity is lost'" (Bennett 2000, p. 20). In this manner, in the finished film, no traces of the individual *auteur* can be found since it is reader's turn. The spectator (reader) reads the text (film) and meaning arises through the confrontation between the textual codes (free from its writer's identity) and the reader's own code. Similarly, for Foucault, "writing creates 'a space into which the writing subject constantly disappears'" (Bennett 2000, p. 20). From Foucault's perspective, the author disappears but his name

survives by means of the 'reader'. Author-name, as Stephen Crofts (1998, p. 319) emphasizes, "labels a given body of texts, to be disengaged from any author as expressive individual" and "serves to classify and evaluate texts differentially." In other words, the spectator (reader) attaches a meaning to the name of an *auteur* through the corpus of his films (texts), not through the author's individual characteristics. Hence, it may be concluded that while Barthes' and Foucault' works have some nuances concerning the 'death of the author' they share a belief that it is time for the 'reader' to act as the interpreter of the 'free-floating signifiers'.

2.10 THE BIRTH OF THE READER

As was stated before, in the context of cinematic authorship, post-structuralism of the 1970s and its ongoing effects in film theory shifted the locus of creative power from the filmmaker to the 'reader' (spectator). Consequently, each reader's encounter with a text, as Lapsey and Westlake (1988, p. 127) state, was accepted as "unique". In this manner, the 'reader' can produce different meanings with each encounter of the same text.

Barthes – who declared 'the death of the author' as Cook (2007, p. 475) states, to permit the birth of the 'reader' – defines the 'reader' as "the space on which all the quotations that make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination" (quoted in Lapsey and Westlake 1988, p. 124). According to Barthes, since all origins are questionable, the unifying 'reader' on whom all the quotations are inscribed, cannot produce an original meaning. However, depending on the reader's particular context, he can produce many variable meanings.

As was mentioned, the 'reader' (spectator) can produce a meaning which the filmmaker never intended. In Jacques Derrida's words, "in all forms of signification the intentions of the sender (author) of a message might not be realised, a letter might not reach its destination" (quoted in Lapsey and Westlake 1988, pp. 124-125). In this case, when the

message (intended meaning) gets lost through the act of reading, the *auteur* (sender) indeed becomes a construction of the 'reader', which, as Cook (2007, p. 461) states, "cannot necessarily be related back to the intentions of a real person."

In contrast, Jean Mitry, in his *The Aesthetics and Psychology of the Cinema* (1963), implied the importance of the intended meaning of *auteur* and the importance of the capacity of the 'reader' to grasp it:

> *The spectator must already be equipped with certain preconceptions for him 'to create' the meaning between two shots […] Mitry insists that a young child, for instance, would see each image perfectly well but wouldn't give them a deeper inference.* (Andrew 1976, pp. 197-201)

Barthes and the reader-oriented film theorists, concerning this case, take into account the meaning that a young child produces despite the *auteur* being dead. At this point, it might be asked which meaning is noteworthy: the intended one of the *auteur*, or the unexpected one of the reader? Cook (2007, p. 460) claims that "a comprehensive, final or 'correct' meaning" never could be provided since the *auteur* and the spectator collaborated to produce "different and conflicting" meanings in such an activity which is always in progress.

It might be asked whether there is such collaboration, as Cook pointed, in producing even "different and conflicting" meanings, it is really necessary to kill the author to give a birth to the reader. Since cinema is accepted as an art form constructed on the principle of public 'exhibition' to the masses, its the only aim was to reach its audience. The *auteur* makes films to share a vision and style, to tell a story. It means nothing without a viewer/reader. Thus, the reader is as important as the *auteur* in this process and the meaning that the reader extracts from the text is as important as the meaning created by the *auteur*. It is not necessary that both these meanings be the same because they are produced by different minds. Since the *auteur* and the viewer have different styles, world views, thoughts, ideologies, talents, senses, beliefs and live in different social, political, economical,

traditional conditions, it may not be possible to attribute fixed meanings to the work of art. It is also may not be possible for subjects, as Brian Michael Goss (2009, p. 54) puts it, "to tell the same story in the same way as their co-enculturated peers even if they are similarly anchored in resonant common reference points."

In light of all this, without killing the *auteur* and his authority, the 'reader' must take the text as a criterion and study the meanings made possible by the films of a given *auteur*. He must not ignore the empirical *auteur* and the elements which distinguish that *auteur* from the others. However, on the other hand, he must also not be tied blindly to them.

It should also not be forgotten that what makes a filmmaker an *auteur* is revealed in the act of viewing. Readers/viewers build a consensus on the consistent and distinguishing thematic and stylistic motifs which are inherent within the corpus of the filmmaker's films and only then they do attribute value to a filmmaker as an *auteur*. Lapsey and Westlake (1988, p. 128) explain this process as follows: the spectator (reader) needs to identify with an "idealized image of the *auteur* constructed from a reading of the work, with the figure whose unity is attested by the unity of his or her vision." The crucial point that requires our attention is the reader's tendency to find, idealize and designate *auteurs*. At this point, perhaps it could be said that if we want the *auteur* to be dead, first the 'reader' should be effaced.

The other way to discount the *auteur* is inscribed in defining cinema as a collaborative art form. Debates on this issue take their departures from the very beginning of the efforts to elevate the status of the cinema to an art form and the status of the filmmaker first to an artist and then to an *auteur*.

2.11 COLLABORATION AND THE *AUTEUR*

> *Theatre is a collective experience, but cinema is the work of a single man, the director* [...] *You've got to have all your helpers, all the necessary collaborators; it's a collective endeavour, but in essence a very personal outcome, much more than the theatre to my mind, because film is something dead, a band of celluloid like the blank sheet on which you write a poem. A film is what you write on the screen.*
>
> *Orson Welles (*quoted in Cook 2007, p. 402*)*

Paisley Livingston, in his article "Cinematic Authorship" (2006), argues the issue of collaboration, serial manufacturing in studio systems and the notion of authorship in details with several instances, for example using Ingmar Bergman, who worked within the Swedish Film Industry's studio system, as an instance of a Welles's 'single man' working in harmony with his collaborators. Livingston uses the word 'author' for Bergman rather than *auteur*. However, this seems like a choice to not use a French word, because his elaborations do not differ from the traditional auteurist approach.

In this manner, Livingston (2006, p. 306), using Bergman's 1962 film *Winter Light*, categorizes the director as one who, on one hand, supervised and exercised control over the activities of his collaborators, and on the other hand worked as a 'foreman' who "showed the building plans to his co-workers, asking for suggestions for changes, and hoping to make sure they grasped the overall plan." Livingston warrants the characterization of Bergman as the 'author' of aforementioned film, even though he knows that Bergman did not personally create or dream up everything that can be seen in the film. Instead, Livingston emphasizes Bergman's decision-making ability and the particular utilizations (choices). He also emphasized Bergman's ability to write his own scripts and read them with the performers, discussing every single line in an effort to arrive at a shared sense of his story and characterizations.

At this point, even though there might be some restrictions related to working as a crew, since he wrote his own scripts, worked in harmony with his collaborators and guided them

with exact briefs, Livingston brands him as an author (*auteur*). What if he did not write his own scripts, as such in Hollywood studios, in cases of Alfred Hitchcock, John Ford, Howard Hawks, Douglas Sirk, George Cukor, and Frank Capra? As auteurist *Movie* critics argued, "by taking a script written by someone else and by imposing his directorial style, an *auteur* makes the film his own" (Lapsey and Westlake 1988, p. 107). It might be argued in the context of studio directors whether it is possible to be the 'unique creator of meaning' in traditional auteurist sense without writing an original script. Yet, even *auteurism* was born as a resistance to the adaptations from literature, and François Truffaut, Jean-Luc Godard, Claude Chabrol, Eric Rohmer, and Jacques Rivette mostly filmed their own scripts, they much admired these aforementioned Hollywood directors and designated them as *auteurs* because of their distinctive styles. For instance, the other zealous auteurist Andrew Sarris (2000, p. 69) with his emphasis on 'style', makes a comparison that, "a Cukor who works with all sorts of projects, has a more developed abstract style than a Bergman who is free to develop his own scripts."

In fact, collaboration is a very controversial aspect of *auteur* studies. There have been many attempts to find different *auteurs* in the processes of filmmaking. In general, stars, producers, writers, directors of photography and production designers are accepted as the major contributors to films. Sometimes their names are credited ahead of the name of the filmmaker. For instance, as Robert Stam (2000, p. 91) points out, "some argued that producers like Selznick, performers like Brando, or writers like Raymond Chandler could be seen as *auteurs.*"

From the very beginning, despite it being a collective medium, cinema needed a 'lone artist figure'[26] to be accepted as art form. Then, it needed an author-figure (*auteur)* to be accepted as a high art. Especially in art house films, working within a small crew, the *auteur* is accepted as the only authority, and may sometimes be the writer, the director of photography, the producer, the editor, the musician or an actor or actress in the film as well.

[26] Andrew Bennett (2000, p. 107) explains the attempt to see the filmmaker as 'lone artist figure' as an aim of "imposing a 'literary' model of authorship on film."

Whether in studio productions or in art house films, it is not possible for the filmmaker to isolate himself as painters, poets, sculptors, writers or composers do to work in direct connection with his materials. For this reason, Richard Corliss argued for a "*politique des collaborateurs*" and posited, as Brian Michael Goss cites, that "the director is right in the middle of things […] while the director of photography is lighting the set that the art director has designed and, later, while the actors are speaking the lines that the screenwriter wrote" (2009, p. 50).

After all these elaborations on the several aspects of *auteurism*, it is important to conclude this part with a reminder of the creating, unifying and decision-making ability of 'one individual' in the process and it is time now to continue with a discussion of the historical flux of *auteurism* and then to elaborate on how the concept of *auteur* is conceived in our globalized world today.

2.12 THE *AUTEUR* IS BACK: "NEW HOLLYWOOD" SINCE 1970'S

As it was stated before, the effects of the upheavals following May 1968 caused an important shift in cultural politics and the ultimate dissolution of the idea of the *auteur* in film theory. This shift, which began in France, gave an impetus to independent filmmakers although they preferred to work in small groups and rejected individual authorship. They embraced, as Cook (2007, p. 467) states, the idea of collective working, skills-sharing and making films for small and specific political audiences. In this period (1968-1972), Jean-Luc Godard – in contrast with his auteurist past – with some Maoists formed Dziga-Vertov Group which is principally bound up in Brechtian forms, Marxist ideology and impersonality. Peter Wollen named Godard's films that belong to this period as "materialist oppositional cinema, a 'counter-cinema'" (ibid).

On the other hand, in the late 1960's, in America, as Stephen Crofts (1998, p. 314) describes, the auteurist movement French New Wave (1959-1965) made a significant

"feedback loop" to Hollywood and started a new era namely "New Hollywood" (American New Wave) which was associated with names as Robert Altman, Martin Scorsese, Woody Allen, Arthur Penn and goes on. In this post-classical era, until the early 1980s, a number of university-educated *auteurs* and others, as Cook (2007, p. 475) states, "prepared to 'subtly update the safe studio genre package' resulting in 'big-budget *auteur* films'."

Timothy Corrigan (1991) and Justin Wyatt (1996) studied these *auteurs* of "New Hollywood" and the reasons for the revitalization of *auteurism* in the mid-1970s, 1980s and especially in the 1990s. Cook (2007, p. 475) points that Corrigan drew attention to "the commerce of *auteurism*" and "the survival of the *auteur* as a commercial strategy for organizing audience reception". Cook also emphasizes that, Justin Wyatt's work on Francis Ford Coppola displayed how Hollywood Studios had benefited from *auteurism* – especially by the mid-1970s with the 'names'[27] of Steven Spielberg, George Lucas and Coppola – to contract talents and marketing the films.

As it has been seen in the studies of Corrigan and Wyatt, *auteurism* in "New Hollywood" era became an indispensable part of marketing films. To this end, in addition to the usage of *auteur*-names as brand names, as Stephen Crofts (1998, pp. 321-322) puts it, there were also other changes in the last quarter-century which were related to this "new *auteurism*"[28]: (1) Authorship has obliged directors to engage with other, wide forms of media coverage such as TV reviews, frequent interviews, magazine profiles, advertising and sponsorship appearances; (2) distribution has grown more powerful and more global; (3) commodification of culture has accelerated; (4) genres have destabilized and audiences fragmented beyond the entertainment-art split towards a larger number of relatively unco-ordinated subgroups.

[27] Usage of these 'names' in marketing of films like 'a Steven Spielberg Film' is a good example of Michel Foucault's notion of the 'author-function', which provides a particular circulation of texts (films).

[28] As Cook (2007, p. 474) points out, in 1995, the *Film Criticism* editorial was titled "The New *Auteurism*". Cook defines the proclamation as "a landmark moment […] offering a new wave of *auteur* criticism complete with the 'necessary corrective' of a more contextual and cautious perspective purged off the 'adulatory enthusiasms' of earlier versions."

In line with these changes and with the new conception of *auteur* as the figure of publicity and advertisement, Corrigan claimed that it became possible to guess the meaning of a film before seeing it because of the "public images of its creator" (Cook 2007, p. 475). Essentially, an *auteur* functioned as a "brand" in the consumer culture of 1980s and 1990s.

Peter Wollen wrote in the 1998 edition of "Signs and Meaning in the Cinema" that he is still an *auteurist*, interpreting the intersection of the *auteurism* and millennialism in the notion of '*auteurism* in the 1990s' as "the author is back" (Cook 2007, p. 475). Yet it seems that the *auteur* that was "back" in the 1990s, was not the romantic one constructed at the beginning. Rather, it served as a trademark in global a commodifying of culture. In general, the domination of Hollywood was accepted as an overshadowing presence affecting the possible awareness of the works of art house *auteurs* in the United States and world-wide.

In our globalized age, commercial (mainstream) *auteurs* maintain their brand names thanks to their unique styles – by using new technologies and through their own way of narration – despite the prevailing tendency to remakes and adaptations of best-sellers. On the other hand, some distinctive art house *auteurs* are now becoming globally well-known thanks to the international film festival circuits, which was certainly not the case in the past. In addition to this basic and broadly accepted conceptualization of contemporary *auteurs*, there are also new approaches, which will be explained in line with the following consequences of globalization with regard to film production, exhibition and distribution strategies in the next part of this study.

2.13 *AUTEURISM* TODAY

Although contemporary *auteurism* seems to be principally developing in the two aforementioned branches, there are also some consequences of globalization that should be taken into consideration for a better understanding of contemporary *auteurs*. For me, the consequences are: 1) since the national borders have lost their importance, emphasises on

national cinemas have weakened, 2) trans-national, diasporic, inter-cultural, multi-cultural, multi-lingual cinemas have attracted larger audiences, 3) co-productions have become widespread, 4) digital film-making technologies and digital media have become popular, 5) dissemination of films via the internet without any screenings at film theatres has become a new way of exhibition, 6) genres have become increasingly hybrid, 7) film festivals have become like new brands of consumer culture. By taking his departure from most of these globalized cinematic conditions, Thomas Elsaesser, in his book *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood* (2005), defines the concept of 'world cinema' and explains the contemporary *auteurs* in relation to the 'world cinema' concept. Elsaesser's approach and the effects of digital film-making and media on the perception of contemporary *auteurism* will be detailed as alternatives to those previously mentioned.

As was already stated, the commercial sense of *auteurism* has roots in the mid-1970s which grew concurrently with countless technological improvements in the production, exhibition and distribution practices of Hollywood. Today, the current change in the production process of Hollywood, as Warren Buckland points out, concerns the contracting policies used to validate for long-term hirings of directors in the past in, contrast with the contemporary policies which treat each film separately. Buckland (2008, p. 105) claims the reason for this change is that "rather than a few directors being defined as *auteurs*, every director has to set himself up as an *auteur* in order to get work. Directors must establish for themselves a distinct visual style so they can be considered for a particular project." In this situation, technological facilities play an important role in the contemporary brand-like *auteurs'* ability to establish their distinctive styles. Yet on the other hand, in every step of the deployment of technology in the production process, the cost and the number of the collaborators continue to rise. In this way, continuous improvements of the facilities (generally concerning special effects and technical equipments) and the increasing number of technicians, specialists, artists, stunt persons who design, operate and perform the equipments and effects seem to serve for one individual within the processes of big-budgeted productions. According to Cook (2007, p. 478), the rise in the number of collaborators – which Goss (2009, p. 51) sees reflected in the ever-increasing length of

contemporary credit sequences – makes individual *auteurs* "increasingly problematic the more film scholarship uncovers the detail of these other contributions." On the other hand, in the case of the rising production costs, it becomes necessary for the industry to focus on promotional strategies, which function through global multimedia technologies, tie-in possibilities through outlets such as TV, DVD, CD, print media and the internet, to make a profit in the box-office. Hence, Cook (2007, p. 479) claims that, in addition to the promotional strategies, since the contemporary *auteurs* "actively participate in and/or control the commercial spin-offs from their films" and the contemporary *auteurism* "has been disseminated over multiple media sites", the distinction between commerce and art, which was central to traditional *auteurism*, has disappeared.

In the context of contemporary Hollywood, this name/style-oriented cinema generally fails to produce innovative themes. Remakes of some *auteurs*' past films, old Hollywood films, old American B-movies, old and contemporary Far-eastern and European films, as well as the films which are released with the names of prominent *auteurs* but without their direction and serial adaptations of best-sellers are prevalent in the world market. In line with this, James Naremore (2005, p. 21) claims that the emphasis on the sense of contemporary *auteur,* as it is defined in marketing strategies of Hollywood industry, is not new. Rather, he states,

> *What makes the contemporary situation relatively new is the presence of a well-organized boutique cinema, geared to an up-market audience. In America, this cinema is promoted by high profile film festivals such as Sundance (which is regularly featured in The New York Times)* [...] *Meanwhile, in Europe, the international art cinema is more alive than ever, and is still dependent upon auteurs.*

What Naremore defines as "boutique cinema" generates globally well-known art house *auteurs*, examples of the second sense of contemporary *auteurism* mentioned at the beginning of this part.

In opposition to the ones that are conceived as brands, this kind of *auteur* works without contracts with big production companies. Rather, they mostly finance their own films or get other alternative funding. They also work with a small group of people, use minimal technological facilities, and prefer not to work with stars; these *auteurs* mostly write their own scripts, sometimes use the camera, edit the film, compose scores for the film and design the production. Cook emphasizes that national cinemas, through this kind of *auteur*, differentiate themselves from Hollywood names and often position themselves as part of the art cinema, which depends on a more personal and distinguished directorial vision. Cook (2007, p. 431) immediately adds that the international status of these *auteurs* "can also result in the loss of national specificity", since they "attract the interest of the major conglomerates" and their work is "absorbed into a 'global' aesthetic". What Cook calls a 'global' aesthetic becomes crucial for these *auteurs* to succeed in the competitive atmospheres of particular international film festivals such as Berlin, Cannes, Vienna, Toronto, San Sebastian, London, Venice, New York, Tribeca, Sundance, Tokyo, Sao Paulo and Locarno. In general, rather than national themes, idiosyncratic and personal ones that are difficult to categorize get applause from the juries of these festivals. As Cook (2007, p. 389) cites, David Bordwell argues that, "art cinema addresses its audience as one of knowledgeable cinemagoers who will recognize the characteristic stylistic touches of the author's *oeuvre*." In other words, art house cinema serves as a marker of high/elite status both for the filmmaker and his spectators. As Stephen Crofts (1998, p. 322) claims, "individualist discourses enjoy this 'high status' globally", since "the socialist alternative to consumer capitalism" has withered away.

As compared with the commercial ones, art house *auteurs* make their films for prestige not for money. Yet, like the commercial auteurs, their *auteur*-names impact the circulation of their films globally, not in the play of marketing strategies of the industry but for maintaining their prestige at different festivals. In art cinema, as Cook (2007, p. 389) claims, an educated audience tries to find "the marks of authorship to make sense of the film, rather than to the rambling story or the characters who are often aimless victims rather than controlling agents." Art house films may be abstract, psychological, and idiosyncratic

and may say nothing new today but they at least seem more individualistic than contemporary Hollywood productions (remakes and adaptations) from the perspective of traditional *auteurism*.

Thomas Elsaesser claims that there are no such clear-cut branches in contemporary cinema. Thus, he positions 'world cinema' in between the commercial (mainstream) cinema and the art cinema. In this manner, Elsaesser (2005, p. 509) defines 'world cinema' as follows:

> *Formally speaking, in many cases, world cinema seems to be art cinema "light". Its treatment of time and space is closer to the mainstream than earlier experimental, avant-garde films or third cinema, and its narratives appropriate or cite conventional rhetorical strategies: for instance, the motif of the journey, quest or chase are almost universal.*

Elsaesser emphasizes 'journey'[29] as the common motif of 'world cinema', by means of which national borders are transgressed and cultures are fused (languages, musics, foods, idioms, memories). According to him, 'world cinema' indicates the "fusion and hybridity of national and international, ethnically specific and globally universal characteristics" (2005, p. 496). In this case, Elsaesser (2005, p. 511) foregrounds the *auteur* (apart from the old conception of European art cinema *auteurs* which were perceived as the national representatives) as a transnational or international figure "addressing the world, in the world's terms." At this point, as Elsaesser (2005, p. 511) states, contemporary *auteurs* have moved far from self-expression. They are also far from having to represent their own constituencies. The essential point, which brings global awareness to the 'world cinema' *auteurs,* is the fact of providing communication between their local/national provenance and global/transnational audiences. As another point, Elsaesser underlines that contemporary *auteurs* create films in different genres with different themes but with the same signature. Or rather, in his words, they are creators "whose signature is able to legitimate these genres and themes" (2005, p. 499). Elsaesser (2005, p. 498) uses football

[29] 'Journey' can be thought as a metaphor for 'world cinema', which travels between lands of commercial and art cinemas.

as a metaphor for the definition of 'world cinema' and emphasizes that Asian cinema, Bollywood, New Zealand and Australian cinemas are "contenders for major league status." He especially emphasizes that Asian cinema, as a rival to Hollywood in both commercial and art house senses, begins to inherit the status that European cinema had in the past, thanks to the international film schools which have graduated Asian *auteurs* who have their own national following giving them cultural credibility and allowing them to participate in international festivals and respective overseas markets (Elsaesser 2005, pp. 496-497).

In sum, Thomas Elsaesser's 'world cinema' is located somewhere between art cinema and mainstream cinema. At the global level, production, exhibition and distribution principles may shift between commercial and art cinemas. There is something very complex to explain. Elsaesser (2005, p. 504) identifies 'world cinema' as a category "conceived of and circulating from the point of use of distribution and exhibition which in turn determines the profile of production." In the context of exhibition, 'world cinema' is dominant at festival circuits – film festivals used to serve for a group of elite who were overly interested in arts and art cinema. However, today, film festivals are shaped as part of the popular culture, especially on television, and in newspapers and film magazines; and today not only art house films, but also much more popular ones get alternative funding or are co-produced, unlike the pre-globalized perception of art cinema. Elsaesser (2005, p. 502) explains the difference between 'world cinema' and the European national cinemas of 1970s and 1980s as follows: today "the funding may not come from the filmmaker's own state, but is disbursed in the manner of 'development aid'."

Furthermore, as far as production, distribution and exhibition principles are concerned, digital film-making is totally a new practice of the globalized cinema. As much digitally-shot films – by digital film cameras – are screened at film theatres, they also mostly reach their audiences *via* the internet – especially those which are shot by non-professional digital cameras or mobile phones. The latter practice is very common today and these kind of films generally seem *auteur*less (authorless). On the internet, the creators of such amateur digital films generally use nicknames and may be known and had have accumulated a following

under that moniker. Sometimes a group of people shoot different parts of a film and collect/edit them on their computers but exhibit the film under a collective moniker or as if it were made by a single person. Or, sometimes, a film is downloaded from the internet, is edited in some way and is reposted as a new film crediting the editor. James Naremore (2005, p. 21) explains this kind of practice:

> *Thus in the age of the computer, the media are able to generate 'hypertexts' – apparently authorless words, sounds, and images manipulated by the reader/viewer according to structural conventions and repertoire of older styles. A great many postmodern artists adopt a similar strategy; more like bricoleurs than creators, they make new texts out of borrowed or retro motifs, becoming ironic about their originality.*

In addition to these contemporary practices, in the context of the usage of digital media, animated films are generally made by *auteurs* – especially those produced in the U.S.A., Japan, India or South Korea – but as Elsaesser (2005, p. 507) points out, sometimes there is "less auteurist participation" in the production process of animation films, as it is in the European context.

In summary, all these and more other globalized conditions show that contemporary cinema seems to be the result of fusion, hybridization, confrontation, co-production. At the end of this chapter, after all the historical and theoretical review of the conception and the perception of *auteurism*, it should be stated that the traditional (romantic) sense of *auteurism* is still alive, no matter how cinema is defined, be it commercial, art house, world, national, international, transnational first, second, third, independent, new, post-national, post-industrial, digital, global cinemas, and no matter what are the conditions the directors dealing with to designate them as *auteurs*. This is probably due to our need to idealize or glorify any creator and the tendency to identify with the creator by means of proving the possible 'coherence' in his body of works that his 'style' provides.

In conclusion, throughout this chapter, it was shown that *auteurism* is a conception that has been developed with an emphasis on 'style'. From the very beginning, *auteurism* has

required an ‘individual style’ established through the ability of a director to write on a pelicule; *auteurism*, in this sense, cared not much for ‘what’ is written, but ‘how’ it is written. As it was born in resistance to the ‘tradition of quality’ (quality in themes) in France, French auteurists were very interested in popular Hollywood films and American B movies.

Principally, traditional *auteurism* has developed around the idea of the necessity of ‘persistence’/ ‘coherence’ rather than ‘quality’ in themes. In a similar way, when French *auteurism* was transplanted to America and shaped as an ungainly ‘theory’, some American critics resisted the prevailing tradition in film criticism which overemphasized content and undervalued formulaic Hollywood films. Furthermore, in the same years in Britain, literary criticism traditions were dominant in film criticism which took cinema as an art form complete with social and moral aspects and denied its popular or entertaining features. What has been reigning in those years in the film critical atmospheres of these three countries was on one hand the same in Turkey because during the same period, the art status of cinema and the artist status of director tended to be explained through ‘content’. However, on the other hand, in Turkey there was no attempt to resist such a tendency and in this manner, no *auteurism* towards directors of commercial films developed in the traditional auteurist sense. Thus, in the next chapter, the development and the conception/perception of *auteurism* in Turkey (in its historical context) will be explicated by taking the traditional sense of *auteurism* as an anchoring point from which we can analyze the films of Yavuz Turgul.

3. AUTEURISM IN TURKEY

In almost the same time (around 1950s) as the birth of *auteurism* in France, the need to foreground the art status of cinema in Turkey revealed itself in the endeavors of a new generation of directors. These directors tried to create unique cinematic languages in a way that diverged from the prevailing theatrical tradition. Concurrently, the possibility of making a profit from filmmaking became more prevalent among the newborn production companies which made up the Yeşilçam film sector, and thus the new generation of directors had to navigate between making films for their personal reasons and for the concerns of 'Yeşilçam cinema'.[30] Probably because of such dual conditioning of directors in a new sector and the insufficiency of theoretical knowledge in Turkish cinema circles (since the opening of cinema schools came in 1974)[31], *auteurism* in Turkey did not develop as it did in Western countries.

In this chapter, I will consider the development of *auteurism* in Turkey through the perspectives of selected cinema scholars and historians (specifically, Giovanni Scognamillo, Gönül Dönmez-Colin, Kurtuluş Kayalı, Rekin Teksoy, Rıza Kıraç and Savaş

[30] At the beginning of this chapter, it is essential to give place to a description of 'Yeşilçam cinema' since cinema practice in Turkey was labeled by it for a long time. Nezih Erdoğan and Deniz Göktürk (2001, p.536) describe it that "Yeşilçam, by deploying the powers of genre [they emphasize melodrama, comedy, historical action/adventure and detective/gangster movies as the popular genres of Yeşilçam] and stardom, set a horizon of expectations for its audience. This did not only guarantee commercial success, but also formed well-established conventions of story-telling." In addition, Erdoğan and Göktürk (2001, p.536) state the characteristics of Yeşilçam cinema as: "there was no capital reserved for the cinema, no investment was made in studios or even technical equipment. From the 1940s dubbing was standard practice, saving money on actors and studio time. Screenplays were written in a rush – sometimes on the spot – just before shooting started. In order to avoid changing lighting and camera set-ups, every object in the studio was given the same amount of light and the shot-reverse system was abandoned almost entirely. That led to a hybrid visual convention that found a compromise between the tradition of two-dimensional Turkish miniatures or shadowplay and the Western regime of perspective. Thus the image lacked the dialectics of figure-background and visual depth, due to flat lighting. In addition, when conversing the actors did not face each other, but rather the camera, thus making full identification impossible for the spectator."

[31] The first cinema school (*Sinema-Tv Enstitüsü*/The Institute of Cinema-Tv) is mentioned as founded by Prof. Sami Şekeroğlu in 1974. For detailed information see (http://www.msgsu.edu.tr/msu/pages/77.aspx) [accessed 27 March 2012]

Arslan[32]). For a better understanding of the approaches developed towards the foregoing generation, I will first elaborate Turkish cinema of the pre-1950s through its most significant director, Muhsin Ertuğrul. Then, I will examine the period between 1950-1970 – called the period of "cinema-makers" by Nijat Özön– and three of its directors namely, Ö. Lütfi Akad, Metin Erksan and Osman F. Seden through the existing auteurist or non-auteurist approaches. I chose these three directors because of the appropriateness of their cases (in relation with Yeşilçam) for the possible traditional auteurist studies such as the writers of *Cahiers*, *Movie* and *Film Culture* developed around the directors working in Hollywood. To justify the choice of Akad, Erksan, and Seden, I may also emphasize their significance in the long-lasting style/content dilemma in the evaluation of films and possible *auteur* statuses of their directors.

In the following section, I will begin with Yılmaz Güney, who has been broadly accepted and acclaimed by a group of cinema writers (which were interested in the authorship of art film directors) as an originator of a new period himself in the 1970s. Having examined Güney, I will elaborate the period of 1980-1990 – which I will call the period of "*auteur* cinema" borrowing from Gönül Dönmez-Colin's periodization – and one of its representatives namely Ömer Kavur through the definitions/perceptions of *auteur* cinema and traditional *auteur* concepts. Kavur was chosen for close study because of his broad acceptance as the most idiosyncratic director of the period who is distinct from the other followers of Yılmaz Güney due to his 'style' and aesthetics which comes to the fore over 'content'. Finally, in light of the dominant perception concerning the contemporary period that is called 'New Turkish Cinema' or 'New Cinema of Turkey' I will elaborate on the development of *auteurism* since 1990s and five directors of the period: Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Zeki Demirkubuz, Yeşim Ustaoğlu, Reha Erdem and Fatih Akın. These five directors will be used to display the existing auteurist approaches (differing but somehow centring on art cinema) of our globalized age.

[32] To avoid confusion regarding Savaş Arslan and Mizgin Müjde Arslan, I will be using the authors' full name in all citations.

3.1 PRE-1950S: MUHSİN ERTUĞRUL

In the context of cinematic history in Turkey, Muhsin Ertuğrul, the dominant figure in the early years (1922-1939)[33] of cinema in the country, is the first director to be considered in terms of 'creativity', 'originality' and 'individuality', and thus in terms of whether or not he is an *auteur*. Rekin Teksoy (2008, p. 21) defines Muhsin Ertuğrul as "the founder of cinema in Turkey" and explains Ertuğrul's existence as the 'one-man'[34] of Turkish cinema in that era on the basis of the lack of "competing directors" and "emerging talents". However, he emphasizes that Ertuğrul himself had a "limited talent in cinematography" and "left no lasting impressions on the Turkish movie industry" (Teksoy, 2008, p. 29). It is a widespread argument among those who have written on the history of cinema in Turkey that Ertuğrul's films did not establish a cinematic language, originality and individuality since they were imitations and adaptations of theatre-plays and literature (Teksoy 2008; Scognamillo 2003; Dönmez-Colin 2008). Giovanni Scognamillo (2003, p. 68) emphasizes that Ertuğrul was not a film artist himself since he had a theatrical perspective and was not able to use the cinematic language in the sense of Western cinema.

Thus, when *auteurism* is simply defined in relation to the cinema as an art form which needs a creator in possession of a unique style, it seems difficult for cinema writers to designate Muhsin Ertuğrul an *auteur* in the history of Turkish cinema.[35] Meanwhile,

[33] 1922-1939 is the period of "theater-film-makers" in Nijat Özön's periodization (quoted in Savaş Arslan, 2011, p. 23) Muhsin Ertuğrul is supposed to dominate this period as the 'one man' of cinema. Then, some other directors entered the practice of film-making. As Rekin Teksoy (2008, p. 35) states, Faruk Kenç was the first one having non-theatrical background and quite amateurish cinematic language. Along with the non-theatrical counterparts, Ertuğrul continued directing films until 1953.

[34] In contrast to Teksoy, Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 55), referring to Nijat Özön, states that Muhsin Ertuğrul had a tendency to prevent others from making films in order to create a 'one man rule' in cinema.

[35] As it is emphasized in the previous chapter, it is not obligatory for a director to make a film by writing the script him/herself to be designated as an *auteur*. When the total *oeuvre* of Ertuğrul is analyzed, there may be found a recognizable style even though he made adaptations from literary or theatrical texts. His 'theatrical language' itself may be accepted as a main element to designate him as an *auteur*. If there were other films made in the same years with a theatrical language by some other directors and despite this, Ertuğrul could have established his own theatrical language and have been distinct from the others, then, it might be more possible to make an *auteur* study concerning him. However, as the historians and writers claimed above, he

although a few other directors had participated in the practice of filmmaking between 1939 and 1950[36], they have also not been accepted as creative *auteur*s with unique cinematic styles.

As Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 64) points out, Burhan Arpad, a journalist, wrote in 1959 that, "the first indications of cinema as an art form evolved in the years between 1947 and 1953." In this respect, Arpad and his some friends (Ömer Lütfi Akad, Aydın Arakon, Orhan M. Arıburnu, and Hıfzı Topuz) founded *Türk Film Dostları Derneği* / The Organization of the Friends of Turkish Film in 1952 to elevate the cinema practice in Turkey to the status of art, and that of Turkish directors from craftsman to artist (Savaş Arslan 2011, pp. 64-65). What Arpad noted as the premise indications overlapping with the aim of their organization are some films which "involved artistic realism that shied away from the influences of theatrical filmmaking" (Savaş Arslan 2011, p. 64). At this point, Ömer Lütfi Akad's *Vurun Kahpeye* (*Hit the Whore*, 1949) was the most significant film, as Rekin Teksoy (2008, p. 38) considered it to be a "breath of fresh air into Turkish cinema" and the beginning of a "new age of Turkish cinema" after the domination of Muhsin Ertuğrul. Akad, the initial director of the 'period of cinema-makers' will be discussed under a new title after an overview of the period.

---

was the only one making films in a period, then it may be hard to find his unique style which would distinct him from the others since there is no others to be talked. In this sense, Ertuğrul case is an interesting one for the auteurist approach which demands a signature of a director to be recognized while watching a film without knowing its director since it is claimed that in an exact period the director of all existing films was Muhsin Ertuğrul.

[36] 1939-1950 is the period of "transition" in Özön's periodization which shows the beginnings of the era of the "cinema-makers" (quoted in Savaş Arslan 2011, p. 23). Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 66) further points out that the films in 1940s (which belong to "pre-Yeşilçam" era in Arslan's periodization) not only include adaptations, but also present "a complete venue of entertainment" by means of some comedies and melodramas. Some of the directors of the period are, Faruk Kenç, Baha Gelenbevi, Şadan Kamil, Talat Artemel, Turgut Demirağ, Şakir Sırmalı, Çetin Karamanbey, Vedat Örfi Bengü, Ferdi Tayfur and Ömer Lütfi Akad (Teksoy 2008, pp. 36-37).

3.2 1950-1970: THE PERIOD OF "CINEMA-MAKERS"[37]

The developments of the period of 'cinema-makers' and the era of Yeşilçam (Green Pine), which has been broadly acknowledged as moving in the direction of 'commercial cinema'[38], should be elaborated concentrically in Turkey. At the beginning of the period (1950-1970), in company with the endeavors of some young directors to make films which could be seen as works of art, there was also a tendency, as Yusuf Kaplan (1996, p. 657) states, to make profit from the films thanks to the 1948 tax cut. As Teksoy (2008, p. 37) states, some directors who had formerly been working with City Theatre started to make melodramas, comedies and historical films after benefiting from the cut. Through the accumulation of film production companies on Yeşilçam Street[39] and the increase in the population of new directors in the 1950s, the commercial sense of cinema started to become prevailing one in the country. For this reason, 'cinema-makers' worked in a way bound to the circumstances of Yeşilçam cinema and directed a lot of commercial films in various genres. When Yeşilçam cinema enjoyed its golden age in 1960s, especially concerning this very increase in the production of formulaic melodramas and adventures with particular

[37] In 1962, Nijat Özön wrote the most noteworthy history of Turkish cinema up to his age. In his work, he established a periodization of Turkish Cinema and named the period 1950-1960 as the period of "cinema-makers". Then he extends the period of "cinema-makers" to 1970 and adds a new period "Young/New Cinema (1970-1987) (quoted in Savaş Arslan 2011, p. 24). Even though there are alternative periodizations, Özön's period of "cinema-makers" is significant in this study since he made such a periodization by emphasizing the artistic nature of "cinema" and making it distinct from the once prevailing theatrical tradition. At this point, Yeşilçam had risen as a new sector in 1950s and this period may also be perceived and named as the "period of Yeşilçam". It should be stated in this study that there will be no resistance to any existing periodizations; however, those which are used have been chosen to establish a better understanding of possible auteurist senses inherent in the tendencies of making such periodizations.

[38] Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 17), while acknowledging the existing historiography and criticisms of cinema in Turkey, proposes a new way of understanding of Yeşilçam and does not categorize Yeşilçam as commercial filmmaking; rather, he considers it as "the name given to the filmmaking practice in Turkey roughly between 1950 and 1990". In a similar manner, this study will emphasize that the directors of the period before New Turkish Cinema (pre-1990s), should not only be studied through what might be called individual or art films but also through popular genre films they made using the same actors, crews and facilities in Yeşilçam production system.

[39] In addition to the contribution made by the 1948 tax cut, Yusuf Kaplan (1996, p. 657) explains that with the help of the open economic system and the industrialization program of the multi-party government of the period, "[a] great number of Anatolian small businessmen moved into Yeşiçam Street in Istanbul, and established film production companies. From this base the film industry witnessed an explosion in production that would lead the Turkish cinema to be labeled Yeşilçam Cinema.

stars, the number of cinema-makers' social realist/artistic films[40] (dramas) concurrently started to increase and gained significant attention in local and international arenas. It should not be forgotten that 'cinema-makers' shot all their films using the technical facilities, crews, and stars already present within the conditions of Yeşilçam. Tarık Dursun Kakınç (1996, p. 336) argues that "this generation of directors tried to find their own cinematic styles – which would be recognized very later – despite all their faults and their dependence to the market" Similarly, İbrahim Altınsay (quoted in Ayça 1987, p. 42) confirms the endeavors of 'cinema-makers' in 1960s and argues that the 1960s a period of endeavoring to create personal styles with the language which had been learned in the 1950s. In addition, Pınar Tınaz Gürmen (2009, p. 88) emphasized that after the 1960 military coup, with the effect of French *Nouvelle Vague*, like many other foreign counterparts, individuality became important in the cinema of Turkey. In line with this, as it is paralleled with the golden age of Yeşilçam, social-realist dramas increased and the "creator-directors" (*yaratıcı yönetmenler*) (possibly implying *auteur* directors) started to make their voices heard abroad through film festivals.

Indeed, the period of 'cinema-makers' seems to hold the key to understanding *auteurism* in Turkey since it includes the endeavors of its directors to create their own personal styles and the growing perception of cinema as an art form. However, a French-influenced group of intellectuals, who founded Turkish Cinematheque Association[41] (1965) and published the film journal *Yeni Sinema* (*New Cinema)*, claimed that it could not have been possible to create a distinct individual style when the production, exhibition and distribution system of Yeşilçam was taken into consideration. In this manner, as Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 39)

[40] Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 100) points out that the 1960 military coup and the resulting new constitution (1961) had an effect on Yeşilçam since the challenges of unions and other civil societal organizations to Turkish political life which demand socioeconomic equality and representation of socialist parties in the parliament influenced the themes of films. Thus, according to Arslan, the genre of social realism became popular in Yeşilçam.

[41] As Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 39) states, some of the activities of the Association were: "publishing interviews with celebrated filmmakers such as Godard and Antonioni, screening masterpieces of European art cinema along with examples of Soviet Revolutionary Cinema and organizing discussions on French *Nouvelle Vague*, Italian *Neo-Realism* and Brazilian '*Cinema Novo*'."

points out, the cinematheque group resisted Yeşilçam and criticized the social realist films of 'cinema-makers' for "lacking a theoretical basis and artistic maturity." In addition, Dönmez-Colin emphasizes that *New Cinema* journal:

> *was perceived as modelled after the art cinema of the West. The aim was to create. The auteur policy and the alternative modes of production were its trademarks. The target audience was the film festivals. Yeşilçam, the domestic popular cinema, was modelled on Hollywood. To produce was the principal aim. The star system, the capitalistic mode of production, distribution and exhibition were its trademarks*. (ibid)

At this point, the period of 'cinema-makers' seems to not include art cinema[42] *auteurs* in the Western sense that the journal and the association followed. However, at the same time as the intensive interest of the Turkish cinematheque group in Western art cinema and their resistance of Hollywood, *auteurism* in the West (French, American, British), in contrast, was very interested in Hollywood directors. Western *auteurists* (Claude Chabrol, Eric Rohmer, Andrew Sarris, Robin Wood, Victor Perkins, Peter Wollen) made some significant detailed analyses of the films produced by some Hollywood directors (Alfred Hitchcock, Orson Welles, Fritz Lang, Nicholas Ray, Howard Hawks, John Ford, Otto Preminger, Max Ophuls) to establish their recognizable stylistic and thematic personalities. While Western *auteurists* declared, thanks to their analysis, that there were *auteurs* in Hollywood despite the restrictive circumstances in which they worked, 'cinema-makers' who worked in the similarly restrictive circumstances of Yeşilçam were defined later by Onat Kutlar (one of the founders of Turkish Cinematheque Association) as those who had tried to use American

[42] According to David Bordwell (2002, p. 94), art cinema appears as a distinct mode of filmmaking concurrent with the waning of Hollywood cinema's dominance after World War II. He points out (2002, p. 95) that art cinema explicitly stands against classical narrative cinema which becomes dominant by studio filmmaking in Hollywood since 1920. In light of this, Bordwell emphasizes (ibid) that through the principles of classical narrative (cause and effect linkage of events, narrative parallelism, goal oriented and psychologically defined characters, fixed figures of cutting (180 continuity, crosscutting, 'montage sequences), mise-en-scéne (three-point lighting, perspective sets), cinematography (a particular range of camera distances and lens lengths), and sound (modulation voice-over narration)), the viewer makes sense of the film as verisimilitude and unified. On the other hand, he emphasizes (ibid) that art cinema constructs its narrative on two principles: realism (real locations, real problems, psychologically complex characters) and authorial expressivity (the author is the textual force 'who' communicates and expresses through the film and 'who' unifies the text since the film lacks identifieble stars and familiar genres).

cinematic language rather than their own. Thus, according to Kutlar (1991, pp. 29-30), quests for an individual style become more significant in the 1980s rather than the 1960s since the directors of the former period shied away from the mentality of Yeşilçam. In opposition to Kutlar, Meral Gündoğdu (1997, pp. 9-10), emphasizes the art films of the pre-1980 era and states that Lütfi Akad's - and some other directors' (Metin Erksan, Atıf Yılmaz, Yılmaz Güney) - social realist films should be considered 'art films' rather than the melodramas of 1960s and the pornographic films of 1970s.

In light of these arguments and the short explanation about the local and foreign factors which effected the development of individual styles, there should be an elaboration on how some particular directors of the period have been perceived and evaluated. Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 29) lists Ömer Lütfi Akad, Atıf Yılmaz (Batıbeki), Metin Erksan, and Memduh Ün as representatives of the period. Scognamillo (2003, p. 151) categorizes the period into three sections[43] and emphasizes that "in general and classical belief, the essential directors […] named as cinema-makers are: Lütfi Akad, Metin Erksan, Atıf Yılmaz[44], Osman F. Seden and Memduh Ün[45]." In this study, based on the level of their significances perceived up to now by Turkish cinema circles, Ömer Lütfi Akad, Metin Erksan, and Osman F. Seden[46] will be discussed seperately to understand the *auteurist* or non-*auteurist* approaches developed in relation to them.

---

[43] 1. *Sinemacı Dediklerimiz* (The Ones We Called Cinema-Makers): Ömer Lütfi Akad, Atıf Yılmaz (Batıbeki), Metin Erksan, Memduh Ün, Osman F. Seden, Orhan M. Arıburnu, Muharrem Gürses
2. *Sinemacılar Kuşağı* (The Generation of Cinema-Makers): Ömer Lütfi Akad, Atıf Yılmaz (Batıbeki), Metin Erksan, Memduh Ün, Osman F. Seden, Halit Refiğ
3. *Yeni Kuşak* (New Generation) includes the ones who were young or around their 30s in the mid-1960s when they shot their first films. Scognamillo lists as: Tarık Dursun Kakınç, Feyzi Tuna, Zeki Ökten, Ferit Ceylan, Tunç Başaran, Remzi Jöntürk, Erdoğan Tokatlı, Bilge Olgaç, Duygu Sağıroğlu and Alp Zeki Heper.

[44] Scognamillo (2003, p. 211) regards Atıf Yılmaz as one of the strongest and most reliable professionals in Turkish cinema, although he also finds it difficult to consider Yılmaz original since he tried all subjects and genres.

[45] Scognamillo (2003, p. 246, 251) defines Memduh Ün as a technician and a professional. In addition, he emphasizes that Ün preferred commercial cinema and tried to strengthen his style of narration within the rules of commercial cinema. (2003, p. 249)

[46] Even though Giovanni Scognamillo (2003, p. 211, 246, 249) defines Yılmaz, Ün and Seden as the strongest professionals of Turkish cinema, I will only discuss Seden since his *oeuvre* is acknowledged as fulfilling the

As was stated at the beginning of this chapter, despite the fact that this period includes other directors worth studying, only three of them (Akad, Erksan, and Seden) will be discussed in the scope of this study. The tendency to select these three derives from the need to emphasize a recognizable shortcoming of Turkish cinema circles: that it used to focus over-much on 'content' in their perceptions of directors. However, traditional *auteurism* while demanding thematic coherence, insists that directors also show evidence of a unique style (signature or fingerprint). In other words, in the traditional auteurist sense, quality not only comes from the 'content' but also from a consistent 'style'; furthermore, quality cannot be measured based solely on the tastes of some writers/critics.[47]

Even though Akad has been respected and studied for initiating a new period with his artistic concerns and for the consistency recognized through the employment of the theme of 'modernization' and the minimalist narration in his films, and Erksan has been respected for his intellectual background, international success and the themes he consistently employed in his social-realist films, Seden has *not* been respected and studied in these or any other senses. The issues Seden handled were thought to be merely entertainment and were not taken seriously. However, because his films maintained the same cinematic style despite their so-called 'unremarkable' contents and he wrote and produced the films himself, Seden has been considered the most professional director of the period. In fact, it should not be forgotten that Akad and Erksan have also been criticized by some circles for making popular genre films (with so-called "light" contents). Thus, these three have been

---

demands of traditional *auteurism* to the extent that it is straightforwardly consistent in its style. It should also be stated at this point that even though Halit Refiğ is acknowledged as one of the representative 'cinema makers' by Scognamillo, he has also been considered a director who could not establish a personal cinematic style, though has been fore grounded by some circles thanks to his theorization of 'nationalist cinema' (Teksoy 2008, p. 58).

[47] It should be stated at this point that, when *auteurism* takes its departure from the writers' tastes, it also becomes full of contradictions. For instance, Andrew Sarris, who challenges the prevailing tendency of social-realist writers – who merely deal with 'content' – while honoring the 'style' of an unfashionable soap opera director Cecil B. de Mille (Naremore 2005, p. 16), at the same time, resists to the probability of Roger Corman to be designated as an *auteur* since Corman made a cheap/underground/exploitation films and failed to "produce high art from popular culture" (Cook 2007, p. 416). According to Cook (ibid), Sarris's resistance to Corman's works comes from their contents which do not take Hollywood seriously, rather rips off and parodies it; thus, Cook gives Will and Willemen's (1970) and Dixon's (1976) studies as "attempts to reclaim the status of *auteur* for Corman" which deal with Corman's 'style'.

chosen to show the necessity of several cinema studies, particularly *auteur* studies, despite their differing conditions, interests, backgrounds, concerns, worldviews and styles.

3.2.1 Ömer Lütfi Akad

Ömer Lütfi Akad, one of the founders of The Organization of the Friends of Turkish Film (1952), described the aim of the organization as "the advancement of Turkish filmmaking in terms of art and to raise its level of respectability in the world of international[48] filmmaking" (quoted in Savaş Arslan 2011, pp. 64-65). However, it has been broadly emphasized that he made lots of commercial films in various genres to correspond to the needs of the Yeşilçam production system as well. Despite this fact, Kurtuluş Kayalı (2006, p. 59) states in 1988[49] that, "when it comes to the feature of 'originality' in Turkish cinema, there can be stated no other director than Lütfi Akad and Yılmaz Güney." In line with this, Kayalı (2006, p. 129) criticized Alim Şerif Onaran for interpreting Akad's films separately and argued that they should be interpreted as a whole regardless of their genres and conditions of production. This is what traditional *auteurism* demands.

In the introduction of *Çok Tuhaf Çok Tanıdık: Vesikalı Yarim Üzerine (So Strange So Familiar: about My Darling from the Brothel* [or *Licensed to Love*]) (2005) which was a collection of articles by some cinema scholars such as Nilgün Abisel, S. Ruken Öztürk, and Nejat Ulusay, Lütfi Akad is called "one of the *auteurs* in Turkish Cinema" (Abisel *et al.* 2005, pp. 14-16). Akad's style is emphasized as unique, which distinguishes him from the

[48] Ömer Lütfi Akad never won a prize in foreign film festivals. However, Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 36) points out that Akad's *Hudutların Kanunu* (The Law of the Borders) (1966) "was declared by critics the most important film up to that time, earning invitations to Berlin and Venice film festivals, although the Central Film Control Commission prevented its participation in foreign events". At this point, Dönmez-Colin's statement is questionable, because before Akad's *Hudutların Kanunu*, Metin Erksan's *Susuz Yaz* (Dry Summer) (1963) won the Golden Bear Award at Berlin Film Festival (1964) and Biennale Award at Venice Film Festival (1964). (http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0062322/awards).

[49] Kurtuluş Kayalı collected some of his articles written in different years into a book which was published in 2006.

previous and contemporary directors of his age. The foregoing scholars characterize Akad's style in the following terms:

> *The persistence in deployment of some technical elements or denial of some – such as zoom –, the ability of locating the mise-en-scéne to explain the relations between characters and between characters and society, choice of creating an emotional atmosphere by using looks, postures and movements rather than using dialogues, minimalism in narration by respecting the principle of continuity in editing are the main elements which form his style.* (2005, p. 14)

In addition to his distinctive style, the coherent content in his oeuvre is given in the book as "modernization in Turkey with its advantages and disadvantages" (Abisel *et al.* 2005, p. 13). On the other hand, Rıza Kıraç (2008, p. 77), without mentioning the word *auteur*, emphasizes that Akad has his own unique style of narration even his films differs in themes.[50] Kıraç (2008, p. 159) also draws attention to Akad's long-term collaboration[51] with the director of photography Gani Turanlı in the development of Akad's unique style. Rekin Teksoy (2008, p. 39) does not explicitly name Akad an *auteur*, but evaluates him as "the first Turkish filmmaker with a truly artistic style." Although, Teksoy praises Akad's artistic style, he finds the emotional content in some of his films rather limited.

As stated above, Akad, as one of the Friends of Turkish Film, began directing films with an interest in the artistic aspect of cinema. However, Halit Refiğ, a director of the later generation of 'cinema-makers', claims that Akad and his crew had no artistic concern when they made *Kanun Namına* (In the Name of the Law) (1952) and were not aware of the

[50] At this point I will add that, as Peter Wollen (2000, p. 72) states; "in time, owing to the diffuseness of the original theory, two main schools of *auteur* critics grew up: those who insisted on revealing a core of meanings, of thematic motifs, and those who stressed style and *mise-en-scéne*." Thus, from now on, it should be taken into consideration that approaches may differ even though the traditional *auteurism* stresses 'style' as a priority.

[51] Brian Michael Goss (2009, p. 47) points out that "the *auteur*'s collaborations in turn become part of the pleasure in seeing the films and recognizing tendencies within them." This probably makes more sense today in the marketing strategies of films and the *auteurs.* However, as was argued in the previous chapter, traditional *auteurists* define the *auteur* as a director who is lucky enough to find the right collaborators for the growth of his talent.

consequence the film would reach. Refiğ (1996, pp. 180-181), who defines Akad's cinematic language used in the films before *Kanun Namına* as quite theatrical, thinks that the film determined Akad's style and became the first instance of what might come to be called the 'cinema of Lütfi Akad'. From a different perspective, Giovanni Scognamillo classifies Akad's films in periods as well. In this manner, he puts *Kanun Namına* and *Öldüren Şehir* (The Killing City) (1954) into the first period which contrasts with the principles of the direct (*yalın*) and slow narration of Akad's future style and perhaps displays the influence of Western cinema (2003, p. 134). On the other hand, concerning Akad's trilogy[52] (an example from his last period), Scognamillo (2003, p. 201) sees Akad as "presenting a maturity and mastery of a philosopher who is neutral in his observations and moves into the depths of the essence." Similarly, a famous Turkish actor, Fikret Hakan,[53] with an emphasis on content, claims that a director must first be a sociologist, psychologist, a perfect novelist and a master of cinema to be designated an *auteur* who "interprets his age with his own philosophy of life."[54] Based on this definition, Hakan calls Akad an *auteur* and becomes a good instance of the then-prominent but also misguided belief that an *auteur* is one whose *oeuvre* is perceived as 'qualified' first in its content.

I will continue with Metin Erksan, who made his first film three years after Akad's *Vurun Kahpeye* (Hit the Whore) (1949), and who worked in the same conditions and with similar cinematic concerns as Akad had. The abovementioned misguided belief (that an *auteur* is one whose *oeuvre* is perceived as 'qualified' first in its content) also finds its counterpart in Erksan's case concerning his intellectual background and the choice of themes in a bound relationship with his intellectuality. In this manner, it is interesting that though Kurtuluş Kayalı (2006, p. 57) mentions the names of Lütfi Akad and Yılmaz Güney as the only

[52] Rekin Teksoy (2008, p. 55) evaluates the trilogy (*Gelin* (The Bride) (1973), *Düğün* (The Wedding) (1974), and *Diyet* (The Sacrifice) (1975)) as "noteworthy examples of the director's placid monotonous style and rationalist narration". In addition, he points out that Akad's following TRT (*Türkiye Radyo ve Televizyon Kurumu* / The Turkish Radio and Television Corporation) films *Ferman* (Edict) (1975) and *Topuz* (1975) "stood out for creating an authentic narrative style in the pre-Yılmaz Güney era of Turkish cinema" (ibid).

[53] Fikret Hakan recently published a book titled *Türk Sinema Tarihi* / *A History of Turkish Cinema* (2010).

[54] See (www.antraktsinema.com/soylesi.php?id=6)

'original' directors, he then adds Erksan to the list when it comes to 'individuality' in Turkish cinema. Although Kayalı defends the approach of thinking a director's *oeuvre* as a whole, he tries to explain Erksan's 'individuality' mostly using his social-realist films and his stylish (art house) works such as *Sevmek Zamanı* (Time to Love) (1965). Thus, it is time to elaborate on Erksan's case (concerning also the other directors of the period) in order to clarify the insufficiency of the evaluations which should have been made by also including Erksan's commercial films.

3.2.2 Metin Erksan

Halit Refiğ (1996, p. 179) claims that the first film made with an artistic concern in the history of Turkish cinema was Metin Erksan's debut feature *Karanlık Dünya: Aşık Veysel'in Hayatı* (The Dark World: The Life of Aşık Veysel) (1952). Rekin Teksoy (2008, p. 39) evaluates the film as an attempt "to step over the traditional Yeşilçam line." However, when the film was censored and not allowed to be shown, Erksan chose to direct some commercial films for Yeşilçam. Scognamillo draws attention to *Dokuz Dağın Efesi* (The Lord of Nine Mountains) (1958), stating that it was the most individual film that Erksan had made up to that time. Scognamillo (2003, p. 144) also emphasizes that even though the following film *Hicran Yarası* (*The* Wound of Separation) (1959) was one of the melodramas of Yeşilçam, in fact it was quite individual. On the other hand, apart from his first film, Rekin Teksoy does not give importance to any of Erksan's films until *Gecelerin Ötesi* (Beyond the Nights) (1960). Teksoy (2008, p. 50) states that "this film was later credited with initiating social realism in Turkish cinema" and emphasizes that it is also "an attempt to go beyond the usual Yeşilçam approach."

In fact, the reason to make such quotations from Teksoy and Scognamillo is to display their tendencies to emphasize the possible individuality of Erksan's films, which distinguishes him from the dominant mentality inherent to Yeşilçam. In this vein, Teksoy and Scognamillo prefer to examine Erksan's films in different categorizations. In the following,

Teksoy (2008, p. 52) cites three categories for Erksan's films and calls his commercial films 'ordinary works':

> *Aside from his ordinary works such as […], Erksan pays great attention to details and gives importance to the unusual developments of the emotions and behaviours of his protagonists. In so doing, Erksan departs from the social realist approach of his earlier films and focuses on a more individualistic point of view. It is undeniable that Erksan's films are among the first examples of the 'arthouse film' concept in Turkish cinema.*

Rıza Kıraç (2008, p. 78) confirms that Erksan has an individual style and puts Erksan's films in two categories: (1) first period, in which Erksan made films with a materialist point of view; (2) period of maturity in which Erksan made films with a passion for Sufism and mysticism.

Not only historians and writers like Teksoy, Scognamillo, and Kıraç, but also Erksan himself evaluates his films separately. An example of this drive for categorizing can be picked up from the personal experience of Savaş Arslan, who defines Erksan as "a Yeşilçam director producing many popular films generally referred to as 'business films' (made just for profit)" (2011, p. 130). Savaş Arslan (ibid) writes that, when he told Erksan that he was going to do a study on his film *Şeytan*[55] (Satan) (1974), Erksan refused to do an interview and said "[*Şeytan*] has no respectable place in his *oeuvre*." I relate this anecdote to highlight the necessity of a 'uniting attitude' inherent in the ideals of traditional *auteurism* (even between the most unremarkable and the most significant films of a particular director). Kurtuluş Kayalı (2006, pp. 92-95), with this attitude, emphasizes that in the scholarly analysis of a director's films there is no need to care what the director says; rather, he suggests that even though it is not common in Turkey, analysis should be made depending only on the films and their connection to each other. However, Kayalı (2006, pp. 78-82; 86) in his article tries to distinguish Erksan from the others not only by his films, but also by giving importance to his educational background and to his possible claim to

[55] Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 130) describes *Şeytan* / *Satan* (1974) as "a 'Turkification' and even an 'Islamization' of The Excorsist (William Friedkin, 1973)."

universality. Kayalı emphasizes Erksan's education in Art History and connects his intellectuality and his openness to what is universal to the emergence of his individual style, which is recognizable even in adaptations from the texts of national and foreign literature. At this point, it should be pointed out that Kayalı (2006, p. 92) does not analyze Erksan's *oeuvre* himself and does not call Erksan an *auteur* but he claims that "the *auteur* theory in the science of cinema seems as if it is produced for Metin Erksan." Dönmez-Colin (2004, p. 43) also states (without mentioning the criteria for her evaluation) that Erksan "is considered as the 'first' *auteur* of Turkish cinema." Similarly, Mehmet Eryılmaz, who is also a director[56], states that Metin Erksan should be considered the 'first' *auteur* of Turkish cinema, not only because of the themes he narrates but also because of his style which is derived from his mastery in locating *mise-en-scéne* even in his commercial films.[57] Even though Eryılmaz's evaluation does not depend on a detailed study on Erksan's *oeuvre*, it is significant in its emphasis on 'style'. As Şükran Esen (2002, p. 437) conveys, Ömer Kavur similarly was interested in not what Erksan tells in his films, but how he tells it. Kavur points out Erksan's distinctive style and states that "Metin Erksan, even in a commercial film starring Zeki Müren (1964), could mark his signature." At this point, Kavur's perception of *auteurism* sounds like a traditional one.

I will continue with Onat Kutlar's opinion of Erksan, since he resisted the idea of the possibility of 'individuality' in classical Yeşilçam. He instead praised some directors of 1980s (including Ömer Kavur, Erden Kıral and Ali Özgentürk with whom Kutlar also collaborated as a scriptwriter) with regard to their individual styles. Kutlar (1991, pp. 29-30) claims that Metin Erksan may be an exception among the directors of the past because of his endeavors to create a personal language. However, from the traditional auteurist perspective, the important thing is to reveal how Kutlar makes such a distinction. By including or excluding Erksan's commercial films? If he included the films, then he would not resist commercial Yeşilçam. If he excluded them, then he would be the one who is

[56] Mehmet Eryılmaz is the director of *Hazan Mevsimi: Bir Panayır Hikayesi* (The Season of Fall: A Story of Fair) (2008).

[57] See (www.kameraarkasi.org/sinema/makaleler/turksinemasindabirdusunur.html)

overtly interested in 'content'. In this case, the previously stated point reveals that again, the concept of '*auteur*' was not clearly understood in its 'original' meaning in Turkish cinema circles – even in the case of a director who has been considered to be the 'first *auteur*' of Turkish cinema.

Parting this section I have explained in detail that the two most noteworthy representatives of the period of 'cinema-makers', Akad and Erksan, caused many debates concerning their endeavors to create individual styles even though they worked within the commercial system of Yeşilçam. Their films – generally the ones which have been accepted as artistic – have been perceived as the most respectable ones and their individual styles (i.e. perhaps, their possible but not mentioned *auteur* statuses) have been given as the reasons behind this respect. Academics have also sometimes described them as *auteurs*. However, there is also another director of the period, Osman F. Seden, who is rarely mentioned as having a style (perhaps his style is more consistent than his foregoing counterparts') and whose films have not been respected as much. The following section will discuss Osman F. Seden to understand the dominant perception about his significance in the period of 'cinema-makers'.

3.2.3 Osman F. Seden

Giovanni Scognamillo, in his sub-categorizations of the period of 'cinema-makers'[58] as "The Ones We Called Cinema-Makers" and "The Generation of Cinema-Makers", often mentions Osman F. Seden as a "professional" rather than a "director."[59] In this manner, Scognamillo (2003, p. 235) describes Seden as "the strongest (*sağlam*), the most certain (*kararlı*) and the most practical (*eli çabuk*) professional of Turkish cinema." This

[58] It may be worthwhile to state that Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 29) calls this period the "period of cinema men" and does not mention Seden's name in the list.

[59] Scognamillo (2003, p. 246) uses the word "technician" for Seden as well.

description might remind the concept of *metteur-en-scéne*[60]. However, since Seden writes most of his scripts (Scognamillo 2003, p. 243) and produces the films himself (Teksoy 2008, p. 60), he differs from being a *metteur-en-scéne*. Teksoy (2008, p. 60) claims that Seden developed a fluent narrative style by adopting the American cinematographic elements (for instance close-ups and frequent zooms)[61] and displayed "an awesome grasp of cinema techniques" in some of his films.[62] However, according to Teksoy his style was "wasted on unremarkable films" (ibid). Scognamillo (2003, p. 242) considers Seden's films to be unremarkable and claims that cinema writers do not pay attention to Seden because he preferred commercial cinema. On the other hand, Scognamillo confirms Seden's success in shooting a single scene or a part of a film in an attractive coherence and rhythm even in his most unremarkable works. In relation to Seden's preference for commercial cinema, Teksoy (2008, p. 60) points out that his films run "the gamut from melodramas to comedies and from arabesque to adventure stories."

At this point, in light of Scognamillo's and Teksoy's analyzes, it is essential to pay attention to Seden case as I try to explain it with some examples from the literature of traditional *auteurism.*[63] As another point which should also not be forgotten is that traditional *auteurism* was built upon the idea of an *auteur* who can make bad films but who nevertheless maintains his individual style through his corpus. Thus, the films of every director should be analyzed through *auteurist* or non-*auteurist* approaches and it may not

[60] *Metteur-en-scéne* was defined in the previous chapter as one who takes the responsibility for the scripts written by someone else and who is very good at in his craft.

[61] For a detailed knowledge, see Bordwell's explanation of the elements of classical narrative in American cinema in the footnote 42.

[62] Teksoy (2008, p. 60) gives *Namus Uğruna* (In the Name of Honor) (1960), *İki Aşk Arasında* (Between Two Lovers) (1961), *Çalıkuşu* (Wild Bird) (1966) and *Akşam Güneşi* (Evening Sun) (1966) as the instances.

[63] Pam Cook (2007, p. 416) states: "*auteur* theory demands that popular entertainment cinema be taken seriously, on a level with art." At this point, Seden's or any other commercial cinema directors' *oeuvres* can be taken seriously as well as it has been done for art cinema directors' and/or for the directors' who made both commercial and art films in Turkey. In this point of view, it may be significant to point out that, though Mizgin Müjde Arslan (2010, p. 22) suggested in her response to Fırat Yücel that, "not only the directors of 1990s but also the directors who worked in conditions of Yeşilçam, can/should be analysed as the possible *auteurs*", she does not mention Seden's or any other director's name in the list than Akad, Erksan and Refiğ.

be appropriate to evaluate a director's films as 'unremarkable' simply because they are commercial films.

In this manner, it may be relevant to draw a comparison between Howard Hawks from Hollywood[64] and Seden from Yeşilçam.[65] As Peter Wollen (2000, p. 73) points out, "throughout his long career he [Hawks] has only once received general critical acclaim, for his wartime film, *Sergeant York*, which closer inspection reveals to be eccentric and atypical of the main *corpus* of Hawks's films." Furthermore, Wollen emphasizes that, despite the fact that Hawks worked in almost every genre, his films "exhibit the same thematic preoccupations, the same recurring motifs and incidents, the same visual style and tempo" (ibid).

Taking my departure here, the elaboration will continue with some quotations from Scognamillo and Teksoy which display the possible recurring themes, motifs and elements of visual style of Seden's films – which deserve to be studied or 'respected' from the perspective of traditional *auteurism*. Scognamillo (2003, pp. 145-146) elaborates the components of Seden's style as:

> *The love and jealousy between opponent characters; bravery; lively milieus; villains and their women; guns, knives and fights; blood, lust and violence; and the background of all these, is Istanbul. These are the components which Seden will often use and by which he will shape his style in the future.*

Moreover, Scognamillo (2003, p. 237) criticizes Seden for repeating himself in his scripts by using the same ingredients, clichés and dramatic tropes. In addition, Teksoy (2008, p.

[64] However, it should not be forgotten that, Hawks had 'worked' in Hollywood studio system and took the scripts written not by him. He had not produced the films himself, either.

[65] In this sense, in fact, there are many other Yeşilçam directors like Seden to be mentioned as the directors of commercial films, for instance, Muharrem Gürses, Aram Gülyüz, Nejat Saydam, Ülkü Erakalın, Süreyya Duru, Ertem Eğilmez, Hulki Saner, Yılmaz Atadeniz, Orhan Elmas. However, the reason to give place to Seden in this study is his films written and produced by himself and his style that is supposed to be consistent in his films of every genre.

40), thinks that Seden's scripts are dynamic even they are unremarkable in content and emphasizes his cinematography, "skilled editing" and "formalist sensitivity".

At this point, it might be significant to point out that, Scognamillo and Teksoy, contrary to their previously mentioned tendencies to elaborate Akad and Erksan in periods or categories, use a more unifying approach in themes and style to evaluate Seden. They both find him coherent in themes and style, even though he makes allegedly 'unremarkable' films. In his evaluation concerning the period of 'cinema-makers', Kakınç (1996, p. 337) points out Akad's and Erksan's individual styles and at the same time draws attention to Seden's "mastery in using an energetic and attractive language" which foregrounds him among the other directors of the period. Rıza Kıraç (2008, p. 77) is also one of the few cinema writers in Turkey who mentions Seden's name in the list of the directors (Metin Erksan, Lütfi Ö. Akad, Atıf Yılmaz, Halit Refiğ, Osman F. Seden and Memduh Ün) who created individual styles and made their own worlds in Turkish cinema.

Having come to the end of the elaboration on the three directors of the period of 'cinema-makers', the overview will continue with Yılmaz Güney, who also worked within Yeşilçam and has earned broad acclaim for his individual style, recognized in his social-realist films, two of which he did not direct. Nijat Özön, quoted by Scognamillo (2003, p. 317), puts forward that Yılmaz Güney mediated between the period of 'cinema-makers' and the period of Young/New cinema [i.e. *auteur* cinema that will be elaborated in future sections] which is generally understood to have started with Güney himself. Hence, the elaboration will continue with how Yılmaz Güney has been perceived within Turkish cinema circles concerning his possible *auteur* status.

3.3 1970-1980S: YILMAZ GÜNEY

Yılmaz Güney's *Umut* (Hope) (1970) is generally considered a 'landmark' in Turkish cinema circles just because the New Cinema group (which defended authorship of art

cinema directors) initially designated it as such. Rekin Teksoy (2008, p. 68), who has a chapter on Güney in his book, evaluates *Umut* as an attempt to stay away from any "concessions to Yeşilçam traditions" and explains Güney's significance in relation to his worldview which largely determines the content of his films:

> *an actor, screenwriter and director Yılmaz Güney cemented his position as an artist that signalled a major turning point in Turkish cinema. He developed a unique and realistic artistic approach where his socialist worldview and artistry were intertwined.* (2008, p.70)

In his book, Teksoy acknowledges Güney's distinctive style in making realist films; however, he explains the reasoning behind the New Cinema group's appreciation of Yılmaz Güney by highlighting the close relationship between the Turkish Cinemathéque Association and the founder of the French Cinemathéque, Henry Langlois (born in İzmir). Teksoy (2008, p. 66) puts forward that, "one could assume that Yılmaz Güney whose work was presented in Paris by Langlois, made a conscious choice to be a 'friend' of the Association." Onat Kutlar (1991, p. 30) claims those who achieved to establish an individual cinematic language in Turkish cinema were the ones who had a strong interest in literature. Thus, according to Kutlar, Yılmaz Güney, a writer as well as a director, created films which could be accepted on the same level as the realist works of Turkish literature with regard both to the development of individual language and their technical competence. In the same article, Kutlar, disregarding Güney's earlier work, states that *Umut* was his first film, at which point he contradicts the traditional auteurist drive for unity by dividing Güney's *oeuvre* into groups and ignoring the previous films he directed.

Despite his films having been subjected to categorizations (such as before/after *Umut*, populist/political, commercial/art, directed/not directed by him[66], dependent on/independent

[66] At this point, it is essential to ask that in a possible *auteurist* analysis of Güney's films, would the ones that were directed by Güney's assistants in accordance with his instructions from the prison be included in his *oeuvre*? From the traditional auteurist perspective, the style of a director can only be recognized through the films he directs at every step of the filmmaking process. Despite the fact that *Sürü*/The Herd (1978), *Düşman*/The Enemy (1979) and *Yol*/The Road (1982) are supposed to display Güney's artistic approach

from Yeşilçam, revolutionary cinema, third cinema) there is also a tendency to unify his films according to style and themes. According to Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 116; p. 118; p. 119; p. 126; p. 127), the following have been said of Güney's films: that they carried humanist elements; that some of them were despised as 'commercial trash'; that they repeated the theme of 'destiny'; that they "stood on the side of the common man trying to survive in an unjust world"; that they used prison locations as a "trope for entrapment"; that they do not offer a solution to the economic, social, political problems of common man, but instead leave the audience on their own. In line with a tendency to find unifying aspects in Güney's films, Giovanni Scognamillo (2003, pp. 321-322) emphasizes that, by means of abstraction, Güney adjusted his characters to fit patterns that were used often in his films, and his films in general "included fantastic or surrealist elements (or it may be stated as folkloric surrealism)." On the other hand, Scognamillo asserts that "Yılmaz Güney's cinema does not come *ex nihilo*. It comes out by means of various affects, especially by the affect of Lütfi Akad's cinema" (2003, pp. 323-324).

The elaboration will continue with Kurtuluş Kayalı, who claimed that aside from Akad and Güney there is no other 'original' director in Turkish cinema. Kayalı (2006, p. 144) asks Akad, in a 1988 interview, about his influence on Güney, and Akad answers that "Yılmaz Güney is a quite 'original' cinema man. Even if he was inspired by me, he could create his own world." Furthermore, Kayalı (2006, p. 202) points out the fact that Güney wrote his own scripts as an important component strengthening his 'originality'. With a similar emphasis on Güney's talent in writing, Fikret Hakan claims that Yılmaz Güney was an *auteur* since he interpreted his age and Turkish cinema despite any cultural deficiencies.[67]

---

through their scripts (which Güney wrote), they should not be included in his *oeuvre* in any auteurist study since he was in prison and could not master the *mise-en-scéne* during their shootings. However, a group of writers who defend the authorship of art film directors, tend to defend Güney's *auteur* status through the consistency of his world view in a couple of his films including especially the foregoing two he did not direct. Those of Güney's films which the writers mostly focus on can be listed as *Umut*/ Hope (1970), *Arkadaş* /The Friend (1975), *Sürü*/The Herd (1978), *Yol*/The Road (1982) and *Duvar*/The Wall (1983) among twenty-two films he directed. In light of this, the tendency to consider Güney an *auteur* because of the films he did not direct can be read as the prioritization of content in the evaluations of some circles.

[67] See (www.antraktsinema.com/soylesi.php?id=6)

At the end of the elaboration on how Yılmaz Güney has been perceived, it should be stated that he is the most significant example of the tendency of some circles in Turkish cinema to consider a director an *auteur* based solely on the content of his films. Güney has also been accepted as having significant influence on the generation that came after him in the 1980s. According to Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 240), "the *auteur* tradition of Yeşilçam" originated in Yılmaz Güney's late social realist films and was continued by the self-reflexive and art films of later Yeşilçam *auteurs* who were considered in relation to European art cinema *auteurs*. At this point, for a better understanding of the different conception of *auteurism* in Turkish cinema, I will elaborate the period of 1980-1990 through its broad definition as *auteur* cinema and the generation which came after Güney, particularly Ömer Kavur.

3.4 1980-1990: THE PERIOD OF "*AUTEUR* CINEMA"

Turkish cinema in the 1980s underwent a transformation in parallel with the country's social transformation. In the years following the 1980 military coup, there were radical and repressive changes in the political atmosphere of the country. Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 211), expressing the general belief Turkish cinema circles share, states that in the post-coup years, the repression of the state on people not to declare their political ideas and in relation to this the practice of censorship on the works of *engagé* writers, artists and filmmakers have played the crucial role in the emergence of the *auteur* cinema. At this point, the concept of '*auteur* cinema' causes confusion when considered in the traditional sense of *auteurism*: that a director can be designated an *auteur* only after the total analysis of his *oeuvre*, and at that point it makes no difference if he makes X cinema or Y cinema. However, *auteur* cinema refers to another conception which narrows the possibility of being designated *auteurs* for the sake of art cinema. Thomas Elsaesser (2005, p. 485) defines this conception in the following as:

> *[…] an auteur cinema that drew on national (literary or theatrical) traditions, whose style was that of an art cinema, with psychologically complex protagonists, often the alter egos of the director, and thus inviting expressive-autobiographical interpretation.*

Rıza Kıraç's explanation of the directors of the 1980s, overlaps with Elsaesser's definition, emphasizing that, in the 1980s, with the effects of 'existentialism',[68] Turkish directors tended to tell the anxiety stories of Turkish intelligentsia – who psychically and mentally tried to escape the restrictions (2008, p. 105). Therefore, the directors of the period created confused, interrogating and trapped characters (i.e. psychologically complex protagonists, perhaps alter egos of the director). In addition to this, according to Kıraç (2008, p. 52), with a tendency to reflect the psychology of the society as well as their own, directors of the 1980s drew on national traditions to make adaptations of the works of Turkish literature. With regard to the tendency to make adaptations, Kurtuluş Kayalı (2006, p.33) points out in his 1991 article that, in the 1980s, Turkish cinema was heavily influenced by contemporary literature and in light of this, the number of films with 'original' scripts decreased. In other words, Kayalı (ibid) states, directors paid much attention not to 'what is told' since the content was depleted, but rather to 'how it is told' since style came to the fore." If Kayalı's this argument is valid for the period, then the 'styles' of some directors, as evident in 'the way' they tell their stories, should be persistent and coherent in their *oeuvres* to be designated traditional *auteurs*. On the other hand, if a director's *oeuvre* includes films which although can individually be defined as the instances of *auteur* cinema but do not present a recognizable, coherent style, then they might be perceived as the disjunctive instances of a mere concern for 'how', which cannot make a contribution to a consistent style (signature).

At this point, the elaboration will continue with the discussion between Engin Ayça, İbrahim Altınsay, Serhat Öztürk and Hüseyin Dönmez, which was published in the journal *...ve Sinema* (*...and Cinema*), under the title *Türk Sineması Nereye Gidiyor? / Where is Turkish Cinema Going?* (1987). Engin Ayça leads the discussion with his detailed analysis on contemporary cinema and situates former instances of Yeşilçam cinema as an anonymous cinema versus the individualist cinema of the 1980s. In Ayça's point of view

[68] Kıraç (2008, p. 105) explains by making an analogy that "in the post-war years of Europe, 'existentialism' was a prevalent trend especially in literature and politics; and in the post-internal war years of Turkey, Turkish directors with an 'existentialist' attitude tended to tell this depressive period they were living in their films.

(1987, pp. 37-38), the directors of 1980s unconsciously (naturally) tended to make individual films (without a theoretical base) in parallel with the condition of the country. However, he admits that the *auteur* cinema fashion of those days might have a small effect on this tendency. Moreover, Ayça (1987, pp. 38) designates the cinema of the 1980s in Turkey as "different (*farklı*) cinema". He emphasizes that "different cinema" tried to replace the classical 'types' of Yeşilçam with non-dimensional/unnatural 'characters' and told unclear stories. Thus, as Ayça states, the "different cinema" of the 1980s failed to reach the traditional audience but instead formed its own minor group of followers.[69] However, Ayça does not directly call '*auteur* cinema' to the cinema of the 1980s: when Hüseyin Sönmez asks him if he means that there is a transition from anonymous cinema to *auteur* cinema in Turkey, Ayça answers that "this is just a determination and its validity can be discussed" (1987, p. 39). In the following of the discussion, İbrahim Altınsay (1987, p. 41) asserts that without any concern for style (*biçim kaygısı*), it cannot be accepted that the cinema of the 1980s in Turkey was transforming into an *auteur* cinema. In Altınsay's view, Turkish films in the 1980s lacked style and it was not possible to guess the director when watching any film of the period.[70] In his own words, "no one in the world perceives *auteur* cinema as 'a little bit difference'; on the contrary, it is always perceived as 'a totally different world'" (ibid). In relation to this, at the end of the discussion, Serhat Öztürk (1987, p. 43) emphasizes that "there is no need to measure how much the cinema of 1980s is different since there is no sensitivity of the directors of this period for distinctive styles or forms. Hence I do not agree with the thesis that there is a tendency towards an *auteur* cinema." In opposition to Öztürk, but sharing the same sentiments concerning the necessity

[69] In some extent, similar to Ayça's opinion, Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 211) claims that, "existential stories with layered narratives and rich metaphors that required audience participation alienated the masses." However, Asuman Suner (2004, p. 305) draws attention to other points with a quotation from Nilgün Abisel that, "the political turmoil" and a "nationwide expansion of tv broadcasting" prevented the traditional audience of Yeşilçam (families) from going to the cinemas in 1980s, as well. In addition, Suner adds that, by the 1980s, Yeşilçam cinema had a downfall because "there had never been a truly powerful film industry in Turkey, despite the appearance of commercial vitality in popular cinema"; and "commercially-minded producers invested the huge revenues that they extracted from cinema not back into the film industry" (2004, p. 305).

[70] At this point, Altınsay implicates the *auteur* of the traditional sense which does not put *auteurs* in art or commercial categories. This is an essential point to recognize the 'style' of any kind of *auteur* when his films are watched without knowing their directors in advance.

of the relationship between art status and *auteur* cinema, Onat Kutlar argued that quests for individual styles became more significant in the 1980s than in the 1960s, since the directors stayed away from the mentality of Yeşilçam[71]. Hüseyin Kuzu (1998, p. 95) explains in the following, how the directors of 1980s stayed away from the mentality of Yeşilçam, even though they continued working with the actors, crews and technical facilities of Yeşilçam:

> *If the problem is doing what the director thinks and feels without any concession [to Yeşilçam], the answer lies in the early 1980s. When 'video' became dominant in production of films, the new-born producer-directors started to make films with the money they got from video-film distributers without feeling the breaths of the old fashion producers on their scruff.*

Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 208) confirms that the directors of the 1980s "attempted to make 'serious films' and other films different from those produced by Yeşilçam." According to Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 207), self-reflexive and individualist *auteur* films – which include characters escaping from "the realities of daily life that offered a harsh and violent past and helplessness in the present" – and social dramas or films about women – [which were generally adapted from Turkish literature] – belong to the category of "serious films"[72]. In Savaş Arslan's opinion 'serious films' of the 1980s fit well into the European national/art cinema since they do not succeed at the box office and bring about "a filmic discourse and narrative with fewer 'flaws,' with a particular economy of the image and of narrative, and with critical acclaim both in Turkey and abroad" (2011, p. 236). Even though Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 208; p. 240) gives a significant place to Yavuz Özkan's *Filim Bitti / The Film is Over* (1989) as the instance of "an individualist, self-reflexive *auteur* film" which "portrays the ends of Yeşilçam", he also agrees with Onat Kutlar in seeing Ali Özgentürk, Erden Kıral, and Ömer Kavur as the *auteurs* of the 1980s.[73] In addition to Kutlar and Savaş Arslan, Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 56) also gives place to Kıral, Özgentürk, and Kavur as the

[71] Kutlar (1991, p. 29, 30) mentions Ömer Kavur, Erden Kıral, and Ali Özgentürk as directors with individual styles in the period.

[72] In line with this categorization, Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 207) puts forward that the end of Yeşilçam came with the "early steps of a distinction between popular cinema and serious filmmaking."

[73] In Savaş Arslan's periodization, they are the *auteurs* of "late Yeşilçam" which includes the 1980s.

representatives of the 1980s, who in her opinion are among those having unique styles, cinematic languages, creative visions and intellectual quests which provide them with international visibility. Selim Eyüboğlu (2004, p. 285), who disagrees to some extent, asserts that, in the 1980s, "the ideal cinema was thought of as the synthesis of *auteurism* and issue films (*misyon sineması*). In fact, the typical instances of the quests for this synthesis are the films of Yavuz Özkan and Ali Özgentürk who perhaps found their ideals in the cinema of Bertolucci." Moreover, Fırat Yücel, quoted in Mizgin Müjde Arslan (2010, p. 21), asserts that in the years of the downfall of Yeşilçam, Ömer Kavur, Yavuz Özkan, Erden Kıral and a few others tried to develop a new style in *auteur* cinema but *auteurism* could not become effective until the late 1990s in Turkey.

At the end of all of these arguments, even though Atıf Yılmaz, Halit Refiğ, Zeki Ökten, Şerif Gören among others dominated the period of the 1980s[74] with their social dramas and films about women, they will not be discussed in this section since their names have not been mentioned by Turkish cinema circles in relation to Thomas Elsaesser's definition of '*auteur* cinema'. As I have formerly argued, the films "with psychologically complex protagonists, often the alter egos of the director, and thus inviting expressive-autobiographical interpretation" (Elsaesser, 2005, p. 485) are defined as the instances of *auteur* cinema. In light of this, only Ömer Kavur will be elaborated since there is a broad acceptance of his *auteur* status in Turkish cinema circles (from both the perspectives of *auteur* cinema and traditional *auteurism*) that is supposed to coming from his narratives based on psychologically complex characters and distinctive style and aesthetics, especially recognized in his employment of locations, coming to the fore over the themes depicted in his films**.**

[74] As was formerly stated, the periods in this study are chosen according to the effect of the differing perceptions of *auteurism* on Turkish cinema circles. Concerning the 1980s, the prevailing *auteurism* seems to be shaped around the concept of '*auteur* cinema'. Thus, the 1980s are detailed in this study by taking the departure from this concept and its appropriateness to particular directors.

3.4.1 Ömer Kavur

Giovanni Scognamillo distinguishes Ömer Kavur from the other young directors of Özön's Young/New Cinema era as a director who transcended "crude realist" (*kuru gerçekçi*) and socialist/political themes the others overemphasized.[75] In Scognamillo's view (2003, p. 341), Kavur preferred to reach a synthesis by establishing a cinema of individuality (*kişilik sineması*). Dönmez-Colin tries to explain Kavur's individuality by drawing attention to his urban background and his Paris education. According to Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 43), Kavur "established the concept of *auteur* in modern Turkish cinema." In a traditional auteurist sense, Dönmez-Colin considers 'journey' to be the common theme of his *oeuvre.* On the other hand, in the later parts of her book, Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 211) claims that Kavur's late works (*Anayurt Oteli* / Motherland Hotel [1986][76], *Gizli Yüz* / The Secret Face [1990]) as the best examples of the *auteur* cinema which emerged in the 1980s. As I have argued before, the concepts of '*auteur*' and '*auteur* cinema' contain different meanings. Kavur's early works are not accepted by Dönmez-Colin as the instances of *auteur* cinema even though she defines him as the director who established the concept of *auteur* in modern Turkish cinema, possibly because a few films Kavur made in compliance with the demands of Yeşilçam.[77] In fact, Dönmez-Colin's statements do not rely on a study of Ömer Kavur's films, making it obvious that these conceptions and their perceptions need to be studied in the extents of other studies in Turkish cinema circles.

Furthermore, in a book by Şükran Kuyucak Esen titled *Sinemamızda Bir 'Auteur': Ömer Kavur / An 'Auteur' in our Cinema: Ömer Kavur* (2002), in which Kavur's *oeuvre*

[75] Rekin Teksoy (2008, p. 71) confirms that Ömer Kavur differed from Yılmaz Güney for his artistic sensitivities, but "found fertile ground in the new cinematic environment created by him."

[76] Mutlu Dirlik calls *Anayurt Oteli* "a significant film because it is internationally well-known of being an instance of *auteur* cinema in the history of Turkish cinema." (http://www.sekans.org/omer_kavur.html)

[77] Ömer Kavur interviewed Mutlu Dirlik and stated that he had a chance to make individual films (which include the themes he believed and felt close to himself) in the period that started with his *Amansız Yol* / *The Merciless Road* (1985) and continued up to 2004. (For the date of the interview, see (http://www.sekans.org/yazi_arsivi.html) He defines the films made before *Amansız Yol* as those made which conformed to the demands of Yeşilçam. (http://www.sekans.org/omer_kavur.html)

(including the thirteen films made up to that time) is analyzed in a semi-traditional auteurist and semi-*auteur*-structuralist sense. In the book, Esen discusses the employment of locations, people, time, themes and cinematic language in Kavur's films, making structural schemas of the films and tries to reveal the social and personal determinants by means of detailed interviews with Kavur. While explaining Kavur's place in Turkish cinema, Esen (2002, p. 25) points out that Kavur is distinct because he does not aim to reach the masses, but only a small group of people who might enjoy the beauty and thoughts of the films he made outside the rules of Yeşilçam's traditional narration style. However, the thirteen films Esen analyzed include the ones that serve for Yeşilçam mentality. At this point, Esen (2002, p. 421) declares Kavur an *auteur* without making any distinction among his films as traditional *auteurism* demands. However, in the conclusion of the book, Esen's (ibid) explanation on Kavur's *auteur* status becomes ambivalent from the traditional auteurist perspective since she finds Kavur thematically coherent, but changeable in his view and approach while handling the themes. In addition, Esen (2002, p. 424) concludes her study saying that

> *Ömer Kavur is an asset (kazanç) for Turkish cinema since he made thirteen films with his highly aesthetic framings, choices of locations to strengthen his themes and his tranquil and masterful narration. His enthusiasm in reflecting his soul to the screen is the most magnificent proof of his auteur status.*

Although Esen's study might be considered important due to the thoroughness of her analysis of Kavur's *oeuvre*, it should also be underlined that her study gives too much place to the director's own statements and to detailed synopsis of the films. It can also be questioned whether it is proper in such a scholarly work to evaluate and praise an *auteur* as an "asset" and give his "enthusiasm" as the proof of his *auteur* status rather than through analysis.

Apart from Esen's study, Rıza Kıraç (2008, p. 113), without specifically using the word '*auteur*', states that Ömer Kavur is an 'original' director, referring to and quoting his previous films since he has no new story to tell. Kıraç (2008, pp. 106-107) categorizes

Kavur's films into two types: films made from socialist/realist view and films that foreground his intuition over his aesthetic view, intellectuality and interest in literature. In light of this, Kıraç (ibid) claims that Kavur differs from the other directors since he relies on his intuition. In addition, Kıraç (2008, p. 116) emphasizes the visual aesthetic of Kavur's films and the main recurring themes such as "waiting", "departure", "voyage", "seeking", and "time" as the distinguishing elements of his cinema. In contrast with the idea discussed and published in *...ve Sinema* magazine that there was no concern for style in the 1980s, Rekin Teksoy (2008, pp. 82-84) points out that Kavur emphasized aesthetics over content when creating his own narrative style and successfully presented the theme of voyage "through innuendos and an aesthetic portrayal" in *Gece Yolculuğu* (Night Journey) (1987)[78] which has been accepted as one of the self-reflexive *auteur* films[79] that Savaş Arslan puts in the categorization of "serious filmmaking" in the 1980s.

Regarding Ömer Kavur, the focus thus far has been on the role played by his 'individuality' and the coherence (both in themes and style) that his individual films maintain as the strengthening points of his *auteur* status. In one hand stands Esen's analysis of Kavur's complete *oeuvre* (including the films he made for Yeşilçam, in the analysis of which she employs Sarris's and Wollen's methods), as it is made from a traditional auteurist perspective. In the other hand, the emphasis of his self-reflexivity and the applicability of some of his films to the *auteur* cinema concept puts Kavur close to the art cinema *auteurs*. Above all, Kavur's aesthetics, considered by some cinema writers as coming to the fore over content, may strengthen his authorship if it can be recognized as a consistency in his *oeuvre* distinguishing him from others. In fact, Kavur's case evidences the variation concerning *auteurisms* that developed towards the 1980s and the implications to the 'authorship' of art cinema *auteurs* by the concept of '*auteur* cinema'.

[78] In Gece Yolculuğu, as Teksoy (2008, p. 82) states, a director and a screenwriter "go scouting for a location for their next film. The character of the director hides himself in an abandoned Greek village (Kayaköy) in the Aegean region as he embarks on an introspective journey ending in suicide."

[79] According to Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 204), these films "allowed filmmakers to analyze themselves and filmmaking, in a period when films were no longer as popular or future-oriented as they were the previous decade."

The following section will examine the auteurist approaches of the contemporary period of Turkish cinema (broadly accepted to have started in the 1990s and continues to today), distinguished from classic Yeşilçam because it developed independently, through the efforts of individual directors both in popular and art branches of Turkish cinema. In this discussion I will examine recent *auteurism* in Turkey by making use of five directors, namely Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Zeki Demirkubuz, Yeşim Ustaoğlu, Reha Erdem and Fatih Akın.

3.5 "NEW TURKISH CINEMA" SINCE 1990S[80]

As discussed in the previous section, the 1980s was the period in which the classic Yeşilçam mentality began to be eliminated in favor of the "serious-filmmaking" practices of some young and also some older generation directors. According to Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 211), since "the so-called angst films that appeared in the post-coup years of the 1980s" disillusioned and alienated the audience and discouraged them from going to the cinema, the 1990s began with a stasis in film production.[81] However, there were other abovementioned economic, political, technological, and social developments that prepared for the decrease in the number of films produced and for the ultimate decline of Yeşilçam as well.

In the 1990s, a new period of cinema in Turkey began with no economic dependence on the old production companies of Yeşilçam. Sevin Okyay (1996, p. 230) explains this

[80] Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 237) call this era "Post-Yeşilçam, or the New Cinema of Turkey".

[81] Giovanni Scognamillo (2003, p. 446), under the title "*Türk Sinemasında 1990'lardaki Değişim* / The Change in Turkish Cinema in the 1990s", claims that one of the reasons so few people went to the cinema was because "the '*auteur* cinema' conception which consistently has a place – with a correct or false perception – in the agenda and the critical film reviews." Actually, Scognamillo points out that Turkish cinemagoers which have been used to go and view the films in Yeşilçam's popular genres (melodrama, comedy, social-drama, action/adventure), generally found the instances of *auteur* cinema strange. Thus, when film critics called some films *auteur* cinema (without sufficient knowledge about the concept) in their film reviews, the cinemagoers' knee-jerk reaction was to avoid seeing those films in 1990s.

awakening in connection with the 'art cinema,' arguing that there was a transition to *auteur* cinema in the 1990s. Such an argument was formerly made in Turkish cinema circles, particularly by Engin Ayça (1987), as I have formerly elaborated in this study concerning the young individual directors of the 1980s. Apart from Hüseyin Kuzu, who claims that the directors of the 1980s[82] made films independent of Yeşilçam producers (i.e. with the money they got from the video-distributers), Okyay (1996, p. 230) asserts that for the first time in the 1990s a tendency of making films outside of Yeşilçam by the endeavors of directors to shoulder or share the burden of producing their own films despite the small audience can be seen.

Differing from Okyay, Asuman Suner (2004, p. 306) states that, in the mid-1990s, the revival of Turkish cinema occurred in two branches: "[1] a new popular cinema achieving considerable box-office success, and [2] what might be called an 'art cinema' receiving critical acclaim and awards at national and international festivals." According to Suner (ibid), popular cinema directors in the 1990s financed their films with the help of their contacts with television channels and advertising sectors. As Mizgin Müjde Arslan quotes (2010, p. 22), Nigar Pösteki (2006) also points out that the young directors of the latter branch made their films with money they earned from the television and advertising sectors. In addition to this similarity, Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 53), without mentioning separate branches for contemporary Turkish cinema, draws attention to the other contributions that effected the development of this "new energy" or the "new generation of filmmakers" of the 1990s, namely the opening of several film schools; the global advancement in technology and communications; the support of European funds and government loans; and the relaxation of censorship regulations. However, as is explicated in the latter parts of Dönmez-Colin's book, the label "New Turkish Cinema" is employed to designate the 'art cinema' of the era (2008, p. 181). Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 181) further

[82] Despite their personal endeavors and the finance they got from the VHS sector, the directors of the 1980s are accepted as the ones who worked in Yeşilçam system with the crews that grew up in a master and apprentice relationship within the rules of traditional Yeşilçam. At this point, I should once more emphasize that Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 240) designates some directors of the 1980s as the "late Yeşilçam *auteurs*" and Fırat Yücel claims that until the late 1990s dependence on Yeşilçam continued in film productions (quoted in Mizgin Müjde Arslan 2010, p. 21).

asserts that "the New Turkish Cinema […] is not a '*nouvelle vague*' in the French sense", although she finds a lot of similar points:

> *There are evident similarities in terms of the dominance of the auteur and the mise-en-scéne, the self-reflexive counter-cinema practices, a deliberate distanciation to avoid audience identification, the subversion of genres, the use of counterpoint and elliptic editing, the attention to camera work and the script (often written by the filmmaker) and the use of professional actors sparingly, but New Turkish Cinema is not a 'wave'.*

Similarly, in 1995, Gülsen Tuncer (1995, p. 371), one of the members of the management board of SODER[83], with an implication to 'art cinema', defines the cinema of those days as "'individual,' which is not dependent on the star system, carrying the signature of its directors and establishing a distance between its audience and itself." Burçak Evren, quoted in Dönmez-Colin, designates the 'art cinema' directors of 1990s as "independent filmmakers" (2008, p. 221). However, Derviş Zaim, who is accepted as the first director of the 'art' or 'independent' cinema branch of the 'New Turkish Cinema' (Dönmez-Colin 2008, p. 181; Zaim 2008, p. 52)[84] emphasizes that by the 1990s there can be no clear distinction drawn between commercial and art cinemas in Turkey with regard to the procedures of production (*üretim yordamları*) and financial sources. Thus, Zaim (2008, p. 50; p. 52) states that it is wrong to define the 'art cinema' of the 1990s as 'independent'[85] and the 'commercial cinema' of the 1990s as 'restricted' by producers as they used to be during the reign of Yeşilçam system since commercial films also benefited from external funding like Eurimages, while at the same time, art film directors were directing mainstream/commercial films in Turkey.[86]

---

[83] SODER: *Sinema Oyuncuları Derneği* (The Association of Motion Picture Actors and Actresses)

[84] Also see (http://www.anlayis.net/makaleGoster.aspx?makaleid=2160)

[85] Derviş Zaim (2008, p. 48) prefers to designate the films made by the group of young directors who "experimented the new national and international production procedures/methods to have a chance to make critical and risky films in their styles and aesthetics by the mid 1990s" as "alluvionic cinema."

[86] It should be stated at this point that 'restriction' can be in any conditions of filmmaking; and even lone artists (painter, writer) may confront it, just as an artist of a collaborative work, a film director more often confronts it. Thus, it should not be understood from what Zaim states above that Eurimages funds or other contributions do not cause any restrictions; however, Zaim alludes to a kind of 'restriction' (working in a

At this point, the 'New Turkish Cinema' is thought to have been born in the same years as Turkey's increasing participation in the globalizing world and it becomes more understandable why the distinction between art and commercial cinemas is muddied. Furthermore, Giovanni Scognamillo (2003, p. 444) draws attention to the fact that the cinemas of most of the European countries have had similar periods since the 1990s: producer/directors increased, benefitting from government loans and multi-national co-productions became the norm. Cengiz Ergun (1998, p. 98), the co-producer of the Ferzan Özpetek's *Hamam* (1997), claims in 1998 that *auteur* cinema (*yönetmen sineması*) should be left behind and Turkish producers should be ready for co-productions and high-budgeted productions in order to enter the global arena. In contrast with Ergun, Thomas Elsaesser (2005, p. 499) claims that the *auteur* status is a *sine qua non* for the worldwide exhibition and distribution of contemporary films, especially in international film festival circuits.[87] What Elsaesser points out may be the reason Selim Eyüboğlu (2004, p. 285) argues that "the existence of an *auteur* and the art status of the cinema are perceived as the essentials of Turkish cinema in 2000s" Against this prevailing auteurist conception, which developed around the art cinema directors by the 1990s in Turkish cinema, Ezel Akay (2010, p. 99), a well-known director of commercial films, resists:

> *The members of this job, which are called as 'directors', in fact do not direct anybody! They first let artists, craftsmen and specialists surround them, then, demand from them. Chiefs of the departments, producers and such, apart from their creative talents, 'direct' their departments instead to response the demands. […]How can we welcome the victimization of such a collective art work to the mentality of a 'one man possessor'?*

---

bound relation with star system, audience demands, producer demands) which traditional auteurists do not care about while looking for the recognizable stylistic and thematic personality of a director.

[87] Ali Özgentürk, in an interview, draws attention to a different aspect of the relation between creative cinema (*yaratıcı sinema*) and film festivals. As Müjde Işıl (2009, p. 64) cites, according to Özgentürk, today there is no sharp distinction between commercial and art cinemas since film festivals serve for the general commerce of cinema. As Özgentürk claims, there is a kinship between contemporary art (installation) and festival films because they both develop when they are purchased and both are purchased when they develop. (quoted in Işıl, ibid)

Resistance may also rise in this study not in the case of one-man dominance, but in the auteurist sense that generally develops around art house directors. As a response to Akay, this study argues that if the chiefs of all departments 'direct' their units to realize the filmmaker's vision, then the filmmaker as the chief of total units – who just "demands" – 'directs' the whole crew in the process of realization. This is valid for both commercial and art cinemas even to the extent that they differ in scales of their crews, budgets, audiences.

In this manner, having explained the "New Turkish Cinema" developing in the 1990s, it becomes beneficial to emphasize the possibility of commercial *auteurs* (despite the prevailing auteurist sense developed around the art cinema branch) since they both benefit from the same financial and technological resources, work with the same crews and actors, and generally work with scripts written by the directors themselves.[88] At this point, it should be stated that when considered both in a global and national sense, the distinction between branches seems to be transcended and there may no longer be a pure commercial or art cinema, as there were in the past. Nevertheless, in the context of contemporary Turkish cinema, 'commercial' means that which reaches the masses and that which cannot find a significant place in international festival circuits.

In the following section I will review the existing auteurist approaches towards some key directors of this period. It should not be forgotten that the 'New Turkish Cinema' is the period which has the most scholarly *auteur* studies. Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 240) categorizes the *auteurs* of the period as "post-Yeşilçam *auteurs*", and specifies Fatih Akın, Ferzan Özpetek, Nuri Bilge Ceylan and Zeki Demirkubuz as "the *auteurs* of postindustrial, global cinema administered by the art house and festival circuits." Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 246) also adds Yeşim Ustaoğlu. By emphasizing their relation to art cinema, Dönmez-Colin first mentions Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Zeki Demirkubuz, Semih Kaplanoğlu, Tayfun Pirselimoğlu and Yeşim Ustaoğlu as directors who developed "individual signatures" and then adds Derviş Zaim while removing Tayfun Pirselimoğlu and Yeşim Ustaoğlu from the ones "who

[88] It is not mandatory but a strengthening criteria to designate a director an *auteur* if he writes his own scripts. It has a special significance in the case of the director that will be studied in the next chapter of this study.

receive international acclaim with self-reflexive films of remarkable artistic accomplishment" (2008, p. 56; p. 221). In addition to these directors Mizgin Müjde Arslan adds Reha Erdem and Kemal Cem Baykal (2010, p. 11; p. 22) draws attention to the *auteur* status of Ahmet Uluçay, while Çiçek Coşkun[89] additionally mentions Serdar Akar, Barış Pirhasan as *auteur* directors of the period. As it is seen, the amount of the directors designated as '*auteur*' rises in this period. However, this study will only focus on five of them, namely Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Zeki Demirkubuz, Yeşim Ustaoğlu, Reha Erdem and Fatih Akın.

These five will be elaborated through different approaches that rise from several auteurist studies. Ceylan is designated an *auteur* who consistently employs pastoral frames and minimalist narration in his films and prefers 'interstitial' mode of production that is common among the instances of Hamid Naficy's 'accented cinema' *auteurs*. Demirkubuz is designated as an *auteur* that converts Yeşilçam melodramas into his own through his distinctive style of narration and – as Bernard Dick emphasizes in his definition of the *auteur* concept – makes references to his previous films, and repeats particular motifs. Ustaoğlu is considered an *auteur* through the analysis of her *oeuvre* by Andrew Sarris's auteurist perspective, and her *auteur* status is explained by the recurring motifs and open-ended final sequences in her films. Erdem's *auteur* status is explained by the consistency in his way of employing sounds (especially Michel Chion's concept of acousmatic sound) and editing. Finally, Akın is designated an *auteur* through Hamid Naficy's definition of 'accented' *auteur* and András Bálint Kovács's definition of self-reflexivity in cinema. The elaboration on the abovementioned approaches will provide a better understanding of traditional *auteurism*.

[89] See (http://www.aktuelsinema.com/haber.php?haber_id=22)

3.5.1 Nuri Bilge Ceylan

Asuman Suner (2004, p. 306) puts forward that Nuri Bilge Ceylan and Zeki Demirkubuz "stand out as *auteur* directors of the new Turkish cinema due to the peculiarity of their *oeuvre*"[90]. In her article, Suner, with a traditional auteurist sense, gives the repeated themes and persistent style as the clues of Ceylan's *auteur* status; on the other hand, she states that she was inspired by Hamid Naficy and used the term '*auteur*' not to "evoke its conventional connotations such as artistic mastery and distinguished talent" (ibid). However, she does not explain how Naficy explicates the term '*auteur*'. That becomes the subject of Suner's other article (2006) in which she touches on the three feature films Nuri Bilge Ceylan had made up to that time, specifically focusing on *Uzak* / *Distant* (2002). Suner examines *Uzak* in parallel with two other foreign films by taking her departure from Hamid Naficy's 'accented cinema theory'. According to Suner (2006, p. 365), Naficy's theory is "an extension of authorship theory in the sense that he perceives 'accented' films as informed by their directors' autobiographies, reflecting their unique stylistic signature or 'fingerprint'." Furthermore, in Suner's view, Naficy departs from traditional *auteurism* as it is conceived in the following quotation:

> *any discussion of authorship in exile needs to take into consideration not only the individuality, originality and personality of unique individuals as expressive film authors but also, and more important, their (dis)location as interstitial subjects within social formations and cinematic practices.* (ibid)

Even though Naficy's theory is based on exilic, diasporic and postcolonial/ethnic directors among whom Ceylan's name cannot be counted, Suner (2006, p. 364) finds an analogy between Naficy's 'accented cinema' and Ceylan's films since they include "somewhat troubled experience of belonging and cultural identity." Thus, Suner elaborates Ceylan's

[90] At the time of publication, Nuri Bilge Ceylan's *oeuvre* contained three feature films and one short film. Suner (2004, p. 311) elaborates on the three feature films in the article and thinks that they "can be considered as parts of a trilogy since they tell different temporal segments of the same story, with the same characters played by his relatives." Suner also draws attention to 'jouney' as a recurring theme of Ceylan's three films which can be seen as "real and imagined journeys of homecoming and escape from home" (ibid).

auteur status based on the 'interstitial' mode of production which is common among the instances of 'accented cinema' and on their self-reflexivity and self-inscription.

In Suner's view, Ceylan's films are 'interstitial' since Ceylan finances his own films and benefits from funds to stand financial constraints. She explains the 'interstiality' of Ceylan, also with Naficy's term 'split reception' that "arises from the disparity between the critical acclaim [especially in the international arena] and small audiences" (2006, p. 367) that his films receive. Suner (2006, p. 368) also emphasizes that Ceylan's films are positioned "at the intersection of the local and the global" while resisting to the dominant production codes and at the same time benefiting from them.

Dönmez-Colin also gives place to Ceylan in the chapter "A Modern Identity or Identity in a Modern World" (2008) and discusses Ceylan's first three films in the same manner as Suner does in her first mentioned article (2004). Dönmez-Colin emphasizes the same points concerning the recurring motifs, themes and style and adds Ceylan's fourth film (*İklimler* / Climates [2006]) to the elaboration of his *oeuvre.* Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 201), differing from Suner, argues that, "[d]ishonesty and cheating are parts of the narrative in all films of Ceylan and perhaps serve as a metaphor for the art of the cinema." Apart from Dönmez-Colin, Rıza Kıraç (2008, p. 163), without specifically using the word *auteur,* emphasizes Ceylan's style in which each frame has its own story separate from the whole and defines it as "pastorally rich." In Kıraç's opinion (ibid), since the short film *Koza* (Cocoon) (1995), Ceylan has preferred to capture frames which can serve as parts of a portfolio, rather than the ones which only serve to advance the story.

Before concluding our discussion of Ceylan, I would like to quote Prof. Dr. Kadri Özçaldıran, the rector of the Bosphorus University, who claims that "Ceylan is one of the most significant names of the *auteur* cinema in the world."[91] Even though Özçaldıran is not a cinema scholar, he subjectively underlines the following six points to designate Ceylan as an *auteur*: (1) there is melancholia in all Ceylan's films which you can easily feel but is

[91] For Çaldıran's speech, see (http://www.nuribilgeceylan.com/speechrector.php)

difficult to define; (2) the binary of urban/provincial is undertaken in Ceylan's films as an individual division rather than a social one; (3) Ceylan's films have more than two dimensions – there is always something other than time and place in his films, namely a 'soul'; (4) Ceylan is straightforward (*açık sözlü*) to the extent that he presents his characters honestly with all their weaknesses; (5) even though cinema is an expensive art form, Ceylan makes his films under no financial or social pressures, working instead with a small crew, friends and relatives; and (6) there is a metaphysical dimension of his films which reveals in the small details of everyday life or in human relationships.

Like the *auteurism* that developed in the 1980s, Ceylan, as one of the contemporary Turkish *auteurs*, is evaluated both through the concepts of traditional *auteur* and *auteur* cinema. However, Asuman Suner approached Ceylan also through Naficy's 'accented cinema' theory and elaborated Ceylan's *auteur* status both in relation to his 'interstitial' mode of production and his themes. Özçaldıran's auteurist approach is given in this study to understand how close well educated people's perception of contemporary *auteur* in Turkish cinema and in the international arena might be to the concept of authorship in art films.

3.5.2 Zeki Demirkubuz

Semire Ruken Öztürk (2002, p. 5), in her article titled *Zeki Demirkubuz Sineması* / *The Cinema of Zeki Demirkubuz* (2002), studies the first five films of Zeki Demirkubuz and designates Demirkubuz as an *auteur* by taking her departure mostly from Bernard Dick's sense of *auteurism*. Öztürk cites that, according to Bernard Dick, there are some common points that all *auteurs* have, such as: collaborating, searching for something different, repeating particular motifs and making references to his previous films. In her detailed analysis, Öztürk (2002, pp. 6-7) reveals recurring motifs, but especially emphasizes the 'employment of television' (characters often watch television) and 'employment of cinematic elements' (characters are often located in the same frame with posters of classical

Turkish or foreign films, characters watch films at theatres or on television, characters work on film sets) as Demirkubuz's strategy to foreground the apparatus and to display the fictional aspect of the text. Öztürk (2002, p. 7; p. 15) thinks that, by means of this strategy, Demirkubuz's cinema becomes an example of 'art cinema'[92] and Demirkubuz becomes one of the most significant representatives of Turkish art cinema. Additionally, Öztürk explains Demirkubuz's choice of making references to his previous films and to himself by quoting David Bordwell's contention that "the art cinema foregrounds the author as a structure in the film's system"[93] (quoted in Öztürk 2002, p. 6). In line with this, Öztürk (ibid) points out that Demirkubuz foregrounds the author [*auteur*] not only symbolically but also as a flesh-and-blood person (sometimes with his voice, sometimes with his photograph or sometimes with a 'cameo'). At this point, with reference again to Bernard Dick, Öztürk also supposes that, despite the repetition of motifs, themes and references to their own films and themselves, *auteurs* should not be questioned about their 'originality' and should not be perceived as always making the same film. As Öztürk (2002, p. 6) states, Dick claims that, "*auteurs* do not steal from their past by making references to themselves and to their works, they just borrow from/respect to the past." In light of this, Öztürk describes Demirkubuz's films as a "rich mine" (ibid) for their repetitions and references.

Asuman Suner (2004, p. 317) designates Demirkubuz an *auteur* due to the peculiarity of his *oeuvre* and claims that his cinema has a "dark and deeply pessimistic tone" which comes from the "sense of compulsive repetition in his films." Suner (2004, pp. 315-316) touches on a couple of Demirkubuz's films but in fact focuses on his third film *Üçüncü Sayfa / Third Page* (2000) and gives 'homelessness' as the covert theme and 'prison' as one of the recurring motifs in his *oeuvre*.

[92] Öztürk (2002, p. 15) gives the essential features of an 'art film' as: realism; foregrounding of directors' own self; individual narration; narrative that focused on characters; weakening of the causal connection in the narrative; blanks and ambivalences in the diegesis and in the conclusion of the film.

[93] The quotation is made from the original article of Bordwell titled "The Art Cinema as a Mode of Film Practice (1979)". (p. 97, http://smile.solent.ac.uk/digidocs/live/Furby/Text/Bordwell_2.pdf).

In the chapter "A Modern Identity or Identity in a Modern World", Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 202) also discusses Zeki Demirkubuz and touches on his seven films made up to that time. Apart from the abovementioned points, she draws attention to the fact that Demirkubuz "adopts" the themes of the Yeşilçam melodramas but transforms their "exploitative nature and exaggerated sensationalism" into his own approach to narration. In line with this, Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 202) argues, in a traditional auteurist sense, that "Demirkubuz seems to be saying perhaps it is not the story but how it is told that counts."

In conclusion, it is essentially emphasized that Zeki Demirkubuz's individual style is largely shaped around how he tells his stories. Semire Ruken Öztürk points out that making references to himself, his previous films and other cinematic elements and 'repetition' determines his style. Öztürk explains this in relation to the concept of art cinema. To some extent, similar points have been previously emphasized for Ömer Kavur. At this point, emphasis on 'how' issues are significant from the traditional auteurist perspective since the content is not be put into the prior category for the abovementioned auteurist studies in the case of Demirkubuz.

3.5.3 Yeşim Ustaoğlu

Mizgin Müjde Arslan, in her book *Yeşim Ustaoğlu: Su, Ölüm ve Yolculuk / Yeşim Ustaoğlu: Water, Death and Journey* (2010), handles Yeşim Ustaoğlu and her films in light of Andrew Sarris's auteurist approach, formerly stated as the one that emphasizes three concentric criteria: technical competence, distinguishable personality, and interior meaning. Müjde Arslan looks at Ustaoğlu's complete *oeuvre* (including her short films) inspired by Şükran Kuyucak Esen's book on Ömer Kavur. Müjde Arslan, like Esen, opens with a short chapter on the history of traditional *auteurism* and concludes the chapter with the following explanation of her own perception of the '*auteur* theory'.[94]

[94] Müjde Arslan prefers to use '*auteur* theory' rather than *auteurism* since she uses Andrew Sarris's 'three concentric circle' model in the analysis of Ustaoğlu's films.

> *Rather than answering 'if a director is an auteur or not', what results will be reached after an analysis made through the opportunities auteur theory provides should be important. Director's films may not be appropriate to look through this theory; the existence of a director may not be felt even though his/her films become successful and/or technically competent. At this point, only a few directors' films can be read by this theory.* (Müjde Arslan 2010, p. 23)

In concluding a detailed analysis of the *oeuvre*, Müjde Arslan (2010, p. 125) asserts that even though she sometimes works with co-writers, Ustaoğlu creates an individual cinematic world and tells the stories with her own cinematic language. When it is looked at her interior journey, as Müjde Arslan (ibid) states, Ustaoğlu seems as if she is making the same film with the same questions. Müjde Arslan explains the reasons that make Ustaoğlu's *oeuvre* unique and consistent through wide-ranging elaborations under several titles[95] and summarizes them in nine topics.

As I have formerly stated in this study, Müjde Arslan (2010, p. 21), in her response to Fırat Yücel defense of the argument that *auteurism* could not be effective in Turkey until the late 1990s because of the dependence to Yeşilçam – states that '*auteur* theory' was initially shaped around the studio directors. However, in one of the nine concluding topics, Müjde Arslan (2010, p. 126) seems to disagree with her foregoing response: she presents Ustaoğlu as an independent filmmaker who never made a film with an order of a producer and emphasizes this as one of the results which are reached in light with '*auteur* theory' and proved Ustaoğlu's *auteur* status. At this point, it should not be forgotten that Sarris's '*auteur* theory' does not emphasize the 'independence of a director' as a criterion; in contrast, Sarris gives importance to the possible individualities of directors working in the Hollywood studio system. What once more arises from Müjde Arslan's study is a lasting confusion between the concepts of '*auteur* theory', 'traditional *auteurism*', and '*auteur* cinema'.

[95] Titles are given as journey; individual stories; the burden of the death; lost and lament; forgetting; the absence of a father figure; questioning and confronting; ethnicity, identities, cultures; minorities; the employment of water; individual locations; scriptwriting; open ended final sequences.

3.5.4 Reha Erdem

Ahmet Terzioğlu asserts that "the exact similarities in themes and the conservative persistence in visual narrative style are not the only requirements to be an *auteur* director," and mentions that the *auteur* status of a director can acquire an alternative definition in the light of the Reha Erdem case in Turkish cinema.[96] According to Terzioğlu, 'searching' (*arayış*) can be accepted as a new consistency in contemporary cinema and Reha Erdem's cinema can be defined as a "cinema of searching" (*arayış sineması*) with consistent procedures (*yordam*) of filmmaking. As Terzioğlu states, Erdem's last four films at first seem to differ from each other; however they have a lot in common when it comes to the employment of sound. In his opinion, Erdem articulates 'persistence' (the institution of authorship) and 'searching' together by means of the employment of sound. Terzioğlu explains Erdem's style in the employment of sound using Michel Chion's concept of "acousmatic sound"[97] which causes the story to leave its creator and take on another narrator. In Terzioğlu's view, for Erdem's cinema, acousmatic sound destroys[98] the institution of authorship but causes a search for cinematic narration styles; finally, Erdem's consistency in 'searching' again allows us to consider him an *auteur*.

Apart from Terzioğlu's alternative auteurist perspective, Mikail Boz, with a more traditional auteurist sense, explains Erdem's *auteur* status as a reflection of his ability in writing his own scripts, collaborating with the same people in his films, his own way of editing through which he creates meaning, and recurring themes such as lovelessness, faithlessness, and the problems of growing up.[99]

---

[96] For Terzioğlu's article, see (http://www.altyazi.net/makale/kosmos-8-111.aspx)

[97] Sounds that are not coming from the sources we see in a single frame; we might be informed in previous frames for their sources or we might be manipulated by the director to guess what might be their sources. (http://www.altyazi.net/makale/kosmos-8-111.aspx)

[98] Location and the acousmatic sounds coming from out of its atmosphere become a kind of narrator; thus, the equality between the *auteur* and the narrator disappears. (http://www.altyazi.net/makale/kosmos-8-111.aspx)

[99] For Boz's article, see (http://sinemasaldunya.wordpress.com/2011/06/11/suskun-ve-yalniz-reha-erdem-sinemasi/)

In this sense, Reha Erdem is a significant instance in this study since he is handled by Terzioğlu through his style which is accepted as coherent in the employment of sound and the attitude of 'searching'. However, Terzioğlu makes his argument dependent on Erdem's last four films: on the one hand, Terzioğlu comes closer to the traditional sense due to his interest in Erdem's style, while on the other hand, because he does not put forward a thesis valid for Erdem's total *oeuvre,* he remains distinct from the traditional *auteurism*.

3.5.5 Fatih Akın*

Nuray Hilal Tuğan, in her article "*Yaşamın Kıyısında Bekle ve Umut Et* / Wait and Hope on the Edge of the Life" (2010), discusses Fatih Akın's *auteur* status and his film *Yaşamın Kıyısında* / *The Edge of Heaven* (2007) first by taking her departure from Hamid Naficy's 'accented cinema' theory and then with reference to Kovács's sense of 'self-reflexivity'. Tuğan (2010, pp. 51-52) points out that Naficy, in one hand, studies the diasporic, exilic and postcolonial [*heimatlos*] filmmakers and positions them as *auteurs*; on the other hand, in his book, Naficy does not have a title that includes the directors who are the children of foreign workers in European countries. However, for Tuğan, Fatih Akın is an 'original' instance of what Naficy draws attention to with his 'accented cinema' theory. Tuğan explains Akın's cinema in accordance with Naficy's theory not for the accented speeches of the characters or the director himself, but for Akın's birth and growth in-between two cultures. According to Tuğan (2010, p. 50), with reference to Naficy, Akın's films should be read not only as "individual texts"; rather, they should be read as "intertextual, multi-

* Even though some Turkish scholars and critics do not accept Fatih Akın as a 'Turkish' director, Savaş Arslan (2011, p. 240) mentions him as one of the post-Yeşilçam *auteurs* and Nezih Erdoğan states that it is not possible to think of the New Turkish Cinema without mentioning Fatih Akın and Ferzan Özpetek. (www.anlayis.net/makaleGoster.aspx?makaleid=2160) In fact, it is hard to explain the positions of Fatih Akın and his cinema in national terms. This is the reason why he has a place in this study since he is one of the instances of the contemporary *auteurs* in the definition of Thomas Elsaesser's world cinema. However, in the extent of this study, Akın will be elaborated from a Turkish cinema scholar's perspective in order to understand the existing auteurist approaches in Turkey. At this point, it should be stated that, because of the limited scope of this study and to some extent, its similarity to Akın's case, Ferzan Özpetek will not find a place in this study.

cultural, trans-national spaces of encounter" and as the products of "collective modes of production" in contrast with the mainstream ones. Furthermore, in addition to Naficy's theory, Tuğan (2010, p. 74) emphasizes that Akın writes the scripts himself by taking his departure from his own life; and this makes 'self-reflexivity' – which is directly connected with the definition of *auteur* – an appropriate concept to use in studying his films. As Tuğan (ibid) cites, Kovács defines 'self-reflexivity' as "*auteur*'s personal reflection on the medium and on reality"[100] and categorizes it as 'covert' and 'overt'. Tuğan (2010, p. 75) categorizes only one film from Akın's *oeuvre*, *Yaşamın Kıyısında* / *The Edge of Heaven* (2007), as an example of 'covert self-reflexivity'[101] and defines Akın as "a Godlike *auteur* who knows and sees everything and plans the events and their timings, but does not let himself to be known and seen."

In conclusion, throughout this chapter, I have discussed the conception and perception of *auteurism* in Turkey from the perspective of traditional *auteurism*. For a better understanding of the endeavors in the 1950s to foreground the artistic aspect of the medium, I have first elaborated pre-1950s era through its most significant representative Muhsin Ertuğrul and found him not to be a proper instance for possible *auteur* studies since there was no other figure from whom to distinguish him and his films were broadly defined as theatrical and not original. In this sense, the period of 1950-1970 has been deemed a more appropriate era to examine how *auteurism* in Turkey has been developed since, as emphasized by Nijat Özön, it was the period of "cinema-makers" and distinguished from the theatrical past of the medium in Turkey. In this manner, three directors were examined

[100] Quoted from the original book of András Bálint Kovács titled "Screening modernism: European art cinema, 1950-1980" (2007, p. 227).
(http://books.google.com/books?id=5eK0TJwLpXkC&printsec=frontcover&dq=screening+modernism+european+art+cinema&hl=tr&ei=TzjWTpLNB8nqObHZ5WU&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CC0Q6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=227&f=false)

[101] Kovács (2007, p. 225), quoted in Tuğan (2010, p. 74), explains covert self-reflexivity in accordance with the following cases: "when the film is reflected by its own narrative or visual composition as belonging to a genre, style, or to a certain group of works of art and there are cases where only external knowledge about the *auteur* or the film can prove the reflexive character of a film, which may act on the whole film or on certain parts of it." At this point, Tuğan (2010, p. 75), provides external knowledge that "the story of the film [*Yaşamın Kıyısında*] comes from Akın's wish to discover his roots by means of his father's homeland."

using the existing approaches to the period, and it was concluded that Akad and Erksan have been respected, studied, and evaluated as *auteurs* by some circles due to the contents of their social-realist (artistically concerned) films – apart from their commercial ones – and their personal features. However, Seden (since the contents of his films were found to be unremarkable) was considered a 'professional' director of popular films with no content worth studying. On that point, I emphasized the contradiction between the traditional *auteurism*, which does not undervalue popular film directors because of the contents of their films if they have distinguishing individual styles, and the foregoing approach that prevailed among the studies concerning the period of 'cinema makers'. Following this period, I considered Yılmaz Güney separate from any periodizations and found that similar tendencies in cinema circles have prevailed: Güney has been praised by some intellectuals for his worldview (content) which he tried to reflect in a couple of his films apart from the commercial films he directed for Yeşilçam. In the next step, I examined the period of 1980-1990, calling it the period of '*auteur* cinema' – which was accepted to come onto scene in the 1980s by means of the films made by the generation after Güney – since Dönmez-Colin pointed out a different conception of *auteurism* in Turkish cinema. Ömer Kavur was discovered to be the most acclaimed director of this period through the definitions and contradictions of traditional *auteur* and *auteur* cinema concepts.

In addition, I gave place to Kavur in this study to further emphasize that some circles considered his aesthetic choices and cinematic language more important than the content of his films. Lastly, I examined the *auteurism* of the contemporary period, namely 'New Turkish Cinema', which is considered to have begun independent from classic Yeşilçam in the 1990s, and its five most prominent directors. Having elaborated the approaches to Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Zeki Demirkubuz, Yeşim Ustaoğlu, Reha Erdem and Fatih Akın in comparison with the traditional *auteurist* perspective, I will conclude this chapter with the argument that, in contrast to the existing *auteurism* before the 1990s, *auteurism* in the period of 'New Turkish Cinema' (as traditional *auteurism* demands) has put the necessary emphasis on consistency of 'style' in recent *auteurs*' films; however, recent *auteurism* seems to be a fusion of different auteurist perspectives, which somehow comes closer to the

concept of authorship in art cinema, while traditional *auteurism* defends the possibility of consistent styles in popular cinema.

4. AUTEURISM AND YAVUZ TURGUL

...about the best way to tell the story, scene by scene. You make specific choices that you think are appropriate or compelling or interesting for that particular scene. Then, at the end of the day, you put it all together and somebody looks at it and, if there's some consistency to it, they say, 'Well, that's their style.'

(Joel Coen, director/writer)
(quoted in Bordwell and Thompson, 2010, p. 304)

The previous chapter explored the development and perception of *auteurism* in Turkey through particular periods and directors, ending with the most recent period of "New Turkish Cinema" (1990-present). The auteurist studies[102] done by Turkish cinema scholars and writers concerning this period broadly center on the authorship of directors who, though only reaching a small group of audience in Turkey, have been praised and awarded at international film festival circuits. On the other hand, there have been a few popular directors who were acclaimed by film critics, scholars in Turkey and at the same time reached to the masses with their popular films, but could not achieve the same success in the international arena as had the former.

The most noteworthy of the few acclaimed popular directors (Çağan Irmak, Ömer Faruk Sorak, Abdullah Oğuz, Ezel Akay, and Yılmaz Erdoğan) in the period of "New Turkish Cinema" is Yavuz Turgul. Turgul started making his films in 1980s and was accepted as a representative of Young/New Cinema (1970-1987) in Nijat Özön's periodization (Yüksel and Tok 2011: 14). However, he continued making his films in the 1990s and 2000s: mostly his significance concerning the period of "New Turkish Cinema" comes from the much appreciated box-office success of his *Eşkıya*/ The Bandit (1996), a film which has been broadly accepted as the first instance of the popular branch of "New Turkish Cinema".

[102] See Asuman Suner's articles (2004, 2006) on Nuri Bilge Ceylan and Zeki Demirkubuz; Semire Ruken Öztürk's article (2002) on Zeki Demirkubuz; Mizgin Müjde Arslan's book (2010) on Yeşim Ustaoğlu; Ahmet Terzioğlu's article (2010) on Reha Erdem; and Nuray Hilal Tuğan's article (2010) on Fatih Akın.

At this point, it should be pointed out that Turgul had a distinguished place in Turkish cinema. He started directing films in Yeşilçam in the same years that '*auteur* cinema' tradition prevailed among the young generation of directors in 1980s; however, Turgul preferred to stay away from that tradition. His first film, *Fahriye Abla* (Sister Fahriye) (1984), was centred on a women's issue and made by following the tendency of the older generation directors of Yeşilçam to displace the classical woman 'types' of Yeşilçam formulas. His second film, *Muhsin Bey* (Monsieur Muhsin) (1986), though a box-office failure, attracted broad attention in the video sector and also in Turkish cinema circles. Then, by using the resources of a Yeşilçam production company, he made *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni* (The Unforgettable Director of Love Movies) (1990) to criticize the '*auteur* cinema' tradition of Yeşilçam and the fantastic film *Gölge Oyunu* (Shadowplay) (1992) which did little to satisfy the demands of Yeşilçam. Furthermore, he made *Eşkıya* (The Bandit) (1996) using the same sources (Eurimages funds, advertising sector, television sector) that the new generation of young directors in 1990s used in making their small-scale first films. Turgul's following films *Gönül Yarası* (Lovelorn) (2005) and *Av Mevsimi* (Hunting Season) (2010) were also produced using resources from the advertising sector and other private sponsors. However, on the one hand, Turgul's name was generally mentioned apart from the others (who adress a small group of audience) in the definitions of the period of "New Turkish Cinema" since he reached a large audience with *Eşkıya* and his following two films. On the other hand, he also has been evaluated apart from the other popular film directors of the period in Turkey.

In 2011, *Sinema* magazine arranged two surveys among two groups: (1) five thousand of its readers to select the best hundred films of Turkish cinema; and (2) forty-two cinema writers to select their top ten. Turgul's *Eşkıya* was awarded the best Turkish film ever and *Muhsin Bey* was rated eighth in the readers' selection [103]. However, in the writers' selection *Eşkıya* did not find a place in the best ten films, but *Muhsin Bey* was ranked seventh. These results have a place in this study not to point to the successes of Turgul and his films but to point

[103] *Av Mevsimi* was ranked twenty-sixth, *Gönül Yarası* as twenty-seventh and *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni* as eighty-seventh.

Turgul's significance for Turkish cinema circles and, to some extent, for the readers (generally considered a reasonably educated audience) of the magazine[104].

In light of Turgul's abovementioned place in Turkish cinema, in this chapter I will review the existing auteurist approaches to Turgul and examine them through the traditional auteurist perspective. Then, I will identify and discuss some other approaches to Turgul, leading to an analysis of Turgul's *oeuvre* (including seven films) by taking my departure from David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson's way of analyzing films through their styles. Finally, I will make a list of the consistent techniques and motifs that Turgul employs throughout his films which are considered the components of his distinctive style.

In this study, I decided not to delve in depth into Turgul's biography nor did I use an interview with him. In this, an auteurist study may construct an image of an *auteur* by using details from his/her personal history or interviews. Yet this may turn into an "image" or even, at times, an "idealized" image of the *auteur*. Second, there is also the risk of overusing the personal knowledge and interviews which might turn a scholarly study on the work of an *auteur* into a presentation of the taste of the artist or the critic. By keeping these in mind, I decided not to utilize an interview with Yavuz Turgul and instead, as it will be seen below, focused solely on an analysis of his films.

4.1 THE REVIEW OF AUTEURIST APPROACHES TO YAVUZ TURGUL

Throughout the previous chapter, three periods have been established and two directors (Muhsin Ertuğrul and Yılmaz Güney) independent from any periodizations have been discussed; and it has been revealed that the concept of '*auteur*' has broadly been perceived in relation to the art cinema (independent cinema) in Turkey. In general, such a perception has emphasized the 'content' of films; however, it is undeniable that, concerning some directors of 1980s and most directors of the period of "New Turkish Cinema", the emphasis

[104] The five thousand readers are supposed to be the ones who might have had an education in the field of cinema, or might be well-educated in other fields and interested in cinema.

has also been put on the director's 'style'.[105] In both cases, concerning the possibility of consistency in 'content' and/or 'style' in their *oeuvres*, popular film directors have not been considered *auteurs*. In fact, such a consideration contrasts with the concept of 'traditional *auteurism*' which was born with an attitude to prioritize the consistence of a recognizable 'style' even among the films – which belong to different genres with different contents – of studio directors.

Since the aim of this study, by taking its departure from the traditional auteurist perspective, is first to draw attention to the possibility of authorship of popular film directors in recent Turkish cinema, Yavuz Turgul seemed to be the most appropriate director to argue the possibility of *auteur* status through analysis of his *oeuvre*. Before analyzing Turgul's *oeuvre* concerning the possible consistency of its 'style', it is essential to give place to some auteurist studies made by cinema writers and scholars up to now, and compare and contrast them with the perspective of traditional *auteurism*.

Tamer Baran, after the release of *Eşkıya*, wrote an article[106] in 1997 to explicate the components of its box-office success and designated Yavuz Turgul an *auteur*. However, Baran's perception of the concept of *auteur* seems problematic in relation to the traditional sense discussed in previous chapters. In the introduction, Baran suggests that the significance of *Eşkıya* comes from its 'content' which centers on the theme of 'human and change'. For Baran, 'change' occurs in the society in Turgul's films and the main character

[105] As I emphasized in the previous chapter, it is hard to call the new generation of directors in the 1980s (Ömer Kavur, Yavuz Özkan, Erden Kıral, Ali Özgentürk) 'independent' filmmakers since they made their films in Yeşilçam conditions, with the crews raised in *Yeşilçam* cinema or with the equipment possessed by *Yeşilçam* production companies. However, since they are accepted as representatives of *auteur* cinema they are thought to be standing somewhere close to art cinema. On the other hand, Burçak Evren calls the young directors of 1990s 'independent' since they "channel[ed] capital from outside into the cinema sector" and "shouldered single-handedly the roles of producer, director, screenwriter, cameraman and if necessary actor" (cited in Dönmez-Colin 2008, p. 221). Evren emphasizes the distinctive characteristics of the 'independent' directors – which overlap with the characteristics of the 'art cinema' concept in Bordwell's definition (see footnote 42 in chapter three) – as: (1) they tried to surpass the boundaries of traditional filmmaking economically, ideologically and aesthetically; (2) used unknown faces as actors; (3) displayed remarkable freedom of narrative choice but gradually began to repeat themselves, lacked a common subject, theme or ideology; (4) their personal and individual cinemas focused on the interior and offered the possibility of several readings (cited in Dönmez-Colin 2008, p.221).

[106] For Tamer Baran's article, see (http://tamerbaran.blogspot.com/2010/01/eskya-bize-bizi-anmsatyor.html)

in the films is always the 'last man' who cannot live as he used to do in the past since the society changes. At this point, with an attitude to exclude *Fahriye Abla* (1984), Baran claims that "it could be possible for Turgul to display (*ortaya koymak*) himself as an *auteur* with *Züğürt Ağa* [which is written but not directed by Turgul] (1985)" since it played an initiative role in Turgul's employment of the foregoing theme. In this case, it is essential to point out the problems inherent in Baran's perception of *auteurism*. First, in such an auteurist article the scripts which were written but not directed by Turgul may be useful in discussing Turgul's way of writing or choices of themes; however, it may not be appropriate to designate him an *auteur* since traditional *auteurism* emphasizes the style of a director which can only be recognized through the films he directs. Second, traditional *auteurism* demands an analysis of a director's total *oeuvre* and denies exclusions. Third, a director can be declared an *auteur* only by cinema writers or scholars. Furthermore, in the rest of the article, Baran draws attention to the coherence between the main characters of Turgul's films, but does not work on the possible coherence between the styles of the films. In the conclusion of the article, Baran states that "Yavuz Turgul made a typical *auteur* film [*Eşkıya*], reached a box-office success, and had a special place not only in Turkey, but in the World."[107] This statement is also arguable in relation to the definition of *Eşkıya* as an '*auteur* film'. As it has been emphasized in the previous chapter, *auteur* cinema is defined by Thomas Elsaesser (2005, p. 485) as close in its 'style' to the art cinema with "psychologically complex protagonists, often the alter egos of the director, and thus inviting expressive-autobiographical interpretation." It will be revealed in the following sections of this study that *Eşkıya* is not an instance of *auteur* cinema since it is established upon a goal-oriented and psychologically-defined main character within a classical narrative. Baran perhaps might not be refering to the concept of *auteur* cinema, but then, it should have been explained in his article what he meant by 'a typical *auteur* film'.

Övgü Gökçe and Berke Göl made another auteurist study on Yavuz Turgul in 2005. Gökçe and Göl take on Turgul as a scriptwriter-director and consider him an *auteur* in their article. They make the same exclusion of *Fahriye Abla* from Turgul's *oeuvre*, detail his *auteur*

[107] See (http://tamerbaran.blogspot.com/2010/01/eskya-bize-bizi-anmsatyor.html)

status based on the other films he had directed up to that time, emphasize the same theme Baran mentioned as 'human and change' and draw attention to Turgul's insistence on working with Şener Şen as the main actor. Gökçe and Göl also evaluate Turgul's films in their relations to "cultural legacy of Turkish republic", in addition to emphasizing some common points inherent in the 'style' of Turgul's films: 'employment of location' such as coffee houses, dark/back streets, night clubs, roofs, terraces, hills of Istanbul; 'employment of camera' such as high-angles to look at the city of Istanbul above; and 'employment of arts' such as music and traditional performing arts. Gökçe and Göl's article is significant from the traditional auteurist perspective since it puts an emphasis on Turgul's 'style' (2005, pp. 20-28). However, Gökçe and Göl also put forward in the conclusion of their article that, while Turgul preserves the persistence in his themes, he may differ in his 'style' because of his mainstream concerns (such as action scenes, popular and new actors and actresses). Such an implication is denied by traditional *auteurism* since it defends that a director can consistently inscribe something individual and recognizable in any of his films even if they are made with commercial concerns.

The more recent auteurist study on Turgul is by Hakan Erkılıç and Senem Duruel Erkılıç[108]. In their article, Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç (2011, p. 85) focus on the fact of 'hero' in four of Turgul's films (*Muhsin Bey* [1984], *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni* [1990], *Eşkıya* [1996], *Gönül Yarası* [2005]); and claim that the 'narrative of hero' (*kahraman anlatısı*) in Turgul's cinema is the indicator of his *auteur* status. While designating Turgul an *auteur*, Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç (2011, p. 84) emphasize that in the second half of the 1990s, concurrent with Turgul's *Eşkıya* (1996), Derviş Zaim, Nuri Bilge Ceylan and Zeki Demirkubuz constructed a 'new' narrative 'style' for Turkish cinema; however, Turgul had a distinct place among them since he preserved the 'classical' narrative style.. Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç, on one hand, take their departure from Robert McKee's definition of

[108] In 2011, a book titled *Yavuz Turgul Sinemasını Keşfetmek / Discovering the Cinema of Yavuz Turgul* was published as an edition of Ala Sivas. The book includes nine articles from several cinema scholars, a couple of opinions of some cinema writers and an interview with Yavuz Turgul. Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç's article is one of the two articles that designate Turgul as an *auteur* in the book. The second article will be elaborated in the following.

classical design[109] and elaborate the fact of 'hero' in Turgul's films in relation to that definition.[110] On the other hand, they emphasize that the 'heroes' in Turgul's films diverge from the 'classical design' since they mostly act out of their internal conflicts beyond the exterior ones. In addition to the analysis of the 'heroes', Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç point out some recurring motifs in Turgul's four films such as: 'social transformation', 'characters in connection to Anatolia', 'minorities leaving Istanbul', and 'nostalgia'. They also find the 'employment of melodramatic codes'[111] to be a common point of Turgul's four films, asserting that Turgul transforms melodramatic codes and traditions of Turkish cinema into his own way of telling stories by putting the main 'hero' in the of the film. In their view, Turgul provides this centralization by his framings: close-up detail shots to introduce the 'hero' and tracking shots to introduce locations (Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç 2011, p. 101).

Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç's article is significant both for its detailed analysis of Turgul's four films on the basis of their narrative styles constructed upon the 'heroes' and its conceptualization of an *auteur* from the perspective of traditional *auteurism.* They define *auteur* in a footnote in their article as one who writes his film (film yazmak)[112] with his own thoughts and feelings; inscribes his personality to the film by means of his ability of mastering *mise-en-scéne,* camera movements; and exists with his own 'style' (2011, p. 101), and the *auteur* Yavuz Turgul they handle seems quite consistent with this definition. In this manner, while explicating Turgul's *auteur* status, the writers focus more on 'how'

[109] McKee lists the principles of "classical design": causality, close-ended final, linear timings, exterior conflict, one hero, coherent reality and active hero (quoted in Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç 2011 p. 86). McKee also defines the kind of narrative which Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç (2011, p. 86) explain as 'new' for Turkish cinema, as the 'economical and simple form of "classical design"' with such principles: minimalist plot-structure, open-ended final, internal conflict, multiple heroes and passive hero.

[110] Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç's study does not include Turgul's *Gölge Oyunu* (1992) since it does not fit the definition of 'classical design'. For them, *Gölge Oyunu* is an instance of epic narrative. (Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç 2011, p. 88)

[111] Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç (2011, p. 100) give love, passion, lust, self-sacrificing, frustration, deprivation and devine love as melodramatic codes that Turgul employs.

[112] At this point, it is necessary to point out the ambiguity in what the writers mean. Writing on a pelicule or writing the script?

Turgul tells it than on 'what' Turgul says, thus taking their departure from McKee's definition of "classical design."

The other auteurist study on Turgul, published in the same book with Erkılıç and Duruel Erkılıç's article, is Zeliha Hepkon's article in which Hepkon (2011, p. 179) puts forward that the contemporary *auteur* is undertook in commercial and industrial contexts rather than the artistic ones. Thus, in Hepkon's (2011, p. 181) opinion, Yavuz Turgul is an "*auteur*-star" not only because of his ability to create a signature with his 'style'[113], but also because of his ability to transform his signature into a trademark in contemporary Turkish cinema. Hepkon locates Turgul as an "*auteur*-star" by taking her departure from Timothy Corrigan's categorization, who defines *auteur*-stars in two categories: "the commercial *auteurs*" and "the *auteurs* of commerce"[114] (quoted in Hepkon 2011, p. 180). In light of this, Hepkon (2011, p. 193-194) puts Turgul to the latter category since he adapts himself to the transformations that Turkish cinema industry had.

The problematical point in Hepkon's study from the traditional auteurist perspective is that, even though she states that there are various components of Turgul's 'style', she considers the concept of *auteur*-star for Turgul only with regard to the recurring themes in his films and marketing strategies he pursues. Hepkon (2011, p. 191) finds 'recurring themes' which revolve around a particular world view in Turgul's films as the most determining factor in the origination of the style of 'Turgul the *auteur*'. At this point, it may be worthwhile to discuss James Naremore's resistance to Corrigan and to the perception of the 'contemporary *auteur*' which has been explained directly in connection with the marketing strategies of the industry as Hepkon did. Naremore (2005, p. 21) claims that not only the contemporary *auteurs* but also Hollywood *auteurs* in the past, such as Welles, Capra and DeMille, were "deeply involved in vulgar showbusiness" and heavily publicized in their

[113]Hepkon (2011, p. 181) thinks that Turgul's style originates from the repeated themes, narrative structure, employment of characters and the cinematographic features in his films.

[114] With a reference to Timothy Corrigan, Hepkon (2011, p. 180, p. 188) explains that commercial *auteurs* differ from the others not with their ideas, styles or nuances of expression, but with their images such as 'movie brats' or 'star-actor-directors'. Furthermore, the *auteurs* of commerce are the ones who are conditioned as stars by new economical developments.

own days. Hence, it should be emphasized in this study that Turgul's *auteur* status had better be declared depending on the recognizable artistic consistency of his films as traditional auteurists did concerning Orson Welles, Frank Capra, Louis DeMille in the past. The 'content' of his films and his function in the commercial processes of a filmmaking activity cannot be sufficient to explicate the *auteur* status of a director in the traditional sense.

Apart from the two abovementioned auteurist articles in the recently published book titled *Yavuz Turgul Sinemasını Keşfetmek / Discovering the Cinema of Yavuz Turgul* (2011), the editor of the book, Ala Sivas, puts forward in an interview that Yavuz Turgul improved his cinema by according himself to the conditions of periods and has since transformed himself into a trademark.[115] In light of this, cinema writer Kültigin K. Akbulut asks Sivas's opinion about the possible parallelism between the endeavors of Atıf Yılmaz and Yavuz Turgul to accord themselves to the conditions of the developing Turkish cinema sector. In her answer, Sivas points out that there is a similarity between the two cases but that Turgul is much closer to the concept of *auteur* than Yılmaz since Turgul made a few films in his long career of directing. From Sivas's point of view, Turgul is more 'original' than Yılmaz because Yılmaz made serial productions following the rules of popular cinema. In this case, Sivas's idea stands closer to the authorship of an art film director given the emphasis on 'making a few films (possibly written by the director) in a long time period' as a strengthening point for the 'originality' of a director. However, traditional *auteurism* was born with an interest in finding the 'original' directors even working in the mass production systems of Hollywood studios. Given this, Sivas's definition of *auteurism* seems problematic from the traditional perspective for its conception of the '*auteur* in popular cinema'.

Up to this point, the existing auteurist approaches to Yavuz Turgul have been evaluated. There are also some other studies and opinions that do not consider Turgul an *auteur*, but rather emphasize his place as 'distinguished' in Turkish cinema. In fact, the

[115] For the interview with Sivas, see (http://www.hayalperdesi.net/soylesi/33-yavuz-turgul-kendisini-markaya-donusturdu.aspx)

abovementioned book includes the most noteworthy of them, but it is not possible to make a thorough review of the book in the extent of this study. Thus, the following instances will be picked up from a couple of other works.

Gökçe İspi's article, which focuses on the common theme of 'transformation' in Turgul's films, puts forward in the article that Turgul handles the theme of 'transformation' in connection with some objects (*nesne*) his characters identify with (2004, p. 150). In this sense, İspi's article is noticeable from the traditional auteurist perspective, since it is interested in 'how' Turgul tells the stories of 'transformation' and 'how' he provides the consistency of his 'style' in handling that theme. For İspi (2004, p. 152), by applying the same method (i.e. creating characters identified with some special objects), Turgul establishes a link among all his films to give a default knowledge to the audience about what kind of people Turgul's characters might be.

The other study worth mentioning is a section on Turgul in Rıza Kıraç's book. In the book, Kıraç handles the contents of Turgul's films and draws attention to their characters and themes. For Kıraç (2008, p. 117-118), Turgul's characters live in transition periods in Turkey and cannot accord themselves to the social relationships that capitalism imposes. Kıraç (2008, p. 120) also thinks that 'love' is an image (*imge*) in all Turgul's films and the main (male) characters always lose as far as love is concerned. After a short analysis of the contents, Kıraç (2008, p. 121) concludes the section by drawing attention to the artistic achievement of his films which can not be overshadowed by the facts of popular cinema.

In a similar manner, Derviş Zaim (2008, p. 54) points out both 'artistic aspects' and the 'popularity' of Turgul's films which have been appreciated by Turkish cinema critics and common people as well.[116] Zaim also draws attention to the fact that, as a respectable and significant director in Turkey, Turgul could only find a place in the programs of one prominent international film festival: San Sebastian Film Festival (1988). In relation with

[116] Zaim (2008, p. 54) associates Çağan Irmak with Turgul for the similarity of their cases.

this, Zaim states that, even though Turgul's *Muhsin Bey* (1986) won a Special Jury Price at San Sebastian, it could not gain international visibility because of the lack of international distribution opportunities.

Differing from Zaim, in Gönül Dönmez-Colin's opinion, Turgul's *Eşkıya* (1996) also achieved "unprecedented" international success[117] by combining "commercially viable qualities (action, melodrama, romance, star actors and technical superiority) with those of a good film (made by an experienced film-maker who knew his craft)" (Dönmez-Colin 2008, p. 46). In this sense, Dönmez-Colin's definition of a director who makes a 'good film' connotes traditional auteurists' conception of 'metteur-en-scéne' and Scognamillo's 'professional'. At this point, as far as *Eşkıya* is concerned, Dönmez-Colin seems to want to evaluate Turgul as a 'craftsman' rather than an 'artist'. In fact, there is no other comment about Turgul's other films in Dönmez-Colin's study. However, by putting contemporary Turkish directors into two categories, Dönmez-Colin (2008, p. 220-221) puts forward that Turgul is one of them who has succeeded in the commercial cinema "that maintain high standards", and that there are some others who have succeeded in the international arena due to their "self-reflexive films of remarkable artistic accomplishment".

Popular film directors in general, and Yavuz Turgul in particular, might have been exposed to several questions for the artistic values of their films; and they might have been blamed for the employment of commercial formulas and techniques. However, it should not be forgotten that cinema is an art form which cannot be considered without taking its commercial aspect into account. Any director can be inspired by the styles of others from Hollywood or anywhere else. The important point is his ability to create his own way of telling stories. It is essential to state once more that traditional *auteurism* seeks a recognizable consistency not only in themes but also in the style of a particular director in

[117] At this point, Zaim might have not appreciated *Eşkıya's* international success - a Golden Dolphin award at Troia International Film Festival (1998). Apart from this, it should also be stated that Turgul's *Gönül Yarası* also won Queens Spirit Award at the Queens Film Festival (2005) (http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0425079/awards).

handling those themes in his *oeuvre*; style can be established by some inspirations, adaptations and/or formulas. However, since all those activities happen and take shape in human minds, the one who is able to inscribe something individual to his creations and to be recognized through them, becomes distinguished. The crucial point is how 'style' distinguishes one director from another and makes him unique 'beyond or above the artist'. In the following sections, Yavuz Turgul's films will be analyzed through the components of his style.

4.2 THE ANALYSIS OF TURGUL'S *OEUVRE*

In this traditional auteurist study, Yavuz Turgul's films will be analyzed through their style, considered to be the consequences of Turgul's particular choices and decisions made while mastering his *mise-en-scéne*s. I will use the four steps in analyzing films provided by David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson: (1) determine the organizational structure; (2) identify the salient techniques used; (3) trace out patterns of techniques; and (4) propose functions for the salient techniques and the patterns they form (2010, p. 306). In the first step, Bordwell and Thompson suggest determining the structure[118] on which the film is constructed. In the following steps, they support determining "the techniques the film relies heavily on" and patterning them through specific examples to be clearer about the organizational structure (ibid). In the last step, through the specific examples, the possible meanings which emerge by the employment of the salient techniques should be emphasized by the analyst as she "looks for the role that style plays in the film's overall form" (2010, p. 308).

[118] For instance, Bordwell and Thompson put forward that *Citizen Kane* (Orson Welles, 1941) is essentially organized as a 'search' since "a detective-like figure the reporter Thompson, tries to find the significance of Kane's last word 'Rosebud'" (Bordwell and Thompson 2010, p. 309). However, Bordwell and Thompson (ibid) put forward in their analysis of *Citizen Kane* that even before Thompson appears as a character in the film, Welles has already set up a 'search' for the audience by the shots, special effects, lighting he employed in the opening sequence of the film.

4.2.1 Fahriye Abla / Sister Fahriye (1984)

Fahriye Abla is organized as a "struggle" of the main character: Fahriye, an attractive girl, lives in a restrictive and "boring" neighborhood which is represented as a place where Fahriye struggles with the reality of her family and with the other people (including her lover and his family) living in her neighborhood. Fahriye also continues struggling alone to establish herself a new life outside the neighborhood.

The film opens on the neighborhood. After Fahriye is introduced with still frames in accordance with the lyrics of the song named "Fahriye Abla", we are shown a couple of scenes about the secret love between Fahriye and Mustafa and another song begins (at approximately the sixth minute) with the words: "*the same black sun, the same thirst, the same hurry, the same, oof, the same thing, the same thing, the same, the same ...*" The song is heard over shots depicting the people living in the neighborhood: several men sitting at a coffee house , among them Fahriye's father, and several women sitting at home, doing lacework, cleaning vegetables, reading coffee cups, looking at star photographs on the newspaper, preparing clews and thinking of their lovers (Fahriye). The song ends during the close-up of Fahriye; a detail shot inserts the birds flapping and flying which wake Fahriye from her daydreaming. Consequently, "the same thing" song and the shots that depict the neighborhood seem to be invoking the start of Fahriye's struggle in the neighborhood.

The film presents two more locations of struggle for Fahriye: "prison" and "factory". Her struggle develops in prison both mentally and physically (she tries to withstand the hard conditions and the people of prison, learns how to sew with a sewing machine, reads and thinks) and continues as Fahriye starts to work at a factory and tries to accord herself to her new life: she has a job, hires a shanty house, brings her mother and grandmother to her house, the little boy Mehmet escapes from home and stays with Fahriye, her old lover Mustafa tries to commit suicide but does not die, instead leaving the neighborhood and seeking Fahriye's help to find a new job.

Turgul establishes the foregoing struggle through the employment of some techniques which also determine *Fahriye Abla*'s style. The techniques Turgul preferred in the organization of the film will be elaborated using specific examples. First, I will elaborate Turgul's use of the camera. Throughout the film, the camera generally captures Fahriye in action and follows her with pans or trackings since she is presented as an energetic character living in a restrictive neighborhood, struggling physically in the prison and at the factory. If she is not moving, then the camera generally moves towards her. Turgul prefers to employ close-up shots of Fahriye with zoom-in or track-in, especially when Fahriye looks at the mirror and her lover's photograph; and at the turning points wherein Fahriye makes decisions on her own or the others make them for her. By using one-person zoom-in or track-in shots, Turgul emphasizes the particular reasons which cause Fahriye's struggle, such as in the scenes when Fahriye gets a letter of separation from her lover; when a woman on behalf of the man from Erzincan offers marriage and asks for permission from Fahriye's parents; when Fahriye learns Mustafa will marry her friend Gülay; when Fahriye refuses Mustafa's offer to be together and explains to him her struggle to stand alone in life. Additionally, in shots with two or more people, Fahriye generally does not enter the other person's static shot. The camera carries Fahriye beside the other characters and establishes two or more person shots by means of following Fahriye.

Turgul prefers to use moving camera (track-in) not only in Fahriye's shots, but also in the shots of other characters that play important roles in Fahriye's struggle and give direction to it. For instance, when Mustafa's father (with no knowledge of the relationship between his son and Fahriye) tries to get Mustafa to agree to marry another girl; when the mother of the man from Erzincan listens to what Fahriye says to her friend about 'love' in a *hamam* (Turkish bath) and finds Fahriye to be an appropriate candidate for a daughter-in-law; when Mustafa confesses to his father the reason for his bad mood and puts the blame on him.

Turgul also employs moving camera to introduce the primary locations of Fahriye's struggle. For instance, to strengthen the persuasiveness of Fahriye's struggle, which develops in the hard conditions of the prison, Turgul introduces the dormitory where she

stays using some detail shots with pans and tilts from Fahriye's point of view and the courtyard of the prison, with the track of the camera to the right from a close-up of the walking feet of a soldier guarding the wall to the kids playing and the women doing laundry, hanging out the laundry, washing their hair, smoking, knitting, pacing back and forth, talking and sitting, as Fahriye does, in the courtyard of the prison.

The other technique Turgul employs is introducing the main character as a struggling character at the beginning of the film, which he does in two ways. First, he employs some still shots in accordance with the lyrics (written by the poet Ahmet Muhip Dranas) of the song which functions as a narrator in the film and emphasizes Fahriye's physical appearance. Second, the lyrics also ensure that the audience knows some of Fahriye's personal features, such as her habit of singing naughty songs, her libertinism, and her cuteness. From the very beginning, Turgul portrays the main character as a lively and attractive girl. In the following scenes, Turgul gives some detail shots of Fahriye chewing gum, reading novels, growing flowers; and gives the knowledge of Fahriye's fidelity to her neighbors by the lyrics of the second part of the "Fahriye Abla" song. On the other hand, by the employment of "the same thing" song, Turgul establishes a contrast between Fahriye's character and life in her neighborhood. This contrast functions in establishing Fahriye as a struggling character at almost the sixth minute of the film. Moreover, in the prison scenes, to emphasize Fahriye's transformation, she is presented with a tilt-up shot from the detail of Aziz Nesin's book *Mahallenin Kısmetlisi* (The Most Fortunate of the Neighborhood) to Fahriye's smiling face.

In addition to the aforementioned techniques, Turgul often employs instrumental music over the one-person shots of the main character to draw attention to the restrictions and hard times Fahriye had during her struggle. For instance, the first time Fahriye takes Mustafa's photo from the back of the mirror and looks at it, sentimental music sets the scene; in the scene when the man Fahriye does not love asks Fahriye's parents' permission to marry her, a dramatic music is employed over the close-up of Fahriye; in the scene when Fahriye puts Mustafa's photo back in its place when she returns from Erzincan, the same

sentimental music is employed; in the scene when Fahriye's best friend, Sevgi, leaves the prison the same dramatic music is employed in a zoom-out from Fahriye's middle frame behind the bars of the dormitory window to a wide frame of the prison-building; in the shot when Fahriye removes her make-up in front of the mirror to resemble the other women workers of the factory, intense music is employed; and in the shot when Fahriye looks at Mustafa's burning photograph, the same sentimental music is employed.

As was previously mentioned, Turgul makes use of two songs with lyrics in *Fahriye Abla* to introduce Fahriye within her neighborhood, to explain her marriage and to draw attention to the reasons behind her struggle. In addition to this, Fahriye's struggle is emphasized through a change in her costume, accessories and hair style in the scenes that she starts working at a factory. She gives up make-up, dons the headscarf and wears dresses modest in color and style. Turgul further emphasizes the three steps of Fahriye's struggle with the employment of the change in the costumes of Mehmet, the little boy from whose point of view and through whose admiration Turgul presents the Fahriye Abla character.[119] Mehmet wears the same sweatshirt until the day Fahriye leaves the prison. On the day Fahriye becomes free, Mehmet wears a suit, and then in the rest of the film he wears another sweatshirt.

As it has also been previously stated, there are particular symbolic locations used to explain Fahriye's struggle through the transformations she has in them. These locations are the neighborhood where her struggle starts, the prison where her struggle develops, and the factory where her struggle continues. Through the struggle Fahriye maintains in three locations, she improves herself and is ultimately able to confront a tough life alone. In addition to these locations, Turgul puts emphasis on three other locations, beginning with the monotony of the coffee house, which is emphasized by "the same thing" song in accordance with the shots of some men sitting and having no work to do. Turgul also establishes two crucial coffee house scenes such as when Fahriye cuts Mustafa with a

[119] Mehmet is a significant character both for Fahriye and Mustafa, mediating between them since he works as an apprentice in Mustafa's carpentry shop.

screwdriver and when Mustafa shoots himself. The other location is the nightclub where Fahriye understands that the kind of life she wants to live is not the life of women working there. In this sense, Turgul employs the nightclub location to emphasize Fahriye's insistence on her struggle to construct a proper life in her post-prison days. The third location is *Büyülü Ev* (bewitched house) where Fahriye and Mustafa meet secretly and make love, even though Fahriye is scared of the place. The transformation that culminates in a new Fahriye is also brought forth by the change in her point of view about *Büyülü Ev.* She tells Mustafa that she has left her superstitious beliefs about *Büyülü Ev* behind having become more self-aware after living in a prison and working at a factory. Turgul also employs shadowy lighting and a misty atmosphere to foreground Fahriye's feelings about *Büyülü Ev* and the secret things she shares with Mustafa.

The other technique that Turgul employs to strengthen the reasons behind Fahriye's struggle is to have other characters speak over Fahriye's shots. For instance, in the scene when Mehmet's grandmother praises Mustafa for helping her grandson, her grateful words are heard on Fahriye's close shot sitting among the other women from the neighborhood (to show that Fahriye loves a man that is appreciated by the others in the neighborhood). This technique is also used when a quarrel between Fahriye's parents about their economic difficulties is heard on Fahriye's shots as she looks at the newspaper, the mirror and Mustafa's photograph in her room (to display Fahriye's way of escaping from harsh realities); when the dialogue of the women who asks for her parents' permission for the marriage of Fahriye and the man from Erzincan is heard on the track-in shot of Fahriye sitting nearby (to display Fahriye's helplessness); when the dialogue between Fahriye's parents about their economic expectations of their potential son-in-law are heard on Fahriye's shot as she is preparing her bag to run away with Mustafa (to display Fahriye's resistance to the mentality inherent in her family and the neighborhood); and finally when a quarrel between Fahriye's father and her uncle about the economic problems is heard when Fahriye comes into her room for the first time since her return from Erzincan and puts Mustafa's photograph in its old place (to display Fahriye's way of escaping from reality).

Parallel editing is also a technique Turgul employs at moments of tension in Fahriye's struggle. When Mustafa decides to commit a suicide, encounters his father and blames him for the loss of Fahriye, Turgul places in parallel the scene of a man named Cemil (working as Fahriye's chief at the factory) who tries to prepare Fahriye for his proposal of marriage. At the end, Mustafa shoots himself; birds flap and fly, synchronized with the sound of the gunfire while Fahriye chills and Cemil gives her time to think. Through this technique, Turgul emphasizes the connection between the two struggles which started in the neighborhood and were based on the secret (impossible) love between Fahriye and Mustafa.

Furthermore, Turgul establishes that Fahriye has an obsession with playing with her hair with her left hand, showing her in two scenes lying down and playing with her hair. In one she is on her bed while looking at the newspaper and listening to her parents' quarrel and the other is in the *hamam* (Turkish bath) while listening to Gülay's complaints about the kind of lives they all have in the neighborhood. In two critical scenes she also plays with her hair at the moments she felt herself sad or anxious. One, in the coffee house before cutting Mustafa with a screwdriver and the other, during her first day at the factory while encountering the obtrusive looks of the other women workers. Another obsession of Fahriye's is her overprotection of Mustafa's photograph. She attempts to burn it but cannot let herself destroy it. Turgul locates close shots of Mustafa's photograph in the scenes when Fahriye takes it from the back of the mirror in her room and puts it into her lingerie when she decides to escape from home with Mustafa; when she puts it back in its place behind the mirror when she returns to home from Erzincan; when she fights to take the photograph back in the prison after a woman steals the photograph to make Fahriye angry; when she talks to the photograph as if she is talking to Mustafa and tells him that she will get over him thanks to the new job she found at the factory; and when she attempts to burn it but then changes her mind. Turgul also prefers to employ a metaphorical detail shot in which birds flap and fly in the film and Fahriye chills with their movement. The first occasion is at the end of the clip of "the same thing" song, as she is, as always, thinking of her lover; the second time is when she is waiting for Mustafa to escape (after the flight of birds Fahriye

realizes that Mustafa won't come); and the third one is when Mustafa shoots himself with a gun.

In the last step of my analysis, it is essential to sum what I tried to draw attention up to this part. Through the traditional auteurist perspective that I have taken as my departure, I have suggested that Turgul organizes *Fahriye Abla* as a struggle of the main character not only by his content or dialogue, but also to great extent by the techniques he employed. At this point, it should be emphasized that even though the techniques he employs are not original, the configuration of these techniques is peculiar to Turgul. The choices he makes during the process of the configuration are all the indicators of his ability to master the *mise-en-scene* in order to convince the audience of the sincerity of Fahriye's struggle. Hence, Turgul is able to to establish a style to tell Fahriye's story with the support of the elements listed below:

1- Songs with lyrics: one of which functions as a narrator in the film and another which depicts the neighborhood where Fahriye's struggle starts
2- Detail shots that introduce the main character at the beginning
3- Locations that function in the development of Fahriye's struggle (neighborhood, prison, factory, coffeehouse, night club, *Büyülü Ev*)
4- Costumes that emphasize Fahriye's transformation (Fahriye's struggle is emphasized through a change in her costumes, accessories and hair style in the scenes that she starts working at a factory and also by the employment of the change in the costumes Mehmet the little boy from whose point of view and through whose admiration Turgul presents Fahriye Abla character)
5- An object (Mustafa's photograph) she identifies with and is overprotective of during her struggle
6- Descriptive obsession or habit of the main character (playing with her hair)
7- Camera movements: to emphasize the crucial moments by track-in shots and introduce the places of Fahriye's struggle by long tracking shots.

8- Instrumental music employed over Fahriye's shots to emphasize the turning points in the film

9- Shadowy lighting and misty atmospheres to emphasize the importance of *Büyülü Ev* in Fahriye's struggle

10- Parallel editing that Turgul employs to emphasize the two struggles that Fahriye had in the neighborhood and at the factory.

11- Monologue in which Mustafa explains his reasons of being that kind of man to his father (in fact the monologue functions as displaying the reasons underlying the start of Fahriye's struggle)

The following films directed by Turgul will be analyzed to determine whether or not they maintain the coherent style of configuration. However, before more analysis, some motifs Turgul chooses and employs during the configuration of *Fahriye Abla* should also be emphasized since they recur in Turgul's *oeuvre*.

These motifs are: (1) a character from the rural parts of Turkey (Fahriye's temporary husband from Erzincan); (2) a mute female character (in Fahriye's prison, Yeter who killed her *kuma* – fellow wife in a polygamous household); (3) a landlady (Safiye Sultan, the owner of *büyülü ev* – bewitched house – whom Fahriye feels scared of since she believes that Safiye Sultan disappeared because of some spirits); (4) swearing female characters (including Fahriye) living in tough conditions; (5) a character who resists the conditions s/he lives in and wants to be a famous star (Gülay, whom Mustafa is forced to marry); (6) a buddy relationship between two male characters (Mustafa and Mehmet); (7) birds flap and fly when Fahriye thinks of Mustafa and Mustafa shoots himself; and (8) the city of Istanbul is actually the most significant motif that Turgul employs in the realization of Fahriye's struggle. I will look for these motifs in the following films since their recurrence is also essential in establishing the consistency of Turgul's style.

4.2.2 Muhsin Bey / Monsieur Muhsin (1986)

Muhsin Bey is organized as a "struggle" of the main character: Muhsin, an honest and idealist concert organizer and a manager of Turkish Art and Turkish Folk Music performers. His job seems to be the main reason behind his struggle since he follows the ethical rules and resists submitting to the current circumstances of the music sector which is dominated by *Arabesk* music. He struggles to earn prestige which he has not been able to achieve and believes that he will gain that prestige through the new singer Ali Nazik who comes to Istanbul from Urfa to be a famous music star.

The beginning of the film sets up a character dreaming of a woman who sings a Turkish art music song with the lines "*my life is full of weeping and groaning. However, there is no cure; my poor heart is withering away day by day*." At first glance, the lines that the woman is singing emphasize somebody's discontented life. Then, it is understood that this might be the discontent of the main character who is woken from the dream by the noise of an alarm clock. After introducing Muhsin with some detail shots, and emphasizing the economic aspect of his struggle with some scenes in which he complains to his landlady, his assistant and the owner of the coffee house, the other and perhaps most genuine aspect of his struggle becomes definite in the scene displaying his love for his neighbor Sevda. Turgul employs (at approximately the twelfth minute) another song which Muhsin plays on a record while watering his potted flowers (one of which he nominates to be a stand-in for Sevda Hanım) and talking to them about his love for the first time in the film. Muhsin tells the flower Sevda that he plays that record for her and at the moment, the lines of the song become significant: "*I am a vagabond since my life has flowed and passed by my dreams. Thus, when I look at the past, I repent*." Apart from the struggles he has had in the past, this scene might be read as the indication of Muhsin's new struggle to succeed first in his job and in his ideals - and consequently in his love life. In brief, in *Muhsin Bey* Yavuz Turgul establishes a main character who struggles in three realms: his job, ideals and love.

In light of this, Turgul establishes the foregoing struggle in the choices he makes while mastering his *mise-en-scene* through the employment of some techniques which also determine the style of *Muhsin Bey*. In what follows, the techniques Turgul preferred in the organization of the film will be elaborated through specific examples.

I will begin with Turgul's choices of the employment of camera. Throughout *Muhsin Bey*, the camera moves economically; probably in order to mirror the maturity of the main character, Turgul in general prefers steady shots. However, tracking shots have a significant place in Turgul's style in organizing *Muhsin Bey* as a struggle movie. Track-in shots are used in the scenes in which Muhsin makes decisions, feels himself anxious about whether or not he will succeed in making Ali Nazik a famous Turkish folk singer, resists the idea that Ali Nazik must sing *Arabesk* songs to be a famous singer and feels excited when he thinks about the possibility of love between himself and Sevda Hanım. For instance, Turgul prefers two or three person track-in shots in such scenes as when Muhsin tells Afitap Hanım (a sick, mute and old woman staying at an asylum that Muhsin visits periodically in deference to her singing performances in the past) about his decision to be the manager of a young singer named Ali Nazik; when Ali Nazik repents that he should have sung an *Arabesk* song in his first performance to get the job at Muhsin's friend's nightclub (*gazino*) and Muhsin gets angry with and chases him; and when Muhsin is obliged to lie in Sevda's bed with her and Sevda compliments him.

Turgul also employs track-in movement in some shots beginning with a two or three-person frame and ending with Muhsin's close frame in the scenes where Muhsin and Sevda sit next to each other and Sevda shares Muhsin's excitement by holding his hand while waiting for the announcement of the results of the singing competition in which Ali Nazik has participated; when Muhsin borrows his friend's walkman in prison to listen to Ali Nazik's cassette which is released in Muhsin's prison days; and when Muhsin sleeps in the same bed with Sevda and her daughter and dreams that Sevda Hanım is singing the same song which Turgul employed in the opening shot of the film.

Apart from the abovementioned usages of the movement, Turgul, in the scenes which include turning points in Muhsin's struggle, employs one-person track-in shots of him, such as: when Muhsin does not listen to what Sevda says but just looks at her with admiration; when Muhsin lists what would he do if he succeeds in making Ali Nazik famous (the items of the list might be read as what Muhsin struggles for in his life); when Muhsin watches Ali Nazik during his first performance at his friend's nightclub, anxious over whether or not he will get the job; when Muhsin invites Sevda to the competition that Ali Nazik will participate in; when Muhsin explains to Ali Nazik that even though it is their last chance to make their dream of making his cassette real, they must stay true to their ethics; and when Muhsin watches Ali Nazik's performance of an *Arabesk* song at the nightclub of Muhsin's rival, Şakir.

Turgul also employs track-in movement in Ali Nazik's, Afitap Hanım's and Osman's one-person shots, but not in Sevda's. This might be read as Turgul locating Sevda not as a means but as an end of Muhsin's struggle. In light of this, Ali Nazik's track-in shots have a significance in the establishment of Muhsin's struggle when he lists what would he do if he becomes famous; when he fails in his first performance at Muhsin's friend's nightclub; when he looks Sevda up and down even though he knows Muhsin has feelings for her; when he suggests to Muhsin to spend the money they collected from others who have applied the competition arranged by Muhsin and Osman for recording his cassette; and when he sings an *Arabesk* song at Şakir's nightclub. Afitap Hanım's track-in shot is significant in that it emphasizes Muhsin's ideals and his thoughts about the old songs and singers. Osman is the other character that Turgul employs as a means in Muhsin's struggle, emphasizing his significance in the scene when Muhsin disparages the plan to organize an Arabesk music competition even though Osman states that it could be their salvation.

In addition to all these elaborations on Turgul's choice of employing moving camera, there is one tracking shot which emphasizes Muhsin's struggle the most: when the camera tracks all the participants of the singing competition one by one, and at the end of the movement

finds not Ali Nazik but rather Muhsin telling Ali Nazik that he will be the winner and they will be able to make the cassette a reality.

The other technique that Turgul prefers in establishing Muhsin as a struggling character is the employment of instrumental music over the one-person shots of the main character. For instance, in the shots where Muhsin does not pay attention to what Sevda says but just looks at her with admiration, a sentimental music is employed; when Muhsin tells Afitap Hanım through a long monologue why he prefers his job, has not married and loves Sevda Hanım, dolorous music is used; when Muhsin lists what would he do if he succeeds in making Ali Nazik a famous singer, the same dolorous music plays; when Muhsin waters his potted flowers the morning after he chased Ali Nazik, looks for Ali Nazik at the coffee house, asks Sevda if Ali Nazik told her where to go or not, dolorous music is again employed; when Muhsin teaches Ali Nazik how to use his body and mimics singing, cheerful music dominates the scene; when Muhsin invites Sevda to the competition that Ali Nazik will participate in, sentimental music is playing. The same dolorous music plays in the following scenes: when Muhsin watches Ali Nazik singing at the competition; when Muhsin asks Sevda to water his flowers and talk to them while he is in jail; when Muhsin sits in the courtyard of the prison and thinks; and when Muhsin looks at his now dead potted flowers.

The other technique Turgul employs is introducing the main character as a would-be struggling character at the beginning of the film through the use of some detail shots. Muhsin is introduced as a regular man who is woken up by an alarm clock, wears his slippers when he gets up from the bed, washes his face and has an elaborate breakfast with the detail shots of the clock, slippers, clean washbasin, and breakfast table full of honey, cheese, olives, tomatoes, bread, and eggs cooking in a pan. Turgul also employs some detail shots at almost the tenth minute to introduce Muhsin as someone who likes to drink *rakı* at dinner, likes to listen to Turkish art music, has a collection of records and grows potted flowers - one of which he has named after the woman he loves. Turgul prefers

employing these kinds of details to make the audience believe in Muhsin's struggle to not change his way of living, his ideals or his way of loving.

As was previously elaborated, Turgul employs songs with lyrics at the beginning of *Muhsin Bey* to establish Muhsin as a struggling character. In addition to this, in the second half of the film Muhsin plays another song[120]– which Ali Nazik considers boring – while watering his flowers, particularly the flower Sevda, which includes the lines "*ah these songs of my heart* (*ah bu gönül şarkıları*)." Through the song and Ali Nazik's feelings about it, Turgul once more emphasizes what Muhsin struggles for. Turgul also signals in this scene how Muhsin's struggle will be shaped in the future since the song continues over the track-in shot in which Ali Nazik looks Sevda up and down. Moreover, Turgul employs the same dream in which Sevda sings a song both at the beginning and at the end of the film; what changes between these two dreams is that Muhsin wakes up alone at the beginning but falls asleep in the same bed with Sevda at the end. Additionally, it should not be forgotten that Muhsin falls a sleep with a smile on his face even though the song describes a discontented life.

In addition to the aforementioned techniques, Turgul emphasizes certain locations to strengthen the persuasiveness of the main character's struggle. It can be stated that Turgul chooses four main locations to develop the three branches of Muhsin's struggle. Muhsin's house is the place where he struggles for love; the coffee house (*kahvehane*) is the place where he struggles for his job and ideals; the prison is the place where he struggles since he cannot compromise his principles; and the asylum is the place where his struggle for his love and ideals finds its illumination. Apart from these, Istanbul is the place which unites these struggles.

Parallel editing is also a technique that Turgul employs while developing Muhsin's struggle. In *Muhsin Bey*, Turgul prefers to present the scene in which Muhsin visits Afitap

[120] The folk songs that Ali Nazik sings throughout the film are not included in the analysis of songs with lyrics because they do not seem to reflect Muhsin's psychology.

Hanım and tells her that he will make Ali Nazik a famous folk music singer in parallel with the scene in which Şakir (Muhsin's rival) offers Ali Nazik a job, hoping he will leave Muhsin. In this way, Turgul compares and contrasts the morality and the principles of two kinds of manager and emphasizes once more the ideals for which Muhsin struggles.

The other technique Turgul employs in *Muhsin Bey* is to establish a main character that has some obsessions. The most evident of Muhsin's obsessions centers around his potted flowers. He talks to them, plays music for them and pays special attention to the one he has named Sevda. The time he spends with them is like a ritual for him. The night Muhsin cannot enter his home because of the risk that police may arrest him, he wonders about the fate of his flowers since he was not able to give them water for a couple of days. Additionally, in the scene when he decides to give himself up to the police, he commends them to Sevda's care because she is the one about whom the flowers know so much. Muhsin's the other obsession is Afitap Hanım, whom he treats in the same kind way that he treats his flowers. Even though Afitap Hanım is sick and mute, Muhsin treats her as if she understands and can answer him. Afitap Hanım has a big influence on Muhsin's life since he confesses that he chose his job and has not yet married because of her; he loves Sevda because the characters of two women resemble each other.

The last instance, though it may be wrong to define it as an 'obsession', is Muhsin's distinct habit of talking to himself. For instance, Muhsin talks to himself in the scenes when he learns that the landlord evicted them from the office he and Osman had been working in; when he sees Ali Nazik waiting for him in front of his apartment even though he was refused by Muhsin when he complains about Sevda to his flowers; when his tooth aches and he realizes that his analgesic is all gone ; and when he listens to Ali Nazik's cassette in prison. This habit could be read as the extension of his habit of talking to his flowers and Afitap Hanım since they cannot respond either.

Before completing the analysis of *Muhsin Bey*, it should be emphasized that Turgul has a technique of employing shadowy lighting and misty atmospheres (wherever Muhsin

struggles) probably to emphasize Muhsin's pessimistic attitude regarding his belief that he has achieved nothing in his job and personal life, and the growing ambivalence in his mind that whether or not he will be able to make Ali Nazik a famous folk singer. The locations where the abovementioned lighting technique is used are: Muhsin's home, the coffee house he temporarily uses as an office, the asylum where Afitap Hanım stays, Şakir's (the rival) office, his friend's (Arap Celal) nightclub where Ali Nazik failed to remember the lyrics of the song in his first performance, the place where the singing competition that Ali Nazik did not win took place, and Şakir's nightclub where Ali Nazik sings an *Arabesk* song at the end.

Up to now I have tried to suggest that Turgul is able to establish a style to tell Muhsin's story through the configuration of particular elements listed below:

1- Songs, one of which is employed in Muhsin's dream at the beginning to emphasize Muhsin's discontent of life, the other one is employed to emphasize the beginning of Muhsin's new struggle to succeed first in his job, his ideals and consequently in his love relation

2- Detail shots that introduce the main character at the beginning

3- Locations that function in the development of Muhsin's struggle (home, coffee house, prison and asylum)

4- Costumes that emphasize the characteristics of Muhsin (suit, tie, hat topcoat)

5- Objects (pot flowers) he protects during his struggle

6- Descriptive habit of the main character (talking to himself)

7- Camera movements: especially track-in shots to emphasize the crucial moments in Muhsin's struggle and a long tracking shot to emphasize his belief on his ideals

8- Musics employed over Muhsin's shots to emphasize the turning points in the film

9- The parallel editing by which Turgul once more emphasizes the ideals for which Muhsin struggles

10- Shadowy lighting and misty atmospheres wherever Muhsin struggles to emphasize his pessimistic attitude towards his past and recent failures in his job

11- Monologue in which Muhsin tells Afitap Hanım why he loved Turkish Art Music, chose that job, did not marry up to that time and loves Sevda Hanım (in fact this monologue explains Muhsin's struggle for his job, ideals and love)

Apart from the abovementioned configuration of techniques that Yavuz Turgul chooses and employs while mastering his *mise-en-scéne,* there are also some motifs he employs in *Muhsin Bey*'s narrative that support the occurrence of Turgul's style in making a struggle movie and recur in his *oeuvre*. These motifs are: (1) characters from the rural parts of Turkey: Ali Nazik from Urfa, Laz Nurettin has an accent of Black Sea region (Muhsin's blood brother), Abuzer has an accent of South-East region (Muhsin's friend who owns a nightclub); (2) a mute female character (Afitap Hanım); (3) a landlady (Muhsin's landlady Madam Agarmik); (4) swearing female characters living in tough conditions (Sevda, Madam Agarmik); (5) a character who resists the conditions s/he lives and wants to be a famous star (Ali Nazik, Sönmez Yıkılmaz – a stunt person who dreams of a leading role in a movie); (6) a buddy relationship between two male characters (Muhsin and Ali Nazik); (7) veterans of music (spending their time at the coffee house and waiting for a job); (8) a character that represents the minorities (Madam Agarmik); and (8) the city of Istanbul is actually the most significant motif that Turgul employs in the realization of Muhsin's struggle.

4.2.3 Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni / The Unforgettable Director of Love Movies (1990)

Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni is organized as a "struggle" of the main character; Haşmet, a film director who wants to be appreciated by intellectual film circles for once in his long directing career. His struggle is established upon the process of filmmaking in the late 1980s, considered to be the stagnant years of Turkish cinema sector. Haşmet aims to make a film which will be "new" both in its content and style and will ultimately provide him with prestige.

The beginning of the film sets up a character who tries first to be "new" himself by changing his outward appearance. Standing in front of the mirror in mixed close shots we see a character transforming into a man with a full beard wearing glasses, a neckerchief, white shirt, waistcoat, and smoking pipe. In the following scenes he shows himself off at the opera, an art exhibition, and a pub with his new (so-called "intellectual") appearance. He visits classical producers to make a deal concerning his "new" script, lying to one of them when he says that the famous actress Müjde Ar will star in the film. However, even though Haşmet insists on making the film in a completely "new" vision - from its content, lights, employment of camera, use of new actors and actresses, the circumstances that he is obliged to work in are outmoded. Thus, Haşmet seems to be struggling with the circumstances in every step of the filmmaking activity to complete his "new" film. However, his main struggle is to be appreciated in Turkish cinema circles through the possible future success of his "new" film and protect himself against being forgotten as just another ordinary director. Turgul evokes the aforementioned aspect of Haşmet's struggle (at approximately the twentieth minute) by employing a track-in movement in the close-up of Nihat, an old Yeşilçam actor and Haşmet's old friend. Nihat's close-up is the first with a track-in. Haşmet asks Nihat whether or not he gets bored at home watching the same old Yeşilçam films again and again behind curtains that never open. By the track-in movement that is employed in Nihat's answer, Turgul emphasizes Nihat's addiction to the past even though he knows that nobody will remember his past performances as an actor. In this way, through Nihat's case, Turgul is able to imply what Haşmet essentially struggles for, and ultimately narrates Haşmet's struggle through the pre-production, shooting and post-production steps of his "new" film.

Turgul establishes the foregoing struggle through the employment of some techniques which also determine the film's style. What follows is an elaboration of the techniques Turgul preferred in the configuration of the film. I will begin with Turgul's choices in the employment of camera. Throughout the film the camera moves in the scenes that are completed in single shots as well as moving in some close shots of the characters in ways which emphasize the struggle of the main character. Turgul's choice to employ single shots

while mastering his *mise-en-scéne* might be interpreted as a display of Haşmet's insistence that he complete his film in any way, i.e. without giving up, by struggling non-stop against every condition. For instance, Turgul employs a single shot in the scene when Haşmet shoots his first scene on his first day of shooting (Turgul's camera mediates between Haşmet's actors on stage and Haşmet and his crew on backstage by tracking movements); when Haşmet and Nihat sit close to each other[121] at Nihat's home and watch the film that Haşmet acted in but now cannot stand to watch anymore since it is outmoded, though Nihat defines the film as naive and *bona fide* (*iyi niyetli*); when Haşmet tries to persuade the crew[122] at the coffee house (located in *Yeşilçam* Street) that even though the producer has disappeared, he will find the money himself to pay the salaries of the crew and finish the film; when Haşmet's request for two boxes of film negative from another producer, Vahap, to be able to finish shooting his film is refused[123]; when Haşmet finishes shooting and while leaving the location, the director of photography, Hakkı, talks to him and praises his persistence to complete the film despite the difficult conditions[124]; when Haşmet talks to Nihat's turtle after stealing the copy of his film[125] (for the first screening) without permission of the post-production studio; and finally when Haşmet watches his film at a theatre among a few guests[126] – some sitting and some leaving the theatre.

[121] The shot begins with a high angle frame that captures the two above from their heads and makes a dolly movement to the angle that they look at the wall on which the images projecting.

[122] The shot begins with a wide high angle frame including the crew, when Haşmet enters the frame first a track-in than a dolly-down movement begin to emphasize Haşmet's persistence.

[123] The tracking begins with the close-up of film reels which Vahap carries and ends with Haşmet desperately leaving from Vahap's office.

[124] The dolly movement follows Haşmet – with a smile on his face – stepping down the stairs of the location and sitting next to Hakkı in the garden.

[125] The camera makes a dolly- up movement from the bottom of the stowed reels of his film to the turtle that stays on the top and then to Haşmet standing in front of the window and asking the turtle whether or not he did right by stealing the copy.

[126] The camera movement begins with a high angle wide frame in which some guests leave the theatre and tracks in to Haşmet's close-up frame in which he is anxious and frustrated.

Apart from the employment of moving camera in the single shot scenes, Turgul shows a preference for camera movements in the close shots of the main character. The first one can be seen at the very beginning of the film in which the camera tracks Haşmet's hands typing his script and makes a dolly-up movement to the close-up of Haşmet. The next one is a movement in which the camera tracks right in a close shot of Haşmet when he learns that the producer has withdrawn financing his film and disappeared. The third one is a track-in shot which begins with a two-person frame and ends in a close-up of Haşmet confessing to his main actress Jeyan that he lied to her about his educational background to impress her and wished to be a well-educated and cultured man even though he did not graduate from middle school. The fourth such shot Turgul uses to explain the roots of the main character's struggle in a long monologue with a track right movement in Haşmet's close-up shot to emphasize that what he actually struggles for in his life is to be appreciated and remembered by some circles and to get an award for once in his life, at least from the Cherry Festival (*Kiraz Festivali*). In Haşmet's last close shot, the track-in movement is employed in the final scene when he changes his mind about committing suicide and destroying the film negatives after receiving a telephone call from a producer who would like him to make a 'love movie'. This track-in suggests that Haşmet, as a director, will continue struggling with the outmoded conditions of filmmaking. However it seems ambivalent as to whether he will be successful in his main struggle to be appreciated and remembered by the circles he so admires.

In addition to the abovementioned instances of camera movements, Turgul also employs long tracking shots to introduce Haşmet together with his home and to emphasize the significance of Nihat in establishing Haşmet's struggle. Turgul, immediately after the shots in which Haşmet changes his outward appearance, locates a tracking shot to introduce Haşmet's home. The movement begins with the frame including portraits of some *Yeşilçam* actors and actresses hanging on the wall and goes on tracking the tidy, clean and lively room with some film posters on the walls, potted flowers by the windows, bookshelves near the worktable and ends in the frame where the "new" Haşmet writes his script. During *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni*, Haşmet makes some changes in the decoration of

his home and adds some accessories to impress his main actress Jeyan with his intellectualism. However, the way he chooses to be appreciated by people like Jeyan does not work (i.e. his fake style in his life and in his "new" film fails) and it becomes clear in the final scene that Haşmet will continue to struggle to be seen as an "unforgettable director of love movies." Turgul emphasizes this in the last tracking shot of the film, which begins with a close-up of Haşmet's feet leaving home, walking through the mass of film negatives and continues tracking the negatives, among which the baby turtles walk, and the portraits of *Yeşilçam* actors and actresses on the wall (which Haşmet took down and hid in the middle of the film to make Jeyan believe his fake style) and finally ends in a close-up of young Haşmet's portrait (Haşmet the "unforgettable director of the love movies").

Apart from the shots tracking Haşmet's home, Turgul also employs tracking movement in Nihat's home to emphasize his addiction to the old *Yeşilçam* cinema and in contrast, Haşmet's struggle to break away and become a "new" kind of director. For instance, Turgul introduces Nihat and his desolated home with a tracking movement which begins on Nihat's back, goes on towards the wall on which a film is projected and ends in a frame in which a smiling Nihat, with a drink in his hand and turtle on his knee, watches the film and recognizes that Haşmet is standing behind him. The other shot that displays Nihat's addiction to the past is the one in which the camera tracks some details (among which Haşmet looks for Nihat's turtle) such as photographs of some Turkish and foreign film stars, posters of some films, some film magazines and photo novels.

The other technique that Turgul uses to establish Haşmet as a struggling character is the employment of instrumental music over the one-person shots of the main character. For instance, in the first shot of the film while Haşmet makes some changes in his outside appearance in front of the mirror, funny music is employed; as Haşmet types his script, the same funny music is employed; when Haşmet explains his dream of success to Jeyan, dolorous music is employed; and when Haşmet changes his mind about committing suicide, the same funny music is employed.

In addition, in *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni*, Turgul employs one song with lyrics to emphasize Haşmet's struggle in the scene in which he confesses to Jeyan about his childhood, lack of formal education, future plans and the kind of people he emulates. It is a song in English with the following lyrics, "*The thousand dreams I dreamed, the splendid things I planned, I always built to last on weak and shifting sand; I lived by night and shunned the naked light of day and only now I see how the time run away*." In his choice of this song, Turgul once more emphasizes Haşmet's effort to gain prestige as a director, believing that without this recognition, he will have led an unsuccessful, meaningless life.

Introducing the main character with some detail shots is another technique Turgul uses consistently. For instance, apart from the first shot of the film in which Haşmet changes his appearance in front of the mirror, Turgul introduces him as an individual ashamed of his past and who wishes to be a "new" man by employing some detail shots in the scene in which Haşmet makes some changes at his home to impress Jeyan. He puts some new magazines (*Varlık*, *Görüş*, *Adam*, *Birikim*) on his worktable and some records (Richter, Bob Dylan, Vivaldi) on the floor, taking down the portraits of *Yeşilçam* stars to make room for some abstract art, and photos of Istanbul instead and hides his love stories, Kerime Nadir novels behind Gorki novels.

Turgul also uses Haşmet's costumes to strengthen the persuasiveness of the character's struggle. As it was previously stated, Haşmet at the beginning of the film, "remakes" himself as an intellectual director with round glasses, white shirt (sometimes a white sweater replaces it), black neckerchief, brown waistcoat and a pipe. Haşmet maintains his new look from the beginning to the end except in the scene when he wears a suit at the press cocktail of his film titled *Av ve Avcı* (The Hunted and the Hunter). Moreover, Turgul calls attention to Haşmet's beard five times in the film, explicitly noting that some characters think it looks good on him while on the other hand, one of the producers Haşmet visits thinks that it is not necessary to grow a beard to be the director of a good film.

Turgul also emphasizes particular locations at the beginning of the film to further clarify Haşmet's struggle such as an operahouse, an art exhibition, Ortaköy square, and a pub in which Haşmet hopes his new look will attract the attention of those he admires. The other location is emphasized only by a name-place reading *Cumhuriyet Gazetesi* in the sequence in which Haşmet delivers invitations to the first screening of his film. Turgul also employs a coffee house to display Haşmet's dependence on his past even though he insists on making something "new". In the scenes located in the coffee house, Haşmet plays games with veteran Yeşilçam actors and talks about his new film with them; he learns from them that Nihat has been having a hard time; and it is in the coffee house that he tries to persuade his crew that he will find the money to pay their salaries. Haşmet, despite trying to break with his past, cannot give up going to the coffee house. In addition, the most significant locations which display the contrast between Haşmet's past and the film's contemporary time are Haşmet's and Nihat's homes.

The other technique Turgul employs in *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni* is to establish a main character with some obsessions. The most evident obsession is Haşmet's habit of touching his neckerchief with his left hand when he feels anxious, sad, or excited. Turgul employs the habit at the moments when Haşmet explains to a producer that he no longer wants to shoot films for music stars; when he refuses veteran actors' request for an advance on their salary; when he listens to some friends' discredit Nihat; when he listens to Nihat speak about his nostalgia for old friends; when he recounts the synopsis of his film to Müjde Ar while offering the main role to her; when he explains to the veteran actors that he won't be able to find roles for them in his "new" film; when Müjde Ar tells Haşmet on the phone that she refuses his offer; when Nihat tells Haşmet that God may not be capable of everything after overhearing Haşmet's prayer to God on his first day of shooting; when Haşmet tells the crew that since Nihat is dead, the character Nihat played in the film will also die; when Haşmet learns that his producer has disappeared without finishing the film; when Jeyan asks Haşmet whether or not he got angry with her when she refused to do the dialogues he had written for her character; and when the director of photography, Hakkı, praises Haşmet's insistence in finishing the film.

Another obsession might be Haşmet's habit of talking to Nihat's pet turtle in moments of despair. Haşmet talks to the turtle when it becomes impossible for him to find money for finishing the film; when he waits for a telephone call from Jeyan; when he cannot find any way out since the studio will not give him the copy of his film; when he questions whether or not he has done the right thing by stealing the copy from the studio; and when he drinks too much alcohol and prepares to commit suicide after the failure of his film.

Turgul's other method of increasing the persuasiveness of Haşmet's struggle is to make the other characters vocalize their real thoughts about Haşmet or Haşmet's struggle behind his back. For instance, when Haşmet gets angry and leaves the office of the first producer he visits, the producer says "growing a beard cannot help you to make this film"; while scouting for the location, Haşmet insists in his conversation with his director of photography that he prefers the "new" style of lighting that is employed in television commercials and Hakkı says immediately after Haşmet leaves that "all the things you demand need money to become true my man; your producer cannot even buy himself underpants"; when Haşmet's producer learns that Müjde Ar won't act in the film and expresses his anxiety about the future risk of box-office failure, Haşmet tells him not to worry about it since the 'period of stars' has ended and the 'period of directors' has started. At the moment when Haşmet leaves the office, the producer says after him "period of directors? I wonder which director is this?" It is also used when Haşmet demands a fog machine from the production manager and states that since his film is a serious film not a sex one, he needs such equipments immediately and the production manager says while walking away from Haşmet "we did not forget that you directed sex films with a pseudonym, but you became a so-called social-realist director now."

Before ending the analysis of *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni*, it should be emphasized that Turgul has a technique of employing shadowy lighting and misty atmospheres in the locations of Haşmet struggle probably to emphasize Haşmet's anxious mood (which is rooted in his lack of self-confidence, his emulation of intellectual circles and his shame of his past) and the growing uncertainty regarding whether he will

accomplish his film. The locations where the abovementioned technique are employed are: his home, the offices of some producers he visits, the coffee house where he meets his old friends from *Yeşilçam* and talks to his crew into not leaving the film, Nihat's home where he encounters with his past, his shooting location, and the tavern (*meyhane*) where he and Nihat remember their past experiences in *Yeşilçam* and talk about their perceptions of the past, present and future.

Based on my analysis, Turgul establishes a style to tell Haşmet's story through the configuration of particular elements listed below:

1- Song which is employed in the scene Haşmet confronts with the realities of his past while confessing them to the girl he likes

2- Detail shots that introduces the main character and the place he lives

3- Locations that function in the development of Haşmet's struggle (an operahouse, an art exhibition, *Ortaköy* square, a pub, *Cumhuriyet Gazetesi*) and also in explaining his struggle (Haşmet's home, Nihat's home and the coffee house)

4- Costumes and physical appearance which are emphasized to provide persuasiveness to Haşmet's struggle since they display his insistence in being "new" from the beginning to the end of the film

5- Descriptive habits of the main character (touching his neckerchief with his left hand and talking to the turtle)

6- Objects that emphasize the characteristics of Haşmet (the portraits of Yeşilçam actors and actresses, the books of Kerime Nadir)

7- Camera movements: especially in single shot scenes and track-in shots to emphasize the crucial moments and Haşmet's insistence in his struggle and a long tracking shot to introduce the places significant in his struggle (Haşmet's home, Nihat's home)

8- Music employed over Haşmet's shots to emphasize the turning points in his struggle

9- Shadowy lighting and misty atmospheres in the locations where Haşmet confronts his past and feels anxious about whether or not he will ever truly be "new"

10- Monologue in which Haşmet confesses to Jeyan what he actually struggles for in his life

Apart from the abovementioned configuration of techniques that Yavuz Turgul chooses while mastering his *mise-en-scéne*, there are also some motifs he employs in *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni*'s narrative that support the occurrence of Turgul's style in making a struggle movie and recur in his *oeuvre*. These motifs are: (1) a landlady (the landlady of the house where Haşmet shoots his film, Betül); (2) swearing female characters living in tough conditions (Haşmet's daughter from his first marriage and his former wife, Hilkat); (3) a character who resists the conditions in which s/he lives and wants to be a famous star (Haşmet's former wife Hilkat who blames Haşmet for preventing her from being a famous actress and states that she still acts in front of a mirror); (4) a buddy relationship between two male characters (Haşmet and Nihat); (5) veterans of cinema (spending their times at the coffee house and waiting for a job); (6) a character that represents the minorities (Nubar, a veteran *Yeşilçam* actor waiting for a job at the coffee house); and (7) the city of Istanbul.

4.2.4 Gölge Oyunu / Shadowplay (1992)

Gölge Oyunu is organized as a common "struggle" of Abidin and Mahmut, outmoded comedians working at nightclubs, circumcision feasts (*sünnet düğünü*) who have been living together for a long time. Although their struggle is essentially established on dealing with economic hardship, it diverges at the point of their individual cases. Abidin has difficulty dealing with loneliness, while Mahmut has a problem in his relations with women. Their divergent struggles develop through the emergence of a mute and deaf girl named Kumru (whose name means 'Turtledove') and her existence has also an economical aspect in relation to their common struggle. Mahmut struggles to keep Kumru secure while Abidin struggles to maintain his partnership with Mahmut, since his friend's affection for Kumru is a potential risk which could destroy it. However, Abidin also cares that Kumru does not cost him his job, because her absence would cause him to owe their boss a large sum of money since the boss once made a deal with a grifter man, paid much money to him to be able to hire Kumru as a hostess at his nightclub without the knowledge of her muteness and deafness and then could not get his money back.

The beginning of the film sets up two main characters who are introduced by the narrator of the film (the musicians of the nightclub where Abidin and Mahmut work) as "unsuccessful comedians working at a shitty place." The nightclub is introduced and Abidin and Mahmut are presented doing their first performances in the film, singing the song they wrote themselves: "*when I entered the market in the morning, it seemed very dark to me, the prices are at full speed, of of rises, sweet fats are guilty, millionaires repeat the wage minimum, poor people are hungry, of of rises, sweet fats are guilty*".[127] That the film begins with this song and the following scenes, in which Abidin and Mahmut are questioned about their debts owed to their landlady and their boss, indicates an early emphasis of financial struggle. Along with such an emphasis, Turgul establishes his film on the ground of Abidin's and Mahmut's personal struggles to deal with anxieties rooted in their respective pasts and which are both conveniently located in Kumru. In brief, even though *Gölge Oyunu* seems to be organized around the divergent struggles of two main characters, Turgul establishes their struggle as 'common' on the basis of their financial interdependencies and on the basis of Kumru, since the existence of the girl is defined as Abidin and Mahmut's common 'dream' of which the other characters are not aware.

Turgul establishes the foregoing struggle while mastering his *mise-en-scene* through the employment of some techniques which also determine the film's style. To begin, I will use examples from the film to elaborate Turgul's choices in the employment of camera. Throughout the film, tracking shots have a significant place in Turgul's style in organizing *Gölge Oyunu* as a struggle movie. He explains the roots of the main characters' struggle through long monologues in track-in shots of scenes when Mahmut talks to Kumru about his childhood experience which made him unable to have relationships with women; when Abidin talks to Kumru about his old love named Mari whose picture he tattooed on his arm when he was in the navy; and when Abidin explains his fear of being alone in connection with his childhood memories of maternal abandonment.

[127] The original Turkish lyrics of the song are: *Sabah girdim markete, kapkara geldi bana, fiyatlar dolu dizgin, of of zam zamlar, yaktı da bizi tontonlar, yaktı da bizi şişmanlar. Asgari ücret dedi milyonelerler kümesi, fakirler açız dedi, of of zam zamlar, yaktı da bizi tontonlar, yaktı da bizi şişmanlar.*

Turgul also prefers to use two or more person tracking shots in the scenes in which Kumru gives a new direction to their struggle through some mysterious event. For instance, Turgul employs track-in shots in the scenes when Abidin and Mahmut see Kumru at *Rüya* nightclub for the first time and Mahmut, probably for the first time in his life, shows a reaction concerning a woman when he sees the boss hitting Kumru; when Abidin and Mahmut watch Kumru miraculously heal a bird that had been injured by a cat; when Abidin and Mahmut are shocked to realize that nobody remembers Kumru at *Rüya* nightclub and question whether or not they themselves met Kumru in a shared dream. In addition, Turgul emphasizes the development in Mahmut's struggle to achieve decent relationships with women and to enjoy life by using a close tracking shot of Mahmut in which the camera tracks right from Abidin's back when Abidin is surprised at Mahmut's unexpected suggestion that they go for a short trip to the countryside of Istanbul with Kumru and drink wine.

Turgul uses one-person tracking shots for Kumru to emphasize her significance in the development of the main characters' struggle. For instance, track-in movement is used in the scenes when Kumru tries to explain to Abidin and Mahmut (by pretending to be a woman giving birth to a child) that the woman in the photograph is her mother and when Mahmut understands what she tries to tell, he decides to find her mother (Abidin resists Mahmut's decision and fights with him in the following scenes because according to Abidin they should first find some money to live on); when Kumru looks at Mahmut as if she understands him when he tells her that they are always broke; when Kumru looks at Mahmut as if she understands him when he tells her about his childhood; and Turgul also employs a close shot for Kumru with a track right in the scene when the news of Abidin's suicide is received by a telephone call by Mehtap, the woman that Abidin impregnated, and Kumru shows anxiety.

Turgul chooses to introduce *Rüya* nightclub, where the main characters work and some of the people they work with at the beginning of the film with a long tracking shot ending at Abidin and Mahmut's performance in which they sing a song complaining about inflation,

high prices and low salaries. In addition, Turgul employs another long tracking shot in the scene when Abidin and Mahmut sit at the bar while Abidin annoys a woman by his obscene offers, in contrast to Mahmut, who sits alone and does not disturb anybody. At the end of the shot Kumru comes in the nightclub. In another tracking shot Mahmut asks everybody at the nightclub whether or not they saw Kumru but everyone he talks to ask "who is Kumru?"

Turgul also employs a narrator and a detail shot to introduce the main characters at the beginning of the film. The film starts with a shot in which some musicians first introduce themselves as the narrators of the main characters' story, and then introduce the nightclub where main characters work. At that point, the narrator's shot ends but dialogue of the narrator continues over the shots of the street *Rüya* nightclub is located, introducing the main characters as "the outmoded comedians who were not good at their jobs, Mahmut and Abidin. Mahmut was a nice guy but Abidin was a mean guy, a thief, a liar, and the one who could not be trusted." After that, Turgul employs a detail dolly down shot while Mahmut and Abidin sing, beginning with a close-up frame of the nightclub's name plate "*Rüya Pavyon*" and ends in the close-up frame of the board on which Abidin and Mahmut's photographs and a poster of their act "*Modern Komikler: Karabiberler"* (Modern Comedians: Black peppers) are hung.

The other technique Turgul prefers in establishing the main characters in their struggle is to employ music over the shots of the key character, Kumru, to emphasize the effect of her existence on the development of the main characters' struggle. For instance, in the shot when Kumru heals an injured bird (this is the first time that Abidin and Mahmut recognize her mysterious features), mysterious music plays; when Kumru makes a shadow play with her hand on the wall unaware of Mahmut watching her, the same mysterious music plays. When Kumru tries to explain to Abidin and Mahmut that the woman in the photograph is her mother, dolorous music plays; when Kumru behaves anxiously while Mehtap is relaying the news of Abidin's suicide, mysterious music is employed.

Employing a song with lyrics to strengthen the persuasiveness of the common struggle of the main characters is another technique Turgul employs in the organization of *Gölge Oyunu* as a struggle movie. As was previously emphasized by the song the main characters sing at their comedy show performance at the beginning of the film, Turgul primarily locates Abidin and Mahmut's struggle as one of a financial nature, and throughout the narrative of the film Turgul emphasizes this in a number of other ways. One of them is the employment of the main characters' dialogues heard over the shots of the key character. In this manner, Turgul prefers to employ some of the main characters' dialogue about their economical problems over Kumru's shots even though she cannot hear them. For example, when Kumru first enters Abidin and Mahmut's home, while she stands in front of the window, their discussion about what would happen if their landlady finds out that a girl is staying with them and then evicts them from the house can be heard over Kumru's shot; also, one can hear Abidin and Mahmut argue about the effort needed to maintain their standard of living over a shot of Kumru lying on Abidin's bed; and while Abidin and Mahmut visit a photographer to ask for an extra job, their discussion about the lack of extra jobs can be heard over a shot of Kumru looking at the photographs on the wall. The same technique is used one can hear Abidin and Mahmut talk about the death of their landlady and the possibility that her descendents will evict them because of their accumulated debts over a shot of Kumru making a shadow play with *Karagöz* and *Hacivat* (Punch and Judy characters) on the wall; and in the scene when Abidin and Mahmut argue about Mahmut's insistence on finding Kumru's mother instead of a solution to their lack of money and their homelessness, their dialogue can be heard over a shot of Kumru counting the money she has hidden. By employing this technique, Turgul emphasizes that Kumru's existence causes some extra problems for them in their common struggle to maintain their lives. However, at the end of the film, it is revealed in the narrator's explanation that Kumru's involvement ultimately causes the main characters to fail in their common (economic) struggle, but on the other hand, causes them to succeed in their individual struggles: Mahmut overcomes his problem with women and Abidin overcomes his fear of losing Mahmut's partnership.

In addition to these techniques, Turgul uses meaningful locations that play important roles in the development of the main characters' struggle. For instance, the house is presented as a risky place since Abidin and Mahmut have not paid rent for a couple of months, have been staying there with a girl, and the landlady has died; the prison is presented as the place where Kumru's mother (because of whom Abidin and Mahmut fight each other) stays and where the mystery about Kumru and her mother is first questioned by Abidin and Mahmut; a coffee house is used to emphasize Abidin and Mahmut's homelessness where they rest and drink hot tea after a long night they had outside on the hills of Istanbul, and is the place where they quarrel and leave each other for the first time in their lives; the nightclub is presented as the only place Abidin and Mahmut can work because of their debts to the boss who has made them promise to keep an eye on Kumru. The nightclub, whose name is the Turkish word for 'dream' is also presented as a mysterious place: even though Abidin and Mahmut met Kumru there, nobody at the club remembers her. It may also be seen as a dream place both with regard to the things experienced there concerning Kumru and to the implication inherent in its name.

Turgul also employs other indicative details and motifs to emphasize the mystery in Abidin and Mahmut's struggle. For instance, there is an alienating character at *Rüya* nightclub, a client (Cevat Çapan)[128] who tells a story about how he fought with the terrorists to one of the hostesses of the club, and then the same client in another scene tells the same hostess that he is a professor, and when he was fired from the university, he was arrested and he continued working as a journalist. In another scene, the same client tells yet another story to the same hostess about how he is the most famous agha (*ağa*) of the *Çukurova* region. With this character, Turgul draws attention to the strangeness of the nightclub and encourages his audience to consider its effect on the main characters' struggle, which develops through meeting Kumru there. Turgul also draws attention to the strangeness of the place by means of a close-up detail shot of the Polaroid photograph which at first includes Kumru, then transforms into a photograph which does not include her after the employment of a superposition effect. In addition, Turgul employs turtledoves (*kumru*) – waiting by

[128] Cevat Çapan is a well-known writer, poet and interpreter in Turkey.

Mahmut's side when he wakes up alone in the morning after he made love with Kumru – to indicate that Mahmut won't see Kumru any more. He also employs a magician just before the end of the film as an indicative motif that suggests there is no sure distinction between what is real and what is not in Abidin and Mahmut's struggle.

Apart from all these, Turgul employs shadowy lighting and misty atmospheres in *Gölge Oyunu* to emphasize mysterious events in the main characters' struggle, especially in Abidin and Mahmut's home while Kumru and Mahmut make shadow plays on the wall; in the prison scene in which Kumru is reunited with her mother; in the scenes when Kumru and Mahmut make love at *Rüya* nightclub, and Mahmut wakes up alone with turtledoves waiting by his side instead of Kumru; and in the narrator's shots (which have big shadows of the musicians on the wall) to emphasize that the story they tell about Abidin and Mahmut is not real, that it is just a shadow play.

I have tried to show that Turgul establishes a style telling Abidin and Mahmut's story through the configuration of particular elements listed below:

1- Song which is employed at the beginning of the film to emphasize the main characters' economical hardship

2- Narrator that introduces the main characters and the place they work verbally

3- Detail shots that introduce the main characters and the place they work visually

4- Locations that function in the development of the main characters' struggle (home, prison, coffee house, night club)

5- Camera movements (especially track-in shots of long monologues and long tracking shots to present the nightclub as a mysterious (dream) place)

6- Music which plays over the key character since the actions she causes determine the turning points in the film

7- Object (Polaroid photograph) which makes the main characters' struggle both real and not

8- Shadowy lighting and misty atmospheres in some locations to emphasize mysterious events in the course of the main characters' struggle

9- Monologues in which Abidin tells Mahmut about why he has been so scared of being lonely and Mahmut tells Kumru why his relationships with women have been problematic (these monologues explain Abidin and Mahmut's common struggle that develops through the existence of Kumru)

Apart from the abovementioned configuration of techniques that Yavuz Turgul chooses and employs while mastering his *mise-en-scéne,* there are also some motifs he employs in *Gölge Oyunu*'s narrative that support his style in making a struggle movie and recur in his *oeuvre*. These motifs are: (1) a character from the rural parts of Turkey (after the fight between Abidin and Mahmut, Abidin denies working with Mahmut and finds a new partner who speaks with an eastern accent); (2) a mute female character (Kumru); (3) a landlady (*Büyük Hanım*, Abidin and Mahmut's landlady); (4) swearing female characters living in tough conditions (Mehtap and the other hostesses working at *Rüya* nightclub); (5) a character who resists the conditions in which s/he lives and wants to be famous (Abidin dreams to make a comedy show on television); (6) a buddy relationship between two male characters (Abidin and Mahmut); (7) a character that represents the minorities (the jeweler whose shop Abidin plans to rob); (8) birds flap and fly when the landlady passes away and birds wait by Mahmut's side when he wakes up alone in the morning after he made love with Kumru; (9) Cevat Çapan: a client of *Rüya* night club; and (10) the city of Istanbul is actually the most significant motif that Turgul employs in the realization of Abidin and Mahmut's struggle.

4.2.5 Eşkıya / The Bandit (1996)

In analyzing *Eşkıya*'s narrative, I found the film to be organized around the "struggle" of the main character; Baran, a bandit from the 1960s who, after his best friend's betrayal and the theft of his beloved Keje, had been in prison for thirty-five years. Baran's struggle is established on his aim of getting the revenge for the years lost behind the bars and spent without his beloved Keje. However, a character named Cumali – whom Baran met on the road to find his enemy – gives a new direction to his struggle. Even though Baran has the

opportunity to take his revenge and get his beloved back from his enemy, he chooses instead to help Cumali, who is in a big trouble since he deals drugs on behalf of a drug lord.

The opening text of the film conveys that Baran is the only member of a group of bandits arrested thirty-five years ago at Cudi Mountain still alive. Having established this knowledge, Tulgul uses a shot of Baran leaving the prison in Viranşehir, to emphasize that Baran has an important errand to do after his long imprisonment. In the following scene, the lyrics of a folk music song accompanying shots of Baran traveling on a minibus, draw attention to the dangerous floods of Fırat River, and also prepares the coming scene in which Baran sees that his village has been annihilated by the flood. In this scene, Turgul employs another song that tells the story of two lovers separated because of the brutality of the Fırat River, invoking the idea that Baran left behind a beloved when he was arrested and cannot find her in the destroyed and deserted village. In line with this, the following scene supports the foregoing idea by use of another folk song that conveys the deep yearning of a lover. However, in the scene, Baran finds the man (Mustafa) who betrayed him to the police on the order of Baran's best friend, Berfo, and learns from the man that Keje had not left the village; unfortunately she was forced to marry with Berfo and went to Istanbul with him. At this point, Baran is presented as a character whose struggle will be established upon revenge. However, Turgul organizes *Eşkıya* as a movie depicting a more complex struggle: Baran not only struggles for himself, but also for another character, Cumali. When Cumali gets into trouble, Baran's struggle transforms in a way established by his loyalty to Cumali. The remainder of the narrative will be analyzed through these two paths of Baran's struggle.

Turgul establishes the foregoing struggle in the choices he makes while mastering his *mise-en-scene* through the employment of the same techniques which also determine *Eşkıya*'s style. The techniques Turgul preferred in the configuration of the film will be examined through a number of examples. First of all, it may be better to elaborate Turgul's choices of the employment of camera. Throughout the film Turgul employs track-in shots for Baran to emphasize his struggle, and for some other characters to draw attention to their significance

in Baran's struggle. Especially in Cumali's shots some tracking movements are used to display how his story changes the route of Baran's struggle. In addition to these, some movements made by steady cam and dolly are also used to emphasize Baran's struggle.

In this manner, each close track-in shot of Baran is used to indicate a turning point in his struggle. For instance, Turgul employs this technique in the scenes when Baran first sees Mustafa, and when Baran first learns that Keje went to Istanbul with Berfo; it is also used when Berfo tells Baran that he is ready to go to hell because of the horrible things he did to have Keje and asks Baran "what about him?" and when Berfo tells Baran that he would not relinquish Keje even though she has not said a single word and nor has she given him a child to him in thirty-five years. This technique is used in the scene when Baran intends to ask Keje for the money to pay Cumali's debt to the drug lord and save his life, and when Baran tells Keje that he will not give up loving her till the day he dies; it is also used when Baran tells Cumali (by preserving his loyalty to him) while he is dying that in fact he will not die, he will be reincarnated and perhaps they will meet again; and finally, it is used as Baran watches the fireworks with a fascination and feels himself ready to die.

Turgul also employs two or three-person track-in shots of Baran when he explains to Cumali why he is in Istanbul and how intent he is on reaching his aim; when he tells the story of 'Baran the bandit' to the kid that stays at his hotel and in this way explains the roots of his struggle to get revenge; when he is in the lobby with two other characters and sees Berfo (his enemy) for the first time on television; and lastly, when he learns that the drug lord will kill Cumali if he does not pay the money he owes.

Turgul employs a steady cam shot to Baran during the scene in which he spins around himself on the roof of the hotel, desperately calling out Keje's name since he has not been able to find her even though he looked at all the faces he saw on the streets. In addition to this scene, Turgul employs track-in movements to the close shots of the other significant characters in the organization of Baran's struggle. For instance, some close track-in shots are employed in the scenes when Mustafa tells him how Berfo betrayed him and took Keje,

and when Berfo tells Baran that he did all the horrible things because of his love for Keje and thus it can not be thought of as a betrayal but rather of him trying to follow his heart; and finally in the scene when Keje tells Baran that she will not speak until he comes back.

Apart from these, there are some track-in shots in which Cumali's actions and decisions have an important role in changing the route of Baran's struggle. For instance, Turgul employs two or more person track-in shots in the scenes when Cumali explains his decision to work for Demircan (the drug lord) to his three friends; when Cumali tells Demircan that he and his friends are at his service; when Cumali, through a long monologue, tells Baran that his father killed both his step-mother and her lover when he learned of her betrayal (a forerunner scene to Cumali's murder); and when Cumali understands that he is about to die and Baran tries to calm him. Turgul also employs close track left shot to Cumali during the scene in which he learns from the mother of the girl (Emel) he loves that she left home with the man (Sedat) who Emel had introduced as her brother and for whom Cumali had stolen from Demircan to provide the money to save him from prison; and during a close track-in shot to Cumali in the scene that he catches Emel and Sedat red-handed. When Cumali first decides to find the money to save Emel's "brother" (Sedat) from prison (Cumali's most important decision in the film since it gives a new direction to Baran's struggle) Turgul employs a single steady cam shot.

The other technique Turgul prefers to use in organizing Baran's struggle is the employment of instrumental music over the one-person shots of the main character. For instance, dolorous music plays in the shots during which Baran looks around on a hill on the way his village after a thirty-five-year imprisonment and when Baran explains to Keje that he stand the bad conditions of prison thanks to his belief to meet her again; mystical music plays in the scene depicting Baran as he is fascinated by the landscape seen from the roof of the hotel and feels himself on Cudi Mountain, and when Baran spins around himself and calling Keje's name on the roof of the hotel; sad music is used as Baran looks desperately at the sea, unable to find Keje, and when Baran wakes up on the roof in the final sequence

and does not know what to do if the police arrest him again; thrilling music is employed when Baran sees Berfo on television.

In addition to the employment of the instrumental music over the one person shots of Baran, Turgul also uses some songs with significant lyrics in parallel with the establishment of his character's struggle. As previously emphasized, the first song in the film is sung by a local man travelling on the same minibus with Baran on the way to his village. The song functions as a forerunner of the following scene by its lyrics describing the brutality of the Fırat River. Then Baran sees that while he was in prison his village was annihilated by the flooding of Fırat. In this scene Turgul employs another folk song (*Fırat Türküsü*), which is a cry of a man whose beloved is taken by Fırat. At this point, Turgul emphasizes the possibility that Baran has left a beloved behind and cannot find her in the deserted village. However, in the following scene, in which Turgul employs another song performed by a local singer where Baran finds Mustafa, first, Baran's yearning for his beloved is emphasized by the song and then Baran gets the news that his beloved was taken to Istanbul. Turgul uses *Fırat Türküsü* again in the final scene, when Baran understands that he will die and won't see Keje again. Apart from these, in the scene in which Cumali tries to sell drugs at a bar, Turgul employs a song sung by the musicians of the bar with the lyrics "*Is it easy to live? Is it easy to fight? Is it easy to cry?*" to emphasize Cumali's desperation.

Aside from his use of camera movements and music, Turgul employs a black screen (narrator) on which the main character is introduced first by a written text as "the only one still alive among a group of bandits who were arrested thirty-five years ago at *Cudi* Mountain." Then, Turgul employs a middle wide shot to depict the opening door of *Viranşehir* prison, through which a man in local dress comes out with a small wooden suitcase in his hand. In this way, Turgul emphasizes that the man leaving the prison is the main character of *Eşkıya* and he has a very important thing to do in his life since he is the only one of his group to have survived.

Turgul's way of establishing the main character's struggle can also be explained through his use of costume. Turgul emphasizes Baran's insistence in his struggle by having him wear the same costume throughout the film. The costume is used to represent Baran's past, and Turgul presents the maintenance of the old values Baran protects in his struggle (struggle for revenge and paying the debt of his loyalty to Cumali) by the employment of only one costume for Baran.

Moreover, Turgul displays Baran's insistence in protecting the old values that give direction to his struggle with an emphasis on certain locations. For instance, he makes Baran leave the prison, brings him to Istanbul and establishes a resemblance between the roof of Baran's hotel and *Cudi* Mountain. The resemblance might have been established to emphasize the similarity between Baran's current desire to find Keje and his previous motivation to be with his love in his days on *Cudi* Mountain. The shot in which Baran spins around and calls out "Keje, Keje" on the roof is the one that most points to this resemblance. Turgul also locates the second crucial scene of the film (the first one being the one in which Cumali decides to find the money for Emel's "brother") in a coffee house in which Cumali recounts his decision to work on behalf of Demircan (drug lord) to his three friends. This decision, as I have previously mentioned, is important because it changes the route of Baran's struggle.

The other technique Turgul employs to add persuasiveness to Baran's struggle is putting an emphasis on a *muska* (good-luck charm) Baran wears around his neck. The *muska* is given to Baran by an old woman living alone in the ruined village to protect him from bullets in his struggle for revenge. However, even though Baran is not hurt, he fails in his struggle to save Cumali's life and get Keje back from Berfo. Therefore, he dies in the final scene not because he lost his *muska*, but because he choses death over returning to prision.

In addition, Turgul employs shadowy lighting and misty atmospheres in the two locations most significant in Baran's struggle. One of them is Berfo's house, in which Baran first confronts his enemy, listens to Berfo recount his betrayal, and then kills him since he

continued betraying Baran by giving a bounced check even though Baran promised that he won't try to get Keje back. In relation to the negative effect of Berfo's house on Baran's psychology, Turgul prefers to use shadowy lighting. The other location in which Turgul employs the same style of lighting is the interrogation room of a prison in which Baran and Cumali are interrogated by police officers about their attempt to enter Berfo's house. This is the other significant scene to understand the negative effect of a thirty-five years imprisonment on Baran's psychology and why he is so insistent on getting his revenge since he shows intensively in the scene that he cannot stand being arrested again.

What has been examined in this section is that Turgul establishes a style telling Baran's story through the configuration of particular elements listed below:

1- Songs which are employed in the first nine minutes of *Eşkıya* to emphasize the brutality of the region, particularly brutality of Fırat River since it flooded Baran's village and especially to emphasize Baran's yearning of his beloved

2- Narrator (written text on the black screen) which introduces the main character at the beginning

3- Locations that function in the development of Baran's struggle (prison, Istanbul, the roof of the hotel, the coffee house)

4- Costume that displays the maintenance of the old values Baran protects in his struggle

5- Object that Baran identifies with during his struggle (*muska*)

6- Camera movements (especially track-in movements in long monologues and trackings of steady cam to establish a resemblance between the roof and *Cudi* Mountain) to emphasize the crucial moments in Baran's struggle and to emphasize Cumali's actions which become also the turning points in Baran's struggle

7- Music employed over Baran's shots to emphasize the turning points in his struggle

8- Shadowy lighting and misty atmospheres to indicate locations which have negative effects on Baran's physchology about the betrayal and the thirty-five years long imprisonment.

9- Monologue in which Cumali tells Baran why he does not try to be a good man (Turgul employs it as the forerunner explanation for why Cumali puts his life in danger and thus, gives a new direction to Baran's struggle.

Apart from the abovementioned configuration of techniques that Yavuz Turgul chooses and employs while mastering his *mise-en-scéne,* there are also some motifs he employs in *Eşkıya*'s narrative that support Turgul's style in making a struggle movie and recur in his *oeuvre*. These motifs are: (1) characters from the rural parts of Turkey (Baran, Keje, Berfo from Urfa, Cumali's father is an immigrant from Adana); (2) a mute female character (Keje); (3) a female character which is established as the protector of the ruins of the village (Ceren Ana); (4) swearing female characters living in tough conditions (Emel, Emel's mother, the prostitute staying at Baran's hotel); (5) a buddy relationship between two male characters (Baran and Cumali); (6) a veteran of cinema (Actor Kemal staying at the same hotel with Baran); (7) a character that represents the minorities (Andre Mışkin, old man staying at the same hotel with Baran; (8) a bird flies when Cumali dies; (9) Cevat Çapan: a man on the street who gets angry with Baran since he looks around through binoculars; and (10) the city of Istanbul is actually the most significant motif that Turgul employs in the realization of Baran's struggle.

4.2.6 Gönül Yarası / Lovelorn (2005)

Gönül Yarası is organized as a "struggle" of the main character, Nazım, a retired primary school teacher who returns to his home in Istanbul after his fifteen-year service at a village school in the Southeast region of Turkey. Nazım's struggle starts in connection with the process of constructing a new life in Istanbul, and is particularly established upon ensuring the safety of a young woman named Dünya and her daughter Melek, who are hiding in Nazım's home from Dünya's former husband Halil.

In the first nine minutes of *Gönül Yarası*, Turgul identifies three characters. The first is an old teacher[129] who declares to his students that he is retiring and it is his last day at the school and the village. The second is a young woman, Dünya, looking for a job at a nightclub as a singer and denies working as a hostess. The last is a young man who gets a telephone call while working at a gas station and decides to go to Istanbul. Immediately after the presentation of these three characters, Turgul employs a song that is sung by Dünya to draw attention to the possibility that Dünya will play an important role in teacher's struggle. The song starts in the shot where Dünya sings at the nightclub and continues over shots of the teacher packing his bags, and returns to Dünya sitting with some clients as a hostess, then leaving the nightclub, taking a taxi and refusing the driver's insistent invitation for a drink. Returning to the hotel, Dünya enters the room where her daughter sleeps with a baby-sitter; Dünya wakes the sitter and lies down beside her little girl as the song finishes. The song tells about a seperation of two lovers and the male lover complains about not getting any news from his beloved. In the following scene, while the teacher wakes up on the day he will leave the village, in parallel the young man gets on a bus in Midyat and the teacher says farewell to the inhabitants of the village; the young man sleeps on the bus as the teacher leaves the village on a donkey and sad music plays. Then, along with the sad music, a narrator begins, the teacher tells about the things he has experienced in that village as his journey progresses from donkey to bus; he concludes the narration by saying that even though he thought while leaving the village that nothing new would happen in his life, life had in fact managed to surprise him. By the narrator's end, the teacher is established as a would-be struggling character, as the audience wonders what kind of surprise is waiting for him.

The surprise develops through Dünya and her daughter's entrance into the teacher now called Nazım's new life in which he rents a house and starts working as a taxi driver in Istanbul. By intersecting Nazım's life with Dünya's, Turgul establishes Nazım's struggle on two grounds: first in his daily life when he invites them into his house to hide from

[129] Turgul does not employ the teacher's name until he arrives initially at his old friend's coffee house in Istanbul.

Dünya's abusive former husband, and secondly in Nazım's emotional life as he struggles with his intense feelings about Dünya and forces himself to behave as if he were her older brother or father.

In light of this, Turgul establishes the two foregoing struggle through the choices he makes while mastering his *mise-en-scene* through the employment of some techniques which also determine *Gönül Yarası*'s style. These will now be discussed through various examples from the film. Firstly, it should be stated that *Gönül Yarası* is a film that, in addition to the main character's stuggle, includes the struggles of two other characters, Dünya and Halil. Interestingly, Turgul uses the two secondary struggles to further establish the main character's struggle. Thus, the film includes several camera movements used to emphasize the different aspects of the foregoing three struggles. However, I will focus on the ones which are significant in explaining Nazım's general struggle to construct a new life in Istanbul and particularly his physical and mental struggles that took their departures from Dünya's existence in his life.

It may be useful to start with the elaboration of the track-in movements used in the close shots of the main character and which seem to be significant in establishing Nazım as a struggling character. For instance, Turgul choses some crucial moments to employ track-in movements, such as in the scenes when for the first time Nazım waits for Dünya in front of her hotel to transport her to the nightclub, and the first time he watches Dünya while singing at the nightclub. It is also used in the following scenes: when Dünya asks Nazım for help; when Halil tells Nazım that Dünya considers him as her father; when for the first time he reacts harshly to Dünya's insistence that she'd better go on working at nightclubs and find another place to stay; when for the first time he goes to a *Türkü Bar* (a kind of bar that organizes live Turkish folk music performances) without Dünya and listens to a folk song about the impossibility of reaching a beloved when snowy high mountains do not let the lover pass beyond; when he receives a telephone call from Dünya asking him to go to Mardin and rescue her from Halil; when he calls Dünya to tell her that he has arrived and is

waiting for her at Midyat bus station; and when Dünya sings a song while looking at Nazım's face at the bus station just before Halil shoots her in the head.

Turgul also employs some two person track-in shots in which Nazım has to make a decision, an explanation or when he shares a significant moment with Dünya. Two person track-in shots are used in the scenes when Nazım tells his best friend Takoz Atakan that he accepts his offer to work as the driver of his taxi at night, and when Nazım and Dünya talk to each other for the first time while eating something on the way from Dünya's hotel to the nightclub. Track-in movement is also used in the following scenes: when Nazım does not know what to do when the doctor says he may take Dünya home after she is injured by Halil; when Nazım explains to Takoz Atakan that he helps Dünya because it is the right thing to do and gets angry when Atakan asks him whether he is in love with her and tells him that Dünya is not an appropriate partner for him; when Nazım gets worried when Atakan tells him that Halil was at the coffee house and talked him about Dünya; when Nazım celebrates Dünya's birthday at a *Türkü Bar* and gives her a red carnation; when Halil tells Nazım that he is the only one who can solve the problem between himself and Dünya; when Nazım notices Dünya and her daughter leaving home –while he is making some preparations for welcoming the man who wants to marry with Nazım's daughter – and requests from Dünya to wait for him to talk at the park; and Nazım tries to convince Dünya not to leave his home and not to work at nightclubs any more. Apart from these, in the scene when Dünya and her daughter get on a bus with Halil to return home, Turgul uses a shot to Nazım which starts with a close track-in and continues with a track left movement ending in a frame from Nazım's back as he watches the bus leave.

Turgul employs track-in movements to Dünya's shots to locate her as the source of Nazım's struggle. The instances can be picked up from the following scenes: when Dünya resists the group of rude taxi drivers to take Nazım's taxi; when Dünya and her daughter sit down in front of the hospital since they have nowhere to go; when Dünya first asks Nazım for help at the hospital; when Dünya takes the water Nazım pours into the glass and takes her pill while resting in Nazım's home; when Dünya cries after Nazım's son Mehmet

accuses her of being an opportunist; when Dünya and her daughter sit down on a bench and Dünya cries while waiting for Nazım at the park; and when Dünya is singing a song while looking at Nazım's face at the bus station, before her husband shoots her.

Turgul also employs a track-in movement (using a jimmy-jib) in Dünya and Melek's wide shot (at the balcony of Nazım's home) in which Dünya describes her ideal man to Melek as gracious, kind-hearted and brave (Turgul inserts Nazım's close shot in the midst of this description to emphasize Dünya's feelings for him). In addition, in the scene when Dünya and Melek leave Istanbul with Halil, while getting on the bus, Dünya looks at Nazım and at that moment Turgul employs a track-in movement to Dünya to emphasize her sadness at the separation and continues the shot by a pan to capture Nazım walking away from the bus without looking back.

Moreover, Turgul uses track-in shots to distinguish the characters that effect the direction of Nazım's struggle. For instance, in the scene when Nazım first watches Dünya singing at the nightclub, before Halil starts the fight, Turgul employs a fast track-in movement to Halil to emphasize his potential to hurt Dünya (who is in fact injured by Halil in this scene, which is the precipitating event that causes Nazım to take Dünya and Melek into his home). In the scene when Nazım is not home and Mehmet talks to Dünya while waiting for his father, Turgul employs a track-in movement to Mehmet as he accuses Dünya of being an opportunist, after which Dünya decides to leave Nazım's home and find another nightclub job, a decision which forces Nazım to persuade her to return to her home since Halil promised him not to harm her any more.

The other technique Turgul uses in establishing Nazım's struggle is the employment of instrumental music over the one-person shots of the main character. For instance, in the scene when Nazım returns to Samatya (his hometown) after fifteen years and looks around with a smile on his face, Turgul employs joyful music to emphasize the new beginning in Nazım's life; in the scene when Nazım first takes Dünya to her hotel, when Dünya gets out of the taxi, Nazım looks at the rearview mirror and catches himself smiling, Turgul

employs rapturous music to emphasize the beginning of Nazım's mental struggle; when Dünya becomes jealous of Nazım and tells him that the pharmacist woman tries to convince him he is sick just to spend more time with him, Turgul employs sentimental music over Nazım's close-up to emphasize his awareness of Dünya's jealousy; when Nazım's daughter tells him that Dünya is too young for him, Turgul employs bitter music to emphasize Nazım's struggle; and when Nazım's son angrily accuses him of protecting Dünya more than he protected his own children, Turgul employs bitter music to emphasize Nazım's dilemma.

In addition to the employment of instrumental music, Turgul also uses some songs with lyrics which strengthen the persuasiveness of the main character's struggle. The first song employed in *Gönül Yarası* is the one which Dünya sings in her first performance at the nightclub. Essentially, not because of its lyrics but by its function in the editing, the song serves as a portent of Nazım's future struggle with regard to Dünya since the song starts in the close-up shot Dünya as sings it at the nightclub, and continues over the shots of Nazım packing his bags to leave the village, of Dünya being exposed to the bad treatment of a taxi driver, and ends with the shot of Dünya lying beside her daughter in the hotel room. It seems to summarize what will happen in the rest of the movie: the teacher will come to Istanbul where the singing woman stays; he will start working as a night-time taxi driver and will become obsessed with trying to protect the woman. At the point in the song where it describes the sorrow of a man separated from his beloved, may be read as the harbinger of Nazım's future sorrow when he loses Dünya. The other song Turgul features in the film is the Kurdish one which Dünya and Nazım listen to at the *Türkü Bar*. Even though Dünya does not understand the meaning of the lyrics of the song, she cries while listening to it and then Nazım translates the lyrics for her: "*you are the fig of the mountains, you are the beauty of the mountains, you are a fig tree, you are the one who sweeps away all the sorrows, and you are between the roses*" - lyrics which emphasize Nazım's intense feelings for Dünya. However, although Turgul does not make Nazım explicitly dedicate the lines to Dünya, he makes Nazım mention them as a translation of a Kurdish song to better display Nazım's mental struggle which prevents him from expressing his feelings to Dünya.

Turgul also employs another song which starts in the shot when Dünya returns the red carnation to Nazım as she prepares to leave Istanbul with Halil, and continues over shots of Nazım crying while hanging the picture Melek made and the carnation Dünya returned on the wall, of him as he sits silently in the coffee house, as he drives the taxi in a bad mood, drinks alcohol and listens to folk singer Neşet Ertaş who sings the song at the *Türkü Bar,* and as he looks at the photographs and letters from his students at the village. The song speaks of the impossibility of reaching a beloved when snowy high mountains do not let the lover pass, emphasizing the impossibility of Nazım being reunited with Dünya. The last song Turgul employs in the film is the one which Dünya sings as she looks at Nazım, who has come once more at her request to try to save her from her abusive husband. The song, with line that "*everybody should bow to their fates*", further emphasizes the impossibility of a reunion between Nazım and Dünya, and ultimately brings Nazım's struggle to a close when Halil recognizes that Dünya is singing the song not for him but for Nazım and shoots her in the head.

In addition to the use of these songs, Turgul also strengthens the persuasiveness of the main character's struggle by introducing Nazım with some detail shots used in conjunction with the song Dünya sings in her first performance at the nightclub. From the detail shots (in which Nazım packs, gathering the letters of his students in a box, the books of left-wing Turkish writers and the classics of some foreign writers from the shelf, the pictures of his students from the wall, a photograph of him with his son and daughter, and his grandfather's congressional medal) Turgul establishes the main character as a leftist and idealistic teacher, a characterization which explains why Nazım struggles to ensure the safety of a woman like Dünya and why he struggles not to express his feelings about her. Turgul also emphasizes Nazım as the main character by employing him as the narrator of the film and as a struggling character through his words as a narrator.

Moreover, Turgul organizes *Gönül Yarası* as a struggle movie by locating two more characters at the beginning of the film who are also about to enter new situations. In parallel with the teacher's decision to retire and start a new life away from the village he

has lived in for fifteen years, Turgul locates a woman who has just been given a job at a nightclub in Istanbul and a man who has just decided to go to Istanbul after getting the news that the person he is looking for has been seen there. In using this technique, Turgul prepares the ground for these individuals' connection to Nazım's struggle.

Turgul also emphasizes the importance of locations to strengthen the development and the persuasiveness of Nazım's struggle, the most evident of which is the employment of *Türkü Bar* in *Gönül Yarası'*s narrative. Turgul presents *Türkü Bar* as Dünya's ideal place to work since she considers it as a decent and civilized place; he further emphasizes its significance in determining the characteristic of the relationship between Dünya and Nazım in two scenes. In the first *Türkü Bar* scene, Nazım celebrates Dünya's birthday and gives her a red carnation without expressing his feelings. However, Turgul reveals the feelings Nazım tries to hide through the lyrics of the song he translates for Dünya in the first scene and by the lyrics of the other song he listens to alone in the second *Türkü Bar* scene. Clearly, in the organization of *Gönül Yarası*'s narrative, Turgul employs *Türkü Bar* as the most significant place for Nazım to endure his longing for Dünya and to remember the sweet memories they shared there.

Turgul also uses some special objects to emphasize Nazım's struggle with regard to Dünya. Even though he never expresses his feelings for Dünya, he keeps them alive by preserving the red carnation Dünya gives him while leaving Istanbul in the company of her former husband. Turgul locates two close-up shots of the red carnation in the scenes when he cries while hanging it on the wall together with the picture Melek made, and he goes on working as a taxi driver after the death of Dünya with the red carnation hung on the rearview mirror of the taxi. Turgul also helps Nazım endure the hard times during his struggle over Dünya by establishing him in a bound relationship with the photographs and the letters of his students. From the beginning of the film, Turgul emphasizes the photographs through detail shots employed in the scenes when Nazım packs his bags on his last night at the village; when he empties the bags on his first day in Istanbul; when he draws consolation from

them and the letters the students sent from the village after Dünya leaves Istanbul and when she dies.

From the preceding analysis, it seems clear that Turgul establishes a style with which to tell Nazım's story by the configuration of particular elements listed below:

1- Songs: one of which is employed at almost the ninth minute to introduce Nazım's struggle regarding his relationship with Dünya (physical and mental) and the other of which is at the end of the film brings Dünya's death

2- Location that is employed as the most significant place for Nazım to endure the longing of Dünya and remember the sweet memories they shared there (*Türkü Bar*)

3- Costume by which Turgul emphasizes the characteristics of Nazım (suit, shirt, classical trousers, hat)

4- Detail shots that introduce Nazım as the main character

5- Objects that Nazım overprotects to endure his struggle (red carnation, letters and photographs of students)

6- Narrator that establishes Nazım as a struggling main character

7- Camera movements (especially track-in movements and steady cam) to emphasize the crucial moments in Nazım's struggle and Dünya's and Halil's actions which become the turning points in Nazım's struggle and introduce Nazım's home (long tracking shot)

8- Musics employed over Nazım's shots to emphasize the internal turning points in his struggle

9- Monologue in which Nazım confesses to his daughter why he has been that kind of father (this monologue emphasizes Nazım's worldview and explains why he helps a woman like Dünya)

Apart from the abovementioned configuration of techniques that Yavuz Turgul chooses and employs while mastering his *mise-en-scéne*, there are also some motifs he employs in *Gönül Yarası*'s narrative that support the occurrence of Turgul's style in making a struggle movie and recur in his *oeuvre*. These motifs are: (1) characters from the rural parts of Turkey (Dünya and Halil from Mardin); (2) a mute female character (Dünya's daughter

Melek); (3) a landlady (Nazım hires the house of Madam Agarmi who died a month before Nazım's arrival in Istanbul); (4) a swearing female character living in tough conditions (Dünya); (5) a character who resists the conditions in which s/he lives and wants to work at decent places as a singer (Dünya dreams of working at a *Türkü Bar* as a singer); (6) a buddy relationship between two male characters (Nazım and Takoz Atakan); (7) veterans of music (Neşet Ertaş); (8) a character that represents minorities (Madam Agarmi); (9) birds flap and settle (when Halil begs Dünya not to leave him before killing her); (10) the coffee house where Nazım meets his best childhood friends; (11) the city of Istanbul is actually the most significant motif that Turgul employs in the realization of Nazım's struggle.

4.2.7 Av Mevsimi / The Hunting Season (2010)

In analyzing *Av Mevsimi*'s narrative, I found that the film is organized as a "struggle" of the main character, Ferman, an experienced homicide detective who takes on a new case in the company of two other detectives. Ferman struggles to solve the murder though the other detectives do not focus sufficiently on the case and the heads of the department constantly try to restrain his investigation of the case. His struggle is established on his desire to find the murderer of a teenage girl named Pamuk, thereby preserving the reputation that earned him the nickname "hunter".[130]

Av Mevsimi opens with a single shot in which the camera tracks over the river accompanied by a girl's narration, and ends in a close-up frame of a dead arm in the river. Immediately after this, a competent homicide detective is seen training the rookie detectives about the methods involved in solving murders. In the following scene, one of the heads of the homicide department puts the old detective (Ferman) and a younger one (İdris) in charge of the case of a severed arm found in a river flowing in a forest. These two detectives take one of the rookies (Hasan) to the crime scene and begin the investigation. Ferman scouts the area alone, looking around suspiciously and Turgul follows him in a close-up track-in shot.

[130] Turgul also uses the hunter and hunted relationship in *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni* as the name of Haşmet's film "The Hunted and the Hunter".

By employing the dead girl's (Pamuk) narration over Ferman's close track-in shot (at almost eleventh minute) with the lines "I am dispersed, I am destroyed," Turgul indicates that Ferman will be the one to solve the murder, and the entire film will be organized around his struggle to solve the case. However, since İdris's death is instrumental in leading Ferman to the murderer, Turgul also places a great deal of significance on İdris's personal struggle (about his former wife) that prepares his death. Thus, in what follows, of the analysis will elaborate on both Ferman's struggle and on some crucial moments in İdris's struggle.

Turgul establishes the foregoing struggle through the employment of some techniques which also determine *Av Mevsimi*'s style. The techniques Turgul uses in the configuration of the film will be elaborated through examples from the film. This analysis will begin by elaborating Turgul's choices of the employment of camera. Although he employs several camera movements throughout the film, Turgul seems to favor track-in movements to the main character and some supporting characters to emphasize the points that add a new dimension to Ferman's struggle. The use track-in movements for Ferman can be seen when he reports to his chiefs about the probable description of the dead person whose arm is being inspected at medical jurisprudence; when he learns from Pamuk's friend that her former lover once threatened her when she refused to sell drugs on his behalf; when he listens to Battal's (Pamuk's husband, a famous businessman approximately fifty years older than his wife) speech at a university[131]; when he sees Pamuk's mother hitting her husband and shouting at him that he is guilty of Pamuk's death because he let Battal marry Pamuk; when he asks Battal whether he knows why Pamuk's former lover might have been killed by Pamuk's brother; when he reprehends his two young colleagues for their insufficient focus on the case and lack of assistance in his struggle to bring Battal to a stalemate (at this point Ferman suspects Battal of hiring somebody to kill Pamuk since he conceives of the case as the revenge of a cuckolded husband); when, while examining the security camera footage, he recognizes that İdris tried to send him a message before dying in Battal's study;

[131] Turgul employs a track-in movement to Ferman in a shot over which can be heard Battal's speech about the essence of life and being hunters and victims in life.

as he stares at the board with only Battal's and Pamuk's names on it and ponders over how to close the case; when he confesses to Battal that he acknowledges Battal's ability to mislead the police until İdris manages to warn Ferman and change his view about the case; when he tells Battal that the murder has been solved (in a close shot with a track right movement); when he asks Battal whether the deaths he had caused lay heavy on his conscience; and finally when he tells Battal that he has no traces of regret on his face for all the evil things he did, even though it was done in an effort to save his daughter's life.

In addition to the moments that the camera tracks in to Ferman, Turgul also employs track-in movements in some two or three-person shots such as when Ferman tells his wife that he failed to close Pamuk's case; when he learns from Battal's former wife that Battal's daughter is a kidney patient; and when he hears the gunshot of Battal commtiting suicide and tells Hasan that hunting season is over. Turgul also uses a track-in shot which starts with a two-person frame and ends in the close one-person frame of Battal in the scene when Battal tells Ferman that he is aware that Ferman's questions about the death of Pamuk's former lover are a ruse to cause Battal to slip up and give himself away.

Turgul also uses track-in movements to some supporting characters in order to emphasize points in the narrative that give new direction to Ferman's struggle. For instance, Turgul employs a track-in shot of Pamuk's father when he tells Ferman that Pamuk was married to an old man; of Pamuk's mother when she tells Ferman that all the members of their family, including Pamuk, were ordered by Battal to give samples of their blood; of the head of the homicide department when he tells Ferman and the chiefs that they have to be careful during the investigation of Pamuk's murder because a famous businessman, Battal Çolakzade, is involved in the case; and finally of the doctor when he tells Ferman that the clue he is looking for is in his computer.

Turgul also employs track-in movements to some details or objects to emphasize their significance in the development of the main character's struggle. In *Av Mevsimi*, this technique is used to emphasize the traces of a shoe and a car tire Ferman recognizes at the

crime scene; the severed arm during Ferman inspection of it; Pamuk's criminal record file as Hasan brings it to the department; the computer screen on which one can see a web-page dedicated to information regarding Battal Çolakzade; a blackboard in Ferman's office on which is written the two names, Battal and Pamuk; and finally, a zoom-in to the screen of the doctor's computer on which Pamuk's donor information is available.

Turgul also employs track-in shots for İdris to establish his personal struggle in his ailing relationship with his former wife (Asiye) to the extent that his obsession with her prepares his death which is a turning point in Ferman's struggle to close the case. Significant instances can be found in the scenes when İdris sees Asiye's boss flirting with Asiye at work; when he sees the boss leaving Asiye's apartment; when Asiye tells İdris that, despite having made love to him recently, it is impossible for her to return to him; when he drinks like a fish at a bar as he over-identifies with the lyrics of the song being performed; when he talks to himself immediately after Hasan gets angry and leaves him alone at the bar about how he has fallen into that position after the severed arm was found; when he asks his mother to sing the folk song named "Asiye"; when he apologizes to Ferman for having been distracted from the case; when he tells Battal that he has nothing to lose since Asiye refused him, forcing Battal to confess his motive for killing the girl; when he tries to breath after being shot by Battal's guard; and when he tries to give a message to Ferman through Battal's security camera by imitating a key gesture of Ferman's to communicate that a homicide detective should always investigate a case by different point of views. Turgul also employs a two-person track-in shot in which Battal tells İdris that if he confesses, it cannot be used as evidence in court and İdris answers that the important thing is for Ferman to learn the truth.

In addition to camera movements, Turgul also employs music over the one-person shots of the main character to emphasize the crucial moments in Ferman's struggle to find Pamuk's murderer. For instance, in the shot when Ferman scouts alone at the crime scene, mysterious music is employed; mysterious music plays in the scene when he finds the footprint and identifies a car tyre at the crime scene, and when he looks around in the

kitchen of Pamuk's parents' home; when he looks for clues in Pamuk's room, sorrowful music accompanies his search; when he recognizes İdris's message in the security camera footage, sorrowful music is employed; as he stares at the two names on the blackboard, intense and stressful music emphasizes Ferman's curiosity.

In addition to the instrumental accompaniment, Turgul also employs two songs to express the emotional depths of İdris's struggle. One of the songs can be found in the scene when İdris is drinking at the bar and has an intense emotional reaction to the lyrics "*In fact, it is not as what you know, I am very jealous of you, do not mind me my love, I can not be a decent man in this life (benden adam olmaz), I can not act my way out of a paper bag (kendime hayrım yoktur), I cannot be a decent man in this life*". Idris identifies deeply with lyrics since they are a repetition of what Asiye had told him earlier. It is his anger towards Asiye, intensified by the emotional song and the alcohol, that cause İdris to decide to force Battal to confess his guilt, allowing him a chance to redeem himself to Ferman. However, his death was the most significant step in the investigation of the case, which Turgul emphasizes by employing another song as he is dying. The song featured at this point is one which İdris sang to his colleagues at a retirement dinner in a former scene; its emotional resonance is tied to its expression of İdris's the last dream. In the shot, over which İdris sings "come on, let's go" song, his colleagues (including Ferman) one by one stand up and clap as if they are congratulating him and bidding farewell to him. At this point it is significant that Turgul does not include Asiye in this "farewell party." Rather, Turgul employs İdris's colleagues in the shot and the song he sang to them to emphasize the significance of his death in solving the case.

Another technique Turgul prefers is that of introducing Ferman by employing the voice of his kidney patient wife over the pages of the notebook he is reading that she prepared for her husband to use in case of her absence. This voiceover emphasizes that Ferman is a man who cannot look after himself, is oblivious, and pays no mind to anything unrelated to his job. In addition, at the beginning of the film, by introducing the main character as a specialist with a motto and a characteristic gesture, Turgul establishes Ferman as an

experienced detective used to training rookies. Turgul makes Ferman and İdris reiterate Ferman's motto and the gesture a couple of times over the course of the case. One instance is in the scene when Ferman warns İdris that his irritable behavior bothers the heads of the department and İdris explains that he has become suspicious about the fidelity of his wife ever since Ferman taught him to change his point of view. Another is in the scene in which Ferman and İdris give a report of the case to their chiefs and Ferman challenges their insistence that Pamuk's former lover and two brothers as the possible murderers. Ferman suggests that they may be the murderers, but also they might be manipulated by Battal to kill Pamuk. The most significant instance is in the scene when İdris tries to imitate Ferman's gesture just before his death to suggest that Ferman change his view about Battal's reason for killing Pamuk. The last instance is in the scene when Ferman tells Battal that he solved the murder by changing his point of view.

The other technique Turgul prefers in organizing *Av Mevsimi* as the struggle of the main character is the employment of an external narrator in the form of the murder victim. In the film, Pamuk narrates and Ferman's struggle is given additional depth by the lines she speaks over the shots tracking over a river until it finds her severed arm. Her narration is also used when Ferman scouts alone at the crime scene and looks around; when the forensic specialist examines the severed arm; when Ferman looks around in the kitchen and in Pamuk's room at her parents' home; and in some shots of the final sequence in which Battal's daughter dies, Pamuk's parents bury her body, İdris's family visits his grave, Ferman and his wife watch television and Hasan tries to get rid of the smell of Pamuk's corpse by washing his hand repeatedly in the shower. By employing Pamuk's voiceover these shots, Turgul emphasizes her innocence and her right to justice to explain why Ferman struggles so much to find her murderer; and he also emphasizes what consequences of her death occurred during Ferman's struggle.

Moreover, Turgul emphasizes the importance of locations such as Pamuk's parents' house and especially her room by employing some tracking and detail shots. Turgul prefers to emphasize the details (such as how Pamuk had lived with her family) not only by the

employment of the camera and Pamuk's voiceover, but also by his choice of music and the employment of shadowy lighting. Turgul foregrounds shadowy lighting, especially in Pamuk's room, not only by tracking some objects Pamuk identified with, but also by tracking their shadows on the wall. By foregrounding shadows while conveying Pamuk's emotional world along with her voiceover, Turgul also points at the dark side of her case concealed behind shadows. Turgul also employs shadowy lighting in the open office shared by Ferman, İdris, Hasan and the other detectives to emphasize that the other detectives' insufficient focus and his bosses' warning to tread lightly where Battal Çolakzade is concerned leaves Ferman to struggle alone to solve the murder .

Up to now I have shown that Turgul establishes a style through which to tell Ferman's story by the configuration of some particular elements listed below:

1- Songs, one of which is employed to emphasize what prepared İdris's beyond control decisions and his death

2- Location (Pamuk's parents' home) used to display the conditions Pamuk lived and to clarify why she was forced to marry Battal

3- Introducing the main character through voiceover

4- Narrator through which Turgul emphasizes Pamuk's innocence as a way to explain Ferman's struggle to find her murderer

5- Camera movements (especially track-in movements and trackings of steady cam) to emphasize the crucial moments in Ferman's struggle and to emphasize those of İdris's actions which become the turning points in Ferman's struggle

6- Music employed over Ferman's shots to emphasize the turning points in his struggle

7- Descriptive gesture and a motto to further characterize the main character

8- Shadowy lighting to point out the dark side of Pamuk's case concealed behind shadows

9- Monologue in which İdris tells Battal why he came to his mansion (this monologue increases İdris's tension and brings his death)

Apart from the configuration of techniques that Yavuz Turgul chooses and employs while mastering his *mise-en-scéne,* there are also some motifs he employs in *Av Zamanı*'s

narrative that support the occurrence of Turgul's style in making a struggle movie and recur in his *oeuvre*. These motifs are: (1) characters from the rural parts of Turkey (Battal and Pamuk's family is from Adana, İdris and his family is from Trabzon); (2) a mute female character (Battal's daughter Ceylan); (3) a character who resists the conditions she lives and wants to live independent from her family (Pamuk); (4) a buddy relationship between two male characters (Ferman and İdris); (5) veteran homicide detectives (Mustafa, who retires and some of his colleagues); (6) birds flap and fly when Battal shoots himself; (7) the coffee house in which veteran detectives are presented; and (8) Cevat Çapan: an academician at the university that Battal makes a speech; and (9) the city of Istanbul is actually the most significant motif that Turgul employs in the realization of Ferman's struggle.

4.3 THE COMPONENTS OF YAVUZ TURGUL'S STYLE

Soon after the overall analysis of Turgul's *oeuvre*, it should initially be stated that the scripts of the seven films Turgul directed are written by him and it default brings the coherence along. Apart from the recurring themes in his scripts, the coherence in his style reveals by the employment of recurring techniques and motifs to emphasize particular moments. Turgul organizes his films upon the struggles of his main characters[132] by the employment of some particular techniques which are listed below.

1) The most evident technique is the employment of songs with lyrics in the first fifteen minutes of his films. The songs are used to introduce the struggling main characters' moods, thoughts or feelings. The following is a descriptive list of the songs features in each film: Fahriye- *Fahriye Abla*, Everything is the Same / *Hep Aynı Şey*; Muhsin- My Life is Full of Weeping and Groaning/*Ağlamakla İnlemekle Ömrüm Gelip Geçiyor*, I am a Vagabond since My Dreams Have Been Passed By / *Hayal İçinde Akıp Geçti Ömrüm Derbederim*; Abidin and Mahmut- Sweet Fats Are Guilty / *Yaktı da Bizi Tontonlar, Yaktı*

[132] In six of his seven films, the main characters are portrayed by the same actor: Şener Şen. In *Gölge Oyunu*, Şener Şen shared the main role with Şevket Altuğ and in *Fahriye Abla* Müjde Ar plays the main character.

da Bizi Şişmanlar; Baran- Song for Fırat / *Fırat Türküsü*, Let Me Be Burned By Your Longing / *Nice Bu Hasret-i Dildar ile Giryan Olayım*; and Nazım- Separation is an Arrow of Fire / *Ayrılık Ateşten Bir Ok*. In addition, Turgul attaches songs to the supporting characters in order to emphasize their significance in the main characters' struggles. These include Ali Nazik- Ah These Songs of My Heart / *Ah Bu Gönül Şarkıları*; Cumali-In the Midst of Darkness / *Karanlığın Ortasında*; Dünya- Fig Tree / *İncir Ağacısın*/*Hejira Çiyaye*; and İdris- I Can't Be a Man / *Benden Adam Olmaz*, Come On / *Hayde*.

2) Turgul employs detail shots to explain psychological aspects of his main characters such as: Fahriye's accessories, dresses, photo-plays, potted flowers; Muhsin's morning routine (clock, slippers, breakfast table) and evening routines (a glass of *Rakı*, Turkish Art Music records, record player, potted flowers); Haşmet's collection of the portraits of *Yeşilçam* actors and actresses, books, music cassettes, typewriter; Abidin and Mahmut's stage name, *Modern Komikler: Karabiberler*, and their photographs on the board; and Nazım's books, photographs of his students, a photo of him with his son and daughter, his grandfather's congressional medal and the pictures his students drew.

3) Turgul also employs narrators to establish his main characters or their struggles. The most characteristic of there narrators are: Fahriye Abla song (poem) in *Fahriye Abla*; the musicians of the *Rüya* Nightclub in *Gölge Oyunu*; the black screen with a written text in *Eşkıya*; Nazım's voice in *Gönül Yarası*; Pamuk's voice in *Av Mevsimi*.

4) Turgul incorporates special objects that his main characters identify with into his narratives of the main characters' struggles, such as: Fahriye- Mustafa's photograph; Muhsin- potted flowers; Abidin and Mahmut- the Polaroid photograph taken at *Rüya* Nightclub (in which only Abidin and Mahmut could see Kumru); Baran- the protective *muska* given to him by an old woman in the ruins of his village; Nazım- the red carnation he gives to Dünya and the photographs and letters of his students. These objects serve as psychological references to the reasons that provide the maintenance of main characters' struggles.

5) Turgul creates multi-faceted main characters by giving them peculiar habits, such as: Fahriye plays with her hair; Muhsin talks to himself and talks to his potted flowers; Haşmet touches his neckerchief; Ferman has a special gesture in accordance with his motto "change your point of view".

6) Turgul uses themed locations throughout his *oeuvre*, such as: 'prison' in *Fahriye Abla*, *Muhsin Bey*, *Gölge Oyunu*, *Eşkıya*; 'coffee house' in *Fahriye Abla*, *Muhsin Bey*, *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni*, *Gölge Oyunu*, *Eşkıya, Gönül Yarası*, *Av Mevsimi*; 'nightclub' in *Fahriye Abla*, *Muhsin Bey*, *Gölge Oyunu*, *Gönül Yarası*; 'bar' in *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni*, *Eşkıya, Gönül Yarası*, *Av Mevsimi*; 'Beyoğlu' in *Muhsin Bey*, *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni*, *Gölge Oyunu*, *Eşkıya, Gönül Yarası*, *Av Mevsimi*; "Istanbul" is the main location of Turgul's *oeuvre*.

7) Turgul puts costumes to use while establishing his main characters' struggles, such as in *Aşk Filmlerinin Unutulmaz Yönetmeni* and *Eşkıya,* Haşmet and Baran wear only one costume from the beginning to the end to emphasize how insistent they are during their struggles; and in *Muhsin Bey*, *Gönül Yarası* and *Av Mevsimi*, Muhsin, Nazım and Ferman wear suits and ties since they are the characters which have similar principles in their jobs and lives.

8) Turgul employs camera movements throughout his *oeuvre* to emphasize specific points. He uses 'track-in movements' to emphasize the secret feelings of Muhsin and Nazım about Sevda Hanım and Dünya respectively; to emphasize the efforts of Baran and Nazım to protect Cumali and Dünya; to emphasize Muhsin's, Haşmet's and Ferman's efforts to succeed in their jobs; to emphasize Abidin and Mahmut's, Baran's and Ferman's efforts to find Kumru's mother, Keje and Pamuk's murderer, respectively; to emphasize how the pasts of the main characters influence their current struggles in the scenes when Muhsin talks to Afitap Hanım at the asylum, Haşmet talks to Jeyan at his home and on the balcony of the restaurant, Abidin talks to Mahmut at the hospital and Mahmut talks to Kumru at home, Baran talks to the kid and Cumali at the roof of the hotel, Nazım talks to his daughter

at the bank where she works; and to emphasize how the pasts of supporting characters effect the main character's struggle, such as in the scenes when Mustafa talks to his father at the coffee house, Cumali talks to Baran on the roof, Dünya talks to Nazım in the park, İdris talks to Hasan and Ferman at the pub and İdris talks to Battal at the latter's mansion.

In addition to the track-in shots, Turgul employs long tracking shots to introduce the locations significant to the main characters' struggles and to strengthen the persuasiveness of their struggles in accordance with the inner relationship they establish with particular locations. Examples include: Fahriye-prison; Haşmet-home, Nihat's home; Abidin and Mahmut-*Rüya* Nightclub; Nazım-home; Ferman-Pamuk's parents' house and her room.

9) Turgul employs instrumental music over one-person shots of the main characters to put emphasis on the moments when the main characters think of their loves. For example, such as Fahriye does when she looks at Mustafa's photograph and thinks of him; when Muhsin gives water to the potted flowers and thinks of Sevda Hanım; when Baran spins around and calls the name of his beloved; when Nazım looks at the red carnation and thinks of Dünya. This technique is also used to film the moments they talk about their past, such as when Muhsin talks to Afitap Hanım at the asylum; when Haşmet talks to Jeyan on the balcony; when Baran talks to the kid on the roof of the hotel. A third instance when this technique is used is to emphasize the crucial moments of the main characters' struggles, such as in the scenes when Fahriye just sits and listens to the woman who asks her parents' permission for a marriage with a man from Erzincan, when Muhsin is anxious about whether Ali Nazik will succeed in the folk music competition, when Abidin and Mahmut recognize that nobody remembers Kumru and no one can see her in the Polaroid photograph except them, when Nazım's daughter tells him that Dünya is too young for him, when Ferman stares at Pamuk's and Battal's names written on the board and mentally forces himself to solve the case.

10) Turgul employs long monologues for the main characters to strengthen the persuasiveness of their struggles, such as in the scenes when Muhsin tells Afitap Hanım

about why he chose that job and has not married; when Haşmet tells Jeyan why he is trying to make this last film and why he has not won the recognition he craves; when Abidin tells Mahmut why he has been so scared of being alone and Mahmut tells Kumru why his relationships with women have been problematic; and when Nazım tells his daughter why he has been that kind of father. He also employs long monologues to emphasize the supporting characters' stories which are significant for the development of the main characters' struggles, such as in the scenes when Mustafa tells his father about why he failed in his life and lost Fahriye; when Cumali tells Baran why he does not try to be a good man; when Dünya tells Nazım why she is obliged to work at nightclubs; and when İdris tells Battal why he came to his mansion.

11) Turgul also employs shadowy lighting and misty atmospheres to emphasize the main characters' psychologies while struggling in particular locations. It is used in *Büyülü Ev* to foreground Fahriye's feelings about the place and the secret things she shares with Mustafa; everywhere Muhsin struggles to emphasize his pessimist mood coming from his past and recent failures in his job; wherever Haşmet confronts his past and feels anxious about whether or not he will be able to be "new"; in some locations of *Gölge Oyunu* to emphasize some mysterious events in the flow of the main characters' struggle; in some locations which have negative effects on Baran's psychology regarding the betrayal and the thirty-five year imprisonment; in Pamuk's room to point out the dark side of Pamuk's case concealed behind shadows.

12) The recurring motifs Turgul uses to create the worlds that his main characters struggle in can be seen in details in Table 4.1:

Table 4.1: The recurring motifs Turgul uses in his *oeuvre*

Motifs/ Films	**Fahriye Abla**	**Muhsin Bey**	**A. F. U. Y.**	**Gölge Oyunu**	**Eşkıya**	**Gönül Yarası**	**Av Mevsimi**
Rural characters	Fahriye's husband from Erzincan	Ali Nazik, Laz Nurettin, Abuzer		Abidin's new partner	Baran, Keje, Berfo	Dünya, Halil, Melek	Battal, Pamuk, İdris, and their families
Landlady	Safiye Sultan	Madam Agarmik	Betül	Büyük Hanım	Ceren Ana	Madam Agarmi	
Swearing female characters	Fahriye	Sevda, Madam Agarmik	Haşmet's daughter, Hilkat	Mehtap and the other hostesses at nightclub	Emel, Emel's mother, the prostitute staying at the hotel Baran stays	Dünya	
Mute female characters	Yeter	Afitap Hanım		Kumru	Keje	Melek	Ceylan
Character that resists the conditions and wants to be famous	Gülay	Ali Nazik, Sönmez Yıkılmaz	Hilkat	Abidin		Dünya	Pamuk (resists the conditions and escapes from home to be free)
Minorities		Madam Agarmik	Nubar	The jeweler	Andre Mışkin	Madam Agarmi	
Buddy characters	Mustafa and Mehmet	Muhsin and Ali Nazik	Haşmet and Nihat	Abidin and Mahmut	Baran and Cumali	Nazım and Takoz Atakan	Ferman and İdris
Veterans		Veterans of music: Afitap Hanım and musicians waiting for new jobs at the coffee house	Veterans of cinema: waiting for new jobs at the coffee house		Veteran of cinema: Actor Kemal	Veteran of music: Neşet Ertaş	Veterans of detectives: Mustafa, Halit and some others at Halit's coffee house

Birds	For three times flap and fly which display Fahriye's chilling while thinking Mustafa and when Mustafa shoots himself			When Büyük Hanım dies birds flap and fly and Kumru disappears birds settle	When Cumali dies a bird flies	birds flap and settle when Halil begs Dünya before killing her	birds flap and fly when Battal shoots himself
Cevat Çapan				A client at Rüya Night club	A man on the street who gets angry with Baran since he looks around by a binoculars		An academic at the university Battal makes a speech
Istanbul	Eminönü, Neighbor -hood, shantyto wn	Galata Kulesi, Beyoğlu	Beyoğlu, Ortaköy	Beyoğlu, hills of Istanbul	Beyoğlu, Tarlabaşı, Galata Kulesi	Samatya, Beyoğlu	Beyoğlu, shantytown

Having listed the particular techniques and motifs Turgul uses peculiarly while configuring the struggles of his main characters, I will conclude this chapter by pointing out Turgul's 'consistent style' that I have emphasized throughout this study as a *sine qua non* of traditional *auteurism*. In addition, I should point out that the abovementioned consistency can be seen in films that Turgul has made in different periods, conditions, and genre and succeeded or failed in box-offices or film festivals. In the traditional auteurist sense, I should finally emphasize that Turgul as the director of popular films deserves to be called as an *auteur* and studied not only for the content of his films but also for his consistent style.

5. CONCLUSION

Arising from my desire to study the director Yavuz Turgul, an influential figure in my childhood and in my choice of career, in this thesis I have focused on searching for the possibility of the *auteur* status of Yavuz Turgul, and more broadly, the development of auteurism in Europe, the US, and Turkey. To this end, I have taken my departure from the initial conception of *auteur* in French cinema circles and used it as 'traditional *auteurism*' throughout this study. In light of traditional *auteurism*'s emphasis on distinctive and consistent directorial styles, I have developed my argument in the following veins: the concept of traditional *auteurism*, as it has been originally elaborated by Western academic and intellectual circles, rarely excludes the possibility of allowing directors who make commercial films *auteur* status. Rather, the concept of *auteur* refers to directors having distinctive and consistent styles, regardless of whether they make "commercial" or "art" films. In this vein, Yavuz Turgul, in so far as he has a distinctive and consistent style of making commercial films, should be considered an *auteur*.

In support of this argument, in chapter two, for a better understanding of the *auteur* in the context of cinema, I first explained the literary origin (i.e. the 'author' of the Romantic era) of the concept of *auteur* and emphasized the relationship between a 'director' (i.e. 'film artist' since cinema is acknowledged as the 'seventh art') and his ways of 'writing' (writing a script and writing on a pelicule). Having established the *auteur* in the cinematic context, for a better understanding of the development of the concept, I have elaborated the *auteur* in its historical flux.

Having elaborated French *auteurism* and its resistance to 'tradition of quality' in favor of emphasizing distinctive and consistent (permanent) directorial styles, I examined the conception and perception of it in the context of America. Having followed the concept across the Atlantic, I followed it back and across the English Channel to examine *auteurism* in Britain, which developed under the lead of writers for *Movie* magazine (1962). These writers emphasized that a detailed analysis of *mise-en-scéne* was essential in developing a

critical approach to film directors, arguing that the approaches demanding serious social themes in directors' films to be able to designate them as *auteurs* were incorrect. Having examined the development of British *auteurism* through *Movie*'s contention that the quality of a film was a direct reflection of directorial style, I have emphasized the influence of French structuralist ideas on the emergence of '*auteur*-structuralism' in Britain, which discounts the individual *auteur*'s capability to create meaning. The *auteur*-structuralism approach suggests that structures determine the whole meanings in a film, and positions the director as a figure functioning in the structure of a film. Through *auteur*-structuralism's definition of *auteur* I critiqued the incompatibility between the concept of *auteur* and the structuralist paradigm.

Having criticized *auteur*-structuralism's discount of an individual *auteur* through its yoking of incompatibles, I continued to examine *auteurism* from the perspectives of three other approaches which also discount the individual *auteur* as the unique creator of his films: historical materialism, post-structuralism, and the approach that insists on the collaborative nature of the medium. The historical materialist definition of the *auteur* is as a determined figure who necessarily works within the constraints and existing conventions of Hollywood, a system which served as both the producer and the bearer of the dominant ideology.

Following the historical materialist approach and its weakening of the role of the *auteur*, I examined the post-structuralist approach through two significant approaches. The first approach presented by Barthes directly kills the *auteur* as the creative source of the meaning in the film and instead gives birth to the 'reader' (spectator) by emphasizing the act of reading (viewing) as the realm from which meaning emerges, and the second approach presented by Foucault acknowledges the *auteur* as disappeared (rather than dead) but surviving through the significance of his 'name' – as the label of a given body of texts (films) – during the reading activity of the 'reader' (spectator). In the last step of examining the approaches that discount the individual *auteur* as the unique creator of his films, I have elaborated the approach that insists on the collaborative nature of the medium and attempts

to locate and establish a number of different *auteurs* in the processes of filmmaking such as stars, producers, writers, directors of photography and production designers whose names are sometimes credited ahead of the name of the filmmaker.

In concluding the second chapter, I first emphasized the development of a new kind of *auteurism* that has its roots in 1970s' marketing strategies of "New Hollywood" era. Then, I interpreted the perception of *auteurism* in today's globalized age through using Elsaesser's conception of 'world cinema' and through the effects of digital filmmaking and media on the perception of contemporary *auteurism*. Having completed a historical and theoretical review of this debatable concept, I finally provided the following definition of 'traditional *auteurism*' which has been the anchoring point throughout this study: 'traditional *auteurism*' is a conception which emphasizes a director's distinctive and consistent 'style' established through his ability of writing on a pelicule (i.e. his ability of mastering his *mise-en-scéne*), and does not care much for 'what' is written, but 'how' it is written.

In chapter three, I used traditional *auteurism* as my anchoring point to examine the development of *auteurism* in particular periods and through particular directors in Turkish cinema. In this manner, I have first elaborated the pre-1950s of Turkish cinema and non-auteurist approaches to its most significant director, Muhsin Ertuğrul, who is broadly considered theatrical and not original because he filmed theatre plays and made adaptations. I then examined the period 1950-1970 as the most appropriate era to understand how *auteurism* in Turkey has developed. Using Nijat Özön's periodization, I have dubbed this period 'the period of cinema-makers' and elaborated the auteurist and non-auteurist approaches to three directors of the period: Ömer Lütfi Akad, Metin Erksan, and Osman F. Seden. Having examined the period and these three directors, my examination leads me to emphasize the contradiction between the traditional *auteurism* – which does not undervalue popular film directors because of the contents of their films if they have distinguishing individual styles – and the approach prevailing among the studies

concerning the period of 'cinema makers' that demands quality in content to be able to consider a director an *auteur*.

Following the period of cinema-makers, I have examined the period of 1970-1980s through its the most significant director, Yılmaz Güney. Having examined the auteurist and non-auteurist approaches to Güney, I have found that the tendency to prioritize content in the evaluation of films and directors similarly prevailed in this period, particularly concerning Güney's social-realist films that arise from his worldview (content) and differ from the commercial films he directed in Yeşilçam.

The next period identified is that of 1980-1990, considered the period of '*Auteur* Cinema', using Gönül Dönmez-Colin's periodization and her different conception of *auteurism*. For a better understanding of the period, I focused on Elsaesser's definition of '*auteur* cinema' and examined one of the directors of the period, Ömer Kavur, through the contradictions of traditional *auteur* and *auteur* cinema concepts. Having examined the period and Kavur, I have found that this period is significant since 'style' began to come to the fore over 'content' in the evaluations of cinema writers.

Lastly, I examined *auteurism* in the contemporary period, 'New Turkish Cinema', which is considered to have begun independent from classic Yeşilçam in the 1990s and to have developed through the efforts of individual directors both in popular and art branches of Turkish cinema. I elaborated its five prominent directors – Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Zeki Demirkubuz, Yeşim Ustaoğlu, Reha Erdem and Fatih Akın – through the approaches that rise from several auteurist studies. The elaboration on the approaches to these directors has been significant in this study to the extent that they have provided a better understanding of traditional *auteurism*. This has led me to conclude the chapter with the argument that, in contrast with the existing *auteurism* before the 1990s, *auteurism* in the period of 'New Turkish Cinema' (as traditional *auteurism* demands) has put the necessary emphasis on consistency of 'style' in recent *auteurs*' films. However, recent *auteurism* seems to be a fusion of different auteurist perspectives, which somehow comes closer to the concept of

authorship in art cinema, while traditional *auteurism* defends the possibility of consistent styles in popular cinema.

While there is an extensive use and history behind them, the notions of *auteur* and *auteurism* are still debated in film criticism and studies circles both in Turkey and elsewhere. Auteurist approaches differ from each other depending on the emphasis they put on the following: the modes film production (studio, independent or interstitial), the employment of scriptwriters (the director himself or not), the level of the involvement of other filmmakers (for instance, stars, producers, scriptwriters, directors of photography, production designers, art directors, etc.), the decision-making mechanisms (for instance, director, star, producer, distributor, sponsor, funding institution), the sources of reception and/or signification of films (director or spectator), the choices made by directors (intentional or unintentional), genres of the films, the director's motivation to make films (commercial and/or artistic), the frequency of a director's filmmaking activity, the personal background of directors (education, intellectuality, knowledge of his craft), the quality of films (determined by their content and/or style), and the consistency of themes and/or style of a director's films and goes on.

By keeping these several emphasis in mind, I tried to focus on a more traditional sense of *auteurism* which is introduced by the French film circles in the 1950s. This sense of French *auterism* is not only important as the source of auteurist discussions in films studies, but also its specific understanding of the relation between a director and his work. Because this is a founding argument on the artistic status of a filmmaker's work, its advantages are located in its constructive view. In other words, the traditional auteurist perspective scans the *oeuvre* of a director to highlight its artistic qualities and instead of creating a hierarchical perspective, it focuses on the work of a single director to see his unique, distinctive, and consistent stylistic practices.

In line with this, in the fourth chapter, I first attempted to place Yavuz Turgul in the history of Turkish cinema as a director of popular films, and then reviewed auteurist and non-

auteurist approaches to Turgul, while keeping traditional *auteurism* as my point of reference. Then, I focused on Turgul's *oeuvre* and tried to pursue an analytic method as proposed by David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson. In this, I first determined the organizational structure in his films and then identified and explained the function of the salient techniques used, illustrating each technique with specific instances from his films. I also emphasized the recurring motifs Turgul employs in his films in order to configure the organizational structure.

Yavuz Turgul's style may be observed in the construction of his films. His films feature 'struggles' of certain characters through the use of specific filmic techniques and elements such as the repetitive use of lyrics of songs to create narrative signification, objects offering unique identifications, obsessions with specific explanations, narrators presenting important information, deliberate use of monologues to highlight characters' personal histories, specific camera movements intended for emphasis of certain props or characters, detail shots with significant characteristics, and the use of particular costumes and locations, and of lighting to trigger particular psychological moods.

Having analyzed his *oeuvre* and provided the list of repeated techniques and the table[133] of recurring motifs which establish Turgul's distinctive style, I have reached the following conclusion: although Yavuz Turgul is a popular film director, there is a recognizable and consistent style linking his films made in different periods and genres, under different conditions, and to varying degrees of success or failure at the box-office or film festivals. His consistent style can be interpreted as arising from the amalgamation of his creative talents, scriptwriting ability, the particular choices and decisions he makes in every step of the production process, ability of mastering his *mise-en-scéne*, and his unifying authority. Thus, in the traditional auteurist sense, Yavuz Turgul is an *auteur* because his films bear consistent and distinctive stylistic traits some of which are highlighted above.

[133] For the table see page 168-169 in this thesis.

REFERENCES

Books

Abisel, N., Arslan, U. T., Behçetoğulları, P., Karadoğan, A., Öztürk, S. R., Ulusay, N., 2005. "Başlarken" in *Çok tuhaf çok tanıdık: Vesikalı yarim üzerine*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, pp. 7-18.

Andrew, D., 1976. *The major film theories: An introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Arslan, M. M., 2010. *Yeşim Ustaoğlu: Su, ölüm ve yolculuk*. İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı.

Arslan, S. 2011. *Cinema in Turkey: A new critical history*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Baykal, İ. C., 2010. "Ahmet Uluçay: Tepecik Köyü'nde bir *auteur*" in *Karpuz kabuğu denize düşünce*, Büker S. (Ed.). İstanbul: Kırmızıkedi, pp. 11-16.

Bennett, A., 2005. *The author: The new critical idiom*. London: Routledge.

Bordwell, D. 2002. "The art cinema as a mode of film practice" in *The european cinema reader*, Fowler, C. (Ed). London: Routlege, pp. 94-102.

Bordwell, T. and Thompson, K., 2010. "Summary: Style as a formal system" in *Film art: An introduction.* New York: Mc Graw Hill, pp. 304-317.

Buckland, W., 2008. "Film authorship: The director as *auteur*" in *Film studies: Teach yourself*. New York: McGraw Hill, pp. 74-108.

Cook, P., 2007. *The cinema book*. London: BFI.

Crofts, S. 1998. "Authorship and Hollywood" in *The Oxford guide To film studies*. Hill, J. and Gibson, P. C. (Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 310-326.

Dönmez-Colin, G., 2004. *Women, Islam and cinema*. London: Reaktion Books.

Dönmez-Colin, G., 2008. *Turkish cinema: Identity, distance and belonging*. London: Reaktion Books.

Donovan, S., Zadworna-Fjellestad, D. and Lundén, R., 2008. "Introduction: Author, authorship, authority, and other matters" in *Authority matters: Rethinking the theory*

and practice of authorship. Donovan, S., Zadworna-Fjellestad, D. and Lundén, R. (Ed.). Amsterdam/New york: Rodopi, pp. 1-23.

Editors of *Cahiers du Cinéma.* 2008. "John Ford's *Young Mr. Lincoln*" in *Auteurs and authorship: A film reader*. Grant, B. K. (Ed.), Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 212-227.

Elsaesser, T., 2005. "European cinema as world cinema: A new beginning?" in *European cinema face to face with Hollywood: Film culture in transition*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 485-511.

Erdoğan N., Göktürk D., 2001. "Turkish cinema" in *Companion encyclopedia of Middle Eastern and North African film.* Leaman O. (Ed.), London&NY: Routledge, pp. 533-573.

Erkılıç, H., Duruel Erkılıç S., 2011. "Yavuz Turgul sinemasında kahraman" in *Yavuz Turgul sinemasını keşfetmek*, Sivas A. (Ed.), İstanbul: Kırmızı Kedi, pp. 84-109.

Eyüboğlu, S., 2004. "2000'lerde değişen bir şeyler var mı?" in *Türk film araştırmalarında yeni yönelimler 4*, Bayrakdar, D. (Ed.), İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, pp. 285-289.

Goss, B. M., 2009. "The auteur theory" in *Global auteurs: Politics in the films of Almodovar, von Trier, and Winterbottom*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, pp. 39-57.

Hepkon, Z., 2011. "Bir "*auteur*-yıldız" olarak Yavuz Turgul" in *Yavuz Turgul sinemasını keşfetmek*, Sivas A. (Ed.), İstanbul: Kırmızı Kedi, pp.179-198.

Hollows, J., Hutchings, P. And Jancovich, M., 2000. "Film and authorship" in *The film studies reader*. Hollows, J., Hutchings, P. and Jancovich, M. (Ed.). London: Arnold Publishers, pp. 45-52.

İspi, G., 2004. "Yavuz Turgul sinemasında "Değişim" teması" in *Türk film araştırmalarında yeni yönelimler 4*, Bayrakdar, D. (Ed.), İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık, pp. 149-156.

Kakınç, T. D., 1996. "Sinemamızın son çeyreği" in *Türk sineması üzerine düşünceler*. Dinçer, S. M. (Ed.). İstanbul: Doruk Yayıncılık, pp.334-347.

Kaplan, Y., 1996. "Turkish cinema" in *The Oxford history of world cinema*. Nowell-Smith, G. (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 656-661.

Kayalı, K., 2006. *Yönetmenler çerçevesinde Türk sineması üzerine bir yorum denemesi*. İstanbul: Deniz Kitabevi.

Kıraç, R., 2008. *Film icabı: Türkiye sinemasına ideolojik bir bakış*. İstanbul: De Ki.

Kuyucak Esen, Ş., 2002. *Sinemamızda bir 'auteur': Ömer Kavur*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.

Lapsey, R. and Westlake, M., 1988. *"Authorship" in film theory: An introduction*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 105-128.

Livingston, P., 2006. "Cinematic authorship" *in Philosophy of film & motion pictures*. Carrol, N. and Choi, J. (Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 299-309.

Naremore, J., 2005. "Authorship" *in A companion to film theory*. Miller, T. and Stam, R. (Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 9-24.

Okyay, S., 1996. "Bugünden yarına" in *Türk sineması üzerine düşünceler*, Dinçer, S. M. (Ed.), İstanbul: Doruk Yayıncılık, pp. 223-231.

Refiğ, H., 1996. "Türk Sineması'nın yükseliş ve çöküşü üzerine bazı düşünceler" in *Türk sineması üzerine düşünceler*. Dinçer, S. M. (Ed.), İstanbul: Doruk Yayıncılık, pp. 177-187.

Sarris, A. 2000. "Notes on the *auteur* theory in 1962" in *The film studies reader*. Hollows, J., Hutchings, P. and Jancovich, M. (Ed.). London: Arnold Publishers, pp. 68- 71.

Scognamillo, G., 2003. Türk sinema tarihi. İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi.

Stam, R.. 2000. *Film theory: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Teksoy, R., 2008. *Turkish cinema*. İstanbul: Oğlak Yayıncılık.

Truffaut, F., 2000. "A certain tendency of the french cinema" in *The film studies reader*. Hollows, J., Hutchings, P. and Jancovich, M. (Ed.). London: Arnold Publishers, pp. 58- 63.

Tuğan, N. H., 2010. "Yaşamın kıyısında bekle ve umut et" in *Karpuz kabuğu denize düşünce*. Büker, S. (Ed.). İstanbul: Kırmızıkedi, pp. 47-91.

Tuncer, G., 1996. "Düne bakarak yarını kurtarmak" in *Türk sineması üzerine düşünceler*. Dinçer, S. M. (Ed.), İstanbul: Doruk Yayıncılık, pp.369-378.

Wollen, P., 2000. "The *auteur* theory" in *The film studies reader*. Hollows, J., Hutchings, P. and Jancovich, M. (Ed.). London: Arnold Publishers, pp. 71-78.

Yüksel, N. A. A., Tok, M. Ç., 2011. "Yaşayan filmlerin unutulmaz yönetmeni" in *Yavuz Turgul sinemasını keşfetmek*, Sivas A. (Ed.), İstanbul: Kırmızı Kedi, pp. 13-33.

Periodicals

Akay, E., 2010. Meslektaşlarıma bir önerim var. *Altyazı 100. Özel Sayı: Filmlerle Yaşayanlar; Düşünceler, Hayaller, Anılar*. **100**, pp. 98-99.

Ayça, E., Altınsay, İ., Sönmez, H., Öztürk, S.. 1987. Türk sineması nereye gidiyor? . *...ve Sinema*. **4** (4), pp. 37-49.

Ergun, C., 1998. Günümüz Türk sineması üzerine: Türk sinemasında yeni dönem mi?. *Sinerama*. **2** (Mart), pp. 98-100.

Gökçe Ö., Göl, B., 2005. "Türk sineması ve gelenek: Bir senarist-yönetmen olarak Yavuz Turgul" in *Altyazı*. **36**, pp. 20-27.

Gündoğdu, M., 1997. Sinemamızda bir dönem kapanırken. *25. Kare*. **18**, pp. 9-14.

Işıl, M., 2009. Geçmişteki filmlerime benzemiyor / Ali Özgentürk ile söyleşi. *Sinema*. Nisan, pp. 64-65.

Kutlar, O., 1991. İyi bir senaryo yazarının herşeyden önce iyi bir sinemacı olması gerekir. *Sanat Dünyamız*. **45**, pp. 28-31.

Kuzu, H. 1998. Günümüz Türk sineması üzerine: Broşür niyetine film. *Sinerama*. **2** (3), pp. 94-97.

Sinema Dergisi Özel Sayısı, 2011. Tüm zamanların en iyi 100 Türk filmi. *Turkuvaz Yayınları*. Ocak, pp. 182-187.

Suner, A., 2004. Horror of a different kind: dissonant voices of the new Turkish cinema. *Screen*. **45** (4), pp. 305-323.

Suner, A., 2006. Outside in: 'accented cinema' at large. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*. **7** (3), pp. 363-382.

Tınaz Gürmen, P., 2009. Dünya sinema tarihi 6 (1950-1965): Dünya değişiyor yeni bir sinema doğuyor. *Sinema*. Ekim, pp. 86-93.

Zaim, D., 2008. Odaklandığın şey gerçeğindir: Türkiye sineması, alüvyonik Türk sineması ve uluslararası kabul. *Altyazı*. **78**, pp. 48-55.

Other publications

Baran, T., 1997. Eşkıya Bize Bizi Anımsatıyor [online] (http://tamerbaran.blogspot.com/2010/01/eskya-bize-bizi-anmsatyor.html) [accessed 14 December 2011].

Boz, M., 2011. Suskun ve Yalnız: Reha Erdem Sineması [online]. (http://sinemasaldunya.wordpress.com/2011/06/11/suskun-ve-yalniz-reha-erdem-sinemasi/) [accessed 4 July 2011].

Coşkun, Ç., 2009. 1990 Sonrası Türk Sineması ve Derviş Zaim [online]. (http://www.aktuelsinema.com/haber.php?haber_id=22) [accessed 1 July 2011].

Erdoğan, N., 2009. Türk Sinemasının Öznesi Yok. *Anlayış* [online]. (http://www.anlayis.net/makaleGoster.aspx?makaleid=2160) [accessed 4 July 2011].

Eryılmaz, M., 2010. Türk Sinemasında Bir Düşünür [online]. (www.kameraarkasi.org/sinema/makaleler/turksinemasindabirdusunur.html) [accessed 16 September 2011].

Hakan, F., 2010. Fikret Hakan ile Sinema Üzerine. *Antrakt Sinema Gazetesi* [online]. (http://www.antraktsinema.com/soylesi.php?id=6) [accessed 30 June 2011].

Kavur, Ö., Genç Yönetmenlere İnanıyorum [online]. (http://www.sekans.org/omer_kavur.html) [accessed 30 June 2011].

Özçaldıran, K., 2010. Nuri Bilge Ceylan Fahri Doktora Töreni'nde Rektör Kadri Özçaldıran'ın Konuşması [online] (http://www.nuribilgeceylan.com/speechrector.php) [accessed 1 July 2011].

Öztürk, S. R., 2002. Zeki Demirkubuz Sineması [online]. (www.demirkubuz.com/images/zeki/Articles/01.doc) [accessed 3 July 2011].

Sivas, Ala., 2011. Yavuz Turgul Kendisini Markaya Dönüştürdü [online]. (http://www.hayalperdesi.net/soylesi/33-yavuz-turgul-kendisini-markaya-donusturdu.aspx) [accessed 14 December 2011].

Terzioğlu, A., 2010. Kosmos: Duyduğumuz Bu Sesler Kimindir?. *Altyazı Sinema Dergisi* [online]. (http://www.altyazi.net/makale/kosmos-8-111.aspx) [accessed 16 September 2011].