

Doppelgänger in Orhan Pamuk's *The Black Book*

Saniye Çancı Çalışaneller*

Abstract

This article examines Orhan Pamuk's *The Black Book* in connection with the doppelgänger motif in literature. In *The Black Book*, Galip's wife Rüya and his cousin Jelal disappear all of a sudden, and the novel narrates Galip's search for them who remain invisible throughout the novel. There is a conflict between the characters Galip and Jelal, and this article claims that although the two characters are depicted in the novel as Galip and Jelal, Jelal turns out to be the second self or author self of Galip. Thus, the doppelgänger motif will also be associated with authorship.

Keywords

Orhan Pamuk, *The Black Book*, doppelgänger, Turkish novel.

Orhan Pamuk's *The Black Book* narrates Galip's search for his wife Rüya and his journalist cousin Jelal, who have suddenly disappeared and who remain almost invisible throughout the novel. While looking for Rüya and Jelal, Galip walks in the streets of İstanbul, and his journey to search for Rüya and Jelal turns out to be a quest for his own identity as a writer. Although it seems that Rüya and Jelal are important for Galip because of the familial tie among them, both Rüya and Jelal have significant abstract connotations in the process of Galip's becoming a writer. In this work, the complex relationship between Galip and Jelal will be examined in line with the discussions on doppelgänger, and this reading of *The Black Book*

* Lecturer, Başkent University, Faculty of Science and Letters, Department of American Culture and Literature / Ankara
scanci@baskent.edu.tr

claims that although it seems there are two different characters as Galip and Jelal in the novel, Galip and Jelal are the same person since Jelal symbolizes the second self or author self of Galip.

Translated into English as double-goer, doppelgänger is defined as “a ghostly counterpart of a living person” in *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* in which the words “double” and “alter ego” are also provided to clarify the concept. According to John Herdman, doppelgänger is “a second self, or alter ego, which appears as a distinct and separate being apprehensible by the physical senses (or at least, by some of them), but exists in a dependent relation to the original” (1990: 14). Herdman suggests that the double or the second self is not subordinated to the original. On the contrary, mostly, “the double comes to dominate, control, and usurp the functions of the subject” (1990: 14). Other than this, as Herdman claims, “the subject and his double are physically similar, often to the point of absolute identity. Brothers... and especially twins, may be doubles, but where this is the case there is always an element, whether overtly supernatural, numinous or otherwise extraordinary, which goes beyond the merely natural relationship” (1990: 14). Thus, in his definition, Herdman draws attention to the conflict between the original and his double, the physical similarity between the original and the double due to the familial tie between them, and the extraordinary relationship between the original and the double.

Other than John Herdman, Jeffrey Berman also defines doppelgänger as “a duality or multiplicity of warring selves struggling toward integration” (1988: 963). According to Berman, the terms doppelgänger, double, secret self, second self, opposing self, alter ego, shadow, mirror image, split personality, dual personality, and multiple personality have a common point: the fact that one self becomes dominant to the other self causes psychic imbalance resulting in “fragmentation, duplication, loss of identity, and inner strife” (1988: 963). As Berman observes, the second self can be “the twin brother, pursuer, tempter, vision of horror, saviour, and the beloved. The other self may be human or nonhuman: a shadow, monster, disembodied voice, or autoscopic hallucination” (1988: 963). In Berman's opinion, the representation of doppelgänger in literature is very dramatic. Most of the time, the struggle between the selves results in “the defeat of one self by another self or, at best, an uneasy reconciliation between the warring selves” (1988: 963). Thus, according to Berman's discussion, as in the case of Herdman's, there is a conflict between the selves, and the

second self can be associated with a relative, particularly with a brother. The most striking point Berman underlines is that in the doppelgänger motif one of the selves has to be defeated, or “an uneasy reconciliation” between the selves can arise as a solution to the conflict. The discussions about doppelgänger coincide with Galip’s actions and experiences in *The Black Book*.

To begin with, it is pertinent to examine the connotations of Rüya and Jelal in the novel since *The Black Book* is based on Galip’s search for them. Throughout the novel, although Rüya and Jelal seem to have material existence, their existence could be called into question. Rüya first appears in the opening scene of the novel when the third person narrator describes her through Galip’s focalization: “Galip, languid with sleep, studied his wife’s head which poked out of the quilt: Rüya’s chin was buried in the pillow. In the curve of her brow there was something surreal that brought on anxious curiosity about the wondrous events that took place inside her head” (3). As Orhan Koçak claims, the word “surreal” suggests the illusory characteristic of Rüya (1996: 148). Throughout the novel, Pamuk’s play with the word *rüya* creates an ambiguity. In Turkish, *rüya* means dream and, in certain passages in *The Black Book*, it is not possible to comprehend exactly whether the narrator talks about a person whose name is Rüya, or just a dream (Atakay 1996: 39). According to Sooyong Kim, Rüya serves as a muse for Galip in his search for becoming a writer (1996: 235). Interestingly, while Galip is trying to find his wife Rüya, he accomplishes his dream (*rüya*) of being a writer. Thus, Rüya turns out to be an abstract entity in the novel.

As for Jelal, he is mentioned in the novel only when Galip reads Jelal’s articles. So, Jelal gains existence according to Galip’s attitude. Galip, one of Jelal’s fans, always starts his day by reading Jelal’s column, as he would “prefer living in a world described lovingly by Jelal” rather than “liv[ing] in his own world” (Pamuk 1994: 82). According to Galip, when Jelal narrates something, “the world would make sense, transforming the ‘hidden’ realities right under our noses into the rich fare of an astonishing story that we already knew but didn’t know that we knew, thereby making life more bearable” (82). Thus, through Jelal, Galip’s life becomes more meaningful and understandable. By reading his articles, Galip wishes to be a person just like Jelal because, according to Galip, “reading someone’s work” is “gradually acquiring the writer’s memory” (280). Galip’s act of writing under Jelal’s name in the end shows that he has inherited Jelal’s

memory, in other words “his ability to write” (Moran 1996: 84). Galip’s search for Jelal turns out to be a search for writing. He aspires to be (like) Jelal: Galip starts his second article he has written for Jelal’s column, saying, “I dreamed that I had finally become the person I wanted to be all these years” (284). Jale Parla, who claims that Galip’s identity is split during his search for his double or other self Jelal, defines *The Black Book* as an allegoric story that narrates the birth of a writer (1996: 104).

Throughout the novel, there is an intricate bond between Galip’s life and Jelal’s articles, and this complex relationship is worth examining to explain the doppelgänger motif in *The Black Book*. Jelal’s articles give clues about the relationship between Galip and Jelal by suggesting that Galip is identical with Jelal. For instance, in “We Lost Our Memories at the Movies,” narrated by an unknown third person narrator, Galip visits Rüya’s ex-husband to see if Rüya is there. After a long conversation, Rüya’s ex-husband sends Rüya his regards, and this chapter ends as follows: “Very well, then, might he [Galip] send Rüya his [ex-husband’s] best regards?” (114). The following chapter “The Kiss,” written by Jelal about a man who sends Jelal’s wife his best wishes, starts with similar words: “He asked me to give you [his wife] his regards two weeks ago, to be exact. ‘I sure will’ I said, but by the time I got in the car I’d already managed to forget, not the regards but the man who sent them” (115). Since these chapters about Galip’s experience and Jelal’s column follow one another with similar words, the reader is forced to question the relationship between the two incidents. Jelal’s ambiguous claims about his marital status in “The Kiss” increase the reader’s level of suspense: “Even those readers who know that I am not married, have never been married, and on account of my profession will never be married, probably suspect by now that this column, beginning with the opening sentence, is a puzzle that I have devised for them. Just who is this woman whom I address so intimately? Hocus-pocus!” (115-116). Jelal emphasizes that his article is puzzling for the reader because he is unreliable in what he has written. While he says he is married in the very beginning of the article, he denies that he is married later in the same article, but finally, he confesses that he is married: “I confessed that I myself had been married for quite some time” (120). It is obvious that this article “The Kiss” is used to create an ambiguous situation about the attachment between Galip and Jelal.

Similarly, the chapters titled “Look Who’s Here” and “We Are All Waiting for Him” display the correspondence between Galip’s experience and

Jelal's article. In "Look Who's Here," the woman in the whorehouse with whom Galip sleeps mentions an enigmatic person: "We are all waiting for Him, all of us; we are waiting for Him" (130). In "We Are All Waiting for Him," Jelal talks about a similar enigmatic person: "We are all waiting for Him at the movie theaters where we watch tough guys break bottles and windows on a Sunday night and the delightful adventures of world-class dolls; returning from whorehouses where we sleep with whores who only managed to make us feel even more lonely" (131-132). The second part of the statement after the semicolon seems to be Galip's response to the whore after sleeping with her, although it is Jelal who narrates it. Such similarities between Galip's life and Jelal's articles give the sense that Jelal narrates the events Galip experiences.

The chapter titled "Brother Mine" also implies that Galip and Jelal are identical. Here, the title of the chapter is of importance in connection with the discussions on doppelgänger where it is seen that brothers have potential to display dual personalities. In this context, it might be claimed that Galip treats Jelal as a brother who can be admired and imitated. Accordingly, after Jelal disappears, Galip moves into Jelal's flat, wears Jelal's clothes, sleeps in Jelal's bed, and pretends to be Jelal by answering the phone. An unnamed ardent reader of Jelal, who speaks to Galip by thinking that he is Jelal, gives many clues to the reader about both Galip and Jelal's identity. In one of the phone calls, Galip asks the man questions about Jelal's writing style and the man replies:

For you, style was life, style, for you, was voice. Style was your thoughts. Style was your real persona you created within it, but this was not one, not two, but three personas...

The first voice is what you call 'my simple persona': the voice that you reveal to anyone, the one with which you sit down at family dinners and gossip through billows of smoke after dinner. You owe this persona the details of your everyday life. The second voice belongs to the person you wish to be: a mask that you appropriated from admirable personages who, having found no peace in this one, live in another world and are suffused with its mystery... What took you-and me, naturally-into realms unavailable to the first two personas you call 'the objective and subjective styles' is the third voice: the dark persona, the dark style! (308-309)

The first subjective persona the man talks about is Galip who leads an ordinary life, while the second objective one is Jelal as Galip's author self. The third persona, who is described as "the dark persona," refers to the third person narrator of this book because this narrator takes the reader "into realms unavailable to the first two personas" by making it difficult for the reader to understand the nature of the relationship between these two personas, Galip and Jelal. Indeed, the dark style or ambiguity of this narrator is indicated with the title *The Black Book*.

Other than this, the most important attachment between Galip and Jelal is an eye that follows both of them. In the article titled "The Eye," Jelal describes the eye that traces him with god-like qualities:

An all-seeing, omnipresent eye now watched me without concealing itself... It was even, yes, an acquaintance; the eye knew me and I knew it. We had known about each other for a long time... I had created it, and it had created me! I thought maybe this idea would just dart through my mind, like one of those stupid words that sometimes appear at the tip of your pen and vanish, but it remained there. And the idea opened the door through which, like that English girl who followed a rabbit down his hole under the hedge, I entered a new world (98-99).

Jelal treats the eye as a subject in the sense that it knows him and creates him, just like he as a writer recognizing and creating the eye. The new world he enters could be interpreted as writing, which is implied with the use of words like "create" and "pen." In this passage, the word pun on "eye" and "I" suggests that the subject "I" is identical with the eye. Indeed, Jelal states that the eye following him is actually himself: "I knew instantly that what I saw in the center of my perception, or imagination, or illusion -whatever you want to call it-it was not a being that resembled me; it was me, myself" (99). Besides, Jelal claims that the eye comes to life out of his own experiences: "There were some clues which revealed to me that I'd abstracted him out of my own life materials and experiences" (100). Since Jelal narrates the events Galip has experienced as in the case of the chapters "Look Who's Here" and "We Are All Waiting for Him," then it could be claimed that Jelal appears as Galip's author self or second self, finding his source of writing in Galip's experiences.

Like Jelal, Galip also senses an eye following him when he comes out of the newspaper building where Jelal works. The eye reveals itself in the

chapter titled “The Letters in Mount Kaf” when Galip feels its existence on the bus:

But it wasn't an eye that belonged to the throng on the bus; the passengers swayed as if on a small steamboat on the high seas and stared out distractedly at the snowy streets and the crowds milling outside. That's when he realized Aladdin had wrapped the political magazines in an old copy of *Milliyet*. On the corner of one of the folds, Jelal stared out at him from his photograph in its usual place at the head of his column. The uncountable thing was that the photograph of Jelal, which was the same morning, now gave Galip a completely different look. Jelal appeared to say, “I'm on to you and I've got an eye on you!” Galip placed his finger on the “eye” that read his soul, but he still felt its presence under his finger the whole time he was on the bus (59).

The same word pun is obvious when Galip puts his finger on Jelal's eye/I to get rid of its/his presence. This act of avoiding Jelal might be interpreted as Galip's annoyance with the presence of his author self Jelal as his second self. Thus, it is evident that there appears a struggle between the selves as in the case of the discussions on doppelgänger.

Galip gets disturbed by the presence of his second self or his author self when he loses his ordinary life because of Jelal's dominance. In the chapter titled “Do You Remember Me?,” Galip expresses his annoyance with Jelal when he thinks that he sees Jelal's mannequin in an underground store. He says, “You are the reason why I could never be myself;... ‘You are the reason I believed in all these fictions which managed to turn me into you’” (166). Galip feels that he gradually loses his own identity. In the article titled “I must be Myself,” Galip/Jelal¹ narrates Galip's disturbance as follows:

Actually, I went to the barber's to loosen up... But as the barber and I looked in the mirror together, we saw there, along with the hair that was to be cut, this head that carries the hair, the shoulders, the trunk; and I sensed at once that the person whom we watched in the mirror sitting in the chair was not “I” but somebody else. This head that the barber held in his hands as he asked, “How much off the front?”, the neck that carried the head, the shoulders, and the trunk weren't mine, but belong to Jelal Bey, Columnist. I had indeed no connection to this man!... [H]e [the barber] asked me the sort of questions columnists get asked, like: “If war broke out, could we whip the Greeks?” “Is it true

that the prime minister's wife is a slut?" "Are greengrocers responsible for the high prices?" And some mysterious power the origin of which I cannot discern would not let me answer these questions myself. But the columnist I watched in the mirror with utter amazement would answer for me (159).

In this passage, the person who looks through the mirror is Galip, but what he sees in the mirror is the columnist Jelal. It should be remembered that the term doppelgänger is also defined as the mirror image. Thus, the fact that Galip sees Jelal in the mirror indicates that Galip has split identity. In this scene, Galip realizes that he is alienated from himself even in his ordinary life because Jelal invades his entire life.

Like the barber, who forces Galip to foreground his author self, the relatives put pressure on Galip to become a successful writer. Galip/Jelal narrates Galip's distress of finding an identity:

I must be myself, I repeated, without paying any attention to them, their voices, smells, desires, their love, their hate. If I can't be myself, then I become who they want me to be, and I cannot bear the person they want me to be; and rather than be that intolerable person they want me to be, I thought, it would be better that I be nothing at all, or not be.

In my youth, when I visited my uncle's and my aunt's, I became the person who was thought of as someone who "works as a journalist, which is too bad, but he works hard at it, and if he keeps on working like this, chances are he will succeed someday..." And what's worse, unable to see myself any other way, I let this person I didn't like cling to my flesh like an ugly skin, and before long I caught myself speaking not my own words but the words of this person; when I returned home at night, just to torture myself I reminded myself of how I'd spoken the words of this person I didn't care for, repeating trite sentences like "I touched on this subject in my long article this week." "I considered this problem in my latest Sunday article," "This coming Tuesday, I will delve into that too, in my long article," until I thought I'd drown in my own unhappiness-when, at last, I could be somewhat myself (157-158).

It is obvious that Galip starts being obsessed with the idea of being himself when he sees that nobody recognizes him as Galip. Jelal's thoughts occupy

his life without leaving him any room to speak or act as Galip. Paradoxically, he tortures himself by repeating Jelal's cliché statements in order to remind himself of his existence as Galip, not only as Jelal. In this way, he endeavors to stop Jelal's encroachment on his life. Finally, he reveals that he hates Jelal: "I hated this columnist who thought he knew everything, who knew it when he didn't know it, and who'd pedantically thought himself to accept his shortcomings and excesses. I even hated the barber who, with each of his questions, turned me that much more into Jelal the columnist" (159).

Jorge Luis Borges deals with a similar dilemma in his writing entitled "Borges and I" as follows:

It would be an exaggeration to say that ours is a hostile relationship; I live, let myself go on living, so that Borges may contrive his literature, and this literature justifies me... Besides, I am destined to perish, definitively, and only some instant of myself can survive in him. Little by little, I am giving over everything to him, though I am quite aware of his perverse custom of falsifying and magnifying things... I shall remain in Borges, not in myself (if it is true that I am someone), but I recognize myself less in his books than in many others or in the laborious strumming of a guitar... Thus, my life is a flight and I lose everything and everything belongs to oblivion, or to him (1970: 282-283).

As in Borges' passage, Jelal creates his writings out of Galip's experiences in life. Thus, Galip's life justifies Jelal's existence. Like Borges, Galip feels that his author self controls him. Besides, Galip believes that, despite being his creation, Jelal as the author self disregards Galip. Galip/Jelal recounts Galip's feelings by speaking on behalf of Galip as follows:

I had reproduced him out of my memories and memorialized persons. This monstrosity, which was the collage of the crowd that I recollected one by one, existed as the soul of the "eye" that he'd turned loose on me, which had now become my own gaze. Within it, I now apprehended myself and my whole life. I lived my life, pleased to be under the scrutiny of this gaze, pulling myself together under its auspices, imitating "him," trying to reach him through impersonation, assured that someday I would actually become him, or at least something like him... On the other hand, 'he' pretends not to be aware that he's been concocted by 'me' who impersonates him (101-102).

In this respect, unlike Borges, Galip and his author self have a hostile relationship. Although Galip tries to be Jelal, he wishes to get rid of Jelal at the same time because Galip is tired of this conflict between himself and his author self.

The bond between Galip and Jelal is also underlined with the story about Rumi and Shams of Tabriz mentioned by Jelal in his column. In "Who Killed Shams of Tabriz?" Jelal claims that Rumi is interested in Shams of Tabriz because he needs a "soul mate" such as this, someone in whose face he could see the reflection of his own face" (223). Rumi searches for the "other" who could move and enflame him, the mirror that could reflect his countenance and his soul" (223). According to the common story, this relationship between Rumi and Shams provokes Rumi's followers to murder Shams. Denying Shams's death, Rumi goes on a journey to Damascus to find Shams. At this point, Galip's search for Jelal and Rüyá in the streets of Istanbul resembles Rumi's quest for his soul mate in the streets of Damascus.

Apart from this similarity between Galip and Rumi, the murder of Shams of Tabriz also gives clues about Jelal's murder. In his article, Jelal claims that the person who killed Shams of Tabriz is Rumi himself, and Rumi is the person who benefits most from his lover's murder "since it gave him a chance to get out of being a humdrum teacher of theology and attain the rank of a Sufi poet" (228). At the symbolic level, the same logic could be used in the case of Jelal's death. The person who benefits most from Jelal's murder is Galip because he starts writing after Jelal is lost, takes Jelal's place for an interview with the British journalists, and, thereby, manages to justify his existence as a writer.

Rumi questions his relationship with Shams of Tabriz by saying "If I am He, then why am I still searching?" (227) and quits searching for Shams of Tabriz because Rumi recognizes that he actually searches for himself. Similarly, Galip stops his quest when he realizes that the person he searches for is nobody but himself in the reflection of Jelal. When Galip walks towards Jelal's dead body the narrator uses Jelal's name while quoting Galip's words. The narrator says: "I remember, I remember, I remember, Jelal was saying" (382). Although the narrator mentions Jelal, s/he actually refers to Galip because this part is narrated through Galip's focalization, and Jelal is dead. This detail shows that for the third person narrator Jelal is identical with Galip. Moreover, as soon as he sees Jelal's corpse, Galip

says, "I am myself!" (382), which suggests that Galip has completed his search, got rid of his own creation Jelal, and proved his identity as a writer.

The death scenes of Jelal and Rüya signify the existence of these characters only in Galip's mind. Jelal's existence in the novel depends on his articles, in other words, texts. Likewise, in his death scene, he is treated as a text. The narrator prefers to talk about not his corpse but the pages of the newspaper that cover Jelal's dead body: "A few paces from the window where the Singer machines were displayed, there was a pinkish white botch on the side walk. A solitary figure: he [Galip] knew it was Jelal. The body had been covered under newspapers, except for the head" (381). The only part of his dead body described above is his head, which might symbolize the imagination of the writer: "[t]he eyes were open but distracted as if dreaming; the face wore the expression of someone lost in his own thoughts, peaceful as if observing the stars, as if both resting and dreaming" (381). Thus, the most precious aspect of writing, namely imagination, is still alive after Jelal's death. The significance of writing is also underlined with the emphasis on the green ink on Jelal's shirt rather than blood stains; as the "bullet had shattered the pen in the left pocket of his jacket" (387).

Similarly, Rüya, like Jelal, is not described as an entity in her death scene. The only thing the reader knows about Rüya's death is that her corpse is found at Aladdin's Store one day after she has been shot. Nobody, not even Aladdin, sees her entering the store after being fatally wounded when she "collapses among the dolls in the corner" (387). Right after this statement, the third person narrator, the dark persona, interferes by addressing the reader and by indicating the sole textual existence of Rüya as the heroine of the novel *Rüya and Galip*:

So, you see, had I been a top-notch wordsmith instead of the johnny-come-lately columnist that I am, I'd assume with assurance that this is one of those pages in my work called *Rüya and Galip* which might accompany my sensitive and intelligent readers for many years to come. But I don't possess that sort of assurance; I happen to be a realist when it comes to my talent and my work. That's why I wish to leave you, the reader, alone on this page with your own recollections (384-385).

This quote gives clues about the identity of the narrator as well. The narrator being a columnist suggests that this person could be Galip/Jelal, meaning Galip's author self or second self. Furthermore, when the narra-

tor claims "I was so far from being myself that I was becoming a stranger to this black book, as well as to Galip" (396), he implies that he is actually Galip who is the narrator of Pamuk's *The Black Book* as well as the book, *Rüya and Galip*, within *The Black Book*. Thus, throughout the novel, the reader actually reads Galip's novel *Rüya and Galip*, narrated by Galip, within Pamuk's *The Black Book*. The fact that Jelal dies as soon as Galip finishes his novel is not a coincidence. That is, since Galip is done with his novel, he does not need his author self any more.

The death of Jelal could also be interpreted in accordance with Roland Barthes's idea of the death of the author. According to the realist tradition in literature, it is the author who creates the meaning in a text. However, in Barthes's opinion, the text and its author should be separated because it is not the author but language that creates meaning(s) in the text. As Barthes suggests, the author is also a grammatical "subject" (1977: 145) identified with the pronoun "I," and therefore, a product of language. Hence, Barthes declares the death of the the god-like author. It should be remembered that in the chapter "The Eye," Jelal is identified with an eye characterized by god-like qualities such as "all-seeing, omnipresent" (98). Hence, Jelal is treated as if he is a god-like author. However, the death of Jelal in the end symbolizes the death of the god-like author in accordance with Barthes's claim. Finally, in terms of the doppelgänger motif, it could be claimed that although Galip is not able to totally escape the fact that he is alienated from himself, the struggle between the doubles seems to be relieved because Galip has finished his novel and Jelal is dead. Thus, Galip, as the original, survives his double, Jelal.

Conclusion

To sum up, in the novel, Rüya and Jelal gain symbolic meanings for Galip. Rüya stands for a driving force to write. Rüya's existence in the novel depends on Galip's narrative, and she never appears as a concrete entity in the novel except for her death scene. Jelal's meaning for Galip is more complicated. Although there seems to be two different characters as Galip and Jelal, Jelal symbolizes Galip's second self. The familial tie between Galip and Jelal creates a legitimate background to suggest doubleness for them. Besides, the hidden dialogues between the chapters in the novel contribute to the idea that Jelal is Galip's double as being his author self. Since Galip develops conflicting feelings towards Jelal after a certain point, there appears a struggle between Galip and Jelal, which coincides with the

discussions on the doppelgänger motif. In accordance with the discussions about doppelgänger, the tension between Galip and Jelal is eased after Jelal, Galip's second self, dies. Finally, *The Black Book* presents the identity crisis of a writer in relation to the writing process, and Galip's journey in the city to find Rüya and Jelal could be interpreted Galip's quest for his own identity as a writer.

Note

- ¹ Galip/Jelal will hereafter be used to indicate Galip's author self, and the chapters which are referred as Jelal's columns in the novel are interpreted in this work as the outcome of Galip's author self.

Bibliography

- Atakay, Kemal (1996). "Kara Kitap'ın Sırrı." *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Nüket Esen. İstanbul: İletişim Yay. 36-47.
- Barthes, Roland (1977). "The Death of the Author." *Image, Music, Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath. London: Fontana. 142-148.
- Berman, Jeffrey (1988). "Personality (Double-Split-Multiple)." *Dictionary of Literary Themes and Motifs*. Ed. Jean-Charles Seigneuret. Vol. 2. New York: Greenwood. 963-970.
- Borges, Jorge Luis (1970). "Borges and I." *Labyrinths: Selected Stories and Other Writings*. Ed. Donald A. Yates and James E. Irby. Trans. James E. Irby. London: Penguin. 282-283.
- "Doppelgänger." Def. 1a, 2a, 2b. (1998). *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*. 10th ed.
- Herdman, John (1990). *The Double in Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. Houndmills: Macmillan.
- Kim, Sooyong (1996). "Mürşid ile Mürid: Kara Kitap'ı Bir Yorumlama Çerçevesi Olarak Tasavvuf." Çev. Kemal Atakay. *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Nüket Esen. İstanbul: İletişim Yay. 233-255.
- Koçak, Orhan (1996). "Aynadaki Kitap/Kitaptaki Ayna." *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Nüket Esen. İstanbul: İletişim Yay. 142-190.
- Moran, Berna (1996). "Üstkurmaca Olarak Kara Kitap." *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Nüket Esen. İstanbul: İletişim Yay. 80-90.
- Pamuk, Orhan (1994). *The Black Book*. Trans. Güneli Gün. London & Boston: Faber and Faber.
- Parla, Jale (1996). "Kara Kitap Neden Kara?" *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Nüket Esen. İstanbul: İletişim. 102-109.

Orhan Pamuk'un *Kara Kitap*'ında Öteki Benlik

Saniye Çancı Çalışaneller*

Özet

Bu makale, Orhan Pamuk'un *Kara Kitap* adlı romanını edebiyatta doppelgänger (ikinci kişilik ya da öteki benlik) kavramı bağlamında tartışacaktır. Romanda Galip ve Celal olarak iki karakter tanımlansa da Celal, roman boyunca Galip'in öteki benliği ya da ikinci kişiliği olan yazar benliğine dönüşür. Bu süreçte ise iki karakter arasında bir çatışma ortaya çıkar. Bu makale, söz konusu çatışma ve gerilimi doppelgänger ışığında yorumlayacak ve öteki benlik sorunsalını yazarlıkla ilişkilendirecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Orhan Pamuk, *Kara Kitap*, öteki benlik, Türk romanı.

* Öğr. Gör., Başkent Üniversitesi, Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı Bölümü / Ankara
scanci@baskent.edu.tr

Альтер-эго в Орхан Памука

Черная книга

Сание Чанджы Чалышанеллер*

Аннотация

В этой статье обсуждается роман Орхан Памука "Черная книга" в контексте литературной концепции doppelganger (второе я или другая личность). Хотя в романе и определены два характера, Джелаль, являющийся на протяжении всего романа другим я или второй личностью Галиба, переходит в личность автора. В этом процессе возникает конфликт между этими двумя персонажами. В этой статье рассматриваются конфликты и напряженность в свете doppelganger и связь проблематики другого я с писателем.

Ключевые Слова

Орхан Памук, "Черная книга", Альтер-эго, Турецкая роман.

* Науч. сотр., университет Башкент, кафедра американской культуры и литературы / Анкара
scanci@baskent.edu.tr