An-Najah National University
Faculty of Graduate Studies

The Spectrality of Translation: Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of Eschatological and Supernatural Terms in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*

By
Rafa Samer Maqboul

Supervisor
Dr. Bilal Hamamra

This Thesis is Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Applied Linguistics and Translation, Faculty of Graduate Studies, An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.
2020

The Spectrality of Translation: Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of Eschatological and Supernatural Terms in Shakespeare's Hamlet

By
Rafa Samer Maqboul

This thesis was defended successfully on 27/10/2020 and approved by:

Defense Committee Members	Signature
1- Dr. Bilal Hamamra / Supervisor	*Bilal Hamamra*
2- Dr. Nabil Alwai / External Examiner	*(signature)*
3- Dr. Ahmad Qabaha / Internal Examiner	*Ahmad Qabaha*

Dedication

To the dearest, father and mother, who offered me genuine love, endless care and support. Their constant belief in me has conjured up this thesis.

Acknowledgment

I cannot find words to express my sincerest gratitude and appreciation for my supervisor, Dr. Bilal Hamamra, for his inspiring words and support. Without his invaluable assistance this thesis would not have been completed. He has taught me more than I could ever give him credit for.

Many thanks are due to Dr. Nabil Alawi for his words of encouragement that have empowered me to complete this research.

I would also like to extend my immense gratitude for Dr. Ahmad Qabaha. What he taught me through the years is far beyond what words can ever express.

My profound debt of gratitude goes also to all of my professors at An-Najah National University.

This work might have never seen the light without the unconditional love and support of the people I am forever indebted to; my parents, siblings and best friends.

الاقرار

أنا الموقعة أدناه، مُقدّمة الرسالة التي تحمل العنوان:

شبحية الترجمة: ترجمات جبرا ومطران للمصطلحات الأخروية والخارقة في مسرحية شكسبير *هاملت*

The Spectrality of Translation: Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of Eschatological and Supernatural Terms in Shakespeare's Hamlet

أُقرّ بأن ما اشتملت عليه هذه الرسالة، إنما هي نتاج جهدي الخاص، باستثناء ما تمت الإشارة إليه حيثما ورد، وأن هذه الرسالة ككل، أو أي جزء منها لم يُقدم من قبل لنيل أي درجة علمية أو بحث علمي أو بحثي لدى أي مؤسسة تعليمية أو بحثية أو أخرى.

Declaration

The work provided in thesis, unless otherwise referenced, is the researcher's own work, and has not been submitted elsewhere for any other degree or qualification.

Student's Name:	**Rafa Samer Maqboul**	اسم الطالب:
Signature:	....	التوقيع:
Date:	27/10/2020	التاريخ

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Table No.	Subject	Page
Table (1)	Qur'anic Intertextuality	9
Table (2)	The Specter's Return in Jabra's and Mutran's Translations	33
Table (3)	Jabra's Added Footnote to Shakespeare's *"spendthrift sigh"*	45
Table (4)	Jabra's Reference to the Qur'an	46
Table (5)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"mark me"*	48
Table (6)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"mark it"*	50
Table (7)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"eyes"*	50
Table (8)	Horatio's Different Reply in Jabra's and Mutran's Versions	51
Table (9)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"walk"*	53
Table (10)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"walk in death"*	53
Table (11)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"ghost"*	54
Table (12)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"mole"*	54
Table (13)	Mutran's Reference to Prophet Mohammad's Hadith on *'hama'*	56
Table (14)	Jabra's and Mutran's Reference to Old Hamlet's *'death'*	58
Table (15)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"death"*	58
Table (16)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"was"* and *"is"*	61
Table (17)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"fires"*	62
Table (18)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of Old Hamlet's *"Crimes"* and Destiny	63
Table (19)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"heaven"* and *"pastor"*	64
Table (20)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"by Saint Patrick"*	65
Table (21)	Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of Revenge-related Terms	66

The Spectrality of Translation: Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of Eschatological and Supernatural Terms in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*
By
Rafa Samer Maqboul
Supervisor
Dr. Bilal Hamamra

Abstract

This thesis examines Jabra's and Mutran's translations of the eschatological and supernatural elements in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* harnessing Derrida's concepts of deconstruction and hauntology and Venuti's strategies of foreignization and domestication. It aims to find an answer for the translators' inconsistent use of Venuti's strategies and to show that there is an association between intertextuality, translation and ghosts. The thesis adopts a descriptive analytical approach that presents the collected data, in tables, from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1992), Jabra's translation (1979) and Mutran's (2012), respectively. The tables also include the source of any intertextual instances in the translated texts. The researcher compares and analyzes the chosen instances in two main sections, namely, the supernatural and the eschatological. The thesis has found that because translation is a spectral phenomenon, the translators' use of Venuti's strategies was inconsistent. It has proven, through the analysis of the chosen examples, that intertextuality, translation and ghosts are deconstructive of temporality, ontology and meaning as they entail 'repetition' and 'différance'. This thesis concludes that ghostliness is intrinsic to the definition of translation and that any inconsistency of translation strategies shall not be viewed as a problem when read through Derridean lenses.

Chapter One

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Statement of the Problem

1.3 Purpose of the Study

1.4 Limitations of the Study

1.5 Research Questions

Chapter One

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Language, Culture and Translation

Language, a means that expresses 'experiences', 'beliefs', 'assumptions' and 'histories' of a certain community, and culture, that consists of such 'experiences' and 'beliefs', are fundamentally intertwined to the extent that one cannot almost *be* without the other (Chaika, 1982, pp.1-2). Kluckhohn's definition of culture suggests that there is a link between culture and language, which is a system of symbols. He says that "culture consists in patterned ways of thinking, feeling and reacting, acquired and transmitted mainly by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups" (Kluckhohn, 1951, p.86). This relationship is also reflected in the analogy Bassnett makes. Bassnett (1980) says that "language is the heart within the body of culture, and it is the interaction between the two that results in the continuation of life-energy" (p.14). Bassnett's analogy suggests that culture is a body and language is its heart; this obviously means that culture cannot survive without a language. She resumes saying "no culture can exist which does not have [a] center [or a] [....] Language" (Bassnett, 1980, p.14). This does not mean, however, that this body/ culture would not stay alive without that specific heart/ language.

Science has developed heart transplanting operations where someone's heart can be replaced by another one considering appropriate follow-up care. Similarly, a certain culture can be expressed by a different

language but certain changes would take place, and translators are the ones responsible for such changes. Hence, heart transplantation procedures sound to represent resonance to the process of translation.

While doctors replace the patient's heart by another one, translators have to deal with the denotative aspect of languages (i.e., to replace a word by another word). Working under sensitive conditions and appropriate settings, doctors have also to suit the 'new' heart to the 'original' body. This is similar to the role that translators take as they deal with the connotative aspect of language (i.e., to deal with the cultural issues using the 'new' language considering the context). The translator's conception of the nature of translation would affect the way this operation is carried out.

The denotative and connotative aspects of language represent an instance of the influence culture has on language. While the former refers to the meaning of a word as defined in the dictionary, the latter depicts the implied meaning that goes beyond the dictionary definition and concerns the associations of the word according to culture (Leech, 1974, p.15). Hence, a word might depict the same thing in two languages but its connotations might differ because the cultures are different. For example, a word such as dog which refers to a specific animal might have different connotations in different cultures. While it might be perceived negatively in Arabic culture as it is used as a derogatory term for people, it has positive connotations in English cultures as "man's best friend, a good companion" (Jiang, 2000, p.329). Similarly, 'mouse' depicts an animal in both Arabic

and English cultures, but it was used as a term of address or a euphemistic expression for women in Early Modern English culture as can be seen in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. King Claudius uses 'mouse' to refer to his wife, Gertrude (3.4.182). Thus, one can argue that "biculturalism is even more important than bilingualism, since words only have meanings in terms of the cultures in which they function" (Nida, 2001, p.82). Moreover, a word's connotation in a certain culture might even change over the time making it impossible for any text to be identical to its former self.

Connotations acquire great importance in literary texts whose meaning depends on inferencing such aspects of meaning. For example, Shakespeare's use of the term 'fishmonger' (2.2.173) in *Hamlet*, referring to Polonius, encourages readers to figure out the connotative meaning rather than just thinking of the dictionary definition of the word as one who sells fish. Bearing in mind that 'fishmonger' was considered as a low class profession at that time and that it was considered the "Elizabethan cant language for pimp" leads readers who know that to understand the analogy Hamlet makes; he sounds to depict Polonius as one who sells Ophelia, his daughter, off for information about him (King, 2011, p.53). This might be easily accessible to readers acknowledged of such culture and context. However, such an association might not be accessible to other readers of different cultures.

Translators' treatment of such terms in the 'new' versions of the text reflects the strategies they use and their conception of the nature of

translation. For example, while Mutran chooses to delete this term in his translation, Jabra renders it as it is, (بياع سمك) (p.83), although Arab readers might not be familiar with the original context that associates it with 'pimp'. So, Jabra's literal translation of fishmonger, an obscene term of address Hamlet uses to address Polonius, Ophelia's father, suppresses Hamlet's misogynist and manipulative rhetoric. Furthermore, the literal translation of this term which shows that Polonius is a bawd who has unfaithful wife and daughter lessens the conflict between Hamlet and Ophelia. While many scholars argue that Hamlet's misogyny is a symptom of his Oedipus complex (Dobie, 2015, p.56), Jabra's literal translation impedes Arab readers to have an access to Hamlet's unconscious desire.

In both cases, it cannot be claimed that these translations are like the original. In Mutran's translation, the change is obvious considering his deletion choice of the 'original' term. One can argue that Mutran's deletion of this term is a conscious act imposed upon him by the Arab ideology that censors obscene words and expressions. While Mutran domesticates the text by deleting such an expression, Jabra whose purpose of translation, as we will see, is to foreignize the text, fails to capture the connotative meaning of the term.

Although Jabra renders the 'original' term as it is, one should notice that it is only a partial rending of meaning, namely, the denotative one. In the words of Benjamin (1996), Jabra renders the 'material content' not 'the truth content' (p.297). Chapman (2019) says that "it might appear then that

'truth content' and 'material content' are equivalent to 'meaning' and the actual words on the page, becoming separated during the 'duration' of a work's reception" (p.17). Hence, "no translation would be possible if in its ultimate essence it strove for likeness to the original" (Benjamin, 1992, p.256). As Jabra, literally, translates a word whose connotation depends on its 'original' context using another language whose audience's culture is different, it would not be possible for him to transfer both the material and the truth content of such a word.

Another reason for the impossible identical return of any text in translation is related to the different meanings that a word may have within the same language. In Derridean words, it is due to 'untranslatability' which is intrinsic to every text. Derrida provides an example referring to the word 'pharmakon'; it has double meanings (both poison and remedy), and this indicates that it might be rendered sometimes as remedy and others as poison. This demonstrates that there is a lack of integrity and unity that "inhabits "one" language and all languages" (Littau, 2000, p.25). Untranslatability or the impossibility of having an access to the original meaning of the text originates from the postmodern view of the impurity of language itself (Kruger, 2004, p.63). As we will see, the impossible, identical return of the text to a different culture is inherent in intertextuality which shows that each text is a translation of a translation and that the text is open to future unrealized meanings. Since no text can be identical in itself in the first place due to such multiplicities and pasts, its return/ translation would never be identical.

1.1.2 Intertextuality and Translation

Intertextuality reveals the ghostly nature of literary texts in the sense that each text is a belated ghost of pre-ghosts / texts. Within the context of this thesis, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is a belated ghost of Kyd's *Ur-Hamlet*. Intertextuality shows that every text is a patch or snatches of pre-texts. Barthes (1973) confirms that intertextuality is "the condition of any text whatsoever" (p.39), and that this text is but "a multidimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash;" "the text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture" (Barthes, 1968, p.116). The lack of originality inherent in the source text (which is not a source) manifests itself in translation which is a process of a promise that, in Hamlet's term, is procrastinated (deferred) or unrealized.

Literary works are laced with allusions to pre-texts and allusions. Klimovich (2014) sees that "the most commonly used intertextual elements in fiction are those from the Bible" (p.256). These elements can be 'referential', 'expressive-normative' or 'quotational', and they have 'stylistic', 'compositional' and or 'pragmatic' functions (Klimovich, 2014, pp.256-259). While Classic literature, like that of Shakespeare's literary corpus, is peppered with Biblical and mythical allusions, equivalent translation becomes impossible. As we will see, Mutran's and Jabra's translations of the eschatological and supernatural expressions bear the mark of Qur'anic expressions detached from the source expressions which, in turn, carry the marks of a range of Biblical allusions.

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the subject of this thesis, is written in English but it carries the mark of Thomas Kyd, Seneca, Greek mythology and biblical allusions. Alou (2017) argues:

Thomas Kyd's [...] *The Spanish Tragedy* has greatly contributed to, if not fathered, [...] (*Hamlet*) in terms of plot and style. This play exhibits some stupendous characteristics of a revenge play, be it the ghostly visitations, or the presence of the Machiavellian character along with the play-within-the play element and delay for revenge (p.52).

In Bloom's words, Shakespeare sounds to be obviously haunted by the works of his predecessor, Kyd. This might reflect Shakespeare's anxiety of influence as he, while trying to differentiate his text *Hamlet* from his predecessor's or, in Freudian terms, father's, could not escape from the ghosts of this precursor's works such as *Ur-Hamlet* (Smith, n.d.). This suggests that it is impossible to have an 'original' text, which is what the theory of intertextuality indicates. Every text "reaches out to other texts in an endless process of echoing, quoting, and repetition" (Korkut, 2005, p.68). This is very obvious when it comes to translation which entails the reformulation of the source text into another language and culture with endless chains of instable significations that deconstruct the originality of the source text and the translated one.

While Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is rooted in Christian discourse of protestant and catholic beliefs, both Mutran and Jabra domesticate many of the Christian expressions in the source text. The following example shows

how Mutran domesticates the 'original' by referring to the Qur'an.

Table (1): Qur'anic Intertextuality

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation	Qur'anic Intertextuality
"King Claudius: O my offence is rank, it smells to heaven It hath the primal eldest curse upon't — A brother's murder. Pray can I not" (3.3.36-38)	"الملك: آه ما أنتن إثمي! بلغت ريحه حتــى الســماء، وحطت عليه أولى اللعنـات وأقـدمها– لقد عجـــزت عـــن الصلاة" p. (133)	"الملك: قتل الاخ مــا أشــقه علــى الــنفس. أود لــو أصـلي وأسـتغفر ربـي لكنــني لا أسـتطيع". p.(60)	"فطوعت له نفسه قتل أخيه فأصبح من الخاسرين" (Al-Māidah; 5: 30) ("The (selfish) soul of the other led him to the murder of his brother: he murdered him, and became (himself) one of the lost ones") (Translated by A. Y. Ali).

Mutran's translation renders Shakespeare's use of the biblical intertextual reference to the story of Cain and Able in a way that reflects his consideration of the Muslim audience he translates for. His choices of "قتل" and "نفس" reflect his influence by the Qur'an.

On the other hand, translators may choose to translate such elements literally and thus do not necessarily consider addressing the target audience in a language that echoes their beliefs and culture. This is the case when it comes to Jabra's translation. Jabra's choices of words do not suggest that he refers to sources such as the Qur'an as he intends to foreignize the text.

In both cases, translation, like intertextuality, "is profoundly disruptive of temporality" (Whitehead, 2004, p.91) which is a characteristic of ghosts. Translation is the return of the text which is embedded in a historical moment into another culture and time. Hence, the ghostly return

of the text "destabilizes space as well as time" (Shaw, 2018, p.2).

Among the intertextual elements that Mutran and Jabra treat differently, being influenced by the strategies they use, are the eschatological and the supernatural. Under such categories, their translations of 'ghost' will be examined and analyzed to then be likened to the ghostly aspect of translation as will be seen in the following sections.

1.1.3 Eschatology and the Supernatural in Christianity and Islam

Among the sensitive issues that translators have to deal with during the process of translating from one culture into another is related to the religious terms employed in the source text. Nida (1961) stated that "the religious culture includes those features which represent an adjustment to 'supernatural' phenomena, e.g., gods, spirits, divine sanctions; revelation, and rites" (pp.147-148). It also depicts religious 'artifacts', 'sites', 'events', 'personages', and 'eschatological' elements (Assi, 2018, pp.6-8). This study focuses on analyzing the renderings of the eschatological and the supernatural that are treated differently in Mutran's and Jabra's translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

Eschatology is, as defined in *Lexico.com. Dictionary*, "the part of theology concerned with death, judgment, and the final destiny of the soul and of humankind" ("eschatology," n.d.). It is, thus, concerned with issues related to heaven and hell and the transition / translation of one's soul to the hereafter.

Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is a theological text that is embellished with ethical concerns related to revenge, suicide and adultery. It is a conflict of "mighty opposites" – soul and body and in extension heaven and earth. It is significant to point out that revenge is God's privilege and domain. Man, thus, based on Christian teachings, must not seek revenge but forgiveness. In the New Testament, in Luke 6:27-29 Jesus says: "Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you [...] pray for them which despitefully use you. And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other." In addition, in Chapter 12 of a letter written by Paul to the Romans, he tells them: "Recompense no man evil for evil […] Avenge not yourselves [...] for it is written, "vengeance is mine; I will repay' saith the Lord" (Romans 12:17-19). The implication of this is that revenge, whether exercised by male or female figures, is feminine gendered. It opposes the paternal word of God.

Shakespeare's *Hamlet* which "refer[s] periodically to Christian morality" (Labriola, 2000, p.320) enacts Hamlet's procrastination of taking revenge, the message of which imparted to him by a Catholic ghost dwelling in purgatory. As a protestant and a student of philosophy in a Protestant university, Wittenberg (1.2.113), Hamlet is confused by the message of the ghost of his Catholic father. Labriola (2000) suggests that the Eschatological morality informs the deliberations of characters concerning their conduct, their culpability for misdeeds, and their opportunities for repentance and regeneration, which may be accepted or declined. Thus, the ongoing exercise of volition in these processes makes one accountable to the deity (p.321).

The fact that Hamlet was reluctant to take revenge and kill his uncle immediately after the ghost of his father, that he doubts it might be a devil tempting him to sin, asks him to is evidence of his awareness of the divine command, "Thou shalt not kill". This Christian viewpoint is different from the Islamic one.

In the religious law of Islam, *Shari'ah*, Allah has given man the right of applying *qisas* to achieve justice. *Qisās* is "perhaps best rendered in English as retaliatory punishment, or a punishment equal to the injury sustained" (Mahfodz, 1982, p.77, as cited in Bradford, n.d.). Ismail (2012) explains that the law of *qisas*, as cited in (Bradford, n.d.), allows for one of three applications on the basis of Quran 5:45: mitigation of the punishment by the plaintiff and pardon (*'afw*), the payment of the blood-wit *(diyah)* in lieu of punishment, or application of the punishment in a manner equivalent to the crime. If intentional killing, then the defendant is executed; if intentional tortious damage to the plaintiff's person, then the same damage is exacted on the defendant. When the perpetrator's intention differs, so does the application of *qisās* (p.362).

In fact, *qisas*, just retaliation, has come to replace *tha'r*, the pre - Islamic intertribal blood revenge. It was prevalent in the pre-Islamic period and is still in some Arab communities such as Upper Egypt who think that it would be a big shame if they do not avenge. They believe that when vengeance had not been taken for one who had been killed, their souls take the form of a hama that flies, and keeps crying 'let me drink from my

killer's blood' until revenge is taken (Al-Tabrizi, 1970, p.955). Prophet Mohammad –peace be upon him- confirms that there is no such a thing in the following hadith:

قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ: "لاَ عَدْوَى وَلاَ طِيَرَةَ وَلاَ صَفَرَ وَلاَ هَامَةَ."صححه الألباني

(Sunan Abi Dawud, Book 30, Hadith Number 8)

(The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said: "There is no infection, no evil, omen or serpent, in a hungry belly and no hama" Related by Al-Albani) (Sunan Abi Dawud, Book 29, Hadith Number 3902).

Hama is defined, in *Al-Maany Dictionary*, as an animal or a bird that emerges from the dead whose *tha'r* had not been taken as some Arabs claim ("hama," n.d.) (My translation).

This conflict between Islamic and pagan elements is reflected in Mutran's domesticated translation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* concerning Hamlet's will to revenge and the conception of the ghost as will be seen in chapter three. Jabra's foreignizing translation, on the other hand, is a reflection of the differences in the Catholic and Protestant belief of ghosts.

Another concept that Christianity and Islam view differently is that which is related to the nature of ghosts. Ghosts are one of the supernatural beings. The term 'supernatural' is defined, in *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, as "of or relating to an order of existence beyond the visible observable universe *especially*: of or relating to God or a god, demigod, spirit, or

devil," and it could be "attributed to an invisible agent (such as a ghost or spirit)" ("supernatural," n.d.).

A ghost is defined, in *OED*, as involving "the idea of a specter, an apparition of the dead, a revenant, the dead returned to a kind of spectral existence – an entity not alive but also not quite, not finally, dead" (Simpson & Weiner, 1989). 'Ghost' and 'specter' are terms that can be used interchangeably as Derrida's definition of the specter suggests. He defines it as "first and foremost something visible. It is of the visible, but of the invisible visible, it is the visibility of a body which is not present in flesh and blood" (Derrida, 1996, p.115).

Islam does not believe in the return of the dead in any form. The dead will be resurrected and judged to, then, enter paradise or hell. Allah says "أَلَا يَظُنُّ أُولَٰئِكَ أَنَّهُم مَّبْعُوثُونَ" (Al-Mutaffifin; 83: 4)

("Do they not think that they will be called to account?-") (Translated by A. Y. Ali).

Allah also says:

" بَلَىٰ مَنْ كَسَبَ سَيِّئَةً وَأَحَاطَتْ بِهِ خَطِيئَتُهُ فَأُولَٰئِكَ أَصْحَابُ النَّارِ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ *وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ أُولَٰئِكَ أَصْحَابُ الْجَنَّةِ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ" (Al-Baqarah; 2: 81-82)

("Nay, those who seek gain in evil, and are girt round by their sins,- they are companions of the Fire: Therein shall they abide (For ever).*But those who have faith and work righteousness, they are

companions of the Garden: Therein shall they abide (For ever)")
(Translated by A. Y. Ali).

This Islamic viewpoint is different from the Christian one. In Christianity, there is a catholic belief in purgatory where sinners will be purified from their sins before going to heaven. This is particularly true of Hamlet's father whose spirit recounts his condition as one

"Doom'd for a certain term to walk the night,

And for the day confined to fast in fires,

Till the foul crimes done in my days of nature

Are burnt and purged away" (1.5.10-13).

Lavater (1569) says that Catholics believe that "certaine, yea before the day of Judgement, are permitted to come out of hell [...] for a season, for the instructing and terrifying of the lyving" and that "the soules which be in euerlasting joye, or in Purgatorie, do often appeare [...] partely for the comfort and warning of the living, and partly to pray aide of them" (pp. 104-105). This asserts that Old Hamlet is "a catholic ghost" (Greenblatt, 2001, p.195).

In literary texts, writers' choices of words reflect that characters have certain eschatological beliefs, but when translators contextualize a text differently, its characters' viewpoints may change. For example, Hamlet in Shakespeare's text is different from Hamlet in Mutran's and Jabra's

versions. As this thesis focuses on the ghostliness of translation, I will substantiate this claim by Mutran's and Jabra's ghostly translation of expressions linked to the ghost of Old Hamlet. I contend that translators' choices differ according to the strategies they use. While domestication entails changing views and beliefs of the ST in a way that suits the religion and culture of the target readers, foreignization does not. It rather tends to preserve the foreign elements of the ST as will be discussed within the contexts of Venuti's strategies of domestication and foreignization.

1.1.4 Mutran's Domestication and Jabra's Foreignization of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*

Shakespeare's *Hamlet* has been translated into Arabic several times by translators who have treated it differently. Among these are Mutran and Jabra who adopted different strategies. This is so obvious in their renderings of the eschatological and supernatural elements. While Mutran sounds to consider the culture of the audience he translates for, Jabra favors to retain the foreignness of the source text.

Mutran (1872-1949), a Lebanese poet and journalist who lived most of his life in Egypt and translated a number of Shakespeare's plays into Arabic, was commissioned, in 1918, to translate *Hamlet* by George Abyad, theatre actor, manager and director of "one of pioneering theatre troupes in the history of Egyptian theatre" in Egypt for Muslims (Inghilleri, 2005, p.170). Hence, Mutran might have taken into account displaying the prominent themes of the original play in an Egyptian and Islamic context.

Revenge and ghosts are among the issues that Mutran's translation suggests he has considered the Islamic as well as the pagan view, of Egyptians in Upper Egypt, concerning these issues. His choices sound to view Hamlet as a character struggling between such discourses.

Mutran (1912), in the introduction to his translation of Shakespeare's *Othello*, asserts that he, as a translator, believes that his job is to use a 'language' that suits the minds of the target audience (p.10). This emphasizes that his translation is a domesticated version of Shakespeare's text. In other words, Mutran translates *Hamlet* in a way that suits the taste and appreciation of Arab readers and audiences. Translators who use domestication as their translation strategy try to minimize the foreign elements of the source text in a way that suits the culture of the targeted audience and supports a natural or fluent reading of the text. For example, Mutran renders "by heaven" (1.5.104) as "وايم الله" (p.43) considering that Muslims swear by Allah.

While domesticating the ST, translators may choose to change or delete the foreign items of the ST as Venuti's strategy of domestication takes into consideration "values, beliefs and representations that pre-exist it in the target language" (Venuti, 1995, p.14). While Mutran domesticates *Hamlet*, Jabra (1960) uses the strategy of foreignization, attempting to preserve the spirit of Shakespeare's texts.

Venuti (1995) defines foreignization as "an ethnodeviant pressure on [target-language culture] values to register the linguistic and cultural

difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad" (p.20). As quoted in Ghazoul (1998), Jabra (1920-1994), a Palestinian Syriac-Orthodox author, novelist, poet, artist and translator, tries to preserve the "native soil of the original" (p.5) as he, always, prefers to treat Shakespeare's plays as "sacred texts" (Jabra, 1986, p.142). Thus, Jabra prefers to render the foreign elements of the ST even if they stand against the fluency and ideology of the TT. For example, Jabra renders "by heaven" (1.5.104) as "وحق السماء" (p.63), which sounds as an 'unnatural' term for the audience who always uses *wallah* (I swear by Allah).

Although Mutran uses domestication and Jabra adopts foreignization, there are instances in their translations that reflect their inconsistent use of these strategies; this thesis discusses and analyzes these issues in light of the spectral nature of translation that deconstructs any possibility of being loyal to only one side marking the inconsistent use of such strategies.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

One of the issues this thesis seeks to examine is the inconsistency of Jabra's and Mutran's translations of the eschatological and supernatural elements in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* using Venuti's strategies of foreignization and domestication.

In addition, none of the previous studies that have examined such Arabic translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* investigates the translators'

treatment of the ghost from a Derridean lens or studied the relationship between hauntology and translation.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

This thesis is conducted to examine Jabra's and Mutran's translations of the eschatological and supernatural elements along with their related terms in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. It attempts to find an answer for the translators' inconsistent use of the Venuti's strategies of foreignization and domestication. It also aims to show that there is an association between intertextuality, translation and ghosts.

1.4 Limitations of the Study

This study is mainly concerned with analyzing and comparing two Arabic translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The analyzed instances are limited to two main subcategories of religious culture, namely, the supernatural and the eschatological. Aiming to uncover the relationship between intertextuality, translation and ghosts, these two religious subcategories are the most appropriate and representative to consider. They are not, however, the only analyzable ones. Future studies, thus, can examine more categories and subcategories of culture so that Derrida's hauntology becomes a more practical approach in translation studies.

1.5 Research Questions

1. What is the association between translation, intertextuality and Derrida's concept of hauntology?

2. Why are not Jabra and Mutran consistent in the strategies they use in their translations of the eschatological and supernatural elements of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*?

3. Can Derrida's hauntology be applied as a practical theory in translation studies?

Chapter Two

Scope and Methodology

2.1 Literature Review

2.2 Theoretical Framework

2.3 Methodology

Chapter Two

Scope and Methodology

2.1 Literature Review

Studies conducted on Arabic translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* have utilized theories such as Vermeer's Skopos theory and Venuti's strategies of foreignization and domestication. None, however, has examined issues in the translated texts through a Derridean lens, which is what this study aims to do.

For example, Younis (2017), within the context of Vermeer's skopos theory, makes a contrastive analysis study of Jabra's, Mutran's and Enani's translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The study examines the problems translators face when they translate Shakespeare's figurative language and the strategies that can be employed in compensating such a loss. My thesis would not, however, examine the translated texts in such a way that privileges the source text over the secondary/ translated one.

In addition, Assi (2018) has examined Jabra's and Mutran's translations in line with Venuti's strategies to study how such strategies of foreignization and domestication affect their translations. He has found that although Jabra mostly uses foreignization and Mutran employs domestication, both are not consistent in their use of such strategies while translating elements of religious culture. His study concludes with the suggestion that "the formulation of the text into a different culture

embodies the workings of the ghostliness of translation and intertextuality"
(p.93) It does not, however, explain how these translations support this
argument, which is why it recommends further studies to read such
translations through Derrida's hauntology to uncover the relationship
between translation, intertextuality and ghosts. My study, thus, adopts
Derrida's theory attempting to find the reasons behind this inconsistency
and to reveal such an association.

While Assi's study provides eleven categories for religious culture,
my study examines instances related to two of these categories, namely, the
supernatural and the eschatological, which are considered as intertextual
elements. The treatment of such intertextual elements in translation has
been discussed in studies related to the phenomenon of intertextuality in
translation studies such as Klimovich's (2014), which traces biblical
intertextual references in Russian translations of English fictional texts.

Klimovich (2014) believes that there is a special connection between
intertextuality and translation noting that "now translation is being
understood not only as the interlinguistic phenomenon, but as the
intertextual phenomenon" (Denisova, 2003, p.207), which is what this
thesis attempts to clarify.

Furthermore, in translating literature, Alawi (2010) states that giving
great importance to the study of intertextuality in translation helps
translators to achieve proficiency in translation. He believes that harnessing
intertextuality in translation "offers models of interpreting texts by texts

and linking texts together so that the translation practice becomes more creative, lucid and attainable" (Alawi, 2010, p.2451). He also proves that intertextual references "gain new meanings and connotations" as they travel through different 'realities', 'spaces', 'places' and 'times' (Alawi, 2010, p.2445). This thesis will emphasize such a view through analyzing the translations of the eschatological and supernatural intertextual references within their new contexts. It will examine the new meanings these references gain in Jabra's foreignization and Mutran's domestication of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

Hence, following the critical lines of Derrida's deconstruction and hauntology and Venuti's strategies of domestication and foreignization, this thesis aims to show how translation is both an intertextual and spectral phenomenon. It focuses on exposing the common features between intertextuality, translation and ghosts, such as their destabilization of temporality, ontology and meaning.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

This thesis shows that translation is linked to the ghostliness inherent in textuality; translation is an apparition of the source text which is not identical to itself. The analysis of Jabra's and Mutran's translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, following the critical lines of Derrida's deconstruction and hauntology and Venuti's strategies of foreignization and domestication, reveals that translation cannot contain the impurity and multiplicity of the source text which is haunted by pre-texts. I propose that

the nature of translation resonates with that of ghosts. Andrew Buse and Peter Scott (1999) point out the nature of the ghost:

The ghost cannot be properly said to belong to the past […] for the simple reason that a ghost is clearly not the same thing as the person who shares its proper name. Does then the 'historical' person who is identified with the ghost properly belong to the present? Surely not, as the idea of a return from death fractures all traditional conceptions of temporality. The temporality to which the ghost is subject is therefore paradoxical, as at once they 'return' and make their apparitional debut (p.1).

The ghost and translation subvert the delineation of time and presence. The ghost is "a return to the past but a reckoning with its repression in the present, a reckoning with that which we have lost, but never had" (Gordon 2004, p.183). This temporal paradox of the ghost reflects that of translation. Translation entails addressing the past from the moment of the present pointing to the future. It deals with a pre-text/ ST that includes other pre-texts through language that operates within Derrida's concepts of différance and supplément.

With respect to Derrida's concept of différance, it is composed of two distinct meanings. The first one, namely to differ, implies "to be not identical, to be other, discernible, etc." The second sense, namely to defer, refers to "the action of putting off until later" (Derrida, 1982, p.8). This notion of différance shows that translation is impossible because the text is open to a chain of significations that are to be realized in the unattainable

future. Translation, nevertheless, is not only impossible but also "necessary" (Derrida, 1985, p.174).

Translation is necessary for the sake of communication, but it is impossible because of the impurity of language which is open to changing meanings. Such a paradox reflects that of ghosts that are 'visible' and 'invisible'. Derrida defines the specter as "first and foremost something visible. It is of the visible, but of the invisible visible, it is the visibility of a body which is not present in flesh and blood" (Derrida, 1996, p.115).

This necessity and impossibility of translation is what marks the survival of the text. The separation between words and their meanings, or in Benjamin's words, 'material contents' and 'truth contents', that takes place during the re-turn of their texts "decide on its immortality" (Benjamin, 1996, p.279). The text's reception by other readers, other times, other languages, other 'authors'/ translators marks this separation that marks and stems from change. Immortality or the condition of the 'living on' of texts is discussed by Benjamin and Derrida who, in Benjamin's (1992) words, believe that:

No translation would be possible if in its ultimate essence it strove for likeness to the original. For in its afterlife – which could not be called that if it were not a transformation and a renewal of something living – the original undergoes a change. Even words with fixed meaning can undergo a maturing process (p.256).

Texts, therefore, are, in Derridean words, translatable and untranslatable simultaneously. Derrida (2004) discusses such opposing conditions along with what he refers to as the survival/ 'afterlife' of a text; he writes:

A text lives only if it lives *on* [*sur-vit*], and it lives *on* only if it is *at once* translatable *and* untranslatable [...] Thus triumphant translation is neither the life nor the death of the text, only or already its living *on*, its life after life, its life after death. […] It neither lives nor dies; it lives *on* (pp.82-83).

Another Derridean concept that reflects the ghostliness of translation is Derrida's concept of supplément. Translation is a supplement to the source text. As the ghost is dependent on a pre-living thing, translation is an iteration of the source text which is a reiteration of pre-texts. The notion of supplément has double meanings. Derrida says that it "adds itself, it is a surplus, a plentitude enriching another plentitude". On the other hand, it "adds only to replace. It intervenes itself *in-the-place-of*: if it fills, it is as if one fills a void" (Derrida, 1976, pp.144-145). This double movement of the supplément represents resonance to that of translation and hauntology. Translation is an addition to the source text which is a lack that cannot be filled due to the slipperiness of meanings. Texts' endless potential for interpretation/ translation exposes the lack caused by the impurity of language that marks the non-fixity of meaning.

Hauntology, "a science of ghosts, a science of what returns" (Derrida, 2008, p.18), resonates with translation which reveals the return of

the text into a different historical and ideological context. Translation, a temporal and chronological sequence in which the source text precedes the translated one, is linked to the ontological disruption/ "hauntology". The ghost's ontology signifies eternal changing return of the present-absent specter. Derrida (1994) explains:

Repetition *and* first time: this is perhaps the question of the event as question of ghost. *What is* a ghost? What is the *effectivity* or the *presence* of a specter, that is, of what seems to remain as ineffective, virtual, in substantial as a simulacrum? Is there *there*, between the thing itself and its simulacrum, an opposition that holds up? Repetition *and* first time, but also repetition *and* last time, since the singularity of any *first time*, makes of it also a last time. Each time it is the event itself, a first time is a last time. Altogether other. Staging for the end of history. Let us call it a *hauntology* (p.10).

In abolishing the dichotomy between "now and then, the specter points towards the dual directions of hauntology—the compulsion to repeat the past, and an anticipation of the future" (Shaw, 2018, p.2). Repetition entails iteration which is intrinsic to translation, the ghostliness of intertextuality.

Shaw (2018) says that "the experience of being haunted is one of noticing absences in the present, recognizing fissures, gaps and points of crossover (p.2). It also entails a repetition that "often functions to highlight new meanings and perspectives" (Shaw, 2018, p.3). This is similar to

translation. In translation, such new perspectives and distortions might result from the different strategies of translation that translators adopt such as Venuti's domestication and foreignization.

While domestication is concerned with familiarizing source texts for target readers, foreignization is about 'preserving' the foreignness of the ST. Hence, translators act as mediators between the languages' different cultures. Venuti also believes, nonetheless, that foreignization "does not offer unmediated access to the foreign – no translation can do that" (Venuti, 1995, pp.18-19.). Baker (2009) comments that Venuti's aim "is not to "preserve" the source text as such, but to disrupt dominant values within the target context, in order to draw the reader's attention to the fact that what they are reading is a translation" (p.65).

As such, this thesis is concerned with analyzing the re-appearances of the ghosts of *Hamlet* in Jabra's and Mutran's texts that have different forms influenced by Mutran's use of domestication and Jabra's choice of foreignization.

2.3 Methodology

The data this descriptive analytical study examines are collected from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1599/1992), Jabra's (1960/1979) and Mutran's (1918/2012) translations. These data depict religious elements that are treated differently in the two translations. It specifically investigates the supernatural and eschatological instances, which are studied under two main sections.

The first section studies instances that refer to supernatural elements such as ghosts. It focuses on finding a link between intertextuality, translation and specters. The second section analyzes eschatological terms related to death, judgment and heaven and hell. It focuses on finding an answer for the translators' inconsistent use of strategies through Derrida's ghostly lens.

This study compares the chosen instances from the 'original' play with Jabra's and Mutran's translations, respectively. The data are presented in tables that also include the source of any intertextual references in the TTs when available. Then, the researcher analyzes these instances in the light of Derrida's deconstruction and hauntology to uncover the relationship between translation and ghosts. The researcher also identifies the strategy of translation that each translator adopts drawing on Venuti's strategies of foreignization and domestication.

Chapter Three

Data Analysis

3.1 The Supernatural

3.2 The Eschatological

Chapter Three

Data Analysis

3.1 The Supernatural

Drawing on Venuti's strategies of foreignization and domestication and Derrida's concepts of iteration, supplementarity, différance and ghostliness, this section examines Jabra's and Mutran's translations of the supernatural elements in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, uncovering the relationship between translation and ghosts which are the stuff of intertextuality.

The term supernatural is defined, in *Lexico.com. Dictionary*, as "manifestations or events considered to be of supernatural origin, such as ghosts" ("supernatural," n.d.). Thus, this section examines translations of expressions such as 'ghost', 'specter', 'apparition' and of terms used to describe or refer to such elements of spectrality. A ghost is defined, in *OED*, as involving "the idea of a specter, an apparition of the dead, a revenant, the dead returned to a kind of spectral existence – an entity not alive but also not quite, not finally, dead" (Simpson & Weiner, 1989). This study uses the terms ghost, specter and apparition interchangeably, showing ghostly affinities between hauntology, the science of ghosts, and translation, a ghostly task par excellence.

This section suggests that Mutran's and Jabra's translations are not replications or duplications of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* but they appear as apparitions of an apparition/ *Hamlet*. This ghostliness of translation is best

expressed in Mutran's and Jabra's translations of the ghost of Old Hamlet, the driving force that leads *Hamlet* and Hamlet to their tragic closures.

Marcellus's and Bernardo's speech on the re-appearance of the ghost before its textual appearance highlights the ghostliness of the text, *Hamlet* which, referring to a pre-text, Kyd's *Ur-Hamlet* (Hoy, 1962, p.viii), begins before it begins. Bernardo, Marcellus and Horatio refer to the ghost as apparition, spirit, ghost, thing which emphasize the insubstantiality of this ephemeral entity that returns in different forms in translation. The following example, from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, displays Marcellus' question about the re-appearance of 'thing', which re-appears in Jabra's and Mutran's versions in another form.

Table (2): The Specter's Return in Jabra's and Mutran's Translations

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation
"Marcellus: What, has this thing appear'd again to-night?" (1.1.21)	"مرسلس: قل لي، هل ظهر ذلك الشيء مرة أخرى الليلة؟" p.28	"مرسلس: وبعد. أفعاد ذلك الطيف في هذه الليلة؟" p.26

While Jabra's translation is a literal rendering of Shakespeare's words except for replacing 'this' with 'that', Mutran replaces 'what' with '*wa ba'd*', 'appear'd again' with 'returned', 'this' with 'that' and 'thing' with 'specter'. All of these replacements have special significance.

Mutran's use of the verb 'return' that entails iteration or repetition and, in hauntological terms, change or 'distortion' confirms that the translated text, like any ghost, "begins by coming back" (Derrida, 1994, p.11). Translation is linked to the re-turn of the text into another cultural

context, highlighting the "turn" / change embedded in this re-turn. It also, besides changing, involves a constant act of turning/ moving, which are highlighted in Mutran's turning of 'what' into '*wa ba'd'* (anyway) or (now then). 'Anyway' is defined, in *Longman Dictionary*, as a term "used when you are changing the subject [...] or returning to a previous subject" ("anyway," n.d.), which best describes what happens in translation that as it re-turns to the ST, it changes it. Thus, the TT becomes a specter that will never be "the same" as its precedent (Derrida, 1985, p.158), for ghosts, as Buse and Scott (1999) argue, cannot be properly said to belong to the past [...] for the simple reason that a ghost is clearly not the same thing as the person who shares its proper name. Does then the 'historical' person who is identified with the ghost properly belong to the present? Surely not, as the idea of a return from death fractures all traditional conceptions of temporality. The temporality to which the ghost is subject is therefore paradoxical, as at once they 'return' and make their apparitional debut (p.1).

In fact, "*wa ba'd*" appears as a ghost as it fractures stability of meaning, ontology and temporality. The absence of Arabic dia*critics* in this word defies any fixed form and thus meaning of it due to the presence of many *critics*, who, as they host the text, vocalize it differently. Some may read "*wa ba'd*" as "وبَعْدْ" (then/ (and) after) instead of "وبَعْدُ" (anyway), (now then) or (*thereafter*). This reading indicates that such a text has come into being after one that precedes it pointing to the 'then'/ what is after the 'after'. It, therefore, like a ghost, dissolves the dichotomy between now and

then as they become inseparable in "now then", (*wa ba'du*). It further indicates that the TT's issuing from the ST marks its *hereafter*/ 'afterlife' entailing change (Benjamin, 1992, p.254). Benjamin and Derrida's notion of the survival/ afterlife of texts is more clarified in section two on eschatology.

Moreover, the ghost, in Mutran's version, makes its apparitional debut when Mutran renders 'thing' as 'specter'; this suggests that translation can be spectral, as it, invisibly, uncovers the 'original's' invisibility. 'Thing', in the ST, is something that is invisible to readers and audience members, for Shakespeare, at that point, still does not reveal to them what this 'mysterious thing' is. However, Mutran renders it as *taif* (specter), which, I see, becomes a specter for 'thing', or something that is visible of the supposed invisible, 'thing'. Obviously, 'thing' has, during translation, turned into a no-thing / *taif* (specter) affirming that translation is a process of conjuring up specters.

This resonates with Derrida's (1996) depiction of the specter as "first and foremost something visible. It is of the visible, but of the invisible visible, it is the visibility of a body which is not present in flesh and blood" (p.115); 'thing', in the ST, is a dead body whose flesh is lost during a process of transformation that turns it into a *taif* (specter). Thus, in Derridean words, translation is "no doubt, the tangible intangibility of a proper body without flesh, but still the body of some*one* as some*one* other" (Derrida, 1994, p.6); translation is a re-dressing of a body whose identity, essence and invisibility are invisible.

This emphasizes that any text is a specter, ghost of pre-texts / ghosts. Translators should be experts in the field of Hauntology (Hamletology), that is, intertextuality, to render the ghostliness of the text into Arabic. However, as mentioned above, this is impossible as return and repetition entail inevitable change as the ST travels through different times and cultures. This change that is embedded in translation suggests that translation entails re-writing the ST. Mutran sounds to rearrange events and pre reveal characters while he re-writes Shakespeare's text. Such a difference might be also attributed to the "invisible style" translators choose to adopt as they translate the ST, as we will see in Mutran's domestication of *Hamlet*.

Furthermore, Jabra's and Mutran's use of 'that' instead of 'this' indicates reference to something that appeared before it re-appears. It is noteworthy to mention that Mutran's translation along with Jabra's that appeared in (1918) and (1960) and re-appeared in (2012) and (1979), respectively, are apparitions of Shakespeare's (1599) *Hamlet*, which re-appears many times later and is itself an apparition of Kyd's *Ur- Hamlet*. This is ghostly as the ghost is a supplement to/ dependent on a pre-living thing but both are not identical to each other. Thus, 'that', in Jabra's and Mutran's translation, emphasizes that "the temporality to which the ghost is subject is therefore paradoxical, as at once they 'return' and make their apparitional debut" (Buse & Scott, 1999, p.1). In other words, it disturbs the time reference as it, at the same time, refers and does not refer to the specter mentioned in its past, ST.

This leads us to consider the question that Mutran raises through his translation "has that specter returned?", to his version, which is the question of all translations, as a question of ghosts; Derrida (1994) writes:

Repetition *and* first time, but also repetition *and* last time, since the singularity of any *first time*, makes of it also a last time. Each time it is the event itself, a first time is a last time. Altogether other. Staging for the end of history. Let us call it a *hauntology* (p.10).

The change embedded in the return/ translation of the ST points to the spectrality of its singularity. Thus, as "any *first time*, makes of it also a last time" (Derrida, 1994, p.10), it is impossible for the "Catholic ghost" (Greenblatt, 2001, p.195) of the ST to return with the same identity in the TT, which is written by another 'author' in a different time to a different audience with a different culture; it is noteworthy to mention that as Mutran domesticates the ST, he Arabizes and Islamizes the Catholic ghost. Thus, replacing 'this', that depicts a present, with 'that', that refers to the past from the present, and bearing in mind that this is not the same return as the past, suggest that the TT, like any specter, "points towards the dual directions of hauntology—the compulsion to repeat the past, and an anticipation of the future" (Shaw, 2018, p.2), which makes it both a "revenant (invoking what was) and arrivant (announcing what will come)" (Blanco & Peeren, 2013, p.13).

Hauntology, "a science of ghosts, a science of what returns" (Derrida, 2008, p.18), thus, becomes a lens through which translation can

be examined. Translation is an apparition of the source text which is not identical to itself, and what returns through translation, as Derrida (1985) observes, is, thus, "never the same text, never an echo, [...] or, if there is, it's always distorted" (p.158). The ST loses its 'identity' as soon as it signs itself to other tongues/ languages, ears/ significations, places and times that conjure up many ghosts.

What further suggests that Jabra's translation is a distortion or a specter of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is his *para*-textual material represented in his preface and footnotes that help to unfold the ghostliness of textuality and translation. It is noteworthy to mention that Jabra uses footnotes as he prefers to foreignize the ST by commenting 'outside' it. Mutran, on the other hand, does not use footnotes as he domesticates the text by intervening and making changes in the body of the text itself. He also omits some scenes from the ST to adhere to the requirements of "modern acting" as he was commissioned to translate for the theatre (Hanna, 2016, p.151). As quoted in Hanna (2016), the deleted parts, Mutran believes, "have no function in the play other than the mere embellishing of dialogue" (p.151).

Jabra's text shows how translation is linked to the ghostliness inherent in textuality; in his *pre*face to his translation, he makes it clear that he translates a text that is in itself not original; Jabra writes:

"إن قصة هاملت نفسها كان احد كتاب الدرامة قد جعل منها مسرحية قبل ذلك ببضع سنوات."

p.17

(The story of Hamlet itself was made a play by one of the dramatists a few

years prior to that one's) (Jabra, 1979, p.17) (My translation).

Jabra sounds to refer to Kyd's *Ur-Hamlet* as Hoy (1962) suggests. He believes that it is "the immediate source of Shakespeare's tragedy" (p.viii).

This obviously confirms that any text is an intertext or an apparition of many apparitions (Barthes, 1973, p.39). The following footnote that Jabra adds clearly asserts that Shakespeare refers to Greek Mythology as well. In (5.1.273), Hamlet mentions Ossa, and Jabra, rendering it as (أصا), adds a footnote that reads:

"جبل آخر في تساليا. في أساطير الاغريق ان العمالقة عند محاربتهم الآلهة ارادوا التسلق الى السماء بتركيب "أصا" على "بليون". p.193

(Another mountain in Thessaly. In Greek mythology, the Titans, while fighting against gods, wanted to climb to heaven by placing "Ossa" on "Pelion") (Jabra, 1979, p.193) (My translation).

These instances emphasize again that every text is a ghost of a ghost of a ghost. Shaw (2018) suggests that 'hauntology', "as an intertextual concept", "opens texts to other texts" (p. 108). Hence, the TT, through its intertextual relations, gives life to pre-texts. In the words of Miller, the TT is a host whose guest is the ST. It is also, in Derridean words, a supplement to the ST whose life would not have been possible without the existence of the pre-texts. The TT, thus, is both a ghost and a host. Wolfreys (2002), highlighting the spectrally of textuality, says "to tell a story is always to invoke ghosts, to open a space through which something other returns"

(p.3), which is the same when it comes to translation. Jabra's TT, therefore, becomes an iteration of the source text which is a reiteration of pre-texts.

Since Derrida's notion of 'iterability' entails "re-citation repetition and changes" (Derrida, 1988, p.47 & Davis, 2001, pp.30-40, as cited in Chapman, 2019, p.20), Jabra's text cannot be said to be an identical replication of Shakespeare's, which resonates with the nature of the ghost that, although dependent on a pre-living thing, is never identical to itself (Buse & Scott, 1999, p.1). Jabra's addition of the following footnotes demonstrates further how translation is ghostly.

At the beginning of act four, scene one, Jabra, after rendering "A room in the castle" as "في إحدى حجرات القلعة *", adds the following footnote:

"* يبدأ الفصل الرابع هنا، بموجب تقسيم اتبعه أصحاب الطبعات الحديثة منذ عام 1676. غير أننا بمراجعة طبعة الفوليو (1623) نجد أن هذا المشهد يتصل بسابقه، والمعنى، كما هو ظاهر، يتطلب ذلك. فالحجرة هنا إذن هي الحجرة نفسها التي رأيناها في المشهد السابق، والحركة مستمرة." p.147

(*Act four begins here according to a division that recent editions have adopted since 1676. However, reviewing the Folio's (1623) edition, we found that this scene is linked to the previous one, which is, obviously, suggested by the meaning as well. The room here, therefore, is that which we saw in the previous scene, and the acting continues) (Jabra, 1979, p.147) (My translation).

Jabra's reference to multiple pre-texts/ versions in the present

suggests that part of the translation process entails confronting and listening to different ghosts from the past and asserts that "[o]ne never inherits without coming to terms with some specter, and therefore with more than one specter" (Derrida, 1994, p.21). Jabra does not translate an original text that is fixed and closed. He rather deals with more than one ghost/ version of the same text.

Moreover, the asterisk that Jabra adds, referring to a footnote, is a ghost that "disorganizes the chronological order, reframes time reference, dislocates the past from its pastness, and introduces a radical discontinuity into the present, making it not contemporaneous with itself" (Lorek-Jezińska & Więckowska, 2017, p.12). Using such a mark stops present readers, for a while, sends them to another place that belongs to the past, and, afterall, tells them that '*wa alharaka mustamera*' (and the acting continues)! In other words, this *para*-textual comment has the spectral paradoxical effect that the prefix *para* possesses. Miller (1977) writes:

'Para' is an "uncanny" double antithetical prefix signifying at once proximity and distance, similarity and difference [...] something simultaneously this side of a boundary line, threshold, or margin, and also beyond it, equivalent in status and also secondary or subsidiary, submissive, as of guest to host, slave to master (p.441).

This comment lies inside Jabra's text and, at the same time, outside it or outside the ST he translates; Jabra adds this footnote under a line at the bottom of the page. Such comments, reflecting the ghost's relation with its

pre-self, show that the TT is similar to its ST that is not identical to itself, which, thus, simultaneously, makes it different from it as well.

In addition, the TT may sound different as some consider it as a derivative or secondary text compared with the 'original', unlike deconstructionists who reject such priority of 'original' texts. They believe that meaning does not come from the author of the 'original' text or that it lies there fixed and closed in the ST itself. They, in Barthes' words, believe in 'the death of the author'. Therefore, dichotomies such as original and secondary, author and translator are undermined through the use of these *para*-textual comments that point to the visibility of the translator/ 'co-author'.

Translators can be visible through employing a number of interventionist strategies such as prefacing and footnoting. Godard (1988) says that such *para*-textual strategies allow translators to be active participants in "the creation of meaning" (p.50). Thus, Jabra sounds to be visible as he, sometimes, chooses to make his voice heard through the views he presents in his comments. Above all, his name is written on the book cover of his translation, which is a big sign of his visibility; " ترجمة وتقديم: جبرا إبراهيم جبرا" is printed on the cover. Jabra becomes, like a ghost, visible and invisible at the same time as he, sometimes, sounds to domesticate the ST or adopt an invisible style as well.

These footnotes are also ghosts in that readers of Jabra's text cannot guess or expect the time of their appearance and they, thus, problematize the linearity of history. Lorek-Jezińska and Więckowska (2017) state that

"the comings and goings of specters are not assigned specific dates [...] Accordingly, haunting transforms the linear time of the calendar into a time of waiting and uncertainty, of not knowing who and when may arrive" (p.12).

In fact, the asterisk is not the only ghostly punctuation mark that appears in Jabra's text. The analysis of the following added footnote explains the reasons behind the appearance of ghosts for ST marks such as the question mark (?). Jabra adds a comment on Ophelia's singing. She sings:

"O, how the wheel becomes it! It is the false

steward, that stole his master's daughter" (5.5.171-72).

Jabra renders it as:

"ما أجمل انسجام الغناء ودولاب الغَزْل! الخازن

p. 167 ."اللئيم هو الذي هرب بابنة سيده*

Then, he, in the following footnote, tries to identify the story that Ophelia refers to and to reach to the meaning it conveys. Jabra writes:

p.167 "* قصة أخرى مجهولة لدينا، كقصة القرد والقفص. لعل فيها إشارة الى كلوديس؟"

(*We have another unknown story like that of "The Ape and the Basket". It might have a reference to Claudius?) (Jabra, 1979, p.167) (My translation).

Jabra's comment refers to absent ghosts that "never die" but "remain

always to come and to come-back" (Derrida, 1994, p.99). Being unable to reach to the 'original' texts does not mean that they disappear. They, nevertheless, keep coming back to haunt the ST and TT marking presence and absence simultaneously very much like specters.

Jabra's comment asks a question instead of giving answers, which reflects the ghostly nature of translation that always gives many possibilities and options due to the death of the author, impurity of language and the slippery nature of meaning. Many full stops (.) turn into such specters as question marks (??) in the TTs as translators cannot claim to reach to the "intact kernel"/ essence of the ST (Derrida, 1985, p. 115). Derrida (1985), reflecting on the central metaphor of Abraham and Torok's "The Shell and the Kernel", writes about the *phantasm* of the kernel. He says, "the desire or the *phantasm* of the intact kernel is irreducible – despite the fact that *there is no* intact kernel [...] and there never has been one" (p.115).

Jabra admits that he cannot get the 'kernel' of the 'original' through the 'probable' words or the question marks he uses in the added footnotes such as "من المحتمل" p. 138, "لعل", "على الأرجح" p. 167, "يبدو" p. 202, and "يعتقد", "هل ممكن؟" p. 208.

Furthermore, the following example in which Jabra mixes the past and the present as he fails to foreignize the ST emphasizes that translation is a ghost that "de-synchronizes" and makes the text "out of joint" (Derrida, 1994, p.7).

Table (3): Jabra's Added Footnote to Shakespeare's *"spendthrift sigh"*

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation
"King Claudius: And then this 'should' is like a spendthrift sigh, That hurts by easing"(4.7.121-22).	"الملك: وعندها نرى أن "يجب" أشبه بزفرة مضنية* تروح عن النفس ولكنها تؤذي الجسد."p.177.
Jabra's Footnote	
"*كان القدماء يعتقدون ان كل زفرة تكلف المرء نقطة من الدم. ولعل في قولنا "ذهبت نفسه حسرات" شيئاً من هذا الاعتقاد." p.177	

This added footnote, in Venuti's words, "send[s] the reader abroad" and "bring[s] the author back home" simultaneously (Venuti, 1995, p.20) as Jabra combines past views with present ones. The past belongs to the original text's culture in which Shakespeare, by saying 'like a spendthrift sigh That hurts by easing', alludes to a view that was shared by common people. They believe, as Jabra says, that "ان كل زفرة تكلف المرء نقطة من الدم"/ (every sigh draws drops of blood). The present, on the other hand, refers to this being reflected in a way that considers the present cultural context of the audience; Jabra, while saying "ذهبت نفسه حسرات", alludes to a verse from the Qur'an that conveys similar associations as shown in table (4). Notably, this technique disturbs readers' reading process as it puts them in a position that does not belong solely to the past nor to the present, which suggests that translation like intertextuality shares a characteristic with hauntology; they are "disruptive of temporality" (Whitehead, 2004, p.91).

Table (4): Jabra's Reference to the Qur'an

Qur'anic Intertextuality
"أَفَمَنْ زُيِّنَ لَهُ سُوءُ عَمَلِهِ فَرَآهُ حَسَنًا فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ يُضِلُّ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَيَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ فَلَا تَذْهَبْ نَفْسُكَ عَلَيْهِمْ حَسَرَاتٍ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلِيمٌ بِمَا يَصْنَعُونَ" (Fater; 35: 8) ("Is he, then, to whom the evil of his conduct is made alluring, so that he looks upon it as good, (equal to one who is rightly guided)? For Allah leaves to stray whom He wills, and guides whom He wills. So let not thy soul go out in (vainly) sighing after them: for Allah knows well all that they do!") (Translated by A. Y. Ali).

It is noteworthy to mention that Jabra avoids rendering the original simile, 'like a spendthrift sigh' in the first place, which is an obvious breach of the strategy of foreignization he claims to adopt.

It is noteworthy to mention that such added footnotes or *para*-textual comments would not have been there without the existence of the ST very much like the specter whose appearance depends on the existence of its former self. It, thus, in the words of Miller, becomes a *para*site that feeds on its host and that will die if the host is not there. Hence, the TT is not only a host and a ghost but also a parasite as well. Therefore, translation, like the ghost that is not alive or dead and not a body nor a soul, is not a host nor a guest / parasite but can be any or both at any time. It is a pharmakon, poison and remedy. Its motto is not "to be or not to be" but is a ghost that lies in between being and non-being. It is a specter (i.e., "a deconstructive figure" (Davis, 2005, p.376) that dissolves all kinds of dichotomies. It takes life, by feeding on the pre-texts and gives life by being fed upon by such texts and critics, for example. Miller (1977) comments on this matter saying that:

The [text], however, any [text], is, it is easy to see, parasitical in its turn on earlier [texts], or contains earlier [texts] as enclosed parasites within itself, in another version of the perpetual reversal parasite and host. If the [text] is food and poison for the [translators/] critics, it must in turn have been a cannibal consumer of earlier [texts] (p.446).

As can be seen, the *site* this *para* comment occupies is where the ghost of Old Hamlet lies. Both are at the edges of the TT and Denmark.

Furthermore, such comments added in footnotes "frequently acknowledge discontinuities" between the ST and the TT "in a way that suggests fundamental disjunctures between two languages" (Stevens, 2010, p.38) very much like the specter whose return entails "some disjointing, disjunction, or disproportion" (Derrida, 1994, p.xix). An example that reflects this resonance is Jabra's confession of his inability to translate some of Shakespeare's puns into Arabic. In rendering Shakespeare's pun "He was the first that ever bore arms" (5.1.148), Jabra translates it as " اول من ملك الارض" (p. 182), and he adds a footnote saying:

"عند شكسبير توريات لا يمكن نقلها الى العربية، هنا واحدة منها استعضت عنها بهذه العبارة." p.182

(Shakespeare has puns that cannot be transferred into Arabic, among which is the following that I replaced with this phrase) (Jabra, 1979, p.182) (My translation).

The pun, like the previous simile, is a ghost that escapes being ontologized.

Hence, *para*-texts can be seen as ghosts as they indicate that "an attempt is made [...] to [translate] the text, but the only result is the record of the attempt – not the narrative, not the artifact" (Scheckter, 2011, p.66). In fact, the difficulty of translating such instances is further discussed by Derrida who believes in the *para*doxical nature of translation as being both "necessary and impossible" (Derrida, 1985, p.174). This view is illuminated further in the following examples.

Table (5): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"mark me"*

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation
"Ghost: Mark me" (1.5.2)	"الطيف: انظر الي" p.58	"الطيف: أصغ الي" p.41

The difference between Jabra's and Mutran's translations, that read "look at me" and "Listen to me" respectively, stems from the impurity of the 'original' term 'mark'. "Mark me" means not only "listen to me," but also, "look at me, and pay close attention" (Weller, n.d.). These different meanings of the same word emphasize that even the 'original', like any ghost, is "not [...] identical to itself" (Derrida, 1985, p.188). Another double term that Jabra and Mutran render differently is 'brother'. King Claudius refers to Old Hamlet as 'brother' (1.2.1). While Jabra translates it as "أخ" (p.35) (a brother who is not necessarily from the same parents), Mutran renders it as "شقيق" (p.30). Father can also have distinct meanings in Arabic. In the list of characters at the beginning of Shakespeare's text, the ghost is mentioned as "Ghost of Hamlet's Father". Jabra renders it as " أبي هاملت" (p.25) but Mutran writes "والد هاملت" (p.24). While "والد" refers to the biological father, "أب" does not necessarily do.

In fact, Derrida (1985) suggests that language "can only exist in the space of its own foreignness to itself" (p.146). Thus, the impossibility of transferring these significations by a single word into the TT suggests that the ST, in all its multiplicity, cannot be transferred intact into the new language, which makes translation like haunting "points to the need to face the past and to accept its multifarious inheritance" (Lorek-Jezińska & Więckowska, 2017, p.12). Hence, the impossibility of an identical transference of the term 'mark' into Mutran's and Jabra's versions must not be considered as a failure but should be viewed within the logic of Derrida's différance. This notion of différance entails 'difference' and 'deferral' of meaning (Derrida, 1982, p.8). In other words, the text is open to a chain of significations that are yet to be realized differently according to its future contexts.

It is important to mention that Jabra's and Mutran's distinct translations of the term 'mark', mentioned again in table (6), shall not be overlooked or thought of as random or haphazard choices. Their translations of this term along with the following examples provide premises that play a big role in revealing the identity of the figure of Old Hamlet in their versions. These premises, which are read in line with the translators' applied strategies, are related to certain features relevant to the visibility of the figure, its movement, and designations.

Visibility:

Table (6): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"mark it"*

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation
"Bernardo: Looks it not like the king? mark it, Horatio" (1.1.43)	"برنردو: ألا يشبه الملك؟ دقق النظر فيه يا هوراشيو". p.29	"برناردو: ألا يشبه الملك؟ تَبَيَّنْهُ يا هوراشيو". p.27

Jabra's translations of 'mark' that read, as viewed in tables (5) and (6), 'look' and 'look closely' mark the visibility of the figure of Old Hamlet. Mutran's, on the other hand, do not. He translates the term as 'listen' and 'discover'; 'discover' is the English term for *tabayyan* as mentioned in *Al-Maany Dictionary* ("تَبَيَّنَ," n.d.). Obviously, while Bernardo, in Shakespeare's and Jabra's versions, asks Horatio to look closely at the ghost, he, in Mutran's text, asks him to discover this 'thing'. This implies that characters in Jabra's version admit that this specter exists and they can look at it and see it. However, they, in Mutran's text, still discover what this 'thing' is. The following example, from Mutran's translation, suggests that even Bernardo himself does not affirm that he sees the ghost. He says "لم أرَ شيئًا" (p.26). As can be seen, Jabra's and Mutran's different translations that mark visibility and invisibility at the same time shed the light on the spectral aspect of translation.

Table (7): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"eyes"*

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation
"Marcellus: That if again this apparition come, He may approve our eyes and speak to it" (1.1.27-28).	"مرسلس: فإذا جاء هذا الطيف ثانية دعم ما رأته عيوننا وتكلم معه". p.28	"مرسلس: حتى إذا بدا الطيف كعادته، تحَقَّقَ منه وكلمْه". p.26

In this example, as can be seen in the ST, Marcellus tells Bernardo that he invited Horatio to let him see the specter they have seen, if it comes again, and thus convinces him that such a thing truly exists as he did not sound to believe them. Saying "he may approve our eyes" that have seen it affirms that they did actually see it. However, Mutran's choice of deleting this part, unlike Jabra, gives no evidence that characters have seen this figure and questions if it is actually a ghost as Horatio replies:

Table (8): Horatio's Different Reply in Jabra's and Mutran's Versions

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation
"Horatio: Tush, tush, 'twill not appear" (1.1.29).	"هوراشيو: لا، لا. إنه لن يظهر". p.28	"هوراشيو: رُويدَكما، رُويدَكما. لن يُرى ذلك الخيال." p.26

Saying 'it will not appear', in the ST and in Jabra's translation, is very different from Mutran's rendering of it as 'this apparition will not be seen'. Mutran's translation implies that a thing may appear, but there is no way that it can be seen in the form of a specter of Old Hamlet as he refers to it as 'that apparition', which refers to Old Hamlet's ghost. This is very logical when it comes to what returns/ re-appears in translation. What comes back in translation is not the identical ghost of Old Hamlet but different apparitions that pass across distinct times and cultures.

Furthermore, Horatio's reply, in the 'original' and Jabra's versions, does not sound to imply the same meanings that his response in Mutran's text conveys. Once Horatio says to Bernardo and Marcellus *rowaydakuma* (do not rush it), he sounds to say that 'wait, instead of you convincing me, I will convince you that what I am saying is right'. On the other hand, it is

the other way around when he says 'no, no' in Jabra's version, which sounds as an instant ungrounded wry skeptical rejection; he might get convinced.

Reading the previous translations along with Jabra's chosen strategy of foreignization and Mutran's adoption of domestication has great significance. In Venuti's words, Jabra's translations that mark the visibility of the specter serve as "an ethnodeviant pressure on [target-language culture] values [that] register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad" (Venuti, 1995, p.20). In other words, they transfer a Christian concept that most target Arab readers consider as foreign. Viewing the specter as something that can be seen refers to a Christian Catholic belief in purgatorial ghosts. Catholics believe that the spirits of the dead, who have not yet been sent to heaven can actually appear.

This contrasts with Mutran's chosen strategy of domestication that takes into account the culture of the audience who are mostly Muslims. Islam does not believe in the return of the dead (i.e., ghosts), and that is why Mutran's translations do not approve that such figures as ghosts can be seen. This is supported by Mutran's rendering of 'illusion' in "Stay, illusion" (1.1.127) as "الوهم" unlike Jabra who chooses "الخيال" that might designate a ghost.

Nevertheless, it is noteworthy to mention that there are certain translated terms used in Mutran's text based on which one can argue that

there is a "strongly pagan element" "which coexists alongside the [Islamic] elements" (Scofield, 1980, p.114), such as 'walk', 'ghost', and 'mole' as shown in tables (9), (10), (11) and (12).

Movement:

Table (9): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of _"walk"_

No.	Shakespeare's _Hamlet_	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation
1	"Ghost: I am thy father's spirit, Doom'd for a certain term to walk the night" (1.5.9-10)	"الطيف: أنا روح أبيك، وقد حُكِم عليّ بأن أطوف في الليل زمناً" p. 59	"الطيف: أنا روح أبيك قضي علي أن أهيم في الليل" p.41
2	"Hamlet: I will watch to-night; Perchance 'twill walk again" (1.2. 240-41)	"هاملت: سأخفر هذه الليلة فلعله يطوف مرة أخرى" p.46	"هملت: سأسهر الليلة معكم لعله يجيء" p 35

Table (10): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of _"walk in death"_

Shakespeare's _Hamlet_	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation.
"Horatio: you spirits oft walk in death" (1.1.138)	"هوراشيو: انكم معشر الأرواح تطوفون بعد الموت".p.33	"هوراشيو: أرواح الموتى فتهب من مراقدها هائمة".p.29

While Jabra uses (التطاوف) and (تطوفون), (يطوف), (أطوف) (p.34), when rendering 'stir' in "no spirit dares stir abroad" (1.1.161), Mutran chooses (أهيم) and (هائمة). He uses (هائمة) (p.29) again as he translates "Th' extravagant and erring spirit" (1.1.154).

The verb forms that Jabra uses form the noun (طيف), specter, which he always chooses to render once the original uses ghost or specter, as the following example in table (11) emphasizes. He also uses _shabah_ (ghost) sometimes. For example, he renders "A figure like your father" (1.2.199) as

"شبح على هيئة أبيك". This affirms that the figure of Old Hamlet is certainly a ghost in Jabra's version.

However, Mutran tends to avoid doing the same. His choices of (أهيم) and (هائمة), from which the noun (هامة) is derived, gain great importance when analyzed along with examples in tables (11) and (12).

Designations:

Table (11): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of "ghost"

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation
"Hamlet: Ay, thou poor ghost" (1.5.96)	"هاملت: أجل، أيها الطيف المسكين"p.63	"هملت: أجل يا أيها الروح الحزين" p.43

Table (12): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of "mole"

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation
"Hamlet: Well said, old mole!" (1.5.161)	"هاملت: حسنا نطقت يا خلد!" p.67	"هملت: أحسنت أيها الخفاش القديم" p.45

Table (11) shows that Mutran avoids rendering 'ghost' as *taif* or *shabah,* the Arabic equivalents for (specter) and (ghost), in positive statements. He rather chooses *ruh* (spirit or soul) that *tahem* (wanders), as shown in table (9.1), but is not something that looks like or an apparition of the old king, as the translation in table (8) suggests. It is rather, as example (12) shows, a bat!

Rendering mole as bat affirms that meaning is not stable and that signs have no ultimate referent. This is applied even on the original; mole in the ST is a sign that has no ultimate referent, for it, at the same time, refers and does not refer to the ghost of Old Hamlet. Many Critics agree

that Shakespeare was "determined to bury the mole so deeply within the language and the structure of the play as to make it inaccessible" (Lukacher, 1986, p.217). It is a ghost of a 'kernel' that can never be accessed in translation. Thus, Mutran's rendering of mole into another animal, bat, supports Roland Barthes' argument; he says "the signifier must not be conceived of as "the first stage of meaning [...] but, in complete opposition to this, as its *deferred action* [...] language [...] is structured but decentered, without closure" (Barthes, 1971, p.171). Language itself is ghostly due to the slippage and deferral of meaning it signifies.

All the previous translations provide premises that reveal the identity of this figure that results from Mutran's choice of domesticating the play, in Egypt, for Arabs. This figure echoes a belief that was prevalent in the pre-Islamic period and is still in some Arab communities such as Upper Egypt. They believe that when vengeance had not been taken for one who had been killed, their souls take the form of a *hama* that flies, and keeps crying 'let me drink from my killer's blood' until revenge is taken (Al-Tabrizi, 1970, p.955). This is an echo of what the ghost said in Kyd's *Ur-Hamlet*.

Hama is defined, in *Al-Maany Dictionary*, as an animal or a bird that emerges from the deceased's soul whose *tha'r* had not been taken as Arabs in the pre-Islamic period claim ("hama," n.d.) (My translation). In fact, in *Al-Maany Dictionary*, hama and bat are considered as synonyms. Hence, Mutran's use of *khufash* (bat) instead of *khuld* (mole) confirms that Old

Hamlet, in his version, is a hama. Hama is mentioned in the following
hadith that Hamlet sounds to refer to in table (13).

قَالَ رَسُولُ اللهِ ﷺ: "لاَ عَدْوَى وَلاَ طِيَرَةَ وَلاَ صَفَرَ وَلاَ هَامَةَ." صححه الألباني (Sunan Abi
Dawud , Book 30, Hadith Number 8).

(The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said: "There is no infection, no evil, omen or
serpent, in a hungry belly and no hama" Related by Al-Albani) (Sunan Abi
Dawud, Book 29, Hadith Number 3902).

**Table (13): Mutran's Reference to Prophet Mohammad's Hadith on
'hama'**

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Mutran's Translation
"Hamlet: Not a whit, we defy augury: there's a special providence in the fall of a sparrow. If it be now, 'tis not to come; if it be not to come, it will be now; if it be not now, yet it will come" (5.2. 204-207).	"هملت: أقِمْ فلا طيرَة ولا شؤم، لا تسقُط ريشةٌ من طائر إلا بإذنَ من رَّبِ السماوات، إن كانت الساعةُ قد دنَتَّ ، فلا رادَ لها، وإلا فهي آتية يوما لا محالة" p.85

Apparently, Jabra's and Mutran's translations subvert the identity of
the ghost of Old Hamlet and confirm that "[o]ne never inherits without
coming to terms with some specter, and therefore with more than one
specter" (Derrida, 1994, p.21).

In conclusion, Jabra's and Mutran's translations mark the ghostliness
of translation that involves re-turns of the ST into other languages, times,
and cultures, which thus deconstruct meaning, temporality and ontology.
Also, Mutran's domesticated translation that includes choices different
from the ST and Jabra's use of footnotes prove that translation is a ghost

that supplements its former self while being non-identical to it. The non-originality the term intertextuality exposes along with the non-integrity of language are also forces that impose différance upon the ghostly translated versions.

3.2 The Eschatological

Aiming to expose the hauntological aspect of translation, this section examines Jabra's and Mutran's translations of the eschatological terms in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* harnessing Derrida's notions of survival/ afterlife, supplément and ghosts and Venuti's strategies of foreignization and domestication while figuring out why Jabra and Mutran are inconsistent in their translations as well.

Eschatology is "the part of theology concerned with death, judgment, and the final destiny of the soul and of humankind" ("eschatology," n.d.). As mentioned earlier, Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, a revenge tragedy, is laced with the moral and ethical implications of suicide and revenge. Thus, the play is orchestrated with eschatological references such as death, judgment, afterlife and the destiny of one's soul. As eschatological beliefs are rooted in religious discourse, it is of paramount importance to study the translation of these references. I contend that Jabra foreignizes the Christian Catholic eschatological beliefs of the ST. However, Mutran domesticates such beliefs as he views them within an Islamic context.

Death or *almawt* in Arabic refers to two conditions. *Almawt alakbar* (passing away), which is designated by the Arabic term (الوفاة) entailing the

end of life on earth and thus any possibility of the return of the dead. On the other hand, the second meaning of *almawt*, namely, *almawt alasghar*, does not necessarily indicate the end of someone's life but designates temporary states such as sleep, which, thus, points to the possibility of appearing or returning to life or earth (Ibrahim, 2005, p.82) (My translation). Hence, rendering 'death' into Arabic as (الوفاة) sometimes and others as (الموت) carries special significance when discussed in relation to Old Hamlet's death in Jabra's and Mutran's translations as the following examples suggest. Table (14) views examples from Jabra's and Mutran's introductions of their translations while table (15) shows examples of their renderings of Shakespeare's words.

Table (14): Jabra's and Mutran's Reference to Old Hamlet's *'death'*

Jabra's Introduction	Mutran's Introduction
"موت أبيه" p.11	"توفي زوجها الملك "هملت"" p.9

Table (15): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"death"*

No.	Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation	Intertextuality
1	"King Claudius: Though yet of Hamlet our dear brother's death" (1.2.1)	"الملك: لئن تكن ذكـــرى مـــوت أخينـــا الحبيـــب هاملت" p.35	"الملك: إن ذكرى وفاة شقيقنا الملك السابق" p.30	"اللَّهُ يَتَوَفَّى الْأَنفُسَ حِينَ مَوْتِهَا وَالَّتِي لَمْ تَمُتْ فِي مَنَامِهَا فَيُمْسِكُ الَّتِي قَضَى عَلَيْهَا الْمَوْتَ وَيُرْسِلُ الْأُخْرَى إِلَى أَجَلٍ مُّسَمًّى ۚ إِنَّ فِي ذَٰلِكَ لَآيَاتٍ لِّقَوْمٍ يَتَفَكَّرُونَ" ﴿الزمر/42﴾.
2	"Horatio: you spirits oft walk in death" (1.1. 138)	"هوراشـــيو: انكـم معشـــر الأرواح تطوفـــون بعـــد الموت". p.33	"هوراشـــيو: أرواح الموتى فتهب من مراقدها هائمة". p.29	"قَـالُوا يَـا وَيْلَنَـا مَـن بَعَثَنَـا مِـن مَّرْقَدِنَا ۜ هَٰذَا مَـا وَعَدَ الـرَّحْمَٰنُ وَصَدَقَ الْمُرْسَلُونَ" ﴿يس/52﴾.

As can be seen in tables (14) and (15.1), Mutran talks about the death of Old Hamlet using the Arabic verb "توفي" and the noun "وفاة". This indicates that Old Hamlet's death, in Mutran's version, is that of *almawt alakbar* that denies any possibility for appearing again on earth in any form. Mutran sounds to refer to the above Qur'anic verse that is interpreted as: ("It is Allah that takes the souls (of men) at death; and those that die not (He takes) during their sleep: those on whom He has passed the decree of death, He keeps back (from returning to life), but the rest He sends (to their bodies) for a term appointed verily in this are Signs for those who reflect") (Al-Zumar; 39:42) (Translated by A. Y. Ali).

What comes after Allah takes the souls of the dead, who stay in their graves for a specific time until the Judgment Day comes, is *alba'th* (resurrection). Mutran's translation in table (15.2) presents this view clearly as he, by saying "أرواح الموتى فتهب من مراقدها", sounds to refer to the mentioned verse, interpreted as: ("They will say: "Ah! Woe unto us! Who hath raised us up from our beds of repose?"... (A voice will say:) "This is what (Allah) Most Gracious had promised. And true was the word of the messengers!") (Yasin; 39:52) (Translated by A. Y. Ali). Obviously, Mutran domesticates the ST in light of such Islamic views that deny the existence of ghosts. This view is supported by Mutran's choices that depict the invisibility of the ghost of Old Hamlet as viewed in the previous section on the supernatural and by his translation in table (16). Jabra's, on the other hand, presents Old Hamlet as a Catholic ghost that can be seen. His renderings of 'death' in tables (14) and (15) support this view.

Jabra's translation of death as "موت" refers to the mentioned condition of death as *almawt alasghar* that depicts a temporary state marking a possible return/ appearance of the 'dead'. Discussing this in light of Jabra's foreignization of Christian elements of the ST, such a temporary state may refer to the purgatorial one in which the dead can appear in the form of ghosts as Catholics believe.

Jabra's and Mutran's versions of the ST points to its potential aspect of translatability and at the same time to its untranslatability; their different translations of 'death' as 'موت' and 'وفاة' respectively reflect the double meaning of 'death' and thus the untranslatable aspect of the ST that does not have one fixed reading. Hence, Jabra's and Mutran's translations, in Derridean words, mark the survival/ afterlife of the ST. Derrida (2004) writes:

A text lives only if it lives *on* [*sur-vit*], and it lives *on* only if it is *at once* translatable *and* untranslatable [...] Thus triumphant translation is neither the life nor the death of the text, only or already its living *on*, its life after life, its life after death. [...] It neither lives nor dies; it lives *on* (pp.82-83).

Hence, translation, using Shakespeare's words, deals with a text that neither 'was' nor 'is' there but both at the same time. This survival, thus, sounds very similar to the ghost that depicts the 'was' and 'is' of its own self, which is suggested by the following example.

Table (16): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"was"* and *"is"*

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation
"Bernardo: so like the king That was and is the question of these wars" (1.1.110-111).	"برنردو: في شبهه القوي للملك الذي كان ولا يزال السبب في هذه الحروب". p.32	"برناردو: شبيهًا كل الشبه بالملك الفقيد، الذي كان السبب في شبوب هذه الحروب". p.28

Jabra's translation sounds very similar to the ST that suggests that Old Hamlet not only "was" but also "is" here emphasizing its appearance as a ghost that can be seen; "الملك كان ولا يزال", Jabra writes. On the other hand, Mutran believes that he only 'was' there but not is anymore as he deletes "is" and adds "الفقيد"/ (the deceased), which indicates his *wafat* (passing away) that denies his existence as a ghost. Mutran's text, nevertheless, becomes the ghost of Shakespeare's text as it supplements its 'former self' by 'replacing' and 'adding' to it.

Derrida's concept of the supplément suggests that "the indefinite process of supplementarity has always already *infiltrated* presence, always already inscribed there the space of repetition and the splitting of the self" (Derrida, 1976, p.163). Many replacements and additions in Mutran's version sound to result from the different eschatological beliefs of the characters, which match those of the target audience, that affect their way of thinking and acting and their attitude towards certain issues. For example, the Islamic belief in the final destiny of the humankind that is different from the Christian Catholic one has affected Mutran's choices as the following example shows.

Table (17): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"fires"*

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation	Intertextuality
"Ghost: To fast in fires" (1.5.11)	"الطيف: بأن اتضور جوعاً في اللُهُب" p.59	"الطيف: مصطليا سعيرَ النار" p.41	"وَيَصْلَى سَعِيرًا" ﴿الانشقاق/12﴾. "وَمَن لَّمْ يُؤْمِن بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ فَإِنَّا أَعْتَدْنَا لِلْكَافِرِينَ سَعِيرًا" ﴿الفتح/13﴾. "الَّذِي يَصْلَى النَّارَ الْكُبْرَى" ﴿الأعلى/12﴾.

Mutran's rendering of fasting in fires as "مصطليا سعيرَ النار" emphasizes that he domesticates the ST in accordance with the beliefs of the Muslim audience he translates for. He, by referring to the above mentioned Qur'anic verses, refers to the destiny of those who do not believe in Allah as that of "النار الكبرى" (hell). Based on their deeds, Muslims will enter hell or heaven as shown further in tables (18) and (19).

On the other hand, Jabra's translation of 'fires' as 'لُهُب' indicates that he foreignizes the Christian Catholic belief in purgatory. Purgatory is "(in Catholic doctrine) a place or state of suffering inhabited by the souls of sinners who are expiating their sins before going to heaven" and it, probably, is filled with fire ("purgatory," n.d.). Nevertheless, not all Christians believe that such a state as purgatory exists, especially Protestants, which makes the destiny of people uncertain when it comes to Christianity as the following example suggests.

Table (18): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of Old Hamlet's *"Crimes" and Destiny*

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation	Intertextuality
"Hamlet: He took my father grossly, full of bread; With all his crimes broad blown, as flush as May; And how his audit stands who knows save heaven?" (3.3.80-82)	"هاملت: لقد اتى أبي غرةً، وهو مليء بخبزه، وخطاياه مفتحة الأكمام كلها، محمرّة كخدّ ايار، ولا يعلم حسابه الأخير إلا الله". p.135	"هملت: أيرسل أبي إلى جهنم باغتياله إيّاهُ لا مصلياً، ولا مستغفرًا" p.60	"مَـا سَـلَكَكُمْ فِـي سَقَرَ ﴿42﴾ قَـالُوا لَـمْ نَـكُ مِـنَ الْمُصَـلِّينَ ﴿المدثر/43﴾

The ST shows that Hamlet was thinking about his father's destiny as he remembers that his uncle kills him before he could repent. Mutran views Old Hamlet's crimes within an Islamic context saying that he was not used to praying. Therefore, he refers to his destiny as that of those who do not pray as *Jahannam/ saqar* (hell) as mentioned in the above Qur'anic verse, interpreted as ("What led you into Hell Fire?") (Translated by A. Y. Ali). However, Old Hamlet's destiny is uncertain when it comes to Jabra's translation.

Jabra's translation that suggests that no one knows the destiny of Old Hamlet but 'God' reflects the disagreement that Christians have towards the destiny of those who do wrong deeds. While Catholics believe that they will be purified from their sins in purgatory, Protestants do not. Mutran's domestication of the destiny of humankind and Jabra's foreignization is further illuminated in the following example.

Table (19): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"heaven"* & *"pastor"*

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation	Intertextuality
"Ophelia: Do not, as some ungracious pastors do, Show me the steep and thorny way to heaven; Whiles, like a puff'd and reckless libertine" (1.3.47-49).	"اوفيليا: لا تفعل كما يفعل كاهن لئيم، يريني الطريق الكأداء الشائكة الى السماء وهو، كخليـع مندلق الكـرش لا يبـالي" p.50	"أوفيليا: لكنني أرجو لك ألّا تكون كبعض أولئك النُّصَّاح الـذين يَـدُلُّون غيـرَهم على الطريـق الـوَعْرة التي يُفضِـي منهـا إلـى الجنـة، وأمـا هـم فَيَضِلونَ عنها". p.36	"وَالَّـذِينَ آمَنُـوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ أُولَئِكَ أَصْـحَابُ الْجَنَّـةِ هُـمْ فِيهَـا خَالِـدُونَ" ﴿البقرة/82﴾.

Mutran's rendering of "heaven" as "الجنة" is a sign of domesticating the ST as it is the term that Muslims use while referring to the place that good people enter as the above Qur'anic verse shows. On the other hand, Jabra's translation of it as "السماء" indicates that he foreignizes the ST. Although 'heaven' is mentioned in Christian sources, its translations into Arabic are only "السماء", "السماوات" or "الملكوت" not "الجنة". It is noteworthy to mention that Jabra's foreignization is manifested in his translation of "pastors" as "كاهن" unlike Mutran whose choice of "النُّصَّاح" emphasizes his domestication of the ST as he sounds to refer to the following hadith.

وَعَنْ تَمِيمٍ الدَّارِيِّ - رضى الله عنه - قَالَ: قَالَ - ﷺ -﴿ اَلدِّينُ اَلنَّصِيحَةُ " ثَلَاثًا. قُلْنَا: لِمَنْ يَا رَسُولَ اَللَّهِ؟ قَالَ:" لِلَّهِ وَلِكِتَابِهِ وَلِرَسُولِهِ وَلِأَئِمَّةِ اَلْمُسْلِمِينَ وَعَامَّتِهِمْ﴾ أَخْرَجَهُ مُسْلِمٌ

(Bulugh Al-Maram, Book 16, Hadith Number 1532)

(Tamim ad-Dari (RAA) narrated that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said:

"The religion is Nasihah." the people said, 'To whom should it be

directed?' He replied, "To Allah, His Book, His Messenger (ﷺ), to the leaders of the Muslims and to the common folk of the Muslims." Related by Muslim) (Bulugh Al-Maram, Book 16, Hadith Number 1575).

Although Jabra tends to foreignize the ST and Mutran chooses to domesticate it, certain choices show that they fail to do so. For example, in the previous example in table (18), Jabra uses 'Allah', which refers to the only God that Muslims believe in. In addition, he renders "hell" (4.5.131) as "سَقَر" (p.164) which is one of the names of hell as mentioned in the Qur'an as shown in ةtable (18). There are other examples that expose Jabra's reference to the Qur'an, such as translating "'Run barefoot up and down" (2.2.492) as "وهي حافية القدمين تركض ذات اليمين وذات الشمال" (p. 97). Allah says: "وَنُقَلِّبُهُمْ ذَاتَ الْيَمِينِ وَذَاتَ الشِّمَالِ" (Al-Kahf; 18:18) ("and We turned them on their right and on their left sides") (Translated by A. Y. Ali). As these examples show Jabra's inconsistent use of foreignization and domestication, the following table shows that Mutran does the same as well.

Table (20): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of *"by Saint Patrick"*

Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation
"Hamlet: Yes, by Saint Patrick, but there is, Horatio" (1.5.135).	"هاملت: بلى، والله، ان فيها لإساءة، يا هوراشيو". p.65	"هملت: بلى، وأحلف بالقديس "بطرس". يوجد ما يسوء " p.44

Although Mutran chooses to domesticate the ST, rendering "by Saint Patrick" as it is into Arabic shows that he does not consider the Muslim audience he translates for. Swearing by Allah is the only legitimate way in Islam that is represented by Jabra's translation of "والله".

These examples that show Jabra's and Mutran's inconsistent use of the strategies of foreignization and domestication can be read through a hauntological lens. As hauntology studies ghosts that entail paradox and uncertainty and defy ontology (Derrida, 1994, p.6), such inconsistent and paradoxical use of strategies should be accepted in translation. Although Jabra states that he wants to foreignize Shakespeare's text, we find domesticated instances that do not match our expectations. This is ghostly as ghosts' appearances are unpredictable. Moreover, since ghosts defy being ontologized in categories such as life and death, translated texts cannot be categorized to only one strategy such as foreignization or domestication. This can be attributed to the return of the 'Christian' text to a different language whose discourses and systems are diverse.

Another issue that Jabra and Mutran treat differently in their texts is that of 'revenge'. Based on their characters' distinct eschatological beliefs of judgment in the hereafter and their final destiny, their attitude towards revenge differ. This is reflected in the terms they use as shown in the following table.

Table (21): Jabra's and Mutran's Translations of Revenge-related Terms

No.	Shakespeare's *Hamlet*	Jabra's Translation	Mutran's Translation
1	"Hamlet: My fate cries out" (1. 4. 82).	"هاملت: مصيري يصيح بي" p.57	"هملت: القضــاء يــدعوني" p.40
2	"Hamlet: And you, my sinews, grow not instant old" (1.5.94)	"هاملت: وانت يا عضـلاتي، لا تشيخي في طرفة عين" p.63	"هملــت: وأنـــتِ أيتهــا، الأعصـاب لا تشيخي بغتةً" p.43
3	"Hamlet: To give them seals never, my soul, consent!" (3.2.385)	"هاملت: إياك يا نفس تنفيذا لها ان نقري" p.131	"هملت: حذار يا نفسـي" p.59

While Jabra's translation, "مصيري يصيح بي", suggests that Hamlet sounds to surrender to and is driven by his will to kill King Claudius, he, in Mutran's text, does not seem to be driven by the same force. Mutran's translation of "fate" as "القضاء" may refer to the religious law of Islam that calls for just retaliation, *qisas*, that Hamlet wants to apply. His use of "أعصاب" instead of "عضلات" emphasizes that he rather prefers to listen to his mind and follow the command of Allah instead of following his desire to kill that is presented in Jabra's translation of "عضلات". Hence, Hamlet sounds to be more cautious in Mutran's text. This can be attributed to his different eschatological beliefs he has towards Allah's judgment and his final destiny.

Although taking revenge or *tha'r* is not legitimate in both Christianity and Islam, the account of those who oppose the word of God and kill is not the same in these religions. While some Christians believe that they will be ultimately forgiven, Muslims know that those who disobey Allah and insist to take revenge will enter hell permanently as the following verses show.

{ولا تقتلوا النّفس الّتي حرّم الله إلا بالحقّ ومن قتل مظلوماً فقد جعلنا لوليّه سلطاناً فلا يسرف في القتل إنّه كان منصوراً} (Al-Isra; 17:33)

("Nor take life - which Allah has made sacred - except for just cause. And if anyone is slain wrongfully, we have given his heir authority (to demand qisas or to forgive): but let him not exceed bounds in the matter of taking life; for he is helped (by the Law)") (Translated by A. Y. Ali).

﴿ومن يقتل مؤمناً متعمّداً فجزاؤه جهنّم خالداً فيها وغضب الله عليه ولعنه وأعدّ له عذاباً عظيماً﴾

(Al-Nisa; 4:93)

("If a man kills a believer intentionally, his recompense is Hell, to abide therein (For ever): And the wrath and the curse of Allah are upon him, and a dreadful penalty is prepared for him") (Translated by A. Y. Ali).

Hence, Hamlet, in Mutran's version, is keen on silencing the desire that asks him to take revenge by saying "حذار يا نفسي" (p. 59). He seems to realize the warning of Allah that the following verse presents. Allah says: "وَٱعْلَمُوٓاْ أَنَّ ٱللَّهَ يَعْلَمُ مَا فِىٓ أَنفُسِكُمْ فَٱحْذَرُوهُۚ" (Al-Baqarah; 2:235) ("And know that Allah Knoweth what is in your hearts, and take heed of Him") (Translated by A. Y. Ali). Therefore, the different eschatological beliefs of characters in Jabra's and Mutran's versions bring about differences in their choices.

In conclusion, translation shares many properties with ghosts such as being a supplement to the ST while adding to and replacing it. Moreover, ghosts and translation both represent the afterlife of their former selves. In addition, the inconsistent use of strategies in translation that entail paradox and unexpectedness result from the ghostly aspect of translation that defies ontology and time.

Chapter Four

Conclusions and Recommendations

Chapter Four

Conclusions and Recommendations

This thesis has examined Jabra's and Mutran's translations of the supernatural and eschatological terms of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* harnessing Derrida's concepts of hauntology, iterability, supplément, différance, and survival and Venuti's strategies of foreignization and domestication. Aiming to uncover the relationship between hauntology and translation and to find an answer for the translators' inconsistent application of Venuti's strategies through such lenses, this thesis has found that ghosts and translation share many properties.

It has shown that both, translation and ghosts, entail repetition and différance as they form supplements to their former selves marking their survival. They also defy time, ontology, originality, and equivalence, and above all, are both conjured up by intertextuality.

This study has emphasized that translation, as a ghostly act, highlights the re-turn of the ST into other languages, cultures and times. Once the ST signs itself to these new contexts, it never comes back in the same form in translation. For example, this thesis has shown that as Mutran sets the Christian supernatural and eschatological elements of ST in an Islamic context, the ST's identity changes.

Furthermore, examining Jabra's foreignization and Mutran's domestication of the ST, this thesis has demonstrated that the impossibility

of any identical returns of the ST to different contexts is in fact inherent in intertextuality. It has opened the TTs to other pre-texts different from those that the ST refers or alludes to. For example, Mutran's reference to the Qur'an instead of the Bible marks the ghostliness of the ST. Moreover, Jabra's declaration of the non-originality of the ST through his para-textual comments emphasizes that translation is a manifestation of the ghostliness inherent in the ST, which is thus not a source, and that the TT is therefore a ghost of such a ghost or a translation of a translation.

Hence, the thesis has considered Jabra's and Mutran's non-identical versions of Shakespeare's text as supplements to it; they are like a ghost that, although dependent on a pre-living thing, is never identical to itself. Thus, the study has shown that as translation adds to and replaces the ST, it marks the repetitive and prospective patterns of hauntology.

Mutran's and Jabra's additions have also exposed the lack of the ST that cannot be filled due to the slipperiness of meanings which, like the ghost, deconstruct 'equivalence'. Their distinct translations of the supernatural and eschatological terms have emphasized that language operates within Derrida's concept of différance. They defer the meaning of the ST while being different from it.

This thesis has also suggested that ghosts and translation entail paradox and unexpectedness. It has proved that the inconsistency found in Jabra's and Mutran's translation was against our expectations, which

matches ours towards the ghost as its appearance is unpredictable. Although Jabra states that he wants to foreignize Shakespeare's text while Mutran wants to domesticate it, they both fail to do that. Such a failure prevents their translations from being ontologized to a specific category that belongs to one strategy, which is the case when it comes to ghosts. They defy being ontologized in categories such as life or death and visibility or invisibility.

Moreover, appearing in different times and addressing the past, present and future at the same time, this thesis has affirmed that translation and specters deconstruct temporality and the linearity of history. As this study has manifested, the ghost of Old Hamlet re-appears in Shakespeare's, Jabra's and Mutran's texts over different historical periods. It has also shown how Jabra's footnotes played a paradoxical role in mixing the past with the present.

This thesis concludes that spectrality is intrinsic to the definition of translation and that any inconsistency of translation strategies is thus a normal phenomenon.

Eventually, focusing on studying intertextuality, which this thesis has linked to Derrida's hauntology while investigating issues in translation, in translation studies, this thesis contributes to both hauntology and translation studies.

As this study has proved the effectiveness of Derrida's hauntology in

approaching translation, it recommends applying it as a theory in translation studies and harnessing its concepts to examine more issues in translation so that it becomes more practical.

References

Abū, D. S. (1984). **Sunan Abu Dawud**. Lahore: Sh. M. Ashraf.

Alawi, N. (2010*). Intertextuality and Literary Translation between Arabic and English*. **An-Najah Univ. J. of Res. (Humanities)**, 24(8), 2437-2456.

Ali, A. Y. (1946). **The Holy Qur'an: Translation & commentary by Abdullah Yusuf Ali**. Birmingham: Islamic Propagation Centre International.

Alou, Y. (2017). *The Relationship between Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy and Shakespeare's Hamlet and Titus Andronicus*. **International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention**, 6(5), 52-57.

Al-Tabrizi, A. (1970). **Mishkat al-Masabih** (J. Robson, Trans.). Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf.

Asqalani, H. I. H. (2002). **Bulugh Al-Maram: Attainment of the Objective According to Evidence of the Ordinances**. Riyadh: Darussalam.

Assi, A. (2018). **Religious culture in Mutran's and Jabra's translation of Shakespeare's Hamlet** (Master's thesis, An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine). Retrieved from: https://fc.lc/AJxoD.

Baker, M. (2009). **Critical Readings in Translation Studies**. London & New York: Routledge.

Barthes, R. (1968). *The Death of the Author.* In Rice & Waugh (Eds.), **Modern Literary Theory A Reader**. (1992, pp.114-118). New York, London: Edward Arnold.

Barthes, R. (1971). *From Work to Text*. In Wallis (Ed.), **Art after modernism: Rethinking representation** (1984, pp. 169-174). New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art.

Barthes, R. (1973). *Theory of the Text*. In Young (Ed.), **Untying the text: A post-structural reader**. (1981, pp. 31-47). Boston, MA: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (1980). **Translation Studies**. London and New York: Methuen.

Benjamin, W. (1992). *The task of the translator*. (H. Zohn, Trans.). In: Schulte, R. & Biguenet, J. (eds.) **Theories of translation: An anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida**. Chicago : University of Chicago Press. 71-82.

Blanco, M. P. & Peeren, E. (2013). *Introduction: Conceptualizing Spectralities*. In: M. P. Blanco and E. Peeren, eds. **The Spectralities Reader: Ghosts and Haunting in Contemporary Cultural Theory**. London: Bloomsbury. 1–27.

Bradford, J. (n.d.). "Qisas". Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/6108429/Qisas_

Buse, P., & Stott, A. (1999). **Ghosts: Deconstruction, psychoanalysis, history**. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Chaika, E. (1982). **Language: The Social Mirror**. Cambridge and New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Chapman, E. (2019). **The Afterlife of Texts in Translation: Understanding the Messianic in Literature**. Manchester. https://fc.lc/n9OJI2R.

Davis, C. (2005). *État Présent: Hauntology, Spectres and Phantoms*. **French Studies**, 59(3), 373–379. https://doi.org/10.1093/fs/kni143.

De Beaugrande, R. & Dressler, W. (1981). **Introduction to Text Linguistics**. UK: Longman Group UK limited.

Denisova, G. (2003). **In the World of Intertext: Language, Memory, Translation.** Moscow: Azbukovnik Publ.

Derrida, J. (1976). **Of Grammatology** (G. Spivak, Trans.). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Derrida, J. (1985). *Des tours de Babel*. Trans. Joseph F. Graham. In: Graham, J.F. (ed.) **Difference in translation**. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 209-248.

Derrida, J. (1994). **Specters of Marx: The state of the debt, the work of mourning, and the New international** (P. Kamuf, Trans.). New York: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (2008). **Ghostly demarcations: A symposium on Jacques Derrida's Specters of Marx**. London: Verso.

Derrida, J. (2008). **The gift of death: &, Literature in secret**. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Derrida, J., & Stiegler, B. (2002). **Echographies of Television** (J. Bajorek, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity. (Original work published 1996)

Derrida, J. (1982). **Margins of philosophy**.   (A. Bass, Trans.) Brighton: The Harvester Press

Dobie, A. (2015). **Theory into practice: An introduction to literary criticism**. Boston: Cengage Learning.

Ghazoul, F. (1998). *The Arabization of Othello*. **Comparative Literature**, 50(1), 1-31. doi: 10.2307/1771217.

Godard, B. (Trans.). (1988). *Preface*. **Lovbers** (p. 50). Montreal: Guernica Press

Gordon, A. F. (2004). **Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination**. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Greenblatt, S. (2001). **Hamlet in Purgatory**. Princeton: Princeton UP.

Hanna, S. (2016). **Bourdieu in Translation Studies: The Socio-cultural Dynamics of Shakespeare Translation in Egypt**. New York: Routledge.

Helgesson, S. (2010). *Literary hybrids and the circuits of translation: the example of Mia Couto*. In H. K. Anheier & Y. R. Isar (Eds.), **Cultures and Globalization: Cultural Expression, Creativity and Innovation** (Vol. 3, pp. 215-224). London: Sage.

Hoy, C. (Ed.). (1962). *Preface*. **Hamlet** (p. viii). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Inghilleri, M. (2005). **Bourdieu and the sociology of translation and interpreting**. London & New York: Routledge.

Ismail, S. (2012). *The Modern Interpretation of the Diyat Formula for the Quantum of Damages: The Case of Homicide and Personal Injuries*. **Arab Law Quarterly**, 26(3), 361–379. doi:10.1163/ 15730255-12341237

Jabra, J. (1979). هاملت [The tragedy of Hamlet, prince of Denmark]. Beirut: Arab Institute for Research & Publishing. (Original work published 1960)

Jabra, J. (1986). مأساة عطيل [The Tragedy of Othello, the Moor of Venice]. Baghdad: Dar al-Ma'mun for Translation and Publishing.

Jiang, W. (2000). *The relationship between culture and language*. **ELT Journal**, 54(4), 328–334. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.4.328.

King, W. (2011). **Hamlet's search for meaning**. Athens, Ga: University of Georgia Press.

Klimovich, N. (2014). *Phenomenon of Intertextuality in Translation Studies*. **Journal of Siberian Federal University**, 7(2), 255-264.

Kluckhohn, C. (1951). *The study of culture*. In D. Lerner & H. D. Laswell (Eds.), **The Policy Science** (pp. 86-101). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Korkut, N. (2005). **Kinds of Parody from the Medieval to the Postmodern** (Doctoral thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from: https://fc.lc/QJPNU.

Kruger, J. L. (2004). *Translating traces: Deconstruction and the practice of translation*: **Literator**, 25(1), 47-72. doi: https://fc.lc/ 0UNQBikM.

Labriola, A. (2000). *The Eschatology of Shakespeare's Great Tragedies: Ultimate Reality and Meaning in Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, and Macbeth. Ultimate Reality and Meaning*. **University of Toronto Press Journals**, 23(4), 319–338. doi:10.3138/uram.23.4.319

Lavater, L. (1569). **Of Ghostes and Spirites Walking by Nyght and of Strange Noyses, Crackes, and Sundry Forewarnynges, Whiche Commonly Happen Before the Death of Menne, Great Slaughters, [and] Alterations of Kyngdomes.** (R. Harrison, Trans.) London.

Leech, G. (1974). **Semantics - The Study of Meaning**. Harmondsworth:

Penguin.

Littau, K. (2000). *Pandora's Tongues*. **TTR : Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction**, 13(1), 21-35. doi:10.7202/037391ar

Lorek-Jezińska, E., & Więckowska, K. (2017). *Hauntology and Cognition: Questions of Knowledge, Pasts and Futures.* **Theoria et Historia Scientiarum**, *xiv*, 8-23. doi: https://fc.lc/1vYYmHjr.

Lukacher, N. (1986). **Primal Scenes: Literature, Philosophy, Psychoanalysis.** New York: Cornell University Press.

Mahfodz, M. (1982). *The Concept of QISĀS in Islamic Law*. **Islamic Studies**, 21(2), 77-88. https://fc.lc/zN3WMRn.

Miller, H. (1977). *The Critic as Host*. **Critical Inquiry**, (Spring, 1977), *3*(3), 439-447. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1342933

Mutran, K. (2011). عطيل [The Tragedy of Othello, the Moor of Venice.]. Cairo: Hindawi Foundation for Education and Culture. (Original work published 1912)

Mutran, K. (2012). هملت [The tragedy of Hamlet, prince of Denmark]. Cairo: Hindawi Foundation for Education and Culture. (Original work published 1918)

Nida, E. (1961). **Bible Translating: An Analysis of Principles and Procedures, with Special Reference to Aboriginal Languages**.

Revised ed. London: United Bible Socities.

Nida, E. (2001). **Language and Culture-Contexts in Translation**. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Scheckter, J. (2011). **The Isle of Pines, 1668: Henry Neville's Uncertain Utopia**. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.

Scofield, M. (1980). **The Ghosts of Hamlet: The Play and Modern Writers**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shakespeare, W. (1992). **Hamlet, prince of Denmark**. C. Watts (Ed.). Wordsworth Editions. (Original work published 1599)

Shaw, K. (2018). **Hauntology: the presence of the past in twenty -first century english literature**. Palgrave Macmillan. https://fc.lc/YYJdO8.

Simpson, J. & Weiner E. (eds). (1989). **The Oxford English Dictionary** (2nd edn, 20 vols). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, E. (n.d.). *Studying Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. In D. Cartmell & M. Scott (Eds.), **Talking Shakespeare: Shakespeare into the Millennium** (pp.2-3). Palgrave.

Venuti, L. (1995). **The translator's invisibility: A history of translation**. London: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (2000). *Translation, community*, Utopia. In L. Venuti (Ed.),

The translation studies reader (pp. 468–488). London: Routldge.

Weller, P. (n.d.). **Hamlet Navigator**. Shakespeare Navigators. https://fc.lc/iVwh9.

Whitehead, A. (2004). **Trauma Fiction**. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wolfreys, J. (2002). **Victorian Hauntings: Spectrality, Gothic, the Uncanny and Literature**. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Younis, I. (2017). **Shakespeare images between loss and compensation in Arabic translation: A skopos perspective**. Saarbrücken, Germany: Noor Publishing.

Arabic References

القرآن الكريم.

إبراهيم، أحمد (2005): أسرار النوم – رحلة في عالم الموت الأصغر. دار نهضة مصر للنشر: المنصورة.

Websites

Anyway. (n.d.). In *Longman Dictionary*. Retrieved from
https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/anyway

Eschatology. (n.d.). In *Lexico.com. Dictionary*. Retrieved from
https://www.lexico.com/definition/eschatology

Purgatory. (n.d.). In *Lexico.com. Dictionary*. Retrieved from
https://www.lexico.com/definition/purgatory

Supernatural. (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*. Retrieved from
https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/supernatural

تَبَيَّنَ. (n.d.). In *Al-Maany.com Dictionary*. Retrieved from
https://www.almaany.com/ar/dict/ar-
en/%D8%AA%D8%A8%D9%8A%D9%86/

هامة. (n.d.). In *Al-Maany.com Dictionary*. Retrieved from
https://www.almaany.com/ar/dict/arar/%D9%87%D8%A7%D9%85
%D8%A9/

جامعة النجاح الوطنية

كلية الدراسات العليا

شبحية الترجمة: ترجمات جبرا ومطران للمصطلحات الأخروية والخارقة في مسرحية شكسبير هاملت

إعداد

رفا سامر مقبول

إشراف

د. بلال حمامرة

شبحية الترجمة: ترجمات جبرا ومطران للمصطلحات

الأخروية والخارقة في مسرحية شكسبير *هاملت*

إعداد

رفا سامر مقبول

إشراف

د. بلال حمامرة

الملخص

تبحث هذه الأطروحة في ترجمات جبرا ومطران للعناصر الأخروية والخارقة في مسرحية *هاملت* للكاتب شكسبير، باستخدام المفاهيم التفكيكية و"الهونتولوجية" لدريدا، واستراتيجيات الترجمة المستعجِمَة والتدجينية لفينوتي، حيث تهدف إلى العثور على إجابة لاستخدام المترجميْن غير المتسق لاستراتيجيات فينوتي، ولتبين أن هناك ارتباطًا بين التناص والترجمة والأشباح. وتتبنى هذه الأطروحة منهجًا وصفيًا تحليليًا يعرض البيانات المختارة من مسرحية *هاملت* لشكسبير (1992) وترجمة جبرا (1979) وترجمة مطران (2012) في جداول تحتوي على مصدر أية أمثلة تناصية موجودة في النصوص المترجمة. تقارن الباحثة وتحلل البيانات المختارة في قسمين رئيسيين، وهما الخارق والاخروي. وجدت الأطروحة أنه نظرًا لكون الترجمة ظاهرة طيفية، فإن استخدام المترجميْن لاستراتيجيات فينوتي لم يكن متسقًا. لقد أثبتت، من خلال تحليل الأمثلة المختارة، أن التناص والترجمة والأشباح تمثل تفكيكًا للزمانية والأنطولوجيا والمعنى حيث تنطوي على "التكرار" و"الـديفيرانس". تخلص هذه الأطروحة إلى أن الشبحية متأصلة في تعريف الترجمة وأن عدم التناسق في استخدام استراتيجيات الترجمة يجب ألا يُنظر إليه على أنه مشكلة عند قراءته من خلال نظريات دريدا.