

On Différance between Shakespeare's Shylock and Bakathir's Shylock

Rasha Saeed Badurais

English Language Studies Section, School of Humanities
Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Penang, Malaysia

Nurul Farhana Low Binti Abdullah

English Language Studies Section, School of Humanities
Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Penang, Malaysia

Abstract

Enigmatic Shylock, the central figure of Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* (1596), and its varied interpretations continue to intrigue critics since the play's publication. One of the most faithful yet different of its adaptations is Bakathir's *The New Shylock* (1945). The present paper aims at deconstructing Shakespeare's Shylock and Bakathir's Shylock in the light of Derrida's concept "différance" to compare the two versions of the Jew and possibly capture the extremes of Jewish identity through several stages of their history. The significance of comparing Bakathir's version of the Jew, which exemplifies the opposite Eastern pole, to the Shakespearean Western is supposed to portray two crucial stages in the process of Jewish identity construction. Tackling the two Shylocks from the deconstructive perspective provides a text-oriented analysis focusing primarily on the binaries and the semantic and etymological meanings of words that reflect the tell-tale moments in both texts. The study finds out that whereas Shakespeare's Shylock is defeated because of his inability to control events, Bakathir's Shylock succeeds in mastering the play of circumstances, but temporarily. His suicide, at the end, enhances possibilities to answer the main inquiry: Who is "Shylock"? Therefore, further studies are recommended to compare and contrast Shakespeare's Shylock with the most recent adaptations, in the East or the West, using the same theoretical framework to provide an image of the Jew/ Zionist in the spatial and temporal processes of the Jewish enigmatic identity development.

Keywords: Bakathir, Derrida, différance, Jewish identity, Shakespeare, Shylock, *The Merchant of Venice*, *The New Shylock*

Cite as: Badurais, R. S., & Abdullah, N. F.L. (2020). On Différance between Shakespeare's Shylock and Bakathir's Shylock. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies* 4 (3) .97-119. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol4no3.8>

Introduction

The controversial nature of Jewish identity is reflected to literature either by or about them. The Jews' portrayal in literature has shown their personalities and positions in the societies where they live. In drama, The Western theaters portrayed the Jews first negatively as villains then neutrally in the 20th century. The appearance of the Jewish character in the newly-born Arab drama has been marked during the Arab-Israeli conflict with special reference to the Palestinian cause. Among the remarkable portrayals of the Jews in literature is Shakespeare's Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice* (1596) and its adaptation in Bakathir's *The New Shylock* (1945). The present article aims at analyzing the characters of Shylock in both texts using Derrida's concept of différance. Following which, in light of the analysis, the two Shylocks are to be compared to elicit the main features of the two characters that can be gleaned through deconstructive analysis to ultimately attempt an answer to the question: "Who is Shylock?" Truly, between Shakespeare's Shylock and Bakathir's Shylock, there is a dialectic of binaries, differences and similarities that invite closer and deeper analyses. Therefore, the selection of Bakathir's version of the Jews to compare with that of Shakespeare is for two main reasons: first, Bakathir's provides an opposite pole (the Eastern) to be compared with the Shakespearean (the Western); and secondly, the two Shylocks represent two significant stages in the process of Jewish identity construction. These points are to be elaborated in the coming sections

Jewish Identity as a Controversial Issue

The lack of a satisfying answer to the inquiry "Who is the Jew?" has made the question of Jewish identity one of the most bewildering issues. Gerson (2018) has highlighted the issue of diversity in Jewish identity stating that "The qualitative variation in the form, expression, and organization of Jewishness over historical time, space, and among social settings is seemingly endless" (p. 5). She has emphasized "the heterogeneous nature of Jewish identity that is always mutually comprised through other configurations of difference and inequality—gender, sexuality, nationality, and ethnicity to name just a few" (Gerson, 2018, p. 12). Aaron Tapper (2016) has added the factors of race and religion, and Deborah Moore (2008) has included the question of politics. Almasiri (2002) has pointed to this enigma by defining the Jewish identity as "the accumulated geological structure" (p. 16). Supporting aspects mentioned above, Almasiri has added another factor behind this multilayered accumulation, i.e., the lack of a central Jewish authority due to Jewish diaspora, the situation that forces the Jews to mix with a wide range of cultures and identities; the matter that has led to diluting the peculiarity of their identity. Moreover, Almasiri has indicated the relevance between the vivid realization of these aspects of Jewish identity and the establishment of the state of Israel. Accordingly, the previous arguments about Jewish identity have agreed that the Jewish identity has been a controversial issue.

Jewish Identity in Literature

Concerning Jewish literature, both Emily Budick (2001) and Hana Wirth-Nesher (2002) have argued that Jewish literature is ambivalent and enigmatic reflecting the nature of its authors or subjects. The Jews' portrayal in literature again shows their personalities and positions in the -societies where they live. Lachman (2020) has explained that the role of the Jews in 17th and 18th century European drama were basically villains, usurers and fools. Among the first plays of this

kind were R.W.'s *The Three Ladies of London* (1584), Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* (1591) and Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* (1596). The scenario changed in the 20th century, whereby the Jewish stereotype on the London stage was finally broken in 1914 by three plays that treated "Jews in some depth: Israel Zangwill's *The Melting Pot*, Harold F. Rubinstein's *Consequences* and Herman Scheffauer's *The New Shylock*" (Lachman, 2020). In the Arab world, by contrast, the drama was not a genuine literary genre. In the 20th century, imitations of the western theater led to some independent attempts. The issue of the Jews as characters in Arab theater gained more ground due to the increasing Arab-Israeli conflict, especially after streams of Jewish migration to Palestine under the British mandate which led to the occupation of Palestine by the Jews in 1948.

William Shakespeare and *The Merchant of Venice* (1596)

William Shakespeare is one of the most famous poets and dramatists around the world and through the ages. He is a prolific writer who created a high influential impact on his successors. *The Merchant of Venice* is, as all of Shakespeare's plays "...a self-contained world. It has its own interconnections, its own atmosphere, its own balance of forces," (Gross, 1994, p. 1). Gross has questioned the play's continuous suitability to be adapted and appropriated to meet the different changes after four centuries. The most important factor that attracts attention to this play is its tragic hero, Shylock, the Jewish moneylender. Baker and Vickers (2005) have surveyed the reception towards and criticism of the play during the period (1775–1939) focusing on Shylock. They have revealed the two main perspectives from which Shylock's character has been analysed: as the pitiful sinned-at hero and as the selfish bloodthirsty moneylender. Approving Baker & Vickers' view, Bloom & Heims (2008) have emphasized the continuity of focusing on Shylock in "early twenty-first-century responses to *The Merchant of Venice*" with more tendency towards "re-evaluating the degree and the nature of Shylock's villainy and the degree to which the Christian characters can be considered virtuous or flawed with regard to their treatment of him" (Bloom & Heims, 2008, p. 225). Shylock, the unique creation of Shakespeare, has thus become something of a literary point of reference on the idea of a Jew for writers worldwide who produce drama and cinema adaptations, poems, narratives to reflect the Jewish identity from a wide variety of perspectives.

The Influence of Shakespeare on Arab Theater

Many attempts have been made to trace the adaptations of Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* in Western literature. However, Shakespeare's influence has moved beyond the confines of the west. Hennessey (2018) has provided an overview of the impact of Shakespeare's theater in the Arab Peninsula by examining how his plays have been adapted and appropriated to suit social, political and academic purposes. Shetywi (1995) has asserted that, along with the famous Shakespearean tragedies, the focal attraction in Arabic theaters has especially been on *The Merchant of Venice* because "it has always been viewed in relation with the Arab-Jewish conflict" (Shetywi, 1995, p. 7) with more focus on the depiction of the Jews, primarily Shylock. However, the reception of the play in the Middle East has not been restricted to the Arabs, the Jews of Israel have had their own adaptations of Shakespeare's play to reflect their existence in the area. Bayer (2007) has further elaborated, "[w]hile both groups [the Arab and Israelis] use the play to encapsulate what they feel to be an objective set of circumstances, one group's appropriation of

the play will appear to the other a gross misappropriation" (p. 469). This reflects the unprecedented flexibility of Shakespeare's Shylock to represent both the oppressors and the oppressed. Bayer provides some examples of the translations and adaptations of Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* in both contexts. Among the adaptations of the play in the Israeli theater were "Charles Marowitz's Variations on The Merchant of Venice (London, 1977), Barry Kyle's 1980 production, and Omri Nitzan's 1994 version (both performed in Hebrew in Tel Aviv adapting Avraham Oz's 1972 translation)" (Bayer, 2007, p. 483). In the Arab world, especially in Egypt during the first half of the twentieth century, Bayer has mentioned two significant portrayals of Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*; the first was "Khalil Moutran's translation of the play for George Abiad's theatrical company in Cairo" (Bloom, 2007, p. 473) and the second was Bakathir's play, *The New Shylock*, which marks a significant development in the adaptations of Shakespeare's play and in Arab theater.

Ali Ahmad Bakathir was a poet, novelist, and dramatist who embodied the widespread influence of Shakespeare, especially in the Arab world. Bakathir was born in 1910 in Surabaya, Indonesia, of a Hadrami migrant father and an Indonesian-Hadrami mother. He was sent back to Hadhramout (now a governorate in Yemen) to acquire the basics of Islam and Arabic language amongst other local cultural disciplines. He proved to be a curious reader and excelled in his studies. However, the stability of his life was shattered by, mainly, the deaths of his beloved wife and his father. He decided to leave Hadhramout, and after some time of wandering in the Arab Peninsula, he arrived in Egypt (1933/1934), settled there, and married an Egyptian lady in 1945. He remained in Egypt until he died in 1969. He was a graduate of the English department, Faculty of Arts – Cairo University in 1939. He was fortunate to have emerged with the Egyptian and Arab intellectuals and critics during a period that witnessed one of the best heydays of Arabic literature (Awwad, 1980).

In Egypt, Bakathir's talent became evident; he proved to be a prolific writer (of poetry and prose) and translator. Juma'a (2003) provides a list of all Bakathir's works, which include *A Lover from Hadhramout*, *The God of Israel* (1959), *Ibrahim Basha* (1968)...etc. Shakespeare's impact on Bakathir is overwhelming. Besides the translations and the adaptations of Shakespearean plays by Bakathir as *Twelfth Night* (1940), *Romeo and Juliet* (1946) and *The New Shylock* (1945), Sufiani (1994) had previously observed Shakespeare's influence on Bakathir in adopting and adapting Shakespeare's style in writing and using methods in dramatic manipulation. Moreover, his broad readings provided him an excellent exposure to a diversity of cultures like the Greek, the German, the Pharaoh, ...etc. Thus, he was inspired to write plays like *Oedipus Tragedy* (1949), *The New Faust* (1967), and *Ikhnaton and Nefertiti* (1940).

According to Bakathir (1958), the idea to write *The New Shylock* (1945) was incited by the comment of

the Zionist leader, Ze'ev Jabotinsky¹ during a speech in the British House of Common stating 'give us our pound of flesh. We will never give up our pound of flesh'. Jabotinsky here refers to establishing the Zionist state in Palestine according to the Balfour Declaration. (p. 49)

This incident reminded Bakathir of Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*, and he started writing his new play in (1945). Bakathir's play provided a prophetic vision of the existence of Israel in Palestine as it was written three years before 1948, the year of the Disaster (AlNakbah)². Awwad (1980) has commented, "the main subject of the play relies on adopting the plot of Shakespeare's play to manipulate the cause of Palestine" (p. 304). She has suggested that Bakathir's primary goal was to propose a solution for the Palestinian issue. Therefore, he divided the play into two independent parts (or plays as he calls them): *The Problem* and *The Solution*³. However, Bakathir was seemingly driven by a desire to record the then-current facts; consequently, the play, especially the second part, was crowded with details –somewhat boring- of the international political attempts to resolve the matter. Such a tendency "makes the play an early example of the documentary drama." As such, Bakathir has been considered a pioneer in this field preceding "the European documentary drama which began in the 1960s" (Jamal, 2015, p.125).

Accordingly, this article tackles the portrayal of Jewish identity through drama works written by non-Jews from two different eras during the development of Jewish identity. Consequently, the present article aims at analyzing the characters of Shylock in Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* and Ali Bakathir's *The New Shylock* using Derrida's concept of différance. Following which, in the light of the analysis, the two Shylocks are to be compared to elicit the main features of the two characters that can be gleaned through deconstructive analysis to ultimately attempt an answer to the question: "Who is Shylock?"

Shakespeare's *Shylock* and Bakathir's *Shylock*

The contexts of the two Shylocks, of Shakespeare and of Bakathir, are almost opposite. Whereas Shakespeare's Shylock lived in Europe during the Early Modern era, a period that was marked by Jewish persecution, Bakathir's Shylock was a representation of the Zionists who occupied Palestine and persecuted the Palestinian⁴. Hence, between Shakespeare's Shylock and Bakathir's Shylock, there is a dialectic of binaries, differences, and similarities that invite closer and more in-depth analyses. Therefore, the selection of Bakathir's version of the Jews to compare with that of Shakespeare is for two main reasons: first, Bakathir's provides an opposite pole (the Eastern) to be compared with the Shakespearean (the Western); and secondly, the two Shylocks represent two significant stages in the process of Jewish identity construction.

Comparisons between Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* and Bakathir's *The New Shylock* has been discussed and analysed from different perspectives: descriptive analysis as Sufiani (1994) and Juma' (2003), postmodern interpretation using intertextuality as in Jamal (2015), and from the perspective of adaptation as found in Muhi, Saleh and Hasson (2019). The only similarity between these previous studies with the present one is the fact that the primary focus is on Shylock from two different eras with a long interval in between. However, this article attempts to view the two Shylocks from the boundaries of the text by deconstructing the language of the two Shylocks and comparing them as two continuous binaries in the continuum of past, present, and future that supply each other and defy reaching a clear identification for the Jewish

identity. Therefore, the best theoretical framework to achieve the objectives of the study is the focal concept of Derrida's deconstruction project, which is *différance*, as Royle (2003) has argued:

Because we live in the Derridean epoch. Because, more than those of any other contemporary writer or thinker, Derrida's texts have described and transformed the ways in which we think about the nature of language, speech and writing, life and death, culture, ethics, politics, religion, literature and philosophy. More than any other contemporary writer or thinker, Jacques Derrida has defined our time. (p. 8)

Besides, the suitability of examining Shakespearean creations from a deconstructive perspective is recommended by Freund (1985) who states, "In the climate of contemporary critical discourse, [...] it is becoming possible to show how the Shakespearean self-reflexive forays of wit match, remarkably, the wit of the deconstructionist enterprise" (p. 21) and by Parker and Hartman (1985) who elaborate that:

Every major rethinking of literature and theory has a way of returning to particular texts [...] Larger theoretical developments have had their echo in what is now amounting to a wholesale reconsideration of the Shakespearean corpus—from the controversy over what constitutes an authoritative "text" for plays which exist in so many versions, to the perception of a kinship between Derridean wordplay or Bakhtinian heteroglossia and Shakespeare's own inveterate punning. (p. vi)

Since literature is a reflection of reality and Shakespeare's Shylock represents the real situation of the Jews in Europe during the Renaissance while Bakathir's Shylock depicts the twentieth-century generation of the Jews, the Zionists, the authors aim at exploring the changing Jewish identity; not to give a final definitive conclusion/ description but to discover the ongoing process of meaning/ identity formation, which is endless to trace, with the hope to open up a new perspective in the ongoing argument and encourage more studies along the same lines. Towards this end, the adopted theoretical perspective is Derrida's *différance*.

Derrida's *Différance*

Deconstruction as a literary project, as Derrida (1978) calls it, has marked a revolutionary attempt in the progress of philosophy and epistemology in general. Derrida has explained his view that the traditional way of thinking is curbed by the hegemony of the center. He has deconstructed the two structural tenets: the existence of a center and the process of signification within the structure elaborating that there is no center and no location for the center, but, instead of the center, there is an infinite number of substitutions in play. This play "is always play of absence and presence, but if it is to be thought radically, play must be conceived of before the alternative of presence and absence" (Derrida, 1982, p. 292). Moreover, the play is in an intensive relationship with the past, present and future. Royle (2003) has described Derrida's new way of thinking as destabilization of tradition, commenting "he [Derrida] is so concerned, everywhere in his writings, with the nature of decision-making and the experience of what he calls the undecidable" (p. 4) or the ghostlike process/ enigma of decision-making.

Derrida has suggested his project without giving or prescribing any limited definitions of the essence of this project or any of its newly-coined terms or other concepts that have been given new meaning within deconstruction like “différance,” “trace,” “play,” “supplement,” ...etc. In this paper, the central concept to be adopted is Derrida's différance. In the coming paragraphs, the authors attempt to provide a comprehensive overview of the concept as it is used by Derrida and discussed by some critics and as it will be used in the analysis of Shakespeare's Shylock and Bakathir's Shylock to achieve the paper's objectives.

Derrida has stated that the idea of différance is like the meaning of "sheaf." Such a "metaphor" makes Derrida's point that there is no center for everything as the meaning of the sheaf is to have a group of things without any attachment between them that might make them have/ share one center. Derrida has rejected following the traditional "philosophical discourse," which relies on the inevitability of cause and effect. Therefore, there are two features of "the delineation of différance," that it is strategic (nothing to govern its totality) and adventurous (without a final goal). Then he has ventured to contradict all his arguments by defining différance and summarising all the possible suggested meanings in one word "temporalization":

the Greek diapherein does not comport one of the two motifs of the Latin differre, to wit, the action of putting off until later, of taking into account, of taking account of time and of the forces of an operation that implies an economical calculation, a detour, a delay, a relay, a reserve, a representation—concepts that I would summarize here in a word I have never used but that could be inscribed in this chain: temporization. Différer in this sense is to temporize, to take recourse, consciously or unconsciously, in the temporal and temporizing mediation of a detour that suspends the accomplishment or fulfillment of "desire" or "will," and equally effects this suspension in a mode that annuls or tempers its own effect. (Derrida, 1982, p. 46)

In this analysis or supposed definition of his “possibility of conception,” Derrida refers to dictionary meaning and the etymology of the word as frequent in his philosophical works. This makes the writers who follow him and attempt to apply deconstruction to philosophy or any texts, like the literary ones, search for dictionary meanings (or semantic meanings) of some selected words and the etymology of these words to prove how the meaning is different and deferred.

In the preface to her translation of Derrida's *Of Grammatology* (1997), Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak has commented on the nature of différance between its pronunciation and written form, a point highlighted by Derrida himself in his article “Différance” (1982). This difference within the word itself explains its basic idea that concepts/ meanings do not necessarily reflect their apparent shape/ appearance; their reality might be different and deferred from being reached through the play of traces and shades of other meanings. Other interpretations of this concept are attempted by Royle (2003) and Colebrook (2014). Royle's focus has been on the ghostlike nature of meaning as reflected through this “possibility of meaning,” i.e., différance while Colebrook has emphasized the comprehensive precedence of Derrida's différance in comparison to other traditional “differences.”

Derrida (1978), then, has supported his arguments about violating the traditional views by referring to two main relevant concepts to différance, which are "the trace" and "the play." This concept is attempted to be used to deconstruct the stereotypic concepts of "the circle in which we appear to be enclosed (Derrida, 1978, p. 12) The trace for Derrida is a present element that is linked to the past and the future. In terms of its main feature "play" and in its relation to perpetual movement or repeatedly, Derrida has elaborated that

Différance is what makes the movement of signification possible only if each so-called 'present' element, each element appearing on the scene of presence, is related to something other than itself, thereby keeping within itself the mark of a past element, and already letting itself be vitiated by the mark of its relation to the future element, this trace being related no less to what is called the future than to what is called the past, and constituting what is called the present by means of this very relation to what it is not, to what it absolutely is not: that is, not even to a past or a future as a modified present. (Derrida, 1978, p. 13)

To sum up, the main features of différance can be summarised as the meaning is postponed continuously by being differed. This process is supplemented by a play of traces that link the different, deferred meaning with the past, present, and future, and the ambivalent movement continues repeatedly. Reading Derrida positively shows that Derrida has rejected the idea that people take everything for granted without questioning it. He has preached to be critical about using any text/ concept/ idea and search for the implications behind them. Therefore, the primary concern of Derrida's différance (and all deconstruction project) is to examine every phenomenon/ concept/ meaning, and put it under question without attempting to reach one final fixed end.

Consequently, the authors attempt to trace the corpus about différance by Derrida and other scholars in the field to come out with a suggested strategy to follow in the analysis. These suggested procedures are not systematic (as deconstruction does not propose a strict clear-cut / prescribed method of analysis), but they are the result of one way of reading différance.

Therefore, to give a clear idea of the adopted and suggested possibility for a method of analysis:

- 1) Focus on neglected but revealing moments that connote the perpetual movement.
- 2) Refer to the semantic and etymological meanings of the selected expressions wherever suitable.
- 3) Consider the perpetual movement between the binaries in the present which reflects/ supplements/ being supplemented by the past and promise for the future.

These steps were applied to the texts after reading them carefully. The focus of the analysis was on the speeches of Shakespeare's Shylock and Bakathir's Shylock and frequently what others say about them. Moreover, the Online Oxford Dictionary was used whenever the analysis requires dictionary reference.

Shakespeare's *Shylock*

Shylock's appearance in the play is delayed until the end of Act I. But when he appears, he dominates the stage. Shylock's speech is very short at the beginning of the conversation with Bassanio, just four words in the lines with white spaces around them, unlike the speeches of other previous characters.

SHYLOCK

Three thousand ducats; well.

SHYLOCK

For three months; well.

SHYLOCK

Antonio shall become bound; well. (Act I, scene iii, p. 19)

The white spaces or the silence of Shylock is either to reduce the surprise of Bassanio's request or to contain his fury that "a dog can lend money" or to calculate and measure the chance and how it can be exploited for his benefit over Antonio. This silence/ white space contradicts the exaggerated detailed speech of Shylock starting with "Oh, no, no, no, no" in which he reveals a thorough knowledge of Antonio's ships and their destinations.

In his "[...] the man is, notwithstanding, sufficient" (Act I, scene iii, p. 20), the word 'notwithstanding' can be traced as 'not'+ 'withstand'+ 'ing.' The meaning of 'withstand' is to "remain undamaged or unaffected by something ; resist." Other synonyms of the verb are: 'hold out against', 'stand firm against', 'stand/hold one's ground against', 'preserve in the face of', 'stand up to', 'fight'... etc. using it in the middle of his speech as an interjection and being surrounded by the prefix 'not-' and the suffix '-ing,' the possible play of meaning here relies on the ability of Antonio to continue being sufficient with the fact that he was –in the past- and he seems now, but is it possible to be sufficient in the future? Who knows? The word 'sufficient' means 'adequate/ enough,' with its origins in Middle English derived from old French or Latin meaning 'meeting the need of.' 'Notwithstanding' also might mean, in the general conception of the sentence, "certainly," but is Shylock sure of Antonio's "sufficiency" to pay the supposed debt? And is it what he wishes?

When Antonio appears on the scene, Shylock murmurs two questions, "...What news on the Rialto? Who is he comes here?" (Act I, scene iii, p. 20). This murmur happens to be in the discourse of rejecting the invitation from Bassanio for Shylock to dine with them. There seems to be no logical connection between the context of declining the invitation and the news on the Rialto. The inquiry about the Rialto is more linked to the previous exaggerated speech, "Oh! No, no, no, no...", between the two moments, Shylock is there thinking and debating the possibility of misfortune. There is a play between Shylock's speech and what is going on in his mind. He is not his current sum but the whole situation and how his past and present with Antonio can play in the future. The first question is a real passionate inquiry about the news of the merchants in the stock market of Venice, and the second is a rhetorical question. Shylock knows Antonio and will not mistake him. However, the two questions are answered by the entrance of Antonio. The two

questions can serve a binary of Antonio: the first new news about Antonio's ships and the second does he still exist? It is a binary between the one imagined in the mind (notwithstanding/withstanding) and the resisting one in front of Shylock. All these interpretations reflect the possible play of plans and thoughts in Shylock's mind and the play between the present reality (stretching from the past) of being humiliated and forced to deal gently with his enemy and the future wishes that question whether Antonio will withstand circumstances.

In the aside,

SHYLOCK

[Aside] How like a fawning publican he looks!

I hate him for he is a Christian,

But more for that in low simplicity

He lends out money gratis and brings down

The rate of usance here with us in Venice.

If I can catch him once upon the hip,... (Act I, scene iii, p. 19)

The use of pronouns: the singular and plural first person and the singular third person (I, We, He) is marked. Shylock put himself and all his tribe as a binary pole against Antonio. What is peculiar here is that Shylock unites with his tribe and uses the first person pronouns interchangeably, but in the end, he suddenly swears never to forgive Antonio wishing the curse to fall on his tribe if he did so. Now with this wish, is Shylock included in the to-be cursed tribe, or does he detach himself from it/ them at that moment? The ambivalence leads to questions about Shylock's position among his fellow Jews. Does he hate them too to wish the curse, or does he mean to be one in good or bad circumstances? Does he suspect his ability to avenge the man, so he detaches himself from the curse?

Shylock's first words to Antonio are, "Your worship was the last man in our mouths" (Act I, scene iii, p. 19). The word "worship" here is a reference of respect to a high-ranking person. Searching for its origin, it came from Old English 'weorthscipe' which means 'worthiness, acknowledgement of worth. Its morphological structure is 'worth' + 'ship.' Again the two worlds of outside and inside are at play with Shylock and in his expressions. The word 'worship' is used repeatedly in the whole play, seemingly with its direct and known meaning. However, Shylock's first use of it in the play carries different dimensions. At the level of the external world, Shylock is praising Antonio showing respect to him. But at the internal level, Shylock is obsessed with news on the Rialto about Antonio's *ships* and their *worth* whether they will come safe and rich as usual or they might face any of the dangers he himself counts in his previous exaggerated speech.

The word "last" is ambivalent. It might mean 'the most recent' or 'the lowest in rank,' and which one is intended by Shylock is left for the readers' guesses. The last pronoun in this line is "our", just as the matter of the pronouns that have been discussed in the aside in which Shylock detaches himself deliberately from Antonio putting themselves as rivals the present 'I' and the absent 'He.' In doing so, Shylock shifts between singular and plural to show the distance between himself and his tribe. Also, in refusing Bassanio's invitation for dinner, Shylock states firmly that

they (the Jews and the Christians generally and Shylock and Antonio/ Bassanio specifically) shall never share the life normally but within the strict borders of business. However, the 'our' here indicates that at one level Shylock links himself to Bassanio. Still, on another level, it might be a hint to his aside and the 'our' here refers to the Jews or as a way to add more dignity to himself and his tribe as against the insults and humiliations from the Christians.

In scene II, Launcelot Gobbo, a servant at Shylock's house, compares Shylock, first, to the devil, and then, to Bassanio:

...Certainly the Jew is the very devil
incarnal; and, in my conscience, my conscience is
but a kind of hard conscience, to offer to counsel
me to stay with the Jew. The fiend gives the more
friendly counsel: I will run, [...] (Act II, scene ii, p. 19)

He hesitates between staying with Shylock and leaving his service. The ambivalent situation he lives in makes him confused between following the devil's urges to run away or to follow his conscience and stay with the Jew who is another devil. Here, why is Shylock considered devilish? Aren't Launcelot's whims devilish too? Is Launcelot's motive here of mere religious background or of mere materialism (to indulge overabundance of food and women in the service of Bassanio)? Also, in his words: "My master's a very Jew" (Act II, scene ii, p. 34), the word 'very' suggests that there are different kinds of Jews of different qualities, as if in a grade. Moreover, for Launcelot, there is an opposition between Bassanio and Shylock which justifies why he wants his father to give the present (gift) to Bassanio, the new master. If there is a present for Shylock, it should be the "halter," i.e., a rope with a noose for hanging. The same idea is repeated later by Gratiano in the court scene after the defeat of Shylock.

In a conversation between Lorenzo and Gratiano about Jessica, Lorenzo declares that the faithless Jew will be blessed by Heaven because of his daughter, who steals her father, runs away with a Christian, and converts to Christianity. The whole matter is full of contradictions and strange justifications for a daughter to disobey her father, steal his money and convert her religion; all are considered by common sense as deeds of disobedience yet now accepted by the Christians since they are in line with their interests. What adds insult to injury is that she plans to do this at the same time Shylock trusts her to keep his money and his house. When Shylock orders Jessica to do so, he says, "my daughter...my house" (Act II, scene v, p. 44) as if she is among his property, and this sheds light on how he deals with her and shakes the previous impression that she is disobedient.

In the same context, Shylock's dream of sealed money bags is significant. Dreaming is unreal, but it is inspired by the real prior experience. It is a perpetual stage between the previous experience and the present moment of sleeping. Shylock's involvement with money and the dream of money bags makes him fear a bad omen. He is in a state of hesitation whether to follow his intuition and declines the invitation to dine or to go, just to vex the extravagant Christians who are spending his own money. So what are these money bags in the dream? Are they the bags given to Bassanio or other bags, those that will be lost? Are these bags the ones handed to Bassanio, the

ones collected, or the ones kept in the house? The dream puts Shylock at bewilderment, and cause him to hesitate.

The scene ends with a conversation between Shylock and Launcelot:

LAUNCELOT

I beseech you, sir, go: my young master doth expect
your reproach.

SHYLOCK

So do I his. (Act II, scene v, p. 45)

The speech of Launcelot is one of the most critical dramatic ironies in the play. There are three possible situations:

- 1) Launcelot addresses Shylock, and the word 'master' refers to Bassanio as he invites Shylock for the feast.
- 2) Launcelot addresses Jessica, and the 'master' is Lorenzo as he conspires to escape with Jessica on the same night.

In these two levels, the dramatic irony is evident, and the message is sent to Jessica to be ready for the elopement.

However, the answer of Shylock does not correspond with what Launcelot says considering the master is Bassanio. "So do I his" means: I expect your master's reproach too. The word "reproach" needs to be analyzed. The Oxford dictionary states that its origin in the Middle English is from old French 'reprochier,' which means 'bring back close' so it is close to mean 'come.' Therefore, in this light, Shylock's reply means, "I expect your master to come too." It is Bassanio, why does Shylock expect Bassanio to come to him? The loan has already been given to Bassanio, and the latter is leaving to Belmont. Does he mean this loan won't be the last, for Bassanio is extravagant and all Christians are careless with money? Or does he think about Antonio? But what will make Antonio come close/ near Shylock? The short highly-elliptic reply leaves all possibilities open. Shylock never suspects the conspiracy of Jessica for his mind is obsessed with other plans. Consequently,

- 3) Shylock understands Launcelot's word 'master' as Antonio, and thus he answers, "So do I his."

In the rest of the play, the words 'lost,' 'loss,' 'losing' appear frequently. Jessica whispers "Farewell; and if my fortune be not crost,/ I have a father, you a daughter, lost." And it has been the last meeting between the two in the play. 'lost' means 'unable to find one's way,' 'unable to be found,' 'has been taken away, or not recovered.' It might indicate that one is not him/herself anymore. But the word itself is negative, and Jessica Shylock is not herself anymore after being Jessica Lorenzo; Shylock passes a series of losses afterward. He states it when he moans, searching for Jessica "loss upon loss" (Act III, scene i, p. 66). Then in the court, Shylock talks about the "losing suit" (Act IV, scene i, p. 94) with Antonio. The word is ambiguous. It sheds light on a somehow stable past, and

the turning point is the moment of loss, then the resulting future becomes vague: the loss of the daughter, the loss of the money, the loss of the case, the loss of one's own right of embracing one religion or another. After being launched by Jessica, Shylock lives in an unexpected endless chain of losses. However, is it the same case with Jessica? Is the loss of the father compensated by the gain of a Christian husband? Is the waste of money compensated by the gain of a husband's love? Is the loss of one's religion compensated with embracing another for the sake of quick assimilation and shedding the previous life's skin? Does Jessica lose or win?

Shylock's passionate inquiry at the beginning of the play, 'What news on the Rialto?' is answered when gossip spread in Venice about the loss of Antonio's ships with their worthy merchandise. The only sources in the play of these rumours are in the conversation between Salerio and Salerino and through Tubal. The word itself is ambivalent; it is about unconfirmed reports about others. Thus it leaves the reader in between the truth and the lie. Is this news fake/real? No one is sure; they report what has been heard from others, especially sailors. These sailors gossip about ships from Venice without indicating Antonio. The other word that corresponds with gossip is "hear." All the ones who transform the gossip have heard it from someone else. They tell others, and so on. The process continues and the gossip spreads. But is it real or fake? No one asks, they just gossip. Really of a strange nature is the actual damage that results from such a shadowy process. Antonio is considered bankrupt and Shylock gets what he is waiting for, i.e., the reproach of the master: "So do I his."

In the court scene, there is a systematic way to humiliate and belittle *the Jew* by the Venetians, starting from the Duke to Gratiano. The central aspect of this is calling him "the Jew" without mentioning his name except sometimes, especially when the context is highly formal. Shylock is not unaware of this, and in his speech to justify the irrationality of his suit, he humiliates them too by comparing himself to a master and Antonio (and all Venetians) to animals or servants. The verbal heating war is under the surface to be obtained by an in-depth analysis of the speeches, especially those of Shylock.

SHYLOCK

...

You'll ask me, why I rather choose to have
A weight of carrion flesh than to receive
Three thousand ducats: I'll not answer that:

...

What if my house be troubled with a rat
And I be pleased to give ten thousand ducats
To have it baned? What, are you answer'd yet?
Some men there are love not a gaping pig;
Some, that are mad if they behold a cat;
And others, when the bagpipe sings i' the nose,
Cannot contain their urine: for affection,

...

So can I give no reason, nor I will not,
 More than a lodged hate and a certain loathing
 I bear Antonio, that I follow thus
 A losing suit against him. ... (Act V, scene i, pp.93-94).

In the court, when Portia starts her arguments, she says, “[t]hen must the Jew be merciful.” The word “must” is somehow offensive here, for as if she wants to force Shylock to forgive Antonio and thus dismiss the case simply. Shylock's refusal supports this, “On what compulsion must I? tell me that.” However, Portia's reply contradicts her first “must,” “The quality of mercy is not strain'd,/ It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven” (Act V, scene i, p. 100) The whole court show is meant to entrap Shylock, and the words of Portia are carefully selected to turn the suit against him later by the appeal for justice and clinging to the strict Venetian laws. This puts the reader in a dilemma: what is justice? And what is mercy? The justice for Shylock is injustice for Antonio and vice versa. Is it an act of mercy to gain Antonio's justice by throwing the “in-” on the shoulders of Shylock deceitfully?

When all the alleged attempts of Portia are consumed, she declares Shylock's right to cut a pound of Antonio's flesh. She bids Shylock a final plea to quit the suit and take the money, he answers, “No, not for Venice” (Act V, scene i, p. 102). Antonio and Venice are interchangeable now. Shylock states the symbolic dimension of the two enemies as a hostility between Jews and Venetians/Christians. And he answers the insulting manner of calling him the Jew by the Venetians in the court. Again, just four words with two punctuation marks are loaded with Shylock's hatred and poisonous passion for taking revenge from all the unfair circumstances he (and his tribe) has been involved in just because he is a Jew.

Shylock keeps insisting on justice and his full legal right. In doing so, he attempts to govern the whole scene by repetition, by providing some pleas to the irrationality of human nature, and by moving between binaries of right/wrong, justice/mercy, money/ flesh, soul/flesh...etc. In all this, he is encouraged by Portia's repeated confirmation of his lawful right. Then, when he is about to realize his victory, the word “Tarry” (Act V, scene i, p. 106) destroys all his claims. It means “wait,” “delay for longer time,” “stay longer than intended.” And the chances to take revenge and have the feeling of real possession and achievement are postponed. The process of “tarry” continues waiting for its moment of being supplemented.

However, the consequences are tragic upon the shoulders of Shylock of Venice. Confiscating his money and belonging means pulling down the “prop” (Act V, scene i, p. 109) of his whole being; death is better. He ends with “I am content” (Act V, scene i, p. 110). “Content” means “in a state of peaceful happiness,” “satisfied.” The agony between the word in its context and its meaning is expressive enough. Shylock disappears, and the process of delaying his revenge continues.

Bakathir's *Shylock*

The Problem (four acts)

Starting from the title, the word "new" is significant. It indicates that there is a Shylock of the past, and now there is a 'different' one or Shylock who is 'introduced, or discovered recently or for the first time'... etc. with the expectations of more changes in the coming future. The discussion of the word "new" leads to another word, which is "now." It is also mentioned at the beginning of the play in the description of the time of the events: (1935- now). Again the word "now" is enigmatic. The "now" of writing the play was (1945). However, the "now" can be projected to the "now" of reading the text, for example (2019)! Then the now of 1945 reader will be the past of the 2019 reader ...the continuity implied by the word is endless. It typically meets the axioms of deconstruction to suggest the dialectic play of the present with the past and the future.

At the very beginning of the play, the phenomenon of the "Khalil Aldawwas" is confronted. He is a cyborg/ a hybrid, a wealthy Palestinian who is evacuated from his national belonging by selling all his wealth and lands to Shylock and lives parasitically on the Zionists to deceive other Palestinian youth. This created hybrid is a vital link between his pure Palestinian past, current ambivalent present, and vague future for Shylock will get rid of him sooner or later. There is also another similar example who is Abdullah Alfayyad. Following the events of the play, the readers can follow the process of evacuating him from his identity to be filled with nothing and thus to be left for chaos.

One of the repeated words in the whole play is "Al-Nakbah" or "the Disaster." The "disaster" of Khalil Aldawwas is because of Shylock the disaster of Palestine is because of the Shylocks, the disaster of the Jews is because of the Zionists (i.e., the Shylocks.) Is that the case? Can the new Shylock and his followers/ organizations be strong to threaten individuals, religions, and nations? The Disaster or Alnakbah is linked to the year 1948 in which Palestine had been occupied by the Zionists/ the Shylocks. So Alnakbah is the other face of Zionism/ Shylock, which is the binary of, say, justice. If Shylock is the agent of Zionism/ Alnakbah, who is the agent of justice? Are they the Palestinians who "kept/keep" withdrawing in front of the activities of Shylock?

Another significant point is the binary between amusement and seriousness. The typical context is in the relation between Abdullah Alfayyad and Rachel, the Jewish girl used by Shylock to seduce wealthy young Palestinians. Her mission, which is referred to –by Shylock as being “serious”- is to seduce Alfayyad, who considers their affair mere amusement. She convinces him that he is safe with Shylock, and his uncle is the real enemy who deprives him of his right to use his wealth. Another binary appears here is friend/ enemy. Amusement is practiced with friends, whereas seriousness is with enemies, which is the logic. However, this logic does not work here, and this is one dimension of Alnakbah. Alfayyad has fun with Rachel, alleging that "it is a harmless urge of youth" (Act I, p. 34), whereas Rachel has this affair with Alfayyad as a part of a role assigned to her for the more significant issue of Zionism. The term used to describe her deed –by Shylock- is “the unavoidable sacrifice” (Act II, p. 51). Alfayyad is involved in his relationship with Rachel, Shylock, and Cohen to the extent that he believes them when they warn him of his uncle,

who becomes the enemy. To sum up, all the previous points are bewilderment of playing between binaries and the leading player of these concepts is Shylock.

In his luxurious office in Jerusalem (AlQuds) (Act II, p. 45), Shylock runs all his Zionist activities using the telephone. The "telephone" is "a system for talking to somebody else over long distances, using wires or radio." This device is situated between two ends, and the correspondence between them is bidirectional: speak-listen/listen-speak. It is a play of binaries, but in the context of the play, it is evident that Shylock is the one who gives orders, and the other end"s" are receivers.

"The green tables" as an indication of gambling is another essential means by which the new Shylock achieves his goals in Palestine. The color "green" is the color of the Palestinian fertile lands that are Shylock's target to be cut from the Palestinians and owned to build the homeland for the Jews of the world. The analogy and the difference between the two green areas is significant. Alfayyad is involved in gambling on the small green tables to lose his vast green lands for Shylock: "The green tables are our shortcut to swallow the vast lands" (Act II, p. 50).

He urges Rachel to keep her illegitimate baby (when she tells him about it after her affairs with Alfayyad) until she gives birth, to help increase the Jews' population even if this is the illegitimate child of Alfayyad. As he explains in (Act II, p. 51), Shylock's excuse is that the Arab society is increasing drastically, and the Jews should make some decisive steps to cope with it! This tendency violates the basics of family formation, which is the direct way for settlement and real increase. The perpetual movement between the goal and the means is Machiavellian.

In one of his heating conversations with his "enemy" Abraham, the anti-Zionist Palestinian Jew, Shylock argues that, "If you had not been a Jew, you would have been free!" (Act II, p. 66). That puts the concept of freedom under erasure. Are not the Jews free? Are they enslaved? If so, to what? Here the idea of the "sacrifice" is repeated significantly. Rachel should sacrifice her body for the holy mission of establishing the Promised Land. Abraham should sacrifice his liberalism and pro-Palestinian opinions for the sake of the holy land. As if Shylock wants to say that, "One who does not toe the line is lost." Here, Bakathir suggests that the Jews are free to do whatever serves the establishment of their state but not free to be themselves even if they disagree with the whole notion.

In another conversation with his agents, he declares that they should spread terrorism to be relieved or "have the feeling of the oppressed when his oppressor is defeated or killed" (Act V, p. 127). Is the new Shylock oppressed? Who are his oppressors? In this context, he talks about the British, and he plans to assassinate one of the British leaders to express their dissatisfaction with the British government. Are the British oppressors then or oppressed? Are the Shylocks suppressed then or oppressors?

The Solution (three acts)

The second part of the play is called the Solution as the first is the Problem. The two titles or subtitles compose a binary. If the Problem is that of the occupation of Palestine by the Zionists,

the new generation of the Jews, isn't there also the problem of the submission of the Palestinians to the occupation with all its activities? Didn't they give in and let Shylock confiscates their lands, seduces their youth, seizes power and authority everywhere on their land, while they just keep withdrawing? Therefore, what is the problem exactly? The Zionists or the Palestinians? And the proposed solution in the second part, is it suitable to negotiate with the Zionists to solve the situation in Palestine, while they occupy it illegally and Arabs and Muslims are helpless? Which solution is sought? Problem/ Solution are interchangeable. The Zionist cause a problem, but more problematic is the attitude of Arabs.

The second part of the events take place in the future. In the first part, the time has been (1935-now). The time (the 'now') of writing the play differs continuously from 'the now' of reading it, as explained before. Similarly, the future is endlessly coming without reaching it. The future of Bakathir is the now of this paper, and the future of this paper is yet to come, and no one knows how the features of the Shylocks will be then.

The Solution is a trial between mainly the Arab and the Zionists. The anti-Zionists and the British are supporters of the Palestinian rights. At the beginning of the first session, Shylock repeats "You've promised us a pound of flesh, so give us that pound" (Act I, p. 143). The implication of this phrase implies a part of a whole, a piece of flesh or of land to be given. This pound of flesh is the heart, and this piece of land is a country of a nation. The verb "give" is imperative here and the object "us" a group of people. The word "promise" implies doing something in the future. Using of the present perfect, the action of promising continues, and the promise has not yet been fulfilled regardless of the Zionists' success in occupying the land and evacuating its people from it.

The new Shylock describes Shakespeare's Shylock as "a false imaginary character" (Act I, p. 144). The word "imaginary" means not real. If Shakespeare's Shylock is not real, the new Shylock is the real one. The binary between imaginary and real, suggesting that Shakespeare's Shylock does not represent the Jews, does the new Shylock reject/ want to obscure the reality of the Jews in the past for Shakespeare's Shylock portrays a stage of the Jews' conditions in their history? Does Bakathir want to say Shylock of the past is marginal and weak, and this situation is reversed in the present?

Shylock explains his point further stating, "the true Jew never abandons his right" (Act I, p. 149). Now Shakespeare's Shylock has lawfully the right to cut a pound of Antonio's fair flesh because Antonio has signed the bond with Shylock. When he abandons his right, he proves himself weak and thus not a real Jew. But the new Shylock does not and will not relinquish his right to occupy Palestine. The dilemma here is between right/wrong.

The arguments continue between all the parties, and Shylock with Cohen never loses the means to twist any point against them, giving the Zionists all the right to live in Palestine as their promised land. Here, Shylock proves an outstanding skill to play with the concepts, especially when Faisal, the representative of the Arab Union, unexpectedly puts the agreed-on solution, to

cede Palestine for the Zionists to build their state on it. Shylock replies that the land returns to its real owners, and it is not an act of generosity on the Arab side: "The owner never cedes his right or accepts compensations. Compensation means loss. The one who claims the right gives it up, for he wins in all cases" (Act II, p. 198). The speech is logical. But portraying the whole issue to make the Jews on the right side and the Palestinians on the other side is unprecedented. The deal is conducted, Palestine is for the Zionists and all Palestinians to leave it, Shylock is victorious, the "oppressed" are finally given "justice."

After seven years, the Zionists ask the international court to be held again to help them overcome the tragic economic failure of their state. Shylock keeps wailing, and he keeps considering his nation the oppressed and complains that, "Diaspora is our eternal fate" (Act III, p. 244). His last word is "Oh!" (Act III, p. 270) the cry wells up from the bottom of a regretting troubled heart for he beholds all his dreams fall apart. Then news comes to inform all that Shylock commits suicide because the "prop" of his life is pulled down, thus, he cannot bear life.

At the end of this analysis, there are two points to be highlighted. The first is that throughout the whole trial acts, Shylock is being called (by all Arab and Western participants in the court) "Monsieur Shylock." It seems that he is considered by all consciously or unconsciously as an outsider, a foreigner. The second point is about the reaction of the court on hearing the news of Shylock's suicide:

Arabi Pasha: "How great were his efforts to serve the Arab issues" (Act III, p. 275)

...

Nadia: "We should thank him for he wakens us, then he sleeps" (Act III, p. 275).

Again the significance of binaries (serve/ destroy, awake/ asleep) is crucial to highlight the fact that the hatred and enmity of the Zionists/ Shylocks should unify and awaken Arab efforts not separate them. Therefore, Shylock is to be thanked for his hostility. For Bakathir, the moment of thanking Shylock had come in his imagination, but in reality, the perpetual movement continues.

Conclusion

Adopting *différance* as an umbrella term opens possibilities without definite endings. Shakespeare's Shylock appears under the oppressive circumstances and thus is defeated. However, between his short repetitive speeches, his replies to Bassanio at the beginning, and his last moment of "I am content." He continues haunted by a play of debating and thinking. Yes, he loses almost everything, but he ignites the spark of change. His attempt to control the process of playing with binaries and being able to play not to be played with is remarkable. Shakespeare's Shylock invents the penalty and enhances circumstances (rumors/ news on the Rialto) to make his enemy "approach" him. He tries, but is defeated.

The new Shylock is literally new, and his novelty is a continuous process. What his ancestors have started, he continues, and surprisingly, he succeeds this time in building organizations to defeat, confiscate, evacuate, and avenge others (Palestinians, non-Zionists, and

British) calling these deeds success, gain, settlement and justice. He succeeds in getting/ being outside the movement of these binaries, and become the leading player. Up to this moment, Shylock gains control and fulfills his goals by seizing the whole land for his project. This is the perpetual movement in its typical moments. However, Bakathir suggests what guarantees destroying the prop of Shylock's life; the economic boycott, that consumes the power of Shylock's to-be-real "dream." Then Bakathir anticipates Shylock's reaction to this, which is the suicide. Does the death of Shylock mean the death/ end of Zionism? From a deconstruction perspective, death/ absence recalls life/ presence and vice versa. The death of one might lead to the appearance of another one, similar/ more vicious/ or less vicious. Here, the important point is that the perpetual movement between the two kinds: a previous weak generation and a new stronger one is not limited to time or place; it might happen anytime and anywhere.

Considering the points above, the only meeting point between the present study, and the previous attempts in the field of comparing and contrasting the two plays (Like Shetywi (1995), Sufiani (1994), Jum'a (2003), Bayer (2007), Jamal (2015) and Muhi, Saleh and Hasson (2019)) is that the primary focus is on Shylock from two different eras with a long interval in between. Unlike the previous studies' reliance on the basic elements of literary analysis; the themes and characters as examples, the deconstructive perspective of the present article highlights the *persistent role* of the two Shylocks from the boundaries of the *text* by deconstructing their speeches, and comparing them as two continuous binaries in the continuum of past, present and future that supply each other and defy reaching a clear identification for the Jewish identity. ?"Accordingly, who is "Shylock Is he a weak creature who survives on the fault lines of others? Is he an unexpected devil? Or is ?he a myth / a shadow that we convince ourselves of its reality.

Recommendations

The authors recommend conducting further studies to compare and contrast Shakespeare's Shylock with the most recent adaptations, in the East or the West, using the same theoretical framework to provide an image of the Jew/ Zionist in the spatial and temporal process of the Jewish enigmatic identity development.

Endnotes

¹Ze'ev Jabotinsky (1880-1940) "was one of the fathers of Zionism" (Schwartz, 2016, p. 387). "He established the Revisionist Movement in Zionism in 1925. He saw himself to be the continuation of the political Zionism of Herzl, which primarily addressed the political issue, namely, the demand to establish the Jewish State, so as to solve the troubles of the Jews of Eastern Europe" (Bela, 1972 quoted in Schwartz, 2016, pp. 387-8.)

²The Disaster/ Alnakbah (1948) the term given to describe "the catastrophe that befell the Palestinian people after Zionist forces forcibly expelled of over 900,000 Palestinians from Palestine between 1947 and 1949... Most Palestinians forcibly expelled became refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and the Gaza Strip. The rest ended up in Arab states, Europe and Latin America" (Abou Salem, 2019.)

³In the first part of the play, which is titled *The Problem*, after being seduced by Shylock's plots and as a representative of the tragic problem faced by all Palestinians, Abdullah Alfayyad cedes his lands and fortune to the Zionists. His Egyptian fiancée, Nadia, is shocked by his irresponsible behavior and breaks their engagement. Unfortunately, Alfayyad does not realize his mistakes until repent, he decides to join the Palestinian fighters against the he loses almost everything. To existence of the Zionists on their land. The second part of the play is titled *The Solution*, a trial in held to solve the Palestinian cause. Shylock insists on the Zionists' right in the international court Palestine and rejects all pleas. Nadia interferes in the trial, disguising as a lawyer (man) on behalf of Arab university, and announces Arab decision to cede Palestine to the Zionists under the condition of the total economic boycott between Arabs and the Zionists in Palestine. Shylock is victorious, and the Zionists gain full control of Palestine. After seven years, Shylock pleads for the court to be held again to help the Zionists and solve their economic crisis. Nadia, the lawyer appears now as a lady and informs Shylock the Arab decision that the Zionists will not get anything, and they have to leave Palestine forever and demolish Tel Aviv before that. Shylock could not bear these sanctions, and he commits suicide

⁴Each of the two terms carries a specific connotation. "Jew" basically implies an ethnic and religious meaning. However, the question "Who is the Jew?" is controversial and it indicates a wide range of meanings from ultra-Orthodox to ethnocultural and secular. "Zionist," according to Saleh, "is a political ideology that calls for "return" of the "Jewish people" to their "homeland" to which they have "historical and religious rights," i.e. the land of Palestine" (p. 123).

About the Authors:

Rasha Saeed Badurais has been a lecturer at Hadhramout University, Yemen for 12 years. She is interested in the fields of identity studies and literary theory. Currently, she is a PhD student at USM, Malaysia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4336-0597>

Nurul Farhana Low bt Abdullah is a Senior Lecturer of English literature at the School of Humanities, Universiti Sains Malaysia. Her primary research area is in Shakespeare studies and she has published articles and book chapters on Malaysian Shakespeare performance, translation and adaptation. Her other publications include critical/literary theory and literary analysis, indigenous knowledge especially in traditional performance, as well as drama and performance in English as a Foreign Language (EFL). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9670-5256>

References

- Abou Salem, H. (2019). "Al Nakbah and the Ethnic Cleansing of Palestinians." *Blogs: Palestinian Refugees: A Crisis of Recognition*. Retrieved 15 December 2019 from <https://blogs.cardiff.ac.uk/palestinian-refugees/al-nakbah-and-the-ethnic-cleansing-of-palestinians/>
- Almasiri, A. (2002). *Man Hoa Al-Yahodi? [Who is a Jew?]*. (3rd ed.). Cairo: Dar Al-Shorooq. Retrieved from <https://foulabook.com/ar/book/%D9%85%D9%86-%D9%87%D9%88->

- Awwad, M. (1980). "Masrah Ali Ahmed Bakathir" [Ali Ahmed Bakathir's Drama]. (Unpublished Master Dissertation). Egypt: Cairo University.
- Bakathir, A. A. (1945). *Shylock Al-Jadeed [The New Shylock]*. Egypt: Maktabat Masr.
- Bakathir, A. A. (1958). *Fann Almasrahyyah min Khilal Tajareby Alshakhsiah [The Art of Drama through my Personal Experience]*. Egypt: Maktabat Masr.
- Baker, W. & Vickers, B. (eds.) (2005). *The Merchant of Venice*. London: Thoemmes Continuum. Retrieved from [file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/The%20Merchant%20of%20Venice%20\(Shakespeare_%20the%20Critical%20Tradition\)%20\(%20PDFDrive.com%20\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/The%20Merchant%20of%20Venice%20(Shakespeare_%20the%20Critical%20Tradition)%20(%20PDFDrive.com%20).pdf)
- Bayer, M. (2007). "The Merchant of Venice, the Arab-Israeli conflict, and the perils of Shakespearean appropriation." *Comparative Drama*. 41(4), 465-492. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-192351853/the-merchant-of-venice-the-arab-israeli-conflict>
- Bloom, H. (1998). *Shakespeare: The invention of the human*. New York: Riverhead Books. Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/shakespeare-the-invention-of-the-human-e185263408.html>
- Bloom, H. & Heims, N. (eds.) (2008). *Bloom's Shakespeare through the Ages: The Merchant of Venice*. New York: Infobase Publishing. Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/the-merchant-of-venice-blooms-shakespeare-through-the-ages-e162447818.html>
- Budick, E. (ed.) (2001). *Ideology and Jewish Identity in Israeli and American Literature*. New York: State University of New York Press. Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/ideology-and-jewish-identity-in-israeli-and-american-literature-e158052868.html>
- Colebrook, C. (2014). "Difference." In Z. Derek & L. Lawlor (eds.) (2014). *Blackwell Companion to Derrida*. (pp. 99-115). Chichester: Wiley Blackwell. Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/a-companion-to-derrida-e196416445.html>
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. (A. Bass Trans.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1967). Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/jacques-derrida-writing-and-difference-web-del-profesor-e7397499.html>
- Derrida, J. (1982). "Signature, Event, Context." In J. Derrida, *Margins of Philosophy* (A. Bass Trans.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1971). Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/margins-of-philosophy-d185663458.html>
- Freund, E. (1985). "Ariachne's Broken Woof": the Rhetoric of Citation in Troilus and Cressida." In P. Parker & G. Hartman (eds.) (1985). *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. (pp.19-35). New York: Methuen. Retrieved from [file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/Shakespeare%20and%20the%20Question%20of%20Theory%20\(%20PDFDrive.com%20\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/Shakespeare%20and%20the%20Question%20of%20Theory%20(%20PDFDrive.com%20).pdf)
- Gerson, J. M. "Gender Theory, Intersectionality, and New Understanding of Jewish Identity." *Journal of Jewish Identities*, 11(1), 5-16. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1353/jji.2018.0002>
- Gross, J. (1994). *Shylock: Four hundred years in the life of a legend*. London: Vintage.

- Hennessey, K. (2018). *Shakespeare on the Arabian Peninsula*. London: Palgrave MacMillan. Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/shakespeare-on-the-arabian-peninsula-e188532898.html>
- Jamal, A. (2015). "Almukhtalif wa Almu'talif bain Masrahyyati Tajer AlBundugyyah li Shakespeare wa Shylock Aljadeed li Ali Ahmed Bakathir: Derasah Tannasyyah Mugarenah." [The Similarities and Differences between Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* and Ali Ahmed Bakathir's *The New Shylock: A Comparative Intertextual Study*]. (Unpublished Master Dissertation). Qatar: Qatar University. Retrieved from <https://qspace.qu.edu.qa/bitstream/handle/10576/3904/Asmaa%20al%20JamalThesis%20Final.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Jum'a, M. N. (2003). "Surat Alshakhsyyah Alyahudiah fi Masrahyyat Ali Ahmed Bakathir." [The image of the Jewish character in Ali Ahmed Bakathir's plays]. (Unpublished Master Dissertation). Islam Abad: World Islamic University. Retrieved from http://www.bakatheer.com/upload/noor_mohamed_juma_2.pdf
- Lachman, F. (2020). "Modern Jewish History: A History of Jews in European Theater from 1600 to the 20th century." Retrieved from myjewishlearning.com/article/European-jewish-theatre/
- Moore, D. (ed.) (2008). *American Jewish identity politics*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/american-jewish-identity-politics-e156650292.html>
- Muhi, M., Saleh, M. & Hasson, S. (2019). "The Character of Shylock as a Cultural Mark: Shakespeare's *The merchant of Venice* and Bakathir's *The new Shylock*." https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334173858_The_character_of_shylock_as_a_cultural_mark
- Oxford University Press (2010, 2017, 2019). Oxford Dictionary of English. Version 11.0.495. www.mobisystems.com
- Parker, P. & Hartman, G. (eds). (1985). *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. London: Methuen. Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/shakespeare-and-the-question-of-theory-e191702757.html>
- Royle, N. (2003). *Jacques Derrida*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/jacques-derrida-e158559997.html>
- Saleh, M. M. (2005). *History of Palestine: A Methodological Study of a Critical Issue*. (3rd ed.). Cairo: Al-Falah Foundation.
- Schwartz, D. (2016). "The Social Doctrine of Zeev Jabotinsky, from the Fathers of Zionism." *Open Journal of Political Science*. 6, 387-392. Retrieved 20 December 2019 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojps.2016.64034>.
- Shakespeare, W. (1596). *The Merchant of Venice*. Feedbooks. <http://shakespeare.mit.edu/>
- Shetywi, M. (1995). "The Merchant of Venice in Arabic." <https://www.bing.com/search?q=Shetywi+The+&form=EDNTHT&mkt=en-my&httpsmsn=1&msnews=1&plvar=0&refig=cae5ee64b335431d90350a3942327169&P=C=HCTS&sp=-1&pq=shetywi+the+&sc=8-12&qs=n&sk=&cvid=cae5ee64b335431d90350a3942327169>

- Spivak, G. C. (1997). Preface. In J. Derrida (1997). *Of Grammatology*. (G.C. Spivak, Trans.). USA: John Hopkins University Press. (Originally published 1967).
- Sufiani, N. (1994). "Al Ta'theer AlShakespearey fi Masrah Bakatheer: Derasah Mugarenah" [Shakespearean Influence on Bakathir's Drama: A Comparative Study]. (Unpublished Master Dissertation). Saudi Arabia: Um Alqura University. Retrieved from http://www.bakatheer.com/upload/al-tathtir_al-shiksberi-2.pdf
- Tapper, A. J. H. (2016). *Judaisms*. California: University of California Press. Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/judaisms-a-twenty-first-century-introduction-to-jews-and-jewish-identities-e188054602.htm>
- Wirth-Nesher, H. (ed.) (2002). *What is Jewish Literature?* USA: Varda Books. Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/what-is-jewish-literature-e184985291.html>