"Swear It": Examining the Secret Pact of the Scholar through the Ghosts of *Hamlet's* Father in the

Works of Borges and Joyce's "Scylla and Charybdis"

by

Tyler Ostapyk

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of

The University of Manitoba

in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English, Film, and Theatre

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg

Abstract

Following contemporary readings/writings of the ghosts of *Hamlet*'s father, in particular those of Derrida, Borges, and Joyce, this study intends to further elucidate the affiliation between scholar, spectre, and archive. This work demonstrates how *Hamlet* both conforms to a scholarly process of archivization and a silencing of the ghost, and simultaneously renders a slipping away of the spectre at its precise point of capture, engendering the infinite archive that is "irreducible by explanation" (Derrida, 1998, p. 87) and never closed. It is this opening and pulling apart, this expansion at the point of its closure, that allows the ghosts of Shakespeare and his *Hamlet* to enter into the texts of Borges, Joyce, and Derrida.

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the many people who have provided me with invaluable assistance. Firstly, thank you to Dr. Fernando DeToro for taking on the role as my advisor and aiding me both in the development and completion of this study. Thank you as well to all of the members of my examining committee for their insightful and helpful input. Also thank you to all of the Professors at the department of English, Film, and Theatre who have consistently encouraged and supported my writing and research. Finally, I would like to thank the Faculty of Arts and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for providing the funding that made this research possible.

I. Introduction

"Everything begins by the apparition of a specter" (Derrida, 1994, p. 4). These words,

delivered at the beginning of *Specters of Marx*, suggest that all readings, that any discourse, must

always begin, and has always begun, with an apparition. It is imperative then, to examine the

role of the scholar in relation to this ghost or spectre, the recurring and reincarnate past that we

encounter every day in the form of documents, artifacts, and texts. Following contemporary

readings/writings of the ghosts of Shakespere's *Hamlet*, in particular those of Borges, Derrida,

and Joyce, this study intends to further elucidate the role of the scholar in relation to the

revenant, the continual reappearance of the past, and the archive. By examining more

contemporary readings of *Hamlet* and Shakespeare's ghosts, it is possible to ascertain whether

the scholar "Marcellus was perhaps anticipating" (Derrida, 1994, p. 12) has yet arrived, and to

establish whether it is somehow possible to not only address but converse with this past which is

unceasingly embodied in the present. Do we, like Horatio, demand that the spectre speak only to

be faced with a deafening silence? In so doing do we then choose to speak for and not with these

spectres, engaging in an archival ventriloquism? This study will endeavor to answer these

questions and to identify the way in which literature is able to provide a space for the spectre

beyond the archive. The works of Borges, Joyce, and to an extent Shakespeare, through a

writing from geographical, political, and linguistic margins, radically disrupted the conventional

canons of their time and their incorporation of previously non-archived events and historical

figures greatly altered the archive.[1] Yet in this way they also contributed to the archive, and

---

[1] Levine states that "Borges created an autonomous American literary language that turned the tables and colonized
Europe, in effect making the son into the father... he embodied but also contested literary authority" (1997, p. 345).
Similarly, Joyce can also be seen as "a 'third world' brother disguised in European clothing- colonially marginalized
as both an Irishman and as an exile, whose only territory, the written page, was further shadowed by blindness"

were eventually consumed by it. How then, can literature be said to escape this archive, or allow

for this opening up to the spectre? It is necessary and possible, by examining the scholarly role

of Stephen Dedalus, Horatio, and Borges himself, to illustrate the ways in which literature is able

to aid the scholar in attempting to address the phantom from beyond the archive, beyond a

demand, a conjuring, and an "apostrophizing [of] the ghost" (Derrida, 1994, p. 12).

Though much work has been done in recent years on theorizing the construction of the

archive and canon, and though there has been a push to rewrite the archive and canon in new

ways,[2] there has been much less work done on the process of archivization, and on canonization,

itself. According to Derrida, the archive always consists of a "patriarchic function" (Derrida,

1998, p. 3) and always "amounts to repressed or suppressed parricide in the name of the father as

dead father" (Derrida, 1998, p. 95). For this reason, even these new and accepting archives can

at best be seen as "the takeover of the archive by the brothers" (Derrida, 1998, p. 95). These

movements to rewrite the archive, to purge the archive, or to construct a new archive must

always in some way remain part of the "the one," engaging in the "the law of the archontic"

(Derrida, 1998, p. 78) that silences or conceals the spectre.[3] As Derrida posits in his reading of

Freud's *Moses*, even modern scholars such as Freud and Yerushalmi, who intend to write a new

---

(Levine, 1997, p. 346). Shakespeare's work, though not necessarily written from a geographical margin, provided a "new articulation of class consciousness… a new sense of history…at a critical juncture in the movement away from feudal institutions toward pre-capitalist modes of production" (Anderson, 2004, p. 1&9).

[2] This movement is reflected in the production of a variety of anthologies that aim to collect and publish 'marginalized' texts such as Dohra Ahmad's Rotten English, Nalo Hompkinson's So Long Been Dreaming, and Craig Silvey's Margins, as well as Postmodernist, Marxist, Feminist, or New Historicist theories that stress the need to develop a new literary tradition which includes voices from the margins of Western society and discourse.

[3] According to Derrida in *Archive Fever*, an archive is always both the "commencement and the commandment" (p. 1) of the logos and the *nomos*, it is simultaneously arche-speech, arche-writing, the arche-ive, and the arche-trace. In their quest for meaning and presence, however, the logos and scholar oppose these arche-terms priveliging arche-speech over arche-writing and the arche-ive over the arche-trace, ensuring that the archive will be understood as commandment and not commencement. Any production of the archive then, must always institute this same originary violence.

archive and engage with their ghosts or phantoms, inevitably produce a reduction of "belief in

the phantom" (Derrida, 1998, p. 94), taking "it into account… [only] to account for it" (Derrida,

1998, p. 93). Derrida's reading of the archive then, differs radically from common practices of

archivization and canonization that attempt to rewrite, reform, or reincorporate certain archives

in order to create a space for the other of any given archive. According to Derrida, in fact, "there

has never been a scholar who really, and as scholar, deals with ghosts" (Derrida, 1994, p. 11);

there is only "the illusion… the complex of Marcellus" (Derrida, 1994, p. 11), and the belief that

the scholar can actively and ethically engage in conversation with the ghosts that have been

repressed within the archive. In this way, any scholar who attempts to produce the archive in

new ways is suffering from this illusion, this disease of the archive, and can do nothing but

reproduce the archive and the concealment of its originary violence. Uncharacteristically,

however, Derrida proposes that this illusion can be broken, and always already has been broken,

by "what literature attests" (1998, p. 100).

Derrida claims to respond to the spectres he addresses within *Archive Fever* and his

Specters of Marx with an oddly "singular testimony, literature itself, as inheritor escaped- or

emancipated- from the scriptures" (Derrida, 1998, p. 100). Though he claims Horatio and

Shakespeare may never speak with the ghost of Hamlet's father, he suggests that literature itself

may open up this possibility, providing an unconditional hospitality which opens itself to the

spectre and enabling the possibility of an encounter with a spectral truth beyond the archive. [4] In

what ways literature is able to produce such an encounter is left unanswered at the end of the

text, however, and remains the secret of "*Gradiva,* of Hanold, of Jensen, and then of Freud"

---

[4] According to Derrida, "pure hospitality consists in welcoming whoever arrives before imposing any conditions on him, before knowing and asking anything at all, be it a name or an identity… but it supposes also that one address him, singularly, that he be called therefore, and that he be understood to have a proper name" (2005, p. 7)

(Derrida, 1998, p. 101). It is this secret, the hidden secret of literature's emancipatory

possibility, which will be the focus of this reading of the ghosts of Shakespeare's scholars.

II. "What is a Ghost:" Defining the Archive and Spectre

Before attempting to define, to redefine, or reveal this secret, it is necessary to define the terms under which this secret has been written. [5] The term arche takes on a significant role throughout much of Derrida's writing, and it is only by first unveiling the notions of the arche-trace, arche-writing, *arca*, and the *arkhe* that the nature of the archive can be revealed. There are several sources for this prefix. This arche signifies both the "commencement and the commandment" of "that which commands" (Derrida, 1998, p. 2), the "stoned tablets" of the law, and "the cupboard, the coffin, the prison cell, or the cistern, the reservoir… from which sages *excavated* and *lawmakers* learned knowledge and judgement" (Derrida, 1998, p. 23). As something that both commands and produces logos[6] the relation between the arche, the commandment, and the origin of *nomos* (the law) is clear. It is necessary to follow this term further into Derridean discourse, however, to discover its relation to commencement and to this becoming of law. According to Derrida in *Of Grammatology*, "arche-speech is writing because it is a law. A natural law. The beginning word is understood, in the intimacy of self-presence, as the voice of the other and as commandment" (Derrida, 1997, p. 17). This arche-speech however, is not the moment of commencement, but a moment of false beginning and of false origin as will become clear through an investigation of the terms arche-writing and arche-trace. In a sense these arche-terms are one in the same. As Spivak points out, "for 'trace' [or arche-trace] one can substitute 'arche-writing'… 'differance,'" and as will later be demonstrated, both arche-speech and the arche-ive (Spivak, 1997, p. xv). This 'difference' or 'arche-trace' "is that very thing

---

[5] This secret, as will be attested to, is both the secret of the spectre and of literature's possibility; The secret pact between scholar and ghost that consistently keeps the spectre repressed and silenced within the archive but simultaneously provides the possibility of an opening up to this spectre.

which cannot let itself be reduced to the form of *presence*" (Derrida, 1997, p. 57) and which, for

this reason, disrupts a determining of "the archaeological and eschatological meaning of being as

presence" (Derrida, 1997, p. 71) and the origin of the *logos* as presence. The arche-trace

"presents itself as the mark of an anterior presence, origin, master" (Spivak, 1997, p. xv) and

thus reveals that arche-speech and the archive are also the products of this origin which is also

not an origin, suggesting that the visible origin does exist, but exists only as illusion, as "the

restoration of internal purity" through a recitation of a false origin, a "myth as such, the

mythology… of a *logos* recounting its origin" through "the subordination of the trace to the full

presence summed up in the logos" (Derrida, 1997, p. 71). Origin, logos, meaning, and "the

human desire to posit a 'central' presence at beginning and end" (Spivak, 1997, p. lxviii) can

only maintain their superior positions through a false opposition to "the inferior" which serves

"to define its status and mark a fall… the opposition between writing and speech [and absence

and presence] takes its place within this pattern" (Spivak, 1997, p. lxix). By naming writing as

subordinate and in this way effacing the "originary trace" which reveals "there is above all no

originary trace" (Derrida, 1997, p. 61), language and the archive ensure "the beginning word is

understood, in the intimacy of self-presence… and as commandment" (Derrida, 1997, p. 17).

Any texts or objects of the archive then, any writing, including the works of Borges, Joyce, and

Shakespeare, thus teeter on the abyss of the archive and "the primal scene at which… [they are]

constantly hinting and which we are constantly on the brink of remembering, falsely, fictively"

(Garber, 2010, p. 213). These objects simultaneously run the risk of supporting the logos and its

myth of origin, and of revealing, in their spectrality and their "play of presence and absence"

(Spivak, 1997, lvii), their existence as trace, as "not originals at all, but [as] signs of the lostness

---

[6] The term Logos, defined as both the "' 'rational' principle that governs and develops the universe" and "the divine
word or reason incarnate" ("Logos," 2011) is significant not only in itself, but in the way that it ties "reason" to

and unrecoverability of origins" (Garber, 2010, p. xxv). The archive does not seek to simply

collect these texts, but "produces as much as it records an event" (Derrida, 1998, p. 17),

silencing, through an illusory claim, this trace of the non-origin, or what will now be referred to

as the spectre.

Before entering into a discussion of the spectre in relation to the archive, to the *logos*, and

to Derridean thought, which we will have always already entered into, it seems pertinent to

investigate the nature, and the unnaturalness, of the spectre. The most striking characteristic of

the spectre is its uncanny ability to simultaneously embody both life and death, absence and

presence, being and non-being, in this way revealing the limits of a language, knowledge, or

philosophy based on these oppositions, one which Derrida will repeatedly refer to as a

Metaphysics of presence. [7] If "an entire history. All of philosophy" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 168) is

based on these differences, and on this arche-writing, then the spectre can be read as radically

disruptive. What makes this spectre especially harmful to the system of the *logos* is its inability

to be repressed through the structure of its logic. In a structure of oppositions, if the ghost

appears as a becoming present of absence, it also reveals a becoming absent of presence. The

spectre's other then, cannot be privileged, and must also remain hidden, as it too unsettles a logic

which is based on the existence of a true presence, and a transcendental signified. In other

words, "the question concerning the mode of being of the spectre cannot be answered by

opposing the mere appearance or the simulacrum to the thing itself" (De Boer, 2002, p. 24). In

order to further discover how this spectre relates to arche-writing, the arche-trace, and ultimately

---

"word, speech, [and] discourse."

[7] Derrida defines "the metaphysics of presence as the exigent, powerful, systemic, and irrepressible desire for… the transcendental signified, which, at one time or another, would place a reassuring end to the reference from sign to sign" (1997, p. 49). As mentioned, this transcendental signified can only be established through the binary oppositions of writing, play, death, and absence to speech, gravity, life, and presence (Derrida, 1997, 25 and 50).

to the arche-ive, it is necessary to turn once again toward Derrida's reading of the spectre and

phantom, two terms which are not synonymous but which are neither mutually exclusive.

According to Derrida in "Plato's Pharmacy," the phantom, "a living-dead, a reprieved

corpse, a deferred life, a semblance of death" (1981c, p. 143), is writing itself. Within the

structure of Western metaphysics, and within the philosophy of Plato on, writing represents "the

phantom, the phantasm… of living discourse" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 143). This ghost is "errant,"

"can no longer repeat its origin" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 144), and is thus forced to wander the

streets, not knowing "even who he is, what his identity… might be, what his name is, what his

father's name is" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 143). It is "a discourse that doesn't amount to much"

(Derrida, 1981c, p. 143) and for this reason wanders "like a signifier freed from *logos*" (Derrida,

1981c, p. 145). This phantom is a subordinate absence opposed to the absolute presence of

reason and speech, "an embodiment of the disembodied, a remembering of the dismembered, an

articulation of the disarticulated and inarticulate" (Garber, 2010, p. 20). It is necessary to

observe that this ghost, according to Derrida, wanders "*like* a signifier freed from *logos*" and not

as this signifier. This phantom is not yet read as the spectre of Hamlet's father, of Shakespeare,

or of Marx, but it is close to, and in fact already is, this spectre.

As in "Plato's Pharmacy," Derrida describes the spectre in *Specters of Marx* as "this

thing that looks at us, that concerns us, comes to defy semantics as much as ontology" (Derrida

1994, p. 6). This spectre is no longer the wandering phantom of Derrida's previous text, it no

longer acts *like* something that defies semantics and ontology, but *is* this something. This

spectre, and this haunting, reveals itself as the arche-trace; "Traced before being written… [this]

haunting [reveals itself] as the very construction of a concept" (Derrida, 1994, p. 161). This

apparition thus reveals that "the truth is spectral" (Derrida, 1998, p. 141). This "hidden figure of

all figures" (Derrida, 1994, p. 120) exposes an ontology which "opposes it only in a movement

of excorcism" (Derrida, 1994, p. 161), revealing a moment of commencement which cannot be

traced, and an ontology and logos based solely on "the effacing of differance" (Derrida, 1997, p.

23). Haunting exposes the false origin of the origin, and the absence of the presence of speech,

the logos, and a transcendental signified. Given the existence of a system of *logos* based on its

opposition and effacement, however, this spectre is not easily revealed. "This other, this person

[which]… is the secret and insists on secret" (Derrida, 2006, p. 21) often remains unrecognized

and undisturbed.

The spectre's disruptive qualities incite the *logos*, and what Derrida would refer to as an

ontology based on presence, to demand "that what is… indeed dead, remain dead," this

conjuration "has to make sure the dead will not come back" and will "do whatever is needed to

keep the cadaver localized in a safe place" (Derrida, 1994, p. 97). This "safe place" is the arkhe-

ive. The scholar and the archivist, as keepers of the archive, thus exhibit a desire "to explain and

reduce the belief in the phantom" (Derrida, 1998, p. 94). Through the incarnation of the spectre

into "another artefactual body, a prosthetic body… a technical body or institutional body,"

(Derrida, 1994, p. 126-127), the scholar "reads it, interprets it, classes it" (Derrida, 1998, p. 55),

attempting to suppress the ghost, to keep it hidden under "the tough institutional or cultural

protection of some artifact" (Derrida, 1994, p. 127). It is not so easy, however, to ensure that the

spectre "stay in its place" (Derrida, 1994, p. 9). As will become clear in a reading of

Shakespeare's ghosts, the spectre always "multiplies itself, gets carried away with itself"

(Derrida, 1994, p. 127), and "one will never be able to objectivize it with no remainder… that is

why the archive is never closed" (Derrida, 1998, p. 68). This spectre will always slip away,

remaining "irreducible by explanation" (Derrida, 1998, p. 87) and protecting "the life of the

secret it keeps" (Derrida, 2006, p. 58), a secret which is synonymous with the secret of the arche-trace, of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, and of literature, a secret held within the arche-ive. The reading of Borges, Joyce, and *Hamlet* that follows will exhibit an unraveling of the archive and this secret of literature which is also the secret of *Hamlet*'s father.

At the beginning of *Specters*, Derrida writes, "as in *Hamlet*, the Prince of a rotten State, everything begins by the apparition of a specter" (1994, p. 4). It would perhaps have been more pertinent to state that an encounter with the apparition of a spectre and the archive must always begin with the ghost of "*Hamlet*, the Prince of a rotten State" (Derrida, 1994, p. 4). It is necessary to ask why *Hamlet* is so paramount to this reading of the archive, to Derrida's, to Joyce's, to Borges', and to our own, and to ask what is it that this play reveals. There is undoubtedly an "uncanny connection between Shakespeare's propensity to write ghosts and his continuing capacity to write us" (Garber, 2010, p. xxvi). This question inevitably leads us to ask "not who the ghost writer is but 'why does the question persist'" (Garber, 2010, p. 4). Perhaps as Scofield has pointed out, it is "the unique malleability or indeterminate nature of the play… [which] seems to leave room for further creation" that causes "the ghosts of *Hamlet* [to] haunt the imagination of modern writers" (Scofield, 1980, p. 6). Undoubtedly this is true, but this statement needs to be pushed further.

As will be later demonstrated, *Hamlet* itself resembles the archive or the arkhe, as the text conforms to a process of archivization, of keeping the secret hidden, and of silencing the ghost. Yet, in this same way, *Hamlet* exhibits the slipping away of the spectre at its precise point of capture, engendering the infinite archive which is "irreducible by explanation" (Derrida, 1998, p. 87) and never closed. It is this opening, and this pulling apart, this movement of expansion at the point of its closure, that allows the ghosts of Shakespeare and his *Hamlet*, and the secret they

keep, to enter into the works of Borges, Joyce and countless others, and to infinitely reappear

within the literary archive. *Hamlet* thus provides a deconstruction[8] of the archive, exposing its

secret, and allowing it to consistently reappear, to be silenced, and to slip away once more.

How though does this reading, and do these readings, differ from those of others which

have attempted to define and explicate the one true meaning of *Hamlet*, or who have written the

ghost of *Hamlet* and his father into their works in an attempt to place the work within an archive

which is dedicated, like a tomb, to the deathly silence of the secret (Derrida, 2006, p. 58)?

Borges, Joyce, Derrida, and even Shakespeare produce this spectre not to exorcise or objectify it,

but in order to examine the possibility of the scholar to go beyond these limits. These works

reveal that Shakespeare, like the spectre, "calls us back to ourselves, to an imposed, undecidable,

but self-chosen attribution of paternity… [a] corpus 'incorpsed' in innumerable authoritative

edition, yet one that breaks the bounds- the margins- set to contain it (Garber, 2010, p. 235).

"Joyce's and Borges's intersections with Shakespeare reawaken the phantom" (Novillo-

Corvalan, 2008, p. 208), dissolving "to bring us back to the play itself, not as referent," but as a

trace, as the secret origin of the "origin…the mark of the unknowability of origins" (Garber,

2010, p. 212). What these representations provide is not a speaking for the spectre, but a spectre

speaking through them, one that unveils the secret it has always attested to, but which has always

remained hidden as the secret possibility of literature itself. In order to further understand these

notions of secret and spectre it is necessary to identify the ways in which Shakespeare, Borges,

and Joyce confront and encounter the archive within their respective works. In their readings of

the archive, Borges, Joyce, Shakespeare, and Derrida place a great deal of focus on the

---

[8] Spivak describes deconstruction as "locating the moment in the text which harbors the unbalancing of the equation, the sleight of hand at the limit of a text which cannot de dismissed simply as a contradiction" (1997, p. xlix).

relationship between the scholar and the archive, and it is here where the similarities between

their respective readings become most explicit. It is for this reason that it is first necessary to

examine this exchange between ghost and scholar, an association which engenders the "pact"

(Derrida, 1994, p. 9) of the archive.

III. An Archive Sworn to Silence

i. Horatio as Scholar: Quieting the Ghost

"Thou art a scholar; speak to it, Horatio" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.1.42). These words, taken from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as spoken by Marcellus, evince both a demand and a request that Horatio, as scholar, address Hamlet's father's ghost. As Derrida demonstrates in *Specters of Marx*, this line strongly signifies the often suppressed or denied relationship that exists between scholar, ghost, and archive. It seems almost purposefully unclear, however, what, through this line, Marcellus and Shakespeare suggest. Is it the role of the scholar to speak to ghosts and, in this way, by addressing the ghost, does Horatio speak to his being a scholar as he speaks to this ghost? Is every ghost conjured simply to affirm the scholar, in order to allow him to speak to his being a scholar? Is it possible for the ghost to exist beyond these limits? Must all scholars speak to ghosts? Do all scholars speak to ghosts? As do all archives, *Hamlet* opens with this spectre, and what will become the pact between archive and scholar, *arkhe* and *archon*.

Beginning in the first Act, Marcellus clearly identifies a flawed knowledge of the relationship between spectre, scholar, and archive in his expectation that Horatio will be able to "speak to," or question the spectre" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.1.45). An examination of Horatio's interaction with the spectre will show this relationship for what it really is. As is typical of a scholar invested in the archive, Horatio first denies the existence of a spectre altogether, insisting "tush, tush, 'twill not appear" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.1.29). Just as Derrida suggests, Horatio, as "a traditional scholar[,] does not believe in ghosts" (Derrida, 1994, p. 11). When this denial is no longer possible, however, and when the spectre stands before him, Horatio demands that it respond, exclaiming "stay! Speak, speak! I charge thee, speak!" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.1.51).

"By charging or conjuring him to speak, Horatio wants to inspect, stabilize, *arrest* the specter in its speech" (Derrida, 1994, p. 12) demanding "*he remain there*. Let him stay there and move no more" (Derrida, 1994, p. 9). Horatio's profound disturbance with this spectre and his own inability to make it stay or "answer" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.1.52) is illustrated when, in its presence, or more precisely in its absence/presence, he begins to tremble and look pale as the ghost begins to fill him with both "fear and wonder" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.1.44-54). As scholar, Horatio is unwilling to express this fear, and instead must endeavor to objectify this ghost. Responding to Marcellus' question "tell me, he that knows… Who isn't that can inform me?" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.1.78), Horatio continues to reply "that can I" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.1.79). Marcellus "appeals to the scholar… as a spectator who better understands how to establish the necessary distance or how to find the appropriate words for observing… for apostrophizing the ghost" (Derrida, 1994, p. 12) and Horatio in many ways succeeds in doing this. Horatio is unable to properly identify the spectre's motives, however, and describes it as a ghost which has returned because of its being "privy" to its "country's fate," or having "extorted treasure in the womb of earth" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.1.130-139), neither of which are the reason for its return. Horatio thus evinces the scholar's "attempt to find false origin," and to deny the ghost's "manifestation as a sign of potential proliferation or plurality and… its acknowledgement of the loss of the original… the loss of the certainty of the concept of origin" (Garber, 2010, p. 6-7 and 21). He has essentially conjured away the ghost, and has told its story without telling its story, keeping its secret silent. In order to understand Horatio's resistance to this ghost, it is necessary to identify what exactly this ghost of *Hamlet's* father represents, both within the text itself, and within the archive. It is here that Derrida's reading of the spectre becomes useful.

From Horatio's first encounter with the ghost onward, this ghost appears not as the "errant" ghost that Derrida describes in Plato's Pharmacy, a ghost which wanders the street not knowing "who he is, what his identity… might be, what his name is, what his father's name is" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 143), the ghost of *Hamlet's* father, this ghost who "can no longer repeat his origin" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 144), is above all else the ghost of "the king" and of Hamlet's "noble father's person" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.2.191 and 1.2.244). This is what is so striking about the ghost of *Hamlet*. According to Derrida, "'the origin of logos is *its father*… the good… the figure of the father… is the origin of all *onta*, responsible for their appearing and their coming into *logos*, which both assembles and distinguishes them" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 77-82). Consequently, the father is "the hidden illuminating, blinding source of logos" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 82) and therefore the absolute presence that produces a metaphysics which privileges presence over absence, writing over speech, etc. This spectre is not only a representation of the father, however, but also a king. Hamlet's father is thus both father and king, the "pharaoh" of speech and presence that is opposed to a writing and absence (Derrida, 1981c, p. 124). Knowing this, it is possible to recognize the radically disruptive possibility of this ghost.

By appearing to Hamlet, Horatio, and the others as a present/absence, the king and father disrupts the logos and the archive not only in his constitution of a present/absence, but by revealing "the dissapearance of truth as presence, the withdrawal of the present origin of presence" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 168). The king as ghost becomes both the origin of the *logos* and "the trace… the disappearance of the origin… [meaning] that the origin did not even disappear, that it was never constituted except reciprocally by a non-origin, the trace, which thus becomes the origin of the origin" (Spivak, 1997, p. xviii). "The Ghost that comes 'in such a questionable shape' (1.4.43) is immediately put in question, is in fact… the shape or sign of putting things in

question" (Garber, 2010, p. 220). This spectre confronts Hamlet as "a memory trace… is the

sign of something missing, something omitted, something undone… incompletely a

representative of the Law, because both he and the tale he tells allow the son to doubt" (Garber,

2010, p. 173). We will later further examine how this apparition will serve to impact Hamlet, the

son of the *logos*, but for now we will once again turn to what will be identified as the complicit

goal of ghost and scholar in keeping this secret hidden.

For a scholar of the archive such as Horatio, "the archive refers to the *arkhe* as the

originary, the first, the principal, the primitive" (Derrida, 1998, p. 2). The apparition of Hamlet's

father clearly disrupts this notion. In its revealing of the origin of the logos and the archive as an

absent/presence, the king's spectre suggests that "any attempt to return toward the untouched,

proper intimacy of some presence or some self-presence is played out [only] in illusion"

(Derrida, 1981a, p. 297). It is for this reason that the scholar must enter into a pact with this

ghost, swearing an oath to keep the secret of its being/non-being hidden. The scholar and

archive "must avow it does not see therefore does not have that which it sees and believes it has,

that it does not regard that which it guards, that which it keeps safe" (Derrida, 2006, p. 33). This

is the first of many embodiments of a suppressive "violence of the archive" (Derrida, 1998, p. 7)

found within *Hamlet*. Horatio's desire to keep this spectre hidden is exhibited not only through

his attempt to conjure away or exorcise this ghost, and to identify and objectify it when it first

appears, but in his attempts to keep it from revealing itself to others.

When Hamlet wishes to go away with the ghost that has beckoned him, so that it may lift

its veil and reveal itself to him, Horatio insists that "by no means" should he follow it,

exclaiming "do not, my lord… what if it tempt you toward the flood?" (Shakespeare, 1998,

1.2.61-69). So adamant is Horatio's determination to deny this unveiling of the spectre that he

attempts to physically restrain Hamlet from accessing its secret, attempting to "rule" the prince

himself, asserting "you shall not go" (1998, 1.2.79). It is of no use, however, and the ghost

exposes itself to Hamlet, identifying "more things in heaven and earth… than are dreamt of in...

[Horatio's] philosophy" (1998, 1.5.166-167) and in the archive of the scholar. This is not,

however, the father and king's intention for, much like Horatio, the king demands they are silent

of this knowledge. All who have witnessed this spectre willingly enter into a pact, must "swear"

(1998, 1.5.144) an oath to "never… make known" this that they "have seen" (1998, 1.5.143).

The king's ghost in fact demands they do so, repeatedly calling on them to "swear" (1998,

1.5.149); "It is the apparition that enjoins them to conspire to *silence the apparition*, and to

promise secrecy on the subject of the one who demands such an oath" (Derrida, 1998, p. 41). As

king and father and as illusory founder of the logos "this other, this person… is the secret and

insists on secret" (Derrida, 2006, p. 21), hoping to remain indistinguishable within the archive.

The ramifications of this pact between scholar and ghost and its relation to the archive become

especially evident at the end of *Hamlet*.

Horatio's relationship with the archive remains less apparent at the beginning of *Hamlet*

than does the relationship of the scholars of Joyce and Borges' texts but by the end of the work

Horatio's position as scholar of the archive, and as *archon* (Derrida, 1998, p. 2), is unmistakable.

With the death of Hamlet and the others, and with the appearance of Fortinbras, Horatio

expresses his intention to "speak to the yet unknowing world/ How these things came about"

(1998, 5.2.380-381). With the approval of Fortinbras, the new king, who hastes "to hear it"

(1998, 5.2.387), Horatio is thus given his place as scholar within the new kingdom and allowed

the opportunity to construct the archive, to "truly deliver" (Shakespeare, 1998, 5.2.387) the

message of what has happened. "Hamlet's dying request is for Horatio to tell his story, and in

the final moments Fortinbras asserts that Horatio has 'some rights of memory in this kingdom' which, with the support of Hamlet's 'dying voice,' he is now prepared to claim" (Garber, 2010, p. 199). Through Horatio, Hamlet's story enters the archive, "the absolute Library, both tomb and conservatory- monument, hail and farewell" (Derrida, 2006, p. 12). As scholar, it is Horatio's role to silence the secret of the spectre, and for this reason the ghost of Hamlet's father will remain absent from his account "of carnal, bloody, and unnatural acts,/ Of accidental judgments, casual slaughters,/ Of deaths put on by cunning and forced cause,/ And, in this upshot, purposes mistook" (Shakespeare, 1998, 5.2.383-386). In this way, the story of Hamlet, told through Horatio, embodies the archive, an archive which above all else desires to repress the phantom which would threaten to disrupt the archive and the *logos*. Though this story will be told, it will be told without the apparition of the secret, and the secret of the apparition who has sworn Horatio to silence. It is Horatio's silence that above all else allows him to remain keeper of *Hamlet*'s story and *archon* of the archive, enabling the archive to remain intact as an illusory whole. Shakespeare's work thus exhibits the scholar's attempt to close the archive, and to silence the arche-trace.

Here we come to the answer to our question. Horatio speaks to his being a scholar through a non-speech, and through a silencing of the secret he keeps repressed within the archive. Opposed to the work of Shakespeare, it is clear that Horatio's account would leave absent the ghost of Hamlet's father. Horatio is *not* the Derridean scholar who "says he is ready to respect the secret, to keep for his personal archives the response that the phantom with its own mouth, could murmur in his ear in private (Derrida, 1998, p. 47), as his personal archive too will remain devoid of this secret. Whether this movement of closure, and this keeping of the secret, was Shakespeare's intention as well is uncertain but, as representations of this connection

between the archive and the scholar in Borges and Joyce will show, regardless of intention this

closure will always provide an opening within the archive, in this way sowing the seeds of its

own dissemination.

"A secret always hangs by a thread" (Derrida, 2006, p. 21). "This expression, already

proverbial in the early 1500s, alludes to Damocles, who vexed King Dionysius with constant

flattery. The king invited him to a banquet where Damocles found himself seated under a naked

sword suspended by a single hair [or thread], symbolizing his insecure position at the court"

("Hang by a Thread," 1997). The secret of the spectre and the archive thus hangs by a thread not

only in its tentative or unstable nature, but because it threatens with the possibility of its pulling

something apart, of making "some incision, some violent arbitrary cut" that allows the teeth to

"become unclenched, the sewn-up mouth opened," and the pen to "have turned into a knife"

(Derrida, 1981a, p. 300-302). This secret, this spectre which Horatio tries so desperately to hide,

marks "the text's interruption" (Derrida, 1981a, p. 300-303) and this possibility of an incision.

Despite Horatio's attempt to trap this ghost of *Hamlet*'s father, and to suppress its knowledge

within the archive, its thread continues to unravel. It is in this way that the spectre of *Hamlet*

makes possible further incisions within the works, libraries, and archives, of both Borges and

Joyce.

ii. Borges as Scholar: Burying the Ghost

In reading works such as "Everything and Nothing" (Borges, 1999), and "Shakespeare's

Memory" (Borges, 1998a), Borges' indebtedness toward the spectre of Shakespeare is apparent.

Before entering into the dialogue of these two authors, however, it will be helpful to examine

Borges' reading of the archive, and the secret pact that will be shown to exist between spectre

and scholar. What will make Borges' evaluation particularly illuminating is the career choice

that led to his position as Director of the Argentine National Library. [9] Borges, perhaps more

than many other authors, was acutely aware of processes of archivization, of his relation as

scholar to these processes, and of his complicit role in the production of archives. This

awareness is evident throughout much of his work but is most visible in his "The Book of Sand"

(1998b) as it serves to expose the relationship between scholar, spectre, and archive. "The Book

of Sand" will begin this unveiling with a knock, the knock of the foreigner and spectre.

Derrida's "Plato's Pharmacy" ends with "knocks… heard at the door… [which] seem to be

coming from outside… maybe… just a residue, a dream, a bit of dream left over, an echo of the

night… that other theatre, those knocks from without" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 171). It is with these

knocks, knocks at the door of Borges' "fifth-floor apartment on Calle Belgrano" (Borges, 1998b,

p. 480) that Borges' "The Book of Sand" begins. Like all spectres, the ghost of Borges' text

immediately gives an "uncanny"[10] sense of haunting. Borges tells us that immediately upon

opening the door he "sensed... a foreigner" embodied in the form of an indistinguishable man

"with blurred, vague features" who Borges describes first as "old" then young, with "blonde"

then "white" hair (1998b, p. 480). Borges the scholar, and the reader, soon both learn that this

ghostly foreigner is a travelling bible salesman (1998b, p. 480). Already, Borges' text has begun

---

[9] "At thirty-six, still living at home, he took a job as an assistant librarian in a small branch of the Buenos Aires municipal library system, which was located in one of the rundown outskirts of the city… There was almost no work to do there, so Borges spent his days reading and writing in the library's subterranean stacks" (Ogden, 2009, p. 375). Later in life, Borges was "appointed director of the National Library" (Ogden, 2009, p. 379).

[10] Majorie Garber defines the uncanny as a "factor of involuntary repetition which surrounds with an uncanny [inexplicable or mysterious] atmosphere," stating "it is a memory trace. It is the sign of something missing, something omitted, something undone" (2010, p. 169-173). This understanding of the uncanny clearly echoes Derrida's concept of the arche-trace or spectre.

to reveal the spectral role of the archive, as this encounter with "the Bible itself, the 'Book of

books'...from which sages *excavated* and *lawmakers* learned knowledge and judgement"

(Derrida, 1998, p. 21-23) is brought about through the apparition of a ghostly embodiment, this

foreigner who knocks at the door of the scholar. This unidentifiable, indistinguishable origin,

and the spectrality of this book of books, is further emphasized when the salesman produces for

Borges a book entitled "Holy Writ" from Bombay (Borges, 1998b, p. 481).

From the moment that the book is opened it is clear that this is not the "Bible," the

"Wyclife," the book of books, which will be used to legitimize and produce Western knowledge,

and which will be excavated toward a possible origin, producing an archive (Borges, 1998b, p.

482). Though it is a Bible, "a sacred book," whose "pages... worn and badly set, were printed in

double columns, like a bible," it is simultaneously not the Bible (Borges, 1998b, p. 481). Unlike

the Bible, this text contains a faulty or indecipherable pagination in which "the even-numbered

page would carry the number 40, 514, let us say, while the odd-numbered page that followed it

would be 999" (Borges, 1998b, p. 481). This, however, like the "characters... unfamiliar" to

him, is originally seen by Borges the astute scholar as merely an "odd fact" (Borges, 1998b, p.

481). What will originally be seen as "odd facts" by Borges the scholar, will become

increasingly dangerous as the text progresses, threatening the very foundation and construction

of the archive which he, as scholar, has sworn to protect.   After encountering a curious picture

of an anchor like "one sees in dictionaries," the foreigner intensifies the "threat," claiming "look

at it well… you will never see it again" (Borges, 1998b, p. 481). In disbelief Borges the scholar

notes the page and closes the book, immediately opening it again and proceeding to search "in

vain… for the figure of the anchor, page after page" (Borges, 1998b, p. 481).   Here the scholar

once again encounters the sliding of the supplement, and of writing, which reveals it as an "is

not... is not a being… is nevertheless not a simple non being, either… [that] its slidings slip it out

of the simple alternative presence/absence" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 109). It is important to note that

this is not any image, but the image of an anchor, something which is generally known to give

"stability and security" (Harper, 2010). This anchor, like the spectre, wanders "like a signifier

freed from *logos*" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 145), freed from this "Book of Books" (Borges, 1998b, p.

481), it is a trace which cannot be traced, an origin which cannot be returned to, and an illusion

of the stability which is not and never was possible. Borges' text suggests that the bible, like

"the tables that Moses brings to the Israelites, the foundations of the Law… are… copies," that

"even this law, the great original, is a copy and a substitution" (Garber, 2010, p. 204). Like

Horatio, however, Borges as scholar is not satisfied with this, and, like all scholars, "he wants to

explain and reduce belief in the phantom" (Derrida, *Archive*, 94) in order to protect the archive.

Like a text with innumerable pages and disappearing illustrations, "one can neither classify nor

count the ghost" (Derrida, 1994, p. 138), but this is precisely what Borges the scholar will

attempt to do. Not able to unlock the text, or to find both the literal and figurative anchor,

Borges the scholar tries "another tack" (Borges, 1998b, p. 481). Failing to decipher the

illustrations, the pagination, or the language of the text, Borges the scholar, like all good

scholars, "reads it, interprets it, classes it" (Derrida, 1998, p. 55), stating that the text "is a

version of Scripture in some Hindu language" (Borges, 1998b, p. 481). The foreigner's prompt

reply "no," however, once again reveals the scholar's unsuccessful attempt to find an anchor, and

to classify a text which remains "forever imperceptible" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 63). Having failed

to account for, to exorcise, or to conjure away this ghost, the scholar is now faced with the

"secret" of this "Book of Books" (Borges, 1998b, p. 481).

In the instant immediately after the scholar has demonstrated his inability to classify the object, the salesman reveals in a "lowered voice, as though entrusting... [Borges] with a secret," the origin of this "book of books" which is also a non-origin (Borges, 1998b, p. 481). He tells of purchasing this book with "a few rupees and a Bible" from a man he "came across... in a village on the plain," exhibiting its origin, but simultaneously stressing that the book is "called the Book of Sand because neither sand nor this book has a beginning or an end" (Borges, 1998b, p. 481). The reader will soon find that "the number of pages in this book is literally infinite. No page is the first page; no page is the last" (Borges, 1998b, p. 482). As if to prove this point, the foreigner asks Borges the scholar to find the first page, an easy job for any man, never mind an archivist. Unfortunately for this scholar, it is not so simple. Borges describes attempting to take the cover in his left hand with his "thumb and forefinger almost touching" but eventually realizes the impossibility of such a task, admonished at the fact that "several pages always lay between the cover and... [his] hand... as though they grew from the very book" (Borges, 1998b, p. 481). After neglecting to find the end, this scholar is only left to stammer "this can't be" (Borges, 1998b, p. 481). Like the spectre, the *logos*, the Bible, and the book of books, "it can't be, yet it is" (Borges, 1998b, p. 481). The text has no origin, no first that can be discovered or rediscovered, "one will never be able to objectivise it with no remainder" (Derrida, 1998, p. 68). It is this that makes it so dangerous and threatening, and so "diabolic" (Borges 1998b, p. 481) to Borges the scholar. It is true that Borges is willing to purchase this book from the salesman, in fact he desires it so much that he is willing to trade the full sum of his pension and "Wyclif's black-letter-Bible" (Borges, 1998b, p. 482) for the book, but, as the rest of "The Book of Sand" will show, this is only in order to keep it "under the tough institutional or cultural protection of some artefact" (Derrida, 1994, p. 127). The text has been "convoked to be revoked" (Derrida,

1998, p. 99). Borges is a scholar who realizes that though "he wants to classify, he can only

chase" (Derrida, 1994, p. 141). He is the archivist entrusted with the secret of the archive and

the spectre, attempting to "hide" its existence within the archive, he places the book "behind

some imperfect volumes of The Thousand and One Nights" (Borges, 1998b, p. 483). Borges

suffers from archive fever, he goes to bed but he cannot sleep, becoming "a prisoner of the book"

he rarely leaves his house, beginning to decipher the indecipherable, noting down that "the small

illustrations were spaced at two-thousand-page intervals... in an alphabetized book that was very

soon filled" (Borges, 1998b, p. 483). Borges "the archivist produces more archive," (Derrida,

1998, p. 68), he runs "after the archive, even if there's too much of it, right where it archives

itself," (Derrida, 1998, p. 91), marking down in a delirium the illustrations which "never

repeated themselves" (Borges, 1998b, p. 483). Borges the scholar must cure himself of this

poison and save others from it, and he must do so by keeping the secret of this poison, this text,

all texts, and all of writing and literature.

  Like Horatio from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Borges as scholar will choose to remain silent,

keeping the spectre's secret hidden within the archive. Just as Horatio does in *Hamlet*, Borges

the scholar "gags his ears" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 170), speaking to his being a scholar through

silence and a refusal to succumb to the infinite, the non-originary, or the indecipherable.

According to Derrida in "Plato's Pharmacy," "the character of the *pharmakos* [writing] has been

compared to a scapegoat. The *evil* and the *outside*, the expulsion of the evil" (1981c, p. 130) and

this characteristic of the spectre of writing is strikingly apparent at the end of Borges' text. At

the end of this story without end, Borges the scholar confesses:

  I remembered reading once that the best place to hide a leaf is in the forest. Before my

    retirement I had worked in the National Library, which contained nine hundred thousand

books; I knew that to the right of the lobby a curving staircase descended into the shadows of

the basement, where the maps and periodicals are kept. I took advantage of the librarians'

distraction to hide the Book of Sand on one of the library's damp shelves; I tried not to notice

how high up, or how far from the door. (Borges, 1998b, p. 483)

Here Borges the scholar enacts "the rite of the *pharmakos*" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 134) and the

archive, expulsing the diabolic book, and putting it to death. The library and archive figure as a

place complicit in this rite, "devoted to keeping the secret" (Derrida, 2006, p. 20), and hiding that

which has been expulsed, "that which must not be thrown away… what… one must hush up"

(Derrida, 2006, p. 81). Borges the scholar, as a devotee of the archive, must at all costs hide the

fact that "the structure of the archive is spectral," that "the truth is spectral and... is irreducible by

explanation" (Derrida, 1998, p. 81), and must do so by ensuring that this phantom "stay in its

place" (Derrida, 1994, p. 9), that this demonstration of the non-origin of the origin remain

concealed within the archive. Though he feels "better" in keeping this secret hidden, this scholar

must actively avoid it at all costs, refusing "to even walk down the street the library's on"

(Borges, 1998b, p. 483). As within *Hamlet*, despite this repression of the ghost by scholar, the

spectre remains within the archive. Though silenced, its presence, or absence/presence, leaves

an opening from which it may escape, a thread from which the archive will begin to unravel.

Like *Hamlet*, "The Book of Sand" demonstrates how "they are always *there*, spectres, even if

they do not exist, even if they are no longer, *even if they are not yet*" (Derrida, 1994, p. 176).

The "Scylla and Charybdis" episode of *Ulysses* will further attest to this fact.

iii. The Scholars of "Scylla and Charybdis": Disguising Shakespeare's Ghost

It is extremely fitting that the discussion of Shakespeare's ghost, and the ghost of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* that occupies much of the "Scylla and Charybdis" episode of *Ulysses* occurs in a museum library, "a sort of holy forum of textual history" (Hansen, 2001, p. 11). This library is identical to the archive and library in which the spectre of "The Book of Sand" has been hidden as it serves to both display and enable the scholar's "archontic injunction to guard and gather the archive" (Derrida, 1998, p. 77) in order to contain the apparition of the spectre.

It is clear from very early on within the episode that Stephen Dedalus is radically opposed to the rest of the scholars of the museum and the *archons* of the archive. Stephen repeatedly attempts to reveal the ghost of *Hamlet* and of Shakespeare but is rebuked by John Eglinton who exclaims "he will have it that *Hamlet* is a ghost story... he wants to make our flesh creep" (Joyce, 2000, p. 240). Like the appearance of the ghost of Hamlet's father to Horatio, Dedalus confronts the scholars with "player Shakespeare, a ghost by absence, and in the vesture of buried Denmark, a ghost by death, speaking his own words to his own son's name" (Joyce, 2000, p. 241), putting "the Good... the figure of the father... the origin of all *onta*, responsible for their appearing and their coming into *logos*, which both assembles and distinguishes them" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 82) into question. By identifying Shakespeare as the ghost of Hamlet's father, Stephen, like this ghost, insists that this "allfather" (Joyce, 2000, p. 237), the source from which the scholar is brought "into contact with the eternal wisdom" (Joyce, 2000, p. 236), is not and never was a presence, but merely a ghost. By asking "who is the ghost from *limbo partum*, returning to the world that has forgotten him? Who is king Hamlet?" (Joyce, 2000, p. 240), Stephen asks a question which has been denied and silenced within the archive, revealing the spectre as "the hidden figure of all figures" (Derrida, *Spectres*, 120). Stephen in this scene

embodies that rare scholar "who would dare to admit that he knows how to speak *to* the

phantom" (Derrida, 1998, p. 39).

     Stephen's repeated attempts to disrupt the contemporary archive of the time through his

suggestions that Shakespeare was Jewish, that the writer of *Hamlet* "was not the father of his

own son, merely but, being no more a son, he was and felt himself the father of all his race, the

father of his own grandfather, the father of his unborn grandson" (Joyce, 2000, p. 267), and that

Shakespeare is both "the ghost and the prince" (Joyce, 2000, p. 272), are incredibly destructive

to the archive for several reasons. According to Derrida in "Plato's Pharmacy," "the origin of

logos is *its father*" (1981c, p. 77) and "as a living thing, *logos* issues from a father" (1981c, p.

143), writing, as "a living-dead, a reprieved corpse, a deferred life, a semblance of breath"

(Derrida, 1981c, p. 143), is thus a supplement to speech and therefore the son which is opposed

to the father. In this way, speech and presence are opposed to and privileged above absence and

writing through a repression of parricide, and a suggestion of "the necessity and inevitability of

parricide" as "the condition of possibility of discourse on the false, the idol, the icon, the

mimeme, the phantasm" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 164). By identifying the ghost of *Hamlet*'s father as

"the allfather," as "all in all," as "the logos who suffers in us at every moment," and as "himself

his own father" (Joyce, 2000, p. 237-267), Stephen Dedalus makes apparent the spectre of

Hamlet's father, denying the oppositions which sustain the archive and a metaphysics of

presence. Stephen demonstrates, as others have done and will continue to do, that, "if anything

is clear, it is that the Ghost is not or not merely- Shakespeare pere or Shakespeare fils, the son of

John Shakespeare or the father of Hamnet- but rather 'Shakespeare' itself" (Garber, 2010, p.

235). Stephen in this way conjures a "phantom who works to violate rather than re-narrate a

familiar narrative" (Hansen, 2001, p. 10). It is this action, and Stephen's breaking of the thread

from which the secret is held in place, that leads Eglinton to insist that Stephen too is "a delusion" (Joyce, 2000, p. 274).

As "Scylla and Charybdis" shows, the other scholars must do whatever they can to remove this delusion from the archive and library in order to ensure that the secret of the spectre remain hidden. Not only does the idea of the ghost of Shakespeare make the scholars' skin crawl, but it becomes clear throughout the episode that "a traditional scholar does not [and should not] believe in ghosts" (Derrida, 1994, p. 11). Stephen threatens the very foundation of the library and the archive by attempting to convince them otherwise. The Quaker Librarian's acknowledgement that Stephen's view of Shakespeare's ghost is "most illuminating," though seemingly in agreement with Dedalus, is spoken through a "blushing" and "covered by the noise of outgoing" (Joyce, 2000, p. 247). So disturbed is this *archon* of the *arkhe* by his acceptance of Stephen's assertion, that he must reassure himself of the dialectic of absence/presence that Stephen's spectre has begun to put into question. His attempt to define the archive without the spectre, stating "coffined thoughts around me, in mummycases, embalmed in spice of words.... they are still. Once quick in the brains of men, still" fails, however, as he is forced to admit that there is "an itch of death... in them, to tell me in my ear a maudlin tale, urge me to wreak their will" (Joyce, 2000, p. 248). Eglinton also continually exhibits great distress at Dedalus' claims, exclaiming "you mean to fly in the face of the tradition of three centuries," and insisting that the "ghost at least has been laid forever" (Joyce, 2000, p. 243). "The bane of miscreant eyes" (Joyce, 2000, p. 248) that follow Stephen throughout the episode as he continues to expound his reading of *Hamlet* signify the violent wish these scholars maintain to keep the spectre silenced within the archive. "The alliance signifies: death to the spectre" (Derrida, 1994, p. 99).

The first attempts of the scholars to arrest the spectre by which they are confronted are evinced in their struggle to use their knowledge of history, literature, and biography, their knowledge of the archive, to reduce it or to explain it away. John Eglinton illustrates the scholars' dependence on this archive, on this "speculation of schoolboys for schoolboys" (Joyce, 2000, p. 236), in his assertion that Stephen Dedalus legitimize his claim that Shakespeare was a Jew through the archive, stating "prove that he was a Jew... your dean of studies holds he was a holy Roman" (Joyce, 2000, p. 263). By utilizing such claims, and through a "saying of Goethe's," readings of critics such as "Dumas pere," "Moore," and "Russel," a knowledge of "Irish myths," and an understanding of what "history shows… to be true," these "archons" (Joyce, 2000, p. 243-265) attempt to stabilize the spectre, and to place it within the archive. These attempts both show that "the interpretation of the archive can only illuminate, read, interpret, establish its object, namely a given inheritance, by inscribing itself into it, that is to say by opening it and by enriching it enough to have a rightful place in it" (Derrida, 1998, p. 67) and simultaneously identify the failure of this task, suggesting that "the corpus remains immeasurably vaster than the library supposed to hold it" (Derrida, 2006, p. 72). Despite their attempts, the scholars are unable to silence or stabilize this spectre, to "bury Hamlet *pere* and Hamlet *fils*" (Joyce, 2000, p. 273) as Stephen is able to continue to question their readings and give voice to this spectre of *Hamlet*'s father. What is particularly striking about Stephen's reading is his final claim to Eglinton that he does not believe his own theory. King claims that "Stephen's duplicity with facts should disqualify his lecture as scholarship- at least to readers- and perhaps distinguish it as something else" (1995, p. 304). It is this 'something else' of Stephen's reading, a reading that goes beyond the role of the archive and scholar, that causes history to "be confronted by fiction, not simply colonized and re-narrated" (Hansen, 2001, p. 12),

and that allows for the spectre of *Hamlet*'s father to remain "a floating signifier... one who puts play into play" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 93). Stephen continuously refuses to allow the archive to define this ghost, to archive it within "a technical or institutional body" (Derrida, 1994, p. 127), or to "take account of its genealogy" (Derrida, 1994, p. 83). By refusing any reading of the spectre, including his own, Dedalus ensures that the archive and library remain "forever... essentially incapable of determining... taking possession of that which it welcomes, shelters, safeguards, that which it has the single virtue of offering hospitality to" (Derrida, 2006, p. 76). Unable to silence Dedalus, the scholars deny him access to the archive, and he is not invited with them to see "monsieur Moore... lecturer on French letters to the youth of Ireland" (Joyce, 2000, p. 275-276). The men see Dedalus as lower than a 'bard,' as they are willing to invite Mulligan. Similarly, Stephen is viewed as worse and more threatening "Herr Beleibtreu, the man Piper met in Berlin, who is working up that Rutland theory," a man who they all consider to be insane, a man who "believes that the secret is hidden in the Stanford monument," (Joyce, 2000, p. 275), and a man who, like these men, suffers from archive fever, a scholar who "wants to exhume a more archaic *impression*... wants to exhibit a more archaic *imprint* than the other archaeologists" (Derrida, 1998, p. 97) and who "believes his theory" (Joyce, 2000, p. 275). Dedalus threatens the archive to the extent that he must be placed among the other enemies of the archive and the "book of books." Not only have the archons ensured he "part" from the archive, like "Socrates" and "Judas" (Joyce, 2000, p. 279) he will forever be admonished by those with power over the archive as a deluded madman, or as even less than a man, a "delusion" (Joyce, 2000, p. 274). Though Dedalus will be removed from the library and archive, and though he will be refused entrance into the archive again, he is neither the first or last of many authors, his writing neither the first nor last of many writings, to demonstrate "literature's emancipatory possibility"

(Derrida, 1998, p. 101), and to utilize "literature's secret, the infinite power to keep undecidable"

(Derrida, 2006, p. 18) and indefinable. Having examined this secret pact of the scholar and

spectre, of the archive and its keeping the secret hidden, we will now turn, like *Hamlet*, toward

this spectre, examining the way in which literature and writing make possible an "unconditional

hospitality" (Derrida, 2006, p. 48) that pulls at the thread of the secret allowing for an incision

into the fabric of the archive.

IV. Literature as Madness

i. The Cowardice of Conscience: *Hamlet*'s Descent from Madness

      Hamlet's reaction to the spectre differs greatly from Horatio's and the scholars of Borges

and Joyce's texts. According to Derrida, in "Plato's Pharmacy," all of Western Philosophy is

built upon "the philosophical, dialectical mastery of the *pharmaka* [writing] that should be

handed down from legitimate father to well-born son" (p. 167) a mastery which silences the

spectre and imposes logos. All of philosophy and the archive institute "both the general

rehearsal of this family scene and the most powerful effort to master it, to prevent anyone's

hearing of it, to conceal it by drawing the curtains over the dawning of the west" (Derrida,

1981c, p. 167). Even before his encounter with the spectre, Hamlet reveals what will eventually

grow into a radical distrust of this familial scene. Hamlet's refusal to accept the "drama of

origins, of birth and of the derivation and filiation of a name" (Derrida, 2006, p. 8) in which his

"father lost a father:/ That father lost, lost his, and the survivor bound/ In filial obligation for

some term/ To do obsequious sorrow" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.2.89-92) is already evident within

the second scene of the play as he continues persevere in an "unmanly grief" (Shakespeare,

1998, 1.2.94). For Claudius, as king and father, Hamlet's rejection, or failure to properly accept

his familial role, is "a fault to heaven,/ A fault against the dead, a fault to nature/" (Shakespeare,

1998, 1.2.101-102). In this scene, then, and with the first appearance of Hamlet, his character

stands radically opposed to a "philosophy… whose common theme/ Is death of fathers"

(Shakespeare, 1998, 1.2.103). Already, even before encountering his father, Hamlet has begun

to move beyond a dialectics of presence/absence, as is further exemplified in his exclamation

"My Father!... Me thinks I see my father... in my mind's eye Horatio" (Shakespeare, 1998,

1.2.183-185). This opposition to the familial scene, and to any motion that would produce itself

through a silencing of the spectre, as well as Hamlet's willingness to speak to and of the spectre, will be reiterated repeatedly throughout the rest of the play. Unlike Horatio who tries to silence the spectre or arrest it through his speech, to "take it into account so as to account for it" (Derrida, 1998, p. 94) in order to stabilize or silence it within the archive, Hamlet is willing to recognize the spectre's radical disruption of both the familial scene and an ontology based on the opposition of absence/presence, writing/speech, etc. In opposition to Horatio, who fears that this spectre, the spectre of Hamlet's father, may tempt him "toward the flood... might deprive... [his] sovereignty of reason/ and draw... [him] into madness" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.4.69-73), Hamlet vows to "follow it" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.4.63), stressing that he is "bound to hear" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.5.6). By accepting this spectre as "Hamlet,/ King, father, royal Dane" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.4.45), Hamlet's reaction differs greatly from Horatio's as he allows the spectre to account for itself, rather than accounting for it, accepting the spectre as King and father as well as presence/absence. For Horatio the ghost consistently remains an archivable object, an "*it*, not *he*… carefully described as '*like*' the king, as one who 'usurp'st' the time of the night and the 'fair and warlike form' of the dead king" (Garber, 2010, p. 194). This objectification stands increasingly opposed to Hamlet's acknowledgement of the ghost as "he" (Garber, 2010, p. 194). Surely, "there is something striking about Hamlet's recurrent *use* of *he* and *his* after all the its of scene 1… the he/it distinction marks an act of naming that is an act of choice, confirmed when Hamlet sees the Ghost face to face" (Garber, 2010, p. 195). By accepting the ghost as "he," and as father and king, Hamlet accepts a questioning of "the paternal position" of the King and father as presence, "as the hidden illuminating, blinding, source of logos" which "sets up the whole of Western Metaphysics in its conceptuality" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 76-77), and instead embraces a "difference, the disappearance of any originary presence… the

condition of possibility and the condition of impossibility of truth" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 168).

This becomes an "honest ghost" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.5.137) for Hamlet precisely because it

reveals "the disappearance of truth as presence, the withdrawal of the present origin of presence,

is the condition of all truth. Nontruth is the truth. Non presence is presence" (Derrida, 1981c, p.

168). It is true that, like the other scholars, Hamlet at first enters into a pact with the ghost,

swearing himself to secrecy. Unlike the others, however, Hamlet is not willing to

wholeheartedly dismiss this apparition or repress it within the archive:

> Hamlet [instead] summons his friend Horatio, the scholar, to welcome the ghost of his father
>
> as one would welcome a stranger. He is aware, however, that this must be very difficult for
>
> his friend; Horatio's philosophy seems to leave no room for strange things like ghosts. (De
>
> Boer, 2002, p. 28)

Contrary to Horatio, Hamlet claims that it is the duty of these men to give hospitality to this

spectre which "is wondrous strange," to "as a stranger give it welcome," despite the fact that it

suggests "there are more things in heaven and earth… than are dreamt of… in philosophy"

(Shakespeare, 1998, 1.5.164-166). Hamlet is in fact so emboldened by this spirit that he seems

willing to reject the archive in its entirety, asserting:

> From the table of my memory/ I'll wipe away all trivial fond records,/ All saws of books, all
>
> forms, all pressures past,/ That youth and observation copied there:/ And thy commandment
>
> all alone shall live/ Within the book and volume of my brain/ Unmix'd with baser matter.
>
> (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.5.98-104)

If, as Derrida suggests, "to be hospitable is to let oneself to be overtaken" (Derrida, 2002, p.

361), in his acknowledgement of this spectre Hamlet, this son of the logos and father, strongly

displays these tenets of the "unconditional hospitality" (Derrida, 2006, p. 48) of writing and

literature, engaging in a "deconstruction" which is a "hospitality to the other…extended to an

other who no longer is, who never was the 'its other' of dialectics" in which "visitor radically

overwhelms the self" (Derrida, 2002, p. 363-372). Hamlet's connection to this type of

hospitality, and to the possibility of an opening up to the spectre, will become apparent

throughout the rest of *Hamlet*. Unfortunately so will a madness, "the madness of the concept of

hospitality" (Derrida, 2002, p. 362), a madness which is indistinguishable from the secret of the

spectre.

Hamlet's celebration of "the truth of writing" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 74) which would offer

hospitality to the spectre and reveal non-presence as presence, replacing the field of dialectics, is

evinced within the play in a variety of ways, the most obvious of which are Hamlets' utilizations

of writing and play and his distrust for language. According to Derrida in *Dissemination*,

"drama is something other than a mere semblance or trap for our unreflectiveness… it represses,

conceals, and always contains the sacred laughter that will be its undoing" (1981a, p. 360).

Similarly, Derrida stresses that "the (non)logic of play and writing enables us to understand,"

(1994, p. 158) the false origin of the origin and the absence of the King-Father as presence thus

revealing the arche-trace and the spectre. Hamlet also believes, like Derrida, that "the play's the

thing/ Wherein... [he'll] catch the conscience of the king" (Shakespeare, 1998, 2.2.616-617). By

having the players "play something like the murder of... [his] father before... [his] uncle"

(Shakespeare, 1998, 2.2.607) Hamlet uses writing, drama, and "play," to expose the King's

secret, and to verify "the ghost's word" for which he would take "a thousand pound"

(Shakespeare, 1998, 3.2.292-293). Hamlet's recognition of the power of writing within the play

is simultaneously coupled with a strong distrust for a language which would claim to be presence or truth.

Though Hamlet is an excellent orator, as evinced throughout the long soliloquies that occupy much of Shakespeare's text, he is also radically opposed to a utilization of speech that would claim to express truth. This distrust can be identified repeatedly throughout the text but is perhaps best demonstrated in Hamlet's confrontation with Laertes over the dead Ophelia in which he states "Doust thou come here to whine?... if thou prate of mountains, let me throw millions of acres on us... Nay thou'lt mouth,/ I'll rant as well as thou" (Shakespeare, 1998, 5.1.279-286). Hamlet is in fact disheartened and disappointed when he must engage in such speech, when he "must, like a whore, unpack... [his] heart with words" (Shakespeare, 1998, 2.2.597). It is also important to note that it is poison which is placed like a word into the ear of the King that kills Hamlet's father. This poison presents itself as a secret whispered into the ear of the king and father. It is through *Hamlet*'s view of speech as poison that it is possible to examine Hamlet's relation to writing in further detail.

In "Plato's Pharmacy," Derrida speaks of the *pharmakon* as a writing which is both the poison and the cure, both a radically deconstructive entity and that which supports Western ontology through its own opposition to it. Derrida claims that through this writing, "the genealogical break and the estrangement from the origin are sounded" (1981c, p. 74). Though the *pharmakon* is in fact the game of dialectics that produces the logos, "god-the-king nonetheless experiences the *pharmakon* as a product... which is not his own, which comes to him from outside (Derrida, 1981c, p. 76). By identifying the poison as the whisper of the secret into the ear of the King (Hamlet's father) by the King (Claudius), and as a "knavish speech" which "sleeps in a foolish ear" (Shakespeare, 1998, 4.2.23), *Hamlet* reverses the order of "the *eidos*,

truth, law, the episteme, dialectics, philosophy," suggesting that the *pharmakon* is not a product

that comes from outside but is in fact the constituting gesture that produces god-the-king, logos,

meaning, truth, presence, and speech, illustrating that these are nothing more than "other names

for that *pharmakon* [good, presence, speech] that must be opposed to the *pharmakon* [evil,

absence, writing]," in a dialectics which places "*pharmakeus* [as speech and cure] against

pharmakeus [as writing and poison], *pharmakon* against *pharmakon*" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 124).

Hamlet thus establishes that "the *pharmakon* has no ideal identity" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 124), that

speech is simultaneously writing, and that speech and writing are simultaneously both poison and

cure. Hamlet will express this understanding that writing should no longer be opposed to speech,

and a belief that presence should no longer be opposed to absence, throughout much of the play,

proposing a reading of the *pharmakon* [writing] that makes possible a "question of truth- and of

thought and speech" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 107). Though *Hamlet* will make these connections, the

rest of the characters of the text will fail to do so, and Hamlet's decision to embrace the

pharmakon (poison/writing) will be read as nothing but madness.

In *Archive Fever*, Derrida asserts that "the archontic is at best the takeover of the archive

by brothers" (p. 95). *Hamlet* clearly demonstrates both this transition of the archive from brother

to brother, from father-king as presence to father-king as presence, and the complicit role the

brothers share within the archive. Though the king has been usurped and murdered by his

brother, it is clear that they both intend to keep the secret of the spectre hidden, the former by

calling Hamlet to a pact, and the latter by attempting to silence Hamlet through a reference to his

madness, and by eventually attempting to take his life. Hamlet, however, attempts to reach

beyond this archival scene through writing, and to offer hospitality to the spectre. It is this

writing, and this attempt at a transgression of the archive, which will ultimately place Hamlet

within the category of a madman. Within the logic of "the origin-of-logos as *its father*" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 77) which places the King-father-presence in opposition to absence, writing, and death, writing itself "is parricidal" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 164) and radically opposed to the father. Writing is thus "the miserable son… the lost son… it writes: the father is *not*, that is to say, not present" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 146). Therefore "difference, the disappearance of any originary presence… the condition of possibility and the condition of impossibility of truth" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 168), the becoming absence/presence of the king, and the apparition of the spectre, must always accompany a parricidal subversion, a making absent of what was once present, even if it was only present through illusion. *Hamlet* shows, both through its characters' reactions to Hamlet's uncovering of the spectre, and through Hamlet's personal struggle with this unveiling, that "this parricide, which opens up the play of difference and writing, is a frightening decision," that "one runs the risk of madness or of being considered mad in the well-behaved, sane, sensible society of grateful sons" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 164).

"I will be brief: your noble son is Mad: Mad I call it" (Shakespeare, 1998, 2.2.92). This sentiment, expressed by Polonius in this citation, will be articulated by almost every one of the characters of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Even Hamlet's mother, amazed at how incensed Hamlet has become with his preoccupation with the spectre, and how willing he is to kill the king, is lead to the frightening conclusion, "alas, he's mad!" (Shakespeare, 1998, 3.4.106). Most frightening of all is the reader's complicity in this reading of Hamlet mad as, in Act 3 Scene 4 when the spectre appears, the reader too is meant to suppress its existence and to simply attribute a madness to Hamlet. Though Hamlet claims "it is not madness/ That I have uttered" (Shakespeare, 1998, 3.4.142-143), the apparition of the spectre in Gertrude's room stands in stark contrast to the apparition at the beginning of the play. Unlike the original ghost who was

seen by all in attendance, this second revenant is not apparent to Gertrude as she sees and hears "nothing at all" (Shakespeare, 1998, 3.4.132-133). It is this charge of madness that will eventually lead to the silencing of the spectre which Hamlet has heard and which will bring about the tragic conclusion of the play, allowing Horatio to sustain the archive and silence the secret that it keeps.

Hamlet's rejection of the law of the father and the logos is clearly articulated within the text through his decision to embrace the absent/presence of his father, and to take apart a privileging of writing over speech. The "ultimate hospitality" Hamlet attempts to offer the spectre, however, the "'law without a law' which exists 'out of' and beyond 'duty'" (Derrida, 2002, p. 83), is accompanied by not only the pact to secrecy, but the familial pact, the pact which Hamlet is "bound to hear" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.5.6) within the framework of the logos, a pact which commands him to be bound to "revenge his [father's] foul and most unnatural murder" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.5.25). According to Majorie Garber, "as long as the Law of the Father is doubted or put into question, it cannot be internalized, not assimilated into the symbolic, and therefore blocks rather than facilitates Hamlet's own passage into the symbolic" (2010, p. 176). Hamlet's "doubt, then," or what others will continuously refer to as "madness," "is a sign of resistance" (Garber, 2010, p. 176) to the law of the father and the archive. The ghost of the father, in appearing as a presence/absence produces for Hamlet a "doubt imperative," the "double bind" both to "'Remember'" and "'Revenge'" (Garber, 2010, p. 197). Like the archive, this "command to 'remember me!' encodes the necessity of forgetting'" (Garber, 2010, p. 205) and is "functionally at odds" (Garber, 2010, p. 207) with the father's call to vengeance. In other words, if Hamlet is to avenge his father and act "justly" within the law of the archive, he must forget the radical possibility of the spectre that reveals the king as an absent/presence. The

ghost's lament "'Remember me,' 'do not forget,' impedes the action, impedes revenge" (Garber, 2010, p. 207), since "what Hamlet needs to do is not to remember, but to forget" (Garber, 2010, p. 207), "Hamlet must renounce him, must internalize the law by forgetting, not my remembering" (Garber, 2010, p. 176) and will struggle against this duty continuously throughout the play before eventually succumbing its logic. Hamlet's reaction to this "impossibility that haunts its possible realization" (De Boer, 2002, p. 26), this commandment to remember/avenge, will change drastically throughout the text, but will open up the possibility of reading the spectre beyond the archive in the process, "one might say that it opens up the space within which Shakespeare can let the full spectrum of possible decisions unfold before our eyes" (De Boer, 2002, p. 28).

From the text's inception, and from the ghost's first appearance, Hamlet's grievance that "the time is out of joint," (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.5.187), though it seems to suggest that Hamlet "curses the fate that would have caused him to be born to set right a time that walks crooked" (Derrida, 1994, p. 20), instead insists that he is cursing the "unjust effect of the disorder, namely, the fate that would have destined him, Hamlet, to put a dislocated time back on its hinges (Derrida, 1994, p. 20). Hamlet does not curse the spectre and its making things 'out of joint' but instead "his mission: to do justice to a de-mission of time" thus stabilizing it. Hamlet laments: "The time is out of joint: O cursed spite./ That ever I was born to set it right" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.5.187-188). Hamlet fears the spirit and attempts to lay it to "rest" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.5.183) not because it disrupts the law of the archive, but because it, as King and father, has commissioned him to reinstate it, to "set it right," to suppress it within the archive by forgetting. Hamlet fears the King will reappear not to disrupt the archive but to push him forward in his purpose to restore it and to enter into the symbolic law of the father and the archive, that it will

come to "chide" the son "that, lapsed in time and passion, lets go by/ The important acting of...

[its] dread command" (Shakespeare, 1998, 3.4.107-109).

> Hamlet [in this way] suffers from 'a bottomless wound, an irreparable tragedy, the indefinite
>
> malediction that makes the history of the law or history as law: that 'time is out of joint' is
>
> what is also attested by birth itself when it dooms someone to be the man of right and law
>
> only by becoming an inheritor, redresser of wrongs, that is, only by castigating, punishing,
>
> killing. (De Boer, 2002, p. 30)

What Hamlet fears most is a visitation which would "whet" the "almost blunted purpose"

(Shakespeare, 1998, 3.4.112) of the king and father of the logos, one which would cause Hamlet

to forget, to no longer doubt, and to once again enter into the symbolic archive. Hamlet

continues to struggle between a duty to the law of the father (to avenge/forget), and a duty to the

spectre that is beyond the law of the archive (to doubt/to remember). Hamlet suffers from a

choice between the archive represented in the prison of "Denmark" and "the world"

(Shakespeare, 1998, 2.2.247-248) and a nothingness, "the dread of something after death./ The

undiscovered country from whose bourn/ No traveler returns" (Shakespeare, 1998, 3.1.78-80).

This is the essential question which Hamlet must face, the question of "to be or not to be"

(Shakespeare, 1998, 3.1.56). Hamlet must choose "to suffer/ the slings and arrows of outrageous

fortune," or "to die, to sleep/… to sleep- perchance to dream" (Shakespeare, 1998, 3.1.56-65).

Though Hamlet feels it better to "fly to… ills… we know not of" he admits that "conscience"

has made a "coward" of him, that his duty to the law will inevitably take precedence over this

other duty which is beyond the law (Shakespeare, 1998, 3.1.83-84). By coming to an

understanding that "purpose is but the slave to memory" (Shakespeare, 1998, 3.2.194), Hamlet

has made possible a movement beyond the archive, but one which must be accompanied by a

lack of purpose and obligation. As in the structure of the logos, "without his father, he [Hamlet] would be nothing" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 77). By escaping the archive Hamlet, "this adventurer… simulates everything at random and is really nothing," he would belong "to the masses," having "no essence, no truth, no patronym, no constitution of his own" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 145-148). Through writing and a moving beyond the duty of the law of the father Hamlet would no longer be able to "be avowed, recognized," would be "outside the law" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 148). Hamlet will continuously demonstrate his realization that, despite his attempts to move beyond the archive and to escape it through writing, "bound to the father, "the seed must thus submit to the logos. And in so doing, it must do violence to itself" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 154) in order to retain its purpose and its being, in order "to be" (Shakespeare, 1998, 3.1.56).

Hamlet's acknowledgement of, and eventual fear of, a transgression of the archive becomes apparent toward the end of the play when he suggests that his "thoughts be bloody, or be nothing worth" (Shakespeare, 1998, 4.4.66), that without avenging his father and entering into the symbolic he will cease 'to be.' During the graveyard scene, Hamlet appears to have fallen into the trap of opposing speech and life to writing and death. It is clear at this point that Hamlet has almost all but given up on his duty to the spectre, and has succumbed to his obligation to the King and Father. Hamlet's question "is not parchment made of sheepskins?" and his subsequent comment "they are sheep and calves which seek out assurance/ In that" (Shakespeare, 1998, 5.1.116-119) stress that he is still willing to question the assurance of a *pharmakon* of life and speech opposed to a *pharmakon* of writing and death, but that he has come to equate writing with death. Hamlet's fear of a lack of purpose in his choosing not to "be" or to carry out his obligations according to the law of the father are further reflected in his bemoaning that it would be possible for one to "trace the noble the noble dust of Alexander, till he find it stopping a bung-

hole" (Shakespeare, 1998, 5.1.205-206). Because he fears that he too may lack meaning, may become nothing but 'noble dust,' by the final scene Hamlet is willing to give up on the spectre and to once again enter into the archive, the illusory patriarchic law of the archontic, and the theatre of familial obligation.

By the final scene of the text, Hamlet himself is willing to confess his 'madness' (Shakespeare, 1998, 5.2.233) claiming:

> Was't Hamlet wronged Laertes? Never Hamlet./ If Hamlet from himself be ta'en away,/ And when he's not himself does wrong Laertes,/ Then Hamlet does it not, Hamlet denies it./ Who does it then? His madness… Hamlet is of the faction that is wronged;/ His madness is poor Hamlet's enemy. (Shakespeare, 1998, 5.2.234-240)

Here Hamlet has chosen to reject the spectre and a recognition of its secret which is madness according to the law and instead embraces his duty to avenge/forget as son of the *logos*, king, and father. When he drives his sword into the King, Hamlet once again becomes a man of purpose, exclaiming "here, thou incestuous, mur'rous, Dane," (Shakespeare, 1998, 5.2.326). Hamlet's actions violently silence both Claudius and the spectre as he chooses to deny the madness which impeded the father's call to remember/avenge and which suggested the impossibility of acting 'justly.' Hamlet's cause, now justified even to Laertes, will be reported by the scholar Horatio and the spectre will once again be silenced. Hamlet is in this way complicit in the reestablishment of the archive as he asks Horatio "report me and my cause aright/ To the unsatisfied" (Shakespeare, 1998, 5.2.340-341). Hamlet's death is thus a reinstatement of the theatrical, the fictional, law of the father, the *logos*, and the archive, as he is "bourne" like a King and "soldier… most royal… to the stage" (Shakespeare, 1998, 5.2.396-397). At the end of the

play, Hamlet, "his father's other," extends hospitality to "his father" in a "moment of

replacement" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 93), and not to the apparition of the spectre and the

presence/absence of the all-father. This is the difference between the hospitality of the law and

the archive, and the madness of the hospitality of literature to the secret, "the difference between

hospitality extended to one's other and hospitality extended to an other who no longer is, who

never was 'its other' of dialectics'" (Derrida, 2002, p. 363). Through Hamlet's actions, *Hamlet*

is able to demonstrate that this hospitality of the archive comes at a cost, that "any actual

enactment of justice is made possible by that which at the same time threatens to corrupt that

very enactment" (De Boer, 2002, p. 26).   Put succinctly, by "becoming an inheritor, redresser of

wrongs, that is, only by castigating, punishing, killing" (De Boer, 2002, p. 26) Hamlet acts

'justly' according to the archive while simultaneously illustrating "the necessity and the

impossibility of acting justly" (De Boer, 2002, p. 31) within it. Though Hamlet, like Horatio,

eventually serves to stabilize the archive, he has provided an opening, a reading, and a putting on

stage of the archive that allows *Hamlet*'s father and its spectre to float free of the archive

Hamlet is a play which is acutely aware of its own being-play, and of its own

theatricality. Not only does the reader/watcher encounter a play within a play that drives the plot

but, as if to emphasize the being-theatre of the play, Hamlet is put on stage, literally, "bourne…

to the stage" (Shakespeare, 1998, 5.2.396-397), at the end of the play. In this way, the

watcher/reader begins to realize that this piece of literature, this writing, this *pharmakon*, "this

pharmacy is also… a theater" (Derrida, 1981c, p, 142). By displaying this "drama of a family…

a drama of origins, of birth" and of the archive (Derrida, 2006, p. 8) as theatre and play, *Hamlet*

identifies the "general *rehearsal* of this family scene" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 167) which produces

the archive and the logos as illusory and as nontruth. Despite the closing over the archive in

which Horatio and Hamlet are both complicit, Hamlet's madness and the true nature of the ghost

remain unresolved at the end of the play. Hamlet's "final paradoxical declaration, 'I am dead'"

(Garber, 2010, p. 196) further complicates this closing as it reminds the reader of the

absent/presence which haunts *Hamlet* in its entirety. Questions of the ghost's existence, of its

uncanny ability to disrupt the archive, of its being or non-being, of the possibility of acting

justly, and of the validity of a choice between "being" and "not-being," remain unanswered at

the end of the play. *Hamlet* thus keeps the secret by making the secret possible. As literature "it

establishes itself as the very possibility of the secret" through "the infinite power to keep

undecidable" (Derrida, 2006, p. 18).   By allowing the ghost to remain indefinable and

unclassifiable, and through Hamlet's brief attempt to transgress the archive, to speak to the

spectre, and to embrace its secret, Shakespeare's text allows for a further transgression, a further

incision, and a wandering of the blade of the secret into the archive through the works of Joyce

and Borges. By first examining the way in which Borges allows the spectre a space within the

archive through his reintroduction of the "monstrous" spectre from "The Book of Sand" we will

see a commonality with *Hamlet*, one which, like *Hamlet*, will make possible a transgression of

the archive, and which will allow the spectre of Shakespeare into the archive through the works

of Borges.

ii. Inviting Insanity: The Irresolvable Ghost in Borges

Borges' "Library of Babel" once again returns to the Library of "The Book of Sand," the

library and archive in which the scholar has attempted to keep the spectre hidden. By

establishing the existence of this spectre within the Library, within this "tomb and conservatory,"

Borges the author makes possible a viewing of "libraries in general as places devoted to keeping

the secret but insofar as they give it a way" (Derrida, 2006, p. 20). Borges the author will

continually demonstrate throughout "The Library of Babel" that identifying this spectre within

the archive and library makes possible a radical disruption of the notion of the archive as law and

logos, exhibiting that within this total library and complete archive, "for every sensible line or

accurate fact there would be millions of meaningless cacophonies, verbal farragoes, and

babblings" (Borges, 2000, p. 216). "Library of Babel" will serve as testament to this fact as

Borges, like *Hamlet*, attempts to "rescue from oblivion a subaltern horror: the vast, contradictory

Library, whose vertical wilderness of books run the incessant risk of changing into others that

affirm, deny, and confuse everything like a delirious god" (Borges, 2000, p. 216). Through

literature Borges the author searches to discover the spectre of the archive, the one which Borges

the scholar had placed there, one which, like the ghost of *Hamlet*'s father, radically disrupts the

archive and library of law, meaning, and *logos*, and divulges its madness.

Within the dichotomy of absence/presence in which speech and life are opposed to death

and writing through which the archive operates, it is writing which is thought to introduce

"difference into language and it is to him that the origin of the plurality of languages is

attributed" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 88-89). Writing is thus "evoked as the author of difference: of

differentiation within language" (Derrida, 1981c, p. 88-89). By titling this depiction of the

archive and library "The Library of Babel," Borges has already begun to disrupt the archive

before he has begun, "the title announces, [that] the narrative is informed by contradictions"

(Keiser, 1995, p. 39), insisting that it is not writing that creates a plurality but the archive and

library itself. Borges' "Library of Babel" thus articulates Derrida's assertion that arche-speech is

nothing but "a Tower of Babel in which multiple languages and forms of writing bump into each

other or mingle with each other, constantly being transformed and engendered through their most

irreconcilable otherness to each other" (Derrida, 1981a, p. 341). Following this, Borges insists

that "the universe (which others call the library) is composed of an indefinite, perhaps infinite

number of hexagonal galleries," "a sphere whose exact center is any hexagon and whose

circumference is unattainable," containing books which, like the book of sand, are "formless"

and "chaotic" in nature (Borges, 1998c, p. 112-113).   Any "sense of security, order and control

evoked by individual hexagons is… [also] undermined by the presence of mirrors which

faithfully duplicate appearances, implying that regularity is illusory" (Keiser, 1995, p. 40).

Borges' work in this way reveals, like Hamlet's encounter with the spectre, that all meaning and

purpose is constructed through an archive and symbolic law which is inherently meaningless,

based only on oppositions, and infinite, demonstrating that "all of Western metaphysics, which

lives in the certainty of what *is*… [revolves around] a tower of babel… [that contains] nothing…

no meaning in itself… is *not*" (Derrida, 1981a, p. 341-342). According to Keiser:

> Since the story's opening line presents the Library as a metaphor for the universe, we can
>
> interpret the reflection in mirrors as an analogue for the play of representation discussed in
>
> Derrida's *Of Grammatology* where he states that in the 'complicity between the reflection and
>
> the reflected' the point of origin becomes ungraspable. (1995, p. 40)

In the narrator's view, "there is 'an infinite reference from one to the other, but no longer a

source, a spring' since 'the reflection, the image, the double, splits what it doubles'" (1995, p.

40). Borges the author and the narrator of this text will struggle to deal with this knowledge, or

this non-knowledge, of the archive throughout the rest of the text. Borges' narrator stresses that,

"…like all men of the Library, in my younger days I traveled; I have journeyed in quest of a

book, perhaps the catalog of catalogs" (Borges, 1998c, p. 112). Though the narrator soon

acknowledges that this was a fruitless endeavor, asserting that within this library and total

archive a nostalgia for a lost origin is useless since there is in fact no "book of books" (Derrida,

1998, pp. 21-23) that was not already both "formless and chaotic" (Borges, 1998c, p. 113). Like

the archive, "the Library's symmetry results from a need to 'organize knowledge' however, this

symmetry is misleading for, far from revealing knowledge, the Library's volumes exhibit

puzzling incoherencies" (Keiser, 1995, p. 41). The library's books do not establish meaning, but

"disperse and defer meaning endlessly," embodying the "conception of language and multiplicity

and dissemination, [and] illustrating Derrida's concept of 'differance'" (Keiser, 1995, p. 41).

Due to this fact, Borges' narrator speaks of archivists and scholars, and those who would attempt

to protect the archive from the secret of this non-meaning, who "have a compulsive, repetitive

nostalgic desire to return to the origin, a homesickness, a nostalgia for the return to the most

archaic place of absolute commencement" (Derrida, 1998, p. 91), as "semibarbarious… vain and

superstitious" (Borges, 1998c, p. 114). These scholars that are dedicated to finding "sense in

books" (Borges, 1998c, p. 114), that assert that "the Library is 'total-perfect, complete and

whole,'" and that attempt to find their "own vindication" or "the fundamental mysteries of

mankind- the origin of the library and mankind" (Borges, 1998c, p. 115), fail to realize "there is

no sense in searching for the secret of what anyone may have known" (Derrida, 1998, p. 100)

and naively refuse to accept that their ability to find such things within the archive "can be

calculated to zero" (Borges, 1998c, p. 115). Clearly, "this "'blasphemous sect' which proposes

to 'shuffle letters and symbols' to compose the 'canonical books' represents our recurrent

attempts to explain away the universe's mysteries through imperfect philosophical systems"

(Keiser, 1995, p. 42). Like Hamlet, and all scholars, these men seek to find vindication,

meaning, and purpose within the archive, but this is a flawed endeavor, since these books are

known to be meaningless. This attempt to return to a false sense of meaning which is known to

be illusory is not considered merely foolishness or tragic choice within "Library of Babel," but

manifests into the violence of the archivist and scholar. According to Borges' within the

Library, as within any archive, there are "official searches" in which these searchers attempt to

discover "a book that is the cipher and perfect compendium of all other books" (Borges, 1998c,

p. 116). What is so arresting is that this search is conducted through the elimination of "all

worthless books" (Borges, 1998c, p. 116). These searchers "invade hexagons… condemn entire

walls of books," in an attempt at "searching by regression" (Borges, 1998c, p. 117). These

searchers in this way epitomize the "violence of the archive" (Derrida, 1998, pg. 7) and scholar

and announce the relentless suppression of the text and spectre that occurs through their vain

pursuit of an originary presence that does not, and never did, exist. Borges' narrator soon

becomes aware that "rather than empowering mankind, the search for absolute knowledge

plunges into violence, alienation, madness, murder, and destruction," asserting, "'these pilgrims

disputed in narrow corridors, hurled dark maledictions, strangled each other on the divine

stairways, flung the deceitful books to the bottom of the tunnels, and died as they were thrown

into space by men from remote regions" (Keiser, 1995, p. 42). Despite this epiphany, however,

Borges' narrator, like Hamlet, will fall victim to the rule of the archive which states that any

opposition to it, that any opening up to the spectre or acknowledgement of archival violence,

must be seen as madness (Derrida, 1981c, p. 164), declaring "infidels claim that the rule of the

Library is not 'sense' but 'non-sense,' and that 'rationality' is an almost miraculous exception...

they speak of 'the feverish Library,' whose random volumes constantly threaten to transmogrify

into others, so that they affirm all things, deny all things, and confound and confuse all things,

like some mad and hallucinating diety" (Borges, 1998c, p. 117). Borges the author, like *Hamlet*,

displays the madness that the archive attributes to such a reading, but simultaneously identifies

this madness, and this acceptance of the spectre, as the truth that is non-truth, professing that the

'God-King-Father' of Western metaphysics is not a rational presence, but a "delirious god,"

supported through "a vast contradictory Library… and the unresolvable ghost (Borges, 2000, p.

216). The Library's absurdities serve to undermine Borges' narrator's faith and "Borges's story

at once asserts and subverts the traditional metaphysical premise that has always assigned the

origin of truth to the logos," intimating instead a "'god in delirium'" (Keiser, 1995, p. 41). Like

Hamlet then, "The Library of Babel" serves to "question the concept of a total signifier

constituted by an ideal, pre existing, independent, signified" (Keiser, 1995, p. 41). Through

literature Borges opens up to the secret of the spectre beyond an accounting for it, attempting to

"rescue from oblivion" (Borges, 2000, p. 216) this other-other of the archive. By "depicting the

universe as a gigantic maze of books, and by reducing human beings to lost, insignificant,

ghosts… Borges's paradoxes… dismantle traditional metaphysical and literary suppositions…

participating in language's free-play of signification" (Keiser, 1995, p. 45). This "emancipatory

possibility" of literature to address the spectre (Derrida, 1998, p. 101), to pull at the string of the

secret, and "to identify 'the paradox that the Library [and the archive] is [both] everything and

nothing" (Ogden, 2009, p. 384) is further emphasized in Borges' encounter with the ghost of

Hamlet's father.

As someone who wants to expose the secret of the archive and scholar, and to pull the

spectre from the labyrinth of the total library in which it is imprisoned, Borges finds a likely ally

in the spectre of *Hamlet*'s father. Like the book of sand, Shakespeare's ghost both continuously

haunts the archive and offers a secret that, once revealed, provides the possibility of a

transgression of the archive. The title of Borges' "Everything and Nothing" not only evokes an

encounter with the spectre of Shakespeare but begins to insinuate that *Hamlet*'s father is both

"everything and nothing," a being which is in fact a non-being, and a truth that is simultaneously

a non-truth. From the opening line, Borges establishes the spectrality of the father of *Hamlet*,

stating "there was no one in him; behind his face and his words, which were copious, fantastic

and stormy, there was only a bit of coldness, a dream dreamt by no one" (Borges, 1999, p. 76).

This ghost, however, realizes that he is a spectre, acknowledging "this emptiness" and "his

condition as no one" (Borges, 1999, p. 76). With this realization Shakespeare, like the father of

the *logos*, strives to become someone, and to produce this presence through "books" in which he

hopes to "find a cure for his ill," or through drama, by "simulating that he was someone so that

others would not discover his condition as no one" (Borges, 1999, p. 76). This attempt

exemplifies the "fictive beginning… [the] false entrance… [the] false exit" (Derrida, 1981a, p.

305), and the archive fever which takes up the movement of language toward "a becoming-

present: to become present, a present in the process of becoming, the becoming of the present"

through a text which is then put under erasure (Derrida, 1981a, p. 310). Shakespeare, like man,

and like the father of the *logos*, attempts to cure and efface his non-being through his profession

as an actor "who on a stage plays at being another before a gathering of people who play at

taking him for that person" (Borges, 1999, p. 76). The reader learns, however, that though "his

histrionic tasks brought him a singular satisfaction, perhaps the first he had ever known… once-

the last verse had been acclaimed and the last dead man withdrawn from the stage, the last dead

man withdrawn from the stage, the hated flavour of unreality returned to him" (Borges, 1999, p.

76). By using this 'play,' Shakespeare is able to alter and produce his identity, to become:

> Caesar, who disregards the augur's admonition, and Juliet, who abhors the lark, and Macbeth
>
> who converses on the plain with the witches who are also Fates. No one has ever been so
>
> many men as this man who like the Egyptian Proteus could exhaust all the guises of reality.
>
> (Borges, 1999, p. 77)

This play brings Shakespeare closer to presence only through illusion, until all of the guises of

reality, all of the assumed appearances or semblances of reality, are proven to be nothing more

than supplements that hide the absence/presence of the father and origin. Both Borges and this

absent/present father are forced to acknowledge that these are merely "controlled hallucinations,"

that no matter what the guise, what the visor, or what the veil, no matter how many attempts at

becoming present there are, the father has hidden a secret somewhere within the corner of the

archive, "in some corner of his work…. that… claims with curious words 'I am not what I am'"

(Borges, 1999, p. 77). This knowledge is what compels Borges to write:

> History adds that before or after dying he found himself in the presence of God and told Him:
>
> "I who have been so many men in vain want to be one and myself." The voice of the Lord
>
> answered from a whirlwind: "Neither am I anyone; I have dreamt the world as you dreamt
>
> your work, my Shakespeare, and among the forms in my dream are you, who like myself are
>
> many and no one." (Borges, 1999, p. 77-78)

 "By declaring that Shakespeare himself was as insubstantial and ethereal as a shadow" (Novillo-

Corvalan, 2008, p. 213), Borges' play, much like *Hamlet*'s, reveals rather than produces or

silences the secret of the spectre. Borges the author, by embracing this spectre, and by using

literature not in order to account for the incongruencies of the author's work, to explain away

"those *absences dans l'infini* of which Hugo apologetically speaks" (Borges, 1998a, p. 513), or

to identify or discover the 'true' author of the works, makes possible the "play" that

Shakespeare's work had already made possible, exhibiting the spectral role of this father of

Hamlet by depicting what has always been the secret of *Hamlet*'s father and the secret of the

archive. "We know that Shakespeare played the part of the Ghost in *Hamlet*. What could not be

foreseen, except through anamorphic reading, was that he would *become* that Ghost" (Garber,

2010, p. 237). Shakespeare's like all spectres, will remain "errant" and float free of this text and will enter once again into Borges' discussion of the archive within "Shakespeare's Memory" (Borges, 1998a, p. 508).

It is important to note, going into Borges' reading of "Shakespeare's Memory," that memory and the archive are essentially one and the same and that they both come into being through a "moment of suppression or of repression" (Derrida, 1998, p. 26). This reading of "Shakespeare's Memory," a reading of the memory of the father, will thus be a reading of memory and the archive, one which must also always be a reading of the spectre. "Shakespeare's Memory" begins with the display of a fairly typical scholar who introduces himself by asserting "there are devotees of Goethe, of the Eddas, of the late song of the Nibelgun; my fate has been Shakespeare" (Borges, 1998a, p. 508). Further demonstrating his role as scholar, "Hermann Sorgel" remarks, the "reader may have chanced to leaf through my *Shakespeare Chronology*, which I once considered essential to a proper understanding of the text: it was translated into several languages" (Borges, 1998a, p. 508). The appearance of this spectre, and the effect of this ghost on Borges' scholar is alluded to within the text even before it has arrived, as the scholar acknowledges a belief that he "knows all too well that such specifics are in fact vaguenesses" (Borges, 1998a, p. 509). Already this scholar seems to be at odds with the scholar of "The Book of Sand," as he no longer believes that his *Shakespeare Chronology* and its contribution to the archive can be "considered essential to a proper understanding of the text" (Borges, 1998a, p. 508). This scholar, like Borges, has come face to face with the apparition of *Hamlet*'s father, the spectre which will put into question the archive and the notion of memory and archive as presence.

Like the scholar of Borges' "Book of Sand," Hermann Sorgel seems to share biographic details with Borges himself, as he not only shares an obsession with Shakespeare but, like Borges, he suffers from "partial blindness" (Borges, 1998a, p. 509). Though this is not necessarily important to our reading, it does show the way in which the spectre has continued to haunt Borges the scholar despite his attempts to hide it away in the National Library, and to place it soundly within the archive. The spectre within this work takes the form of Shakespeare's memory, which is also not Shakespeare's memory, it is "a metaphor," a thing which is offered that is "wondrous" and "magical," "lost… of course…. probably in some secret place" (Borges, 1998a, p. 509-510). Similar to the other spectres of *Hamlet*'s father that we have encountered so far, not only is this spectre kept hidden, it is accompanied by an overwhelming danger which, like a "flood" (Shakespeare, 1998, 1.2.61-69), threatens to drown the purpose and being of the self and scholar. This is evinced in the scholar's assertion:

> At first the waters of the two memories did not mix; in time, the great torrent of Shakespeare threatened to flood my own modest stream- and very nearly did so… I noted with some nervousness that I was gradually forgetting the language of my parents. (Borges, 1998a, p. 510-514)

Similarly any acceptance of the spectre is at first attributed to a loss of "sanity" or a becoming "insane" (Borges, 1998a, p. 510-514), this being another allusion to the madness of literature and of *Hamlet*. This spectre is also, however, identified as a "gift" (Borges, 1998a, p. 510), enacting a "scene of… bestowal" which strikes the scholar as "literary" (Borges, 1998a, p. 510). Borges in this way identifies the gift of literature which is also the gift of the possibility Shakespeare's spectre, the gift of insanity, of ultimate hospitality, and the secret gift of *Hamlet's* father.

After the scholar's acceptance of "Shakespeare's Memory," it is stressed to this recipient that, though the memory has entered his mind, "it must be 'discovered'" (Borges, 1998a, p. 511). The anonymous man who provides this gift mentions only that "it will emerge in dreams or when you are awake, when you turn the pages of a book or turn a corner," and insists that Herman must not "be impatient… *invent* recollections" (Borges, 1998a, p. 511). There is a commonality then between this scholar's relationship to the spectre and Borges', who recognizes and allows the spectre of Shakespeare to both float free of, and inhabit his texts. Borges and this scholar display a desire to not "apostrophize" (Derrida, 1994, p. 12) this ghost, attempting to go beyond a speaking for this spectre. Though this scholar may exhibit the archival desire to discover "the *unique*," (Derrida, 1998, p. 77), to discover an undiscovered impression, or to "possess Shakespeare, and possess him as no one had ever possessed anyone before- not in love, or friendship, or even hatred," this is a desire to possess the spectre beyond the archive, and beyond the law of the father to which Hamlet ultimately succumbs, beyond "love, or friendship, or even hatred" (Borges, 1998a, p. 511). "Shakespeare's Memory," and this spectre of Shakespeare, will make possible this transition beyond the archive.

Though at first encounter this scholar thinks of perhaps writing a "fictionalized biography" (Borges, 1998a, p. 510) like his predecessor, or of becoming wholly Shakespeare and recalling "the instant at which the witches had been revealed to me, the other instant at which I had been given… vast lines" (Borges, 1998a, p. 511), he soon realizes that this is an impossibility. This scholar who believes he can possess Shakespeare fully, and who "for one curiously happy week… almost believed… [himself] Shakespeare," begins to consider such beliefs to be misleading and false (Borges, 1998a, p. 512). Hermann instead comes to the conclusion that it would serve little purpose "to unravel that wondrous fabric, besiege and mine

the tower, reduce to the modest proportions of a documentary biography or a realistic novel the

sound and fury of *Macbeth*" (Borges, 1998a, p. 514), and that it is better it remain indefinable

and "forever imperceptible" (Derrida, 1981c, 63) because this is closer to the truth. "This dead

man's magical memory," this spectre, begins to suggest to him that "no one may capture in a

single instant the fullness of his entire past," that "that gift was never granted to Shakespeare…

much less to… [him] who was but his partial heir," that "like our own, Shakespeare's memory

included regions, broad regions, of shadow- regions that he wilfully rejected" (Borges, 1998a, p.

513). Shakespeare's spectre also allows the scholar of Borges' text to witness not only that

"personal identity is based on memory" (Borges, 1998a, p. 514), but "that our brain is a

palimpsest. [In which] every new text covers the previous one, and is in turn covered by the text

that follows" (Borges, 1998a, p. 512), that "there is nothing outside the text," (Derrida, 1981b, p.

35-36), "there is nothing before the text; there is no pretext that is not already a text" (Derrida,

1981a, p. 328). "The memory of the specter is neither capable of reproducing Shakespeare's

genius nor offering a coherent narrative of his life; instead, it elicits further gaps, uncertainties,

and the eerie, disturbing force of the supernatural" (Novillo-Corvalan, 2008, p. 213-214). With

this knowledge, the scholar encounters "both a nostalgia for the book" he had desired to "have

written, and now never would," "and a fear that the guest, the spectre, would never abandon"

him (Borges, 1998a, p. 515). Like Hamlet and Horatio at the end of Shakespeare's play, this

scholar of the archive, after a realization of the frightening possibilities of the spectre, exhibits a

nostalgia for the archive, for 'the book of books' that would restore his notions of a stabilized

personality and purpose, and for a return to a knowledge that does not include the secret of the

spectre, claiming "I had invented exercises to awaken the antique memory; I had now to seek

others to erase it" (Borges, 1998a, p. 515). Unlike Horatio and Hamlet, however, and like

Borges the author, this scholar and the recipient of Shakespeare's memory recognizes that this endeavour is destined for failure, acknowledging "that and other paths were futile; all led me to Shakespeare" (Borges, 1998a, p. 515). Borges' scholar admits that once encountering this spectre of Shakespeare it is not possible to deny its possibilities or to hide it within the archive, suggesting that it, like the ghost of *Hamlet's Father* and the "Book of Sand," will always reappear and continue to haunt the absolute library. Even after his disposal of the memory, the scholar continues to lament: "I putter about the card catalog and compose erudite trivialities, but at dawn I sometimes know that the person dreaming is that other man. Every so often in the evening I am unsettled by small, fleeting memories that are perhaps authentic" (Borges, 1998a, p. 514). It is not only this continual haunting that Borges' text shows, but also an understanding that though, like Horatio, the scholar will eventually attempt to rid himself of this ghost, it will not remain completely hidden, and the scholar will only be able to rid himself of the spectre by passing it on to others, just as *Hamlet* can only really dispose of the spectre of Hamlet's Father by having it reappear within the works of Borges and Joyce. The spectre cannot be silenced within the archive, its secret will always open up to the future (Derrida, 1998, p. 79).

The scholar cannot be entirely rid of this spectre and this is also true for the archive itself. Sorgel decides to free himself from this dangerous ghost that threatens to disrupt both the archive and his sense of self, but can only do so through a passing the gift on, through a reiteration of the secret, offering "Shakespeare's memory," to a stranger who is willing to "take that risk… [to] accept Shakespeare's memory" (Borges, 1998a, 515). In this way, Sorgel's relationship to the spectre attests that the text and trace produce an exit that always "lays siege… by referring- by exiting- toward another text" (Derrida, 1981a, p. 336), that regarding the spectre "not only are the references infinite, but they conduct you through texts and referral-structures that are

heterogeneous to each other… [there will always be a trace] referring to the other, to another

trace" (Derrida, 1981a, p. 331). "As texts pick up previous texts, as they open themselves to

future ones, they do not settle but literally unsettle fixity, Borges implies, corroding the

monument where literature is so often buried" (Molloy, 2009, p. 183). Both Borges' reading of

Hamlet's Father's ghost, and its continual reappearance within his texts suggest that this ghost,

this spectre, is "always referring to another whose eyes can never be met" (Derrida, 1998, p. 84).

In this way, the consistent reapparition of Shakespeare's ghost within the work of Borges

establishes both that "the archive is never closed" (Derrida, 1998, p. 68) and that "the surplus

value of an archive" (Derrida, 1998, p. 7) will always already have made an escape possible,

literature need only give it room. Turning once again to Joyce's *Ulysses*, and Stephen's

engagement with his own ghosts, as well as *Hamlet*'s, will similarly unveil the possibility of

literature to provide this space through "the gift of writing… this test of unconditional

hospitality" (Derrida, 2006, p. 44-48), this madness which reaches beyond the law of the archive.

iii. Stephen Dedalus: On Becoming Shakespeare and Remaining Mad

The Circe episode of *Ulysses* contains both the spectral encounters and the slow ascent

toward madness which function within the works of both Borges and Shakespeare. The most

striking characteristic of this episode, however, is the way in which these events are staged.

Unlike the "Scylla and Charybdis" episode of *Ulysses* which is written fairly conventionally and

given a setting which is comfortable and supportive of the archive and archivists that Stephen

encounters, "Circe" exists as a hallucinogenic movement beyond the archive in which a man is

no longer one thing, and a thing can be anything or nothing, in which the entirety of dialectics

and a logic based on oppositions is brought into question. The world of "Circe" is a world in

which a man can become both "Messiah," "king," "hog," "cod," and even "mother" (Joyce,

2000, p. 614-618). By literally staging these events, as this episode of *Ulysses* is written entirely

in the convention of a play, Joyce opens up the possibility of an appearance and readdress of the

ghosts which Stephen had begun to identify and incite within "Scylla and Charybdis." No longer

under the strict institutional law of the archive and the scholars who would attempt to protect it,

these ghosts, like those of *Hamlet* and Borges' works, have a profound effect on those who are

willing to listen, allowing Stephen to "flourish… his ashplant shivering the lamp image,

shattering light over the world" (Joyce, 2000, p. 564).

According to King in "Trapping the Fox You Are(n't) with a Riddle: The

Autobiographical Crisis of Stephen Dedalus in *Ulysses*," "The Stephen of *Ulysses*… has

forfeited any autobiographical privilege," and in rejecting his father and having lost his mother in

birth "must content himself… at posturing as Hamlet and Shakespeare" (1999, p. 305). By

writing *Hamlet* and in creating it to produce his sense of self, Stephen is able to become his own

progenitor (King, 1999, p. 305). Similarly, King claims that "if Stephen Dedalus of *Ulysses* can

no longer be reassured that he is autobiographical, then he would prefer to become Hamlet- the

character who made Shakespeare his own progenitor- and in turn, make himself his own

progenitor" (King, 1999, p. 305). In other words, by becoming Hamlet Stephen intends to

become the Shakespeare of "Scylla and Charybdis," to assume the form of ghost, king, father,

and son, and to literally embody the Proteus-like Shakespeare of Borges' "Everything and

Nothing." Stephen's likeness to Hamlet is repeated throughout *Ulysses* and is marked not only

by his claiming to understand the motives of Hamlet in "Scylla and Charybdis," but in the way it

is noted that he and his counterpart Bloom are continuously "already marked by negation,

already dressed in black" (Garber, 2010, p. 182) (Joyce, 2000, p. 599). Stephen's "somber pose,

strict black attire, 'Hamlet hat' (3.390), and mourning for the death of his mother render him a

self-conscious avatar of Shakespeare's noble hero" (Novillo-Corvalan, 2008, p. 217). These

similarities are further compounded in the way in which Stephen, like Hamlet, specifically in the

"Circe" episode of *Ulysses*, is placed on a stage in which he and the other characters of *Ulysses*

must come face to face with the ghosts that continuously haunt the archive.

The relationship between *Hamlet* and Stephen becomes increasingly clear throughout

"Circe" as the ghost of *Hamlet* and its father continuously haunt the text. The first of these

recurrent appearances occurs when Bloom encounters an apparition of his father who is

simultaneously not his father, a man who exclaims "are you not my dear son Leopold, the

grandson of Leopold? Are you not my dear son Leopold who left the house of his father and left

the god of his fathers Abraham and Jacob?" (Joyce, 2000, p. 569). Though this is not yet the

ghost of Shakespeare, this is one of many apparitions which will be shown to function in the

same way and which in fact, as Stephen states in "Scylla and Charybdis," are the same as

Shakespeare, resembling in some way the king, father, son, and ghost. This ghost, like the ghost

of *Hamlet*, is a fatherly ghost that demands the son to enter into the "house of his father" and the

law of the archive. Bloom, like Hamlet and Stephen, originally rejects this call, stating only "I

suppose so, father," (Joyce, 2000, p. 569), making possible a madness which will bring about the

continued apparition of this ghost. Bloom's rejection of this law of the father and the archive is

further exhibited when he hands to Zoe "a shrivelled potatoe" which he claims is "a talisman.

Heirloom" but which he is more than happy to give away (Joyce, 2000, p. 599). As it did for

Hamlet, Hermann, and Shakespeare, however, this rejection comes at a cost, as Bloom must in

this way subscribe to a non-father and a non-identity, immediately becoming "a plagiarist. A

soapy squeak masquerading as a literateur" (Joyce, 2000, p. 585). Bloom not only loses a stable

identity and becomes "many and no one'" (Borges, 1999, p. 78), but, like Stephen, is identified

as the villain of history and the archive, the "Judas" of the book of books (Joyce, 2000, p. 596).

The appearance of the ghost of Paddy Dignam further exhibits this connection between

the ghosts of *Hamlet* and "Circe" as she proclaims "Bloom, I am Paddy Dignam's spirit. List,

List, O List" (Joyce, 2000, p. 597), directly echoing the ghost's speech in *Hamlet* which begins

"I am your father's spirit" and ends with the identical "List, List, O List" (Shakespeare, 1998,

1.5.22). Like the ghost of Hamlet's father, Dignam's voice also beckons from below the stage

on her exit, "Dignam's voice, muffled, is heard baying underground" stating "Dignam's dead

and gone below" (Joyce, 2000, p. 598). Not only does this echo the voice of *Hamlet*'s father, but

according to Bloom it is also "the voice of Esau" (Joyce, 2000, p. 597), who, according to

genesis, was the son of Isaac and the progenitor of the Edomites, and the fraternal twin brother of

Jacob, the patriarch of the Israelites. In this way, Bloom links this ghost to the first ghost, and to

the father of his people who has called on him to enter into his law and history. Bloom,

however, continues to reject these ghosts, claiming he stands "for the reform of municipal morals

and the plain ten commandments. New worlds for old. Union of all, jew, moslem and gentile"

(Joyce, 2000, p. 610). This radical dismissal of the law of the father, and a recognition of the

ghostly existence of this father as an absence/presence, will cause Bloom to come to terms with

what others will only consider to be madness.

After these invitations and refusals to enter into the pact of the archive like a good and

acceptable scholar, Bloom is diagnosed by those in power as a sufferer of a variety of disorders

ranging from "hereditary epilepsy," to "chronic exhibitionism," "ambidexterity," and a rather

Shakespearean "midsummer madness" (Joyce, 2000, p. 613). Bloom, removed from the archive,

can also no longer cling to a stable existence or story of existence, as he simultaneously "had a

father" and "forty fathers," and "never existed" (Joyce, 2000, p. 636).   So staunch is Bloom's

denial of this law of the father that he is attributed to have become "the new womanly man"

(Joyce, 2000, p. 613-614). As a "mother," or as a mother who rejects the law of the father,

Bloom has found a way to create beyond the archive, and like a "Messiah… heals several

sufferer's from kings evil" (Joyce, 2000, p. 615). It is precisely in the way that Bloom is

everything and nothing, "any anythingarian seeking to overthrow… [the] holy faith" (Joyce,

2000, p. 611) that he is able to heal others of this evil of the king and father which is

simultaneously the evil of the archive. This will not last forever, however, as Bloom, like

Hamlet, will release himself from the spell of this madness which is also a hospitality to the

ghost and will once again enter into the archive.

Though Bloom earlier rejects the potato, this heirloom which he continues throughout

"Circe" to identify as "nothing," when faced with Zoe's frightening proposition that "what's

yours is mine and what's mine is my own" (Joyce, 2000, p. 663), Bloom can no longer accept a

madness that leaves him with nothing, even if the something is only illusory, and claims the

patatoe "is nothing, but still a relic" and asks Zoe to give it back (Joyce, 2000, p. 663). Bloom,

like Hamlet, eventually succumbs to the archive which provides at least the illusion of stability

with "a memory attached to it" (Joyce, 2000, p. 663). It is this action which presents Stephen

with a realization of the radical effect of the ghost of Hamlet's father and the statements he had

made within "Scylla and Charybdis." When Bloom asks for the potato Stephen enters into the

act, exclaiming "to have or not to have, that is the question" (Joyce, 2000, p. 663). This is not

only once again a reference to *Hamlet*, but demonstrates an understanding that Hamlet's "to be

or not to be" is not truly a question of life or death within the play, or even a question of whether

to exist or not-exist, to have meaning or to lose meaning, that in fact the question is whether one

wishes to *have* this illusion of being which is based on a privileging of absence over presence, son over father, writing over speech, etc., or not to *have* this illusion. Stephen, like Bloom, initially rejects the law of the archive and the king and father completely stating "I must kill the priest and the king" (Joyce, 2000, p. 688) while also recognizing the illusory nature of these figures of authority, comparing "kings and unicorns" (Joyce, 2000, p. 689). Stephen claims that he refuses to play with his "eyes shut" and blindly "imitate pa" (Joyce, 2000, p. 634) and unlike Bloom he does not want to return to an acceptance of this illusion which would hide the ghost and recognize a memory in something that is in fact nothing, that would acknowledge a being in a not-being.

Stephen's rejection of the father and the archive opens the possibility of a further haunting within "Circe." Like Bloom's, however, Stephen's rejection of the father and the archive as evinced both within "Scylla and Charybdis" and "Circe" also leads to an absence of meaning and a madness. Earlier within the episode Stephen claims "to be or not to be. Life's dream is over… No more. I have lived. Farewell" (Joyce, 2000, p. 618). Not only does this passage exhibit Stephen's acceptance of the fact that he can no longer live life's illusory dream that gives the choice of being or not being, but Stephen, like the ghost of *Hamlet*'s father, speaks of having lived as if he is already gone yet remains able to speak. Stephen's likeness to this ghost is further illustrated when, soon after this statement, Lynch deeply voices the phrase "enter a ghost and hobgoblins," and "the wand in Lynch's hand flashes," revealing Stephen standing "at the pianolo on which sprawl his hat and ashplant" (Joyce, 2000, p. 621). Here Stephen is described as a ghost that has been conjured much like others have conjured the ghost of Hamlet and his father. This becoming ghost is further exemplified when Florry points to Stephen and cries "look! He's white" (Joyce, 2000, p. 682). Like Hamlet, Hermann, and the scholar of

Borges' "Library of Babel," in removing himself from the archive Stephen becomes errant, a

"nothing" (Joyce, 2000, p. 683), encountering "world without end" (Joyce, 2000, p. 674). As

Bloom, and the Shakespeare of Borges' work, Stephen becomes both "Everything and Nothing."

        This movement of Stephen and Bloom's comes to a climax when Lynch, holding "a

mirror up to nature" allows Stephen and Bloom to gaze into the mirror only to see "the face of

William Shakespeare, beardless… rigid in facial paralysis, crowned by the reflection of the

reindeer antelered hatrack in the hall" (Joyce, 2000, p. 671). "Stephen's face… transfigured into

Shakespeare's" not only represents "a fulfillment of the prophecy of his lecture" within the

Library, but echoes when "Stephen looks into a cracked mirror in the opening 'Telemachus'

episode" (King, 1999, p. 308), serving to demonstrate that the ghost of *Hamlet*'s father has been

haunting the text from its very inception. Immediately afterwards Shakespeare's ghost, faced

with Mrs. Dignam holding "a Scottish widow's insurance policy" (Joyce, 2000, p. 671), is

afflicted with "paralytic rage" (Joyce, 2000, p. 672), suggesting that the apparition of Paddy

Dignam's ghost earlier within the episode was already the ghost of Shakespeare and that they,

like Stephen, are one and the same. Soon "the face of Martin Cunningham, bearded, refeatures

Shakespeare's beardless face" (Joyce, 2000, p. 672) and it is further stressed that this ghost has

come to resemble all men. Like Hamlet, however, Stephen's recognition of this ghost for what it

is denies him the ability to act, as to act would once again place him within the realm of the

archive and the father. Stephen is forced to admit that within this movement beyond the archive

he has truly become a ghost, he has "no voice," and is "a most finished artist," "the bird that can

sing (he has the ability to speak of the spectre) and won't sing (because it would require entering

into logos and the archive which sustains it)" (Joyce, 2000, p. 634). Like Hamlet, Stephen will

succumb to the beckoning of the archive and the ghost of his father.

Near the end of "Circe," the ghost not of Shakespeare but of Stephen's present father, Simon Dedalus, a father who is not yet dead, appears. This father who Stephen has rejected comes in his full presence, though it is an illusory presence, and beckons Stephen, "think of your mother's people" (Joyce, 2000, p. 680). Though Stephen recognizes this as the "dance of death," he obeys the commandment of this father who appears as presence, and in so doing conjures the image of his mother:

> Emaciated... [rising] stark through the floor in leper grey with a wreath of faded orange blossoms and a torn bridal veil, her face worn and noseless, green with grave mould. Her hair is scant and lank. She flies her bluecircled hollow eyesockets on Stephen and opens her toothless mouth *uttering a silent word*." (Joyce, 2000, p. 681)

Unlike other ghosts both from within *Ulysses* and the works of Shakespeare and Borges, this is not a ghost which resembles an absent/presence but one who is "beastly dead" (Joyce, 2000 p. 681). Also, "unlike the substantial image of his father, Stephen's mother is presented in ethereal terms, as a passive victim, as a ghostwoman with ashes on her breath" (Oded, 1985, p. 6). As opposed to calling Stephen to revenge through an assertion of her law over the living world, the ghost simply states "(*with the subtle smile of death's madness*) I was once the beautiful May Goulding. I am dead" (Joyce, 2000 p, 681).

By following the call of his father and entering once again into the archive, Stephen is no longer able to imagine the ghost on the terms he had set earlier within the Library, or during his encounter at the mirror, and instead of welcoming this apparition is now "horrorstruck" exclaiming "Lemur, who are you? What bogeyman's trick is this?" (Joyce, 2000, p. 681). Stephen still desires to know the secret of the spectre, asking "tell me the word, mother, if you

know now. The word known to all men" (Joyce, 2000, p. 682) but refuses to listen to her advice

instead proclaiming "ghoul! Hyena!... The corpsechewer! Raw head and bloody bones" (Joyce,

2000, p. 682). By entering once again into the archive and the law of the father, of king's and

priests, Stephen is only able to recognize the ghost as a demon from "the fire of hell" (Joyce,

2000, p. 682) and a warning to others that they must "repent" (Joyce, 2000, p. 682), once again

accepting the dichotomy of life/death, presence/absence, heaven/hell, etc. which sustains the

archive. With a final action that stands in stark contrast to Hamlet's, however, Stephen exclaims

"*Nothung!*" (Joyce, 2000, p. 683) and "*lifts his ashplant high with both hands and smashes the

chandelier. Time's livid final flame leaps and, in the following darkness, ruin of all space,

shattered glass and toppling masonry*" (Joyce, 2000, p. 683), "shivering the lamp image,

shattering light over the world" (Joyce, 2000, p. 564). Stephen's final act shatters the illusion of

the archive, and disrupts the archive and father's attempt to suppress the radical existence of the

ghost. What is most important about Stephen's proclamation is that his "*nothung*" is written in

italics, signalling that it is not a word, but in the structure of the play in which it is written, an

act. Stephen is in effect producing an action which he knows to be only an act, a play, a part of

the act which is simultaneously meaningless and meaningful, something and nothing. Unlike

Hamlet, Stephen does not claim to act 'justly' as he realizes that this too would be an act (both an

action and an acting). In this way, this actionless action, unlike Hamlet's final act, does not

reinstate the law of the father but shatters its illusory existence. By utilizing the text, Stephen

writes a toppling of the masonry on which the archive is founded that exhibits the possibility of

'play,' leaving an opening through which *Ulysses* characters, and its ghosts, can escape.

When Stephen awakens from the ordeal he is once again able to question the "priest and

king" (Joyce, 2000, p. 688). Bloom too seems effected by this non-action as he is willing to

accept that he and Stephen have no claim to archivable meaning, that Stephen has "said nothing. Not a word. A pure misunderstanding" (Joyce, 2000, p. 693). Though it is possible to recognize that "burying the dead" and silencing or defining the spectre that disrupts the archive provides a "safe home" (Joyce, 2000, p. 701) of illusory meaning, these characters acknowledge that it is no longer desirable to do so. As the appearance of the ghost of Bloom's son Rudy which is simultaneously the ghost of Shakespeare and his *Hamlet* at the end of "Circe" attests to, Stephen and Joyce have used the text to provide a space for the ghost, and to allow it to continue to haunt an archive which would attempt to suppress it, allowing "the ghosts of the past [to] haunt the peripheries of history" and the archive (Hansen, 2001, p. 32).

V. (In)Conclusion

By following the ghost of *Hamlet*'s father through the works of Borges, Joyce, and Derrida, it has been the intention of this study to examine the role of the scholar in relation to the past, the text, the spectre, and the archive. Ultimately, what this haunting has shown to provide is not only an escape for the spectral other of the archive, and an escape for the notions of writing/absence/death that serve to constitute the system of *logos* that is based on their opposition, but most importantly, an escape for scholars themselves. In studying this ghost, it is evident that there does exist a possibility for the scholar to speak to or of this ghost from beyond the archive. Through a utilization of the emancipatory possibility of literature, Borges, Derrida, Joyce, and Shakespeare unveil the possibility of a writing which is no longer a writing opposed to speech, a *pharmakon* opposed to *pharmakon*, but one which is able to expose writing as both truth and non-truth, as the founding gesture of meaning and non-meaning. In so doing, these authors take part in a radical departure from the archive, even if they will ultimately return to it, suggesting that the scholar can in fact read the text and spectre beyond its institutional and archival constraints. These works evince that the scholar "Marcellus was perhaps anticipating" (Derrida, 1994, p. 12) has arrived, but that this scholar is always on the brink of a precipice of returning like *Hamlet*, like Borges, like Herman, and like Dedalus, to the archive. It is the modern scholar's role then to be acutely aware of their precarious position, and to always remember that acting justly will inadvertently produce injustice, and that any inclusion must also always be an exclusion. Even if the modern scholar is unable to continue with this task, the archive will always remain open, the spectre of writing will "neither [be] maintained nor contained in the clasp of a book" (Derrida, 1981a, p. 334), and the ghost of *Hamlet*'s father will continue to haunt the peripheries of the archive.

References

Anderson, T. (2004). Class, Class Consciousness and Spectres of Marx in Shakespeare's History Plays. *Literature Compass, 1*, 1-12.

Borges, J.L. (1998a). Shakespeare's Memory. In *Collected Fictions* (pp.508-516). (A. Hurley, Trans.). Toronto, Ontario: Penguin Group (Canada).

Borges, J.L. (1998b). The Book of Sand. In *Collected Fictions* (pp. 480-483). (A. Hurley, Trans.). Toronto, Ontario: Penguin Group (Canada).

Borges, J.L. (1998c). The Library of Babel. In *Collected Fictions* (pp.112-118). (A. Hurley, Trans.). Toronto, Ontario: Penguin Group (Canada).

Borges, J.L. (1999). Everything and Nothing. In *Everything and Nothing* (pp 76-78). (Trans. J.E. Irby). New York, New York: New Directions Publishing Corporation.

Borges, J.L. (2000). The Total Library. In Eliot Weinberger (Ed.), *Selected Non-Fictions* (pp. 214-216). (Trans. E. Allen, S. Jill Levine, and E. Weinberger). Toronto, Ontario: Penguin Group (Canada).

De Boer, K. (2002). Enter the Ghost/ Exit the Ghost/ Re-enter the Ghost: Derrida's Reading of Hamlet in Spectres of Marx. *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology, 33(1)*, 22-38.

Derrida, J. (1981a). Dissemination. In *Dissemination* (pp. 287-366). (B. Johnson, Trans.). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (1981b). Outwork. In *Dissemination* (pp. 1-59). (B. Johnson, Trans.). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (1981c). Plato's Pharmacy. In *Dissemination* (pp. 62-171). (B. Johnson, Trans.). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (1994). *Spectres of Marx*. (P. Kamuf, Trans.). New York, New York: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1997). *Of Grammatology*. (G.C. Spivak, Trans.). Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Derrida, J. (1998). *Archive Fever*. (E. Prenowitz, Trans.). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (2002). *Acts of Religion*. (G. Anidjar, Trans.). New York, New York: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (2005). The Principle of Hospitality. *Parallax*, 11(1), 6-9.

Derrida, J. (2006). *Geneses, Genealogies, Genres, and Genius*. (B.B. Brahic, Trans.). New York, New York: Columbia University Press.

Garber, M (2010). *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers*. New York, New York: Routledge Classics.

Hang by a Thread. (1997). In *Dictionary.com*. Retrieved from
http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/hang+by+a+thread

Harper, D (2010). Anchor. In *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved from
http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=anchor

Hansen, J.A. (2001). The Uncreating Conscience: Memory and Apparitions in Joyce and
Benjamin. *Mosaic, 34(4)*, 85-107.

Joyce, J. (2000). *Ulysses*. New York, New York: Penguin Putnam Inc.

Keiser, G. (1995). Modernism/Postmodernism In "The Library of Babel": Jorge Luis Borges's
Fiction as Borderland. *Hispanofila, 115*. 39-48.

King, J. (1999). Trapping the Fox You Are(n't) with a Riddle: The Autobiographical Crisis of
Stephen Dedalus in Ulysses. *Twentieth Century Literature, 45(3)*, 299-316.

Levine, S.J. (1997). Notes to Borges's Notes on Joyce: Infinite Affinities. *Comparative
Literature, 49(4)*, 344-359.

Logos. (2011). In *Dictionary.com*. Retrieved from
http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/logos

Molloy, S. (2009). Disparate Libraries, Erratic Scribes: Borges and Literary History.
The Romantic Review, 1(1-2), 181-186.

Novillo-Corvalan, P. (2008). Joyce's and Borges's Afterlives of Shakespeare. *Comparative
Literature, 60(3)*, 207-227.

Oded, B. (1985). The Maternal Ghost in Joyce. *Modern Language Studies, 15(4)*, 40-47.

Ogden, T.H. (2009). Kafka, Borges, and the Creation of Consciousness, Part II: Borges- A Life
of Letters Encompassing Everything and Nothing. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 78(2)*,
369-396.

Scofield, M. (1980). *The Ghosts of Hamlet*. New York, New York: Cambridge University
Press.

Shakespeare, W (1998). *Hamlet*. New York, New York: Penguin Group Inc.

Spivak, G (1997). Translator's Preface. In J. Derrida *Of Grammatology* (pp. ix-lxxxvii).
Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.