

Kyra Triebold

Christoph Irmscher

ENG-L 499

30 March 2018

Theroux's *Mothballs*: The Importance of Translators' Archives

Thanks to former director Breon Mitchell, the Lilly Library is unusually rich in holdings pertaining to literary translation. Among them is an uncatalogued collection containing the papers of Peter Theroux, a prolific American translator of Arabic literary works into English. Though he is best known for prestige projects like Abdelrahman Munif's *Cities of Salt* (1984) and Nobel Prize winner Naguib Mahfouz's *Children of the Alley* (1959) (previously translated by Philip Stewart under the title *Children of Gebelawi*), he has translated an additional eight novels, including the Iraqi author Alia Mamdouh's novel *Ḥabbāt al-Naftāl īn (Mothballs)*. The *Mothballs* folder of the Theroux Mss. consists of faxes exchanged between Peter Theroux and his editor at Garnet, Anna Watson; promotional materials related to Garnet's Arab Women Writers series; and three chapters of an early draft of the translation, with corrections by Mamdouh and her family. The folder relates only to Garnet's translation, which was published in 1996 as part of the Arab Women Writers Series edited by Fadia Faqir. An American edition, also translated by Theroux, was published in 2005 by the CUNY Feminist Press under the title *Naphtalene*.

What is the purpose of keeping a literary archive? According to Erick Kelemen in *Textual Editing and Criticism*, "As an abstraction, an ideal, a work's text can always only be imperfectly realized in a document's text, and the role of textual criticism is, in this

formulation, to attempt to reconstruct the ideal text from the imperfect versions in the various documents" (11). This view about the role of archives in textual criticism is influenced by the New Bibliography school of the first half of the twentieth century. Working first with Shakespeare's plays, New Bibliographers hoped to reconstruct the authoritative originals written by Shakespeare, before careless compositors, actors, and editors "ruined" the texts. Preserving a translator's archive might therefore seem strange. Translation works at cross-purposes with seeking the authoritative original of a literary work. As Finkelstein writes in *Theorizing the History of the Book*, "Seeking original textual and authorial meaning, scholars examined the recension of manuscripts in order to produce the most complete and least corrupted version of a text possible. The intervention of agents other than the author in the transmission of the text was seen as part of that corrupting process" (8). The translator is one such intervening agent responsible for "corrupting" the text. Translation can only move the text farther away from the lost original, since the author's intent is most perfectly realized in the original form, and some things will inevitably be lost or changed in translation.

It can be argued that translations are a mere necessary evil until that unlikely day when more English speakers can read Arabic fluently. However, it is more helpful to re-think Kelemen's formulation about the role of textual criticism. Rather than acting as corrupting agents, translators actually provide a more nuanced view of the original (especially when, as in the case of *Ḥabbāt al-Naftāl īn*, the original itself is far from perfect). Translators' archives can help clarify ambiguities in the original language through queries to the author, even as translation creates new ambiguities. Countless decisions,

negotiations, and compromises go into the work of translation, and the author fights to keep what is important in the text. The archive acts as a record of these decisions.

This duality of translating—clarifying some features of the text while muddying others—is evident in the *Mothballs* folder of the Theroux Mss. The novel's experimental use of language works very differently in English than it works in Arabic. *Ḥabbāt al-Naftāl īn* is notable for its use of Iraqi dialect rather than formal literary Arabic, as well as its fluidity and ambiguity in switching between first, second, and third person to describe the protagonist Huda. Since English does not have a dramatic difference between formal and spoken registers or allow ambiguity in conjugation, these features are inevitably lost in translation. However, the tradeoff for the loss of meaning is realizing what Mamdouh considers important enough to retain. When Mamdouh, in her correspondence with Peter Theroux, corrects words or corrects an ambiguous pronoun choice, it reveals a window into her thought process. The archive acts as a useful record of these decisions.

Definitive Edition?

The three relevant editions to Mamdouh's novel differ in many ways. The Arabic original, *Ḥabbāt al-Naftāl īn*, was published in 1986 by the Egyptian General Books Commission. The English translation, *Mothballs*, was published by Garnet in 1996 as part of its Arab Women Writers series. A re-worked English translation was published in 2005 by the CUNY Feminist Press under the title *Naphtalene* (*sic*). Which one is closest to Kelemen's "ideal" text, and can the archives help account for the differences between them?

Ḥabbāt al-Naftāl Īn was chosen to be translated by Fadia Faqir, the editor of the Arab Women Writers series at Garnet. According to F.A. Haidar in the afterword to *Naphtalene*, Faqir rescued the novel from relative obscurity in the Arab world and “[placed] Mamdouh firmly on the international literary map” (192). Whether or not this is true, the Arabic edition, originally published in 1986 by the Egyptian General Books Commission, does not look impressive. A low-quality paperback, riddled with spelling mistakes and typos, the novel was an installment in a monthly series of novels and plays to which readers could subscribe. The cover is just the title on a purple background (this lack of cover art is typical for books published in the Arab world). Besides frequent spelling mistakes, the printer consistently prints the letter *ي* as *ى* (as is common in Egyptian printing); Mamdouh adds the dots to every *ى* in the copy of the novel she sent to Theroux. Her corrections, in green ink, appear on nearly every page.

In addition to making corrections to the published novel itself, she also sent pages of corrected proofs of the Arabic text to Theroux. For the most part, her corrections are restricted to correcting typos and spelling mistakes and adding diacritical marks. However, it is debatable at least if this sloppy Arabic edition matched Mamdouh’s expectations of what the book should look like. Mamdouh seems to have treated *Mothballs* as her chance to correct the mistakes the publisher made with *Ḥabbāt al-Naftāl Īn*.

Meanwhile, the differences between the two American editions show how translation problematizes the notion of the “ideal text.” Though it appears from the similar sentence structure that Theroux revised his earlier translation rather than starting from scratch, there are subtle differences between the two translations:

Mothballs

The clouds are over your head, and the test is always waiting for you. Just look at your father. It seems to you that he is driving a truck. Your mother is sitting in the back, monopolizing the silence and illness. The rest of the herd are playing inside the detention camp, growling a little, then falling silent.

Your isolated and dispossessed grandmother removed herself from all housework, as if she were created only for worship. She was proud of this distinction of hers, sprinkling water behind us after every meal, with prayers, to obliterate our footprints so that Satan could not envelop us. (1)

Naphtalene

The clouds are over your head and the trials of life are always ahead of you. Just look at your father. It seems to you that he is driving a truck. Your mother is sitting in the back, monopolizing the silence and illness. The rest of the herd are playing inside the detention camp, growling a little, then falling silent.

Your grandmother knew how to withdraw from company and free herself from all chores, as if she were created only for worship. She was content with this distinction, showering us with prayers after every meal to protect us from the wiles of Satan. (1)

A close comparison of the two sheds light on the vocabulary- and syntax-level decisions literary translators have to make.

In translation theory, domestication refers to a translation that feels like it could have been originally written in English. A domesticated translation uses smoother English syntax, finds English equivalents for idioms, and lacks an explanatory apparatus (such as footnotes or endnotes, a glossary, etc.). A foreignized translation tries to remind readers that they are reading a foreign novel, linguistically and culturally--strategies include leaving fixed expressions in the original language (inshallah, al-hamdulillah, etc.), mimicking the syntax of the original language, and explaining the choices with footnotes. According to Lawrence Venuti, the choice between domestication and foreignization is not a neutral one. On the one hand, foreignization is seen to retain valuable cultural and linguistic information from the original in a way that domestication does not. On the other

hand, a foreignized translation can be more difficult to read. Especially given the wide cultural gulf between the Arab and Western worlds, it can also run the risk of being too alienating, of overemphasizing the foreign strangeness of the novel (Hartman). Therefore, it is a worthwhile question to ask why Theroux chose his particular strategy.

The original British edition ended up a more foreignized translation than the American edition. For example, the opening sentence of *Mothballs*--"The clouds are over your head, and the test is always waiting for you" (1)--is a literal word-for-word translation of the Arabic ("السحب فوق رأسك، والامتحان دائماً بانتظارك"). The use of the word "test" in English for the Arabic امتحان especially contributes to the awkwardness of the sentence--what test? *Naphtalene* opts for a sense meaning instead: "The clouds are over your head, and the *trials of life* are always *ahead of you*" (1, emphasis added). Another example is the literal versus metaphorical meaning in Theroux's translation of the Arabic "إن ترشنا وبعد كل الوجبات بالصلوات" (literally, "she sprinkles us after all meals with prayers so that Satan does not encircle/besiege us"). In the British edition, actual water is involved: "[Your grandmother] sprinkl[ed] water behind us after every meal, with prayers, to obliterate our footprints so that Satan could not envelop us" (*Mothballs* 1). This speaks to a foreign and unfamiliar ritual. In the American edition, this becomes, "[Your grandmother] shower[ed] us with prayers after every meal to protect us from the wiles of Satan" (*Naphtalene* 1). Whereas the water in the British edition version is literal, "showering us with prayers" could be read as a mere idiom in English.

Theroux might have deliberately chosen a foreignizing strategy for *Mothballs*. However, this seems strange, because Garnet seems to have wanted a fairly domesticated

translation. Early in their correspondence, editor Anna Watson asks Theroux for a “fluent and literary translation.”¹ Another domesticating touch is the frankly puny glossary at the beginning of the novel, which contains a mere 5 entries, and the lack of footnotes. Theroux asked Garnet if he could include footnotes, because he was applying for a translation grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, which requires some sort of “scholarly and critical apparatus” in order to fund projects.² Garnet gently refused: “So far on this series, we have encouraged translators not to use footnotes, as they often break the flow of the book.”³

The archive might be useful in explaining the discrepancy between *Mothballs* and *Naphtalene*. The archives do not contain Theroux’s notes on the American edition, which would be most helpful for determining why Theroux made the changes that he did to *Naphtalene*. However, the archive does suggest a possible explanation for *Mothballs*’ more foreignized feel, albeit one more mundane than translation theorists would like to see: Theroux was behind on the project from the beginning, and was racing the clock to get it done on time.

The archives show that the *Mothballs* project was plagued by delays. Garnet first approached Theroux after their original translator quit, so Theroux was behind the rest of the series from the beginning. By December of 1994, there was already mutual frustration between Garnet and Theroux: Garnet felt that Theroux was not devoting his full attention

¹ Watson to Theroux, 28 May 1993. *Mothballs* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

² “Scholarly Editions and Translations Grants.” National Endowment for the Humanities. Accessed 5 May 2018.

<https://www.neh.gov/grants/research/scholarly-editions-and-translations-grants>

³ Watson to Theroux, 10 June 1994. *Mothballs* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

to *Mothballs*; Theroux felt it was reasonable to spend his time on other projects, since Garnet had not yet paid him the amount due at signing (25% of his total fee, or about \$1,250).⁴ By March 4, Theroux sent a letter to Garnet telling them that they were “irrevocably in breach of its contract” and that he would discontinue his work on the project until he was paid.⁵ Garnet promptly pulled out all the stops to keep Theroux on board, offering him \$3,000 to keep working on the project.⁶ Theroux agreed, but by this point, there was no way he could make the May 31st deadline specified in his contract. Garnet began sending him regular letters asking him to work faster, and Theroux sent back some rather testy replies that he was *trying*: “I would like to give you a firm delivery date for this translation, but that is complicated by the diabolical difficulty of the novel itself and my ongoing, though helpful correspondence with Alia, who has enlisted some English-speaking relatives of hers to offer advice... For my part, I have many other preoccupations, yet am longing to get this difficult project off my desk for good.”⁷ He sent the finished translation to Garnet on 28 July 1995, but by the time the novel went through literary editing, it had missed the release of the rest of the Arab Women Writers series.

It is merely speculation on my part, but part of the reason that the British edition feels more foreignized might be because of the time crunch to get it done. It seems to me that it would be easier to do a literal translation quickly, whereas revising the syntax to sound more like English or brainstorming English idioms to take the place of unfamiliar Arabic ones would take time that Theroux did not have. Between the argument over

⁴ Theroux's contract. *Mothballs* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

⁵ Theroux to Watson, 4 March 1995. *Mothballs* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

⁶ Theroux to Watson, 4 March 1995. *Mothballs* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

⁷ Theroux to Sue Coll, 28 June 1995. *Mothballs* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

payment and the constant badgering over deadlines, there was little love lost between Garnet and Theroux, so maybe he was just trying to finish the translation as quickly as possible to get it done. With *Naphtalene*, however, he had the space of the intervening nine years to review the project mentally and come back to it with fresh energy. Of course, my interpretation that *Mothballs* can be seen as an earlier draft of *Naphtalene* betrays my personal preference for the American edition. Whether or not my interpretation is correct, the different editions of the novel problematize the notion of one ideal text. *Habbāt al-Naftāl Īn*, riddled as it is with typos and mistakes, was never pure to begin with, while the two English editions based off of it, *Mothballs and Naphtalene*, display the relative advantages and disadvantages of foreignization and domestication.

Language Barriers

Peter Theroux was the second translator Garnet approached for the *Mothballs* project. The first translator quit, because she was “of the opinion that [the novel] would be as difficult to translate as James Joyce’s *Ulysses*.”⁸ Theroux was recommended for the project because of his knowledge of the Iraqi dialect, which he gained while translating *Cities of Salt* by the Saudi-Iraqi author Abdelrahman Munif.⁹

One of the major problems for foreigners learning the Arabic language is the difference between formal Arabic (fusha) and dialect (amiyya). Fusha can refer to classical Arabic, the language found in the Quran, which can still be understood by Arabic speakers for religious reasons, but otherwise is as dead a language as Latin. Fusha can also refer to

⁸ Watson to Theroux, 28 May 1993. *Mothballs* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

⁹ Watson to Theroux, 5 May 1993. *Mothballs* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), the version of Arabic taught in American classrooms. As a middle register, this fusha is used in news broadcasts and political speeches, but it is predominantly literary—taught in schools for reading and writing but rarely spoken. On the street, people speak the dialect, amiyya, which, from a language learner's perspective, might as well be an entirely different language. Vocabulary, verb conjugation, pronunciation, and syntax are all different in amiyya than they are in fusha. Amiyya also varies from region to region: broadly speaking, it can be divided into Levantine, Gulf, Egyptian, and North African variants, though naturally there are also differences from country to country within those regions.

Many Arabic novels are written in fusha. *Ḥabbāt al-Naftāl ʾIn*, however, uses a blend of fusha and colloquial Iraqi vocabulary. Theroux thought his work on *Cities of Salt* qualified him to translate a book in the Levantine dialect. However, he found that gender was a crucial factor. In a translator's note not included in the published version of the novel, Theroux writes that he struggled with the language of *Mothballs* because

dictionaries largely ignore Arab women. While the most minute and obscure financial, scientific, and military vocabularies are represented in mainstream dictionaries, and are celebrated in specialized glossaries and other printed resources, the most wide and obvious world you can imagine--the daily life of a woman--is very hard to map linguistically. An Arab woman's speech, her relationships, her clothing, her habits, her wedding and married life, the traditions

by which she lives and raises her children, exist outside the close attention of philologists!¹⁰

Always a conscientious translator, Theroux's usual strategy when he encounters an unfamiliar word or idiom is to write to a native speaker and ask. For instance, the archive contains a whole folder of his correspondence with the Iraqi-Israeli professor Sasson Somekh, who helped him with tricky words and phrases in Naguib Mahfouz's *Children of the Alley* (*Awlad Haretna*).¹¹ However, Theroux suggests that this method did not work for *Mothballs*, because even male Arabic speakers are unfamiliar with certain female-specific words of Arabic:

I am used to dealing with texts of great difficulty, which raise problems solvable by a telephone call or a walk to my bookshelf. With *Mothballs*, I was rattling my begging bowl, so to speak, usually in front of my male colleagues, many of them Iraqi; sometimes their efforts to help me worked, sometimes they didn't.¹²

Mamdouh herself also tried to help Theroux with unfamiliar vocabulary words. The archive includes an eight-page dictionary that she made for Theroux with words from the first three chapters, defined in Arabic. She seems to have preemptively picked the words, rather than waiting for him to ask. For example, one of the words she defines is "madame," which she explains is a foreign word borrowed from French that conveys a sense of elegance.¹³ Maybe she did not realize that English has also borrowed "madame" from

¹⁰ Theroux, unpublished translator's note. *Mothballs* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

¹¹ Theroux to Somekh, 7 January 1992. *Children of the Alley* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

¹² Theroux, unpublished translator's note. *Mothballs* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

¹³ Mamdouh, dictionary for Theroux. *Mothballs* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

French and therefore Theroux would not struggle with the word. However, it is possible that she wanted to ensure that he understood that “madame” is not just another synonym for “missus” but carries an added connotation of elegance.

Theroux was not the only one out of his depth with a foreign language. Theroux habitually corresponds with authors on his translations, and Mamdouh was no exception. Mamdouh's willingness to review and approve the drafts of his translation was complicated by the fact that she is not fluent in English. With the help of her brother and her son, she made suggestions and corrections to the proofs, some of which were not entirely helpful. Often she crosses out words, only to suggest synonyms. Sometimes this is justified, for example, on page 11 of the proofs, where Mamdouh crosses out Theroux's translation “courtyard” and replaces it with “house.”¹⁴ It is easy to guess how the confusion happened: in an old-fashioned Iraqi house with a large central courtyard, a word that means “courtyard” could easily act as a synecdoche for the whole house. In other cases, it is hard to see how Mamdouh's suggestions add a meaningful difference. For example, in the scene in chapter three, in which Huda and her family visit the bathhouses, she replaces “cake” of soap for “pack” of soap. Perhaps there is a meaningful difference between “cake” and “pack,” but it seems likely that someone with a low proficiency in English might be confused about the word “cake” referring to an inedible substance.

Except where lack of vocabulary is clearly the only issue, however, Theroux generally respects Mamdouh's changes. The archive therefore acts as a record of the words, phrases, and symbols she thought were important enough to correct, though in this

¹⁴ Proofs with corrections by Mamdouh & family. *Mothballs* folder, Theroux Mss., Lilly Library.

particular instance, the record is complicated by Theroux's limited vocabulary in feminine Iraqi *amiyya* and Mamdouh's limited vocabulary in English.

Difficult and ambiguous language

One of the most frequent corrections Mamdouh makes in the proofs is correcting the person of the verbs. On most projects, this would be embarrassing: any translator worth his salt *should* know verb conjugations. However, the style of *Habbāt al-Naftāl īn* is experimental, with narration switching regularly between past and present tense and first, second, and third person. For those who complain that only domesticated, non-experimental novels are translated into English (Allen, Hartman), this is a major point in *Mothballs'* favor, which perhaps was not much consolation to Theroux.

Because of the way Arabic conjugates, these switches in person are not always immediately obvious in the past tense. In general, usually only the core consonants are written; vowels, which are written as diacritic marks, are optional. For example, the voweled version of the verb "to go" is "ذَهَبَ," whereas the unvoweled version is "ذهب." Most texts, except for the Quran and children's books, are unvoweled, and literate adults just know where the vowels are through force of habit. In the present tense, conjugations are marked by consonants, so there is no ambiguity about person. In the past tense, however, many of the conjugations are marked by vowels, so there is ambiguity in unvoweled texts. The unvoweled "ذهبت" for example, could be "I went" (ذَهَبْتُ), "you (masculine) went" (ذَهَبْتَ), "you (feminine) went" (ذَهَبْتِ), or "she went" (ذَهَبَتْ). Since *Habbāt al-Naftāl īn* was

unvoweled, there was often no way for Theroux to tell which conjugation Mamdouh had intended in any particular context.

It seems likely that some of the ambiguity was intentional in Arabic. Unless someone were to read the text out loud, it would not be necessary to make a decision about which conjugation was meant. This allows a much more natural fluidity between first, second, and third person in Arabic. English, however, does not allow the freedom of ambiguous conjugation, and in given context, Theroux was forced to choose one.

The bath scene in chapter three is a good example of the dizzying number of times Mamdouh switches conjugations in a short span of time.

In the first paragraph on this page, it is clear from the present-tense conjugations and enclitic object pronouns of the Arabic that the person must be second person feminine. Likewise, it is clear from the present-tense conjugation that the last paragraph must be in the first person. However, the verbs in the middle paragraph are anyone's guess: the verbs describing Huda are in the past tense, with no pronouns for clues. Second person masculine can be ruled out because Huda is feminine, but grammatically, that still leaves first person, second person feminine, and third person feminine.

Paragraph	Arabic	Gloss	English
1	يتسرب كل شيء من أمامك: الأيدي تأخذك، تكورك بين الأفضاء، تتادين باسم كل من تعرفين	You: second person enclitic object pronoun You know: 2nd fem. present	Everything passes before you : hands take you and cuddle you , calling you the names of everyone you know ...
2	ونظرت ببذاءة إلى كل تلك التفاصيل	1st past? 2nd fem. past? 3rd fem. past?	[She looks] I looked with loathing at all these details.
2	هناك كسبت أول الاكتشافات وفزت بأول الجولات وصرخت، لا، لا، وسط النعم الطويلة التي كنت تسمعها من الجميع	Made: 1st past? 2nd fem. past? 3rd fem. past? You hear: 2nd fem. past progressive	There she made her first discoveries and started at her first outings and shouted "No, no" among the long yes you hear from everyone else.

3	أفلت من الجميع، أترحلق بين السيقان، وقوالب بعيدا [sic] الصوابين تدفعني	I slip: 1st present Me: 1st person enclitic object pronoun	I slip away from them all, glide between their legs, and the cakes packs of soap push me far
---	--	---	---

Theroux's strategy seems to be: when in doubt, switch as many times as possible. For example, in the sentence "There she made her first discoveries and started at her first outings and shouted 'No, no' among the long yes you hear from everyone else," he switches from third person ("she made") to second person ("you hear"). Technically, "made" is one of the ambiguous past-tense verbs; there is no reason it couldn't also be second person, except that Theroux has fully committed to the switching by this point. Mamdouh does not correct his choice, which could mean that he chose the right conjugation, or, since "right" conjugation is almost meaningless in this context, she just does not care in this particular instance.

In other instances, however, Mamdouh does care. The "she looks" in the first sentence of the second paragraph, which Mamdouh replaces with "I looked," is another example of an ambiguous past tense verb. Like the "she made" in the same paragraph, there is nothing in the context that suggests this should be first person--no personal pronoun, no instance of first person in any of the surrounding sentences. Perhaps a native speaker would be able to pick up on why this verb should be first person instead of third. However, it could also be a case of the author telling the translator what is important. Though there is no grammatical reason why this verb should be first person, Mamdouh wrote this sentence

with the first person in mind, and it is important to her that this be preserved in the English translation.

These details are technical. However, they are worth mentioning because the style is one of the most noteworthy things about the novel--something that both English editions feel they need to warn readers about from the outset of the novel. Faqir mentions Mamdouh's stylistic quirks in her introduction to *Mothballs; Naphtalene* devotes a paragraph-long editor's note to it at the start of the first chapter. However, the English language's need for explicit pronouns before verbs might have forced Theroux to overemphasize the switching between conjugations. In Arabic, the changes are much more subtle, because it is not always immediately obvious that the conjugation *has* changed. However, English forced Theroux to make a decision on conjugation in every sentence.

Concluding Thoughts

According to Kelemen, "the role of textual criticism is... to attempt to reconstruct the ideal text from the imperfect versions in the various documents." The notion of ideal text is complicated in the case of a project like *Habbāt al-Naftāl Īn*. The Arabic edition is far from ideal, riddled as it is with typos. The differences between the two English editions further undermine the idea of one perfect ideal text. Is the foreignized or the domesticated version closer to the original? Superior in style? Then there are questions of how accurately Theroux rendered the language. Did Theroux understand all the nuances of feminine Iraqi dialect? Did Mamdouh understand the nuances of Theroux's translation enough to approve

the final draft? Given these language barriers, as revealed by Theroux's archive, it is possible that neither translation can claim to be an accurate reflection of the original text.

No matter how perfect the translation, the translator must inevitably make changes to the original to fit the constraints of a new language. *Ḥabbāt al-Naftāl īn*'s switches in conjugation are one such feature. The Arabic allows greater ambiguity in person, where English forces Theroux to make a choice between first, second, or third person on every verb. This stylistic choice, though unusual in both languages, makes the English translation more jarring than the Arabic original.

That said, the connotations and features that an author fights to keep reveal what is important about the text. Mamdouh's corrections on conjugation show when she thought it was important for a verb to be first, second, or third person. Likewise, her dictionaries provide a snapshot of which connotations she thought were important.

In any case, tracing these changes and choices would not be possible without the archives. It might seem strange to keep translators' papers, since unlike poets and authors, they do not create an original product. However, even for those concerned with reconstructing the "ideal text" from imperfect extant documents, translators' notes and correspondence provide vital information about the history and meaning of a work.

Works Cited

Allen, Roger. "The Happy Traitor: Tales of Translation." *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. 47, no. 4, 2010, pp. 472-486.

F.A. Haidar. Afterword. *Naphtalene*, by Alia Mamdouh. New York: The Feminist Press at the City University of New York, 2005.

Finkelstein, David, and Alistair McCleery. "Theorising the History of the Book." *An Introduction to Book History*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Hartman, Michelle. "Gender, Genre, and the (Missing) Gazelle: Arab Women Writers and the Politics of Translation." *Feminist Studies*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2012, pp. 17-49.

Kelemen, Erick. *Textual Editing and Criticism: An Introduction*. W.W. Norton and Company, 2009.

Mamdūh, 'Āliyah, and Peter Theroux. *Mothballs*. 1st English ed. Reading, UK: Garnet, 1996.

Mamdūh, 'Āliyah, and Peter Theroux. *Naphtalene : a Novel of Baghdad*. New York: The Feminist Press at the City University of New York, 2005.

"Scholarly Editions and Translations Grants." National Endowment for the Humanities.

Accessed 5 May 2018.

<https://www.neh.gov/grants/research/scholarly-editions-and-translations-grants>

Theroux Mss. *Mothballs* Folder. Lilly Library, Bloomington, Indiana.

Works Cited

Allen, Roger. "The Happy Traitor: Tales of Translation." *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. 47, no. 4, 2010, pp. 472-486.

F.A. Haidar. Afterword. *Naphtalene*, by Alia Mamdouh. New York: The Feminist Press at the City University of New York, 2005.

Finkelstein, David, and Alistair McCleery. "Theorising the History of the Book." *An Introduction to Book History*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Hartman, Michelle. "Gender, Genre, and the (Missing) Gazelle: Arab Women Writers and the Politics of Translation." *Feminist Studies*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2012, pp. 17-49.

Kelemen, Erick. *Textual Editing and Criticism: An Introduction*. W.W. Norton and Company, 2009.

Mamdūh, 'Āliyah, and Peter Theroux. *Mothballs*. 1st English ed. Reading, UK: Garnet, 1996.

Mamdūh, 'Āliyah, and Peter Theroux. *Naphtalene : a Novel of Baghdad*. New York: The Feminist Press at the City University of New York, 2005.

"Scholarly Editions and Translations Grants." National Endowment for the Humanities.

Accessed 5 May 2018. <https://www.neh.gov/grants/research/scholarly-editions-and-translations-grants>

Theroux Mss. *Mothballs* Folder. Lilly Library, Bloomington, Indiana.