An Overview of Contemporary Research on Retranslations and Retranslation Theory

Abderraouf CHOUIT

Mentouri Brothers University Constantine 1, ALGERIA

ch.raouf91@gmail.com

Abstract

The phenomenon of retranslation is as old as the phenomenon of translation itself. However, research on retranslation has only started to attract scholarly attention recently. It is well clear that various literary works are being translated and retranslated all the time. However, the real motives and reasons behind that are still relatively unexplored. One prevalent answer to that is encapsulated in the work of Antoine Berman (1990), who claims that first translations are domesticated, lacking, and are marked with what he called 'inherent failure', while subsequent retranslations are foreignized, accurate, and close to the original. The dynamic move from deficient first translations to great accomplished retranslations has been consolidated into what is now called in Translation Studies as the Retranslation Hypothesis (RH), mainly the underlying assumption that first translations of a given source text (ST) are domesticated while later retranslations are foreignized. Despite the recent scholarly interest in retranslations and the RH, this phenomenon has only been investigated by a handful of researchers. Therefore, conducting further in-depth studies on retranslations and testing and assessing the validity of the RH in empirical and systematic settings is, hence, of the utmost importance. These studies will greatly help gain better understanding of the dynamics of the complex phenomenon of retranslation and unravel the very nature of this unique and significant intercultural activity.

Key Words: Retranslation, Retranslation Hypothesis, Domestication, Foreignization, Culture.

Résumé

Le phénomène de la retraduction est ancien comme le phénomène de la traduction lui-même. Cependant, les recherches sur la retraduction ont récemment commencé à attirer l'attention des chercheurs. Il est bien clair que différent des travaux littéraires sont en train d'être traduits et retraduits tout le temps. Cependant, les motifs et les vraies raisons derrière ça, restent relativement inexplorés. La réponse la plus courante à cela, est encapsulée dans les travaux d'Antoine Berman (1990), qui prétend que les premières traductions sont localisées, lacuneuses, et sont frappées par « La non-traduction ». Tandis-que les traductions

subséquentes sont exotiques, Précises, et proches de l'original. Le passage dynamique à partir des premières traductions déficientes vers des retraductions idéales et accomplies, a été consolidé en ce qu'on appelle dans la traductologie : « l'hypothèse de la retraduction », principalement la supposition sous-jacent que la première traduction d'un texte d'une source donnée soit localisée tandis-que la retraduction du même texte est étrangère.

Malgré l'intérêt savant récent sur les retraductions et l'hypothèse de la retraduction, ce phénomène a été étudié par qu'une poignée de chercheurs. Donc, mener en profondeur les études sur la retraduction, tester et évaluer l'hypothèse de la retraduction dans des contextes empiriques et systématiques, et par conséquent, de la plus grande importance. Ces études vont être très utiles pour une meilleure compréhension des dynamiques de ce phénomène complexe qui est la retraduction et ainsi révéler la vraie nature de cette importante activité interculturelle.

Mots clés : Retraduction ; l'hypothèse de la retraduction ; localisation ; exotisation, culture.

Introduction

Retranslation, as a frequently-occuring age-old phenomenon, has always had a tangible presence. However, research into the subject is recent and quite limited. Serious research and theoretical discussions on retranslations started to take shape in 1990, when Antoine Berman and Paul Bensimon edited a special issue of the French journal *Palimpsestes*, in which they brought to the fore some very significant research topics of what was later coined the retranslation theory.

This Article is a review of the scholarly literature on retranslation, a phenomenon that still lacks detailed and systematic study. It summarizes the main key elements and contemporary research on retranslation. It starts by defining the complex concept of retranslation and unraveling the various denotations that it has. It also explores the different possible motives that lead to retranslation as they were suggested and thoroughly discussed by different translation scholars. Furthermore, it highlights the underlying assumptions of the so-called Retranslation Hypothesis (RH) followed by its criticism. Finally, it ends by focusing on the rational of studying retranslations and the reasons why they are deemed an interesting subject for study and research.

1. The Fuzzy Concept of Retranslation

Perhaps one of the most complicated problems in retranslation studies is related to the very definition of the concept itself. There seems to be no consensus among translation scholars on what the term may refer to. The concept of retranslation briefly refers to new translations of earlier translated texts. However, it can also refer to the process of translating a work that has already been translated into the same language. Therefore, it is used in a double sense to denote both the process of retranslating a work that has already been rendered into the same language and the result of that process (Gürçağlar, 2009).

Indeed, defining retranslation is by no means a clear-cut; in fact, the term can denote three different interpretations in Translation Studies.

1.1 Indirect Translation

The first denotation of the term retranslation may also be called indirect translation, intermediate translation, mediated translation or second hand translation, which refers to the process of translating a text through a mediating language which is different from the source language (SL) of the original text. This phenomenon takes place when the ST is no longer available or when there is no suitable bilingual dictionary in existence. It may also happen in weak poly systems which depend on other stronger poly systems for literary models, especially when the language of the prevailing system is vastly spoken (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2014, p. 76). A good and

typical example would be the different English versions of the Bible that have not been directly translated from Hebrew "the Old Testament" or Greek "the New Testament" (Feng, 2014, p.69). Another example of indirect translation would be the translation of Tolstoy's "War and Peace" into some European languages via French rather than Russian.

Despite the fact that indirect translation is very common in some parts of the world, it is not considered approved of unless it is absolutely necessary. That can be due to the fact that the ST in this case (which is a translated version of the original) may be inaccurate, biased, misinterpreted or flawed. This may very well result in the production of divergent and unfaithful translations of the original text (Landers, 2001, pp.130-131).

1.2 Back Translation

A second denotation of the term retranslation may be referred to as back translation, which means the process of translating a translated text back into the SL of that text. This procedure has been used extensively in literature and Bible translation for various aims. One of which is to illustrate the existing differences between the SL and target language (TL). It may also be used in contrastive linguistics as a technique to compare the specific syntactic, morphological, or lexical features of two or more languages. However, in Translation Studies, the term has been used by scholars (mainly Holmes) as an argument against the existence of real equivalence in poetry translation (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2014, pp. 14-15). According to Newmark (1993), back translation can be used to measure the level of deviation between the original and the translation. It may also be used to explain translation examples to readers who are unfamiliar with the TL (p. 124). Another important use of back translation is to verify the conformity of the two versions so as to correct the original from ambiguous or unclear formulations that have resulted in errors in the TL (Sfetcu, 2015).

1.3 New or Multiple Translations

The last denotation of the term retranslation, which is the most commonly used, and the one that is going to be used throughout this paper, refers to either the act of translating a work that has already been translated into the same language or the result of that process. According to Koskinen and Paloposki (2010, p. 294), retranslation as a product refers to a second or later translation of a single ST into the same TL, while retranslation as a process refers to a phenomenon that takes place over a period of time. In a similar vein, Susam-Sarajeva (2003, p. 02) defines retranslation as a "subsequent translation of a text, or part of a text, which is carried out after the first translation that introduced the text to the same TL". As stated by Berman (1990, pp. 01-05), "toute traduction faites après la première d'une oevre est donc une

retraduction". He argues that retranslation is seen as an act of betterment of initial translations that are deemed "blind" and "hesitant". That is to say, these initial translations may be blind to either the meaning and the stylistics of the ST, or to the needs and expectations of the target readership. In the first case, these initial translations are seen as adaptive, domesticating and even unfaithful to the ST, while in the second case, they could be regarded as literal and inarticulate (Hanna, 2016, pp. 128-129).

While Berman considers retranslation as a movement towards a better and more accomplished translation, AntoinPym in his book *Method in Translation History* makes distinction between two types of retranslation: passive and active retranslations. Passive retranslations refer to those that are separated by geographical area and time and do not compete against each other. Active retranslations, on the other hand, include those that share the same cultural location and generation and are rivals that often compete against each other.This may be due to disagreements over the translation strategies used by different translators in rendering the work(as cited in Gürçağlar, 2009). Vanderschelden (2000) uses the metaphors "hot" and "cold" to distinguish between first translations of a given work and its subsequent retranslations. According to her, hot translations refer to those translations that take place soon after the publication of the ST, whereas cold translations refer to the retranslations of the ST that are undertaken later on. In her point of view, cold translations make use of the knowledge of previous translations of the ST, their evaluation, and the critical reception of the work by the target readers and culture, which may very well have an impact on the new interpretation and retranslation of the work (as cited in Brownlie, 2006).

The first and second definitions of the term retranslation will be disregarded in this article so as to keep our focus within the scope of retranslation studies. Therefore, retranslation in this paper will only refer to new translations of a ST that has already been translated within a given TL.

2. Motives of Retranslation

Although all kinds of texts can be retranslated, sacred texts and canonical literary works have been and they are still the most frequently translated works. While retranslating literature is regarded as a rather positive phenomenon, as it contributes to the diversity and leads to the broadening of the existing interpretations of literary works in the TL and TC, retranslating non-literary works, such as scientific and technical texts for example, is generally viewed as redundant and is generally avoided (Gürçağlar, 2009, p. 233). But why are texts translated again? What are the reasons that may lead to a second translation of a given text?

According to Berman (1990), retranslation is considered an essential act of repetition that gives rise to various versions of the ST in the TL. In his article, he mentions the "issue of ageing" of a given translation with the passage of time as the main reason of issuing subsequent translations. According to Berman (1990), retranslations are required so as to update initial translations and make them less archaic or clumsy to readers. In his opinion, while the ST remains forever young, the translation ages and needs to be replaced with fresher and more accurate versions. Berman (1990) points out :

Alors que les originaux restent éternellement jeunes (quel que soit le degré d'intérêt que nous leur portons, leur proximité ou leur éloignement culturel), les traductions, elles, « vieillissent ». Correspondant à un état donné de la langue, de la littérature, de la culture, il arrive, souvent assez vite, qu'elles ne répondent plus à l'état suivant. Il faut, alors, retraduire, car la traduction existante ne joue plus le rôle de révélation et de communication des œuvres. (p. 01)

In his article entitled *Retranslation and the Ideosomatic Drift*, Robinson (1999) rejects the idea of "timeless" originals and "ageing" translations. He considers the idea of outdated translations rather simplistic. Taking specifically literary classics as an example, he asserts that there is a host of different other reasons that may trigger the retranslation of literary works and that only some of which are related to the passage of time. He further suggests that a given literary work may come to be retranslated if it is felt by editors, translators, or even ordinary readers that the translation does not reflect the greatness of the original work. This may lead to the publication of a retranslated version so that it would capture more of the original's properties (pp. 01-02).

In a similar vein, while using a different argument, Susam-Sarajeva (2003) points out that retranslations are not necessarily the result of ageing first translations or changing times. She claims that a text may be translated more than once within a very short span of time (p. 05). Considering the multiple translations of French theorist Barthes into Turkish in a quite short time span, she concludes that retranslations may emerge as a result of synchronous struggle in the TC to create "an indigenous literary critical discourse through competing terminological proposals in translation" (Brownlie, 2006, pp. 156-157). Susam-Sarajeva (2003)further argues that retranslations may have more to do with the needs and attitudes in the TC rather than any inherent characteristics of the ST, which makes it likely to get retranslated (p. 26).

Another reason for retranslation, as Brownlie (2006) states, may be due to the changing social contexts and the evolution of translation norms. She further explains that changing ideologies as well as literary, linguistic, and translational norms may very well result in the production of different translations (p. 167). Similarly, Desmidt

(2009) supposes that retranslations result from the wish to meet the needs of the receiving culture, mainly when these requirements are no longer met by existing translations (p. 670).

Venuti (2013), on the other hand, introduces multiple causes for retranslation. He states that retranslations could be published for economic reasons. He points out that publishers may choose to invest in a retranslation so as to capitalize in the market. This means that the reason in this case for retranslation is primarily economic rather than literary or scholarly. He also claims that retranslations may also be published so as to reassert and strengthen the power and authority of a given social institution, such as religious or academic establishments (p. 97). He further explains that texts are sometimes retranslated within a new ideological context in order to reposition themselves in a given culture (the case of feminist retranslations is a good example). Venuti also arguesthat there are sometimes simpler explanations for retranslations, such as the lack of coordination and communication among publishers which may lead to the simultaneous publication of two or more translations. In that case, the result (the translated text) may be seen as initial and as a retranslation at the same time (as cited in Gürçağlar, 2009).

In her examination of translated children's literature into Hebrew, Du-Nour (1995) finds a close correspondence between the evolution of linguistic and stylistic norms and the publication of new retranslations. She argues that readability was the main reason behind later retranslations, as first translations were of high language and less readable, which reflected the prevailing translation norm in the 1920s (p. 327).

Another claim is made by Kujamäki (2001). After analysing eight different German retranslations of Kivi's Finish work entitled "*Seitsemän veljestä*", which were undertaken between 1901 and 1997, he concludes that retranslations may be caused by ideological and political factors, especially when it comes to retranslating canonical literary texts (p. 47).

According to Paloposki and Koskinen (2004), introducing the source culture (SC) to the target culture (TC) is deemed another reason for retranslation. In their opinion, if the ST seems foreign to the TC's readers or translators, the result will be the production of a domesticated version of that text, as the translator will share and acknowledge the unfamiliarity of the ST with the target readers and produce a text which is more comprehensible to them. However, later translators will benefit from the increased familiarity with the SC and, then, retranslate the text to produce a more source-oriented and more accurate version of the text (p. 28). They also claim that retranslation also contributes in keeping the status of classics. They reckon that a retranslation becomes a classic more easily than a one-off translation. This may lead,

according to them, to boost the sales of older works (Paloposki & Koskinen, 2010, p. 35).

The need to update and modernize the language of a particular translation, the publication of an extended or revised version of the ST, or the discovery of mistakes and misinterpretations in an initial translation may very well also lead to the publication a new retranslation (Gürçağlar, 2009, p. 235).

Gambier (1994) states that the increased knowledge of the ST and SC may also motivate retranslations to emerge (415).

Toury suggests that retranslations are produced to overcome a deficiency in the target system and introduce something that was not there before. He considers translation as an act of planning as it always includes changes in the TC (as cited in Gürçağlar, 2009).

Contrary to that, Massardier-Kenney (2015) contends that retranslations do not necessarily emerge from deficiency, weakness or inadequacy in previous translations, but from the unacknowledged power of translation to constitute a text as literature and also to make the process through which literature is constituted apparent (p. 73).

Vanderschelden (2000) puts forward five different reasons to justify retranslations. According to her, retranslations happen in the following cases :

01-   When the existing translation of a given ST is lacking or unsatisfactory and cannot be revisited efficiently.

02-   When a new version of the ST is released and becomes the standard reference. This results in the retranslation of already translated works from the new ST.

03-   When the existing TT is considered outdated from a stylistic point of view, a retranslation is therefore mandatory.

04-   When there are new interpretations of the ST in the TC that may justify retranslations.

05-   When retranslations have a particular function in the TL (a good example would be the synchronic retranslations for British and American markets).

Venderschelden (2000) explains that retranslations may very well contribute to the revival of forgotten literary texts (pp. 3-13).

As it can be seen, texts can be retranslated for a whole host of different reasons. These reasons may be related to political, economic, literary, cultural, historical, ideological and aesthetic factors. Therefore, in order to understand the complex phenomenon of retranslation, all these factors and reasons should be taken into consideration.

3. The Retranslation Hypothesis

The theoretical assumptions on retranslation were introduced first by Berman (1990), Bensimon (1990) and later by Gambier (1994) and Chesterman (2000). Those scholars founded and formulated what is known today in Translation Studies as the "Retranslation Hypothesis" (RH).

3.1 Berman's Notion of the Retranslation Hypothesis

The basis of the retranslation hypothesis originated in an article written by Berman (1990) entitled *"La retraduction comme espace de la traduction"* published in a special issue of the French journal *"Palimpsestes"*. In his article, Berman (1990) claims that translation is an incomplete act that can only be accomplished through the act of retranslation: "Dans ce domaine d'essentiel inaccomplissement qui caractérise la traduction, c'est seulement aux retraductions qu'il incombe d'atteindre — de temps en temps — l'accompli" (p. 01).

Accomplishment, according to Berman (1990), means the success in getting close to the soul of the ST and representing its letter and form. He argues that all translations are marked with what he called "failure" and that this failure is at its peak in first translations. He states "Toute traduction est défaillante. . . Ce qui veut dire: toute traduction est marquée par de la « non-traduction ». Et les premières traductions sont celles qui sont le plus frappées par la non- traduction" (p. 05).

Berman (1990) further claims that retranslation arises from the need to suppress, or at least reduce, the failure of first translations. Berman (1990) believes that it is only via setting out retranslations over time that great translations emerge (pp. 01-07). Therefore, retranslation for Berman is deemed as a restorative operation which corrects and fixes the deficiencies of initial translations. Berman's position and arguments are greatly influenced by the German Romanticism, notably the scholar and theorist "Johann Goethe". According to Goethe in his *"West-Östlicher Divan",* which was translated by Robinson (2014), there are three stages of translation within a given culture. The first epoch of translation introduces the work and makes us more familiar with the foreign country on our terms. The second kindis'parodistic' in which the translator appropriates the foreign meaning of the text and, then, represents it with his own. The third epoch of translation, which is regarded as the finest and highest, seeks to make the translation as close as possible, or rather identical to the original work, so

that the translation does not exist instead of the original work, but it rather exists in its place. According to Goethe, the notion of time is regarded as a progress towards achieving perfect translations; that is to say, the repetitive and chronological act of translation will reveal the true identity of a given text within the TC (pp. 222-223).

Berman (1990) seems to follow the same rationale in his article. According to him, all human actions, in order to be accomplished, need repetition, and translation is no exception. He claims that it is only in the aftermath of a blind and hesitant first translation that the possibility for an accomplished translation rises "C'est dans l'après-coup d'une première traduction aveugle et hésitante que surgit la possibilité d'une traduction accomplie" (pp. 4-5).

The main difference between first translations and retranslations does not lie in the terms used by translators to express the original ideas, but it rather lies on the understanding of the ST. In other words, while first translations understand the text from the standpoint of the TC, retranslations do the same thing but from that of the SC. This difference means that there may be more intentional or unintentional misunderstanding or misinterpretations in first translations than retranslations, which may justify the existence of retranslations and the fact that they have fewer mistakes and errors than initial translations (Sankar, Jaya, &Jain, 2016, p. 20).

This progressive movement towards accomplishment, according to Berman (1990), will eventually yield what he called "grandes traductions". He states that great translations come at the right time and can only be made by great translators. In Berman's terms, great translations are defined by abundance and richness : "Dans la retraduction accomplie règne une abondance spécifique: richesse de la langue, extensive ou intensive, richesse du rapport à la langue de l'original, richesse textuelle, richesse signifiante, etc" (p. 05).

3.2 Bensimon's Notion of the Retranslation Hypothesis

In the preface of the same journal, Bensimon (1990) seems to share the same stance. He asserts that first translations are naturalizations of foreign works that seek to introduce the foreign culture to the target audience. He claims that first translations tend to favor the target audience and culture, and that is by reducing the alterity of the ST. The reason behind that is for them to be accepted and integrated in the target polysystem and cultural sphere. Bensimon (1990, p. 01) claims :

« La première traduction procède souvent – a souvent procédé – à une naturalisation de l'œuvre étrangère; elle tend à réduire l'altérité de cette œuvre afin de mieux l'intégrer à une culture autre. Elle s'apparente fréquemment — s'est fréquemment apparentée — à l'adaptation en ce qu'elle est peu respectueuse des

formes textuelles de l'original. La première traduction vise généralement à acclimater l'œuvre étrangère en la soumettant à des impératifs socio-culturels qui privilégient le destinataire de l'œuvre traduite ».

According to Bensimon (1990), first translations are domestications of foreign works that need to ensure a positive reception by the target readers.

Bensimon (1990) considers retranslation as an individual and cultural activity that cannot be separated from the culture, ideology, and literature of a given society at any given time in history. He believes that when the target reader is already acquainted with the ST, the translator will no longer need to maintain the distance between the SC and TC; therefore, he will try to deliver the original letter and form of the ST with its exoticism and foreignness to the target readers. He argues that when time has elapsed since the first translation of a given work, the reader will then be ready to receive and perceive the work in its irreducible strangeness and foreignness. For these reasons, Bensimon seems to think that later retranslations tend to maintain the foreign aspects of the ST and be more source-oriented than initial translations (p. 01).

Besides Berman (1990) and Bensimon (1990), other theorists have taken up the idea that first translations are target-oriented and that later translations are source-oriented, mainly Gambier (1994) and Chesterman (2000).

3.3 Gambier's Notion of the Retranslation Hypothesis

In his Article entitled "*La Retraduction, Retour Et Detour*", Gambier (1994) sees retranslations firmly linked to the notion of evolution and to the needs and preferences of the receiving culture "la notion de réactualisation des textes, déterminée par l'évolution des récepteurs, de leurs goûts, de leurs besoins, de leurs compétences" (p. 413). Retranslations, according to Gambier, are therefore seen as some sort of consequence of evolution in the receiving system.

Gambier puts forward similar arguments to those of Berman and Bensimon. He states that while first translations tend to be rather assimilative and reduce the "otherness" of the ST due to local constraints, retranslations, on the other hand, would mark a return to the ST. Gambier (1994, p. 414) claims,

On peut prétendre qu' une premiere traduction a toujours tendance a etre plutôt assimilatrice, a réduire l'alterite au nom d'imperatifs culturels, editoriaux: on fait des coupures, on réarrange l'original au nom d'une certain lisibilite, elle-meme critère de vente. La retraduction dans ces conditions consisterait en un *retour* au texte-source.

Gembier, therefore, suggests that when first translations are judged to be unacceptable, deficient or blind, retranslations emerge in an effort to get close to the

ST (pp. 414-415). According to him, retranslation is hence considered as a process of improvement throughout the course of time, which is based on an immanent meaning contained in the ST (as cited in Gürçağlar, 2009).

Gambier (1994, p. 414) further argues that retranslations are brought about to exceed the blindness of first deficient translations in an effort to getcloser to the ST "L'aveuglement des premiers traducteurs serait depasse par les denegations des seconds, dans leur effort pour se rapprocherde la source".
However, the core of the RH as it is known and described today has been formulated by Chesterman.

3.4 Chesterman's Notion of the Retranslation Hypothesis

Chesterman (2000) claims that the so-called retranslation hypothesis is a descriptive hypothesis that can be formulated as follows: later translations (same ST, same TL) tend to be closer to the original than earlier ones. In other words, first translations are inclined towards the target audience whereas retranslations tend to be more source-oriented by bringing the readers closer to the ST, SL, and SC (p. 23). In other words, the RH may be seen as an interpretive hypothesis that proclaims that only later translations can be "great translations" or as a descriptive hypothesis that measures the distance between STs and TTs and describes later translations as more source-oriented (Paloposki & Koskinen, 2010, p. 31).

Chesterman (2000) maintains that there seems to be evidence to both support and reject the RH; that is to say, as far as the corroboration of the RH is concerned, the "jury is still out" (p. 23). Chesterman (2004) suggests that this is not a statement of fact, but it is rather a claim that might be true or worth considering (p. 01). Although it is true that Chesterman is the scholar who coined the current version of the RH, his claim is based on previous statements of Gambier (1994), Bensimon (1990) and Berman (1990). Hence, it is safe to say that all of these scholars are responsible for the introduction and formulation of the RH as it is known today.

For those scholars, retranslations succeed previous translations in a linear fashion. That is to say, retranslations come up as time passes to replace initial translations of a given text and be successful in delivering its letter and form. In other words, subsequent retranslations, as the RH suggests, are presumed to succeed in bringing forth more appropriate and faithful texts closer to the original. In short, in one way or another, retranslations are "better" than previous and initial translations (Susam-Sarajeva, 2003, p. 02). In a similar vein, Lewis (2004) seems to share the same stance. He claims,

« The very possibility of translating strongly derives from that of reading insightfully, and the latter derives in turn from a familiarity that can only be gained over time. The closer a translation of a monumental text. . . is to the original's date of publication, the more likely it is to be unduly deficient ». (p. 281)

Since its introduction as an empirical hypothesis, The RH has created some theoretical discussions on its validity, and more importantly, on how to construct valid methods to test it. According to Koskinen and Paloposki (2010), it is proving extremely hard to measure the level of "closeness", "greatness", or "accuracy" of translations. This is true due to the multiple explanations and definitions of the terms, and the way they can be measured against different units of comparison, such as culture specific items, syntax, style, dialect, and so on, which makes it really hard to compare the results of existing studies (p. 296).

The theoretical aspects of retranslating literature, though detailed and insightful, often address issues other than retranslation itself, such as norms, strategies, or audience expectations (Paloposki & Koskinen, 2010, p. 30). That is to say, as Susam-Sarajeva (2003) puts it, "there is no detailed or systematic study on retranslations per se". she supports her claim saying, "Although the practice itself is common, theoretical discussions on the subject are rather rare. Retranslations often serve as case studies illuminating other aspects of translational research rather than drawing attention onto themselves as a topic in its own right" (p. 02).

This lack of inquiry may very well be due to the predominant assumption that initial translations are always lacking and flawed and that later retranslations are more accurate and closer to the original. According to Paloposki and Koskinen (2004), although various studies dealt with retranslation, such as those of Lefevere, Du-Nour, Kujamäki, Tymoczko, and Oittinen, RH has not been tested extensively in any of these. Therefore, they stress the need to test the RH in empirical settings (p. 28). They claim that numerous retranslations do, indeed, fit into the RH schema, but there also exist some counter examples in which this schema is turned the other way round (p. 36). That is to say, the underlying assumption about lacking, deficient assimilating first translations and more accurate, great, source-oriented target oriented subsequent retranslations do not always seem to hold true against empirical data. Therefore, it is clear enough that the RH needs more testing in empirical and systematic settings so as to better the understanding and comprehension of the dynamics of the complex phenomenon of retranslation.

4. Retranslation Hypothesis Criticism

The above notions on the RH can be summarized in two points :

01-   First translations tend to be target-culture biased (domesticated) while later subsequent retranslations tend to be source-culture biased (foreignized).

02-   First translations are less accurate and full of mistakes while later subsequent retranslations are more accurate, close to the original, canonical and great translations.

In consideration of these points, there are several studies that have challenged the underlying assumptions of the RH. These studieshave been conducted by:Susam-Sarajeva, Brisset, Koskinen and Paloposki, Brownlie, Desmidt, Deane and O"Driscoll.

Research conducted by Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) on the Finish translation and retranslation of Alice's Adventures in Wonderland (by Lewis Carroll) and The Vicar of Wakefield (by Oliver Goldsmith) reveals the inexistence of the alleged linear progression from first domesticated translations to subsequent foreignized ones. The research data they gathered support the RH only within a specific period of time. The conclusion they reached suggests that the RH may apply only during the initial stage in the development of literature and not for all (re)translations. In other words, they claim that domesticated first translations may appear in a phase of literature and it is by no means a general feature of translation. Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) question some of the RH concepts such as closeness, accuracy and improvement and consider them dependent on the observer's viewpoint (p. 36).

Deane's (2011) research on the retranslation of Flaubert's Madame Bovary reveals the same conclusion and shows that the so-called RH is "untenable when confronted with the polymorphous behaviour of retranslation, both within and without the text" (p. I).

Susam-Sarajeva (2003) criticizes Gambier's teleological view of retranslation that claims that retranslation process improves over time. She also claims that retranslations are not necessarily the consequence of ageing translations and they are by no means the result of deficient and assimilative existing translations (p. 05).

Brownlie (2006) combines in her research narrative theory and retranslation theory to analyze the retranslation of Nana (by Emile Zola). Her findings indicate that there does not appear to be a movement towards improvement or the production of canonical translations. She claims that it is very hard to say that the translations improve in any way (p. 166).

Desmidt (2009) argues, after analyzing a corpus of 52 German and 18 Dutch translated versions of the children's classic book "*Nils Holgerssons underbara resa genom Sverige*" (by Selma Lagerlöf), that the RH does not have a general validity, as the corpus did not support it. She claims that recent versions did not turn out to be closer and more truthful to the original than earlier versions. She contends that the hypothesis may certainly be valid to some extent only if it is not formulated in absolute terms (p. 679).

Other scholars including Hanna, Susam-Sarajeva, Pym and Jenn claim that there is no existing straightforward link between the passage of time and the need for retranslation. They argue that there are lots of texts that get retranslated in a rather short span of time (as cited in Gürçağlar, 2009).

5. Rationale for Doing Research on Retranslations

Despite all the already-mentioned criticism on retranslation theory, there are lots of reasons why conduncting research on retranslations is considered extremely fruitful.

Without doubt, one of the most important reasons for studying retranslations is related to the significance of the results they offer for translation history research. Unlike studies on single translations, retranslations help uncover the sociocultural conditions and norms of the time when different translations were undertaken. In other words, if we focus on single translations, we may only uncover the norms and sociocultural conditions of a single period in history. However, studies on retranslations enable us to perform diachronic and synchronic analyses. Diachronic studies on retranslation will aid us disclose the different attitudes, expectations, and interpretations of the receiving culture towards authors and their different works. Synchronic studies on retranslations will contribute greatly to our understanding of similar and different translation objects and subjects, such as translators and translation norms (Tian, 2017, p. 10).

In addition to that, studies on retranslation offer researchers a wide field of study. To put it differently, they enable researchers explore the relation between the ST and several TTs and compare these TTs to identify their intertextual relation.

Moreover, studies on retranslations can be considered as a kind of dynamic research, as they allow the investigation of the development and change of sociocultural evolution and translation activity and offer significant contributions to cultural and translation studies.

Finally, as Tian (2017) puts it, conducting solid research on retranslations may very well result in the exploration of new methods, new paradigms, and may lead to new directions in Translation Studies as a whole (p. 10).

Conclusion

In a nutshell, we tried in this paper to provide an overview of the scholarly literature on contemporary research on retranslations and retranslation theory. Indeed, retranslation has become a hot and interesting subject of research in recent years. Issues regarding the real motives of retranslation, hypotheses and laws of retranslation, approaches and methods of analyzing retranslations, or even the very definition of retranslation itself are still creating theoretical discussions and springing up heated debates among translation scholars. The theoretical body of literature on retranslation, though insightful and detailed, is still limited and far from satisfactory. Hence, it is paramount to expand the boundaries of retranslation studies and conduct further in-depth research that extends beyond isolated case studies so as to fully fathom and comprehend the ins and outs of this complex phenomenon.

References

[1] Bensimon, P. (1990). Présentation. Palimpsestes, 4, IX-XIII. Retrieved from http://palimpsestes.revues.org/598

[2]Berman, A. (1990). La retraductioncommeespace de la traduction. *Palimpsestes*, *4*, 1-7. doi:10.4000/palimpsestes.596

[3] Brownlie, S. (2006). Narrative theory and retranslation theory. *Across Languages and Cultures*, *7*(2), 145-170. doi:10.1556/acr.7.2006.2.1

[4] Chesterman, A. (2000). A causal model for translation studies. In M. Olohan (Ed.), *Intercultural faultlines: Research models in translation studies I: Textual and cognitive aspects* (pp. 15-27). Manchester, United Kingdom: St. Jerome Publishing.

[5] Chesterman, A. (2004). Hypotheses about translation universals. In G. Hansen, K. Malmkjær, & D. Gile (Eds.), *Claims, changes and challenges in translation studies: Selected contributions from the EST congress, Copenhagen 2001* (pp. 1-14). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[6] Deane, S. (2011). *Confronting the retranslation hypothesis: Flaubert and Sand in the British literary system* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Edinburgh). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

[7] Desmidt, I. (2009). (Re)translation revisited. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*, *54*(4), 669-683. doi:10.7202/038898ar

[8] Du-Nour, M. (1995). Retranslation of children's books as evidence of changes of norms. *Target International Journal of Translation Studies*, *7*(2), 327-346. doi:10.1075/target.7.2.08dun

[9] Feng, L. (2014). Retranslation hypotheses revisited: A case study of two English translations of "SanguoYanyi" - the first Chinese novel. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, *43*, 69-86. doi:10.5842/43-0-209

[10] Gambier, Y. (1994). La retraduction, retour et détour. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*, *39*(3), 413-417. doi:10.7202/002799ar

[11] Gürçağlar, S. T. (2009). Retranslation. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (2nd ed., pp. 233-236). London and New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

[12] Hanna, S. (2016). *Bourdieu in translation studies: The socio-cultural dynamics of Shakespeare translation in Egypt*. New York: Routledge.

[13] Koskinen, K., & Paloposki, O. (2010). Retranslation. In Y. Gambier & L. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 294-298). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[14] Kujamäki, P. (2001). Finnish comet in German skies. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, *13*(1), 45-70. doi:10.1075/target.13.1.04kuj

[15] Landers, C. E. (2001). *Literary translation: A practical guide*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

[16] Lewis, P. (2004). The measure of translation effects. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 264-283). London and New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

[17] Massardier-Kenney, F. (2015). Toward a rethinking of retranslation. *Translation Review*, *92*(1), 73-85. doi:10.1080/07374836.2015.1086289

[18] Newmark, P. (1993). *Paragraphs on translation*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

[19] Paloposki, O., & Koskinen, K. (2004). A thousand and one translations: Revisiting retranslation. In G. Hansen, K. Malmkjær, & D. Gile (Eds.), *Claims, changes and challenges in translation studies: Selected contributions from the EST congress, Copenhagen 2001*(pp. 27-38). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[20] Paloposki, O., & Koskinen, K. (2010). Reprocessing texts. The fine line between retranslating and revising. *Across Languages and Cultures*, *11*(1), 29-49. doi:10.1556/acr.11.2010.1.2

[21] Robinson, D. (1999). Retranslation and ideosomatic drift. Retrieved from http://www.umass.edu/french/people/profiles/documents/Robinson.pdf

[22] Robinson, D. (2014). *Western translation theory from herodotus to nietzsche*. London and New York: Routledge.

[23] Sankar, G., Jaya, K., & Jain, N. (2016). Revisting retranslation hypothesis in Goethe's and Lu Xun's selected works. *International Journal of English Literature and Culture*, *4*(2), 19-23. doi:10.14662/IJELC2016.009

[24] Sfetcu, N. (2015). *How to translate: English translation guide in European Union*. Charleston: CreateSpace.

[25] Shuttleworth, M., & Cowie, M. (2014). *Dictionary of translation studies*. Abingdon, United Kingdom: Routledge.

[26] Susam-Sarajeva, S. (2003). Multiple-entry visa to travelling theory: Retranslations of literary and cultural theories. *Target International Journal of Translation Studies*, *15*(1), 1-36. doi:10.1075/target.15.1.02sus

[27] Tian, C. (2017). Retranslation theories: A critical perspective. *English Literature and Language Review*, *3*(1), 1-11. Retrieved from http://arpgweb.com/?ic=journal&journal=9&info=aims

[28] Vanderschelden, I. (2000). Why retranslate the French classics? The impact of retranslation on quality. In M. Salama-Carr (Ed.), *On translating French literature and film II* (pp. 1-18). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Rodopi.

[29] Venuti, L. (2013). *Translation changes everything: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.