

Submitted: 4 Jan, 2021

Accepted: 10 Jan, 2021

## INTRODUCTION

**Snježana Veselica Majhut, University of Zagreb**

This issue of *Hieronymus* is dedicated to retranslation, a topic that has recently attracted substantial interest in translation studies. Though an old practice, the phenomenon of retranslation was not systematically explored until relatively recently. An impetus to the growing scholarly interest in this phenomenon was given by the special issue of *Palimpsestes* devoted to the topic of retranslation, edited by Antoine Berman and Paul Bensimon (1990).

Berman and Bensimon's initial theoretical discussion of the nature of retranslations provoked extensive empirical research and scholarly exchange over the profile of retranslation and possible reasons for their existence. To put it simply, according to Berman (cited in Paloposki and Koskinen 2004: 27), the main reason for launching new translations of a source text into the same target language lies in the fact that first translations are somehow "deficient". This view is based on the premise that the production of translations is characterized by linear progression, and that a "great" or perfect translation may be achieved only after several attempts have been made to introduce a foreign work into the target culture. Related to this is the assumption that retranslations tend to be closer to the source text than first translations, which are viewed as "introductory translations". Further reasons for launching retranslations are linked to the notion of the "ageing" of translations, which, unlike source texts, become old-fashioned and need to be updated. The essence of the argument presented in *Palimpsestes* came to be known as the Retranslation Hypothesis. A number of case studies aiming to test the Retranslation Hypothesis have since been conducted. While in some cases the

hypothesis has been supported to some extent (Brownlie 2006, Dastjerdi and Mohammadi 2013), most of the research has pointed out that a wide range of other factors apart from those included in the hypothesis should be taken into account (Paloposki and Koskinen 2004, Koskinen and Paloposki 2010) and that the hypothesis may not be valid for all text types (Desmidt 2009)

Apart from the motivation for retranslations and their profile, a host of other issues related to this phenomenon has lately been addressed. In addition to the fundamental question of how to define retranslation as a product and how to draw a line between various forms of intralingual "rewriting" (Koskinen and Paloposki 2010; Desmidt 2009) the specific role of the different agents involved (translators, editors, publishers, censors, reviewers, and readers) and economic considerations related to the decisions to retranslate or revise an existing translation have been addressed. While a number of possible motives for retranslations have been identified, there is still a need to support some of them by solid empirical research. The present issue contains four case studies that aim to provide empirical evidence on various aspects of retranslation.

**Veronika Mesić** challenges the universal validity of the Retranslation Hypothesis by analysing the first translation and retranslation of Joyce's *Ulysses* into Croatian. In her study, Mesić raises the issue of how to measure the closeness or proximity of the target text to the source text, as one of the central elements of the Retranslation Hypothesis. The author applies Chesterman's taxonomy of translation strategies to codify the translators' interventions and obtain quantitative data on occurrences of these interventions, considered to be a parameter of the closeness to the source text. Another parameter is the preservation of the use of creative language and the estranging effect of the source text, one of the main features of modernist writing. Mesić's case study shows that the profile of first translations and retranslations may be influenced by factors not posited in the retranslation hypothesis, such as "the individual style and decisions of the translator".

Yet another case study in this issue addresses the problems of translating modernist literature. **Matea Vraneković** compares two Croatian translations of Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury* focusing on translation shifts employed, seen as an indicator of the target text's closeness to the source text. The results of the analysis support the Retranslation Hypothesis, as the first translation contains more shifts from formal correspondence than the retranslation, which exhibits fewer deviations from the source text. This study highlights the complexity of the factors that should be taken into consideration when studying retranslations, in particular the impact that the expectations of the target culture readership may have on the (re)translator's decisions.

The impact of a target culture context on the linguistic features of first translations and retranslations and their reception is addressed by **Marta Brajnović**. Brajnović combines a quantitative analysis of the use of English loan words, in particular slang expressions, in the first, Soviet-period translation of Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye* and one of the retranslations published in contemporary Russia with a thorough analysis of their paratexts. The study provides an insight into the role of particular patronage networks (Lefevere 1985/2014, 1992) operating in the Soviet Union and into the dominant attitudes towards retranslations of canonized works, which have been massively produced in the post-Soviet period.

**Dora Lukač** presents a comparative analysis of first translations and retranslations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* into Russian and Croatian. The rendering of the names of characters in allegorical works is particularly challenging for the translator. In addition, translations of *Animal Farm* are interesting because of the influences of the political and socio-cultural context on their publication and reception in communist countries. The strategies of rendering proper names could be viewed as contributing to the orientation (assimilating, exoticizing, neutralizing or informative) of the entire target text. Instead of tracing linear chronological progress towards the exoticizing pole, as predicted by the Retranslation Hypothesis, Lukač observes a tendency towards a "circular motion" (Deane 2011) in Russian

target texts, with the first retranslation being more “domesticating” than the first translation. On the other hand, the first translation and retranslation into Croatian, though produced in different periods, do not exhibit differences in text level orientation.

As it can be seen from the studies presented in this issue, the research on retranslation may be conducted from various perspectives: from textual analysis of first translations and retractions of canonized works in an attempt to get an insight into the profile of retractions to the investigation of paratext (understood in its broadest sense) in order to identify specific socio-cultural influence on (re)translation. The wide range of currently discussed issues related to retranslation, including the impact of digitalisation on theoretical conceptualization of retranslation, the role of retractions of non-literary texts in specific cultural contexts, the mode of retranslation (or re-subtitling) in audiovisual translation, the exploration of the process of retranslation, the ethical issues related to the act of retranslation, to mention just a few, is an apt illustration of the expanding scope of this field of inquiry. This may come as no surprise, if we invoke the claim made by Isabelle Collombat that the 21st century is the “Age of Retranslation” (cited in Sanz Gallego and Van Poucke 2019: 10). We hope this issue will provide an impetus to further research on retranslation.

## References

- Bensimon, Paul. 1990. “Présentation”. *Palimpsestes* XIII(4): ix-xiii.
- Berman, André. 1990. “La retraduction comme espace de la traduction”. *Palimpsestes* XIII(4): 1-7.
- Brownlie, Siobhan. 2006. “Narrative theory and retranslation theory”. *Across Languages and Cultures*. 7: 140-170. doi:10.1556/Acr.7.2006.2.1
- Dastjerdi, Hossein Vahid and Mohammadi, Amene. 2013. “Revisiting “Retranslation Hypothesis”: A Comparative Analysis of Stylistic Features in the Persian Retranslations

of *Pride and Prejudice*". *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics* 3: 174-181.  
doi:10.4236/ojml.2013.33024.

Deane, Sharon L. 2011. *Confronting the Retranslation Hypothesis: Flaubert and Sand in the British Literary System*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.

Desmidt, Isabelle. 2009. "(Re)translation Revisited". *Meta* 54(4): 669-683.

Paloposki, Outi and Koskinen, Kaisa. 2004. "A Thousand and One Translations. Revisiting Retranslation". In: Hansen, Gyde, Malmkjaer, Kirsten and Gile, Daniel (eds.), *Claims, changes and challenges in Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 27-38

Koskinen, Kaisa and Paloposki, Outi. 2010. "Retranslation." In: Gambier, Yves and Van Doorslaer, Luc (eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies 1*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 294-298.

Lefevere André. 1985/2014. "Why waste our time on rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm". In: Hermans, Theo (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature*. London: Croom Helm. 215-243.

Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London/New York: Routledge.

Sanz Gallego, Guillermo and Van Poucke, Piet. 2019. "Retranslation in context". *Cadernos de Tradução* (special issue) 39(1): 10-22.