



University of Tehran press

Investigating Filial and Dissident Intertextual Relationships Between Retranslations: A Case Study



Zohreh Gharaei*✉

Department of English, Faculty of Literature and Foreign Languages, University of Kashan, Kashan, Iran.

Email: zgharaei@kashanu.ac.ir

0000-0002-2983-3589



Hadis Hosseinasab**

Department of English, Sheikhbahae University, Isfahan, Iran.

Email: h.hnassab5@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Given the abundance of retranslations in Iran on the one hand and the scarcity of research in this area on the other hand, in this qualitative and exploratory study, applying a comparative approach through content analysis, the (re)translations of three short stories from *Dubliners* were investigated. The aim was to draw on filial and dissident intertextual relations and, thereby, to investigate the effect of the preceding translations on the subsequent ones. Moreover, attempts were made to test Berman's retranslation hypothesis. After identifying filial and dissident cases, those with the same nature were categorized and coded to find the realization of filiation and dissidence. The findings revealed both filial and dissident relations between the second translation and the earlier ones. The fact that the inappropriate collocations of the first translation(s) found their way to the second translation served as evidence for the filial relationship. The salient instances of dissidence included correcting the wrong choices of the earlier ones, adding omissions, appropriating the level of formality in dialogues, and cultural toning down. However, the third translation revealed a dominantly dissident relationship with its predecessors as cases of wrong translation were observed. Considering that a tendency was observed in the second translation to tone down the cultural elements and that translational errors were found in the third translation, Berman's idea as to source-orientedness and the evolutionary nature of retranslations was rejected. The present study bears pedagogical implications as the approach taken can be used in comparative translation courses. Besides, the findings are awareness-raising among policymakers in the publishing industry as they highlight the need for taking supervisory measures and creating restrictive laws on retranslations.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 11 July 2022

Accepted: 24 October 2022

Available online:

winter 2022

Keywords:

rettranslation,

intertextuality,

dissidence,

hypothesis

filiation,

Berman's



Gharaei, Z., & Hosseini Nasab, H. (2023). Investigating Filial and Dissident Intertextual Relationships between Retranslations: A Case Study. *Journal of Foreign Language Research*, 12 (4), 515-535.

* Zohreh Gharaei is currently an assistant professor of Translation Studies at the University of Kashan. Her research interests particularly lie in issues concerning literary translation and translator training.

** Hadis Hosseinasab holds an M.A. in Translation Studies from Sheikhbahae University. Her areas of interest in research include literary translation and interpreting.

1. Introduction

Retranslation is defined as a work that has been translated into the same language earlier (Gürçağlar, 2020) and is a commonplace activity in the world. To many researchers and literary figures, retranslation is a requisite. Berman (1990), for instance, believes that the first translation is an “incomplete act” and it is the retranslation that brings it closer to perfection. Hanna (2006) also believes that changes to languages over time make retranslating a necessity. Another reason justifying retranslations is multiple readings and interpretations of works. Multiple readings could be due to the nature of the text. Philosophical and literary texts, for example, may give rise to various interpretations. Additionally, changes in the social, cultural and historical contexts lead to various interpretations and highlight the need for retranslations. Along similar lines, Brownlie (2006) argues that any change in the social context and any evolution in translation norms serve as true reasons for presenting a retranslation. Likely, Jenn (2006) believes that political and ideological changes pave the way for new translations of the same work. The quality of the first translation could be also another reason justifying the retranslation; if comprehension problems are evident in the first translation or the stylistic features of the source texts are not reproduced, retranslations may be presented with a focus on such aspects.

In Iran, the retranslation of works is commonplace. Some are purposeful and justified serving one of the functions stated above. However, the absence of restrictive regulations has led to the publication of a bulk of unjustified retranslations (Khazae Farid, 2018; Payandeh, 2015). Despite the importance of the issue, only limited empirical studies have brought different aspects of retranslations under close scrutiny. Moreover, the existing studies have mostly validated Berman’s Retranslation Hypothesis. In such investigations, source-orientedness has been mostly reduced to one or a limited number of items (such items as proper names, sentence length, and type/token ratio). A deeper analysis of such studies reveals that although the given element might be investigated properly, the studies do not present a comprehensive view of source-orientedness in the translation in its totality. Therefore, the framework chosen for validating Berman’s hypothesis seems not to be appropriate.

Considering the importance of the issue and the scarcity of research informed by new frameworks, the present study, adopting an intertextual approach to the study of retranslations, has embarked on investigating the effect of preceding translations on retranslations. The framework used in this study has its roots in Kristeva (1986) and Genette’s (1997) thoughts. The view was theoretically extended to translation and the relationship between retranslations by

Hermans (2003). Zhang and Ma (2018), afterward, further expanded on it and presented a framework for investigating the intertextual relationships among retranslations through conducting a case study. Considering that their study is the only empirical investigation into retranslations within an intertextual framework, and that despite the abundance of retranslations in Iran no such study has been reported yet, the present study has taken the initiative. The purpose is particularly to study the presence and types of intertextual relations among the retranslations of three short stories from the collection *Dubliners* by James Joyce. Therefore, in this study, attempts are made to address the following research questions:

1. **What is the dominant intertextual relationship between the second and the first Persian translations of the three selected short stories from *Dubliners*?**
2. **What is the dominant intertextual relationship between the third and the second Persian translations of the three selected short stories from *Dubliners*?**
3. **Considering the intertextual relationships between the retranslations, is Berman's hypothesis confirmed?**

2. Literature Review

2.1 Retranslation from the Perspective of Berman's Hypothesis

The study of retranslations is usually tied with Antoinette Berman and his Retranslation Hypothesis. Berman, inspired by German Romanticism, argues that retranslations are

closer to the source text compared with their precedent translations (Berman, 1995 as cited in Brownlie, 2006). He regards it as a kind of perfection and believes that on the path toward perfection retranslations should be offered to the extent that a canonical translation is presented to unveil the truth of the source text. Berman's ideas concerning retranslations are known as Berman's Retranslation Hypothesis in Translation Studies.

The bulk of case studies on retranslations both in Iran and abroad have put Berman's hypothesis to the test. While some have explicitly confirmed or rejected it, some have assigned it partial validity. VahidDastjerdi and Mohammadi (2013), for instance, investigated the translations of Austin's *Pride and Prejudice* from a stylistic view. As they reported, the retranslation was closer to the source text as far as the given stylistic elements were concerned. As a result, their study confirmed Berman's Retranslation Hypothesis. Similarly, Feng (2014) studied the English translation and retranslation of a Chinese novel and, stressing the necessity of presenting retranslations, found that although the first translation was more localized, the retranslation was more source-oriented. He, therefore, confirmed Berman's hypothesis. From among more recent studies, one can refer to the study conducted by Canli and Karadag (2018). In their study, they analyzed three Turkish retranslations of *Sanctuary* from the perspective of deforming tendencies and the retranslation hypothesis. The findings

revealed that the last retranslator had been aware of the deforming tendencies and had produced a translation closer to the source text compared with other translations of the same work. In a more recent study, Sanaatifar and Etemadi (2021) investigated three Persian (re)translations of *Le Petit Prince* by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry to validate Berman's hypothesis. The researchers found that the first translation was closer to the norms of the target society while the last retranslation was closer to the source text.

Although the studies reviewed confirmed Berman's hypothesis, there are other case studies that called it into question. As an example, Chan (2004) analyzed the Chinese translations of the Russian novel *Razgrom*. The novel was first translated in 1935 and the translation, contrary to Berman's claim, was an obvious case of foreignization. However, the novel was localized in retranslations. Moreover, Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) studied the Finnish retranslations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *The Vicar of Wakefield*. Their findings indicated that the hypothesis is not applicable to all retranslations. They further argued that the Retranslation Hypothesis holds true only during the initial stages of the development of literature. Likewise, Desmidt (2009), in her case study, investigated 52 German and 18 Dutch versions of a children classic book. She claimed that although some recent versions of this book were closer to the source text in certain aspects, the evidence is

not strong enough to substantiate Berman's claim. Besides, as she argued, literary, moral and social norms of the society play a more important role in determining the source-oriented or target-oriented nature of the translation. von Flotow (2009), in a similar vein, studied the English retranslation of *Le Deuxième Sexe* by Simone de Beauvoir and acknowledged the presence of the retranslator and her effective role in presenting a new interpretation of the source text. She, arguing that retranslation never gives first-hand access to the source text, called Berman's claim as to the existence of a true translation into question. De Letter (2015), in another study, selected four Dutch retranslations of *The Rose and the Ring*. Seven categories were examined in this study namely fictional names, cultural geography, natural geography, ethnography, history, society, and culture. The researcher did not find a consistent pattern of source-orientedness in retranslations. To justify these observations, Paloposki and Koskinen (2004; 2010) brought a counter-argument concerning Berman's hypothesis. As they argued, the tendency to localize observed in some first translations is more suggestive of the specific stage of the translated literature and the evolutionary path of literature in a given society than a feature inherent in all first translations.

The review of the literature on retranslations revealed that different studies conducted in various pair languages to test Berman's

hypothesis have not reached an agreement. As a result, Mousavi Razavi and Tahmasbi Boveiri (2019) in a meta-analysis study investigated fourteen case studies conducted over three decades. Their analysis indicated that 60% of the studies rejected the validity of Berman's hypothesis and, therefore, in their analysis the validity of this hypothesis was not confirmed.

2.2 The Sociology of Retranslation

Although Iranian translation scholars, practicing translators, and publishers have discussed the threats of uncontrolled retranslations, few systematic studies have been conducted in this area. As it seems, the only study with a sociological approach is that of Saeedi (2020). She, drawing on a sociological approach and through paratextual analysis and interviews with translators and publishers, addressed the issue of retranslation in Iran. Her study suggested that while professional translators were more interested in passive retranslations, amateur translators were engaged with active retranslations (i.e., retranslations produced for the same generation and in the same social and cultural context). Additionally, the results revealed that professional publishers view the retranslation of classic works as a cultural capital and ask professional translators to retranslate such works. However, amateur publishers are interested in retranslations because they can get the publication license easier. Moreover, they prefer amateur translators because they are underpaid. For

amateur publishers, retranslations can be a source of economical capital as well. As for the amateur retranslators, the study also revealed that they make minimal changes to the existing translations and present a new retranslation. Considering that the publication of the translation can help them gain recognition, these retranslators sometimes have non-financial motives as well; they enter the field of literary translation. However, mid-career translators prefer not to accept the risk of retranslations. To them, retranslations can be a threat to their symbolic capital and, therefore, they prefer to introduce new works through translation in their way toward professionalism.

2.3 Retranslation and Intertextuality

The term *intertextuality* was first used by Julia Kristeva in the late 1960s to describe the phenomenon of continual exchange and relationship-building between texts. To her (1986), "any text is the absorption and transformation of another". Later, Genette (1997, p.1) defined intertextuality as "all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts". Bakhtin (1981), similarly, described this concept in terms of the dialogue between texts.

Intertextuality provides a certain framework for the analysis of retranslations as in today's world, with the rapid flow of news and information, providing that the retranslations are not parallel, the retranslator is aware of the preceding translations. One of the first scholars who applied intertextuality to

retranslations was Hermans (2003). Later, Martens (2009) extended the idea and predicted two types of relationships between retranslations. As he argued, the retranslator either is inspired by the preceding translation and has a tendency to the choices made in it or decides to be different and be independent of it. However, such scholars as Martens (2009) and Zhang and Ma (2018) believe that even in the second scenario the retranslation is affected by the preceding translation since it is intended to be different from it. Gürçağlar (2011), in the same vein, argued that the relationship between (re)translations is sometimes revealed in terms of similarities while it is occasionally reflected in differences. He uses the terms “filiation” and “dissidence” to refer to these relations. The only study in which retranslations are investigated drawing on these concepts is conducted by Zhang and Ma (2018). They, expanding on Gürçağlar’s idea, analyzed three English retranslations of a Chinese short story based on filial and dissident intertextual relationships. The researchers, confirming the presence of such relationships, presented a classification for filial and dissident relationships and detected the cases in the retranslations.

3. Method

The present study is an exploratory and qualitative investigation that fits within the scope of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS). In what follows, the theoretical

framework, the corpus of the study, and procedures are elaborated on.

3.1 Theoretical Framework

In the present study, a special type of intertextual relationship elaborated on by Zhang and Ma (2018) served as the framework. According to this framework, intertextual relationships among retranslations are of two general types: filiation and dissidence. Filiation is defined in terms of textual similarities between retranslations: when other equivalents are present and are more probable, but the retranslator opts for the choice made by the precedent translator, filiation occurs. Conversely, when the intertextual differences are indicative of a retranslation presented to be different from the earlier translation or to be in a competitive relationship with it (p. 4), an intertextual dissident relationship occurs. Both types of relationships can happen at lexical, structural, semantic, stylistic, and narrative levels.

3.2 The Corpus

Considering that at the time of conducting the present study four translations were available from the collection *Dubliners* by James Joyce (1914), the collection provided a rich ground for the analysis of tendencies in retranslations. Three short stories, namely “Two Gallants”, “A Little Cloud”, and “Counterparts”, comprising a total of 12951 words, were chosen randomly. From among the four Persian translations, Parviz Dariush’s (1993) translation and the joint

translation by Mohammadali Safariyan and Saleh Hosseini (1994) were both taken as the first translations, Ahmad Golshiri's (2012) and Amir Alijanpour's (2016) retranslations were considered as the second and third retranslations, respectively. It is worth noting that the joint translation by Safariyan and Hosseini was also considered as one of the first translations due to the fact that it was published in 1994 soon after Dariush's translation and, therefore, the translators, most probably, were unaware of Dariush's translation. Dariush's translation is marked with A1, and Safariyan and Salehi's translation is marked as A2. Golshiri and Alijanian's translated excerpts are marked with B and C, respectively.

3.3 The Procedure

In order to investigate the intertextual relationship between the retranslations, Zhang and Ma's (2018) framework comprising filial and dissident relationships was employed. Three short stories from the collection *Dubliners* were chosen randomly. The English stories along with the (re)translations were meticulously studied to unveil the cases of filiation and dissidence. It should be noted that neither all similarities were taken as filiation nor all differences were regarded as dissidence. The cases of filiation were limited to those where a choice different from that made by the earlier translator was more probable but the retranslator opted for the choice made by his precedent. Examples of such cases included the omissions or additions in an early

translation repeated by the retranslator or the mistakes of the first translation that opened their way up to the later translation. As for dissidence, the cases where the retranslator intentionally made different choices were counted. Examples included the additions of the first translation that were omitted, omissions that were added, mistakes that were corrected, or where a different approach to translation was adopted. As a result, the cases of filiation and dissidence were identified, classified, and if repeated were marked as a tendency and were coded.

Mention should be made that considering that in a study as such it is not always possible to count cases, the frequency of the cases of filiation and dissidence was not the concern of this study. As an example, tone, which was an element under investigation, is intertwined with the text; it is sometimes reflected in the word choice, occasionally at the level of sentence or above sentential level, and sometimes even in the choice of punctuation marks. Thus, in the present study, textual tendencies have been in focus and to ascertain the accuracy of the decisions made regarding such tendencies, inter-rater reliability was opted for. In so doing, another expert in English Literature was consulted. The cases where an agreement was not reached were subject to further discussion and analysis to reach an agreement (this was particularly important in cases of translational mistakes). Inter-rater reliability revealed a significant correlation between the judgments of the two raters ($r=0.81, p<0.05$).

Thereby, the intertextual tendencies of the (re)translations were identified.

4. Results and Discussion

In this section, in order to address the research questions, the realizations of the intertextual relationship between (1) the second translation and the first translations (the first research question) and (2) the third translation and preceding translations (the second research question) are elaborated on. Moreover, this case study has seen Berman's retranslation hypothesis in light of an intertextual framework (the third research question).

4.1. The Intertextual Relationship between the Second Translation and the First translations

The relationship between the second and the first translations was realized in terms of both filiation and dissidence. However, dissidence was the dominant tendency.

4.1.1 Filiation

In what follows, the filial intertextual relationship between the second translation and the first translations is explained.

4.1.1.1 The Repetition of Collocational Clashes

The filial intertextual relationship between the second translation and the preceding ones has been realized in terms of the non-conventional collocations of the first translations opening their way up to the second translation. In what follows, some example excerpts are given.

E1: Little Chandler's thoughts ever since lunch-time had been of his meeting with Gallaher, of Gallaher's invitation, and of the great city London where Gallaher lived.

A2. افکار چندلر کوچولو، از ناهار به بعد، اطراف دیدارش با گالاهر، دعوت گالاهر، و شهر بزرگ لندن که گالاهر در آن می‌زیست، دورمی‌زد. (ص. ۹۱)

B. افکار چندلر ریزاندام از هنگام ناهار در اطراف دیدار با گالاهر، دعوت گالاهر و شهر بزرگ لندن که گالاهر در آن زندگی می‌کرد، دورمی‌زد. (ص. ۱۶۳)

As it seems, دور زدن فکر اطراف چیزی is an unconventional phrase that has found its way to the second translation from Safariyan's translation. E2 is another example:

E2: He emerged from under the feudal arch of the King's Inns, a neat modest figure, and walked swiftly down Henrietta Street.

A2. با اندامی تمیز و فروتن از زیر رواق فئودالی کینگزاینز بیرون آمد، و تند، در خیابان هنریتا به‌راه‌افتاد. (ص. ۹۲)

B. او، با آن تن و اندام تمیز و فروتن، از زیر طاق فئودالی کینگزاینز بیرون آمد و به‌سرعت در خیابان هنریتا به‌راه‌افتاد. (ص. ۱۶۵)

The Persian adjective فروتن is indicative of a personality trait and does not serve as a commonplace collocate for the noun اندام. E14 is another example of the same case; in this excerpt, the verb imitate is translated as تقلید in the first two translations. This is less commonplace and less probable compared with ادا درآوردن or تقلید کردن. However, it is used in the second translation.

4.1.2 Dissidence

Dissidence is the dominant intertextual relationship between the second translation and the preceding ones, which shows itself in terms of (1) revision of the mistakes in the first translations, (2) adding the omissions, (3) changing the register in conversations so that it gets appropriate considering the context and level of formality, and (4) cultural toning down. In what follows, each category is explained with sample excerpts.

4.1.2.1 Correcting the Mistakes in the First Translations

Considering that the first translations date back to three decades ago, there are some mistakes in them. In many cases, these mistakes have been revised in the second translation. Therefore, correcting the mistakes in the preceding translations is one way in which the dissident intertextual relationship between the second translation and the first ones has been realized. In what follows, some example excerpts are given:

E3: As soon as he was on the landing the man pulled a shepherd's plaid cap out of his pocket, put it on his head and ran quickly down the rickety stairs.

A1. فارینگتون همینکه به کنار پله‌ها رسید کلاه‌ی بره‌مانند از جیب درآورد و بر سر نهاد و به شتاب از پله‌های مارپیچ پائین رفت. (ص. ۱۰۷)

A2. وی به پاگرد پله‌ها که رسید کلاه‌ی نمدی از جیبش درآورد، بر سرش گذاشت و به شتاب از پله‌های مارپیچ پائین رفت. (ص. ۱۱۲)

B. مرد همین‌که به پاگرد پلکان رسید کلاه پچازی از جیبش بیرون آورد، بر سر گذاشت و دوان‌دوان و عجولانه از پلکان زهواردررفته پائین رفت. (ص. ۱۸۸)

In the excerpt above, the adjective *rickety* is translated as مارپیچ in the first translations, but the second translation has used the adjective زهواردررفته. Another example is *oyster*, which is translated as خرچنگ in the first translations and corrected in the second translation:

E4: He knew that people went there after the theatre to eat oysters and drink liqueurs.

A1. می‌دانست که مردم بعد از اتمام تئاتر آنجا می‌رفتند تا خرچنگ بخورند و مشروب بیاشامند. (ص. ۸۷)

A2. می‌دانست که مردم بعد از تئاتر به آنجا می‌روند تا غذای خرچنگ بخورند و مشروب بیاشامند. (ص. ۹۳)

B. می‌دانست که مردم پس از تئاتر به آنجا می‌روند تا صدف خوراکی بخورند و نوشیدنی بنوشند. (ص. ۱۶۵)

Likewise, in the following excerpt, the phrase *four or five seconds* has been rendered in the second translation more meticulously:

E5: It began to sobpiteously, losing its breath for four or five seconds, and then bursting out anew. (71)

A1. طفل با وضعی ترحم‌انگیز به گریستن و هق‌هق پرداخت، سه‌چهار ثانیه نفسش بند می‌آمد و باز از نو به گریستن و هق‌هق پرداخت. (ص. ۱۰۱)

A2. کودک به‌نحوی ترحم‌انگیز هق‌هق می‌کرد، سه‌چهار ثانیه‌ای نفسش بند می‌آمد، و باز از نو گریه سر می‌داد. (ص. ۱۰۶)

B. بچه چهارپنج ثانیه‌ای نفسش بند آمد و سپس باز زیر گریه زد. (ص. ۱۸۳)

Another example is the translation of "ragged" in E6:

E6: She wore a short black jacket with mother-of-pearl buttons and a ragged black boa.

A1. حذف

A2. نیم‌تنه کوتاه سیاه‌رنگی با تکمه‌های صدفی، و شالی از خز به‌تن داشت. (ص. ۷۰)

B. نیم‌تنه کوتاه مشکی با دکمه‌های صدفی پوشیده بود و شال مشکی نخنمایی داشت. (ص. ۱۴۲)

4.1.2.2 Adding the Omissions from the Preceding Translations

One intertextual tendency observed in the second translation is directing attention to the parts omitted from the earlier translations and adding them to the translation. The omissions are sometimes at lexical level and sometimes exceed the level of words. In what follows, some examples of this intertextual relationship are given:

E7: Catching the light stuff of her white blouse like a clip.

A1. پارچه نازک بلوز او را مثل منگنه گرفته بود. (ص. ۶۴)

A2. پارچه نازک بلوز او را منگنه دار گرفته بود. (ص. ۷۰)

B. در واقع مثل آن بود که پارچه بلوز سفیدش را منگنه کرده- باشند. (ص. ۱۴۲)

In the first translations of this excerpt from “Two Gallants”, the word *white* is not translated; however, in the second translation, the word is added. E8 is another example from the same story:

E8: He sat down at an uncovered wooden table opposite two work-girls and a mechanic.

A1. سر یک میز بدون رومیزی مقابل دو دختر کارگر و یک مکانیک نشست. (ص. ۶۶)

A2. سر میزی بدون رومیزی برابر دو دختر کارگر و یک مکانیک نشست. (ص. ۷۲)

B. پشت یک میز چوبی بدون رومیزی، روبه‌روی دو دختر کارگر و یک مکانیک نشست. (ص. ۱۴۴)

As evident, while the word *wooden* is omitted from the first translations, it is preserved in the second translation. One further example from this story is given below:

E9: Corley remained standing at the edge of the path, a little distance from the front steps. (49)

A1. کورلی در همان گوشه در چند قدمی پله‌ها ایستاده بود. (ص. ۶۹)

A2. کورلی همچنان کنار جاده، در چندقدمی پله‌ها ایستاده بود. (ص. ۷۴)

B. کورلی همان‌طور لب خیابان سرجایش، کمی دور از پلکان جلو، ایستاد. (ص. ۱۴۸)

In the last example from “Counterparts”, the phrase *swishing trolleys* is omitted from the first translations but persevered in the second translation:

E10: His head was full of the noises of tram gongs and swishing trolleys and his nose already sniffed the curling fumes punch. (79)

A1. سرش از سروصدای زنگ‌های ترامواها پر بود و بینی او به‌همان زودی بوی اشتهانگیز پانچ را در خود گرفته بود. (ص. ۱۱۲)

A2. سرش از سروصدای زنگ ترامواها و بینی‌اش از بوی کف‌آلود پانچ پر بود. (ص. ۱۱۸)

B. سرش از سروصدای زنگ ترامواها و غزغز گاری‌ها و بینی‌اش از بوی ناراحت‌کننده نوشابه پر بود. (ص. ۱۹۴)

4.1.2.3 Changing the Register in Conversations

One more aspect of the dissident relationship between the second translation and the first translations is changing the tone in conversations among characters through using informal language and more colloquial

words. In what follows, three example excerpts are given, the first two examples are from “Two Gallants” and the last is from “Counterparts”:

E11: Well!... That takes the biscuit!

A1. خوب! ... این دیگر ناز شست دارد! (ص. ۵۸)

A2. خوب! ... این دیگر ناز شست دارد! (ص. ۶۴)

B. بابا... این یکی دست خوش داره. (ص. ۱۳۴)

E12: That takes the solitary, unique, and, if I may so call it, *recherché* biscuit!

A1. این دیگر خیلی خیلی نازشست دارد. (ص. ۵۸)

A2. این دیگر مستحق نازشستی تنها، یگانه، و شاید بشود

گفت نادر است. (ص. ۶۴)

B. دست خوش این یکی دیگه راستی راستی، منحصر به فرد و

جانانه س. (ص. ۱۳۴)

E13: Do you hear me now?... Ay and another little matter! I might as well be talking to the wall as talking to you. Understand once for all that you get a half an hour for your lunch and not an hour and a half. How many courses do you want, I'd like to know... Do you mind me now?

A1. حالا شنیدی؟ ها، راستی یک چیز دیگر! اگر چه حرف-

زدن با تو و دیوار نتیجه اش یکیست. این را بفهم که وقت

معین شده برای ناهار نیم ساعت است نه یک ساعت ونیم. مگر

چند دوره غذا می خوری؟ چکار می کنی؟ حالا خوب فهمیدی

چه می گویم. (ص. ۱۰۶)

A2. که شنیدی؟... خوب، و اما یک چیز دیگر! گر چه حرف

زدن با تو مثل حرف زدن با دیوار است، اما این را دیگر بفهم

که وقت ناهار نیم ساعت است نه یک ساعت ونیم. مگر تو

چند بار غذا می خوری؟ دلم می خواهد بدانم... می فهمی چه

می گویم؟ (ص. ۱۱۲)

B. می گم گوشت با منه چی می گم؟... آهان و یه موضوع

دیگه! هر چند چه با تو حرف بزنی چه با دیوار. یه بار برای

همیشه تو مغزت فرو کن که نیم ساعت ناهار خوردنت طول

بکشه نه یه ساعت ونیم. می خوام بدونم، مگه تو چند پرس

غذا می خوری... حواست جمع من هست؟ (ص. ۱۸۷)

As evident from the examples above, the second translation, using informal language in conversations, has adopted a different approach compared with the first translations. This tendency of the second translation can be traced in other example excerpts in this article where a conversation is in progress between characters (see E17 and E22).

4.1.2.4 Cultural Toning Down

Another aspect of the intertextual dissident relationship between the second translation and the earlier ones is toning down some cultural elements of the source text. In this translation, as opposed to the preceding one, references to alcoholic drinks, places to serve them, and taboo words are either nullified or toned down. In what follows, some examples are given from “A Little Cloud”:

E14: The light and noise of the bar held him at the doorway for a few moments.

A1. روشنی و صدای بار او را چند لحظه ای نزدیک در

متوقف ساخت. (ص. ۸۹)

A2. نور و صدای بار چند لحظه ای او را نزدیک در

نگهداشت. (ص. ۹۵)

B. نور و صدا سبب شد که چند لحظه ای توی درگاه ها درنگ

کند. (ص. ۱۶۹)

In the excerpt from the second translation, the word *bar* is omitted.

E15: What is it to be? What will you have? I'm taking whisky.

A1. خوب، چی می خوای؟ چه؟ من دارم ویسکی می خورم.

(ص. ۹۰)

A2. خوب چه می خواهی؟ چه می خوری؟ من دارم ویسکی

می خورم. (ص. ۹۵)

B. میوهات با چی جوهره؟ چی می خوری؟ من دارم نوشیدنی

می خورم. (ص. ۱۶۹)

Likely, in the example above, the word *whisky* is changed into نوشیدنی (meaning *drink*) while it is preserved in the first translations.

E16: Poor O'Hara! Booze, I suppose?

A1. بیچاره اوهارا! لابد مشروب، ها؟ (ص. ۹۱)

A2. بیچاره اوهارا! لابد از مشروب است، هان؟ (ص. ۹۷)

B. بیچاره اوهارا، گمونم علتش افراطه؟ (ص. ۱۷۱)

In the translation of E16, the second translator has avoided the word *booze* and, thereby, has chosen to be different from his precedents. The following excerpt from "Counterparts" serves as another example of this dissident relationship between the second translation and the first ones:

E17: Then he imitated Farrington, saying, "And here was my nabs, as cool as you please," while Farrington looked at the company out of his heavy dirty eyes, smiling and at times drawing forth stray drops of liquor from his moustache with the aid of his lower lip.

A1. و بعد تقلید فارینگتون را درآورد و فارینگتون از گوشه چشمان سنگین کتیف خود به جمع می‌نگریست، و گاه در ضمن که قطرات مشروب را با کمک لب پایینی از میان سبیل خود می‌مکید لبخند می‌زد. (ص. ۱۱۳)

A2. بعد تقلید فارینگتون را درآورد و گفت: این جناب هم خونسرد خونسرد ایستاده بود و فارینگتون هم که از گوشه چشمان قلنبیده‌اش به جمع می‌نگریست، لبخند می‌زد و گاه قطرات مشروب را به کمک لب پایینی‌اش از میان سبیل خود می‌مکید. (ص. ۱۱۹)

B. او سپس تقلید فارینگتن را درآورد و گفت: «این آقا هم تا بخواین خونسرد اونجا ایستاده بود.» و در آن حال فارینگتن با آن چشمان بی‌حال و کتیفش به گروه نگاه می‌کرد و گهگاه با کمک لب پایینش تک‌قطره‌های نوشابه را از لابه‌لای سبیلش مک می‌زد. (صص. ۱۹۶-۱۹۵)

To sum up, in this part, the first research question of the study was addressed. The analysis revealed that the intertextual relationship between the second translation and the preceding ones was both of filial and dissident nature. Filiation was realized through the repetition of unconventional collocations of the first translations in the second translation. Moreover, the dissident intertextual relationship showed itself in the form of correcting translational mistakes, adding the parts omitted from the earlier translations, changing the register in conversations in accordance with the formality level of the source text, and cultural toning down. It seems the second translation has purposefully intended to improve the first translations. Moreover, in the second translation, a tendency was observed to tone down cultural clashes and bring the source culture closer to the target culture. This has been effectuated through opting for cultural and functional equivalents (Newmark, 1988). Viewed from the perspective of intertextuality, in the second translation attempts are made to take an approach different from the first translations and, thereby, enter into a relationship with them. This is indicative of the claim that even in case of dissidence the presence of intertextual relationships is undeniable.

The findings of the present study corroborate Brownlie's (2006) argumentation as to the effect of preceding translations on retractions. Similarly, Taivalkoski-Shilov

(2015), who investigated six retranslations of *Robinson Crusoe*, acknowledged the presence of the voices of earlier translations in retranslations. Moreover, these findings are in line with Zhang and Ma's (2018) claim regarding the presence of an intertextual relationship among retranslations and the effect of earlier translations on retranslations in the form of filiation and dissidence.

4.2 Intertextual Relationship between the Third Translation and the Preceding Ones

The analysis of the intertextual relationship between the third translation and the preceding ones revealed that although some cases of filiation were identifiable, the dominant tendency was dissidence. The analysis of the cases of dissidence showed that this has been majorly in the form of changing the appropriate equivalents in the preceding translations into translational mistakes.

4.2.1 Changing the Proper Equivalents in the Earlier Translations into Mistakes

The dominant intertextual relationship between the third translation and the preceding ones is dissidence. In what follows, some examples are given:

E18: Alleyne had hounded little Peake out of the office in order to make room for his own nephew. (78)

- A1. آقای آلدین چچور بیک بیچاره را با زیرکی از اداره بیرون کرده بود تا برای برادرزاده خودش جا باز کند. (۱۱۱)
- A2. یادش بود که آقای الاین چگونه بیک بیچاره را از اداره بیرون انداخته بود تا برای برادرزاده اش جا باز کند. (ص. ۱۱۷)

B. یادش بود که آقای الاین به چه وضعی بیک بیچاره را از دفتر بیرون انداخته بود تا جا برای برادرزاده اش باز کند. (ص. ۱۹۳)

C. چطور آقای الاین دمار از روزگار بیک کوچکه درآورد تا جایش را به عموزاده اش بدهد. (ص. ۹۶)

As evident from the example chosen from "Counterparts", although in the three earlier translations *برادرزاده* has been rightly chosen as the equivalent for *nephew*, the last translation has opted for *عموزاده*.

E19: A man with two establishments to keep up, of course he couldn't... (78)

- A1. آدمی که دو خانواده داشت مگر می شد پول (ص. ۱۱۲)
- A2. آدمی که دو خانواده را نگه می داشت البته که نمی توانست پول ... (ص. ۱۱۷)
- B. آدمی که دو خانواده را اداره می کرد البته که نمی توانست ... (ص. ۱۹۳)
- C. مردی که باید دو دکان را همزمان می چرخاند البته که امیدی بهش نبود.... (ص. ۹۷)

The above excerpt is also from "Counterparts". Higgins is the character in focus who does not have enough income to keep up two families. While the word *establishments* has been rightly translated as *خانواده* (meaning *family*) in the first translations, in the last translation, the word *دکان* (meaning *shop*) has been used.

Another example is from "Two Gallants". The plural word *Florentines*, which is appropriately rendered as *فلورانسها* in the first translations, is translated wrongly in the third translation.

E20: When he reported these dialogues he aspired the first letter of his name after the manner of Florentines.

A1. حذف

A2. هنگام بیان این گفتگوها اولین حرف اسمش را به شیوه فلورانسی‌ها از ته گلو تلفظ می‌کرد. (ص. ۶۶)

B. وقتی مشغول این گزارش‌ها بود اولین حرف اسمش را به شیوه فلورانسی‌ها از ته گلو ادامی‌کرد. (ص. ۱۳۷)

C. وقتی این دیالوگ‌ها را تعریف می‌کرد حرف اول اسمش را چون فلورنتین معروف از حلق ادامی‌کرد. (ص. ۵۶)

Another example is the expression *on the turf* from the same story. While the expression is translated properly in the first translations, in the last translation it is translated literally.

E21: She's on the turf now. I saw her driving down Earl Street one night with two fellows with her on a car.

A2. حالا دیگر روسپی شده‌است. یک شب او را در اتومبیلی در خیابان ارل دیدم. (ص. ۶۷)

B. حالا با همه هست. یه شب پایین دست خیابان ارل، تو یه ماشین، با دو نفر دیدمش. (ص. ۱۳۸)

C. او الان در پیست اسبدوانی است. یک شب دیدم با دو مرد جوان سوار ماشینی در خیابان ارل می‌رفتند. (ص. ۵۸)

In some cases, the translational mistakes in the third translation are not limited to the level of words and expressions but have distorted the meaning of the whole sentence. Following is an example from "A Little Cloud" which narrates the conversation between Chandler and Gallaher:

E22: I'm deuced glad, I can tell you, to get back to the old country. Does a fellow good, a bit of a holiday.

A1. واقعاً به تو می‌گویم، از برگشتن به مملکت قدیمی خودمان خیلی خوشحال شده‌ام. یک خرده تعطیل برای آدم مفید است. (ص. ۹۰)

A2. باید به تو بگویم که من از برگشتن به مملکت قدیمی خودمان خیلی خوشحال می‌شوم. یک‌خورده استراحت برای آدم مفید است. (ص. ۹۶)

B. باورکن نمی‌دونی چقدر خوشحالم که برگشتم به کشور قدیمی خودمون. ی‌خورده هم مرخصی برای آدم خوبه. (ص. ۱۷۰)

C. خداراشکر که می‌توانم بهت بگویم بچسب به همون شهر خودمون. پسر خوبی باش و از تعطیلات لذت ببر. (ص. ۸۰)

In this excerpt, Gallaher regards getting back to Dublin as a holiday. However, in the last translation, the message is deviated as if Gallaher is advising Chandler. Another example is E23 from "Counterparts":

E23. He could not touch him for more than a bob—and a bob was no use. (79)

A1. اما از او بیش از یک شیلینگ نمی‌شد قرض کرد و یک شیلینگ هم فایده‌ای نداشت. (ص. ۱۱۲)

A2. اما از او بیش از یک شیلینگ نمی‌شد قرض گرفت و یک شیلینگ هم به دردی نمی‌خورد. (ص. ۱۱۷)

B. او می‌توانست برای پول به هیگینز فشار بیاورد اما آخر هیگینز خودش هم پولی نداشت. (ص. ۱۹۳)

C. نمی‌توانست بیشتر از چند لحظه آنجا بماند و این فایده نداشت. (ص. ۹۷)

E24 is also from "Counterparts". In this part of the story, Farrington asks his friends in the bar to order once again. While friends are giving their orders, Higgins enters. Although in the first translations the message is rendered properly, in the third translation it is distorted:

E24: Just as they were naming their poisons who should come in but Higgins!

A1. درست وقتی داشتند اسم مشروبی را که می‌خواستند بخورند می‌بردند هیگینز از در آمد. (ص. ۱۱۳)

A2. درست وقتی داشتند زهرماری را که می‌خواستند نام می‌بردند سروکله هیگینز پیدا شد! (ص. ۱۱۹)

- B. درست وقتی هرکدام اسم زهرماری را می‌آوردند که طالبش بودند، هیگینز وارد شد. (ص. ۱۹۵)
- C. وقتی از شیرین‌کاری‌هایشان می‌گفتند چه کسی می‌توانست بهتر از هیگینز باشد! (ص. ۹۸)

As the last example, see the following excerpt from the same story:

E25: Then he imitated Farrington, saying, "And here was my nabs, as cool as you please," ...

- A1. حذف
- A2. بعد تقلید فارینگتون را درآورد و گفت: این جناب هم خونسرد خونسرد ایستاده بود. (ص. ۱۱۹)
- B. او سپس تقلید فارینگتون را درآورد و گفت: «این آقا هم تا بخواین خونسرد اونجا ایستاده بود.» (ص. ۱۹۵)
- C. سپس با تقلید صدای فارینگتون گفت: «این هم از دشت من، امیدوارم خوششان آمده باشد.» (ص. ۹۸)

The word *nabs* in this excerpt means *friend* and refers to Farrington. While in the first translations the message is rendered appropriately, it has been distorted in the last translation.

To sum up and to answer the second research question concerning the intertextual relationship between the third translation and the earlier ones, it should be argued that this relationship has been majorly an intertextual dissidence as in the translation a tendency was observed to change the appropriate renderings of the first translations into mistakes. Viewed from the framework chosen in this study, considering the time interval between the third translation and the earlier ones, it is obvious that the retranslator had been aware of the earlier translation and, therefore, the existence of intertextual relationships between the translations is undeniable. It seems that in the third

translation the tendency to be different from the earlier translations prevails; however, it has led to translational mistakes. The presence of intentional dissidence is also reported in Zhang and Ma's (2018) study. However, this special type of dissident relationship which results in translational mistakes is not reported in their study. As it seems, this observation can be justified considering the situation in study, Iran. Considering that in Iran no supervisory measures and restrictive regulations are in effect, new unjustified retranlations are published.

4.3 Berman's Retranslation Hypothesis through the Lens of Intertextual Relationships

As stated in Literature Review, the bulk of studies on retranslation have validated the accuracy of Berman's retranslation hypothesis as to the tendency of retranlations to be source-oriented –in the sense of revealing the nature of the source text. In order to answer the third research question based on the findings of this study, it is necessary to trace the way one translation has evolved into the next retranslation. As for the relationship between the second translation and the first ones, the findings revealed that in the second translation there was a tendency to improve the earlier ones as some mistakes were corrected, the omitted parts were added, and the conversational language of the source text was preserved. Such cases are indicative of an evolutionary path from the first translations to the second.

However, in the second translation, along with such features, a tendency was observed to tone down the cultural elements of the source text and bring them closer to the target culture. This is at odds with Berman's claim as to the source-orientedness of retranslations. Therefore, in response to the third research question, considering this tendency in the second translation, Berman's hypothesis is not confirmed. This is in line with the findings obtained from Paloposky and Koskinen's (2004) study in which partial validity was assigned to Berman's hypothesis. Similarly, Desmidt (2009), who worked with an almost large corpus of translated texts, concluded that although some retranslations are closer to the source text in terms of some aspects, the evidence is not enough to substantiate Berman's hypothesis.

Concerning the relationship between the third translation and the preceding one, considering that in the third translation a tendency was observed to make translational mistakes, Berman's hypothesis is not verified since no evolutionary progress was identified in the transition from the second translation to the third one. To sum up and to address the third research question, it should be stated that Berman's hypothesis is not verified since the evolution predicted by Berman was not observed either in the transition from the first translations to the second or in the transition from the second translation to the third. This is in agreement with the findings obtained

from Chen's (2004) study. Moreover, the same findings were reported in the studies conducted by Desmidt (2009) and De Letter (2015). The observation made in this study as to the non-evolutionary transition from the second translation to the third is justifiable if seen in the context of Iran where no supervisory and restrictive regulations are in place in publishing retranslations; it should be noted that Berman's hypothesis originated from a context where restrictive regulations on retranslations are in effect. In a context as such, retranslations are published providing that they pursue a purpose and, therefore, it is not far from expectation to observe the evolution Berman predicted in the relationship among (re)translations.

5. Conclusion

The present study was conducted to investigate the intertextual relationships among retranslations. The theoretical framework used presupposes the presence of intertextual relations among retranslations, which manifest themselves as both filiation and dissidence. Accordingly, in this study, types of relationships among the retranslations of three short stories from the collection *Dubliners* were investigated. In the second translation, the signs of both intertextual filiation (i.e., the repetition of unconventional collocations of the first translations in the second translation) and dissidence (i.e., correcting the mistakes, adding the omissions, changing the register in conversations, and cultural toning down)

were observed. In the third translation, the signs of intertextual dissidence prevailed which led to translational mistakes. This observation was interpreted considering the context of Iran where no restrictive supervisory regulations control the publication of retranslations.

This study may benefit translation instructors as the approach taken to compare translated texts can be applied in those courses that entail comparisons between the translations and the source text. Moreover, the present study can familiarize translation researchers with a new approach to investigating other aspects of retranslation (e.g., pathology). Conducting such studies with a focus on retranslations can serve as a step toward raising awareness among policymakers and publishers, which can, in turn, direct their attention toward the importance of restrictive regulations and supervision in the publication of retranslations.

The intertextual approach to the practical investigation of retranslations is a new framework. In light of this approach, it is possible to investigate intertextual similarities and differences among retranslations at different levels. This makes it an appropriate framework for the pathology of retranslations and makes it possible to draw a borderline between a justifiable purposeful retranslation from an unjustified retranslation. Considering the abundance of retranslations in Iran, this is of particular importance. However, the only case study conducted prior to the present study using

this framework is Zhang and Ma's (2018) investigation. Therefore, future researchers are suggested to use this approach as a framework for the pathology of retranslations.

References

پاینده، ح. (۱۳۹۴، ۱۲ آبان). آموزش نقد ترجمه در کشور صرفاً نظری است/ رشته ترجمه را تقویت کنیم. فرهنگ امروز.

<http://farhangemrooz.com/news/39808>

خزاعی فر، ع. (۱۳۹۷). در باب ترجمه مجدد. مترجم، ۲۷ (۶۴)، ۶۷-۶۹.

کریمی بهبهانی، م. (۱۳۹۸، ۲۷ اردیبهشت). بازترجمه‌ها بیشتر سوداگری در بازار نشر است. ایرنا.

<https://www.irna.ir/news/83317530>

رضویان، ح.، و طاهری، م. (۱۳۹۸). استعاره‌ی دستوری در ترجمه: بررسی ترجمه‌ی حمید رفیعی و مژگان منصوری از رمان سالار مگس‌ها. پژوهش‌های زبانشناختی در زبان‌های خارجی، ۹ (۱)، ۹۷-۷۱.

قرائی، ز. (۱۴۰۱). رویکردی انتقادی به بازترجمه در ایران: چارچوبی کارآمد برای آسیب‌شناسی بازترجمه‌ها. مطالعات ترجمه، ۱۷، ۸۹-۱۰۸.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. (M. Holquist, Ed., C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.

Berman, A. (1990). La retraduction comme espace de la traduction. *Palimpsestes*, 4 (2), 1-7.

Brownlie, S. (2006). Narrative theory and retranslation theory. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 7(2), 140-170. <https://10.1556/Acr.7.2006.2.1>

- Canli, G., & Karadag, A. (2018). Retranslation of Faulkner's Sanctuary in Turkish literature. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(3), 173-184.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.9n.3p.173>
- Chan, L.T. (2004). *Twentieth-century Chinese translation theory: Modes, issues and debates*. John Benjamins.
- De Letter, N. (2015). *Children's literature and the re-translation hypothesis: The Rose and the Ring*. [Master Dissertation, University of Ghent, Belgium].
- Desmidt, I. (2009). (Re)translation revisited. *Meta*, 54(4), 669-683.
- Feng, L. (2014). Retranslation hypothesis revisited: A case study of two English translations of Sanguo Yanyi – the first Chinese novel. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, 43, 69-86.
<https://10.5842/43-0-209>
- Genette, G. (1997). *Palimpsests: Literature in the second degree*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Gürçağlar, S.T. (2020). Retranslation. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (3rd ed., pp. 484-489). Routledge.
- Gürçağlar, S.T. (2011). Gulliver travels in Turkey: Retranslation and intertextuality. In L. Weldy (Ed.), *Crossing textual boundaries in international children's literature* (pp. 44-58). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Hanna, S. F. (2006). *Toward a sociology of drama translation: A Bourdieusian perspective on translations of Shakespeare's great tragedies in Egypt*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation] University of Manchester.
- Hermans, T. (2003). Translation, equivalence and intertextuality. *Wasafiri*, 18(40), 39-41.
- Joyce, J. (1914). *Dubliners*. London: Grant Richards Ltd.
- Joyce, J. (1993). *Dubliners* (P. Dariush, Trans.). Asatir.
- Joyce, J. (1994). *Dubliners* (M. A. Safariyan, & S. Hosseini, Trans.). Nilufar.
- Joyce, J. (2016). *Dubliners* (A. Alijanpour, Trans.). Avaye Maktoob.
- Koskinen, K., & Paloposki, O. (2010). Retranslation. In Y. Gambier & L.V. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 294-298). John Benjamins.
- Martens, D. (2009). *Intertextuality in translation: Modelling the textual relationships in translation*. [Doctoral dissertation, University College London]
- Mousavi Razavi, M.S., & Tahmasbi Boveiri, S. (2019). A Meta-analytical critique of Antoine Berman's retranslation hypothesis. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 17(65), 21-36.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. TicHall Press.
- Paloposki, O., & Koskinen, K. (2004). A thousand and one translations: Revisiting retranslation. In G. Hansen, K. Malmkjaer, & D. Gile (Eds.) *Claims, changes and challenges in translation studies* (pp. 27-38). John Benjamins.

Saeedi, S. (2020). New perspectives on retranslation: The case of Iran. *Transcultural*, 12(1), 27-46.

<https://doi.org/10.21992/tc29496>

Sanatifar, M.S., & Etemadi, M. (2021). One step closer to the theorizing of Berman's retranslation hypothesis: Analysis of Farsi (re)translations of The Little Prince. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Translation Studies*, 6(1), 75-96.

<http://doi.org/10.22034/EFL.2021.272059.1074>

Vahid Dastjerdi, H., & Mohammadi, A. (2013). Revisiting "Retranslation Hypothesis": A comparative analysis of stylistic features in the Persian retranslations

of *Pride and Prejudice*. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 3(3), 174-181. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2013.33024>

von Flotow, L. (2009). This time 'the Translation is Beautiful, Smooth and True': Theorizing retranslation with the help of Beauvoir. In J. Day (Ed.) *Translation in French and Francophone literature and film* (pp. 35-50). Brill.

Zhang, H., & Ma, H. (2018). Intertextuality in retranslation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 26(4), 576-592.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1448875>