Mahmoud Afrouz

Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis for classical and religious literary texts

A meta-analytical study

Abstract

Later translations of an original text into the same target language are referred to as 'retranslations'. The Retranslation Hypothesis (RH) suggests that later translations may more closely resemble the source text. This paper seeks to conduct a meta-analytical study, incorporating 23 relevant studies over the course of a 17-year period. In addition, the study incorporates 13 source texts and 89 retranslations as part of the research. Only classical literary texts (CLTs) and religious literary texts (RLTs) were selected as the main focus of the study. Altogether, the overall orientation of the translators of the RLTs and the CLTs were found to be dissimilar. As the results revealed, while the RH is refuted in the case of religious literary texts, the very hypothesis is generally confirmed for classical literary texts. Prospective researchers are highly recommended to conduct confirmatory or replication research to see if the findings of the present study are verified.

1   Introduction

Retranslation is a term that has been used in Translation Studies (TS) to refer to subsequent translations after an initial or 'first' translation. Koskinen and Paloposki define a retranslation as "a second or later translation of a single source text into the same target language" (Koskinen/Paloposki 2010: 294). The term can also refer to the process of producing such a product. On the basis of the Retranslation Hypothesis (RH), retranslations are closer to the original texts than the earlier ones. "The conceptual framework of retranslation has expanded considerably since" the RH "proposed in the 1990s" (Albachten/Gürçağlar 2019: 1).

The present study aims to explore the validity of the hypothesis through a meta-analytical investigation of the studies conducted on the issue up until now. The selection of the studies is not restricted to those works which have overtly concentrated on the RH. In each study considered here, the researchers have focused on translation 'strategies' and since a "strategy" is defined as "an overall orientation of the translator (e. g. towards 'free' or 'literal' translation, towards the target text (TT) or source text (ST),

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 157

towards domestication or foreignization)" (Munday 2016: 88), it was quite practical to analyze each work's data to specify whether or not the later translations were closer to the original texts than the former ones. In other words, investigating the validity of the RH was discernible. In the current study, domesticating (as opposed to foreignizing) strategies are considered as those which lead to the reproduction of target-language oriented translations. Therefore, in the analysis of the data, based on the general tendency of strategies towards either domestication or foreignization, the researcher could trace the inclination of later translations in comparison to the earlier ones.

Not all studies have come to the same conclusion as regards the RH. Some retranslations "follow the schema of RH, some fit in uneasily, but for some RH is completely dysfunctional" (Paloposki/Koskinen 2004: 35).

The corpus of the study mainly consists of classical literary texts. Almost all religious texts considered here also belong to classical literature. The author of this paper seeks to find the answer to the following questions:

(1)   Is the RH validated in works dealing with retranslations of classical and religious literary texts?

(2)   Is it generally feasible to prove or disprove the RH for these two categories?

2   Literature review

A meta-analytic study consisting of "70 case studies on retranslation" was conducted by Van Poucke (2017: 99). The researcher employed "five volumes dedicated to the phenomenon of retranslation: three special issues of TS journals and two conference proceedings" (Van Poucke 2017: 99). However, the aim of the study was the issue of 'aging' as a reason for retranslation. Van Poucke has not tested the hypothesis, but rather explored the motivations behind the RH. Moreover, most of the studies used French language sources and this "could slightly bias the results of this article"; consequently, as the researcher has acknowledged, "future research should reveal whether retranslation is treated differently in different cultures" (Van Poucke 2017: 99).

Another meta-analytic study was conducted by Mousavi Razavi and Tahmasbi Boveiri who have concentrated on "studies carried out in different settings and between different language-pairs" (Mousavi Razavi/Tahmasbi Boveiri 2019: 21). Their findings revealed "that empirical data has failed to confirm the RH as roughly 60% of the studies have refuted it while the remaining 40% have lent support to it" (Mousavi Razavi/ Tahmasbi Boveiri 2019: 21). However, their study merely embraced a total of fourteen articles and/or theses which had overtly dealt with the RH and testing its validity – the term 'retranslation' has been explicitly mentioned in the title of all the studies investigated by them. However, the corpus of the current study, including 23 studies (13 STs and 89 TTs), is not limited to those studies overtly dealing with validating the RH. Moreover, the present study has not mainly concentrated on one language/culture or the potential motivations of the retranslations.

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 158

3   Methodology

The present meta-analytical study is a corpus-based quantitative study concentrating on the issue of testing the validity of the Retranslation Hypothesis in classical literary and religious texts.

3.1   Corpus

Searching more than six hundred sources to find those which examined retranslations of a single source text, the researcher finally found more than twenty relevant studies consisting mainly of research articles, PhD dissertations, MA theses, and book chapters – covering a period of 17 years (from 2004 up to 2021). On the whole, 102 source texts and (re)translations had been examined in the studies. The studies are introduced in section 4.

General Category of Studies	Number of Studies	Number of STs	Number of TTs
CLTs	10	10	32
RLTs	13	3	57
Total	23	13	89

Table 1: The number of studies, the STs and the TTs

3.2   Procedure

In order to conduct the present meta-analytical study, first of all, the studies concentrating on retranslations of a single source text were specified; then, the studies were classified into literary and religious categories; in the third phase, the results of each study was analyzed and the data of each category were separately tabulated; and finally, the final results were summed up.

4   Results and discussion

The studies are categorized into classical literary texts (CLT) and religious literary texts (RLT). Approval or Disproval of the RH in each study is indicated by (+) and (-), respectively. In order to avoid duplication, where the STs or TTs were the same, they were counted only once (e. g. the authors working on the Holy Qur'an). Furthermore, where the RH is supported in a study, for instance, with a corpus including 1 source-text and 3 target-texts, it would be documented as 4 (+). Where refuted, as 4 (-).

4.1   Examining the RH in religious literary texts

The data related to the studies are tabulated as follows. Religious text here includes both sacred texts and literary-religious texts. It should be noted that in studies consisting of more than one case study, if the results were not consistent in approving the RH or rejecting it, two rows of the table would be allotted to the same study: one for displaying

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 159

the cases where the RH is confirmed; another for the ones where it is refuted. In Table 2, this applies to Masbugh and Gholami (2018).

Studies [Articles/ Theses]	Confirmed	Refuted	Number of STs	Number of TTs
Paloposki & Koskinen (2004)		2 (-)	1	1
Al-Salem (2008)		6 (-)	1	5
Pirnajmuddin & Zamani (2012)		5 (-)	0	5
Moradi & Sadeghi (2014)	3 (+)		0	3
El Damanhoury (2015)	3 (+)		0	3
Valavi & Hassani (2016)		4 (-)	0	4
Tabatabaee Lotfi (2017)		5 (-)	0	5
Oyali (2018)		6 (-)	1	5
Afrouz & Mollanazar (2018)	2 (+)		0	2
Masbugh & Gholami (2018)		2 (-)	0	2
Masbugh & Gholami (2018)	3 (+)		0	3
Mohammadi & Valavi (2019)		3 (-)	0	3
Afrouz (2020)		9 (-)	0	9
Afrouz (2021a)	3 (+)		0	3
Total	14 (+)	46 (-)	3	57
Final Result	32 (-)			

Table 2: Exploring the RH in religious literary texts (RLTs)

Paloposki and Koskinen (2004: 27) endeavored to take "a closer look at" the retranslation "hypothesis and comparing its claims with data from Finnish first translations and retranslations". Their findings revealed that "while there are numerous (re)translations that fit in the RH schema, there also exist several counter-examples where the schema is turned the other way round, and also cases where the whole issue of domestication/ assimilation versus foreignization/source-text orientation is irrelevant" (Paloposki/ Koskinen 2004: 36). Confessing that they have not found enough support for the RH, Paloposki and Koskinen finally assert that there were "no inherent qualities in the process of retranslating that would dictate a move from domesticating strategies towards more foreignizing strategies" (Paloposki/Koskinen 2004: 36). In the current meta-analysis study, Paloposki and Koskinen's (2004) study is considered as three separate studies: the first and the last case studies belong to classical and religious texts, respectively. The second one is not analyzed here since its ST belongs to modern literature.

In the first case study, Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) have referred to Oliver Goldsmith's (1766) *The vicar of Wakefield* which was translated into Finnish by Gustaf Erik Eurén in 1859and Samuli Suomalainen in 1905. They conclude that "[b]oth the syntax and the lexicon in Eurén's translation are closer to the original than in Suomalainen's" (Paloposki/Koskinen 2004: 30); therefore, the RH is refuted in the first case study.

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 160

In investigating the second case study, Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) have focused on Finnish translations of *"Alice's adventures in Wonderland"* (Paloposki/Koskinen 2004: 33).

In examining the last case study, Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) considered religious texts (re)translations. According to them, Pentti Saarikoski's (1969) translation of *the Gospel* has been "produced as a response to the (then) existing official version authorized in 1938" where the translator wanted to produce a more target-oriented translation or, to employ "Schleiermacherian phraseology", Saarikoski has strived "to bring the text to the reader, not the other way round" (Paloposki/Koskinen 2004: 35). The RH is refuted in the last case study.

Al-Salem's (2008) study aimed at identifying the best procedure for rendering metonymies in the *Holy Qur'an* through the evaluation of the methods metonymy is translated in five English translations of this literary-sacred text. He has detected the frequency and percentages of the following methods and tabulated them: (a) "Translation into the same metonymy"; (b) "Reduction of metonymy to its sense only"; (c) "Translation into the same metonymy with the intended meaning in parentheses"; (d) "Translation into a metaphor"; (e) "Translation into another metonymy"; and (f) "Assuming that there isn't a metonymy" (Al-Salem 2008: 196).

Method	Pickthall (1992)	Arberry (1996)	Al-Hilali & Khan (1996)	Ghali (1998)	Bewley & Bewley (1999)
(a)	18 (60%)	22 (73.3%)	10 (33.3%)	14 (46.7%)	15 (50%)
(b)	11 (37%)	7 (23.3%)	11 (36.7)	13 (43.3%)	14 (46.7%)
(c)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (23.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
(d)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
(e)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.3%)
(f)	1 (3.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.3%)	3 (10%)	0 (0.0%)

Table 3: Distribution of the methods (adopted from Al-Salem 2008: 196)

The methods can generally be categorized into 'target-oriented' and 'source-oriented' ones:

Source-oriented ←					→ Target-oriented
(a)	(c)	(f)	(d)	(e)	(b)

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 161

In order to make a comparison, we can choose the two extremes in each category. Comparison of method (a) with (b) in Pickthall's (1992) and Bewley & Bewley's (1999) translations reveals that the RH cannot be supported since Pickthall's procedures are 10% more source-oriented and 10% less target-oriented than Bewley & Bewley's.

Pirnajmuddin and Zamani's (2012) study focused on translation of culture-specific terms to examine the strategies used in rendering these terms in five English translations of *the Holy Qur'an* (by Pickthall, Yusuf Ali, Arberry, Shakir, and Al-Hilali & Muhsin Khan). Specifically focusing on "Practical laws of religion (Furū al-Dīn)", they have come to the conclusion that "literal translation is not only the most frequently used procedure but also the most appropriate one in translating such terms" (Pirnajmuddin/Zamani 2012: 71). The data extracted from their findings are tabulated as follows:

Procedure's Tendency	Source-oriented	Target-oriented
Pickthall (1930)	100%	0%
Yusuf Ali (1934)	100%	0%
Arberry (1955)	100%	0%
Shakir (1980)	100%	0%
Al-Hilali & Muhsin Khan (1995)	73%	27%

Table 4: Percentage of strategies (adopted from Pirnajmuddin/Zamani 2012: 80)

As regards the translations presented from the 1930s to the 1990s, the data contributes nothing to either the refutation or confirmation of the RH. However, taking the two borderline translations into consideration (i. e., Pickthall 1930 and Al-Hilali/Muhsin Khan 1995), we can infer from their findings that the RH is refuted.

Moradi and Sadeghi's (2014) study examined the techniques opted for in three English translations of cultural references found in *the Qur'an*. Ivir's (1987) model (including (1) Definition (2) Literal translation (3) Substitution (4) Lexical creation (5) Omission (6) Addition (7) Borrowing[1]) has been used as the model of their study. Translators included Pickthall (1930), Yusuf Ali (1934), and Shakir (1980).

Procedure's Tendency	Source-oriented	Target-oriented
Pickthall (1930)	70%	30%
Yusuf Ali (1934)	85%	15%
Shakir (1980)	82%	18%

Table 5: Percentage of the strategies (adopted from Moradi/Sadeghi 2014: 1743)

---

[1] Of these, (2) Literal translation and (7) Borrowing are considered source-oriented, the others target-oriented. In Moradi and Sadeghi's study, (3) Substitution, (4) Lexical creation and (5) Omission were never used by any translator.

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 162

As Table 5 demonstrates, the retranslations have generally shown greater tendencies towards the source-text. Therefore, taking the two borderline translations into account, we can infer that the RH is supported on the basis of Moradi and Sadeghi's (2014) study.

El Damanhoury's (2015) study examined the Japanese translations of the culture-bound terms in *the Qur'an*. The researcher's peripheral purpose has been to test the validity of the RH in the context of religious texts. The three Japanese translators include Izutsu (1964), Mita (1972), and Nakata (2014). Her findings revealed that "Izutsu used foreignizing techniques at approximately 60%, Mita at 62% and Nakata at 70%" of the items; therefore, the results of her study are in line with the RH (El Damanhoury 2015: 56–59).

Valavi and Hassani's (2016) study examined the translations of Qur'anic metonymies in four Persian translations by Elahi Ghomshei (1944), Moezzi (1993), Makarem Shirazi (1994), and Fouladvand (2010). The researchers have classified the methods chosen by the translators into two categories: literal (source-oriented), and figurative (target-oriented).

Methods	Literal	Figurative
Elahi Ghomshei (1944)	50%	50%
Moezzi (1993)	86%	14%
Makarem Shirazi (1994)	64%	36%
Fouladvand (2010)	57%	43%

Table 6: Methods of rendering metonymies (adopted from Valavi/Hassani 2016)

Comparing the first translation (Elahi Ghomshei 1944) with other later translations, we can conclude that the RH is confirmed; however, when we ignore Elahi Ghomshei's (1944) translation, we observe that with the passage of time, the translators have dramatically lost their tendencies towards the source text. To put it another way, the RH is rejected when the three subsequent retranslations by Moezzi (1993), Makarem Shirazi (1994), and Fouladvand (2010) are taken into account. On the other hand, if we divide the translators into two groups, we will come to the conclusion that while the RH is confirmed on the basis of Elahi Ghomshei's (1944) and Moezzi's (1993) translations, the hypothesis will be refuted based on Makarem Shirazi's (1994), and Fouladvand's (2010) translations. All in all, since the results of the three subsequent retranslations (i. e., Moezzi, Makarem Shirazi, and Fouladvand) decline the hypothesis, we have to announce the rejection of the RH on the basis of Valavi and Hassani's (2016) study.

Tabatabaee Lotfi's (2017) study has concentrated on the Qur'anic proper nouns in English translations of George Sale (1734), John Medows Rodwell (1861), Mohammed Marmaduke Pickthall (1930), Abdullah Yusuf Ali (1934), and Arthur John Arberry (1955). The researchers have adopted Van Coillie's (2006) taxonomy of strategies as the framework of their study. The findings revealed that the most frequently employed procedures for rendering the proper nouns include, "replacement by a counterpart in the target language (exonym), translation (of names with a particular connotation), phonetic

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 163

or morphological adaptation to the target language, non-translation plus additional explanation, replacement of a personal name by a common noun" (Tabatabaee Lotfi 2017: 99).[2]

Procedure's Tendency	Source-oriented	Target-oriented	Average of Procedures' Percentages in each Century	Source-oriented
Sale	14%	86%	18th century	14%
Rodwell	13%	87%	19th century	13%
Pickthall	16%	84%	20th century	14.6%
Yusuf Ali	18%	82%		
Arberry	10%	90%		

Table 7: Percentage of procedures (adopted from Tabatabaee Lotfi 2017: 113–114)

Based on the findings, the RH is disproved if the 18th-century translation is compared to the 19th and 20th century's. Furthermore, considering the two borderline translators' works (Sale 1734 and Arberry 1955), again we can infer that the results are not in line with the RH. All in all, Tabatabaee Lotfi's (2017) study does not support the RH.

Oyali's (2018) study investigated the validity of the RH "in representations of certain biblical concepts in the translations of the *Bible* into Igbo" and discovered that "most of the borrowings in the first translation are de-borrowed in the retranslations" (Oyali 2018: 84). Studying five translations, he finally concludes that, as far as the *Bible* (re)translations are concerned, the RH is disproved.

Afrouz and Mollanazar's (2018) study aimed at comparing *the Holy Qur'an*'s two English translations by Maulana Muhammad Ali (1917) and M. Habib Shakir (1980). The focus of the researchers has been on culture-specific references and they have selected Aixelá's (1996) model as the framework of their studies. The data are tabulated as follows:

Strategies	Substitution	Conservation
Muhammad Ali (1917)	279 (84%)	53 (16%)
Shakir (1980)	252 (76%)	80 (24%)

Table 8: Percentage of strategies (adopted from Afrouz/Mollanazar 2018)

As Table 8 displays, the retranslation (24%) shows greater tendency towards source-oriented strategies than the earlier one (16%). Therefore, the RH is confirmed on the basis of their findings.

Masbugh and Gholami's (2018) study focused on the translations of *the Holy Qur'an*'s "metaphorical images" based on Newmark's (1988) model. The translations include Elahi Ghomshei (1944), Ayati (1992), Moezzi (1993), Rezaie Esfahani (2005),

---

2   Of these, the non-translation plus additional explanation is considered source-oriented, the other procedures target-oriented.

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 164

and Fouladvand (2010). The researchers have concluded that "Ayati, Moezzi and Fouladvand mostly used literal translation while Elahi Ghomshei employed semantic translation" (Masbugh/Gholami 2018: 123).

Procedure's Tendency	Source-oriented	Target-oriented
Elahi Ghomshei (1944)	34 (61%)	22 (39%)
Ayati (1992)	40 (71%)	16 (29%)
Moezzi (1993)	50 (89%)	6 (11%)
Rezaie Esfahani (2005)	48 (86%)	8 (14%)
Fouladvand (2010)	44 (79%)	12 (21%)

Table 9: Percentage of procedures (adopted from Masbugh/Gholami 2018: 144)

As for the three consecutive translations by Elahi Ghomshei, Ayati, and Moezzi, we observe an increase in their tendencies towards the ST; on the other hand, a reverse tendency is detected in translations presented by Rezaie Esfahani and Fouladvand. Therefore, while the RH is supported for the 20th-century translations, the very hypothesis is refuted for the 21st-century translations.

Mohammadi and Valavi's (2019) study analyzed the three ancient translations of Qur'anic metonymies. Translators include Tabari (13th century), Meybodi (15th century) and Abul-Futouh Razi (15th century). Based on their findings, while "Tabari and Abul-Futouh Razi have followed mostly literal translation", "Meybodi has had the most content-wise translation in rendering metonymy" (Mohammadi/Valavi 2019: 17). Therefore, comparing Tabari with Meybodi, we can infer that the RH is refuted since the earlier translation has been more source-oriented than the later one.

Exploring the way Muslims (including Shia, Sunni and those who have claimed to be 'neither Shia nor Sunni') rendered *the Holy Qur'an* into English, Afrouz's (2019: 1) study revealed that "translator's religious background" does not play a pivotal role in adopting particular translation procedures of translating religious-bound terms. The data are presented in Table 10.

Strategies	Frequency of the Strategies			
	20th-century Translators		21st-century Translators	
	Pickthall (1930)	Irving (1985)	Nikayin (2000)	The Monotheist Group (2012)
Conservation	47 (14%)	40 (12%)	57 (17%)	38 (11%)
Substitution	285 (86%)	292 (88%)	275 (83%)	294 (89%)

Table 10: Frequency of the strategies (adopted from Afrouz 2019)

A decreasing trend in the tendency of both the 20th-century and the 21st-century translators towards conservation (i. e., source-oriented) strategies is observable. In other words, the RH is disproved based on the findings in Afrouz's (2019) study.

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 165

Afrouz's (2020) study aimed at exploring the RH in the context of religious texts by focusing on culture-specific terms in nine English translations of *The Holy Qur'an*. Translators included Sale, Irving, Pickthall, Muhammad-Ali, Arberry, The Monotheist Group, Edip Yuksel et al, Starkovsky, and Nikayin. Davies's (2003) model was employed by the researcher. Based on his findings, "the RH is disproved" (Afrouz 2020: 115).

Employing Vermes's (2003) model, Afrouz (2021a) examined anthroponyms in three English (re)translations of *the Holy Qur'an* by Muhammadali Habib (1980), Al-Hajj Ta'lim Ali Abu Nasr (1985) and Muhammad A. S. Abdel Haleem (2005). In the model, "transference" is employed when a translator "incorporate the SL proper name unchanged into the TL text" (Vermes 2003: 93); "substitution" is used when the SL anthroponym "has a conventional correspondent in the TL, which replaces the SL item in the translation" (Vermes 2003: 93); "modification" involves replacing the original name "with a TL name which involves a substantial alteration in the translation of the form and of the analytic implications (if any) that the name effects" (Vermes 2003: 94); and translation refers to the act of translating the name "by a TL expression which gives rise to the same, or approximately the same, analytic implications in the target-text as the original name did in the source text" (Vermes 2003: 94). Afrouz (2021a) expanded the model by adding the procedure of "interpretative equivalent" for analyzing the Qur'anic anthroponyms. It refers to cases where translators substitute the original PN "with an anthroponym which is interpreted by commentators in exegetical texts to refer to the same person" (Afrouz 2021a: 5). Transference; and interpretative equivalent are source-oriented procedures, while substitution, modification, and translation are target-oriented procedures. It was interestingly found that while the earliest translation (by Habib) showed zero percent tendency to the source-oriented procedures, the tendencies of later translations, by Abdel Haleem and Abu Nasr, tremendously increased to 74.20% and 80.70%, respectively. The RH is, therefore, confirmed in Afrouz's (2021a) study.

4.2   Examining the RH in classical literary texts

In the current section, 10 studies focused on classical literary texts are investigated. Before reviewing each study in detail, we prefer to display the characteristics of these studies in Table 11.

Vahid Dastjerdi and Sahebhonar's (2008) study aimed at exploring personal proper-name allusions (PPAs) in *the first Book of the Masnavi*, and its two English translations by Redhouse (1881) and Nicholson (1940) "to find out how translation strategies can help translators to elicit meanings associated with the proper-name allusions in question" (Vahid Dastjerdi/Sahebhonar 2008: 41). They have resorted to Leppihalme's (1997) model to analyze the data. Suggesting that the selection of procedure "is related to the translator's fidelity or lack of fidelity to the ST author", the researchers have asserted that translators who utilized the procedure of "retention" have finally produced a more source-oriented translation and consequently, have been "more faithful to the ST author" (Vahid Dastjerdi/Sahebhonar 2008: 54). As the findings of their study reveal, while the 19th-century translator, Redhouse, has used 'retention' for 74% of proper-name allusions

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 166

Studies [Articles/ Theses]	Confirmed	Refuted	Number of STs	Number of TTs
Paloposki & Koskinen (2004)		3 (-)	1	2
Vahid Dastjerdi & Sahebhonar (2008)	3 (+)		1	2
Khamsi and Dehbashi Sharif (2014)		4 (-)	1	3
Karshenas & Ordudari (2016)		3 (-)	1	2
Kitanovska-Kimovska (2017)	4 (+)		1	3
Afrouz & Sabourzadeh (2018)		3 (-)	1	2
Ghafouripour & Eslamieh (2018)	3 (+)		1	2
Zhang & Ma (2018)	3 (+)		1	2
Budianto (2019)	10 (+)		1	9
Zandjani (2019)	4 (+)		1	3
Afrouz (2021b)		2 (-)	0	2
Total	27 (+)	15 (-)	10	32
Final Result	12 (+)			

Table 11: Exploring the RH in classical literary texts (CLTs)

(PPAs), the 20th-century translator, Nicholson, has resorted to this strategy for rendering almost all of the PPAs (98.53%). Therefore, "faithfulness is much more pronounced in Nicholson's translation" (Vahid Dastjerdi/Sahebhonar 2008: 51). All in all, their study supports the RH since the later translation has been identified to be more source-oriented than the former one.

Khamsi and Dehbashi Sharif (2014) have worked on translations of metaphors in Shakespeare's Macbeth. Three Persian translations by Shadman (1961), Pasargadi (1996), and Ashouri (1999) were investigated by the researchers. The researchers have selected Newmark's (1988: 88–91) model consisting of seven procedures: transferring or "reproducing the same image in the TL"; substituting the original image "with a standard TL image"; translating metaphors "by simile"; rendering metaphors "by simile plus sense"; "conversion of metaphor to sense"; deletion and using the "same metaphor combined with sense". Their findings indicated that while Shadman (1961) had most frequently resorted to Newmark's (1988) procedure of 'reproducing the same image in the TL' (a source-oriented procedure), Pasargadi (1996) had more tendency to use the procedure 'conversion to sense' (a mild target-oriented procedure), and Ashouri (1999) had mostly adopted the procedure 'replacing the image' (an extremely target-oriented procedure). Therefore, based on their findings, as regards rendering metaphorical expressions from classical English literary text into Persian, the RH is strongly declined.

Karshenas and Ordudari (2016), focusing on translation strategies in time span, worked on metaphors in English translations of Sa'di's *Gulistan*. Translations were selected from Newman's (2004) and Rehatsek's (1888) works with more than one century time span. They have additionally realized that the 'Time' factor has a critical role in opting for specific strategies. Their findings showed that the 19th-century translator, Rehatsek, had most frequently resorted to literal translation (a source-oriented procedure);

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 167

while, the 21st-century translator, Newman, had more tendency towards transferring the sense of the ST to the TT readership and providing them with a "more understandable" or target-oriented translation (Karshenas and Ordudari 2016: 104). Therefore, their study does not support the RH, as far as translating metaphors of classical Persian literary texts into English are concerned.

Kitanovska-Kimovska's (2017) study is conducted to validate the Retranslation Hypothesis by focusing on three Macedonian translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The analysis has been "based on a comparison between" the ST and the TTs by Shopov (1960), Gjuzel (1989), and Mihajlovski (2008) "in terms of the number of lexical inventions, i. e. the number of words derived through the processes of conversion and compounding" (Kitanovska-Kimovska 2017: 201). Shopov's translation "is done from a Russian source and is, thus, indirect translation" (Kitanovska-Kimovska 2017: 204). The other two trans-lations are translated directly from the original English text. According to the researcher, "the very first translation, which is an indirect one, is more target-oriented, the first direct translation is also target-oriented, while the second direct translation is more source-oriented" (Kitanovska-Kimovska 2017: 210). Therefore, Kitanovska-Kimovska's study has confirmed the RH.

Afrouz and Sabourzadeh (2018), investigating methods of rendering ambiguity in the Persian literary work '*the Divan*' of Hafiz, have proposed a model consisting of five general methods, including literal translation, compensation, preservation, sense for sense translation, and amplification. In literal translation and compensation (as source-oriented methods), translators only resort to primary meanings of ambiguous terms, while in preservation, sense for sense translation and amplification (as target-oriented methods), translator render an SL ambiguous word with a TL one, focuses just on conveying the central message, and adds clarifying notes of any kind, respectively. The corpus of their study consisted of one English translation (by Clarke, 1890) and two German translations (by Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall and Vincenz Ritter von Rosenzweig-Schwannau). However, for the purpose of the present study, the English one should be ignored. In Table 12, the methods are classified into two general categories:

General Tendency of the Methods	Source-oriented	Target-oriented
Hammer-Purgstall (1812)	40%	60%
Rosenzweig-Schwannau (1864)	39%	61%

Table 12: Tendency of the methods (adopted from Afrouz/Sabourzadeh 2018)

As the findings reveal, although the differences of the percentages are negligible, since the former translator has shown more tendency towards the source text, the RH is refuted.

Ghafouripour and Eslamieh's (2018) study was on the assessment of the quality of the two English translations of Khayyam's quatrains by Edward Fitzgerald (1859) and Saeed Saeedpour (2012). The data presented in Table 13 are extracted from their study.

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 168

Translator's Target-oriented Behaviors	deleted items	slight change in meaning	significant change in meaning	breach of the SL system	creative translation	cultural filtering	total
Fitzgerald	19	7	10	5	32	3	76
Saeedpour	12	13	8	6	22	2	63

Table 13: Translators' tendencies toward TL system

Based on what is revealed in Table 13, the first translator has more tendencies towards the TL system; and therefore, the later translation is closer to the source text. All in all, Ghafouripour and Eslamieh's (2018) study supports the RH.

Asserting that the "similarities and/or differences" between retranslations and their predecessors "attest to a textual relationship between the two (re)translations", Zhang and Ma (2018: 576) refer in their study "to this relationship as 'the intertextual relationship between (re)translations' and these textual similarities and differences as 'intertextuality in retranslation' (IR)". The researchers have mentioned the following two reasons for justifying their choice of the ST: (a) *Kong Yiji* "is considered a literary classic both at home and abroad", (b) the story "is one of those with the largest number of published English translations" (Zhang/Ma 2018: 581). Comparing "three English versions of" the ST and identifying "two types of IR, i. e. 'filiation' and 'dissidence', in real texts, particularly (re)translations of literary classics", they have finally come to the conclusion that the earliest translation has played a pivotal "role in the production of the later two" (Zhang/Ma 2018: 581). The three English translations include an earlier one by Snow and Yao (1936) and two editions by the Yangs in 1954 (Zhang/Ma 2018: 582). While the initial translation produced by Snow and Yao is "primarily target-oriented", the Yangs' versions were source-oriented since "the Yangs contended that translators should not tamper with the source texts" (Zhang/Ma 2018: 583). Therefore, on the basis of Zhang and Ma's findings, the RH is confirmed since the later translations have been more source-oriented than the earlier ones.

Budianto's (2019) study analyzed the foreignization and domestication processes "in nine books of Indonesian Tao Te Ching translations" (Budianto 2019: 185). The *Tao Te Ching* is one of the most prominent Chinese classics "written by Laozi" (Budianto 2019: 186). The researcher has studied nine translations by Tan (1937), Kwee (1938), Liem (1960), Tjan (1962), Majelis Tridharma (1995), Khrisna (1999), Tjan (2007), Lika (2012), and Wang (2014). Via the analysis of the nine translations, the researcher realized that the translation procedures of "'Dao道' in the translated versions embodied a very clear regularity, and the translation versions from the oldest to the newest one basically tend to be foreignized" (Budianto 2019: 190). All in all, the study confirms the RH.

The aim of Zandjani's (2019: 809) article was to scrutinize "the social and literary context of three German translations" of the Persian classical masterpiece '*the Gulistan*' by Karl Heinrich Graf (1846), Dieter Bellmann (1982), and Kathleen Göpel (1997). Possessing "a poetic sensitivity", the first translator, Graf, has assumedly more target-

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 169

oriented tendencies and wished to provide the German readership with a beautiful TT by placing "emphasis on poetic devices" and "recreating rhymed prose (saj) of Saʿdi's *Golestān*" (Zandjani 2019: 828). The later translator, Bellmann has shown more tendencies towards the ST and "deleted parts of the rhymed prose when he believed that the content was not in line with the Persian text"; in other words, "[h]e prioritizes the elements that introduce the reader to a foreign culture" (Zandjani 2019: 828). Göpel, as the latest translator, wanted "to break with the traditional 'European' translations and keep closer to the (source) text" (Zandjani 2019: 828). Therefore, it can be inferred from Zandjani's study that later translators have shown greater inclination to produce a more source-oriented translation than the former ones. All in all, her study confirms the RH.

The corpus of Afrouz's (2021b) study included *the Gulistan*'s English translation by Rehatsek (1888) and its retranslation by Newman (2004). The researcher had focused on stylistic issues of translation and found that recent translators have shown greater tendency "to deviating from the ST author's style" and "providing easy-to-understand texts for today's TT" readers (Afrouz 2021b: 214). Therefore, we can infer that the RH is disproved since the earlier translation (by Rehatsek) was more source-oriented than the later one (by Newman).

5   Conclusion

Table 14 reveals the frequency of the studies which confirmed or disproved the RH. Here, the number of STs and TTs examined in each study is taken into consideration.

General Category of Studies	Confirmed	Refuted	Number of STs	Number of TTs
CLTs	12 (+)		10	32
RLTs		32 (-)	3	57
Total	20 (-)		13	89

Table 14: Exploring the RH in terms of the number of STs and TTs

Table 14 displays that when the total number of STs and TTs is taken into account, the RH is supported in the case of CLTs, but it is rejected in the case of RLTs. Altogether, however, the RH is rejected. This result is in line with the findings of Mousavi Razavi and Tahmasbi Boveiri (2019).

Moreover, when we just take each single study (independent of the number of case studies involved), the total result remains the same. Table 15 illustrates the frequency of articles, thesis, and dissertations which have either confirmed or disproved the RH.

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 170

General Category of Studies	Confirmed	Refuted	Total	Final Result
CLTs	6 (+)	5 (-)	1 (+)	4 (-)
RLTs	5 (+)	10 (-)	5 (-)	

Table 15: Number of studies in acceptance/refute of the RH

Altogether, as Tables 14 and 15 reveal, while the RH is totally disproved in the case of religious literary texts, the very hypothesis is generally confirmed for classical literary texts.

Therefore, on the basis of the data analyzed in the present study, we can draw this conclusion that (re)translations of the RLTs and the CLTs have not revealed the same tendencies towards their respective source texts. Although almost all religious texts can be accounted as classical literary texts, (re)translators of these two categories of texts do not behave similarly, as far as the RH is concerned, of course.

It presumably sounds rational to consider sub-text-type as an influential factor in rejecting or confirming the validity of the RH. Prospective researchers can investigate this issue. This line of research can also be continued to pave the way for the development of a more comprehensive understanding of the RH. Future researchers can also conduct a meta-analytical study in order to investigate if retranslated versions have really resulted in the production of improved translations.

Acknowledgements

References

Afrouz, Mahmoud (2019): "How different Muslim translators render *the Holy Qur'an* into English? The case study of Sunni, Shia and 'neither Sunni nor Shia' translators." *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation* 12 [1]: 1–14

Afrouz, Mahmoud (2020): "Exploring the retranslation hypothesis in *The Holy Qur'an*'s English translations." *Linguistic Research in the Holy Quran* 9 [2]: 115–126 – https://doi.org/10.22108/NRGS.2022.131661.1727 (14 December 2022)

Afrouz, Mahmoud (2021a): "How three different translators of *The Holy Qur'an* render anthroponyms from Arabic into English: Expanding Vermes's (2003) model of translation strategies." *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* 69 [4]: 21–29 – https://doi.org/10.5195/names.2021.2255 (14 December 2022)

Afrouz, Mahmoud (2021b): "Investigating literary translator's style in span of time: The case of Sa'di's *Gulistan* translated into English." *Lebende Sprachen* 66 [2]: 214–230 – https://doi.org/10.1515/les-2021-0016 (14 December 2022)

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 171

Afrouz, Mahmoud; Hussein Mollanazar (2018): "A comparative study of the Holy Qur'an's English translations by Muhammad Ali and Shakir: Plagiarism or revision?" *Translation Studies Quarterly* 16 [61]: 51–68

Afrouz, Mahmoud; Morteza Sabourzadeh (2018): "Methods and strategies of translating ambiguity in literary texts." *Translation Studies Quarterly 15* [59]: 39–56

Aixelá, Javier Franco (1996): "Culture-specific items in translation." Román Álvarez, M. Carmen África Vidal (eds): *Translation, power, subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 52–78

Albachten, Özlem Berk; Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar (2019): *Perspectives on retranslation: Ideology, paratexts, methods*. New York: Routledge

Al-Salem, Reem Salem (2008): Translation of metonymy in *the Holy Qur'an*: A comparative, analytical study. PhD Dissertation. Riyadh: King Saud University, Department of English

Budianto, Pauw (2019): "Foreignization and domestication strategies in Indonesian translations of Tao Te Ching." *Litera* 18 [2]: 185–195

Davies, E. Eirlys (2003): "A goblin or a dirty nose? The treatment of culture-specific references in translations of Harry Potter books". *The Translator* 6 [2]: 65–100

El Damanhoury, Yoesra (2015): Translation of *the Quran* from Arabic to Japanese: A study of translation techniques usage in translating cultural references. Unpublished MA thesis. Leiden University

Ghafouripour, Sonia; Razieh Eslamieh (2018): "A translation quality assessment of two English translations of Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam based on Juliane House's model (1997)." *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies* 6 [2]: 217–226

Ivir, Vladimir (1987): *Procedures and strategies for the translation of culture*. London: Routledge

Karshenas, Hosna; Mahmoud Ordudari (2016): "Translation procedures in span of time: A case study on Newmark's translation procedures in two English translations of Saadi's *Gulistan*." *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies* 4 [2]: 96–106

Khamsi, Niks; Forouzan Dehbashi Sharif (2014): "The strategies for translating metaphors and similes in three Persian translations of Shakespeare's Macbeth." *Critical Language & Literary Studies* 6 [12]: 43–62

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 172

Kitanovska-Kimovska, Sonja (2017): "The Retranslation Hypothesis revisited: Shakespeare's Hamlet in Macedonian." *Horizons* [A 21]: 201–211 – https://doi.org/10.20544/HORIZONS.A.21.2.17.P17 (06 December 2022)

Koskinen, Kaisa; Outi Paloposki (2010): "Retranslation." Yves Gambier, Luc van Doorslaer (eds): *Handbook of translation studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 294–298

Leppihalme, R. (1997): *Culture bumps: An empirical approach to the translation of allusions*. Great Britain: WBC Book

Masbugh, Mahdi; Ali Gholami (2018): "A methodology of translations of metaphorical images of the scenes of the Day of Judgment in *the Qur'an* based on Newmark's model." *Literary Qur'anic Researches* 5 [2]: 123–151

Mohammadi, Zahra; Simin Valavi (2019): "Methods employed in rendering metonymy in the ancient translations of *the Holy Qur'an*: The case of Tabari, Meybodi and Abul-Futouh Razi." *Translation Studies Quarterly* 16 [64]: 17–30

Moradi, M.; M. H. Sadeghi (2014): "Translation of culture-specific phrases in *the Holy Qur'an*." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 4 [8]: 1735–1746 – https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.8.1735-1746 (06 December 2022)

Mousavi Razavi, Mir Saeed; Sajjad Tahmasbi Boveiri (2019): "A meta-analytical critique of Antoine Berman's Retranslation Hypothesis." *Translation Studies Quarterly* 17 [65]: 21–36

Munday, Jeremy (2016): *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. London: Routledge

Newmark, Peter (1988): *Approaches to translation*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Oyali, Uchenna (2018): "The Retranslation Hypothesis and lexical borrowings in Bible translations into Igbo." *Lebende Sprachen* 63 [1]: 84–100

Paloposki, Outi; Kaisa Koskinen (2004): A thousand and one translations: Revisiting retranslation. Gyde Hansen, Kirsten Malmkjær, Daniel Gile (eds.): *Claims, changes and challenges in translation studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 27–38

Pirnajmuddin, Hossein; Bahareh Zamani (2012): "A study of the translations of terms related to practical laws of religion (furū al-dīn): Raising students' awareness of culture-bound items." *Applied Research in English* 1 [2]: 71–82

Tabatabaee Lotfi, Seyyed Abdolmajid (2017): "A descriptive study on translation strategies of the Quranic proper nouns in five English translations." *ISQS Islamic Studies and Culture* 1 [1]: 99–117

Vahid Dastjerdi, Hossein; Sara Sahebhonar (2008): "Lost in translation: An intertextual study of personal proper-name allusions." *Across Languages and Cultures* 9 [1]: 41–55 – https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.9.2008.1.3 (06 December 2022)

Valavi, Simin; Maryam Hassani (2016): "Translation of some types of singular metonymies in the last ten units of the Qur'an: A case study of the translations done by Elahi Ghomshei, Makarem, Moezzi, and Fouladvand." *Translation Studies Quarterly* 13 [52]: 19–38

Van Coillie, Jan (2006): "Character names in translation: A functional approach." Jan Van Coillie, Walter P. Verschueren (eds): *Children's literature in translation: Challenges and strategies*. Manchester: St Jerome, 123–140

Van Poucke, Piet (2017): "Aging as a motive for literary retranslation: A survey of case studies on retranslation." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 12 [1]: 91–115 – https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.12.1.05van (12 December 2022)

Vermes, Albert Péter (2003): "Proper names in translation: An explanatory attempt." *Across Languages and Cultures* 4 [1]: 89–108

Mahmoud Afrouz
Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis
for classical and religious literary texts

trans-kom 15 [2] (2022): 156–173
Seite 173

Zandjani, Nina (2019): "The social and literary context of German translations of Saʿdi's *Golestān*."
Iranian Studies 52 [5–6]: 809–832 –
https://doi.org/10.1080/00210862.2019.1653173 (06 December 2022)
Zhang, Huanyao; Huijuan Ma (2018): "Intertextuality in retranslation." *Perspectives* 26 [4]: 576–
592 – https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1448875 (06 December 2022)

Author

Mahmoud Afrouz is Assistant Professor at the Department of English Language and Literature,
University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. He graduated with a PhD degree in the field of English
Translation Studies in 2015. Dr Afrouz has been teaching translation and interpretation-related
courses since 2007. His research interests include, among others, literary translation, audiovisual
translation, machine translation and studies related to culture and translation.
E-mail: m.afrouz@fgn.ui.ac.ir
Website: http://fgn.ui.ac.ir/~m.afrouz
ORCID: 0000-0003-3051-4769

Neu bei Frank & Timme

TRANSÜD. Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens

Herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Klaus-Dieter Baumann, Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Hartwig Kalverkämper, Prof. Dr. Sylvia Reinart, Prof. Dr. Klaus Schubert

Sabine Dievenkorn/Shaul Levin (eds.): **[Re]Gained in Translation I: Bibles, Theologies, and the Politics of Empowerment.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0789-2

Véronique Lagae/Nadine Rentel/Stephanie Schwerter (dir.): **La traduction en contexte migratoire.** Aspects sociétaux, juridiques et linguistiques. ISBN 978-3-7329-0825-7

Stephanie Schwerter/Katrina Brannon (eds.): **Translation and Circulation of Migration Literature.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0824-0

Hanna Reininger: **Fremde Sprachen im literarischen Original – Translatorische Herausforderungen.** Gezeigt an *Villette* von Charlotte Brontë. ISBN 978-3-7329-0877-6

Jutta Seeger-Vollmer: **Schwer lesbar gleich texttreu?** Wissenschaftliche Translationskritik zur *Moby-Dick*-Übersetzung Friedhelm Rathjens. ISBN 978-3-7329-0766-3

Richard Pleijel/Malin Podlevskikh Carlström (eds.): **Paratexts in Translation.** Nordic Perspectives. ISBN 978-3-7329-0777-9

Paweł Bielawski: **Juristische Phraseologie im Kontext der Rechtsübersetzung am Beispiel deutscher und polnischer Anklageschriften.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0836-3

Easy – Plain – Accessible

Herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Silvia Hansen-Schirra, Prof. Dr. Christiane Maaß

Sarah Ahrens/Rebecca Schulz/Janina Kröger/Sergio Hernández Garrido/Loraine Keller/Isabel Rink (eds.): **Accessibility – Health Literacy – Health Information.** Interdisciplinary Approaches to an Emerging Field of Communication. ISBN 978-3-7329-0895-0

Verwaltungskommunikation

Herausgegeben von Dr. Stefanie Koehler und Prof. Dr. Rocío Bernabé Caro

Stefanie Koehler/Rocío Bernabé Caro: **Deutsche Leichte Sprache für öffentliche Stellen.** Anforderungen, Empfehlungen, Umsetzung. ISBN 978-3-7329-0914-8

Alle Bücher sind auch als E-Books erhältlich.

Transkulturalität – Translation – Transfer

Herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Dörte Andres, Prof. Dr. Martina Behr, Prof. Dr. Larisa Schippel, Prof. Dr. Cornelia Zwischenberger

Hannah Spannring: **Lore Segal – Ein translatorisches Porträt im Kontext Exil.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0901-8

Cornelia Zwischenberger/Alexa Alfer (eds.): **Translaboration in Analogue and Digital Practice: Labour, Power, Ethics.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0913-1

Andreas F. Kelletat: **Wem gehört das übersetzte Gedicht?** Studien zur Interpretation und Übersetzung von Lyrik. ISBN 978-3-7329-0843-1

Annika Bergunde/Sonja Pöllabauer/Lilian Hagenlocher/Ursula Stachl-Peier für das UNHCR (Hg.): **Handbook for Interpreters in Asylum Procedures.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0860-8