

BOOK REVIEW

REDISCOVERING RETRANSLATION IN DIFFERENT CONTEXTS

İmren Gökce Vaz de Carvalho*

Universidade NOVA de Lisboa/Universidade de Aveiro

Studies from a Retranslation Culture: The Turkish Context, edited by Özlem Berk Albachten and Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Springer, 2019, 194pp, 96,29€, ISBN 978-981-13-7313-8, 53,49€, ISBN 978-981-13-7314-5.

Since the proposal of the “retranslation hypothesis” (Berman, 1990; Chesterman, 2000; Koskinen & Paloposki, 2003), many Translation Studies researchers have conducted research mainly to test its adequacy to explain retranslation phenomena (e.g. Brisset, 2004, Brownlie, 2006). Although, in recent years, the volume of research focusing on retranslation has increased significantly, most research has been limited to book translation, with literary works at the centre (Koskinen & Paloposki, 2010). This new book contributes to the development of Retranslation Studies by presenting a series of case studies that explore retranslation in different realms such as legal texts and songs, in addition to literary and philosophical contexts. However, this book’s uniqueness results from the fact that it focuses on one particular geocultural region, namely Turkey. Following their previous book *Perspectives on retranslation: ideology, paratexts, methods* (2019), which surveys international methodological approaches to retranslation, the editors, Özlem Berk Albachten and Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar now offer readers an opportunity to compare retranslation practices in a different sociocultural and linguistic framework, bringing together chapters that tackle retranslation from various perspectives and use a wide range of methodologies.

In chapter 2, Fatma Büyükkarcı Yılmaz reports on a paratextual survey of various (re)translations of *Gülistan*, a 13th-century literary work originally written in Persian. An important part of this chapter revolves around twelve different terms used to denote (re)translation. Yılmaz’s conclusion that *Gülistan* was not presented as “translation” is in line with the common practice of the time, considering that the Western concept of “translation proper” only started to be established in Ottoman-Turkish literary discourse after the end of the 19th century. Curiously, in chapter 3, A. Handan Konar also demonstrates that even in later periods the terms that refer to “translation” in Turkish were not used to designate many of the intralingual (re)translations of *Hüsn ü Aşk*, one of the latest examples of the classical era Ottoman poetry.

In chapter 4, Y. Tükel Kanra considers the retranslation of philosophical concepts in three translations of Kant’s *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. Kanra shows how retranslators’

* imren.gkce@gmail.com

efforts to adjust the existing translation to the readers' changing needs fail, mainly due to the use of decontextualizing terms that hinder comprehensibility. A similar issue, i.e. retranslations motivated by changing legal and terminological conventions, is dealt with in chapter 5, which is concerned with retranslations of the European Convention of Human Rights in Turkish. Kurme's study focuses on the translations of "detention" and "arrest" into Turkish in the official translation of the Convention and its two independent retranslations which have no official validity and function only as informative supplements to the official translation.

Chapters 6 and 7 shift the focus to ideology and indirect translation – which are considered as possible motivations for retranslation – as well as the tension between publishers and retranslators. İrem Konca's study analyses paratextual elements surrounding five Turkish retranslations of Marx's *Das Kapital*. It centres on different challenges that the agents of these retranslations face when creating a Turkish leftist discourse. To complete the picture, the chapter authored by Muazzez Uslu looks at another work by Marx, titled *Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei* (The communist manifesto). Drawing on the results of textual and paratextual analyses, Uslu traces the tension between the agents of direct and indirect translations, showing that this conflict existed mainly due to political and ideological reasons. The tension between retranslators and publishers is also discussed in chapter 8, where Ceyda Elgül analyses selected retranslations of Thomas Moore's *Utopia*. While there have been more than thirty retranslations of this work (the first one dating back to 1964), this chapter is dedicated to two 2003 retranslations, which were issued by two different publishing houses (one with leftist and the other with conservative ideology) and aim at two different readerships.

In chapter 9, Şule Demirkol Ertürk examines the motivations behind the retranslations of a Turkish novel, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* (The time regulation institute), into English. Ertürk's work is significant not only because of the rarity of similar cases, but also because it shows how the paratexts and the retranslations were influenced by Orhan Pamuk's writings about this novel and his representation of Turkey. Similarly, in chapter 10, Selin Erkul Yağcı investigates the retranslations of Arthur Conan Doyle's *The hound of the baskervilles* and Alexandre Dumas' *Le Comte de Monte Cristo* into Turkish, focusing on the notion of "popularity" as both a reason and a consequence of retranslations.

Finally, chapter 10 illustrates the factors influencing the deviations between the (re)translation of the famous Spanish song *¿Quién será?* in Turkish. Comparing three different translations of the song produced between 1968 and 2000, Mine Güven shows that the agents creating Turkish versions have rewritten the lyrics in a singable way in the target language, being loyal to the melody and the source performance, but adapting them to the image of the singers and/or expectations of the audience, and the linguistic needs of the target language.

Illustrating examples of retranslational practices within Turkish context, where (re)translation constitutes a significant part of the literary system, this book is both a

valuable contribution to the field and an important resource in terms of methodology and perspectives for researchers and students of Translation Studies.

REFERENCES

- Berman, A. (1990) 'La retraduction comme espace de traduction', *Paralimpestes*, 13(4), pp. 1-7.
- Brownlie, S. (2006) 'Narrative theory and re-translation theory', *Across languages and cultures* 7(2), pp. 145-170.
- Brisset, A. (2004). 'Retraduire ou le corps changeant de la connaissance. Sur l'historicité de la traduction', *Palimsestes*, 15, pp. 39-67.
- Chesterman, A. (2000) 'A causal model for translation studies' in M. Olohan (ed.) *Intercultural faultlines: research models in translation studies*, pp. 15-28. London: Routledge.
- Koskinen, P., and Paloposki, O. (2003) 'Retranslation in the age of digital reproduction', *Special Issue of Cadernos de Tradução: Tradução, Retradução e Adaptação*, 11, pp. 141-159.
- Koskinen, P., and Paloposki, O. (2010) 'Retranslation' in Gambier, Y. and Van Doorslaer, L. (eds.) *Handbook of Translation Studies I*, pp. 294-298. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

About the author: İmren Gökce Vaz de Carvalho holds BA and MA degrees in English – Turkish Translation and Interpreting Studies, and is currently pursuing a PhD in literary translation at the interuniversity doctoral program in Translation and Terminology coordinated by UNL and UA. Her research interests include literary translation, retranslation, indirect translation, reception studies, the role of the translator/interpreter, and sign language interpreting/translation.