trans-kom ISSN 1867-4844 https://www.trans-kom.eu
trans-kom ist eine wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für Translation und Fachkommunikation.

trans-kom 18 [2] (2025): 712–730

Mahmoud Afrouz & Narjes Asgari Vartooni

The Retranslation Hypothesis revisited

A meta-analytical study

Abstract

The Retranslation Hypothesis has been examined by a lot of researchers some of whom have lent support to it, while others have totally refuted it. The current study aims at investigating the validity of the RH via a meta-analytical exploration of 29 relevant research papers (produced from 1995 up to 2020). More than 39 source texts and 120 translations and retranslations were explored in this study. The results revealed that 62 % of the researchers have supported the RH in the last three decades. The findings indicate that by the passage of the decades, more studies supported the RH. However, when the overall number of source texts and target texts were considered, it was found that 60 % of the case-studies refuted the RH. It was also revealed that the RH was majorly supported by those retranslations, which appeared more than 10 years after the first translation. Moreover, based on the results, the RH was supported in the case of (re)translations made from major to minor cultures. Finally, it was found that while the RH was generally supported in the cases of modern novels, short stories and poems, it was strongly disproved for children's literature, audio-visual texts and video-game translations.

1 Introduction

Retranslating refers to the process of translating a source text that has formerly been rendered into the same target language. As a product, it "denotes a second or later translation of a single source text into the same target language" (Koskinen/Paloposki 2010: 294).

The Retranslation Hypothesis (henceforth the RH) refers to the "[t]heoretical assumptions on retranslation formulated in the 1990s" (Gürçağlar 2009: 233). The RH posits that later (re-)translations would "tend to be closer" to the source texts than the earlier ones (Chesterman 2004: 8)

The RH originated in a research-article in 1990 by Berman who, arguing that "no translation can claim to be 'the' translation" (Peeters/Van Poucke 2023: 5), believed that "while originals remain forever 'young', translations will age with the passage of time, thus giving rise to a need for new translations" (Gürçağlar 2009: 233–234).

Production of retranslations may have various motivations, among which we can refer to the inadequacy of earlier productions, eminence of the ST or its author, "ageing", or even "the needs, expectations, and attitudes" prevailing in the target culture (Susam-Sarajeva 2003: 30).

There seems to be "no discernible rhythm to retranslation, with intervals between the appearance of new target texts ranging from the sporadic to the periodic and the simultaneous" (Deane-Cox, 2014: 1). Therefore, the RH needs to be "tested in more depth" (Deane 2011: 9) since "[e]ven the major principles of the RH are not always confirmed" (Afrouz 2020: 116). The current study aims at investigating the validity of the RH via a meta-analytical exploration of some studies carried out thus far on the issue. It does not mean that studies explicitly dealing with the issue of RH were selected as samples. The researchers, in all studies investigated here, had concentrated 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 TT or ST, towards domestication or foreignization)" (Munday 2016: 88), it was quite operational to analyze the data of each work and detect whether the retranslations tended to be closer to the STs than the earlier ones. For this purpose, a collection of studies was accumulated in which several TTs of a single ST had been examined. It is worth mentioning that a finding based on the concept of foreignization is interpreted as an indication of closeness to the source text.

The main research questions of the present study are:

(1) To what extent is the RH validated in studies dealing with various text types (i. e., modern literary texts and audio-visual (multimedia) texts)?

(2) Is it possible to refute or confirm the RH on the basis of the direction of translation?

(3) To what extent do differences in the time elapsed since the first translation result in the refutation or confirmation of the RH?

It is noteworthy that in the current quantitative meta-analytical study, we do not deal with the underlying reasons behind the rejection or support of the RH in each case-study or text-type. Dealing with such an issue needs separate qualitative research with a socio-linguistic approach which is out of the scope of the present study.

2 Literature review

As far as we know, in recent years, only two meta-analytical studies have been conducted on the subject of the RH.

The first study, carried out by Van Poucke (2017: 99), examined "a survey of 70 case studies on retranslation in search for references to aging." The researcher has used "five volumes dedicated to the phenomenon of retranslation: three special issues of TS journals and two conference proceedings" (Van Poucke 2017: 99). However, the main objective of the research was the question of 'aging' as an incentive for retranslation; in other words, the RH was not tested but the motivation behind this phenomenon was

studied by Van Poucke. Furthermore, as the researcher acknowledged, most of the research papers utilized French sources and this predominance "could slightly bias the results of this article"; therefore, "future research should reveal whether retranslation is treated differently in different cultures" (Van Poucke 2017: 99).

The second study is Afrouz's (2022) paper in trans-kom journal which adopted classical literary texts (CLTs) and religious literary texts (RLTs) as its corpus. The researcher carried out "a meta-analytical study over the course of a 17-year period, incorporating 23 relevant studies" and interestingly found out that "while the RH is refuted in the case of" RLTs, the hypothesis is "confirmed for" CLTs (Afrouz 2022: 156).

This study intends to fill the research gap, mainly present in Afrouz's (2022) paper. Unlike him, we no longer took the RLTs and the CLTs into account. Our main concerns were modern literary texts and audio-visual texts. Furthermore, the present study does not predominantly focus on one language or the motivations of the RH (like van Poucke's). We mainly seek to test the validity of the RH while meticulously investigating the potential impacts of various factors involved in this respect.

3 Methodology

This meta-analytical study is a quantitative corpus-based study focusing on the issue of assessing the validity of RH.

3.1 Corpus

Exploring more than five hundred articles and thesis to find those which investigated retranslations of a single source text, we finally detected 29 relevant studies consisting mainly of MA theses, PhD dissertations, research papers, and books – covering a period of 25 years (from 1995 up to 2020).

In total, 39 source texts and 120 (re)translations (extracted from 29 studies) had been examined in the study. In the present study, the source texts from the 19th century on, considered here as modern literature, along with their TTs are explored.

3.2 Procedure

The steps taken to carry out the meta-analytical study include:

(i) identifying those studies focusing on retranslations of a ST;

(ii) categorizing the studies;

(iii) analyzing the findings of each study and tabulating the data; and

(iv) summing up the final results and drawing conclusions.

4 Results, discussion and data analysis

4.1 Results and discussion

The studies, consisting mainly of articles and dissertations, are generally classified into the following two categories: Modern Literary Texts (MLTs) and Audio-visual (Multimedia) texts (AVT). MLTs could also be subdivided into various categories (e. g., novels, short stories, poetry, etc.). The following paragraphs chronologically review the studies conducted by each researcher.

Working on (re)translations of children's books, Du-Nour (1995: 330) pointed out that "translations intended for children" are adjusted to target language norms. Du-Nour (1995), investigated "nine original books for children" and realized that "in the Hebrew polysystem" the former translations were "still more conservative than the latter" translations (Du-Nour 1995: 331–342); in other words, later translations were found by the researcher to be less source-oriented than earlier ones. Therefore, Du-Nour's (1995) study does not lend support to the RH. From among the nine works selected by Du-Nour, only the following 6 books were taken into account here: *Little Women* (translated in 1954 and 1992); *Cuore* (translated in 1922, 1923, 1957, 1958, 1985, and 1992); *The Wizard of Oz* (translated in 1949, 1968, 1974 and 1980); *Nils Holgerssons underbara resa genom Sverige* (translated in 1942–43, and 1981); *The Story of Doctor Dolittle* (translated in 1929, 1975a, 1975b, 1985); and *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (translated in 1929, 1955, 1969 and 1982). Three of the books were just revised (not retranslated).

Kujamäki's (2001) study explored eight retranslations into German of Aleksis Kivi's (1870) Finnish work 'Seitsemän veljestä'. The retranslations of this novel were made in 1921, 1935, 1942, 1947, 1950, 1961, 1962, and 1989. His study intended to show "that translations deviate from the original not because the translators have failed to do better but because they have worked as they saw fit in the context of time-bound normative conditions" (Kujamäki 2001: 65). Claiming that orientation of TT towards source or target depends on a number of different factors, Kujamäki (2001) has detected that retranslations had appeared to be more source-oriented than the earlier ones. The study supports the RH.

In exploring a case study, Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) took Oittinen's (1997) work into account. Oittinen (1997) had investigated three Finnish translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (by Lewis Carroll 1865). Translations selected by him included that of "Anni Swan in 1906", "Kirsi Kunnas and Eeva-Liisa Manner in 1972", and "Alice Martin in 1995" (Paloposki/Koskinen 2004: 34). According to the researchers, Oittinen's findings were "nicely in line with RH" (Paloposki/Koskinen 2004: 33).

Birdwood-Hedger's (2006) study focused on the issue of domestication and foreignization in five English translations of Tolstoy's (1866) *Anna Karenina*: Dole (1886), Garnett (1901), Maude (1918), Edmonds (1954), and Pevear and Volokhonsky (2000). Based on the findings of Birdwood-Hedger (2006: 264–266), Maude's (1918) translation "is more domesticating than Garnett's" (1901) rendition; Garnett's (1901) translation was "more

domesticating than Dole's" (1886) translation; Edmonds' (1954) rendition "is the most domesticating of all"; Pevear and Volokhonsky's (2000) translation was more faithful "to the original author's style". The results are tabulated to give a more vivid picture of the general orientations.

FOREIGNIZATION ◄——————————► DOMESTICATION				
Pevear & Volokhonsky (2000)	Dole (1886)	Garnett (1901)	Maude (1918)	Edmonds (1954)

Table 1: Domestication and foreignization (adapted from Birdwood-Hedger 2006)

Ignoring Pevear and Volokhonsky's (2000) translation, we realize that, based on Birdwood-Hedger's (2006) findings, the RH is totally refuted since the earlier translations were found to be more source-oriented than the later ones. However, in order to come to be better understanding and a more accurate analysis of the data, we can divide the findings into two groups: group (A) includes translations of Dole (1886), Garnett (1901), Maude (1918), and Edmonds (1954); group (B) includes translations of Pevear and Volokhonsky (2000) and any of the translators in group (A). Under such circumstances, the RH is found to be confirmed for translations in group (B), while it is totally disproved for translations in group (A).

The corpus of Brownlie's (2006: 145) study was comprised of "Zola's novel *Nana* and its five major British (re)translations": anonymous translator (1884), Victor Plarr (1895), Charles Duff (1956), George Holden (1972), and Douglas Parmée (1992). As regards "the retranslation hypothesis it is true that the first translation is adaptive to the target system, and the later translations are more source-oriented" (Brownlie 2006: 166). Therefore, her study confirms the RH.

Dealing with "culture-specific items (CSIs) or culture-bound terms (CBTs)" (Afrouz 2019: 5) in Japanese-English literary translation, Tobias (2006) found that culture-bound customs are difficult to express "without risking overtranslation", and words with "mimetic features inevitably lose some of their iconicity when rendered into English" (Afrouz 2019: 34). She has analyzed and compared two translations of Kawabata's (1926) story 'Izu no Odoriko'. The work "was first translated as 'The Izu dancer' by the American Edward Seidensticker in 1954" and "[t]he second translation, with the title 'The dancing girl of Izu' was produced by another American, J. Martin Holman, in 1997" (Tobias 2006). As she has concluded Seidensticker's (1954) approach to translation "is one of 'fluency', smoothing over CSIs to enable TL readers to relate to the story according to the terms of their own culture and literary norms" and "[h]is sentence structure, syntax and style also depart significantly from the ST, so as to be more 'readable' from an English language point of view" (Afrouz 2019: 33). On the other hand, Holman's (1997) "more foreignizing approach", as she (Tobias 2006) maintains, "exposes the cultural differences in more detail" and this work "adheres much more closely to the wording and sentence structure of the ST." All in all, the findings of Tobias's (2006) study support the RH.

The main objective of the research conducted by Vándor (2010) was to define adaptation and retranslation, and "to highlight their common features, shared functions in constructing cultural/literary norms", and to show "if retranslation theory is valid or not" (Vándor 2010: 1). As the corpus, the following "English and American novels of the 19th century written by woman writers were chosen" (Vándor 2010: 4): Brontë *Wuthering Heights* translated by Sötér (1957), Borbás (1993), Feldmár (2006); Austen *Sense and Sensibility* translated by Borbás (1976) and Sillár (2008), Brontë *Jane Eyre* (1969) translated by Mária (1959), Zsuzsa (2007) and its adaptation for girls, *A lowoodi árva* (*The Orphan of Lowood*) rewritten by Szász (1967; 2007); and Alcott *Little Women* translated by Prém (1926); Sóvágó (2004) and Barta (2006). Her study does not support the RH.

Focusing on CSIs in two English translations of the Persian novel *Savushun*, Akef and Vakili (2010) resorted to Aixelá's (1996) framework to analyze the translation strategies employed by the two translators: Ghanoonparvar (1990) and Zand (1991). It should be noticed that Aixelá's (1996) model generally consists of two main strategies: 'conservation' (source-oriented) strategies and 'substitution' (target-oriented) strategies. The data are tabulated, and the sub-strategies are abbreviated in the following way: Repetition (Rep), Orthographic Adaptation (OA), Linguistic (non-cultural) Translation (LT), Extratextual Gloss (EG), Intratextual Gloss (IG), Synonymy (S), Limited Universalization (LU), Absolute Universalization (AU), Naturalization (N), Deletion (D), Attenuation (A), Autonomous Creation (AC), and Dislocation (Di).

Strategies		Frequency and Percentage of the strategies			
		Ghanoonparvar (1990)		Zand (1991)	
Conservation	Rep	0	101 (53 %)	0	80 (42 %)
	OA	2		9	
	LT	42		43	
	EG	51		19	
	IG	6		9	
Substitution	S	34	90 (47 %)	31	111 (58 %)
	LU	1		9	
	AU	13		24	
	N	42		34	
	D	0		5	
	A	0		2	
	AC	0		0	
	Di	0		6	

Table 2: Distribution of strategies (adapted from Akef/Vakili 2010: 165)

As Table 2 reveals, the first translation (by Ghanoonparvar 1990) is approximately 10 % less target-oriented, while the retranslated version (by Zand 1991) is about 10 %

less source-oriented. Based on the findings of Akef and Vakili (2010), the RH is disproved.

Bollettieri and Torresi (2012) worked on the two Italian translations of James Joyce's *Ulysses*: one by Giulio De Angelis (1960), and the latest one by Enrico Terrinoni and Carlo Bigazzi (2012). As their findings reveal, the retranslated version is closer to the ST so that in the later translator's work (i. e., Terrinoni's), "the foreignizing potential of *Ulysses* was brought to life" (Bollettieri/Torresi 2012: 38). Their study, therefore, provides support for the RH.

The corpus of Salehi's (2013) study consisted of the culture-specific items in the modern novel *Buf-e Kur* (i. e., *The Blind Owl*) by the famous Persian novelist Sadeq Hedayat, and its two English translations by D. P. Costello (Hedayat 1957) and Iraj Bashiri (Hedayat 1974) based on Aixelá's (1996) model. He had merely provided the percentages of strategies via figures. Based on Salehi's (2013: 13) findings, while 32 % of Costello's selected strategies were of 'conservation' type, Bashiri had resorted to such strategies in rendering 37 % of the CSIs. Therefore, since more source-oriented strategies were utilized by the later translator, we can infer that the RH is confirmed on the basis of Salehi's (2013) study.

Darvishi (2013) explored the validity of the retranslation hypothesis in a corpus consisting of two children's novels (Roald Dahl's *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* (1964) and *Charlie and the Great Glass Elevator* (1972)) and their six Persian translations – each novel had three translations. Concentrating on Toury's (2012) norms to specify the degree of adequacy and acceptability of each translation, the researcher hypothesized that the RH would not be confirmed in the case of children's literature due to their specific characteristics: "e. g. preference for a natural and 'domesticating' style" (Darvishi 2013: 5). According to Darvishi (2013: 5), the "re-translation of children's books is (and should be)" TL-oriented. His study refuted the RH.

Attempting to test the validity of the Retranslation Hypothesis, Vahid Dastjerdi and Mohammadi (2013) chose Austen's (1813) novel *Pride and Prejudice* "together with its first and subsequent translation into Persian" (Vahid Dastjerdi/Mohammadi 2013: 174). The comparison of "three stylistic features (type/token ratio, average sentence length, speech representation) between" the STs and the TTs "was underpinned by Baker's (2000) and Short's (1996) methodologies for investigating style as a means of measuring degrees of closeness or divergence, and charting the treatment of the retranslation over time" (Vahid Dastjerdi/Mohammadi 2013: 174). The first Persian translation was presented by Mosaaheb (1955) and its retranslated version has been carried out by Pooraanfar and Adelpoor (2007). Based on "what was depicted through" their research, retranslations got closer "to the stylistic properties of the source text for all the three stylistic markers, while the first translation kept more distance from the source text's style to ensure the positive reception of the translated text in the target context" (Vahid Dastjerdi/Mohammadi 2013: 180). Therefore, the results achieved from their study were in line with the RH.

The corpus of Heino's (2013) study consisted of English novel *Mary Poppins* (by Pamela Lyndon Travers 1956) and its three Finnish translations called Maija Poppanen. The work has been translated into Finnish by Tuulio (1980), Makkonen (2009), and Kapari-Jatta (2010). According to the RH, "the translator of the initial translation should always use more assimilative strategies, whereas the translator(s) of the retranslation(s) should use more aggressive strategies" (Heino 2013: 51). The researcher has finally come to this conclusion that the two retranslations were "less assimilated than the initial translation" (Heino 2013: 89). To put it another way, the two retranslations were detected to be closer to the ST than the initial translation, which implies that in Heino's (2013) study, the RH is considered "valid" (Heino 2013: 89).

Han and Cho's (2014) study concentrated on examining the RH in modern literary texts. The novel *The Martyred* was written by Richard Eun Kook Kim (1964). Its first version was rendered into Korean by Chang Wang-rok (1964); the second, by Doh Jung-il, (1979); and the third, by Richard Kim (1990). Based on the findings of the researchers, the "descriptive" hypothesis, "in which retranslation tends to be closer to the ST", "is not always adequate" since "there are counter-examples against it" (Han/Cho 2014: 56). Their study did not support the RH.

Feng (2014) investigated the RH by analyzing two English translations of the Chinese novel *Sanguo Yanyi*, published in 1994 and 2002. The study, focused mainly on cultural references, revealed that while the first translation was more domesticated, its retranslation was more foreignized. The findings of Feng's (2014) study supported the RH.

Askari and Akbari (2014) considered two Persian translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* as the corpus of their study in order to scrutinize the translation strategies "of proper nouns in accordance with Newmark and Vermeer's (Skopos) theories of translation" (Askari/Akbari 2014: 19). The results of their study have shown that while Mohammad Firuzbakht's (1988) translation "is moving toward the reader", Amir Amirshahi's (2010) translation "is moving toward the author". To put it another way, the retranslated version is more source-oriented. Askari and Akbari's (2014) study supported the RH.

A similar study was done by Dehbashi Sharif and Shakiba (2015) where the researchers had again focused on the novel *The Blind Owl* and its translations by Costello (Hedayat 1957) and Bashiri (Hedayat 1974) based on a combination of the strategies provided by the models of Ivir (1987), Aixelá (1996), and Davies (2003).

Similar to the previous research conducted by Salehi (2013), more source-oriented strategies were utilized by the later translator (i. e., Bashiri: Hedayat 1974); therefore, the RH is confirmed on the basis of Dehbashi Sharif and Shakiba's (2015) study.

Strategies		Frequency and Percentage			
		Costello (Hedayat 1957)		Bashiri (Hedayat 1974)	
Source-oriented	Borrowing	13	108 (59 %)	9	123 (67 %)
	Extratextual Gloss	16		25	
	Intratextual Gloss	15		19	
	Literal Translation	64		70	
Target-oriented	Globalization	29	76 (41 %)	27	61 (33 %)
	Localization	14		12	
	Deletion	10		1	
	Synonymy	13		12	
	Transformation	10		9	

Table 3: Distribution of strategies (adapted from Dehbashi Sharif/Shakiba 2015: 54)

De Letter (2015) investigated the RH in Children's Literature – William Makepeace Thackeray's (1855) *The Rose and the Ring*. The first Dutch translation of the work was presented by Mark Prager Lindo (1869). The second and the third translations were respectively produced by J. van der Hoeve (1888) and Toos Blom (1961). The last translation was presented by Yge Foppema in 1976. De Letter has concluded that the retranslation hypothesis does not "apply to the original Dutch translation and three retranslations of the English fairy tale *The Rose and the Ring*" since "the ADF" (i. e., average degree of foreignization) "of the third retranslation is lower than the ADF of the second retranslation" (De Letter 2015: 143). As a result, De Letter's (2015) study does not support the RH.

Naghmeh-abbaspour and Mahadi's (2015) joint work was limited to 'food and drink' terms and illustrated "the way that Persian translators approach these culture-bound elements in a 70 years period" (Naghmeh-abbaspour/Mahadi 2015: 58). The corpus comprised Persian translations of two "children's books of *Alice's adventures in wonderland*, and *Grimm Brothers' Fairy Tales*" (Naghmeh-abbaspour/Mahadi 2015: 61). The quantitative data extracted from their work are tabulate as follows.

Source text	Translators	Domestication	Foreignization
Alice's adventures in wonderland	Honarmandi (1928)	50 %	50 %
	Pirzad (1996)	87 %	13 %
Grimm Brothers' Fairy Tales	Mosaheb (1956)	100 %	0 %
	Panjeshahi (2006)	67 %	33 %

Table 4: Distribution of strategies (adapted from Naghmeh-abbaspour/Mahadi 2015)

As far as the retranslation of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* is concerned, the RH is totally disproved, but when it comes to the retranslation of *Grimm Brothers' Fairy Tales*, the RH is confirmed.

Afrouz (2017) compared two English translations of Hedayat's *The blind owl*, one by the native English Costello (Hedayat 1957) and the other by the native Persian Bashiri (Hedayat 2013) in order to investigate "the role of native and non-native translators in preserving national identity" (Afrouz 2017: 41). Newmark's (1988) model was used as the framework of this study. He has realized that Costello, as compared with Bashiri, has been less concerned with observing the cultural differences, while Bahiri had been more cautious of preserving the national identity. The data extracted from his study is presented in Table 5.

Procedures	Frequency and Percentage	
	Costello (Hedayat 1957)	Bashiri (Hedayat 2013)
Source-oriented	16 %	30 %
Target-oriented	84 %	70 %

Table 5: Distribution of procedures (adapted from Afrouz 2017: 48)

As Table 5 demonstrates, Bashiri (Hedayat 2013), the most recent translator, has shown more tendency towards the source text by applying 'source-oriented' procedures approximately twice as much as Costello, the former translator, has done. Therefore, Afrouz's (2017) findings seem to be in line with the general assumption of the RH. This second study on the same data as above (i. e., Salehi 2013) gives the same result as the previous one.

Working on the issue of aging as a reason for literary retranslation, Van Poucke (2017: 108) conducted "a small-scale pilot study" considering two translations of Chekhov's (1886) "short story *Dlinnyi iazyk* [Loose tongue]" by Charles Timmer (1954) and Aai Prins (2005). For each alteration "in the retranslation, compared to the earlier translation," Van Poucke has "looked for an explanation, and when aging was detected as a motive, the changes were categorized into linguistic (lexical, grammatical, stylistic) and translational (cultural) features" (Van Poucke 2017: 108). Asserting that on the lexical and syntactic level the changes have been inconspicuous, the researcher has detected "more evidence of aging" on "stylistic level", in a way that "simplification and lowering of register appear to be prominent in the retranslated short story. In the majority of cases, the basic parts of speech from the earlier translation were replaced by more contemporary and frequently used lexicon" (Van Poucke 2017: 109). To put it another way, as far as stylistic issues are concerned, the re-translation has appeared to be more target-oriented. On the other hand, as regards "the changes in the retranslation", Van Poucke (2017: 109) has realized that "the verbosity of the 1954 version" has been "replaced by an austerity that is much more in keeping with Chekhov's original", in other words, in this respect, the later translator has produced a translation closer to the original text. Furthermore, as Van Poucke (2017: 110) has underlined, "[t]he retranslator also adopts another, more source-oriented, strategy with regard to loanwords". All in all, the RH is partially confirmed by Van Poucke (2017).

Obeidat's (2019: 13–17) study worked on "the translations of collocations in" the Arabic novel *Awlad Haratina* on the basis of "Venuti's domestication and foreignization and its English translations by Philip Stewart (1981) and Peter Theroux (1988)". The distribution of the two general strategies is tabulated to give a more vivid picture of the whole event.

Strategies	Domestication	Foreignization
Stewart (1981)	104 (40 %)	236 (65 %)
Theroux (1988)	158 (60 %)	129 (35 %)

Table 6: Distribution of strategies (adapted from Obeidat 2019)

As is illustrated in Table 6, the retranslation (35 %) has been outstandingly less source-oriented than the earlier translation (65 %); therefore, Obeidat's (2019) study has definitely refuted the RH.

The study carried out by Shabani, Emadi, and Daftari (2019) consisted of selected poems of an Iranian contemporary poet Forough Farrokhzad rendered into English by Jascha Kessler (2006) and Sholeh Wolpé (2007) on the basis of Vinay and Darbelnet's (1958/1995) framework. The "direct" and "oblique" procedures resemble "literal" (or source-oriented) and free (or target-oriented) translations, respectively (Shabani/Emadi/Daftari 2019: 88). The results are tabulated as follows:

Procedures	Source-oriented	Target-oriented
Kessler (2006)	36 %	64 %
Wolpé (2007)	47 %	53 %

Table 7: Distribution of procedures (adapted from Shabani/Emadi/Daftari 2019)

As Table 7 demonstrates, Kessler (2006) presented a more target-oriented translation than Wolpé (2007). In other words, the later translation has been more source-oriented, and therefore, the RH is supported on the basis of their study.

Ziemann's (2019: 88) study explored the role of extratextual factors in three "English versions of the fiction of the Polish-Jewish modernist author and visual artist Bruno Schulz (1892–1942)": one presented by Wieniewska (1963/1978), and the two retranslations by "John Curran Davis's and Madeline Levine's 21st-century". It has been revealed that the two retranslations "differ in almost all respects possible in how they present themselves to their prospective readers" and Wieniewska "domesticated or assimilated Schulz" (Ziemann 2019: 89–96). The hypothesis is finally "tested and confirmed on closer inspection of the retranslations" (Pan 2019: 3009).

In Widman's (2019: 149) study, the RH "was quantitatively tested by applying the Translation Modalities Method (TMM) to a case of two English translations of *A Paixão Segundo G. H.* (APSGH), by the Brazilian novelist Clarice Lispector (1964)". The translations were produced by Ronald W. Sousa (1988) and Idra Novey (2012). The findings

revealed that "each subsequent translation of *APSGH* is more literal, therefore foreignizing, in line with Berman's hypothesis" (Widman 2019: 162).

Obeidat and Mahadi (2019) concentrated on religious-cultural collocations in the novel *Awlad Hartna* and its two English translations by Stewart (1981) and Theroux (1988). The result of their study is tabulated as follows.

Strategies	Domestication	Foreignization
Stewart (1981)	90 %	10 %
Theroux (1988)	70 %	30 %

Table 8: Percentage of strategies (adapted from Obeidat/Mahadi 2019)

On the basis of what is demonstrated in Table 8, the later translator has more frequently resorted to foreignization strategies (30 %) than the earlier one (10 %), and consequently, has produced a more source-oriented translation than the initial one. Therefore, in this case, the RH is supported.

Alshehri's (2020) study, being comprised of three case studies, aimed at investigating the RH. His first case study consisted of Edgar Allan Poe's English short story *The Tell Tale Heart* and its two Arabic renditions by Khalid Alawadh (1992) and Khalaf Alqurashi (1993). His second case study was comprised of O. Henry's *While the Auto Waits* and its two translations by Khalid Alawadh (1992) and Hessa Alammar (2003). His third case study included O. Henry's *Hearts and Hands* and its two translations by Khalaf Alqurashi (1993) and Hessa Alammar (2003). The results are tabulated as follows.

Strategies		Source-oriented	Target-oriented
1st case study	Alawadh (1992)	38 %	62 %
	Alqurashi (1993)	31 %	69 %
2nd case study	Alawadh (1992)	39 %	61 %
	Alammar (2003)	39 %	61 %
3rd case study	Alqurashi (1993)	67 %	33 %
	Alammar (2003)	60 %	40 %

Table 9: Distribution of strategies (adapted from Alshehri 2020)

Based on the data presented in Table 9, as for the first and the third case study, the later translation is less source-oriented than the earlier one (each by 7 %). Therefore, while the RH can neither be proven nor be refuted on the basis of the findings of the second case study, the results of the first and the third case studies refuted the RH.

Bywood's (2019) study examined English subtitles of two German movies with an eye to validating the retranslation hypothesis. The focus of her study had been on "culture-specific references" in the films *Die Blechtrommel* (subtitled in 1995, 2002, and 2010) and *Die verlorene Ehre der Katharina Blum* (subtitled in 2003 and 2009). Based on her study, "[t]he choices of the subtitler(s), as we move through time from oldest to newest

translations, show a demonstrable tendency to give priority to more target-culture oriented solutions", and therefore, "the retranslation hypothesis does not apply in this case" (Bywood 2019: 815). However, directionality (translating from English vs. translating into English) may be assumed to play a pivotal role and be considered as a potential factor for changing the results (cf. Gottlieb 2009).

Purnomo, Purnama and Untari (2019) focused on retranslations in the context of video game translation (VGT). Translations had been made into English. The study included one ST and seven (re)translations. After applying "theories of retranslation, multiplicity, commodified nostalgia, and intertextual continuity on seven titles of Square Enix's award-winning Final Fantasy series", they have found that "retranslations on the series are oriented to target gaming system and the aesthetics of mechanics and narrative intertextuality and thus refuting Retranslation Hypothesis" (Purnomo/Purnama/ Untari 2019: 12).

4.2 Data Analysis

Approval and Disproval of the RH in each case-study is indicated by (+) and (-), respectively. If, however, the study neither supported nor refuted the RH, it is specified as (0). Moreover, the number of case-studies needs to be taken into account in order to obtain fair results. Therefore, for instance, if the RH is supported in an article with a corpus consisting of one ST and two translations, it would be documented as 3 (+).

The data related to the 29 studies carried out during the last three decades are presented in Table 10. Two studies had contradictory results and were not taken into account.

Decade	Number studies	Supported	Refuted	Final results
1990–1999	1		1 (-)	1 (-)
2000–2010	7	4 (+)	2 (-)	2 (+)
2011–2021	22	14 (+)	8 (-)	6 (+)
Total		62 %	38 %	

Table 10: Exploring the RH in three decades (based on studies)

Based on what is presented in Table 10, as a decade passes, more studies have supported the RH. While one study disproved the RH in the last decade of 20th century, the hypothesis is generally supported by the studies carried out in the first and the second decade of the 21st century.

In order to present a more accurate analysis, we also need to consider the number of STs and TTs in each study. In Table 11, we have tabulated the related data.

Decade	Number of STs	Number of TTs	Supported	Refuted	Final results
1990–1999	6	22		28 (-)	28 (-)
2000–2010	11	35	23 (+)	23 (-)	0
2011–2021	22	63	41 (+)	44 (-)	3 (-)
Total			40 %	60 %	

Table 11: Exploring the RH in three decades (based on the number of STs & TTs)

In general, after examining 29 studies (including 39 STs and 120 TTs), it was revealed that the RH was supported by 68 and was disproved by 91 case-studies. As is shown in Table 11, as a decade passes, the number of STs and TTs supporting the RH is increased. While the hypothesis was seemingly refuted in the first decade (1990–1999), we observe a balance between the case-studies supporting and refuting the RH in the first decade of the 21st century. But the number of case-studies supporting the RH has surpassed those refuting it in the second decade of 21st century.

In the cases analyzed in this paper, and from the perspective of RH, three reasons seem to have had an impact on the target texts: (A) Differences in the time elapsed since the first translation, (B) The direction of translation (from minor to major cultures and the other way round), and (C) Text types. Table 12 demonstrates the quantitative data related to each criterion.

Potentially influential factors	Categories	Number of STs	Number of TTs	Supported	Refuted	Final results
Differences in the Time Elapsed	0 to 5 years	8	23	7 (+)	24 (-)	17 (-)
	5–10 years	8	23	7 (+)	16 (-)	9 (-)
	more than 10 years	23	74	50 (+)	47 (-)	3 (+)
Direction of Translation	from minor to major cultures	15	55	44 (+)	26 (-)	18 (+)
	from major to minor cultures	24	65	20 (+)	69 (-)	49 (-)
Text Types	modern novels	18	56	44 (+)	30 (-)	14 (+)
	modern short stories	5	11	10 (+)	6 (-)	4 (+)
	modern poetry	1	2	3 (+)		3 (+)
	children's literature	12	39	7 (+)	44 (-)	31 (-)
	AVT & VGT	3	12		15 (-)	15 (-)

Table 12: Exploring the RH considering various criteria

5 Conclusion

Considering the total number of 29 studies, we can conclude that the majority of the researchers (62 %) have supported the RH during the last three decades. In contrast to Afrouz's (2022) study, which confirmed the RH for classical literary texts, we could not claim so for the case of modern literary texts (see Table 12). The reason that our findings are not in line with his study might be the difference in the nature of translating modern vs classical literary text.

The findings indicated that by the passage of the decades more studies supported the RH. But the issue of either supporting or disproving the RH appeared to be more complicated. We could not simply count the number of researchers and their general ideas about the hypothesis. We needed to take other criteria into consideration. One of such criteria was the number of works (STs and TTs) studied by each researcher. As the findings revealed, while 60 % of the case-studies had refuted the RH, only 40 % supported it. Therefore, we came up with contradictory results: on the one hand, the majority of the researchers have supported the RH, but on the other, the majority of the case-studies had disproved it.

Such an apparent contradiction indicates that we needed to take other potentially influential factors into account.

One factor we deemed to have impact was 'the differences in the time elapsed since the publication of the first translation'. The final results indicated that the RH was majorly supported by those retranslations which have appeared more than 10 years after the first translation.

Another factor was 'the direction of translation from minor to major cultures and the other way round'. The results were quite interesting. The RH was refuted in the case of (re)translations made from major to minor cultures, while it was majorly supported by the studies focusing on (re)translations made the other way round.

The last, but not least, potentially influential factor considered in the present study was 'the text type'. The findings were attention-grabbing. While the RH was totally supported in the case of modern novels, short stories and poetry, it was strongly disproved for children's literature, audio-visual texts and video-game translations. Actually, our study confirms Darvishi's (2013) findings and emphasizes that the RH does not seem to hold true in the case of children's literature.

Another interesting finding of the study was that all works belonging to children's literature were translated from major cultures into minor ones. Therefore, as the results revealed, now we can more confidently hypothesize that the RH does not hold true in the case of children's literature translated into minor cultures. Future studies can examine the RH in (re)translations of children's books made from minor to major cultures in order to test the validity of such a claim.

We cannot still 'generally' support or reject the RH. It sounds more realistic to consider a host of factors as influential ones in rejecting or confirming the validity of the RH. Prospective researchers can investigate factors untouched in the present study.

Acknowledgements

We wish to express our heartfelt gratitude to Professor Dr Leona Van Vaerenbergh and Professor Dr Klaus Schubert for their great patience, invaluable help and constructive comments by whose assistance and patient guidance, this paper appeared in its current form. We would also like to thank reviewers for their insightful comments and cordially congratulate Dr Sylvia Jaki and Dr Franziska Heidrich-Wilhelms on their joining the editorial team.

References

Afrouz, Mahmoud (2017): “A comparative-interpretative study of the role of native and non-native translators in preserving national identity.” *Journal of Language and Translation Studies* 49 [1]: 41–55

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

Afrouz, Mahmoud (2022): “Testing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis for classical and religious literary texts: A meta-analytical study.” *trans-kom* 15 [2]: 156–173 – https://www.trans-kom.eu/bd15nr02/trans-kom_15_02_01_Afrouz_Retranslation.20221219.pdf (16 February 2025)

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

Akef, Kourosh; Tahmineh Vakili (2010): “A comparative analysis of culture specific items in two English translations of Savushun.” *Journal of English Language Studies* 1 [4]: 157–168

Alshehri, Fawziah Ali (2020): “Examining the re-translation hypothesis: The case of three short stories in the Saudi literary system.” *Athens Journal of Philology* 7: 1–22

Askari, Mojtaba; Alireza Akbari (2014): “Challenges in translation of proper nouns: A case study in Persian translation of George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*.” *International Journal of Comparative Literature & Translation Studies* 2 [2]: 19–28 – https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijclts.v.2n.2p.19

Baker, Mona (2000): “Towards a methodology for investigating the style of literary translator.” *Target* 12 [2]: 241–266 – https://doi.org/10.1075/target.12.2.04bak

Berman, Antoine (1990): “La retraduction comme espace de la traduction.” *Palimpsestes* XIII [4]: 1–7 – https://doi.org/10.4000/palimpsestes.596

Birdwood-Hedger, Maya (2006): Tension between domestication and foreignization in English-language translations of Anna Karenina. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh

Bollettieri, Rosa Maria; Ira Torresi (2012): “Reforegnising the foreign: The Italian retranslation of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*.” *Scientia Traductionis* 12: 36–44 – http://dx.doi.org/10.5007/1980-4237.2012n12p36

Brownlie, Siobhan (2006): “Narrative theory and retranslation theory.” *Across Languages and Cultures* 7 [2]: 145–170 – https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.7.2006.2.1

Bywood, Lindsay (2019): “Testing the retranslation hypothesis for audiovisual translation: The films of Volker Schlöndorff subtitled into English.” *Perspectives* 27 [6]: 815–832 – https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2019.1593467

Chesterman, Andrew (2004): “Hypotheses about translation universals.” Gyde Hansen, Kirsten Malmkjær, Daniel Gile (eds): *Claims, changes and challenges in translation studies*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1–14

Darvishi, Akbar (2013): Norms governing translation and retranslation of children's literature. Unpublished master’s thesis. Tehran: Allameh Tabataba’i University

Davies, 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

De Letter, Nicole (2015): Children’s literature & the retranslation hypothesis: The Rose and the Ring. Unpublished MA thesis. Ghent: University of Ghent

Deane, Sharon Louise (2011): Confronting the retranslation hypothesis: Flaubert and Sand in the British literary system. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh

Deane-Cox, Sharon (2014): *Retranslation. Translation, literature and reinterpretation*. London: Bloomsbury

Dehbashi Sharif, Forouzan; Sima Shakiba (2015): “A modification of culture-specific items and translation strategies used by native and non-native translators in translation of ‘*The Blind Owl*’ by Sadegh Hedayat.” *ELT Voices* 5 [3]: 48–59

Du-Nour, Miryam (1995): “Retranslation of children’s books as evidence of changes of norms.” *Target* 7 [2]: 327–346 – https://doi.org/10.1075/target.7.2.08dun

trans-kom **ISSN 1867-4844**

trans-kom ist eine wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für Translation und Fachkommunikation.

trans-kom veröffentlicht Forschungsergebnisse und wissenschaftliche Diskussionsbeiträge zu Themen des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens, der Fachkommunikation, der Technikkommunikation, der Fachsprachen, der Terminologie und verwandter Gebiete.

Beiträge können in deutscher, englischer, französischer oder spanischer Sprache eingereicht werden. Sie müssen nach den Publikationsrichtlinien der Zeitschrift gestaltet sein. Diese Richtlinien können von der **trans-kom**-Website heruntergeladen werden. Alle Beiträge werden vor der Veröffentlichung anonym begutachtet.

trans-kom wird ausschließlich im Internet publiziert: https://www.trans-kom.eu

Feng, Lei (2014): “Retranslation hypotheses revisited: A case study of two English translations of Sanguo Yanyi-the first Chinese novel.” *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 43: 69–86

Gottlieb, Henrik (2009): “Subtitling against the current: Danish concepts, English minds.” Jorge Díaz Cintas (ed.): *New trends in audiovisual translation*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 21–46

Gürçağlar, Şehnaz Tahir (2009): “Retranslation.” Mona Baker, Gabriela Saldanha (eds): *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. New York: Routledge, 232–235

Han, Miae; Euiyon Cho (2014): “Retranslation hypotheses and three Korean translations of *The Martyred*.” Conference proceedings. Spring Conference at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies. *The Journal of Translation Studies* 15 [4]: 29–59 – https://www.dbpia.co.kr/Journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE02485594 (11 November 2025)

Hedayat, Sadeq (1957): *The blind owl*. D. P. Costello (trans.). London: John Calder

Hedayat, Sadeq (1974): *Hedayat’s ivory tower: Structural analysis of The Blind Owl*. Iraj Bashiri (trans.). Minneapolis: Manor House

Hedayat, Sadeq (2013): *The blind owl*. Iraj Bashiri (trans.). Minneapolis: Manor House

Heino, Anu (2013): Assessing the validity of the retranslation hypothesis in the Finnish translations of the novel Mary Poppins. Unpublished MA Thesis. Vaasa: University of Vaasa

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

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

Kujamäki, Pekka (2001): “Finnish comet in German skies: Translation, retranslation and norms.” *Target* 13 [1]: 45–70

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

Naghmeh-abbaspour, Bita; Tengku Sepora Tengku Mahadi (2015): “On translation of children’s literature: Characters of children’s books enjoy a different diet in Iran.” *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding* 2 [6]: 58–68

Newmark, Peter (1988): *A textbook of translation*. New York: Prentice Hall

Obeidat, Adham Mousa (2019): “The application of domestication and foreignization strategies in translating Arabic-English collocations in *Awlad Haratina* Novel.” *International Journal of Language, Literacy and Translation* 2 [2]: 13–28 – https://doi.org/10.36777/ijollt2019.2.2.024

Obeidat, Adham Mousa; Tengku Sepora Tengku Mahadi (2019): “The translation of Arabic religious-cultural collocations in literacy texts into English: An application of domestication and foreignization translation strategies.” *International Journal of Humanities, Philosophy, and Language* 2 [6]: 155–165

Oittinen, Riitta (1997): *Liisa, Liisa ja Alice*. Tampere: Tampere University Press

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

Pan, Feng (2019): “Book review of *Perspectives on Retranslation: Ideology, Paratexts, Methods*.” *International Journal of Communication* 13: 3008–3011

Peeters, Kris; Piet Van Poucke (2023): “Retranslation, thirty-odd years after Berman.” *Parallèles* 35 [1]: 3–27 – https://doi.org/10.17462/para.2023.01.01

Purnomo, Luthfie Arguby; Lukfianka Sanjaya Purnama, Lilik Untari (2019): “Prosthetic translation: Retranslations of video game remakes and remasters refute retranslation hypothesis.” *Humanus* 18 [1]: 12–24

Salehi, Mohammad (2013): “Strategies applied by native and non-native translators to transfer Persian culture-specific items: A case study on an Iranian novel.” *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies* 3 [4]: 1–17

Sand, George (1999): *La Mare au diable*. Paris: Gallimard

Shabani, Enayatallah; Nafiseh Emadi, Fatemeh Daftari (2019): "Examining the translations of Forough Farrokhzad's selected poems by a native and a non-native speaker using Vinay and Darbelnet's model." *Journal of Language and Translation* 9 [1]: 77–91

Short, Mick (1996): *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose*. London: Longman

Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem (2003): "Multiple-entry visa to travelling theory: Retranslations of literary and cultural theories." *Target* 15 [1]: 1–36

Tobias, Shani (2006): "Culture-specific items in Japanese-English literary translation: Comparing two translations of KawabataslIzu no Odoriko." *Monash University Linguistics Papers* 5 [1]: 27–35

Toury, Gideon (2012): "The nature and role of norms in translation." Lawrence Venuti (ed.): *The translation studies reader*. London/New York: Routledge, 168–182

Vahid Dastjerdi, Hossein; Amene Mohammadi (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

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

Vándor, Judit (2010): Adaptation and retranslation. Unpublished PhD proposal. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University

Vermeer, Hans J. (1989): *Skopos und Translationsauftrag*. Heidelberg: Abteilung Allgemeine Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschwissenschaft des Instituts für Übersetzen und Dolmetschen der Universität

Vinay, Jean-Paul; Jean Darbelnet (1958): *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*. (Bibliothèque de stylistique comparée 1.) Paris: Didier / Montréal: Beauchemin – translation (1995): *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins

Widman, Julieta (2019): "Translation modalities method in retranslation analysis: *A Paixão Segundo G. H.* in English." Özlem Berk Albachten, Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar (eds): *Perspectives on retranslation: Ideology, paratexts, methods*. New York: Routledge, 148–165

Ziemann, Zofia (2019): "Extratextual factors shaping preconceptions about retranslation: Bruno Schulz in English." Özlem Berk Albachten, Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar (eds): *Perspectives on retranslation: Ideology, paratexts, methods.* New York: Routledge, 87–103

Authors

Mahmoud Afrouz is Associate 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

Narjes Asgari Vartooni is M.A. student of Translation Studies at the Department of English Language and Literature, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. She completed her undergraduate studies in the same field at the same university as an outstanding talented student. Her research interests include literature, children's literature, and the translation of sports texts.
E-mail: naO14asgari@fgn.ui.ac.ir
ORCID: 0009-0003-1740-5936

Empfehlungen

TransÜD.
Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens

Herausgegeben von Hartwig Kalverkämper und Sylvia Reinart

Hervé Delplanque / Stephanie Schwerter (dir.): **L'incompréhension culturelle à l'épreuve du droit.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1071-7

Easy – Plain – Accessible

Herausgegeben von Silvia Hansen-Schirra und Christiane Maaß

Laura Marie Maaß: **Erwartungen, Einstellungen, Erfahrungen. Zur Interaktion zwischen hörenden Gebärdensprachdolmetschenden und ihrer tauben Kundschaft.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1161-5

Sarah Ahrens: **Einfache Sprache in der Gesundheitskommunikation. Patientinnenaufklärung für Frauen mit Deutsch als Zweitsprache.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1132-5

Anke Radinger: **Researching Subtitling Processes. Methodological considerations for the investigation of AI-assisted subtitling workflows.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1029-8

Forum für Fachsprachen-Forschung

Herausgegeben von Hartwig Kalverkämper

Claudio Di Meola / Joachim Gerdes / Livia Tonelli (Hg.): **Sprachvariation im Deutschen zwischen Theorie und Praxis. Fachsprachlichkeit, Inklusion, Didaktik, Übersetzung, Kontrastivität.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1042-7

Anna Malena Pichler / Barbara von der Lühe / Felicitas Margarete Tesch (Hg.): **Deutsch als Fremd- und Fachsprache im internationalen Kontext.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1047-2

Daniel Green (Hg.): **The Future of Teaching Law and Language.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1090-8

Audiovisual Translation Studies (AVTS)

Herausgegeben von Marco Agnetta und Alexander Künzli

Marco Agnetta / Astrid Schmidhofer / Alena Petrova (Hg.): **Bild – Ton – Sprachtransfer. Neue Perspektiven auf Audiovisuelle Translation und Media Accessibility.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0921-6

Alexander Künzli / Klaus Kaindl (Hg.): **Handbuch Audiovisuelle Translation. Arbeitsmittel für Wissenschaft, Studium, Praxis.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0981-0

Transkulturalität – Translation – Transfer

Herausgegeben von Martina Behr, Larisa Schippel und Julia Richter

Michael Schreiber: **Die Übersetzungspolitik der Französischen Revolution und der napoleonischen Zeit. Studien zu Übersetzungen ins Deutsche, Italienische, Niederländische und Kreolische.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1141-7

Leipzig Middle East Studies

Herausgegeben von Sebastian Maisel

Ahmed Ibrahim Abdallah Mohmmed: **Übersetzung als interkultureller Dialog. Sudanesische Romane in deutscher Übersetzung.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1087-8

Malek Al Refaai: **Challenges in Interpretation Services for Syrian Refugees.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1193-6

Magdalena Zehetgruber / Bernadette Hofer-Bonfim / Elisabeth Peters / Johannes Schnitzer (Hg.): **Linguistic Diversity in Professional Settings.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1089-2

Lola Debüser / Jekatherina Lebedewa: **Ein deutsch-russisches Leben.** ISBN 978-3-7329-1181-3

Alle Bücher sind auch als E-Books erhältlich.

Frank & Timme

Wittelsbacherstraße 27a, 10707 Berlin • Telefon +49 (0)30 88 66 79 11 • info@frank-timme.de • www.frank-timme.de