



The Russian Retranslation of Gabriel García Márquez's *One Hundred Years of Solitude*¹

Sergio Bolaños-Cuéllar

sbolanosc@unal.edu.co

Universidad Nacional de Colombia

Abstract:

The Retranslation Hypothesis (RH), initially outlined by Antoine Berman (1990) and Paul Bensimon (1990) and later presented as a descriptive hypothesis by Andrew Chesterman (2000), states that retranslations of the same source text into the same target language tend to be closer to the original than earlier translations. This means that retranslations would tend to foreignize the original, i.e. they would display the linguistic and cultural peculiarities of the original, which were mostly obliterated in previous translations. As Yves Gambier (1994) points out only through a corpus-based analysis is it possible to test RH. The corpus for our description and analysis included the original Spanish text of the novel (1967), the first Russian translation by Nina Butyrina & Valerii Stolbov (1970), and the retranslation by Margarita I. Bylinkina (2011). Gregory Rabassa's English translation (1970) was used as a *tertium comparationis*. The results of our research indicate that RH was confirmed in the foreignizing narrative mode of the retranslation, but disproved in its domesticating dialogic mode.

Keywords: Retranslation Hypothesis, domesticating, foreignizing, discursive narrative mode, discursive dialogic mode.

La retraducción al ruso de *Cien años de soledad* de Gabriel García Márquez

Resumen:

Según la Hipótesis de la Retraducción (HR), esbozada inicialmente por Antoine Berman (1990) y Paul Bensimon (1990) y formulada después como una hipótesis descriptiva por Andrew Chesterman (2000), las retraducciones del mismo texto origen a la misma lengua meta tienden a ser más cercanas al original, es decir, presentan las particularidades lingüísticas y culturales del original que se omitieron en gran medida en las primeras traducciones. Tal como lo postula Yves Gambier (1994) solo es posible confirmar la HR mediante un análisis basado en corpus. Así, el corpus de nuestra descripción y análisis comprende el texto original de la novela (1967), la primera traducción al ruso de Nina Butyrina y Valerii Stolbov (1970) y la retraducción de Margarita I. Bylinkina (2011). La traducción al inglés de Gregory Rabassa (1970) sirve de *tertium comparationis*. Los resultados de

¹Este artículo es producto del proyecto de investigación “La traducción de *Cien años de soledad* de Gabriel García Márquez”, en el marco de la línea de investigación sobre Traductología Descriptiva del grupo de investigación *LINGUAE: Comunicación, Bilingüismo y Traducción*, que dirige el autor.

nuestra investigación muestran que la HR fue confirmada en el modo narrativo extranjerizante, pero fue refutada en el modo discursivo dialógico domesticador.

Palabras clave: Hipótesis de Retraducción, domesticación, extranjerización, modo discursivo narrativo, modo discursivo dialógico.

La retraducción russe de *Cent ans de solitude* de Gabriel García Márquez

Résumé :

D'après l'Hypothèse de la Retraduction (HR), initialement esquissée par Antoine Berman (1990) et Paul Bensimon (1990) et formulée après par Andrew Chesterman (2000) comme une hypothèse descriptive, les retraductions d'un même texte source vers la même langue cible ont la tendance à être plus proches du texte source, c'est à dire, qu'elles présentent des particularités linguistiques et culturelles du texte source qui avaient été largement omises dans les premières traductions. Comme le postule Yves Gambier (1994), il n'est possible de confirmer l'hypothèse de la retraduction que par une analyse axée sur un corpus. Ainsi le corpus de notre description et analyse comprend le texte source du roman (1967), la première traduction en russe par Nina Butyrina et Valerii Stolbov (1970) et la retraduction par Margarita I. Bylinkina (2011). La traduction en anglais par Gregory Rabassa (1970) sert de *tertium comparationis*. Les résultats de notre recherche montrent que la HR a été confirmée dans le mode narratif sourcier, mais a été réfutée dans le mode discursif dialogique cibliste.

Mots-clés : Hypothèse de Retraducción, cibliste, sourcier, mode discursif narratif, mode discursif dialogique.

1. Introduction

Antoine Berman (1990) is one of the first authors to introduce the topic of retranslation in Translation Studies (TS) in a special number of *Palimpsestes*. Even though other authors participated in this journal's number, such as Paul Bensimon and Liliane Rodriguez, Berman's paper lay down the basis for the description of retranslating. Almost three decades later, Berman's views have been amply criticized, but the status of the concept of 'retranslating' has been firmly rooted in TS, particularly since 2000 when Andrew Chesterman used it to discuss basic models for TS through four kinds of hypotheses related to the phenomenon of retranslation.

Remarkably, most research on retranslation has been focused on the discussion and description of literary and religious texts because it is felt that retranslation of scientific/technical texts is an uninteresting or simply a useless exercise in this respect. Without confirming that this may be in fact the case, I will focus my attention here on the description of a very interesting case of retranslation: how *One Hundred Years of Solitude* (Spanish original *Cien años de soledad*) by Gabriel García Márquez, originally translated into Russian by Nina Butyrina & Valerii Stolbov (1970), was retranslated four decades later by Margarita Bylinkina (2011).

With more than 50 million copies sold and translated into more than 45 languages, *Cien años de soledad* has become a world bestseller and is also widely recognized for its literary and aesthetic values. Both the English and Russian translations of the novel date from 1970. Gregory Rabassa's version into English has an astounding coincidence with the Spanish original: it is a rather foreignized translation in the sense that the Spanish syntactic structures and lexical units are reproduced as closely as possible in English as will be evident in the examples I discuss in this paper. Russian is a language typologically different from Spanish and English. Russian is a highly inflected language that has more syntactical flexibility than Spanish and English where a rather fixed word-order plays a crucial role and flexibility of expression is more restrained. Thus, Rabassa's English translation of the novel will be used as *tertium comparationis* because, as noted above, it sticks syntactically and lexically as much as possible to the Spanish original.

2. Literature Review

As mentioned above, Antoine Berman was one of the first authors to focus his attention on the problem of retranslation in his paper "La retraduction comme espace de la traduction" (1990), published in a special issue of *Palimpsestes*. Initially, Berman delves into the reasons why retranslations appear, and he argues that they are made because translations get older and decay. There is no such thing as *the* translation either, unless one is dealing with the *great translations* (*grandes traductions*) such as those of Shakespeare's works, the *Quixote*, and the *Vulgate* (p. 2). He further presents an ontological reason, according to which retranslations exist to obliterate or at least to diminish the original *failure* (*défaillance*). In Berman's view, most first translations are defective, as they are not as rich in language in comparison to the original language and they are not as meaningful, either (p. 5). In this same vein, Bensimon (1990) points out that the problem with first translations is that they yield a naturalization of the foreign work (p. 1), i.e. they are target-oriented or domesticating. Bensimon follows Berman, when the latter argues that this type of translation peters out the alterity of the original to better integrate it into another culture. Briefly, both Berman and Bensimon consider that retranslations are called for because it is necessary to display the original's foreignness and exoticisms that have been watered down in the first translations. This entails that first translations would tend to be target-oriented or domesticating, whereas retranslations would be marked as source-oriented or foreignizing. In Gambier's terms, the first translations would be target-oriented, focused on the norms of the target linguo-culture, whereas retranslations would be source-oriented or literal (1994, p. 414).

More recently, Andrew Chesterman in "A Causal Model for Translation Studies" (2000), discusses comparative (product-oriented, equivalence-based), process (translation as a process, not a product, and time-determined) and causal models (causation with multiple levels and effects: sociocultural conditions; translation events, acts and profiles; and cultural, behavioral and sociocultural effects) (p. 20) in TS. The models are related to the four standard kinds of hypotheses (interpretive, descriptive, explanatory and predictive) (p. 21). He argues that only the causal model accommodates

all four types of hypothesis and illustrates this in relation to the phenomenon of retranslation. The interpretive hypothesis would distinguish retranslation from revision, for example, insofar as revision focuses on a previous translation, whereas retranslation focuses on the original. For Chesterman, the problem with interpretive hypotheses is that they are not explicitly presented as such, “to be tested like any other hypothesis” (p. 23). A descriptive hypothesis, that makes a claim on the generality of a condition, would state, in the case of retranslation that “Later translations (same ST, same TL) tend to be closer to the original than earlier ones (See, for example, *Palimpsestes* 4, 1990)” (p. 23). “Descriptive hypotheses are attempts to answer ‘what’ questions.” “What are translations like?”. However, Chesterman adds a caveat regarding this descriptive hypothesis of retranslation: “The jury is still out on this one: there seems to be evidence both for and against. Much depends on how ‘closeness’ is to be measured, of course.” (p. 23). Finally, explanatory and predictive hypotheses deal with the causes for explaining a phenomenon and the conditions under which a phenomenon will (tend to) occur (p. 24). For example, retranslations, would the explanatory hypothesis go, tend to be closer to their original texts “because later translators take a critical stance to the earlier translation, seek to improve on it” (p. 24). This is just one of multiple possibilities. And the predictive hypothesis would state that “later translations of a given text will be found to be closer than earlier ones [Later = (a) not yet in existence now, or (b) not yet studied]” (p. 25). Chesterman also warns in this respect: “Much testing obviously remains to be done” (p. 25).

Clearly, Chesterman provides one of the most comprehensive and thorough approaches to the phenomenon of retranslation both from a conceptual and a methodological point of view. First, retranslation must be presented in form of a descriptive hypothesis for it to be tested. This requires collecting as much evidence as possible, from an empirical point of view. Second, a clear criterion of ‘closeness’ is to be developed, i.e. it needs to be somehow ‘measurable’. Third, multiple explanations or causes can be presented that help to explain the phenomenon under scrutiny, in this case retranslation. However, I would like to add that several different causes or explanations may in fact coexist and that they cannot necessarily be ‘tested’ in the traditional scientific sense of the term, as one is dealing with decisions made on account not of one factor but of several complex intertwined factors. Similarly, it should be underscored that predictive hypotheses in general and predictive hypotheses regarding retranslation will not hold as laws but simply as tendencies at most.

In “Retranslations: The Creation of Value” (2004), Lawrence Venuti thinks that retranslations create domestic values present in the original and in the first translation (p. 25). Venuti seems to subscribe to Berman’s source-orientation of the retranslation hypothesis, as he sees the retranslator’s ethical responsibility in preventing the target language and culture from effacing the foreignness of the original text (p. 36). He also seems to accept Berman’s *failing* (*défaillance*) characteristic of a first translation because it is not accepted and is judged as insufficient, “erroneous, lacking linguistic correctness” (p. 26). More interesting are Venuti’s views regarding the role of retranslations. He says

Latinoamérica traducida: caminos y destinos de la literatura latinoamericana contemporánea entre las lenguas

that they help to maintain and strengthen a social institution's authority "by reaffirming the institutionalized interpretation of a canonical text" (p. 26). Venuti also adds that retranslations may also help to change institutions or create new ones (p. 26). He acknowledges the importance of the study of retranslation in Translation Studies and advocates a textual analysis, which considers the cultural and political factors that provide it with meaning and value (p. 27). In this respect, he underscores the translator's agency that also involves the creation of a network of relations (intertextuality), linked to the original text and other translated texts into the target language (p. 28). As to the retranslator's intention, Venuti assumes that he selects and interprets the original to produce a new and different reception of the original in the target culture (p. 29). Thus, a retranslator's goal may be "to maintain, revise or displace norms and the institutions in which they are housed" (p. 29). As to the commissioning institution, when it is a commercially oriented publisher, Venuti maintains that a foreign canonical text can be retranslated purely for commercial reasons. A discursive strategy that enhances the readability of the retranslated texts is used to ensure prospective sales. To save expenses of commissioning a retranslation, a profit-driven publisher may also simply reprint a previous translation that has proven successful in the market place (p. 30). Even though Venuti supports Berman's retranslation hypothesis, he broadens the discussion by incorporating cultural and political factors as well as norms and institutions (commissioners) affecting retranslation. In this regard, a publisher's commercial intent may play a crucial role in retranslating a canonical literary work.

In her paper on "(Re)translation revisited" (2009), Isabelle Desmidt shows the results of an empirical study of 52 German and 18 Dutch versions of the children's classic book *Nils Holgerssons underbara resa genom Sverige* (*Nils Holgersson's Wonderful Journey Through Sweden*, Selma Lagerlöf, 1906-1907), published between 1907-1908 and 1999, and discusses them regarding the retranslation hypothesis. The study shows that the retranslation hypothesis does not have a general value. Desmidt relates it to a (re-)writing hypothesis and she concludes that "Some of the recent versions did show consideration for the original, but there was no overall tendency to go back to the original and produce a source oriented text" (p. 678). In other words, the empirical evidence Chesterman was calling for does not support the source text orientation of the retranslation hypothesis as envisaged by Berman.

Outi Paloposki and Kaisa Koskinen (2010) set out to conduct a large-scale survey on retranslation, focusing their attention on three main areas: retranslation in Finland, the motives for and the reception of retranslations, and, finally, what happens to a text when it is either retranslated or revised (p. 29). The results of their research are presented in the comprehensive paper "Reprocessing texts. The Fine Line between Retranslating and Revising". To borrow Chesterman's terms, I would say that the authors are dealing with explanatory and descriptive hypotheses of retranslation. Paloposki and Koskinen found that, contrary to the retranslation hypothesis stated by Berman, their data show that second translations [retranslations] are less source-oriented than first translations. "Domesticating translations," they add, "may be a feature of a certain phase in translated

Latinoamérica traducida: caminos y destinos de la literatura latinoamericana contemporánea entre las lenguas

literature rather than a property of all retranslations” (p. 30). In their initial review in 2000, they found 9 retranslations and 359 translations (261 new ones and 89 reprints) into Finnish (p. 34). Paloposki and Koskinen advance the explanatory hypothesis that the number of retranslations and reprints may be related to the profile of the publishers: young publishing houses, which do not have the stock to recycle, would favor retranslations, whereas older publishing companies not having the required stock would prefer reprints (p. 35). They also found that “translation reviews for the year 2000 indicate that retranslations attract much greater publicity than new translations and reprints” (p. 35). It is clear, then, that retranslations are commercially more attractive. Another reason they mention for retranslating has to do with the fact that “prior to Finland’s signing the Bern agreement in 1928, authorial rights were not always respected, and many translations were made without the author’s and his/her publisher’s consent” (p. 35). As a result of this situation, two or more versions of the same book could be published almost simultaneously. Classics also tended to be retranslated. As to causation in retranslation, Paloposki and Koskinen say that their “results also point in the direction of multiple causation [...] retranslation cannot be encapsulated by a simplistic cause-and-effect formula” (p. 46). They end their paper by emphasizing that the textual relations between original texts and retranslations or revisions are very complex like a ‘rhizomatic’ network, to use Brownlie’s term (2006), where influences, ideologies, and value judgments meet (p. 47).

In her paper “Finnische Neuübersetzungen deutschsprachiger Literatur” (2013) (“Finnish Retranslations of German Literature”), Liisa Tiittula discusses the reasons why some books are retranslated by researching German-language prose literature retranslated into Finnish from 1850 until today (p. 140). After reviewing the situation of German translated literature in Finland since 1850, Tiittula focuses her attention on the causation for retranslation. First, she perceives a trend towards linguistic change in retranslations into Finnish, but -she clarifies- it is not due to the ageing of translations but to changes in the Finnish literary language itself (p. 146). In another research (Tiittula/Nuolijärvi, 2013) of Finnish retranslations of seven literary works, it was found that first retranslations were ‘livelier’ -more target-oriented I would say- than more recent versions, thereby contradicting the retranslation hypothesis that would have expected more source-oriented retranslations. Second, according to Pöckl (2004, p. 205) in the German literary market it is commonly accepted that classics of a foreign literature should be retranslated in regular periods, an idea Tiittula does not share because reality shows otherwise (p. 146). Another reason for retranslation can be a new edition of the original work, in which case the retranslated text is bestowed the status of the original (Vanderschelden, 2000, p.4). Tiittula also mentions other reasons for retranslations presented by Pöckl (2004, p. 201), for instance, anniversaries (birthday or death date of writers) as well as legal regulations concerning copyright and publishing (p. 147). Besides dealing with causation of retranslation, Tiittula argues that it is problematic to label completely retranslated works as domesticating or foreignizing because retranslations usually exhibit both tendencies. She thinks there is a continuum, along which translators make decisions (p. 147).

On the other hand, Yves Gambier in his paper “La retraducción: Ambigüités et défis” (2011) (“Retranslation: Ambiguities and Challenges”), presents three different ways of understanding retranslation: 1) As a return to the original (back-version or back-translation) to verify transformations on account of transfer; 2) As a translation of another translation, through a mediating, relay-like language and culture, in an indirect process; and 3) A new translation into the same language the original text has already been translated into (p. 53). As far as retranslated text-types are concerned, Gambier, following Şebnem Susam-Sarajeva (2003), points out that not only philosophical, religious and literary, but also scientific texts are retranslated, with the caveat that sometimes these retranslations are inevitable, but also useless repetitions (p. 53). Unlike his position in 1994 (see above), this time Gambier challenges Berman’s hypothesis and calls it simplistic because, among other things, historical explanations of retranslations are much more complex than a simple updating for ageing reasons; retranslations do not improve on defects of first translations (p. 55). Gambier’s most important criticism of Berman’s retranslation approach is that Berman conceives of history as a linear chronological progression, a teleological synonym of progress. First translations are hesitant, blind, and advance towards a better performance in retranslations (p. 57). For Gambier, this is a logocentric view (focused on the original text) and an immanent view of sense, as if translators could make a non-ideological, non-cultural reading of the allegedly stable style of the original. There is no reason for retranslations to be necessarily source-oriented. To retranslate is to reinterpret; it is a new edition of the original and it occupies a new place in the reception polysystem (p. 59). Following Paloposki & Koskinen (2004), Gambier also advocates the empirical testing of the retranslation hypothesis. The editorial chain should also be better described in terms of agents and their power relationships to better understand decisions and strategies. Retranslation history and its causality is much more complex than Berman’s conception. It is not simply a constant accumulating process. Retranslation is the result of changing needs and perceptions, which include technical means of production and reproduction that nowadays modify our relationship to writing (p. 61). For Gambier, translating is a dated, historicized act in relation to the translator’s decisions and the acceptability norms where there is more or less resistance or opening regarding the source language (p. 62).

3. Method

As far as data collection methods in Translation Studies are concerned, Hans Peter Krings (2005) envisages initially two methods: offline (post-action i.e. after the translating process has taken place) and online (in-action, parallel to the translating process). Offline methods are divided into product analyses and verbal data. Product analyses include analysis and review of the translation product, translation notes, other translations of the same translator, and translations of the same text by different translators. Verbal data include translators’ retrospective commentaries, interviews and questionnaires. Online methods are divided into behavioral observation and verbal data. Behavioral observation includes observation protocols, video recording, computer protocols, key logging, eye-tracking, MRI (Magnetic Resonance Imaging), EPI (Echo

Latinoamérica traducida: caminos y destinos de la literatura latinoamericana contemporánea entre las lenguas

Planar Imaging), PET (Positron Emission Tomography) and EEG (Electroencephalography). Online verbal data includes TAP (Think Aloud Protocols) and Dialogue Protocols (p. 348). In my research, instead of using online verbal methods which aim at determining how retranslations are carried out, e.g. Gleiton Malta's "El concepto de (re)traducción bajo el abordaje procesual: un estudio empírico experimental basado en datos de registro de teclado y ratón" (2017), I have used an offline product analysis to deal with the retranslation of *Cien años de soledad*. There is no possibility to observe online how the novel was translated or retranslated for that matter. In James Holmes's terms, this is a product-oriented descriptive translation study which corresponds to a "comparative translation description, in which comparative analyses are made of various translations of the same text, either in a single language or in various languages" (1988, p. 72).

The corpus of my study is made up of the texts of the novel in Spanish (1967) (A), the English translation by Gregory Rabassa (1970) (B), the first translation into Russian by Nina Butyrina and Valerii Stolbov (1970) (C), and the retranslation by Margarita Bylnkina (2011) (D). The English translation was used as a kind of *tertium comparationis* because it follows very closely the syntax of the Spanish original. However, it is not intended to be read as a back-translation *stricto sensu*. The narrative mode was first analyzed in the twenty unnumbered chapters of the novel (100 cases, 5 per chapter) by comparing the original with the corresponding translation and retranslation; then the same procedure was followed for the dialogic mode (100 cases, 5 per chapter). The Retranslation Hypothesis (RH) by Berman (see discussion above) states that retranslations would tend to be mostly source oriented, whereas first translations would tend to be target oriented. In my study, I set out to test RH by analyzing the Russian first translation of the novel vis-à-vis its retranslation. I focus my attention on the discursive mode of the original text. i.e. two discursive modes are initially differentiated: the narrative and the dialogic. I assume, as a subsidiary hypothesis, that these two discursive modes could display the use of different translation strategies, oscillating between source-oriented (foreignizing) and target-oriented (domesticating). A key linguistic parameter to establish the source-oriented (foreignizing) or the target-oriented (domesticating) translation strategy is the closeness of the syntactic structure i.e. the *literalness* of the (re)translation in relation to the original. A marked presence of literalness would indicate that a source-oriented translation strategy is at work; its absence would point to a rather target-oriented strategy. Another parameter to establish the source or target orientation of the (re)translation is the use of *idiomatic / colloquial structures or expressions*, especially for the analysis of the dialogic mode, i.e. the russification of the (re)translated text. In other words, one can ask whether the characters in the novel are speaking everyday 'natural' Russian or they are using a somehow stilted, 'artificial' language. The use of idiomatic Russian would indicate a tendency towards a target-oriented (domesticating) (re)translation; otherwise, a source-oriented (foreignizing) strategy would be taking place.

4. Results

In this section I will illustrate the results of the analysis of the text of the Spanish original (A) and the almost interlinear English version (B) in comparison with its Russian translation (C) and retranslation (D). I discuss some of the most telling examples of the (re)translation in the narrative and the dialogic modes. The examples have been taken manually by a careful comparison of the texts of the novel.

4.1. Narrative mode

The most interesting aspect one notices regarding the way the narrative mode of the novel was translated into Russian (C) and later retranslated (D) is that the translation tends not to comply with the parameter of literalness, i.e. it does not follow the syntactic structure of the original, whereas the retranslation does. In other words, the narrative mode of the translation favors a target-oriented (domesticating) strategy, while in the retranslation an effort has been made to keep the same syntactic structure of the Spanish original as closely as possible; thus, it tends to be source-oriented (foreignizing). Evidently, this result would confirm the retranslation hypothesis, which states the source orientation of the retranslation. For example:

1)

- A. “Todos los años, por el mes de marzo, una familia de gitanos desarraigados plantaba su carpa cerca de la aldea, y con un grande alboroto de pitos y timbales daban a conocer los nuevos inventos” (p.7)
- B. “Every year during the month of March a family of ragged gypsies would set up their tents near the village, and with a great uproar of pipes and kettledrums they would display new inventions” (p.1)
- C. «Каждый год в марте месяце у околицы селения раскидывало свои шатры оборванное цыганское племя и под визг свистулек и звон тамбуринов знакомило жителей Макондо с последними изобретениями ученых мужей» (p.7)
- D. «Каждый год в марте месяце лохмотное цыганское племя ставило свой шатёр близ поселка, и под звонкое дребезжание бубнов и визготню свистулек пришельцы показывали жителям новейшие изобретения» (p.7)

This is the original Spanish syntactic sequence (A):

- Time complement** (*Todos los años, por el mes de marzo,*)
- + **Subject** (*una familia de gitanos desarraigados,*)
- + **Predicate** (*plantaba su carpa cerca de la aldea*)
- + **Conjunction** (*y*)
- + **Clause** (*con un grande alboroto de pitos y timbales daban a conocer los nuevos inventos*).

The retranslation (D) follows the original syntactic structure:

Time complement (*Every year during the month of March / Каждый год в марте месяце*)
 + **Subject** (*a family of ragged gypsies / лохмотное цыганское племя*)
 + **Predicate** (*would set up their tents near the village / ставило свой шатер близ поселка*)
 + **Conjunction** (*and / и*)
 + **Clause** (*with a great uproar of pipes and kettledrums they would display new inventions / под звонкое дребезжание бубнов и визготню свистулек пришельцы показывали жителям новейшие изобретения*).

However, the translation (C) favors a non-literal, more traditional and flexible Russian syntactic structure:

Time complement (*Every year during the month of March / Каждый год в марте месяце*)
 + **Place complement** (*near the village / у околицы селения*)
 + **Verb** (*would set up / раскидывало*)
 + **Direct complement** (*a tent / свои шатры*)
 + **Subject** (*a family of ragged gypsies / оборванное цыганское племя*)
 + **Conjunction** (*and / и*)
 + **Clause** (*with a great uproar of pipes and kettledrums they would display new inventions / под визг свистулек и звон тамбуринов знакомо жителей Макондо с последними изобретениями ученых мужей*).

2)

- A. “Días después, de un modo intempestivo, la mujer lo llamó a su casa, donde estaba sola con su madre, y lo hizo entrar en el dormitorio con el pretexto de enseñarle un truco de barajas” (p.26)
- B. “Days later the woman suddenly called him to her house, where she was alone with her mother, and she had him come into the bedroom with the pretext of showing him a deck of cards” (p.29)
- C. «Через несколько дней женщина неожиданно позвала Хосе Аркадио к себе и под предлогом, что хочет научить юношу одному карточному фокусу, увела его из комнаты, где сидела со своей матерью, в спальню» (p.33)
- D. «Через несколько дней эта женщина ни с того ни с сего позвала Хосе Аркадио к себе домой и увела из комнаты, где была её мать, в спальню, якобы показать ему карточный фокус» (p.35)

The Spanish original has a complex syntactic structure:

Time complement (*Días después,*)
 + **Mode complement** (*de un modo intempestivo,*)
 + **Subject** (*la mujer*)
 + **Direct object** (*lo*)

Latinoamérica traducida: caminos y destinos de la literatura latinoamericana contemporánea entre las lenguas

- + **Verb** (*llamó*)
- + **Indirect object** (*a su casa,*)
- + **Subordinate clause** (*donde estaba sola con su madre,*)
- + **Conjunction** (*y*)
- + **Clause** (*lo hizo entrar en el dormitorio con el pretexto de enseñarle un truco de barajas*).

A similar syntactic structure has been reproduced in the retranslation (D):

- Time complement** (*Days later / Через несколько дней*)
- + **Subject** (*the woman / эта женщина*)
- + **Mode complement** (*suddenly / ни с того ни с сего*)
- + **Verb** (*called / позвала*)
- + **Direct complement** (*him / Хосе Аркадио*)
- + **Indirect complement** (*to her house / к себе домой*)
- + **Subordinate clause** (*where she was alone with her mother / и увела из комнаты, где была её мать,*)
- + **Conjunction** (*and / и*)
- + **Clause** (*she had him come into the bedroom with de pretext of showing him a deck of cards / в спальню, якобы показать ему карточный фокус*).

In contrast, the translation (C) modifies the original syntactic sequence:

- Time complement** (*Days later / Через несколько дней*)
- + **Subject** (*the woman / женщина*)
- + **Mode complement** (*suddenly / неожиданно*)
- + **Verb** (*called / позвала*)
- + **Direct complement** (*him / Хосе Аркадио*)
- + **Indirect complement** (*to her house / к себе*)
- + **Conjunction** (*and / и*)
- + **Prepositional phrase** (*with the pretext of showing him a deck of cards / под предлогом, что хочет научить юношу одному карточному фокусу*)
- + **Clause** (*she had him come into the bedroom / увела его из комнаты,*)
- + **Subordinate clause** (*where she was alone with her mother / где сидела со своей матерью, в спальню*).

3)

- A. “El padre Nicanor Reyna -a quien don Apolinar Moscote había llevado de la ciénaga para que oficiara la boda- era un anciano endurecido por la ingratitud de su ministerio” (p.74)
- B. “Father Nicanor Reyna-whom Don Apolinar Moscote had brought from the swamp to officiate at the wedding- was an old man hardened by the ingratitude of his ministry” (p.89)

- C. «Для совершения бракосочетания дон Аполинар Москоте привёз из соседнего города падре Никанора Рейну, старика, ожесточённого своей неблагодарной профессией» (p.90)
- D. «Падре Никанор Рейна - которого дон Аполинар Москоте привёз откуда-то из низины для совершения бракосочетания - был духовно закалён своим неблагодарным трудом» (p.99)

This example illustrates a typical Spanish parenthetical structure:

Subject (*El padre Nicanor Reyna*)

+ **Embedded clause** (*-a quien don Apolinar Moscote había llevado de la ciénaga para que oficiara la boda-*)

+ **Predicate** (*era un anciano endurecido por la ingratitud de su ministerio*).

The retranslation (D) follows the original syntactic structure as closely as possible:

Subject (*Father Nicanor Reyna / Падре Никанор Рейна*)

+ **Embedded clause** (*-whom Don Apolinar Moscote had brought from the swamp to officiate at the wedding- / - которого дон Аполинар Москоте привёз откуда-то из низины для совершения бракосочетания -*)

+ **Predicate** (*was an old man hardened by the ingratitude of his ministry / был духовно закалён своим неблагодарным трудом*).

In contrast, the translation (C) alters this sequence:

Final clause (*To officiate at the wedding / Для совершения бракосочетания*)

+ **Non-embedded clause** (*Don Apolinar Moscote had brought Father Nicanor Reyna from the swamp / дон Аполинар Москоте привез из соседнего города падре Никанора Рейну*)

+ **Predicate** (*was an old man hardened by the ingratitude of his ministry / старика, ожесточённого своей неблагодарной профессией*).

4)

- A. “Al cabo de tres meses de amores vigilados, aburrido con la lentitud de la construcción que pasaba a inspeccionar todos los días, Pietro Crespi resolvió darle al padre Nicanor el dinero que le hacía falta para terminar el templo” (p.77)
- B. “After three months of supervised love, fatigued by the slow progress of the construction, which he went to inspect every day, Pietro Crespi decided to give Father Nicanor the money he needed to finish the church” (p.93)
- C. «Через три месяца такой поднадзорной любви Пьетро Креспи, каждый день проверявший состояние работ и измученный медлительностью, с которой возводился храм, решил дать падре Никанору недостающие деньги, чтобы тот мог довести дело до конца» (p.95)

Latinoamérica traducida: caminos y destinos de la literatura latinoamericana contemporánea entre las lenguas

D. «На исходе третьего месяца, потеряв всякое терпение при виде вяло растущей церкви, на которую он любовался каждый день, Пьетро Креспи решил дать падре Никанору денег для завершения постройки» (p.104)

The Spanish syntactic sequence (A) is as follows:

Time complement (*Al cabo de tres meses de amores vigilados,*)
 + **Adjective clause** (*aburrido con la lentitud de la construcción que pasaba a inspeccionar todos los días,*)
 + **Subject** (*Pietro Crespi*)
 + **Predicate** (*resolvió darle al padre Nicanor el dinero que le hacía falta para terminar el templo*).

It has been reproduced literally in the retranslation (D):

Time complement (*After three months of supervised love / На исходе третьего месяца*)
 + **Adjective clause** (*fatigued by the slow progress of the construction, which he went to inspect every day / потеряв всякое терпение при виде вяло растущей церкви, на которую он любовался каждый день*)
 + **Subject** (*Pietro Crespi / Пьетро Креспи*)
 + **Predicate** (*decided to give Father Nicanor the money he needed to finish the church / решил дать падре Никанору денег для завершения постройки*).

However, the translation (C) presents a non-literal syntactic sequence:

Time complement (*After three months of supervised love / Через три месяца такой поднадзорной любви*)
 + **Subject** (*Pietro Crespi / Пьетро Креспи*)
 + **Adjective clause** (*fatigued by the slow progress of the construction, which he went to inspect every day / каждый день проверявший состояние работ и измученный медлительностью, с которой возводился храм*)
 + **Predicate** (*decided to give Father Nicanor the money he needed to finish the church / решил дать падре Никанору недостающие деньги, чтобы тот мог довести дело до конца*).

5)

- A. “En la calurosa sala de visitas, junto al espectro de la pianola amortajada con una sábana blanca, el coronel Aureliano Buendía no se sentó esta vez dentro del círculo de tiza que trazaron sus edecanes” (p.144)
- B. “In the hot parlor, beside the specter of the pianola shrouded in a white sheet, Colonel Aureliano Buendía did not sit down this time inside the chalk circle that his aides had drawn” (p.182)
- C. «На этот раз полковник Аурелиано Буэндиа не вошёл в меловой круг, который его адъютанты начертили в душевой гостиной возле похожей на призрак пианолы, укрытой, словно саваном, белой простыней» (p.180)

D. «В накаленной солнцем гостиной, рядом с гробовым силуэтом пианолы, накрытой белым саваном, сидел полковник Аурелиано Буэндия, презревший этот раз меловой круг, начертанный его адъютантами» (p.197)

The original (A) has the following syntactic structure:

Place complement (*En la calurosa sala de visitas, junto al espectro de la pianola amortajada con una sábana blanca,*)

+ **Subject** (*el coronel Aureliano Buendía*)

+ **Predicate** (*no se sentó esta vez dentro del círculo de tiza que trazaron sus edecanes*)

It has been recovered almost literally, except for an inversion subject-verb, in the retranslation (D):

Place complement (*In the hot parlor, beside the specter of the pianola shrouded in a white sheet / В накаленной солнцем гостиной, рядом с гробовым силуэтом пианолы, накрытой белым саваном*)

+ **Verb** (*did not sit down / сидел*)

+ **Subject** (*Colonel Aureliano Buendía / полковник Аурелиано Буэндия*)

+ **Complement** (*this time inside the chalk circle that his aides had drawn / презревший этот раз меловой круг, начертанный его адъютантами*).

The syntactic sequence of the translation (C) differs from the structure of the original:

Time complement (*This time / На этот раз*)

+ **Subject** (*Colonel Aureliano Buendía / полковник Аурелиано Буэндия*)

+ **Predicate** (*did not sit down this time inside the chalk circle that his aides had drawn / не вошёл в меловой круг, который его адъютанты начертили*)

+ **Place complement** (*in the hot parlor, beside the specter of the pianola shrouded in a white sheet / в душной гостиной возле похожей на призрак пианолы, укрытой, словно саваном, белой простыней*).

4.2. Dialogic mode

In contrast to the results obtained for the retranslation in the discursive narrative mode, there is a clear prevalence of a target-oriented (domesticating) strategy in the dialogic mode. This target orientation is evident in the use of Russian idiomatic/colloquial expressions. This means that, while the foreignizing retranslation hypothesis was supported in the retranslation of the discursive narrative mode, it was disproved regarding the retranslation of the dialogic mode, which tends to be rather domesticating. This time the parameter of *literalness*, both syntactic and lexical, has been active mostly in the translation (C), thereby rendering it foreignizing, whereas the use of idiomatic/colloquial expressions has been the key factor in the retranslation (D), underscoring its target-orientation i.e. domestication. For example:

Latinoamérica traducida: caminos y destinos de la literatura latinoamericana contemporánea entre las lenguas

1)

- A. “Todavía no tenemos un muerto -dijo él-. Uno no es de ninguna parte mientras no tenga un muerto bajo la tierra” (p.17)
- B. “We have still not had a death,” he said. “A person does not belong to a place until there is someone dead under the ground” (p.14)
- C. « - Но у нас тут пока ещё никто не умер, - возразил Хосе Аркадио Буэндиа. – Человек не связан с землёй, если в ней не лежит его покойник» (p.20)
- D. «- Но у нас в семье ещё никто не умер, - сказал он. Человек – вольная птица, пока мертвец не свяжет его с землёй» (p.21)

The original (A): *Uno no es de ninguna parte mientras no tenga un muerto bajo tierra* has been reproduced in the translation (C) almost literally: *A person does not belong to a place until there is someone dead under the ground / Человек не связан с землёй, если в ней не лежит его покойник*. However, in the retranslation (D) a more colloquial expression has been used: *A person is a free spirit, until someone dead is not under the ground / Человек – вольная птица, пока мертвец не свяжет его с землёй*.

2)

- A. “-Vete al carajo -le gritó José Arcadio Buendía-. Cuantas veces regreses volveré a matarte. (p.24)
- B. “You go to hell”, José Arcadio Buendía shouted at him. “Just as many times as you come back, I’ll kill you again” (p.25)
- C. «Убирайся к черту, - закричал ему Хосе Аркадио Буэндиа.- Сколько бы ты ни возвращался, я тебя каждый раз буду убивать снова» (p.29)
- D. «Сгинь, сучий сын! – взревел Хосе Аракадио Буэндиа. – Попробуй еще прийти, я снова убью тебя» (p.31)

The Spanish rude remark (A): *Vete al carajo* has been recreated as closely as possible in the translation (C): *“You go to hell” / Убирайся к черту*. In contrast, a stronger colloquial expression is used in the retranslation (D): *Get lost, you son of a bitch! / Сгинь, сучий сын!*

3)

- A. “-Sería muy bueno -dijo-. Si estamos solos, dejamos la lámpara encendida para vernos bien, y yo puedo gritar todo lo que quiera sin que nadie tenga que meterse y tú me dices en la oreja todas las porquerías que se te ocurran” (p.29)
- B. “That would be fine”, she said. “If we’re alone, we’ll leave the lamp lighted so that we can see each other, and I can holler as much as I want without anybody’s having to butt in, and you can whisper in my ear any crap you can think of.”
- C. «-Да, хорошо бы, - согласилась она. – Если мы будем одни, мы зажжём лампу, чтобы видеть друг друга, я смогу кричать что вздумается, и никому до этого не

будет дела, а ты сможешь болтать мне на ухо разные глупости, какие только тебе взбредут в голову» (р.36)

- D. «-Хорошо бы, - отвечала она. – Когда будем одни, зажжём лампу, чтобы видеть друг друга, и я смогу кричать так, как захочется, и никто нос не сунет, а ты будешь говорить мне на ухо всякие сладкие гадости, все, что надумаешь» (р.39)

In this case, the Spanish sequence (A): *у yo puedo gritar todo lo que quiera sin que nadie tenga que meterse y tú me dices en la oreja todas las porquerías que se te ocurran* has been reproduced in the translation (C) in a milder tone: *and I can holler as much as I want without anybody's having to care about it, and you can whisper in my ear any nonsense you can think of / я смогу кричать что вздумается, и никому до этого не будет дела, а ты сможешь болтать мне на ухо разные глупости, какие только тебе взбредут в голову*. The Spanish colloquialism (*meterse*) and sexual innuendo (*porquerías*) have been recreated in the retranslation: *nobody will stick his nose and you will whisper in my ear any luscious nasty things, everything you can think of / никто нос не сунет, а ты будешь говорить мне на ухо всякие сладкие гадости, все, что надумаешь*.

4)

- A. “-En este pueblo no mandamos con papeles -dijo sin perder la calma-. Y para que lo sepa de una vez, no necesitamos ningún corregidor porque aquí no hay nada que corregir” (p.52)
- B. “In this town we do not give orders with pieces of paper,” he said without losing his calm. “And so that you know it once and for all, we don't need any judges here because there's nothing that needs judging” (p.61)
- C. «-В этом городе распоряжаются не бумаги, - возразил он спокойно. – И запомните раз и навсегда: нам никто не нужен для исправления, у нас здесь нечего исправлять» (р.64)
- D. «-В этом городе мы обходимся без бумаг, сказал он, не теряя присутствия духа. Зарубите себе на носу: нам не нужен никакой управитель, мы сами прекрасно здесь управляемся» (р.70)

The Spanish expressions (A): *sin perder la calma* and *para que lo sepa de una vez* were reproduced in the translation (C) as: *calmly / спокойно* and *so that you know it once and for all / запомните раз и навсегда*. In contrast, more colloquial expressions were used in the retranslation (D): *without losing his cool / не теряя присутствия духа* and *Get this through your head / Зарубите себе на носу*.

5)

- A. “-Collons -maldecía-. Me cago en el canon 27 del sínodo de Londres” (p.334)
- B. “Collons,” he would curse. “I shit on Canon Twenty-seven of the Synod of London” (p.431)
- C. «-Collons*, - ругался он. Так-перетак двадцать седьмой канон Лондонского синода.» (р.421)

*Каталонское ругательство

D. «Блядуны проклятые, - выходил каталонец из себя. -Плевал я на двадцать седьмой канон Лондонского синода» (p.459)

The original Spanish (A) uses a Catalan swearword: *collons* and a scatological expression: *me cago*. The Catalan rude remark has been calqued in the translation (C) and an asterisk marks it as a *Catalan swearword* (*Каталонское ругательство) but no meaning is given. The scatological expression has been watered down to a euphemism: *such* / *так-перетак*. In contrast, the Catalan profanity was recovered in the retranslation (D) through a culturally equivalent colloquialism: *Damn pricks!* / *Блядуны проклятые*, and the scatological expression was reproduced as: *I wouldn't care a damn for* / *Плевал я на*.

5. Discussion

First, I would like to underscore that the methodology I proposed for the analysis and description of the retranslation of the original work proved to be fruitful and may also be used profitably in similar subsequent studies. An initial distinction should be made between the two discursive modes one generally finds in a novel: the narrative and the dialogic. The underlying assumption is that the translator may have chosen to use different strategies for translating each discursive mode. Another assumption I made is that professional translators, as in this case, generally tend to stick to the strategy they have chosen in order to (re)translate. It means that very few deviations from the (re)translation strategy chosen will be recorded. In my research I also found a rather constant strategic behavior by the (re)translators. I was also able to confirm the subsidiary hypothesis I had formulated that these two discursive modes could display the use of different translation strategies, oscillating between source-oriented (foreignizing) and target-oriented (domesticating). However, this is not always necessarily the case. It is likely that only one single strategy will be used for translating both discursive modes; or, alternatively, that different strategies will be resorted to. A careful analysis of different chapters of the work will shed light on this issue.

Second, I also proposed to use the key linguistic parameter of *literalness* (syntactic and lexical) to establish the source-orientation (foreignizing) or the target-orientation (domesticating) of the translation strategy at work. This parameter of syntactic and lexical closeness between the original and the (re)translation proved to be useful especially for the analysis of the discursive narrative mode. The Russian retranslation in the narrative mode confirms the traditional retranslation hypothesis by displaying a characteristic literal and foreignizing strategy. On the other hand, for the analysis of the discursive dialogic mode it was necessary to turn to another benchmark: the use of *idiomatic / colloquial structures or expressions*. The results obtained in this study indicate that this parameter proved useful for the analysis of the dialogic mode, which turned out to be characteristically domesticating. It should also be borne in mind that these are tendencies, i.e. no completely homogeneous behavior by the (re)translator is to be

expected. It is worth mentioning that this methodology I proposed has the *apparent* drawback that most of the comparison and analysis between the original work and the (re)translations should be carried out manually, as one is not dealing with isolated words but with complete sentences and expressions. It is a very time-consuming task, but it is clearly offset by the quality and robustness of the findings. Alternatively, if one has access to the texts in digital format, which is not always the case, the painstaking work still must be done. It goes without saying that, within this approach, a sound knowledge of linguistic categories and functions is also assumed.

As stated above, the retranslation hypothesis regarding the analysis of the narrative mode seems to have been confirmed i.e. there is a clear tendency towards *literalness* in the retranslation (D). From the point of view of the Russian reader, this is important in two ways. The reader may feel some kind of 'foreignness' in the way the information is presented in the novel, as it does not necessarily respond to the expectations when reading a novel in Russian. In other words, the syntax may feel somewhat stilted. A more traditional or 'natural' syntactic sequence appears in the first translation (C). Second, as far as the narration itself is concerned, this sense of a possible stilted style in the retranslation is counterbalanced by the fact that it recovers the narrative perspective of the original and compels the Russian reader to zoom in on the scenes, precisely the way García Márquez has created them in Spanish. As if dealing with a movie scene, he would have the public visualize first the location and time where the scene would take place and only afterwards would the characters appear.

On the other hand, the retranslation hypothesis has been disproved regarding the dialogic mode in the retranslation, as the dialogic structure tends to be mainly domesticating. The retranslation is characterized using everyday colloquial and idiomatic constructions, which include swearwords and sex-related innuendos, or explicit expressions that have been watered down in the first translation. Open-minded Russian readers may relate more readily to the use of this type of colloquialisms in the retranslation. However, readers that are more conservative may prefer more traditional or euphemistic expressions.

6. Conclusion

The results confirmed only partially the retranslation hypothesis as stated by Berman (1990), Bensimon (1990), and Chesterman's (2000) descriptive retranslation hypothesis. And as Gambier (2011) pointed out: "There is no reason for retranslations to be necessarily source-oriented" (p. 59). The Russian retranslation of *Cien años de soledad* tends to be source-oriented or foreignizing, but only in the discursive narrative mode, where the syntactic structure of the Spanish original has been followed as closely as possible. In contrast, the retranslation tends to be target-oriented or domesticating in the discursive dialogic mode because idiomatic/colloquial expressions have been used extensively. Perhaps the more liberal Russian readers may feel closer to this colloquial

use of the language, but it is also likely that the openly rude remarks that appear in the text may not comply with the literary taste (norm) of more conservative readers. This means that, while the syntactic 'foreignness' of the retranslation may cause only occasional -if any- trouble, the dialogue domestication may dissatisfy some readers. This dual strategy used in the retranslation is in line with Tiittula's (2013) views, for "it is problematic to label whole retranslated works as domesticating or foreignizing because retranslations usually exhibit both tendencies" (p. 147).

Venuti's (2004) hypothesis about the retranslator's intention could also be confirmed: Margarita Bylinkina seems to have created "a new and different reception of the original in the target language" (p. 29). This means that the reception of the first translation has been widened in the retranslation to include a more modern, colloquial version, intended for a somewhat different reader. In this sense, our results regarding the retranslation of the dialogic mode would also coincide with those obtained by Paloposki & Koskinen in their research that show that "second translations are less source oriented than first translations" (p. 29). It should also be pointed out that readers do not necessarily have the opportunity to compare first and second translations and they will generally tend to think of the translation they are reading as the canonical work in their own language. As the Russian retranslation of the novel was published four decades after the first translation, it is very likely that a new generation of readers may feel at ease with the idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms used by Bylinkina.

As to Chesterman's (2000) explanatory hypothesis that retranslations tend to be closer to the original texts "because later translators take a critical instance to the earlier translation, seek to improve on it" (p. 24), one could argue that it is not necessarily the case. It's not just a matter of improving on a previous translation of the original text, provided that a parameter of improvement is clearly and objectively established, but as Paloposki & Koskinen (2010) say: domestication in a retranslation "may be a feature of a certain phase in translated literature rather than a property of all retranslations" (p. 30). In other words, literary taste and canons change periodically over time and even occasionally two or more reception norms may be at work or disputing prevalence, as Gambier (2011) points out, "in the reception polysystem" (p. 59).

In terms of the external motives or causation of the retranslation, one can argue that in the former USSR it was common practice to publish translations without having received the authorization from the Western copyright holders. Therefore, the first translation of *Cien años de soledad* can be considered a *pirate* version from this commercial point of view, even though its literary quality and faithfulness to the Spanish original are remarkable. This situation was rectified when AST Publishers (Издательство АСТ) acquired the rights to the works of García Márquez from Agencia Literaria Carmen Balcells, S.A. and commissioned a new translation of the novel. There is a new national and international market for the retranslation. Bylinkina's version is now the book that is being advertised and marketed more frequently on the Internet worldwide.

Finally, it is important to underscore that the 2011 retranslation of the novel is not a *revision* of the 1970 translation, but a completely new translation of the work. Theoretically speaking, both the translation and the retranslation follow what I have called the Default Equivalence Position because the original author's communicative intention has been respected as much as possible and "no significant modifications of the text type and function of the translated text in the target culture are envisaged" (Bolaños-Cuéllar, 2016, p. 188). The differences found regarding domesticating and foreignizing translation strategies can be located within the Equivalence Range of the (re)translations, i.e. the range of possible equivalents that is activated "depending on the translator's decisions and on the prevailing Translational Norms and Initiator's Instructions" (*Ibid*, p. 193). As discussed previously, the translational norms seem to have differed for the translation and the retranslation. Based on the corpus analysis, one could say that a more conservative literary canon was at work when the first translation was published, but it seems to have been expanded and updated to include a more liberal, colloquialism-prone literary canon for the retranslation. The initiator's instructions seem to have been also commercially oriented in both cases. However, it is also likely that some kind of soviet censorship could have been enforced in the first translation and, as a result, euphemisms were more frequently used to avoid swearwords, rude remarks, or sex-related innuendos or explicit expressions.

References

- Bensimon, P. (1990). Présentation. *Palimpsestes*, 4, iv-xiii.
- Berman, A. (1990). La retraducción como espacio de la traducción. *Palimpsestes*, 4, 1-7.
- Bolaños-Cuéllar, S. (2016). Equivalence within the Dynamic Translation Model (DTM): Default Equivalence Position, Equivalence Range, Initiator's Instructions, and Translational Norms. *Forma y Función*, 29(2), 183-201.
- Brownlie, S. (2006). Narrative Theory and Retranslation Theory. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 7(2), 145-170.
- Chesterman, A. (2000): A causal model for Translation Studies. In M. Olanhan (Ed.), *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies I: Textual and Cognitive Aspects* (pp. 15-27). Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Desmidt, I. (2009). (Re)translation Revisited. *Meta*, 54 (4), 669-683.
- García Márquez, G. (1967/1984). *Cien años de soledad*. Biblioteca de Literatura Colombiana. Bogotá: Editorial Oveja Negra.
- García Márquez, G. (1970/1998). *One Hundred Years of Solitude*. (G. Rabassa, Trans.). New York: First Perennial Classics edition.
- García Márquez, G. (1970/1997/2001). Сто лет одиночества. (N. Butyrina & V. Stolbov, Trans.). Saint Petersburg: Symposium.
- García Márquez, G. (2011/2017). Сто лет одиночество. (M. Bylinkina, Trans.). Moscow: Издательство АСТ.
- Gambier, Y. (2011). La retraducción: Ambigüités et défis. In E. Monti & P. Schnyder (Ed.), *Autour de la retraducción. Perspectives littéraires européennes* (pp. 49-66). Paris: Orizons.
- Gambier, Y. (1994). La Retraducción, retour et détour. *Meta*, 39 (3), 413-417.
- Holmes, J. (1988). *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Koskinen, K. & Paloposki, O. (2010). Retranslation. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Ed.), *Handbook of Translation Studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 294-298). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Krings, H. (2005). Wege ins Labyrinth – Fragestellungen und Methoden der Übersetzungsprozessforschung im Überblick. *Meta*, 50(2), 342-358.
- Malta, G. (2017). El concepto de (re)traducción bajo el abordaje procesual: un estudio empírico-experimental basado en datos de registro de teclado y ratón. *Mutatis Mutandis*, 10(2), 195-228.
- Paloposki, O. & Koskinen, K. (2010). Reprocessing texts. The fine line between retranslating and revising. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 11(1), 29-49.
- Paloposki, O. & Koskinen, K. (2004). A thousand and one translations: Revisiting retranslation. In G. Hansen, K. Malmkjær, & D. Gile (Ed.), *Claims, changes and challenges in translation studies: Selected contributions from the EST congress, Copenhagen 2001* (pp. 27-38). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Pöckl, W. (2004): Zwischen Zufall und Notwendigkeit: Neuübersetzungen. *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur*, 29(2), 200-210.
- Rodriguez, L. (1990): Sous le signe de Mercure, la retraduction. *Palimpsestes*, 4, 63-80.
- Susam-Sarajeva, S. (2003). Multiple-entry visa to travelling theory: Retranslations of literary and cultural theories. *Target International Journal of Translation Studies*, 15(1), 1-36.
- Tiittula, L. (2013). Finnische Neuübersetzungen deutschsprachiger Literatur. *Trans-kom*, 6(1), 140-170.
- Tiittula, L. & P. Nuolijärvi (2013). *Puheen illuusio suomalaisessa kaunokirjallisuudessa*. Helsinki: SKS.
- Vanderschelden, I. (2000). Why Retranslate the French Classics? The Impact of Retranslation on Quality. In M. Salama-Carr (Ed.), *On Translating French Literature and Film II* (pp. 1-18). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Venuti, L. (2004). Retranslations: The Creation of Value. In K. M. Faull (Ed.), *Translation and Culture*. Special Issue of *Bucknell Review*, 47(1), 25-38.