



**'Translation Plurality' and 'Retranslation' in Gibran Khalil
Gibran's The Prophet:**

**A comparative Analysis of Selected translations of Okasha,
Naimy and Al Khal**

By

Dina Abdelrahman AbdelKhalek Al Dewee

Dr.Muhammed Said Negm

Professor of Linguistic Faculty of arts Department of English
Tanta University

Dr. Ayman Ayad

Associate Professor Faculty of Arts Department of Arabic
Tanta University

Abstract: This paper deals with the issue of "retranslation" or "multi-translation" of the exact literary text. It is a phenomenon that is repeated in the field of translation, and literary translation in particular. This paper begins with a definition of the "translation plurality" concept and then moves on to the reasons for retranslation. The book "The Prophet" by Gibran Khalil Gibran was chosen, which is one of the most retranslated books and continues to be retranslated to this day. Some justified the retranslation in the introduction by referring to the idea of "bringing out the best," as some of the previous translations had shortcomings in faithfully conveying Gibran's spirit and had some errors. In this paper, there is a trial to answer some of the following questions: Is there a need for retranslation? Is retranslation? Or is it a new translation with a new vision and spirit that differs from the previous one? To what extent does the time interval affect translation and its retranslation? Through an analysis of the above issues and comparing examples of translations, we come up with a new concept of the "retranslation" process.

Keywords: Literary Translation, Translation Plurality, Retranslation, The Prophet, Gibran.

Once a translated text is printed and published, it becomes available for new translation versions or multiple translations. This action or phenomenon of retranslation triggers translation researchers' curiosity. If studying and theorizing about the issue of retranslation is a recent action, the process of retranslation itself is an old one that has developed over time. Starting from Berman and his pioneer theory of retranslation in 1990 to Gambier, who emphasizes Berman's theory in 1994 (Gambier, 1994, 413) and then refutes it in 2011 (Gambier, 2011, 49), For Monti and others, the concept of retranslation is in continuous development. The 21ST century has witnessed a fruitful retranslation movement. The most prominent retranslation is of the Holy Book (the Bible) into French. While revising some translated editions of literary heritage, it was found that it is rare to find only one translation for a book.

Definition of Retranslation:

Retranslation meaning has been developed over the years from the concept of 'translating a translated text' to 'producing a new translation'. In bilingual dictionaries, the terms '*retraduction*, which means 'translation of a translated text', and '*retraduire*, which means translating again or translating a translated text from a foreign language (Abdelnour 906), are used. In monolingual dictionaries, '*retraduction* means translating a text that itself is translated from another language (Robert, 2011, 247). All three definitions define retranslation as a 'translation of translation' that is done through a text that has been translated before, in this case, this translation is called a "*medium, mediatress, or mediatrix*' translation (Mattos, 2011, 42).

The term "retranslation" could be defined as "a new translation produced in the same language where an earlier translation of the same text already exists" (Koskinen, 2018, 38). Throughout history, literary and other texts have been translated and retranslated, and as Lawrence Venuti points out, all acts of retranslation share one common goal: the creation of a kind of new "value" (Venuti, 2004, 25).

Translation Plurality and the Retranslation Phenomenon:

The French philosopher Ernest Penan states that "untranslated fiction could be considered a half-published one". From this



perspective, retranslation could be considered a criterion for assessing the literary value and aesthetic features of the text. Is this something that could be considered a fact, or are there backgrounds and causes that make one's fiction a translatable work? Multi-translations could come simultaneously, successively, or with a period between them.

Plurality in translation is a notable phenomenon. If a translation is the process of transferring a text to another foreign language, it attracts more readers and turns out to be a functional element in the new culture. In this way, translation plays the role of a distributor of texts and a bridge that connects languages. Could the retranslation phenomenon be considered a trial to overcome history and produce a new version that aligns with the linguistic and civilized status quo, or are the older versions not appropriate anymore for cognitive and aesthetic needs, or is it only a matter of imitation? Maybe this is due to the previous versions being wrong. Does no one exactly know which of the reasons is the real motif of 'plurality in translation' in a literary work? Maybe this multiplicity is due to the semantic multiplicity of the literary texts, which features the text and opens it to different readings, even contradictory ones, without lessening the value of the other versions.

Therefore, what are the reasons that motivate a translator to translate a literary work that has already been translated before? whether he or she knows that this work has been translated before? Most of those who translate a literary work that has already been translated write a note at the beginning of their translation saying that the previous versions were not that good, weren't good enough, were bad, or add any other reasons. They are justifications presented to the reader. The 'translation plurality' of a certain work has its own historical and cultural value, and it could be fertile soil for studies and comparisons. It could also be a new highlighter on the original text. Most of these enlightenments are ideological ones.

Translation scholars define retranslation as "a new translation in the same language of a text that has been partially or totally translated before. This concept is connected with text actualization and the development of the receptors, their tastes, their needs, and

their competence. This process goes beyond being just a revision of a reproduction from the same source.

The Negativity of 'Translation Plurality':

Some critics see that the multiple Arabic translations, for example, are alike, so they are less useful. This issue could be digested in terms of the idea that there may be multiple translations that appear at one time in countries that may have similar or different cultures. Those versions do not differ from each other as long as the translator's plan is to transfer the original text. But this idea could also be criticized because it tends to simplify the issue to a large extent because translations are always structured upon "difference" or "being different ". Additionally, this perspective reflects a great deal of the translator's subjectivity in terms of his or her relation to the original text and his/her cultural level. Even if there are some similarities, this does not mean that these translations are exact replicas of each other.

The Positivity of 'Translation Plurality':

However, there is some positivity in the 'plurality of translation' phenomenon: if multiple translations are considered favored and known practices, this is due to their multi-beneficial functions concerning both SL and TL, and these benefits are definitely undeniable. As for the TL level, multiple translations in the same language give it richness from one side, unleash its hidden speech, and grasp it with new meanings. It also reveals its aesthetics, tastes, and profundity on the other side.

Based on the fact that all texts are "translations of translations of translations," as Octavio Paz (1971) said in Translation Studies, Paz's view reflects the concept of Terry Eagleton (1977), who supposes that "every text is a set of determinate transformations of other..." (Eagleton, 1977, 72).

According to Paz:

Every text is unique and, at the same time, a translation of another text. No text is entirely original because language itself, in its essence, is already a translation: firstly, of the non-verbal world, and secondly, since every



sign and every phrase are the translation of another sign and another phrase. However, this argument can be turned around without losing any of its validity: all texts are original because every translation is distinctive. Every translation, up to a certain point, is an invention, and as such, it constitutes a unique text (Paz, 1971, 9).

The Purpose of Retranslation:

The act of retranslating would seem to make little sense if the purpose was not to remove the 'deficiencies' of an older translation or to improve its quality, so it is self-evident that retranslations are frequently broadly advertised as "new" and "refreshed" versions of older translations due to "replacement," even if the changes to previous versions are not always for the better. There are many translations of each given source text into any target language. The reason for the plurality and diversity of these translations, regardless of whether they are considered to be insufficient, mediocre, optimal, etc., is still a problem in translation studies. However, the existence of multiple translations of a source text into a target language, or the possibility of such occurrences, is proof that translation, by its very nature, possesses the property of being indeterministic, at least in some cases.

Because each translation is motivated by a different explanation that is drawn from the source material (the original); each one is a unique work of art. But ironically, it has something in common with translations of the same source text in other target languages. This is due to two factors. The first is that the same social environment determines and controls each individual's interpretation. In other words, translators are not free to read and interpret the source text any way they see fit.

The Function of Translation Plurality:

It is known that the reader of a translation cannot, most of the time, read the text in its original language and has limited knowledge about it. Therefore, he goes for multiple translations that help him get the SL text more accurately and get a better grasp of it. Here comes the utility of multiplicity in translation for both the original and the



translated. Its role is then that of a mediator, and it can also play the role of an interpreter who suggests many meanings for a text.

If the function of 'translation plurality' is for the original text, i.e., being considered a producer of multi-translations, then the translation process itself denotes the relation between a translation and its antecedents. This series of potential translations is considered a translational effect and a progressive mutual correction because these successive translations for the same text try to correct one another successively. In other words, every new version tries to criticize, correct, or reveal what was missed in the previous versions and highlights the missing features that may not have been noted in the previous trial. In this way, it achieves two integrated functions: a critical function and a correction function, even if these are conducted indirectly.

As far as 'translation plurality' is an existing fact, there is a need to investigate the reasons and conditions behind it. Muhammed Abdulghani Hassan (1986) states that "all those who are interested in or work in the translation field agreed that the nature of the original text is the main cause of the appearance of its multiple translations. Hassan says that the higher the value of a literary work in its original language, the greater the importance of having multiple translations in one language and having many other translators transfer it. Sometimes, the reason behind having another translation in the same language is that the first translation needs a retranslation process, either simultaneously or successively. Thus, the retranslation process comes after the process of reading a translation, which becomes the trigger to do another one. The trigger in this way—consciously or unconsciously—is to correct the first translation, catch the eye of the other translations, or try to vanish it.

Reasons for Retranslations:

There is a reason for retranslating a work that has been translated before by the translator: the pleasure that a translator feels when reading the original text, so he or she works on sharing this pleasure with the readers. Roland Barth defines this pleasure as "the text pleasure, like this impossible escaping moment of poetic rhetoric." The reader expresses this pleasure in a variety of ways that range from rereading, explanations, and analysis to transferring and



translating. And if the original bears half of this pleasure, its translation bears a part of it too, like the Sophie or Serial texts. Partly because literary translation has its own special pleasure, it triggers other textual reactions through the retranslation process by other translators. This pleasure could not only be excluded from the original text but should also be found in the translated text because it also has its own poetics and aesthetics. In this way, the pleasure could be transferred to the new culture.

The action of retranslation may be used to gain a greater understanding of the culture of the source text. It may provide a fresh interpretation of it, as well as new insights into the texts, authors, and cultural contexts, allowing for the creation of a higher-quality, better translation. According to Gambier (1994), the process of retranslation might provide "a new meaning to the translator's knowledge of the ST and its culture" (Gambier, 1994, 414).

According to Brownlie (2006), "evolving translation norms and shifting social circumstances" are key contributors to retranslation (Brownlie, 2006, 145). And according to Deane (2010), the fundamental motivations for the process of retranslation, "mainly derive from both intrinsic (linguistic and cultural) and extrinsic (para- and extra-textual) elements." She emphasizes the value of analyzing the linguistic, cultural, paratextual, and extratextual materials because they serve as "a site of evidence of sociological reasons for retranslation and as an indication of the nature of any interactions that may occur between different versions" (Deane, 2014, 66–74).

Motives for Retranslation:

Literary translation is a creative endeavor and a challenge for translators; hence, there is a constant need for new translations of literary works. Retranslation is typically studied by academics who are interested in publishing books about literary history. Due to their established status in translated or translating culture, the classics frequently undergo retranslations into additional literary forms and genres (Venuti, 2004; Brownlie, 2006). Other reasons for retranslating classics include the translator's subjectivity, personal appreciation of a specific author and work, or dissatisfaction with how earlier translations have rendered the aesthetic function of a literary work. Literary translations are the most common type of translation



that is exposed to the retranslation process because they are likely to be retranslated more frequently than any other type of translation. Furthermore, the style and originality of a translated literary text are of higher importance than those of other text types (journalistic, political, historical, scientific, and many others).

It is no surprise that later readings of the same literary text could well yield "different impressions" from the first". A translation enters the never-ending dilemma of a continuous editing process based on changes in interpretation resulting from several readings of the same text at different time intervals and, most likely, during different personal temperament changes. Thus, the variable nature of interpretations means that there is more than one well-reasoned target-language text (Chau Hu, 2003, 111). Here, the case is about one reader or Translator of the same text; no wonder then why translations of the same text by different translators with different, or similar, cultural backgrounds keep appearing as the years go by.

Text Aging:

According to Bassnett (1989), time and genre play a crucial role in the motivation for literary retranslation (Bassnett, 1989, 99). For example, it is often believed that plays should be retranslated almost every 20 years. Since a play is basically a transcript of spoken language, a transcript of spoken language ages more quickly than a transcript of written language. As a result, the aging process will be more noticeable in a play's translation than in other types of written literature.

Why do some translations age rapidly?

Translation experts frequently pondered why some translations seemed to have aged so rapidly while others were still regarded as "classics" in their translated forms. Translation, according to Berman (1990), is an "incomplete act," and the only way to complete it is through creating retranslations over time. He agrees that early translations have become dated and that new translations are therefore constantly needed (Berman, 1990, 1–7). He uses the word "accomplishment" to suggest that each translation succeeds in approaching the ST and in capturing the interaction between the translator and the original language (Berman, 1990, 3). The issue of

translations deteriorating over time is another one that Berman focuses on. He provides three key justifications for translating a text that has already been translated: to be cited in history, to be more interpretive, or for audience-reception-focused reasons.

In terms of literary retranslation, Berman argues that a translation of any classical work is an "incomplete act", and it can only strive for completion through retranslations (Berman, 1990, 1)". Completion," according to Berman, means that new retranslations usually get "closer" to the ST compared to previous ones (Berman 1). He argues that the initial translation is "necessarily blind and hesitant." Hence, there is a need for retranslation (Berman, 1990, 5). In other words, Feng (2014) states that if a translation becomes very old and its language and style become outdated, a new translation will be necessary to match the need of the contemporary readership. Berman (1990) introduces the "issue of aging" and suggests that "while originals remain forever 'young', translations will age with the passage of time, thus giving rise to a need for new translations" (Berman, 1990, 1). This is true in the sense that the original work is the only permanently stable version, while its translations may vary in language or format.

The necessity for new translations and the aging of existing translations are related to "language change and the need to update the wording and terminologies used in earlier translations, as well as the presumption that the original text must always imply more than is needed to any interpreter or any generation of interpreters" (Hanna, 2016, 194). This is the foundation for the notion that translations deteriorate over time, whereas the original source text in the original language does not (Robinson, 2016, 1).

In other words, the original is timeless, while its translation needs updating over time (Robinson, 2016). Thus, in order for a translator to make the original ST appropriate for a specific target culture and readers in a specific period of time, he or she must reduce the original's "signification surplus" (Robinson. 2016, 5). However, it will cause the translation to age more quickly than the original text.

The idea of 'improvement' is also discussed by Venuti (2003), who contends that retranslations aim to "make an appreciable



change" in comparison to earlier translations, i.e., to create a better version (Hanna, 2016, 193). According to Venuti, retranslation is viewed as a necessary or beneficial action, created as a result of "text aging" over time. And a translation is legitimate and worthwhile if it questions the established social and cultural structures of the target culture and encourages original thought.

Authors frequently discuss how outdated translations need to be retranslated due to the passage of time (Gambier, 1994; Schulte and Biguenet, 1992). The frequency and periodicity of retranslations are issues brought up by Gambier (1994), who states that "retranslation introduces modifications since times have changed." In terms of the distance in time from the ST, or the amount of time that has passed between the initial translation and successive retranslations, Gambier emphasizes that time is crucial in offering a more explicit explanation for retranslations (Gambier, 1994, 413).

Comparisons between translations mean comparing between translators; this is why the competition is harder and the mission is more difficult when comparing a retranslation conducted after a well-known competent translator or writer has done it or after a translation that is considered of great importance according to Berman's criterion.

The Prophet's translation is not an easy work for two reasons: firstly, because of the rhythm and the music, and secondly, because Gibran worked on repetition and balance in his sentences. So, the texts came close to the poetic prose. Secondly, Gibran's special language is so close to the Bible. *The Prophet's* style of advice is so much like that of Christ. The images of the book are so much inspired by the Bible, and most of the images are symbolic, connoting multiple meanings because Gibran, as a sophist, feels that "the direct, frank term is unable to deliver the Sophie meaning, this is why it should be connotated and symbolized (Gibran, 1997, 32).

Consequently, retranslation could be considered at times as a paraphrase or a presentation that is compared according to who writes better. Or could it sometimes be seen as a repetition of what has already been written with simple linguistic editing? Thus, retranslation occurs due to the idea that the new translator grasps the meaning better than the previous translator. And consequently, is

retranslation assessed by how much the text is understood or expressed? So, the equation could be like the following:

RETRANSLATION = new understanding + new paraphrasing.

The text 'on Giving' has been chosen to be compared, and the similarities and differences appeared in the following points:

The Opening Sentence:

Some sentences were translated literally while other sentences were not literally translated and sometimes the two strategies appear in the same text or even in one sentence. The translators kept it translated literally with slight differences on the level of vocabulary choice.

Then said a rich man, speak to us of Giving And he Answered	
Translator	Translation
Naimy	عندئذ قال له رجل غنى حدثنا عن العطاء فأجاب قائلا
Okasha	وهنا قال رجل ثرى حدثنا عن العطاء أجاب المصطفى
Al Khal	ثم قال له رجل غنى حدثنا عن العطاء فأجاب قائلا
A suggested translation	وعندئذ قال رجل غنى أخبرنا عن العطاء فأجاب المصطفى

AL Khal and Naimy used "غنى" while Okasha opt "ثرى".
Searching the term "wealthy" resulted in the following equivalents:

أثرياء، أغنياء، ثري، رَأْسَمَالِي، عَائِش، غَنِي، مُتْرَف، مُتَمَوِّل، مُثْر، مِعْطَاء، مُقْتَدِر،
مُقْرِش، مُكْتَبِر، مَلِيء، مُوسِر، مُوسِع

While searching the term "rich" resulted in the following meanings

أغنياء، أنيق، ثري، خصب، دسيم، رَأْسَمَالِي، صارخ، عائش، عميق، غَنِي، فاخر، فخم،
قوي، مُتْرَف، مُتَمَوِّل، مُسَلِّ، مضحك، مُقْتَدِر، مُكْتَبِر، مَلِيء، مُوسِر، نَفِيس، وافر

I think "rich" is better translated as 'غنى' because the word "غنى" could bear the meaning of being rich in knowledge and experience does not only indicate to "moneyed person" who is rich with money. The context here expresses all types of giving, giving money or giving love, kindness, and tenderness.

AL Khal and Naimy used "غنى" while Okasha opt "ثرى".
Searching the term "wealthy" resulted in the following equivalents:

أثرياء، أغنياء، ثري، رَأْسَمَالِي، عَائِش، غَنِي، مُتَرَف، مُتَمَوِّل، مُتَر، مِعْطَاء، مُقْتَدِر، مُقْرِش، مُكْتَبِر، مَلِيء، مُوسِبِر، مُوسِع

While searching the term "rich" resulted in the following meanings أغنياء، أنيق، ثري، خصب، دسيم، رَأْسَمَالِي، صارخ، عائش، عميق، غني، فاخر، فخم، قوي، مُتَرَف، مُتَمَوِّل، مُسَلِّ، مضحك، مُقْتَدِر، مُكْتَبِر، مَلِيء، مُوسِبِر، نفيس، وافر

I think "rich" is better translated as 'غنى' because the word "غنى" could bear the meaning of being rich in knowledge and experience does not only indicate to "moneyed person" who is rich with money. The context here expresses all types of giving, giving money or giving love, kindness, and tenderness.

Example 2:

You give but little when you give of your possessions	
Translator	Translation
Naimy	إنكم تعطون قليلا عندما تعطون من حطام ما تملكون
Okasha	إنك لتعطي القليل حين تعطي مما تملك
Al-Khal	أنتم تعطون القليل حين تعطون من مالكم
A Suggested translation	إنما تعطون القليل حين تعطون مما تملكون

Okasha used the singular pronoun 'you', while Niamey and Al Khal used the plural one. Naimy and Al Khal tend to generalize the advice using the plural 'you' while Okasha was more specific and used singular 'you'.



The same idea is applied on the next examples:

Example 3:

It is when you give of yourself that you truly give	
Translator	Translation
Naimy	أما العطاء الحقيقي فهو أن يعطى الإنسان من نفسه
Okasha	فإذا أعطيت من ذاتك أعطيت حقاً
Al Khal	أما حين تعطون من نفوسكم فعندئذ تعطون حقاً
A Suggested translation	ولكنكم تعطون بحق حين تعطون من ذواتكم

Translator	Translation
Naimy	وهل الخوف من الحاجة إلا الحاجة بعينها؟
Okasha	وهل الخوف من الحاجة إلا الحاجة بعينها؟
Al Khal	وما هو الخوف من الحاجة إلا الحاجة نفسها؟
A Suggested translation	أفليس الخوف من العوز عوزاً؟

Is not dread of thirst when your well is full, the thirst that is unquestionable?	
Translator	Translations
Naimy	أليس العطش الذي لا يرتوى هو خوفكم من العطش في حين تفيض بئركم بالماء
Okasha	أليست خشية الظمأ وبئر ملى هو العطش لا تروى له غلة؟
Al Khal	أما الخوف من العطش وبئركم مليئة هو العطش الذي لا يروى
A Suggested translation	والخوف من الظمأ والبئر ملى ، ظمأ لا يرتوى ؟



Concluding Remarks:

- On the layout level, Tharwat Okasha's translation had footnotes for (the difficult vocabularies) so the text came out like that of the English one.
- Naimy changed in his translation; instead of using the pronouns of the addressee, he preferred generalization in the sentences

"أما العطاء الحقيقي فهو أن يعطى الإنسان من نفسه"

- He deleted the pronoun of the addressee in some Arabic sentences even if they do exist in the English text.

Example: 'your well' بئر – بئرک

- Omitting some vocabs such as over/ trackless in Naimy and Al Khal.
- Adding some vocabularies in other translation:
خزائنك ، جهديك ، حطام ، جزء
- Substituting some words with its synonyms such as:
(خوف- عوز) (عطش – ظمأ) (ذات- نفس) (فصل – موسم)
- In the suggested translations, adaptation is not excluded on rephrasing sentences and changing vocabularies only; but sometimes also the adaptation technique is used.

The translations differentiated between one translator and another. Each translator chooses the equivalent that he sees appropriate, hence, vocabulary is differentiated between one translation and another:



ST (English)	Naimy	Okasha	Al-Khal	A Suggested translation
Your possessions	ما تملككم - ممتلكاتكم	ما تملك	ما لكم	ما تملكون/ممتلكاتكم
Things trackless	أشياء -	أشياء المهجورة	مالكم -	أشياء -
The thirst that is unquenchable	العطش الذي لا يرتوى	هو العطش لا تروى له غلة	هو العطش الذي لا يروي	ظماً لا يرتوى
Your well is full	تفيض بئركم بالماء	بئركم ملأى	بئركم مليئة	البئر ملأى
Desert	إستحقاق	ثواب	جزاء	جزاء
For recognition	طمعاً في الظهور	تباها بالعطاء	حبا بالظهور	حبا في الظهور
Their hidden desire	شهوته الخفية	نياتهم المستورة بطيبات	رغبته الخفية	نياته المخفية
Makes unwholesome	تفسد	تذهب	تجعل فاسدا	تفضح
The trees in your orchard say not so, nor the flocks in your pasture.	ما هكذا تقول الأشجار في بساتينكم ولا القطعان في مراعيكم	وليس ذلك قول الأشجار في بستانك ولا القطعان في مرعاك	لكن الأشجار التي في حديقته لا تقول هكذا ولا القطعان في مراعيكم	لكن أشجار الحدائق وقطعان المواشى في مراعيكم لا تقول ذلك
They give that they may live for withhold is to perish	بل هي تعطى لتحميا إذ إن في إمساكها هلاكها	إنها تعطى لتحميا: لأن المنع سبيل الفناء	هي تعطى لتحميا فإن تبخل هو أن تموت	لكنها تعطى بصمت لتحمي و من يعطي يتحقق هلاكه

Conclusion:

Is Retranslation a Renovation or Correction Process?

One of the excuses a translator might use to claim to retranslate a translated work is that, the antecedent translation has some defects, even if the text is a good one and does not fail to



convey the intended meaning directly. It is acceptable for the translator himself to go back to work on his own translation after years of its production, this is acceptable as it is considered a correction process, but most of the time this correction is made by another person. In this case, or in this correction process, retranslation focuses on the parts that may have been deleted in the first translation or the parts that have undergone debate or censorship issues."

In this case, translation does not take on its real dimension; it becomes merely a renovation of the old, keeping its function and highlighting the gaps that may have appeared over the years. These types of translations are a kind of expression of progression and change on the level of vision and tackling. When a book might be read in translated versions in a particular language presented by many different translators, and maybe the same literary work is translated so many times by the same translator that each one of them comes with its own new vision in a non-stop promotion. Based on this concept, retranslation is an act of complying with linguistic evolution and getting along with the translator's knowledge maturity and the new reading style.

The analysis of the selected samples of the literary text has shown that retranslations, despite their very individual nature, still have some hallmarks in common. The key distinction between translating and retranslating a text is that re-translators can (and perhaps always should) use the previous translation to familiarize themselves with at least one possible method of translating the source text (ST) and be able to reuse those specific sections of the translation that show no obvious flaws and, therefore, can be reused in the new version without harming the outcome. It would be absurd to attempt to change a term or a phrase when there is frequently only one apparent translation.

Most of the suggested motives for the retranslation process seem to have one particular feature in common: retranslation's main goal is to present an enhanced or better version of the previous translation version. Without the purpose of eliminating the 'deficiencies' of the older translation or enhancing its quality, the

retranslation process would seem to make little sense, so it is self-evident that retranslation is often known as “new” and “refreshed” versions of older translations due to the "Replacement," even if the changes made to the previous versions are not needless for improvement. In some cases, due to 'marketing purposes', the reader has been masked with the fact that he/she is not reading a retranslation, but a version with a new revision of an older translation.

As in the selected examples in this research, the three translations demonstrate that the three translators can present a comparable translation in some sentences. This would be based on the supposition that, more than half of the lexical elements in a literary text have a natural and evident translation equivalent that does not present a significant challenge for the translator and can thus be securely reused by a re-translator. The real job of a literary translator indeed begins in the other half of the text. And that job often requires the upgrade of a group of elements in translation, such as lexical, syntactic, and stylistic features that are no longer accepted within the literary system of the TT cultural norms.

The retranslation process, at least in the three selected retranslations, does not show excessive borrowing of lexical translation choices made by the previous translator, nor does the process of retranslating seem to lead to a complete denial of the interpretation of the previous translators. Throughout the analysis, it can be admitted that the voice of the first translator affects indirectly the successive translations of the same literary work. The shadow of the first translator remains there even if the next translators did not confess it frankly. In the case of Gibran's, *The Prophet* translation, is the first spark that has enlightened the road to the rest of the translators. It is doubtless, even if not frankly mentioned that, any translator who is going to retranslate.

It is important to draw attention to the fact that multiple translations of the same literary work indicate an awareness of the importance of that work; however, it also reflects the poor coordination between translators, hence the need for a general list of translated works so as not to keep retranslating the same work

again and again, which leads to wasted efforts. Translating another book for Chomsky, for example, would have been better than a retranslation of the same translated one, especially since it seems that the subsequent translator did not inadvertently or unintentionally familiarize himself with the first translation. Without prejudging the results, it appears that in some cases, in the work of translation, the second translation may be considered a waste of time and effort. Nevertheless, practically, it has been proven through research that each translator can do a retranslation of any literary work as long as there is a new addition, a new vision, a creative approach, and a style; otherwise, retranslation becomes a waste of time and has no value.

One of the concluding remarks of the research is finding that translators are free to use whatever techniques they might find appropriate for them, but they are not totally free not to deliver the aesthetic effect of the original text, especially if it was a literary one of great impact and had a remarkable influence and popularity among the source audience.

The lexical choices overlap in the three translations quite consistently and do not differ significantly, for example, emphasizing the assumption that a translator has only a limited number of methods to translate the ST and should not deviate from a previous version of a translation more than is necessary. In many cases, the retranslator only slightly changes the lexical diversity of the translations, but he actually restructures a new type of writing, using the same building blocks as the previous translation but reordering them in such a way that they create a new, fresh, and innovative look in the source text.

However, 'plurality in translation' could be criticized if it is considered a waste of the translators' time and efforts. What is the utility of retranslating a literary work that has already been translated before? It is possible if the previous translation exceeded one hundred years (a century); in this case, a new version becomes acceptable. In this regard, three main points could be suggested:

- 1- There is no communication between the translators
- 2- Founding an Association for Translators
- 3- There is no bibliography for the translated works



References

Abdelnour, J. (2006). Retraduction. Dans Abdelnour dictionnaire detaillee Francais-arabe, Beyrouth, Liban: dar al-'ilm lil-malayin.

Berman, A. (1990). La retraduction comme espace traduction, Palimpsestes, 4, 1-9. Paris, France: Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle.

Chau Hu, Helen. Cognitive-functional considerations in translating. IRAL 41,2003, 107-130.

Deane-Cox, Sharon. (2014). Retranslation: Translation, Literature and Reinterpretation. London and New York, NY: Bloomsbury.

Eagleton, T. (1977) Translation and Transformation. Stand, 19(3),

Gambier, Y. (1994). La retraduction, retour et detour, Meta, XXXIX (3), 413-417. Doi: 10. 7202/002799ar

Gambier, Y. (2011). La retraduction: ambiguites et defis. Dans E. Monti, & P. Schnyder (dir.), Autour de la retraduction: Perspectives litteraires europeennes. Paris, France: Editions Orizons

Gibran, Khalil. (1997). The Prophet, New York, United States of America: Alfred A. Knopf.

Hanna, Sameh F. Bourdieu in Translation Studies: The Socio-cultural Dynamics of Shakespeare Translation in Egypt. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2016.

Mattos, T. (2015). Definir et redefinir la retraduction : d'Antoine Berman jusqu'a present. Atelier de traduction, 23, 41-51. Suceava, Roumanie: Editura Universitatii din Suceava. Monti, E. (2011). La retraduction, un etat des lieux, Dans E.

Monti, E. (2011). La retraduction, un etat des lieux, Dans E. Monti, & P. Schnyder (dir.), Autour de la retraduction: Perspectives litteraires europeennes. Paris, France: Editions Orizons.



Paz, O. Traduccion: Literatura y literalidad.
Barcelona: Tusquets Editor, 1971.

Robert, P. (2011). Retraduction. Dans Le nouveau
petit Robert de la langue franqaise, Paris, France: Editions
Le Robert.

Robinson, Douglas. (1999). Retranslation and
Ideosomatic Drift.

Retrieved 16 June 2023 from:

www.umass.edu/french/people/profiles/documents/Robinson.pdf.

Venuti, Lawrence. (2004). "Retranslations: The
Creation of Value." Bucknell Review, vol. 47, no. 1, 25-38.

المراجع العربية:

الخال ، يوسف . ١٩٦٨ . جبران خليل جبران : النبى . بيروت : دار النهار
للنشر.

حسن ، محمد عبد الغني . ١٩٨٦ فن الترجمة في الأدب العربي، دار المستقبل.

عكاشة ، ثروت . ١٩٥٩ . الروائع جبران خليل جبران . الهيئة المصرية
العامّة للكتاب.

عكاشة، ثروت، النبى: ترجمة موازية للنصين الإنجليزى والعربى ، دار الشروق ، ٢٠٠٠

نعيمة ، ميخائيل . ١٩٨٨ . النبى . جبران خليل جبران : دراسة وتحليل
الدكتورة نازك يارد. بيروت: مؤسسة نوفل.

**"التعددية الترجيحية" و"إعادة الترجمة" في العمل الأدبي "النبي" لجبران خليل جبران:
دراسة مقارنة لثلاث ترجمات مختارة لعكاشة ونعيمه و الخال**

إعداد

دينا عبد الرحمن عبد الخالق الدوي

أ.د محمد سعيد نجم

أستاذ اللغويات قسم اللغة الانجليزية كلية الآداب _ جامعة طنطا

أ.د أيمن عياد

أستاذ اللغة العربية قسم اللغة العربية كلية الآداب _ جامعة طنطا

المستخلص: تتناول هذه الورقة البحثية مسألة "إعادة الترجمة" أو "التعددية الترجيحية" لنفس النص الأدبي. كونها ظاهرة تتكرر في مجال الترجمة وفي الترجمة الأدبية على وجه الخصوص. تبدأ هذه الورقة البحثية بتعريف مفهوم "التعددية الترجيحية" لتنتقل إلى الأسباب التي تدفع إلى إعادة الترجمة. واختير كتاب "النبي" لجبران خليل جبران والذي يُعد من أكثر الكتب المعاد ترجمتها والتي تستمر إعادة ترجمته حتى يومنا هذا. وبالرغم من ظهور بعض الترجمات في حياة جبران نفسه وبناء على طلبه وقد صدق على ترجماتها، إلا أن الترجمات لكتاب "النبي" توالى بلا توقف البعض برر إعادة الترجمة في المقدمة بالإشارة إلى فكرة "الإتيان بالأفضل" مبررين ذلك أن بعض الترجمات السابقة كان بها قصور في نقل روح جبران بأمانة وأنها يشوبها بعض الأخطاء. تحاول الورقة البحثية الإجابة على بعض الأسئلة التالية: هل هناك ضرورة لإعادة الترجمة؟ هل إعادة الترجمة هي إعادة صياغة؟ أم هي ترجمة جديدة بروية جديدة وروح مختلفة عن سابقتها؟ إلى أي مدى يؤثر الفارق الزمني بين ترجمة وأخرى تليها لنفس العمل؟ من خلال التحليل لما سبق ومقارنة لنماذج من الترجمات و من الإجابات للأسئلة التي تم طرحها يمكن الخروج بمفهوم جديد لعملية "إعادة الترجمة".

الكلمات الإفتتاحية: الترجمة الأدبية ، التعددية الترجيحية ، إعادة الترجمة ، النبي ، جبران