

## The Retranslation of Intertextuality: Paul Auster's *New York Trilogy*

### Metinlerarasılığın Yeniden Çevirisi: Paul Auster'ın *New York Üçlemesi* Örneği

İrem Ceren Doğan<sup>1</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Ass. Prof. Dr., Bitlis Eren University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Western Languages and Literatures, Bitlis, Türkiye

Sorumlu yazar /

Corresponding author : İrem Ceren Doğan

E-posta / E-mail : iremcerendogan@gmail.com

#### ABSTRACT

Intertextuality is a concept that has emerged in postmodernism and since become an integral part of postmodern theory. It refers to how each text is shaped by its relationship with other texts, as well as to the cultural and historical contexts in which it was produced. Postmodernism questions the notion that a text has a singular, objective meaning, suggesting that each text can be interpreted in multiple ways. This study approaches the translation of intertextuality by examining the intertextual connections in the first and retranslations. The corpus of this study is composed of the famous works of Paul Auster, an American postmodernist writer, namely "City of Glass," "Ghosts," and "The Locked Room" known as the "New York Trilogy". This study aims to analyze the dynamics of retranslation of postmodern literature to present a different understanding of retranslation contrary to the retranslation hypothesis asserted by Berman (1990), Bensimon (1990), and Gambier (1994) as it seems outdated. As postmodernism is a contemporary movement of literature, the first and retranslations of the prevalent narrative techniques require a different understanding from the traditional point of view. This different understanding is related to contemporary approaches to retranslation asserted by Kaisa Koskinen, Outi Paloposki, Tahir Gürçağlar, and Siobhan Brownlie. In the comparative analysis of the examples taken from the "New York Trilogy," the methodology of Hatim and Mason (2001) is utilized.

**Keywords:** Retranslation, postmodernism, intertextuality, Paul Auster, New York Trilogy.

Başvuru / Submitted : 05.04.2023

Revizyon Talebi /  
Revision Requested : 12.06.2023

Son Revizyon /  
Last Revision Received : 26.06.2023

Kabul / Accepted : 21.09.2023

Published Online /  
Online Yayın : 15.12.2023



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

## ÖZ

Metinlerarasılık, postmodernizm bağlamında, akımın ayrılmaz bir parçası olarak ön plana çıkan bir kavramdır. Bu kavram, her metnin üretildiği kültürel ve tarihsel bağlamın yanında, diğer metinlerle olan ilişkisi üzerinden nasıl şekillendiğini ifade etmek üzere kullanılır. Postmodernizm, metinlere atfedilen tekil ve nesnel anlamı sorgulayarak, her metnin farklı şekilde yorumlanabileceğini, böylelikle çeşitli anlamlara açık olduğunu ileri sürer. Bu çalışmada metinlerarasılığın çevirisinde, ilk çeviriler ve yeniden çeviriler arasındaki metinlerarası ilişkiler ele alınacaktır. Çalışmanın amacı, Berman (1990), Bensimon (1990) ve Gambier (1994) tarafından ileri sürülen yeniden çeviri hipotezinden farklı bir yeniden çeviri algısı sunmak üzere, postmodernist eserlerin yeniden çevirilerinin doğasını ve dinamiklerini açıklamaktır. Postmodernizm daha güncel bir edebi akım olduğundan, akım içindeki anlatım teknikleri, geleneksel bakış açısının dışında farklı bir analiz gerektirmektedir. Bütüncüye ise Amerikalı postmodern yazar Paul Auster'ın New York Üçlemesi olarak da bilinen “Cam Kent”, “Hayaletler” ve “Kilitli Oda” adlı eserleri oluşturmaktadır. New York Üçlemesi'nden seçilen örneklerin karşılaştırmalı incelemesinde ise Hatim ve Mason (2001) tarafından ileri sürülen metinlerarasılık kategorilerinden yararlanılacaktır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Yeniden çeviri, postmodernizm, metinlerarasılık, Paul Auster, New York Üçlemesi.

## Introduction

Postmodern literature is a literary movement that emerged in the mid-20th century in opposition to previous textual conventions like modernism. Instead, postmodern literature often employs metafiction, intertextuality, fragmentation, and irony to challenge the notion of coherent narratives. Intertextuality is a prominent aspect of postmodern literature that involves allusions to other literary or cultural works and the incorporation of references within the text. By implementing this technique, a profound layer of complexity is added to the content, giving rise to an intricately interwoven web of meanings that spans numerous works of literature. This enriching effect elevates the value and impact of literary pieces by infusing them with a deep sense of interconnectedness and significance. The intricacies of the intertextual elements present in postmodern works necessitate extensive knowledge and academic familiarity with a diverse spectrum of literature, cultural references, and allusions. This comprehensive understanding is crucial to deciphering the implications and connotations embedded within the text, as it requires a deep dive into numerous layers that are intertwined within the work. It calls for not just surface-level interpretation but rather demands an in-depth analysis from multiple perspectives to comprehend its true essence. Moreover, postmodern literature often challenges the authority of the author and undermines traditional notions of authorship by blurring the lines between reality and fiction and by exposing the constructed nature of language and meaning. Meaning is derived not from a single, coherent narrative but rather from an array of fragmented and disjointed elements that come together to form a complex web of interpretations (Derrida, 1976). Meaning in postmodern literature is constructed through a web of fragmented elements, and intertextuality plays a crucial role as it challenges the dominant status of the author.

This web of intertextuality results in the translatability of postmodern literature becoming a challenge for translators, as translating intertextual elements requires not just linguistic expertise but also in-depth knowledge of the referenced literary works. Therefore, the successful translation of postmodern literature necessitates the translator to be well-versed in the source and target systems. Furthermore, if the translator aims to preserve the intended meaning, he should possess a literary background and familiarity with intertextual references within the source text. The retranslation process requires even greater awareness of the source text and previous texts within the same system. This complex network of intertextual relationships prompts us to critically examine retranslations, both as finished products and ongoing processes. The corpus of this study comprises the renowned literary masterpiece, *New York Trilogy* by Paul Auster, a distinguished postmodern writer. *New York Trilogy* has intertextual references to various other literary works, including the detective fiction genre and famous philosophical texts. *The trilogy* is composed of three books: *City of Glass* (1985), *Ghosts* (1986), and *The Locked Room* (1986). In this study, the first translations and retranslations of these novels were scrutinized in terms of their intertextual references. The first Turkish translations of *The City of Glass* and *The Locked Room* belong to Yusuf Eradam with the titles of *Cam Kent* (1991) and *Kilitli Oda* (1993). All the first translations were published by the Aylak Adam Publishing House. *Ghosts* were translated into Turkish, as in *Hayaletler* (1993), by Fatih Özgüven for the first time. All three novels were re-translated by the same translator, İlknur Özdemir, with the same titles in 2004 by Can Publishing. In this study's comparative analysis, the intertextual elements were classified based on the categorization put forth by Hatim and Mason (2001). The different examples of the three novels are compared with each other as well as with the source text. The purpose of this study is to discern the necessity and dynamics of retranslations of *Trilogy* in terms of the translation strategies employed to convey intertextual elements to provide a general perspective regarding the nature of retranslation in the framework of postmodernism.

## 1. Intertextuality

### 1.1. Theoretical Basis of Intertextuality

During the reading activity, readers try to capture meaning. However, literary works possess meanings based on cultural and literary systems and traditions. Moreover, literary works depend on previous works in their system. While reading, the reader also interprets the meaning. Therefore, the basic notions of independent meaning and associating meaning with the author become obsolete. As a text gains meaning based on its links to literary traditions and cultural codes, there can be no independent meaning. Contemporary literary theories move beyond the idea of an independent text and meaning in the network of meanings provided by textual relations within a specific literary system.

Textual relations come into prominence with French linguist Ferdinand de Saussure. Saussure focuses on language as a system embodying the relationship between meaning and text (qtd. Allen, 2000). Later, the sociocultural context was thought to be a crucial part of the meaning, requiring more research on this aspect. Mikhail Bakhtin, the Russian literary theorist, asserts theories regarding language and its existence within the frame of “specific social situations”. Bakhtin’s multiplicity of languages termed “polyphony” and the theories of Saussure were further developed by Julia Kristeva. Kristeva, a poststructuralist theoretician, employed neologism *intertextualité* for the first time in the 1960s. She mentions the texts as a “mosaic of quotations” (Kristeva, 1974:59–60). Therefore, the term “intertextuality” is used for the first time by a poststructuralist objecting to the idea of stable meaning.

Another poststructuralist Roland Barthes asserts that because of the intertextual nature of every work, there is no way to stabilize the meaning of a literary work, especially by the reader. The famous essay of Barthes titled *The Death of the Author* (1977) gives the reader freedom by liberating him from the traditions and authorities of the author as the author is “dead” now. Barthes evaluated the authority of the author within the framework of a capitalist society in which consumption is crucial. He asserts that the name of the author is necessary while turning a work into a material having the value of exchange. Therefore, the author is “what fosters the ‘work’ as opposed to the ‘text’”. His emphasis on the difference between the work and the text highlights the existence of the texts in the market as meta-products. The author dies because what should be highlighted is the reader. The integrity of the text is about its “destination” (Barthes, 1977: 148), which is directly related to the reception of the text by the reader. As the meaning of a text is composed of manifold layers, the composer is not thought to be the author but the reader. In this sense, “intertextuality replaces the challenged author-text relationship with one between reader and text, one that situates the locus of textual meaning within the history of discourse itself” (Hutcheon, 1988: 126). This is because the reader is the only one to interpret the complex network of social, cultural, and psychological elements. Moreover, even if the meaning is at the centre, he argues that a text is not only about the multiplicity of cultures but also about the multiplicity of forms of writing. Thus, the reader is the junction of all intertextual elements. Therefore, meaning lost its static status and started to be considered dynamic and free, as the author was no longer the “guarantor of meaning” (Orr, 2003:30).

In the late 1970s, intertextuality was used as a system-based approach within the frame of literary studies because of systems theory. Gérard Genette deals with intertextuality as a part of the literary system. His approach changes the focus of intertextuality as an analytical tool. It is no longer a core of the text, but one of the elements required to compose the text. Genette uses many sub-elements while referring to the traces of intertextuality in literary texts. These are quotation, plagiarism, and allusion (1992: 1-5). This categorization is based on the degree of explicitness of intertextual references. The first one, quotation, is used when the second author directly gives the first author’s words in his text. Therefore, quotation is the most explicit form of intertextuality. When the second author uses signs to imply the intertextual reference by neither hiding nor directly explaining, it becomes a type of allusion, allegory, or metaphor. The most problematic type of intertextuality is plagiarism when the second author benefits from the first text but tries to hide it without any direct reference to the first author. Genette accepts plagiarism as a type of intertextuality which is crucial, especially in terms of literary translation.

Intertextuality is still crucial for postmodernist literature because it shares its role with different standards. These standards, as Hutcheon asserts, are still needed even if there is no exact influence of the author because critical language is crucial for discussing all intertextual elements (Hutcheon, 1988).

After discussing the roots and influences of intertextuality, we move on to our focus: the translation of intertextual elements. The nature of intertextuality within the structure and layers of each text is a matter of debate in translation studies. As the complex process of translation is multiplied by the nature of intertextuality, different scholars have focused on the issue from their perspectives, creating two opposite poles between translatability and untranslatability.

## 1.2. Intertextuality in Translation

Theo Hermans pairs the hermeneutic approach with intertextuality asserting the concept of “translation-specific intertextuality” (Hermans, 2003: 72). As the nature and necessity of translation are different from an original text, the intertextual relations should be scrutinized within the dynamics of translation. In his approach, translation-specific intertextuality has different perspectives such as the connection of translation to the previous translations of the same source text. In this case, the translation is assumed to be retranslation. There is no way for a translator to abstain from the previous ones, lately termed “anxiety of influence” (Bloom, 1997). As each translation is considered a continuum of literary tradition, previous texts also provide intertextual elements for upcoming retractions. Another network of “translation-specific intertextuality” was enabled by other translations of the same type. Moreover, the common notion of translation in a specific culture is the active mechanism of intertextual relations. Based on the “self-referentiality” of the translations, “intercommunication between different translations” comes to the fore as a part of the translational process.

Intertextuality in translation is considered in parallel with reception, which brings the reader to the stage. Lawrence Venuti, a translation scholar handles this subject by considering the necessities of the translation process. Venuti starts with the assertion that “Every text is fundamentally an intertext, bound about other texts which are somehow present in it and from which it draws its meaning, value, and function” (2009:157). In translation studies, there are two different types of readers: the receiver of the source text and the target text. Therefore, it can be asserted that every translation is also an intertext because of the link between the source and target systems and its role as a connector. In this sense, intertextuality makes translations possible. The connection provided by translation concerns the culture-oriented nature of translation as a process and product. If we assume the translation process as a loop with the source text’s presence in the source culture, the target text’s presence in the target culture, and their parallelism, the intertextuality is also central. According to Venuti, to talk about intertextuality, it should be assumed that there is a literary and cultural tradition because intertextuality is a matter of continuity. As translation is “a unique set of intertextualities”, he asserts three different types of intertextualities within the translation. The first one is the intertextuality between the foreign text and other texts, no matter which language they are written in. The second type of intertextuality is between the foreign text and the translation. This relationship is analysed within the concept of equivalence in a traditional sense. The third dimension of intertextuality in translation is between the translation and other texts (ibid: 158). This emphasis on the “equivalence” creates an impossibility because there is no way to create an equivalent effect. As the source text is decontextualized, every effort to compensate for the loss leads to a recontextualizing process. Establishing equivalent intertextuality is assumed impossible by Venuti because of the different sociocultural and literary systems of the source and target sides. As a solution, foreign intertexts are usually replaced by “analogous but ultimately different intertextual relations in the receiving language.” Thus, there is no way to create equivalent intertextuality in the target text according to him (Venuti, 2009: 172).

Another crucial point of Venuti’s argument is considering translation as the source text’s alternative interpretation. On this basis, the reception of this interpretation comes into prominence. The translator is to be evaluated as the first receptor of a target text, followed by the target reader. Even if the reception is assumed generally to be related to the target reader, the translator’s bicultural competence is also crucial in creating closer intertextual relations. Venuti opposes the idea of translating intertextuality because he considers this process as a substitution, not as a translation. He does not accept the idea of substitution to translate intertextuality due to the culture and/or literature-based nature of intertextuality.

The common point of the arguments of Hermans and Venuti is that they both mention intertextuality as a factor disrupting equivalence (Hermans 2007; Venuti 2009). Therefore, it is possible to state that the prevalent concept of “equivalence” of the 1970s is transposed by the concept of “intertextuality”. As intertextual relations bear no hierarchy contrary to equivalence, the primary status of the original text is assumed to be subverted as both the source and the target texts are parallel to each other within the scope of textual interactions. The crucial part of this transposition is related to the problem of translatability, which was scrutinized in depth by Venuti. The culture-oriented nature of translation brings translatability and interpretation in terms of intertextual relations.

## 1.3. Intertextuality in Retranslation

Retranslation is described as “a product denotes a second or later translation of a single source text into the same target language (Koskinen& Paloposki, 2003: 20). The research on the name and nature of retranslation dates to 1990 with the special issue of *Palimpsestes: Retraduire*. Paul Bensimon, with his *Présentation* of the issue, Antoine Berman, with his essay titled *La Retraduction comme Espace de la Traduction*, and Yves Gambier, with his essay titled

*La Retraduction, Retour et Détour* assert similar opinions regarding retranslation, which is named as “retranslation hypothesis” later. The retranslation hypothesis is like a manifest of retranslation studies at that time. The arguments asserted within the frame of this hypothesis are related to the agents, dynamics, and position of retranslations compared to the source texts. The main debate of the hypothesis is that retranslations emerge because of “aging” first translations or to compensate for the deficiencies of existing translations. Therefore, retranslations are assumed to be “innovators”, and they are source-oriented (Berman, 1990). However, retranslation has a dual nature both as a product and a process. The retranslation hypothesis presumes retranslation as a phenomenon that occurs over a period following the first translation. As a result, it is asserted that retranslations emerge because of the need to update language use. The alleged reason for this is that the language of the first translation will be out of date when the same text is retranslated. Therefore, when the first translation is domesticating and target-oriented, the retranslation is source-oriented (ibid.). However, these presumptions are not valid for the nature of retranslation especially nowadays, as retranslations may even exist simultaneously with the first translations or there is not a long period between the first and retranslation all the time. On this basis, contemporary researchers have criticized the retranslation hypothesis from different angles because of its limited perspective and prescriptive arguments. For example, Siobhan Brownlie opposes the hierarchical order of retranslations and “the homogeneous relationship between the duration and norm/ideology” (2006:151). Another translation scholar, Miryam Du Nour (1995), asserts that retranslations are shaped by changing norms, a point that is not considered in the frame of the retranslation hypothesis.

The process becomes even more complex when it comes to retranslating intertextuality. Alvstad and Rosa state that in retranslation, “the web of intertextual voices becomes even more complex than in first (or only) translations, as the intertextual influence from earlier translations of the same text (and their intertexts) also enters the game (Alvstad& Rosa, 2015:6). Zhang and Ma asserted another point of view regarding retranslation. The researchers discussed intertextuality based on the (re)translations of the same text. The intertextual connections between the first translation and retranslations are accepted as the textual similarities and differences between them, termed “intertextuality in retranslation.” They divide intertextuality into two categories “filiation” and “dissidence” (2018: 3). The similar or same usage of words and phrases in the first translation and retranslation is accepted as “filiation” and these phrases enable intertextual relations. “Dissidence”, on the other hand, is about the differences between the translations because of opposition or desire to present a new interpretation. However, the complexity of retranslation may require a wider framework for explaining intertextual relations. The positions of the translations regarding similarity and difference were considered based on the target side. The intertextuality within the source text because of its connection to the other texts of its system as well as its culture is ignored in the work of Zhang and Ma. Even if the emphasis is on the first translation and retranslation, each similarity and difference is directly related to the source side, implying the necessity of considering the retranslation process. They tend to consider intertextuality among target texts, whereas the intertextuality of a text is directly related to its cultural and social context. Without interrogating these dynamics in composing a text and decontextualizing the source text, it is impossible to recontextualize the target text. Therefore, focusing merely on interrelations between the target texts can be useful in explaining their positioning within the target literary system; however, the term intertextuality embodies “transtextuality,” which can be described as “a particular form of intertextual reading across languages” (O’Neill, 2005:10). The source text within the source system and its relations with the first translation and retranslations matter as much as they relate to the target system’s relations in terms of intertextuality.

Another perspective regarding the complexity of intertextuality in retranslation belongs to Venuti. He considers a contact reproduction of intertextuality in the target text impossible; therefore, there is only “a ratio of loss and gain” (2013:101) when it comes to retranslation. Moreover, if the retranslation aims to challenge the previous versions, then it is likely to have a “denser and more complex intertextuality to signify and call attention to their competing interpretation”. He also emphasized the position of the retranslation in shaping the reception. Intertextuality requires “a special form of reading” even if for the informed readers. The mere focus on the meaning is not enough to detect the intertextual reference. To give the target text autonomy, a reader should be aware of the interpretative nature of the translation through its formal features. Therefore, he controlled the creation and reception of intertextuality in the retranslation. As a result, the retranslation is the authority to determine this ratio of loss and gain (Venuti, 2009: 100-104). However, as intertextuality is multidimensional in terms of retranslation, loss in one dimension may lead to gain in another. A target-oriented retranslation may lose the intertextual elements of the source text whereas a more complex web of intertextuality may be created in the target text. Thus, we consider the (re)translation of intertextuality not as a substitution as Venuti asserts because it is a process of reading, analysing, detecting differences, and recontextualizing. His idea of loss is related to the denial of substitution of intertextual elements; however, as this loss/gain scale has many variables, a proper understanding of the source texts with the (re)translator’s competence may provide another



dimension of intertextuality. In other words, substitution is not the only strategy applied in the translation of intertextual elements. Consequently, this ratio may operate differently on different dimensions of the translation process regarding intertextual elements.

While scrutinizing the intertextuality in first and retranslation, it is possible to take subcategories as a basis asserted by Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (2001). These subcategories include reference, cliché, literary allusion, citing or referring to a celebrated work, self-quotation, conventionalism, proverbs, and mediation. The corpus of this study involves intertextual elements that can be categorized into subcategories. For this reason, the comparative analysis in this study is based on these subcategories, focusing on the translation of the intertextual nature of selected examples.

#### 1.4. Intertextuality in Paul Auster's *New York Trilogy*

The postmodern sense of intertextuality is directly related to changing perspectives. Postmodern theory assumes that texts are composed of different cultural and social codes, as much as previous texts, and literary traditions. Based on past versions, the new ones are considered as multiple layers added on top. One of the main debates in postmodern literature is the determination of meaning, destroying the authoritarian status of the author (Platt & Upstone, 2015). Because a text is composed of various codes, the reader comes into prominence in terms of interpretation, for which intertexts are crucial. The text is no longer an entity by itself; it exists because of its connection to other codes, systems, and traditions. Intertexts have become a crucial part of postmodern texts, opening them to new interpretations.

Paul Auster is one of the prominent American representatives of postmodern literature. Auster's *New York Trilogy* comprises three novels: *City of Glass* (1985), *Ghosts* (1986), and *Locked Room* (1986). This is a series of detective novels or "meta-detective novels" (Bernstein, 1999). These novels were categorized within the framework of postmodernism. According to Bernstein, the *New York Trilogy* is suitable for Fredric Jameson's definition of "postmodernism" in such a way that all three novels the materials of murder mystery, science-fiction, romance, and biography "no longer simply quote. . . but incorporate into their very substance" (qtd. Bernstein, 1999: 134).

*New York Trilogy* is postmodern in terms of narrative strategies and themes. Meaning is never stable and there is always a sense of unease for the reader. The various possibilities of meaning result in discomfort related to not knowing or being certain. Auster's *Trilogy* exhibits a typical trait of postmodern autobiographical fiction, wherein the author transforms his life events into multifaceted narratives. (Özbay, 2020). He uses his own life and experiences as a basis while writing *Trilogy*. Both the names of the characters and their stances reflect Auster's perspective. *Trilogy* also reflects the influence of his own experiences. Even a character named Paul Auster exists in the *City of Glass*. The fictional Paul Auster is also a writer; however, the reader cannot be sure of the line between the author himself and the fictional Paul Auster. Sweeney and Marivale call this situation "Doppelgänger fiction" (1999: 258) in which characters are duplicated leading to the perception of identity as "fractured" and "unstable". This perception is also related to the unstable meaning prevalent in postmodern texts. In his *The Invention of Solitude*, Auster states by referring to himself that "at his bravest moments, he embraces meaninglessness as the first principle. . ." (1982: 148). It is understood that this choice of duality and uncertainty regarding both characters and meaning is a deliberate choice of the author overlapping with the postmodern narrative. The representation of the author is so dominant that "the characters of the trilogy collapse into one another through their own labyrinthine (but illogical) interrelationships and then, finally, into multiple images of the author himself". (Bernstein, 143).

A further symbol of the *Trilogy* regarding Auster's life is the red notebook which connects the books. Auster also has a short story called *The Red Notebook*. As Bernstein asserted, "Auster foregrounds intertextuality as a determinant of existence and experience" (1999: 135). He links the fictional world to his inner world, using it as the main source. As reality is a ground for battles of interpretation, there are no strict lines between fiction and real experiences in his writing. The reader has the freedom to interpret all of these. Therefore, in Auster's *Trilogy*, there is an "intertextual play of names and identities, and where the author becomes a part of this intertextual play" (Hogue, 2007: 85).

Intertextuality has different dimensions in the *Trilogy*. In the first dimension, the *City of Glass*, *Ghosts*, and the *Locked Room* have intertextual references within the triangle. The same names of characters and symbols, such as in the red notebook, are observed in all these novels, even if the qualities attributed to them may differ. For example, Fanshawe of the *Locked Room* and Stillman of the *City of Glass* are both nicknamed "Professor". Auster himself depicts the three novels as the same story. However, different narrators symbolize different layers of author awareness. As they are all the same texts, references among them are inevitable. In the second dimension, Auster reflects on his inspiration from previous writers and their work. In his *The Art of Hunger*, he admits to being fascinated by the works of Cervantes, Herman Melville, Franz Kafka, Edgar Allan Poe, and Nathaniel Hawthorne. They inspired the names of the characters in the *Trilogy*. In *The City of Glass*, the protagonist, William Wilson, is named after the short story of Edgar Allan Poe, "William Wilson" (1839). Daniel Quinn of the same book carries the same initials as Cervantes's *Don Quixote*. The

third dimension concerns the intellectual wealth of the author and his creativity. Examples from all dimensions were scrutinized based on their first and retranslations.

The corpus of this study was composed of *New York Trilogy's* translations. The first book of the *Trilogy*, *City of Glass*, was translated into Turkish for the first time by Yusuf Eradam. This first translation was published in 1991 by Aylak Adam Publishing House. *Ghosts* was translated into Turkish by Fatih Özgüven in 1993. The third novel, *The Locked Room* was translated into Turkish by Yusuf Eradam in 1993. All the retranslations of the *Trilogy* belong to İlknur Özdemir. The retranslations of the *Trilogy* were published by Can Publishing House in 2004. Turkish first translators and the retranslator are recognized for their proficient translations of literary works. Yusuf Eradam is the first translator of two novels *Trilogy*, whereas Fatih Özgüven, a famous translator of modernism and postmodernism translates one of the books. The first and retranslation will be compared to each other and the source text in terms of the transference of intertextual elements based on different types of intertextualities asserted by Venuti (2009).

## 2. The (Re)Translation of Intertextuality in the *Trilogy*

### *City of Glass*:

"The theory I present in the essay is that he is a combination of four different people. Sancho Panza is of course the witness. There's no other candidate—since he is the only one who accompanies Don Quixote on all his adventures... It seems perfectly possible to me that he dictated the story to someone else—namely, to the barber and the priest, Don Quixote's good friends. They put the story into proper literary form—in Spanish—and then turned the manuscript over to Samson Carrasco, the bachelor from Salamanca, who proceeded to translate it into Arabic. Cervantes found the translation, had it rendered back into Spanish, and then published the book *The Adventures of Don Quixote*." (*City of Glass*, p. 153)

### **Yusuf Eradam's First Translation:**

"Denememdeki kuram şu: Adam aslında dört farklı kişinin birleşimi. Sanço Panza elbette ki bir tanık. Don Kişot'a bütün maceralarında eşlik ettiğine göre ondan başka aday yok. Bana öyle geliyor ki öyküyü bir başkasına, örneğin Don Kişot'un yakın arkadaşları berbere ve papaza yazdıran, ondan başkası olamaz. Kitabı İspanyolca'da uygun bir edebi biçime sokan ve daha sonra da el yazmasını Salamancalı Simon Carasco'ya veren onlardır. Simon da öyküyü Arapça'ya çevirtmiştir. Cervantes çeviriyi bulmuş, gerisingeri İspanyolca'ya çevirtmiş ve kitabı *Don Kişot'un Maceraları* adı altında yayımlamıştır." (*Cam Kent*, p. 108-109)

### **İlknur Özdemir's Retranslation:**

"Yazımda savunduğum kuram, onun aslında dört değişik kişinin birleşimi olduğu/ Tanık elbette Sancho Panza. Başka bir aday yok- çünkü Don Quijote'ye bütün serüvenlerinde eşlik eden kişi o. Onun hikayeyi bir başkasına dikte ettirmiş olması bana pekala da mümkün görünüyor – yani Don Quijote'nin iyi arkadaşları olan berberle rahibe. Onlar hikayeyi düzgün bir edebi metin haline sokuyorlar- İspanyolca olarak- sonra elyazmasını Salamanca'lı edebiyatçı Samson Carrasco'ya veriyorlar, o da Arapçaya çevirtiyor, sonra da *Don Quijote'nin Serüvenleri* adıyla kitap olarak yayımlıyor." (*Cam Kent*, p. 120-121)

### **Back Translation:**

I am asserting in my essay that he is the combination of four different individuals. Sancho Panza is the witness for sure. There is no other witness because he is the only company of Don Quijote during all his adventures. It is very possible that he dictated the story to someone else—namely the barber and the priest, Don Quijote's good friends. They turned the story into a literary text – in Spanish- then gave the manuscript to Samson Carrasco, an author from Salamanca, and then translated the story into Arabic. Then, it was published as *Don Quijote's Adventures*.

This example from the *City of Glass*, the first book of the *Trilogy*, shows how Auster is inspired by Cervantes's *Don Quixote*. It can be categorized as a literary allusion within the classification of Hatim and Mason (2001) as it includes a reference to a celebrated work. There are several references to *Don Quixote*, affecting the theme of the novel. This work is considered "a central meta-fictional intertext in the trilogy" (Bernstein, 1999: 139). In the paragraph, the narrator mentions speculations regarding the author of *Don Quixote*, asserting the problem of authorship as a part of the postmodern narrative. Therefore, Auster explains his ideas of authorship over the narrator. This paragraph is also a crucial part of the Doppelgänger situation of the *Trilogy* as Don Quixote is thought to be "a stand-in" for Cervantes, and Daniel Quinn is assumed as Auster's double, "a paper-Auster" (Russell, 1990: 74) creating the parallelism between them. The initials of the protagonist, Daniel Quinn is the same as Don Quixote, as an intertextual connection.

Another reference is in the first meeting of Quinn with Paul Auster. During this encounter, Auster was working on an article about how *Don Quixote* was written. The paragraph is about the narrator of the story with a lot of references to Sancho Panza. In the first translation of the paragraph, all the information is transferred to the target language without any omission. However, the name of the characters seems adapted to the Turkish language. The translator uses "Don Kişot", the Turkish pronunciation of Don Quixote. He applies the same strategy to Sancho Panza as "Sanço Panza". In retranslation of the same paragraph, the translator again preserves the style of the source text without domesticating the intertextual elements. Therefore, the retranslation is source-oriented whereas the first translation preserves the meaning and style while adapting foreign elements for the target side.

**City of Glass:**

“Quinn then copied out the letters in order: OWEROFBAB. After fiddling with them for a quarter of an hour, switching them around, pulling them apart, and rearranging the sequence, he returned to the original order and wrote them out in the following manner: OWER OF BAB. The solution seemed so grotesque that his nerve almost failed him. Making all due allowances for the fact that he had missed the first four days and that Stillman had not yet finished, the answer seemed inescapable: THE TOWER OF BABEL.” (p. 140)

**Yusuf Eradam’s First Translation:**

Quinn bundan sonra harfleri yan yana yazdı: OWEROFBAB. On beş dakika boyunca yerlerini değiştirip, birbirinden ayırıp, yeni bir sıraya koyarak oyalandıktan sonra eski sırasına yeniden koydu ve şöyle yazdı: OWER OF BAB. Sonuç o denli acayıpti ki neredeyse cesareti kılacaktı. İlk dört günü kaçırmış olması ve Stillman’ın turunu henüz bitirmemiş olduğunu da düşününce, yanıt kesin gibi görünüyordu: THE TOWER OF BABEL (Babil Kulesi). (p. 79-80)

**İlknur Özdemir’s Retranslation:**

Quinn harfleri sırayla deftere yazdı: OWEROFBAB. Harflerle on beş dakika kadar oyalandıktan, onların yerlerini değiştirip, ayırıp, sırasını değiştirdikten sonra ilk sıralamaya döndü ve şöyle yazdı: OWER OF BAB. Bu çözüm öylesine tuhaftı ki neredeyse siniri bozuldu. İlk dört günü kaçırdığını ve Stillman’ın yazacaklarını henüz bitirmediğini de göz önünde alınca ister istemez şu sonuç çıkıyordu: THE TOWER OF BABEL (BABİL KULESİ). (p. 89)

**Back Translation:**

Then Quinn put the words in order: OWEROFBAB. He changed the order, separated the letters, put the words in a new order for fifteen minutes, and then put them in the previous order and wrote: OWER OF BAB. The result was so weird that he almost lost his nerves. Considering that he had already missed the first four days and Stillman hadn’t completed his tour, the answer seemed obvious: THE TOWER OF BABEL.

This is an example of the “Tower of Babel” taking place in the Old Testament and told in its various versions. The story is about people gathering to build a tower to live without scattering all around the world. These people speak the same language. The purpose of the tower is to reach God in some narratives. In the end, God gets angry, and destroys the tower and people scatter to different parts of the world, speaking different languages (“Tower of Babel”, Britannica). This prevalent narrative of the Tower of Babel is extraordinarily utilized by Auster. In the *City of Glass*, Quinn follows Stillman’s daily walking route and realizes that he is drawing some letters. As he is a bit late to solve the pattern, some of the letters are missing. However, when he arranges them, it turns up like he is trying to write “TOWER OF BABEL”. According to Bernstein, this intertextual element is “another suggestion of the fragmentation, the unrecoverability, of reality as text” (1999: 137). By presenting this intertextual reference, Auster both shows his intellectual wealth and fragments his narrative. The first and retranslation of this instance display a notable similarity in retaining the meaning and the reference. Both the mixed and arranged versions of letters are explained clearly in a source-oriented way. Therefore, it is possible to state that both translations keep the foreign element to provide intertextuality.

**Ghosts:**

“But let’s say Brooklyn Heights, for the sake of argument. Some quiet, rarely travelled street not far from the bridge—Orange Street perhaps. Walt Whitman handset the first edition of *Leaves of Grass* on this street in 1855, and it was here that Henry Ward Beecher railed against slavery from the pulpit of his red-brick church.” (p. 205)

**Fatih Özgüven’s First Translation:**

Adet yerini bulsun diye Brooklyn Tepeleri diyelim. Köprüden çok uzakta olmayan sakin, çok ender olarak kullanılan bir sokak- Portakal Sokağı mesela. Walt Whitman 1855’te *Çimen Yaprakları*’nın ilk basımını bu sokakta elle dizdi, Henry Ward Beecher kırmızı tuğla kilisesinin kürsüsünden köleliğe karşı bu sokakta bayrak açtı. (p. 9)

**İlknur Özdemir’s Retranslation:** Brooklyn Heights semti diyelim isterseniz, bir şey demiş olmak için. Orada, köprüden pek uzakta olmayan, pek ayakaltı olmayan, sakin bir sokak, Turuncu Sokak olabilir örneğin. Walt Whitman, *Çimen Yaprakları*’nın ilk baskısını 1855 yılında bu sokakta dizmişti; Henry Ward Beecher da kırmızı tuğlalı kilisesindeki kürsüden köleliğe karşı konuşmasını burada yapmıştı. (p. 11)

**Back Translation:** “Let’s say Brooklyn Heights, for form’s sake. A quiet, calm street not far from the bridge, maybe Orange Street. Walt Whitman composed the first edition of *Leaves of Grass* on this street in 1855. And it was again here where Henry Ward Beecher made his speech against slavery from the dais of the red-brick church.”

This quotation of *Ghosts* is a compact example of Auster’s narrative as it involves many elements in a few sentences. It is possible to state that this is like an overview of the whole *Trilogy* in terms of intertextuality. All intertextual elements of this paragraph are direct references based on Hatim and Mason’s (2001) subcategorization. The first reference, “Brooklyn Heights”, is related to the duality of identity because Auster has lived in Brooklyn for more than 30 years. Moreover, he has a novel called *Brooklyn Follies*. This is an allusion created by the author to refer to himself. *Leaves of Grass* by Walt Whitman is another touch connecting Auster’s *Trilogy* with one of the cornerstones of American literature. The last allusion is about Henry Ward Beecher, who is a reformer fighting against slavery in the 19th century. In the first translation, Brooklyn Heights, a proper noun, is translated as “Brooklyn Tepeleri”, which destroys the original reference. As “Brooklyn Heights” is the intertextual element related to the doppelganger situation, the disruption of this reference leads to losing the intertextuality related to dual identity. *Leaves of Grass*



by Whitman was translated into Turkish by Mehmet Fuat in 1954 with the title of *Çimen Yaprakları*. Therefore, this collection of poems is known as such in Turkish and both translators use this title of the book in translation. The last intertextual element, Henry Ward Beecher and his struggle against slavery is conveyed in a source-oriented way without any intervention. It is possible to observe that the translator did not need to censor any part of these intertextual elements. In the retranslation, the retranslation conveys all intertextual elements involving “Brooklyn Heights” based on the source text. The only difference between the first and retranslation is the translation of “Brooklyn Heights” in terms of intertextuality. Consequently, both translations are close to each other in terms of preserving the intertextual references and translation strategies.

***The Locked Room:***

“I handed him the manuscript of Fanshawe’s big novel. In the end, I said, it would have to be all or nothing—the poems, the plays, the other two novels—but this was Fanshawe’s major work, and it was logical that it should come first. I was referring to Neverland, of course.” (p. 398)

**Yusuf Eradam’s First Translation:**

Fanshawe’un uzun romanının el yazmasını ona verdim. Sonunda, ya bütün yapıtları ya hiçbiri dedim; şiirler, oyunlar, öteki iki roman, ama bu roman Fanshawe’un en önemli yapıtıydı ve ilkin onun çıkması mantıklıydı. *Hiçistan*’ı kastediyordum tabii. (p. 39)

**İlknur Özdemir’s Retranslation:** Fanshawe’un büyük romanının müsveddesini ona verdim. “Sonunda ya hep ya hiç olacak,” dedim – şiirler, oyunlar, öteki iki roman- ama Fanshawe’un asıl büyük yapıtı buydu, mantıklı olan, ilk önce onun okunmasıydı. Hiçülke’den söz ediyordum elbette.” (p. 44)

**Back Translation:**

“I gave him the manuscript of Fanshawe’s greatest novel. In the end, I said, all or none. His poems, plays, and other novels, but this novel is his best work, the most sensible choice was this one to come first. For sure, I was talking about Nullstate.”

The intertextual touch in this example is a literary allusion (Hatim& Mason, 2001). The double notion of identity is dominant in *The Locked Room* just like in the other novels of the *Trilogy*. The narrator of this novel is Fanshawe, who is also an author. His work, *Ground Work*, has the same name as the collection of Paul Auster. Based on that, the reader faces another self of the Auster. The name Fanshawe is inspired by Nathaniel Hawthorne’s novel. However, the narrator of *The Locked Room* takes possession of his disappeared friend, Fanshawe. Therefore, there are multiple layers of duplicates (Martin, 2008:104).

The first novel of Fanshawe is *Neverland*. The name of the book is also an intertextual element because it is the fantastic island where Peter Pan lives. What is special about *Neverland* is that Peter Pan lives there as a child without getting old. In the first translation of the novel, *Neverland* is translated as “Hiçülke” (“Nullstate”). The retranslator uses “Hiçistan” by utilizing the suffix “-istan” used for countries in Turkish. There are multiple translations of Peter Pan, and there are different translations such as “Yokülke” (“Nullistan”) or “Varolmayan ülke” (Nonexistent Land”). In both translations, translators keep this intertextual touch of the author by translating this “Neverland”. However, they both chose to translate this proper name into Turkish instead of preserving it as “Neverland”. There can be two reasons for this choice. In the first place, Peter Pan is a well-known book, and the translator may assume that the target reader is used to seeing the Turkish translation of the phrase. On the other hand, this may be a deliberate choice to make it more familiar to the target audience, which can be interpreted as a target-oriented translation strategy.

***City of Glass:***

“Turning to the Babel story, Dark then elaborated his plan and announced his vision of things to come. Quoting from the second verse of Genesis 11—“And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shi-nar; and they dwelt there” (p. 81)

**Yusuf Eradam’s First Translation:**

Dark daha sonra, Babil öyküsüne dönerek, planını geliştiriyor ve ileride olacakları duyuruyordu. Dark, Tekvin 11, ikinci Bab’dan “Ve Doğu’dan geldiler ve Şinar diyarında bir ova buldular ve oraya yerleştiler” alıntısını yapıyor. . .” (p. 55).

**İlknur Özdemir’s Retranslation:**

Babil hikayesine dönen Dark, planını geliştirip gelecekte olacakları nasıl gördüğünü açıklıyordu. Tekvin’in 11. Babının ikinci cümlesinden alıntı yaparak: “Ve vaki oldu ki Şark’tan göçtukleri zaman Şinar diyarında bir ova buldular; ve orada oturdular.” (p. 62)

**Back Translation:**

Later, Dark turns to the Babel story improves his plan, and explains his vision regarding the future. He quoted Genesis 11, second verse as: “And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shi-nar; and they dwelt there”.

Another intertextual element of the *City of Glass*, following the Tower of Babel, is again related to the origin of language. This falls into the category of biblical allusion. In the narrative, Quinn analyses Stillman’s book and all the references of language are written in there. Stillman mentions the biblical narrative of the “Tower of Babel” and links it with the “Garden of Eden” story. In the story, Adam is responsible for naming everything in the world and creating a language. His fall from heaven “records not only the fall of man, but the fall of language” (Auster, 1985: 76). The

intertextuality provided by both “Tower of Babel” and the “Garden of Eden” are also interrelated as they are both related to the emergence of various languages. This paragraph quotes the biblical story of Babel mentioned in Genesis. “The second verse of Genesis 11” states the place of the given verse, emphasizing it is a verse of the Old Testament. In the first translation, the phrase is translated as “Tekvin 11, ikinci Bab”. However, the first sentence “it came to pass” is deleted in this translation and the verse is translated as a shorter version. The retranslation preserves the integrity of the verse, translating the phrase as “vaki oldu ki” (“it happened”) which is a proper usage in the frame of biblical language in Turkish. Both the first and retranslation keep intertextual elements and focus on the transference of meaning stating its origin. However, the retranslation is more source-oriented in terms of meaning and style, as it preserves the punctuation marks as well. Another crucial point of both translations is that they both sustain the intertextual link of Genesis with the story of Babel. Therefore, the two-dimensional intertextuality of the source text is preserved in the target texts.

## Conclusion

The phenomenon of translation is redefined within the perspective of intertextuality. As the focus of the translation shifts from equivalence to intertextuality, the nature of the relations change. The foremost turn of the intertextual approach is that it questions the assumed binary relations of translation between the source text and target text. With the rise of intertextuality, the relation of the target text with the other texts in its system gains importance. Moreover, the meaning is a matter of question in terms of its composition and reception. Both the author of the source text and the text itself are dethroned and the differential nature of the meaning rises. This rise is accompanied by the emphasis on interpretation and agents involved in the process. When the reader lusters as the actor for the creation of meaning via interpretation and cultural connection, the role of the agents participating in the recontextualizing process is questioned. By dethroning the source text, translation is no longer considered an imitation but a creation on its own. Furthermore, the assumed need to transfer an objective meaning is also ruled out because the multiplicity of meanings becomes more of an issue. Both the translator and the reader are the creators of the meaning joining the author, while translation becomes a unique set of contexts not reproduced or imitated, but as distinctive as the original text. The effect of cultural and social factors determining the meaning, and the way it is interpreted and received also come into prominence in this line of thought.

Intertextuality is a crucial part of postmodern writing as observed in the *New York Trilogy* of Paul Auster. Intertextual references exist in varying degrees, ranging from interconnections within the trilogy of books to allusions made to earlier sources. As the texts are retranslated, another dimension of intertextuality arises as the intertextual link of the target text with other texts in the target system. In this study, the first translations and retranslations of the intertextual elements of the *Trilogy* have been scrutinized. The findings of the study shed light on the dynamics of retranslation in a postmodern sense.

The translation strategies about the intertextual components in both the first and retranslations exhibits noteworthy resemblances. We assert that the reason for this is the bidirectional competence of the first translators. Yusuf Eradam and Fatih Özgüven, who are the first translators, possess extensive translation expertise coupled with profound intellectual capacity as part of their habitus in a Bourdieusian context (2003). The two translators hold undergraduate degrees in English literature, which could potentially equip them with a deeper understanding of the intricacies involved in both the source culture and text. Additionally, their extensive experience as translators may allow for a more comprehensive viewpoint from the target audience’s perspective.

This assertion may be supported by the parallelism of the translations of these two translators with the retranslations of İlknur Özdemir. Özdemir is also an experienced translator with more than 30 translations. The competence of the first translators and the retranslation as well as their experiences seem close to each other, making the target text similar. Following this assertion, a question arises: If the first translation and the retranslation are so close to each other, why does the next need to be retranslated? The period between the first translation and the retranslation is most likely to be the answer. There are 20 years between the translations, proving the basic assertion of the retranslation hypothesis wrong. Berman states that the first translations are target-oriented and domesticating while retranslations are source-oriented (1990: 1-10). Based on the analysis of the corpus of this study, it is possible to state that even if the first translations and retranslations have a long period between them, the prevalent translation strategies do not differ profoundly. Therefore, one of the findings of this study is that retranslations do not have to emerge to compensate for the deficiencies of the source text. They can have quite similar tendencies to the first translations.

Another answer to the question may be the influence of patrons of translation. The first translations of the *Trilogy* have been published by Metis Publishing in the 1990s. However, all retranslations have been published by Can Publishing. There may be issues related to the copyright of the books, or the publishing house may work with another translator

whom they assume is experienced and competent enough to translate postmodern works full of intertextual references. No matter which reason is more valid, the similarity of the first translations and retranslations, with slight differences, proves that the first translators use the current language without needing an update. Moreover, the first translations are considered disadvantaged because of their introducing function. However, as the first translators manage to keep almost all intertextual elements in their target text, they even provide an advantage to the upcoming translations.

As a result, the reasons, and dynamics of retranslation within the context of intertextuality as a part of postmodernism turn out to be different from the allegations of the retranslation hypothesis. The similarity between the first and retranslations because of language use, source-oriented translation strategies, and preserving intertextual elements may result from the intellectual baggage of the first translators and the retranslation. It can be asserted that the reason and necessity of retranslation do not always lie in the qualities of the previous translations. Due to the multidimensional nature of intertextuality in retranslation, the strategies of the translators should be scrutinized from a wider perspective to cover the relations of the source text in its system, source and target texts, and the target text in its system. Such a comprehensive analysis clears up the way to the target text as a product considering the process.

---

**Hakem Değerlendirmesi:** Dış bağımsız.

**Çıkar Çatışması:** Yazar çıkar çatışması beyan etmemiştir.

**Finansal Destek:** Yazar finansal destek beyan etmemiştir.

**Peer Review:** Externally peer-reviewed.

**Conflict of Interest:** Author declared no conflict of interest.

**Financial Disclosure:** Author declared no financial support.

---

#### Yazarların ORCID ID'leri / ORCID IDs of the authors

İrem Ceren Doğan 0000-0003-4929-6159

#### KAYNAKLAR / REFERENCES

- Allen, G. (2000) *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Alvstad, C.; Assis Rosa, A. (2015) Voice in retranslation: An Overview and Some Trends. *Target*. 27. pp. 3-24.
- Auster, P. (1991) *Cam Kent*. Tr. Yusuf Eradam. İstanbul: Aylak Adam Publishing.
- (2004) *Cam Kent*. Tr. İlknur Özdemir. İstanbul: Can Publishing.
- (1985) *City of Glass*. London: Penguin Books.
- (1987) *Ghosts*. London: Penguin Books.
- (1993) *Hayaletler*. Tr. Fatih Özgüven. İstanbul: Aylak Adam Publishing.
- (2004) *Hayaletler*. Tr. İlknur Özdemir. İstanbul: Can Publishing.
- (1993) *Kilitli Oda*. Tr. Yusuf Eradam. İstanbul: Aylak Adam Publishing.
- (2004) *Kilitli Oda*. Tr. İlknur Özdemir. İstanbul: Can Publishing.
- (1982) *The Invention of Solitude*. Los Angeles: Sun and Moon Press.
- (1987) *The Locked Room*. London: Penguin Books.
- Barthes, R. (1977) "The Death of the Author". In *Image, Music and Text*. Trans. S. Heath. London: Fontana. pp. 142-148.
- Barrie, J.M. (2020). *Peter Pan*. Tr. A. Konaç. YKY.
- Beaugrande, R.; Wolfgang D. (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. New York: Longman.
- Berman, A. (1990) La Retraduction comme Espace de la Traduction. *Palimpsestes*. 4/1. pp. 1-7.
- Bernstein, S. (1999). The Question is the Story Itself: Postmodernism and Intertextuality in Auster's New York Trilogy. *Detecting Texts: The Metaphysical Detective Story From Poe to Postmodernism*. Ed. P. Marivale & S.E. Sweeney. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bloom, H. (1997) *The Anxiety of Influence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P.; Wacquant, L. (2003) *Düşünsel Bir Antropoloji İçin Cevaplar*, Tr. N. Ökten, İstanbul: İletişim Publishing.
- Brownlie, S. (2006). "Narrative Theory and Retranslation Theory". *Across Languages and Cultures*. 7/2. pp. 145-170.
- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of Grammatology*. Trans. G. Spivak. The Johns Hopkins University Press. Baltimore& London.
- Du-Nour, M. (1995). "Retranslation of Children's Books as Evidence of Changes of Norms". *Target*. 7/2. pp.
- Genette, G. (1992). *The Architect: An Introduction*. Tr. Jane E. Lewin. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (2001) *Discourse and the Translator*. New York: Routledge.
- Hermans, T. (2003) Translation, Equivalence and Intertextuality, *Wasafiri*, 18:40, 39-41, Doi: 10.1080/02690050308589868
- Hogue, L. W. (2007). Postmodernism, Paul Auster's The New York Trilogy, and the Construction of the Black/Woman of Color as Primal Other. *Women & Others: Perspectives on Race, Gender and Empire*. Ed. C.R. Deileader et al. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hutcheon, L. (1988). *A Poetics of Modernism: History, Theory and Fiction*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Koskinen, K.; Paloposki, O. (2003). Retranslations in the Age of Digital Reproduction. *Cadernos de Tradução*. 1/11, pp. 19-38.
- Kristeva, J. (1974). *La Révolution du Langage Poétique*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Mallia, J. (1988). *Paul Auster by Joseph Mallia*. Online: <https://bombmagazine.org/authors/joseph-mallia>. Access: 22.12.2022
- Martin, B. (2008). *Paul Auster's Postmodernity*. London & New York: Routledge.
- O'Neill, P. (2005) *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation*. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Orr, M. (2003). *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Özbay, E. (2020) Postmodern Edebiyat Bağlamında Paul Auster'in Romanlarına Genel Bir Bakış, *Erzincan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13:2, pp. 86-95.
- Platt, L. & Upstone, S. (2015). *Postmodern Literature and Race*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Russell, A. (1990) Deconstructing the New York Trilogy: Paul Auster's Anti-Detective Fiction. *Critique*. 21: (2). pp. 71-84.
- Sweeney, S.; Marivale, P. (1999). *Detecting Texts: The Metaphysical Detective Story from Poe to Postmodernism*. Pennsylvania: The University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Venuti, L. (2009) Translation, Intertextuality, Interpretation. *Romance Studies*, 27: 3. pp. 157-173.
- Venuti, L. (2013) Retranslations: The Creation of Value. *Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice*. pp. 96-109.
- Zhang, H.; Ma, H. (2018) Intertextuality in Retranslation. *Perspectives*, 26: 2. pp. 1-17. DOI: 10.1080/0907676X.2018.1448875

#### **Atf biçimi / How cite this article**

Dogan, I.C. (2023). The retranslation of intertextuality: Paul Auster's New York trilogy. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Çeviribilim Dergisi - Istanbul University Journal of Translation Studies*, 19, 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.26650/ijts.2023.1277640>