



Kaveh Bassiri

Whatever Happened to *The Little Black Fish*?

This essay uses retranslation studies to trace the defanging and domestication of Samad Behrangi's The Little Black Fish, a children's story once hailed as a major revolutionary and literary text. Behrangi's book is the only modern Iranian prose work to have been translated multiple times both before and after the Islamic Revolution of 1979. The study compares the texts from several of these retranslations, by considering whether they have been domesticated for their English readers, as well as their context, by looking at the cultural impact of such factors as the Islamic Revolution and US-Iran relations. It looks at how various translators and publishers have interpreted the story and how their perspectives reflect Iranian history, the influence of Middle East studies, and the interests of the Iranian diaspora. The result sheds light on translation norms, as well as on the circulation and interpretation of Iranian literature in the global context.

Keywords: Retranslation studies; world literature; Iranian diaspora; children's literature; domestication and foreignization; Samad Behrangi; modern Persian prose; Committed Literature

This essay compares the English retranslations of Samad Behrangi's popular story, *The Little Black Fish* (*Māhi-ye Siyāh Kuchulu*), and examines the different translation strategies and interpretations followed by its translators and publishers in order to determine why it has been retranslated into English more than any other modern Iranian book. In particular, it shows how, over time, shifts in these strategies and interpretations have involved the defanging and domestication of Behrangi's tale, once lauded as a major revolutionary and literary text. By retranslation, I mean “the act of translating a work that has previously been translated into the same language.”¹ This study looks at complete translations into English by different translators. It is not considering indirect translations from an intermediary language, revisions, or adaptations.²

For those who are unfamiliar with Behrangi or his tale, the paper begins with a brief review of the author's life and *The Little Black Fish*. Interpretations of his life and the story play a pertinent role in how the text has been translated and contextualized.

Kaveh Bassiri is a PhD candidate in Comparative Literature at University of Arkansas.

Next, I review the different retranslations, identifying relevant details, such as the background of the translators and publishers, as well as the contexts in which the translations were published. This information is germane to the later analyses and comparisons of the translations. *The Little Black Fish* is unique: not only has it been translated into English more times than any other modern Iranian book, but the translations have been contextualized in widely varying forms—such as a revolutionary underground text, a modern literary classic, and an inspiring children’s story.

This study follows two approaches common in retranslation studies. First, I try to identify the relationship of each translation to the Persian source, evaluating whether there has been a shift or development toward or away from the source. I determine whether the translators have tried to domesticate the text for their target audience. Next, I examine whether sociopolitical factors have influenced the translations. If so, what are the specific factors and how have they influenced the translators? I identify how the text is rewritten by translators and re-contextualized by publishers in order to reflect their different interpretations and interests. In particular, I look at the important place this story has held in the Iranian diaspora community.

In the analysis, I consider not only the story but also what Gérard Genette calls the peritext (accompanying materials that come with the book, such as an essay, preface, or footnotes) and the epitext (peripheral materials, such as marketing content, interviews, and reviews).³ These sources help reveal how the translators and publishers presented and situated their work. Ultimately, this analysis sheds light on recent and changing translation norms, as well as on the circulation and interpretation of Iranian literature in the global context.

Behrangi and The Little Black Fish

Behrangi (1939–68), a leftist writer, teacher, and folklorist, played a prominent role in the history of modern Iranian literature. Best known for his children’s stories, he also wrote critically about the Iranian educational system, gathered Azerbaijani folklore, and translated to and from Turkish. In his essays, Behrangi advocates for a new type of children’s literature that does not cultivate obedience, false hope, and indoctrination. Instead, he wants stories to tell the truth about the harsh realities of the world and teach resistance against oppression.⁴

Behrangi’s experiences growing up in a lower-class family in Tabriz and his association with leftist groups inform the readings of his works. His drowning, at the age of only 29, recalls Little Black Fish’s death, and many attributed it to the shah’s regime. It also burnished his status as a revolutionary hero, though the accusation against the regime is probably baseless.⁵ His friend Hamzeh Farahati, years later, wrote of having been with Behrangi, who didn’t know how to swim and was carried away by the river’s current.⁶ But a lack of evidence did not stop the guerrilla organization Fadā’iyān-e Khalq from eulogizing him in song and poetry as “the first of their number killed by the enemy before the start of the actual battle.”⁷ Peyman Vahabzadeh writes, “The dissident generation needed a martyr so badly that it readily accepted

this fabrication.”⁸ Major writers and critics, such as Jalal Al-e Ahmad, turned him into symbolic capital, naming him as an exemplary “committed” writer. In 1971, three years after his death, the University of Tehran sponsored a festival in his honor, and by 1973 his writings were banned by the shah. As will be shown, the translators’ accounts of Behrangi’s life and death vary, and what they highlight influences their translations of *The Little Black Fish*.

Behrangi’s last story, *The Little Black Fish*, is one of the earliest and most renowned modern Iranian children’s stories. He first submitted it to *Arash* magazine. But it was deemed not ready for publication and only after edits, conducted with his permission, was it published posthumously by Kānun (the Institute for the Intellectual Development of Children and Young Adults) as a children’s story in 1968.⁹ Mohammad Ghanoonparvar points out that it was “one of the most popular stories” in Iran in the late 1960s through the 1970s.¹⁰ In fact, few modern Persian works have received as much attention when they were published. Ahmad Karimi-Hakkak writes, “*The Little Black Fish* is at once the culmination and the conclusion of Behrangi’s short but productive career as a writer of fiction.”¹¹ In a few years, the story was translated into many languages. But the success of the book may have had as much to do with Farshid Mesghali’s illustrations as with Behrangi’s writing. In fact, it was the illustrations that won the Hans Christian Andersen Award (1974), the first graphic prize from the International Children’s Books’ Fair in Bologna (1968), and the Honorary Diploma from the Bratislava Biannual (1968). The inclusion of illustrations and their prominence becomes an important consideration for the retranslations.

The Little Black Fish is a story told by a grandmother to her children and grandchildren about the legendary adventures of Little Black Fish, who decides to leave his routine life to explore the world. On his way to learn where their stream ends, he finds friends such as a lizard (*mārmulak*), who gives him a sword, and fights oppressive creatures such as a pelican (*morgh saqā*) who feeds on fish. He ultimately reaches the sea but dies trying to set other fish free by killing their nemesis, a fish-eating bird (*parandeh-ye mābi-khār*).

The story has been read and studied in a number of ways—as a children’s fable, a literary text, and a sociopolitical allegory. It has been discussed as a coming-of-age journey foregrounding the importance of both freedom and education, as a story of cosmopolitanism, or as a political parable of a young revolutionary who leaves the shelter of family to fight oppression.¹² Various translators and publishers, with different readers in mind, reinforce specific interpretations.

Overview of Retranslations

Retranslation is not a new activity, and writers have remarked on it for centuries. Yet the theorization, systematic research, and cultural study of retranslation are rather new.¹³ Early scholarly works on retranslation can be seen in a special 1990 issue of *Palimpsestes* on retranslation.¹⁴ In 2006, Siobhan Brownlie first coined the term “retranslation theory” for the “theoretical discussions and observations concerning

the phenomenon of retranslation.”¹⁵ Isabelle Collombat even called the twenty-first century *l'âge de la retraduction* (“the age of retranslation”).¹⁶ This paper uses the theories and approaches of this emerging field in order to study Behrangī’s story.

Here, I focus on the six complete English translations of *The Little Black Fish* in print. After the very abridged adaptation put out by Carolrhoda Books in 1971, three more translations were produced in the United States before the Islamic Revolution, by the Confederation of Iranian Students, National Union (early 1970s), Donald C. Croll (1974), and Eric Hooglund (1976). These translations supply the revolutionary, literary, and scholarly renditions of Behrangī’s story.

The Confederation was mostly made up of “Maoists” and “pro-guerrilla” factions.¹⁷ Its politically encoded translation, published in a small “underground” pamphlet, includes an introduction and two additional stories by Behrangī. The introduction states that “[t]hose who contributed in the translation had little previous experience” and in fact the translation is prone to many errors and typos, such as “lizzard” or “shpherd.”¹⁸ It also includes mistakes such as identifying the grandmother telling the story as a grandfather. I came upon two different self-published editions of the Confederation’s translation. Unfortunately, no publication date or translator’s names are listed on these books. The first copy, with RCW (the Research Committee of Washington) as publisher, is an earlier printing, possibly 1972, based on a reference in an edition put out by Three Continents Press.¹⁹ Although the second copy has a call number dated 1970, it is from 1976 based on the fact that it is a reprint and the introduction states it was published eight years after Behrangī’s death.²⁰

Croll was a graduate student of Persian literature at the University of Michigan. His translation was published in a 1974 special edition of *The Literary Review: An International Journal of Contemporary Writing*, dedicated to modern Iranian literature and edited by Thomas Ricks, who was at the time teaching Near East and Iranian History at Macalester College. Here Behrangī is placed among the leading modernist writers such as Sadeq Hedayat, Sadeq Chubak, Ebrahim Golestan, and Bahram Sadeqi. He is not the revolutionary figure portrayed by the Confederation. The short bio identifies Behrangī as “best known for his children’s stories and collections of Azari folk literature.”²¹ Ricks writes that the selections were made based on “literary merits,” “historical importance,” and relevance to the “developments within contemporary Persian literature.”²² He depicts Behrangī’s writing as an example of a “new and more sophisticated level of short-story writing.”²³ Yet this publication is the only time that Behrangī’s story is printed beside other prominent literary selections in English. Interestingly, even Ricks, the great champion of Behrangī, does not discuss *The Little Black Fish* as a major literary text in his essay on “Contemporary Persian Literature” that is included with this special issue of the journal.

Hooglund (b. 1944), a political scientist specializing in Iran with a doctorate in international relations from Johns Hopkins University, is the second and last non-Iranian translator. His translation was published along with four additional stories translated by his wife at the time, Mary Elaine Hooglund (née Hegland). The result was the first Persian book put out by Three Continents Press, a small publisher with a focus on African studies and Caribbean literature that was adding the Middle

East to its catalog. It was later reprinted in 1987 by Lynne Rienner, another scholarly and textbook publisher, which continued to print Three Continents' books after it ceased publication. In the co-authored introduction, the translators write that the book is "for both those who have special interests in Iran and those English readers who enjoy good literature."²⁴ This edition, which became the standard source for other academics, is also the most scholarly. The book is not meant for children and there are no illustrations with the stories. Instead, it comes with acknowledgements, a translators' introduction, an elegiac essay by Gholam Hoseyn Sa'edi, and an extended "Bibliographical-Historical Essay" (twenty-nine pages) with a separate bibliography written by Ricks. The scholarly attention can also be seen in the intertextual reference to other translations, the inclusion of their reasons for the retranslation, as well as the reviews the book received. In fact, this is the only book included in this study that received any scholarly review.

There are also three new translations published after the Islamic Revolution, by Hooshang Amuzegar (1991, revised 1996), Ruby Emam (2008), and Azita Rassi (2015). These retranslations are not published with other stories and they reframe the story as a tool for learning Persian or as a children's story.

Amuzegar (b. 1921), whose brother was prime minister of Iran during the shah's reign, is from an older, pre-revolution generation of Iranian immigrants. He taught Persian at the Diplomatic Language Centre of the British Foreign Office and wrote Persian-language textbooks. His translation is intended for learning Persian. His bilingual edition of *The Little Black Fish* was published first in 1991 by Iranbooks as a small pamphlet with J. Athill's translation assistance and Yousef J. Javidan's simple illustrations. A revised edition with a brief foreword by publisher Farhad Shirzad (b. 1959) and gray-scale illustrations by Allison Remick was published in 1996 (reprint 2007) under Iranbooks' new name, Ibex Publishers.²⁵ The new edition is also part of the Classics of Persian Literature series that includes *The Poems of Hafez* and *Selected Poems from the Divan-e Shams-e Tabrizi*. Like the Confederation's version, this is an instance where illustrations were added. Unlike Croll and Hooglund, Amuzegar gets no biography. His name was even removed from the cover of the revised edition.

The translation by Ruby Emam (b. 1945), the first female translator of *The Little Black Fish*, is a self-published family effort supported by her niece and nephews. Emam grew up in Azerbaijan, like Behrangi. Though listed on the cover, she has no biography. After Carolrhoda's adaptation, Emam's version is the first time the story was published with colorful illustrations (seven full pages) and for children (age eight and over). But for some reason, Behrangi's name is spelled "Beh-rang."

Like Emam's book, the most recent edition, translated by Rassi, is also a large, standard-format children's book. It is packaged as an English children's book and not as an exotic oriental tale. *The Little Black Fish* (age seven and over) is a bestseller for Tiny Owl Publishing, a new publisher of Iranian work that produces children's books and is based in London. Delaram Ghanimifard (b. 1973) and Karim Arghandehpour (b. 1969) founded the press in 2015 after they moved to the United Kingdom in 2010. Rassi, who lives in Malaysia, translated Tiny Owl's first eight books. But she

is listed only inside the edition, alongside other contributors. *Tiny Owl* includes the original color illustrations of Mesghali and features him on the cover. The edition also contains biographies of both Mesghali and Behrangi. As with many children's books, there are no page numbers.

For this study, I follow two approaches in translation studies: textual and contextual. In my textual analysis, I evaluate the original retranslation hypothesis, which argued that later translations are more literal and closer to the original text. I also examine whether the text has been domesticated for English readers. In the contextual analysis, I look at another retranslation hypothesis, questioning whether retractions are the results of changes in historical, cultural, and social contexts. I evaluate the impact of such factors as the Islamic Revolution, US-Iran relations, and the growing Iranian diaspora. I examine how the subsequent translations rewrite Behrangi's story to reflect their differing interpretations.

Textual Analysis and Domestication

Andrew Chesterman coined the much-discussed "retranslation hypothesis": the descriptive proposition that "[l]ater translations ... tend to be closer to the original than earlier ones."²⁶ The hypothesis references earlier studies by Antoine Berman and Paul Bensimon in the special 1990 issue of *Palimpsestes*, where they argued that a culture at first is reluctant to accept a foreign text and needs to adapt it.²⁷ But in time, there is no longer a need and the retractions move closer to the source. Inspired by Goethe's evolutionary model for translation, Berman proposes a maturing trajectory in which, ultimately, a grand canonical translation is produced—one that restores the essence of the source as well as its unique foreignness. However, later case studies by a number of scholars have questioned the universality of such a hypothesis and shown that closer translation does not always occur.²⁸ Brownlie, for example, argues that "rather than through reference to a general historical progression, the nature of translations and retractions is best explained through particular contextual conditions."²⁹

My purpose here is not simply to prove or disprove the hypothesis—though, as I will show later, the retractions of *The Little Black Fish* prove the hypothesis wrong. I am interested in the relationship of the translations to the Persian source. Analyzing how close these translations stay to the original—i.e. how literal they are—also reveals a tendency toward foreignization. The use of *domestication* and *foreignization*, which has been much discussed in translation studies, goes back to Friedrich Schleiermacher's idea that "the more precisely the translation adheres to the turns and figures of the original, the more foreign it will seem to its reader."³⁰ Paloposki defines foreignization as "the preserving of the original cultural context, in terms of settings, names, etcetera."³¹ On the other hand, translations that domesticate remove the foreign elements in order to produce a text that seems native to the target culture.³²

It is obvious that literal translation is not possible and in most cases not even desirable. The notion of what may be truly closer to the original source can also be com-

plicated by many factors, including the original aim and effect of the text for the author and its readers. A text may appear domesticated but be close to the source, as Karimi-Hakkak argues in “Beyond Translation: Interactions between English and Persian Poetry.”³³ However, for the purpose of this study, I focus on literal translation as a means for getting closer to the original source. Berman, for example, contends that “‘literal’ means: attached to the letter (of works). Labor on the letter in translation is more originary than restitution of meaning.”³⁴ Literal translation is well suited as a quantifiable measure for comparing a number of retranslations and for identifying the strategy of domestication. My intention is not to discuss the values of literal translation, advocate foreignization, or prescribe a translation method.³⁵

To analyze how literal a translation is, one can start by reviewing what is added to or removed from the source text. Although a word-for-word translation is not possible, a translation that is significantly longer than the original has often added more words to explain or elaborate on the text. When comparing word counts, all translations of *The Little Black Fish* are longer than the original Persian, possibly because they have to explain the cultural-specific idioms, or because Persian uses fewer words and its syntax is more flexible. Yet some, like Emam’s translation, are significantly longer than others.

For this study, I will use Hooglund’s translation as the standard for comparison. His translation, which is around 680 more words than the Persian, usually stays close to the original. For instance, when referring to Little Black Fish, Hooglund is the only one who follows Behrangī as he uses such variations of the name as “little black fish,” “little fish,” “black fish,” or just plain “fish.” Behrangī even uses “little black fish” as both a proper name and a description or type. The fish introduces himself as Little Black Fish (*mābi-ye siyāh kuchulu*) to *kafche māhi-hā* (a made-up name for tadpoles), while to the lizard he describes himself as “a little black fish” (*mābi-ye siyāh kuchulu’i*). Hooglund follows Behrangī and varies between “a” and “the” appropriately to compensate for the lack of articles in Persian. Croll and Confederation mainly use “the little fish,” and when they employ other variations they are not necessarily following Behrangī. The post-revolution translators, on the other hand, apply the full name, though in different ways. Amuzegar mainly uses “the little black fish.” Emam follows suit, but capitalizes the name, while Rassi turns “Little Black Fish” into a proper name without an article. The translators also seem inconsistent in their implementation. For example, Rassi’s use of “Little Fish” and “the Little Black Fish” seems accidental.³⁶

Hooglund’s translation, which came after Croll’s, is in debt to him and sometimes even uses the same phrases. For example, Hooglund is the only translator, beside Croll, who uses “half-pint” for *nīm vajab-e* (“half of a handspan”). But, unlike Hooglund, Croll’s language is often awkward. For example, Croll translates *tu-ye sar va sineh-ash mezad* (“hitting the chest and head”) as “The black fish’s mother tore at her hair and breast.”³⁷ Not only is the use of “hair” not literal here, it is even incongruous.

Hooglund’s translation is more domesticated and fluent than Croll’s. In fact, he uses around 300 fewer words than Croll, despite the fact that Croll (I assume acciden-

tally) omits a few lines from an early argument between an older fish and Little Black Fish. The result, even with problems, yields a faithful and readable translation. Karimi-Hakkak, in his review of the edition, complains of Hooglund's mistakes but ultimately agrees that the result is "fairly readable" and that Behrang's "style is not altered much and his images are evoked faithfully."³⁸ Gert J. J. DeVries, while complaining of the sluggish translation, describes the result as "generally correct, if seldom brilliant or particularly inventive."³⁹ Hooglund, on occasion, does move away from the source for reasons of style and variation, or to reduce repetition. For example, he reduces the repetition of "mother said" and "little fish said" and varies the translation for *goft* ("said") in exchanges between Little Black Fish and the school of tiny fish (*māhi rizeh-hā*).⁴⁰

Amuzegar also tries to stay close to the original but is more prone to cut what he feels is unnecessary. The result, as I will show, is a sloppier and looser translation. He, for example, misrepresents the exchange between Little Black Fish and *parandeh-ye māhi-khār* (translated as "heron"), which is based on an ancient fable.⁴¹ In Behrang's story, *parandeh-ye māhi-khār* is tricked into talking and dropping Little Black Fish, caught in its beak. All other translators are careful to distinguish between when *parandeh-ye māhi-khār* is thinking or speaking. But Amuzegar writes that the bird "replied" and "answered" when it is reflecting to itself—thus missing the punchline.⁴² Amuzegar also feels free to omit things. For example, he shortens the conversation between Little Black Fish and the tiny fish in the pouch of the pelican, as well as the encounter between Little Black Fish and the swordfish (*areh māhi*).⁴³ His translation has around 100 fewer words than Hooglund's.

Confederation is more concerned with the message and is willing to expand the story to enhance its political interpretation. Its translation runs more than 750 words longer than Hooglund's. Sometimes the additions are in parentheses, other times not. Confederation is not domesticating the text for an English-speaking audience. Instead, it adds its own political interpretation, such as identifying the fisherman with the oppressive regime. For instance, the fish's condition of living in a state of fear is elaborated on with such parenthetically added sentences as: "Whenever someone suggested that something should be done differently, it was said that it was better not to do it because it might get the attention of the fisherman."⁴⁴ The demand for revolution is underscored with added text such as, "all the fish who have found the sea started out alone and afraid. But together they, too, are mighty" and "even their worst enemies will not dare to try to hurt them."⁴⁵

Emam's translation is the longest, with over 2,000 words more than Hooglund's. Emam does not usually add text to advocate a new interpretation. Instead, she domesticates by elaborating, embellishing, or encouraging a positive message. For example, she qualifies Little Black Fish's threat "I will ... kill you all with this dagger" by adding "against my will."⁴⁶ Instead of Hooglund's more literal translation ("The little fish's words angered everyone"), Emam writes, "The Little Black Fish's courageous words and the fearless manner in which he was expressing his thoughts and ideas were upsetting and alarming the whole community."⁴⁷ Emam's voice interjects not only by expanding on the story, but also by adding footnotes, which are rarely found in children's books.

Rassi's translation is the most domesticated and furthest from the source. In an interview with *Shahrvand BC* (29 May 2015), Rassi states that the language and vocabulary of the early translations of Behrangi's story were "not particularly tailored for children." For her translation, she also got help from an "English-speaking editor, who has much experience in creating children's books in the UK." Rassi explains that the editor provided "the necessary freedom to the Little Black Fish so that he could communicate with English-speaking readers." The goal is to have the book "as if a native English speaker has originally written it." To this end, the tone has been changed; she explains, "If we translate those words to English exactly as they are, it could become the language of disrespect and impudence."⁴⁸ For example, when Little Black Fish says to the frog, "Even if you live a hundred times as long as you already have, you'll stay as ignorant as you are!", Rassi qualifies this by adding, "Which was a rude thing to say to the frog, but Little Black Fish had had enough of being told off for one day."⁴⁹

Rassi's translation, similar to the Confederation version, has an interpretation that it wants to promote. Although she keeps the plot, she abridges and modifies content deemed too repetitive or not appropriate for children. The result ends up being the shortest, with over 300 fewer words than Hooglund's. Rassi, for instance, abridges the conversations of Little Black Fish with the frog, the lizard, and the school of tiny fish. The goal of her retranslation is to produce a domesticated children's book with a positive, inspiring message for all English readers. For example, she adds such cheerful children's book elements like, "It was such fun—whee! Splash!" To give Little Black Fish a better reason for wanting to leave her home, Rassi describes the community: "They weren't very nice or very clever fish." Her translation minimizes the armed struggle, and the idea that rebellion is the solution. Instead of the martyrdom emphasized by Confederation, she concentrates on sharing what is learned through the journey and adds, "I must try and return to tell my friends all that I now know."⁵⁰

As another basis for comparison, I will consider the translation of unusual or arguable authorial choices. The first example, Behrangi's reference to a moon landing, has been pointed to as an anomaly by both critics and translators. In Hooglund's translation, the wise moon says "have you heard that humans want to fly up and land on me in a few years?" and later, "It's a difficult task ... but whatever they want, humans can ..."⁵¹ The conversation is then interrupted by the dark cloud that covers the face of the moon. This contemporary reference, which may seem irrelevant, is in fact important. Behrangi interjects his time into the fable, telling readers to interpret a timeless tale as an allegory for the modern era. The moon is not just the idealized messenger sharing its light; it is also the real moon. The reference also advances the importance of scientific pursuit. Confederation, Croll, and Hooglund include the story. Emam adds a footnote: "the story was written before the American astronauts landed on the moon."⁵² Amuzegar ignores it. Rassi keeps the tenor of the message but updates it by adding that the moon landing has already occurred and that one day fish can also visit the moon.⁵³

The second example is Behrangi's use of punctuation, such as when setting off a story within the story. For instance, to start the grandmother's story, Behrangi uses only a colon and a paragraph break. Hooglund, Amuzegar, and Confederation also use the colon. But only Hooglund follows Behrangi's style and does not add any additional markings. Amuzegar and Confederation use punctuation inconsistently and they use double quotes for the grandmother's story, but they do not distinguish the quotes inside her story with single quotes. Emam ignores Behrangi's punctuation, and does not add any of her own. Croll and Rassi domesticate the text by inserting quotation marks, as is more common in English texts. Croll uses the American style of single quotes inside double quotes, while Rassi uses the reverse, British, style. These two examples seem to confirm the general sloppiness of the translations of Amuzegar and Confederation, while also validating how Hooglund tries to produce a close translation, Emam adds description, and Rassi adapts the text for English readers.

For the last textual comparison, I will examine the translation of culture-specific idioms and phrases.⁵⁴ These terms include untranslatable concepts, metaphors, and images. The translator can choose from a number of different strategies: keep the foreign words, do a literal translation, substitute an English equivalent, translate only the meaning, explain the term, use a hypernym, or ignore it. In evaluating foreignness, I also consider if the translations that feel foreign in English are also unusual for the source readers. Below are two examples of cultural-specific idioms.

تو ما را از خواب خرگوشی بیدار کردی .

Confederation: "You woke us from a long sleep"⁵⁵

Croll: "You woke us up from the sleep of a rabbit"⁵⁶

Hooglund: "You've awakened us from a deep sleep"⁵⁷

Amuzegar: "You have shown us how lazy we have been"⁵⁸

Emam: "You woke us up from our hare-like slumber" (with a footnote)⁵⁹

Rassi: Doesn't translate the sentence.

This sentence is used by Little Black Fish's young friends to describe how he had opened their eyes to their hollow lives. The literal meaning of the phrase *khāb-e khargushi* in the sentence is, as Croll has translated, the "sleep of a rabbit." Of course, in Croll's translation, readers encounter something unfamiliar in English that is not actually odd in Persian. They have to guess the implication, i.e. to be uninformed and inattentive. The phrase comes from the belief that rabbits sleep with their eyes half-open and thus appear to be awake while they are actually asleep—akin to sleepwalking through life. Emam also gives a literal translation but adds a footnote with a short synopsis of Henri La Fontaine's "Tortoise and Hare," though it is not the actual source. Furthermore, instead of a simple "his friends answered," as it is in Persian, she translates, "Announced his friends with great respect and admiration in their tone." Hooglund and Confederation retain the concept of sleep and try to find an English equivalent. Hooglund's use of "deep sleep" is technically not the same but it does convey the tenor. Confederation,

going after a similar equivalence, uses “long sleep,” which is not as accurate as “deep sleep.” Amuzegar ignores the idea of sleep and uses a phrase that is, I assume, based on the well-known fable of the tortoise and the hare. Rassi ignores the phrase altogether.

شما ها سر آن بیچاره را زیر آب کردید.

Confederation: “you people, in your cruelty chased him out of our village”⁶⁰

Croll: “you all put his poor head under the water”⁶¹

Hooglund: “you all drowned that poor fellow”⁶²

Amuzegar: “you people certainly got rid of him”⁶³

Emam: “you all joined together, teamed up and got rid of the poor creature”⁶⁴

Rassi: “you killed him! You killed my friend!”⁶⁵

The second example refers to what the elders did to Little Black Fish’s friend, the snail. Here again, Croll does a literal translation. Hooglund’s version is not word-for-word but does capture the same meaning while referencing water. Rassi uses short, emphatic phrases as a hypernym, ignoring how the killing occurred. Emam, Amuzegar, and Confederation do not directly reference a killing, Emam again elaborates by stressing the collective reprisal. With the use of “people,” Amuzegar and Confederation move away from the context and anthropomorphize. Following its reading of the story as a political allegory, Confederation paraphrases in a way that goes even further and qualifies the act by placing the action in a village and adding the qualifier “cruelty.”

This study disproves the retranslation hypothesis that retranslations progressively get closer to the original. In fact, the later translations of *The Little Black Fish* have domesticated the text. The earlier translations by Croll and Hooglund are more literal, while the post-revolution translations move away from the source. Croll, as a student of Persian who was publishing some of his first translations, seems concerned with getting things exact, especially when it comes to cultural-specific idioms. He produces the most foreign and literal translations, even when the awkwardness does not exist in the original or benefit the story. Hooglund, another foreign scholar of Persian who also respects Behrangī’s literary significance, is more confident with the Persian language. His aim is to produce a close translation “into colloquial English” and “avoid the turgidity of Persian phraseology.”⁶⁶ He also benefits from the previous translations. Ultimately, Croll and Hooglund, as American scholars wanting to inform English-language readers about Iran, are engaged in foreignizing by wanting to take the reader toward the source.⁶⁷

Although acknowledging the difficulty of translation and the importance of Behrangī’s words, Confederation is less interested in literal translation or in domesticating or foreignizing the text. Its contribution is also less consistent and more prone to error. Sometimes they use literal translations, other times they are writing their own story. Amuzegar is also a native Persian speaker and his book comes with the Persian text. But he does not seem to be in dialogue with the previous translations and, surprisingly for a teacher of Persian creating a bilingual edition of the story, he produces a less literal or accurate text than Hooglund.

Eman and Rassi, the most recent translators, produced the longest and shortest translations, respectively. They both domesticate the text for English readers. Emam's translation tends to domesticate through explanation. She tries to convey her understanding of the story by interjecting her voice with elaboration and expansion. Rassi's translation, produced with the help of an English editor, moves away from the original text and focuses on the plot and general story. The result is the most domesticated translation. Yet by placing the translation alongside the original illustrations, the children's book is also close to the original, without a sense of foreignization. Ultimately, although they use two very different approaches, Rassi and Hooglund have produced valuable contributions to the translation of *The Little Black Fish*: Hooglund by his adherence to the actual text and by providing greater context, and Rassi and Tiny Owl by producing the children's story with its original illustrations.

Contextual Analysis and Rewriting

Another approach to the study of translation is in the wider context of cultural studies. The "cultural turn" in translation studies was championed in the 1990s by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, who argue that translators are not just engaged in representing a foreign culture, they are also in dialogue with the different ideological discourses of the receiving society. Bassnett writes that "the study of the practice of translation had moved on from its formalist phase and was beginning to consider broader issues of context, history and convention."⁶⁸ Lefevere asserts that translation is "a rewriting of an original text" and can be "inspired by ideological motivations, or produced under ideological constraints" of the target culture.⁶⁹ Within the ideological constraints of their culture, translators select and rewrite texts through their word choices, ordering, and emphasis, as well as by any omissions and additions. Publishers then package the text so as to highlight a specific reading for their intended patrons and audience. The work of translation studies helps identify the ideological discourses and manipulations that shape these rewritings. As a product of the discourses of the target culture, retranslation is also closely coupled with rewriting.

In 2012, a cultural retranslation hypothesis was evaluated by *RETRADES* (Studies on Cultural and Textual Interaction: Retranslation). It was proposed that "each new translation must represent a socio-historical change and... be linked to external changes in the historical, cultural and social context of the target culture or to changes in the poetic and aesthetic considerations of the translations themselves."⁷⁰ Unlike the earlier hypothesis, which offers a progressive understanding of retranslation, this cultural hypothesis is not meant to be evolutionary. Instead, as a diachronic approach to retranslation study, it exposes the ideological shifts in a society. Although the research done by *RETRADES* did not confirm this cultural hypothesis, the retranslations of *The Little Black Fish* do. Changes in the ideological discourses in the United States and Iran are linked to the rewritings found in the different retranslations of Behrang's story.

As the Amazon rankings attest, the retranslation of Behrangi's story is not due to demand from an American readership or what Tony Bennett and Janet Woolcott call "reading formations."⁷¹ There is no American market waiting, as there has been for Iranian memoirs. For example, based on Amazon rankings as of 24 December 2017, the best-selling translation of Behrangi's story is by Rassi with the ranking of 1,128,384. On the other hand, the memoir *Reading Lolita in Tehran* is ranked 46,653; *Funny in Farsi* is ranked 45,498; and *The Complete Persepolis* is ranked 3,334.

The translations of *The Little Black Fish* are the results of the interests of the translators and publishers, as well as the ideological discourses of the target countries. They are the products of such sociopolitical factors as US-Iran relations and the growing Iranian diaspora community. Possibly the most significant factor is the paradigm shift that followed the Islamic Revolution.

Several important transformations occurred before the revolution, when the United States and Iran enjoyed close and growing relations. These included the start of the Middle East Studies Association in North America (1966) as well as a wave of Iranian students coming to US shores and their radicalization in Iran and abroad. By 1978, over 36,000 Iranian students were attending US universities, a larger number than from any other foreign country.⁷² Many of these students had close ties with Iran even if they opposed the regime. During the 1970s, membership in the Confederation was "illegal" and a "prison offense,"⁷³ which is one reason there is no mention of the translators' names in their publications. Yet inspired by dominant *adabiyat-e moteahed* ("committed literature") in Iran and the start of guerrilla warfare, students became more vocal and radical. By "1975 the Confederation approved a new charter... calling explicitly for the overthrow of the shah's regime."⁷⁴ The pre-revolution translations of Behrangi's story parallel the increased politicization of Iranian writers and students. The radicalization can be seen by comparing the different introductions that come with the Confederation's editions as well as Ricks' essays that accompany the translations by Croll and Hooglund.

The literary publication of the Confederation was part of its promotion of a revolutionary struggle that lent itself to the greater global leftist movements of the time. The translation was not published to promote its literary merits. The Confederation wanted to showcase a revolutionary message, which in its eyes was to prepare and educate the youth for uprising. For the Confederation, Behrangi wrote children's stories partly to avoid censorship (the "limitations placed upon him by the oppression").⁷⁵ The inclusion of "reprinted by Rastakhiz-e Siahkal" ("Siāhkal resurgence") in the back of the later edition confirms this revolutionary mission. Iranian leftists called the 1971 Siāhkal incident (a guerrilla operation against the Pahlavi regime) the resurgence and the "guerrillas gradually rose to the status of hagiographized liberators."⁷⁶ As the country moved toward the revolution, introductions to the later publication also became more militant, calling for armed struggle. For example, the earlier Confederation edition describes Behrangi's death as "an alleged drowning incident,"⁷⁷ while the later edition declares that he was "killed by the SAVAK agents."⁷⁸ The earlier edition talks about the "barbaric oppression existing in Iranian society,"

“a call for action,” and “organized conscious revolt against the established norms.”⁷⁹ The later printing goes further, pointing to “starting the armed struggle as the only way toward liberation” and endorsing “IRANIAN PEOPLE’S FEDAI GUERRILLAS.”⁸⁰ It also alludes to the “imperialist exploitation headed by the U.S.”⁸¹ In the later introduction, the story is interpreted as a call for arms against the shah’s regime, e.g. “the tadpoles represent the petit-bourgeoisie and the seagull represents the dictator regime and the Shah.”⁸² The poverty and hardship of Behrangi’s upbringing is also further foregrounded to emphasize his working class background.

The American translators Croll and Hooglund were not literary scholars or creative writers. Translation was only a secondary activity for them, and they did not continue to translate Persian literature. They were students of area studies during the cold war when the United States was invested in the Middle East and it was possible for Americans to study in Iran or work in related diplomatic services. Their translations, printed by small, international-focused publishers, were evidence of the growing impact of Middle Eastern studies and the rising scholarly research on the Middle East. For them, the revolutionary aspects of *The Little Black Fish* were part of a greater resurgence of neoliberalism and liberal democracy’s fight for freedom during the cold war. They tried to uncover Iran through its literary canons and were not partial to the radical leftist rhetoric. For example, in their introduction, Eric and Mary Hooglund identify the themes of Behrangi’s stories as “(1) the acquisition of knowledge and (2) the use of knowledge to help correct social problems.”⁸³ Unlike the Confederation’s interpretation, where the menacing birds become symbols of “the dictator regime and the Shah,”⁸⁴ the translators describe them as just “deceitful” and “dangerous.”⁸⁵ They interpret the characters as archetypes, such as “deceitful (the pelican)” or “wise (the moon).” They also describe Behrangi’s “untimely death” by noting “he drown [sic] while swimming with a friend.”⁸⁶

A more political-historical treatment is provided by Ricks’ essays. And as with the Confederation’s introduction, Ricks’ essays become more radical with time. In an early essay in *The Literary Review* (1974), Ricks focuses on literary movements and innovations, instead of such political moments as the Siāhkal incident. For example, he briefly mentions the 1953 coup and describes it as the “final struggle between Mussadiq and the reigning monarch in August, 1953.”⁸⁷ In a later essay accompanying Hooglund’s translation and subtitled “Samad Behrangi and Contemporary Iran: The Artist in Revolutionary Struggle” (1976), he expands on the event and notes the “now well publicized intervention of the C.I.A. in Iran’s affairs.”⁸⁸ Earlier, he wrote that “the petty *bourgeoisie*, grew more cautious with the unexpected death of Samad Bihrangi,”⁸⁹ whereas in the later essay he argues, “It is now clear that Behrangi’s unexpected and untimely death in 1968 arose out of his role in the movement both as a teacher and a writer.”⁹⁰ In the later essay, Ricks even lists the themes of Behrangi’s stories as including “the historical conflict between the monarchy ... and the revolutionary groups; ... the need for armed struggle in order to create lasting benefit for all the people.” As with the Confederation, in Ricks’ later essay, Behrangi’s use of a children’s story is characterized as a way “to evade censorship through allegories and metaphors.”⁹¹

Ricks' second essay became controversial and received much criticism. For example, Karimi-Hakkak points out its "many mistakes," as well as "[l]ong digressions and an excessive use of undefined terms of reference."⁹² DeVries spends most of his book review repudiating Ricks' analysis and arguing against its "untenable equation of political with literary revolutionariness."⁹³ Hillmann calls it "flawed by the writer's radical bias and misinformation."⁹⁴ In the end, the essay, which was meant to provide important historical background, was removed from Lynne Rienner's 1987 reprint, reducing the more radical evaluation of Behrangi's works.

An important factor in the post-revolution translations is the growing role of the Iranian diaspora community. In the case of Behrangi's works, post-revolution translations are done by Iranian immigrants.⁹⁵ Already the population of Iranians in America had jumped from 46,000 in the late 1970s to 155,000 in the 1980s.⁹⁶ Iranian immigrants took over the promotion of Iranian culture that had earlier been facilitated by the Pahlavi government. Their extended immigrant community were now also potential readers. In addition, this generation introduced many women writers and translators; Emam is one example.

As members of the Iranian immigrant community tried to "move away from the urgency of an exilic and immigrant narrative to one that situates Iran and Iranian culture in the continuum of more global diasporic consciousness," they encountered many difficulties.⁹⁷ Whether back in Iran or in the West, they feared the loss of their rights or what Giorgio Agamben describes as being turned into "bare life" (*zoë*).⁹⁸ James Clifford writes, "Peoples whose sense of identity is centrally defined by collective histories of displacement and violent loss cannot be 'cured' by merging into a new national community. This is especially true when they are the victims of ongoing, structural prejudice."⁹⁹ Most Iranian immigrants recognize this "violent loss" and continue to experience prejudice. They are also hailed and interpellated to respond to the prevailing ideological discourse and to speak for Iran and Iranians. So, they use writing and translation as a way of constructing an identity that responds to the antagonist public narrative.

The Little Black Fish has an important place in the consciousness of Iranians growing up during the revolution, and the story continues as a powerful reminder and a source of nostalgia among the diaspora community. Laura Secor begins the history of the revolution in her nonfiction work *Children of Paradise: The Struggle for the Soul of Iran* by retelling "[the children's story] that inspired a generation of Iranian revolutionaries."¹⁰⁰ Roya Hakakian's popular autobiography *Journey from the Land of No: A Girlhood Caught in Revolutionary Iran* and Zohreh Ghahremani's fictionalized narrative *Sky of Red Poppies* both reference the story and Behrangi's death. Hakakian even parallels her growing up in a Jewish family during the revolution with the story of Little Black Fish and indirectly extends the allegory to her later immigration. In a recent critical work, *Iranian Identity and Cosmopolitanism: Spheres of Belonging* (2016), Lucian Stone also identifies *The Little Black Fish* as the story of "cosmopolitans," who learn "to sensorially and intellectually explore the world, and to appreciate diversity and cultivate empathy."¹⁰¹

Translations support Iranian immigrants' attempts to transform from an exilic community reclaiming the past to an assimilated diasporic community striving for the cosmopolitan, transnational future. Immigrants want to rewrite the negative public narrative on Iranians using literature and art as positive cultural capital. To this end, *The Little Black Fish* has been defanged of its overt militant references and is no longer tied to its leftist revolutionary time. Instead, the narrative is reframed as a universal tale with beautiful illustrations that can speak to all children. The story is meant to advocate a vision of liberal democracy and offer a positive portrayal of immigrants' desire to go beyond the confines of home in search of freedom and democracy.

As early Iranian immigrants, Amuzegar and the publisher of Ibex participated in academic studies of Iran. Ibex, which started in 1979, has a very different mission than the Confederation. It wants to introduce "the culture of the Persian speaking world ... to the West" and publishes books that are "used to teach Persian," like Amuzegar's Persian-language textbooks.¹⁰² Regarding Behrangi's death, the publisher is vague: "Because of his anti-government views, suspicions were raised regarding the circumstance of his death."¹⁰³ For Ibex, "the story can be read in many ways." The "call to rebellion" is only one reading, along with "encouragement to independence" and the "journey from innocence to experience."¹⁰⁴ And although Behrangi's story is included in the "Classics of Persian Literature,"¹⁰⁵ the publisher still finds fault with its "not so subtle anti-authoritarian message."¹⁰⁶

Unlike other translators we have discussed so far, Emam and Rassi, whose work appears after 9/11, are not tied to academe. Behrangi's story is not packaged as an important literary work or a revolutionary text. Instead, they present *The Little Black Fish* as a children's story for a larger, mainstream, audience. Emam grew up before the revolution and immigrated to the United States in 1992. She is an example of an Iranian immigrant self-publishing as a way to reclaim the past and rewrite the negative discourse on Iran. Though Emam is influenced by the revolutionary analysis of the story, her commentary frames the book with a broad universal message that can appeal to most readers. She calls it "one of the best stories ever written for children," with "many great lessons."¹⁰⁷ On the back cover, Behrangi is described as "a national hero" and his writing is "filled with hope, stamina for life, awareness and wisdom, portraying realities of life." Emam emphasizes teamwork and elaborates on the importance of diversity and acceptance. For example, instead of Hooglund's more literal translation ("you'd know that there are many others in the world who are pleased with their appearances"),¹⁰⁸ she writes, "you would have known by now that there are many other creatures in this world, who might look like me, and also there are others who do not look like me, but we all are beautiful each in our own unique and precious way."¹⁰⁹

Yet her translation is also dedicated to her sister, Parvaneh Emam, who died as a leftist in 1983 and is "on the list of 'Martyrs of the Peykar Organization for the Liberation of the Working Class.'"¹¹⁰ The revolutionary narrative of *Little Black Fish* thus recalls her sister's story, but Emam does not mention her sister's background in the book. Emam also avoids reproducing the narrative of the victimized Iranian woman. Her translation can be recognized as a veiled nostalgic elegy for the heroic

leftist martyrs and their struggle for freedom. On social media, meanwhile, she speaks more openly about the book's revolutionary message. For example, in response to an online Amazon reviewer's comment on a comic-book adaption of the story, she writes of the translator's awareness of "dialectical materialism" and reports that Behrangi "was executed after submitting this work for publishing."¹¹¹

Emam employs explanation to domesticate the text, while Rassi edits the language and rewrites the tone. Rassi and the Tiny Owl publishers grew up after the revolution.¹¹² They signal a new generation of Iranian publishers, who want to be part of the larger literary community of their target culture by promoting cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism. Tiny Owl has been the most successful distributor and proponent of Behrangi's story. Amazon sales rankings attest to the reception of the Tiny Owl edition. The book was also shortlisted for the Marsh Award for translated children's literature and selected by David Cadji-Newby as one of the top ten children's books for *The Guardian* (2 April 2015).¹¹³ Judges for the Marsh Award describe the story as having "[s]nappy dialogue, lyrical asides, and a strong narrative embodying a timeless message."¹¹⁴ The publishers also have ties to Iran. The translation was discussed in the *Sharq* newspaper (19 April 2015) by the Persian publication editor Ali Seidadbadi.¹¹⁵ Nazar Publisher puts an award sticker (for *The Guardian* endorsement that Tiny Owl received) on its Persian-language edition of the book.

Rassi and Tiny Owl cast the Iranian story as a tale that deals with "universal themes such as love, friendship and freedom, and a greater awareness of the diverse and colourful world."¹¹⁶ On the back cover, it is written that Little Black Fish "wants to explore the wider world" and in the "About the book" we read it is "about a fish daring to mix with other kinds of creatures and other ways of life." To strengthen the positive message, Rassi also adds such sentences as "the more that Little Black Fish found out about the world, the more he realized that it was a dangerous as well as beautiful place."¹¹⁷ Her translation encourages diversity, freedom, and co-existence.

Tiny Owl is sympathetic to Iranians' struggle for freedom and acceptance. But the book is not meant as a tool to educate the young for a new Iranian revolution. Rassi adds that the fish fear others' judgement and being "different."¹¹⁸ Like Little Black Fish, Behrangi is also described as someone who "dare[d] to be politically different"¹¹⁹ and his death is reported as only "rumoured to have been ordered by the Iranian government."¹²⁰ Tiny Owl wants to bridge cultures and publish positive universal stories with a message of liberal democracy and acceptance that is aligned with the cosmopolitan experience of immigrants. In an interview published in the online magazine *Mirrors Windows Doors* (8 January 2016), Ghanimifard contends that Tiny Owl's "books illustrate a different image of Iran from the one you see in the news and in the media." For her, "[c]hildren's books are the best messengers of peace and understanding."¹²¹ Osman Coban, reviewing *The Little Black Fish* for the International Board on Books for Young People Link (February 2017), confirms a similar vision, writing "Considering the violence expressed against different ethnic groups within societies in the wider world, the message of this book is important for the peaceful coexistence of today's diverse world."¹²²

What I hope to have shown is that the different retranslations reflect the impact of the United States' engagement in the Middle East, the influence of Middle East

studies, the Islamic Revolution, the negative ideological discourse about Iran, and the growing Iranian diaspora. The result of this study also shows that retranslations of *The Little Black Fish* did not actually follow the original retranslation hypothesis. In fact, the extrication of the story from its revolutionary application freed the translators to look at the book as a universal story and to domesticate it for the children of the target culture. Ultimately, each retranslation has fostered a different reading of the book as a revolutionary text or political allegory, a literary work or modern fable, a source for learning about Iran and the Persian language, and a coming-of-age tale or a children's book that speaks to the experience of immigrants. All the different approaches are the result of the translators' interests as well as the cultural and political ideological discourses of their time.¹²³

Before the revolution, Behrangi's story had been translated more than any other modern Iranian story and was hailed as a major revolutionary and literary work. But its literary reputation has declined and Behrangi's standing as a revolutionary martyr minimized. The work is missing from English anthologies of modern Persian literature and no recent scholarly work on Behrangi has been conducted in English. Yet, as the number of retranslations show, his story continues to play a prominent role in the Iranian immigrant community. More recently, it has been reintroduced by Iranian immigrants as a nostalgic reminder of growing up during the revolution and as an inspiring domesticated children's book with colorful illustrations that can be seen to champion liberal democracy and cosmopolitanism. The domestication strategies of such publishers as Tiny Owl can thus be seen as a gesture to promote Iranians' integration and acceptance in the target culture.

Notes

1. Gürçağlar, "Retranslation," 233.
2. There are a number of other translations, including Carolrhoda's abridged adaptation (1971), Bizhan Khodabandeh's comic-book adaptation (2011), Christine Steinberg-Mund's translation published in Tanzania (2004), and the Iran Chamber Society's online translation (http://www.iranchamber.com/literature/sbehrangi/works/the_little_black_fish.php).
3. Genette, *Paratexts*.
4. See for example, his essay "Adabiyât-e Kudak."
5. I use Little Black Fish as a proper name, and give it a masculine pronoun here. Since Behrangi does not specify the gender of many of the animals in his story, translators into English have been left with the challenge of assigning gender. My study of various translators' choices shows no clear trend. For example, Croll, Emam, and Rassi use the masculine pronoun, while Hooglund uses a neutral pronoun ("it") and Confederation and Amuzegar use the feminine. In all cases, except Croll, translators also pick a different gender for Little Red Fish, who follows the path of Little Black Fish at the story's end. So with the exception of Croll, it appears all translators were consciously choosing a gender, based on their own interests and concerns, and not in a uniform manner or as a response to a specific cultural or sociopolitical discourse. The approach taken by Amuzegar and Hooglund is noted in the introductions to their works.
6. Farahati, *Az Ān Sâl-hâ*, 157–8.
7. Behrooz, *Rebel Without a Cause*, 45.
8. Vahabzadeh, *A Guerrilla Odyssey*, 23.

9. Mesghali has outlined how Behrangi's children's story came to be published in several published interviews. He states that Sirius Tahbaz received the story from Behrangi for publication in *Arash* magazine. But Tahbaz felt it wasn't ready. So, a few years later, Tahbaz gave the story to Firouz Shirvanlu from Kānun. It was then published posthumously after edits by M. Azad and Farideh Farjam. See Shahr-e Ketāb (March 2, 2016; <http://www.bookcity.org/detail/7367/root/papers>, accessed May 31, 2018) and *Sharq* Newspaper (April 22, 2015; <http://sharghdaily.ir/News/61008/رویا، صد-قدم-از-واقعیات-جلوتر-است>, accessed May 31, 2018). He also references the information found in *Tārikh-e Adabiyāt-e Kudakān-e Iran* by Mohammad Hadi Mohammadi and Zohreh Ghaeni.
10. Ghanoonparavar, *Prophets of Doom*, 84.
11. Karimi-Hakkak, "Review," 217.
12. See, for example, Mir'abedini's *Sad Sāl Dāstān-nevisi dar Iran*, Stone's *Iranian Identity and Cosmopolitanism*, Talatof's *The Politics of Writing in Iran*, and Ghanoonparvar's *Prophets of Doom*.
13. Deane-Cox's *Retranslation* (2014) is possibly the first scholarly book on retranslation.
14. Bensimon and Coupaye, "Retraduire."
15. Brownlie, "Narrative Theory," 168.
16. Collombat, "Le XXIe siècle," 1.
17. Matin-Asgari, "Confederation."
18. Confederation, trans., *Little Black Fish*, iv, 8, RCW Publication.
19. In the Three Continents Press edition (Hooglund, trans., *Little Black Fish*, 129), Thomas Ricks writes that the Iranian students' edition was first published in 1972.
20. Confederation, trans., *Little Black Fish*, xi. Rastakhiz-e Siahkal.
21. *Literary Review* 18, no. 1 (1974): 1.
22. Ricks, "Contemporary Persian Literature," 14.
23. *Ibid.*, 11.
24. Hooglund, trans., *Little Black Fish*, xiii. (Three Continents Press edition is used for all references.)
25. All references here are to the 2007 edition.
26. Chesterman, "A Causal Model," 23.
27. See essays by Bensimon and Berman in *Palimpsestes* 13.
28. See, for example, works by Vanderschelden ("Why Retranslate"), Brownlie ("Narrative Theory"), Outi Paloposki and Kaisa Koskinen ("A Thousand").
29. Brownlie, "Narrative Theory," 166.
30. Schleiermacher, "On the Difficult Methods," 53.
31. Paloposki, "Domestication and Foreignization," 40.
32. For further reading on foreignization, see works by Lawrence Venuti, Philip E. Lewis, and Antoine Berman.
33. Karimi-Hakkak, "Beyond Translation."
34. Berman, "Translation," 252.
35. See, for example, works by Lawrence Venuti, Antoine Berman, and Philip E. Lewis for foreignization and critical responses by Anthony Pym, Maria Tymoczko, and Kaisa Koskinen to their approach. Many of the arguments revolve around Venuti's work, in particular *The Translator's Invisibility*, which builds on Schleiermacher's advocacy of foreignizing.
36. Rassi, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 27; 3, 19, 20, 39. (Rassi's edition doesn't have page numbers, so I have used my own numbering scheme starting with the first page of the story.)
37. Croll, trans., "The Little Black Fish," 72.
38. Karimi-Hakkak, "Review," 219.
39. DeVries, "Review," 127.
40. Hooglund, trans., *Little Black Fish*, 2, 11. (The English translations in the parentheses are the ones done by the author.)
41. Similar stories can be found in Aesop's "The Fox and the Crow," or in "The Turtle and the Geese" from *Kalila and Dimna*.
42. Amuzegar, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 29–30.

43. Ibid., 31, 28.
44. Confederation, trans., *Little Black Fish*, 4.
45. Ibid., 16.
46. Emam, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 21.
47. Ibid., 5.
48. Quotes from the translation of the interview posted on the Tiny Owl website (<http://tinyowl.co.uk/creation-of-cultural-bridge/>). Original interview can also be found online on the Shahrگون site (<http://shahrگون.com/fa/2015/05/29/مترجم-کتابها-از-یتارائی-گفت-و-گوبا-از-یتارائی-مترجم-کتابها>, accessed May 31, 2018).
49. Rassi, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 15.
50. Ibid., 23, 1, 35.
51. Hooglund, trans., *Little Black Fish*, 12. (The second ellipsis appears in the translation.)
52. Emam, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 27.
53. Rassi, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 27.
54. For additional information on culture-specific concepts, items, and expressions, see Mona Baker's *Other Words* or Peter Newmark's discussion of translation and culture in *A Textbook of Translation*.
55. Confederation, trans., *Little Black Fish*, 5.
56. Croll, trans., "The Little Black Fish," 72.
57. Hooglund, trans., *Little Black Fish*, 5.
58. Amuzegar, trans. *The Little Black Fish*, 13.
59. Emam, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 6, 27.
60. Confederation, trans., *Little Black Fish*, 3.
61. Croll, trans., "The Little Black Fish," 71.
62. Hooglund, trans., *Little Black Fish*, 4.
63. Amuzegar, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 11.
64. Emam, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 5.
65. Rassi, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 11.
66. Hooglund, trans., *Little Black Fish*, xix.
67. See also Schleiermacher, "On the Difficult Methods," 49.
68. Bassnett and Lefevere, *Constructing Cultures*, 123.
69. Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting*, vii, 7.
70. Cadera and Walsh, *Literary Retranslation in Context*, 1.
71. Bennett and Woollacott, *Bond and Beyond*, 64.
72. See Hakimzadeh's article, "Iran: A Vast Diaspora."
73. Matin-Asgari, "Confederation."
74. Ibid.
75. Confederation, trans., *Little Black Fish*, ii, RCW Publication.
76. Vahabzadeh, *A Guerrilla Odyssey*, 213.
77. Confederation, trans., *Little Black Fish*, i, RCW Publication.
78. Confederation, trans., *Little Black Fish*, iii, Rastakhiz-e Siahkal.
79. Confederation, trans., *Little Black Fish*, iii, RCW Publication.
80. Confederation, trans., *Little Black Fish*, ix, v, Rastakhiz-e Siahkal.
81. Ibid., vii.
82. Ibid., ix.
83. Hooglund, trans., *Little Black Fish*, xvii. (Although *The Little Black Fish* is translated by Eric Hooglund, the introduction is written by Hooglund and Mary Elaine Hegland, who at the time was his wife.)
84. Confederation, trans., *Little Black Fish*, ix, Rastakhiz-e Siahkal.
85. Hooglund, trans., *Little Black Fish*, xviii.
86. Ibid., xviii, xv.
87. Ricks, "Contemporary Persian Literature," 8.
88. Ricks, "Bibliographical-Historical Essay," 105.
89. Ricks, "Contemporary Persian Literature," 9.
90. Ricks, "Bibliographical-Historical Essay," 97.

91. Ibid., 117, 123.
92. Karimi-Hakkak, "Review," 219, 222.
93. DeVries, "Review," 126.
94. Hillmann, "Review," 673.
95. My own research shows the unique role of Iranian American translators. See also works done by Nanquette, such as "Translations of Modern Persian Literature."
96. See Hakimzadeh's "Iran: A Vast Diaspora."
97. Elahi and Karim, "Introduction: Iranian Diaspora," 384.
98. Agamben, *Homo Sacer*.
99. Clifford, "Diasporas," 307.
100. Secor, *Children of Paradise*, 4.
101. Stone, *Iranian Identity and Cosmopolitanism*, 4.
102. From the homepage of Ibex's website (<http://www.ibexpub.com>, accessed August 10, 2017).
103. Amuzegar, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 5.
104. Ibid., 6.
105. A designation the publisher gives to the book by placing it in their classics series.
106. Amuzegar, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 5.
107. Emam, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 1.
108. Hooglund, trans., *Little Black Fish*, 6.
109. Emam, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 8.
110. From the website of Human Rights & Democracy for Iran, a project of the Abdorrahman Boroumand Foundation (<http://www.iranrights.org/memorial/story/-4400/parvaneh-emam#sthash.QzrdUOHF.dpbs>, accessed August 10, 2017).
111. Philip Schultz, June 18, 2016 (https://www.amazon.com/gp/customer-reviews/R1BYENL7RM29H1/ref=cm_cr_ar_p_d_viewpnt?ie=UTF8&ASIN=1438913990#R1BYENL7RM29H1, accessed May 15, 2018).
112. Unlike the other publishers, Tiny Owl is a British establishment. Some of the owner's approach may be particular to the British-Iranian immigrant experience.
113. Link: <https://www.theguardian.com/childrens-books-site/2015/apr/02/david-cadji-newbys-top-10-quests-in-childrens-books> (accessed May 15, 2018).
114. See <http://booksforkeeps.co.uk/childrens-books/news/marsh-award-for-children's-literature-international-2017-shortlist-announced> (accessed May 15, 2018).
115. Link: <http://sharghdaily.ir/News/60680/کتابی-انقلابی-در-کشوری> (accessed May 31, 2018).
116. From the "About us" page on Tiny Owl's website (<http://tinyowl.co.uk/contact-2/>; accessed May 31, 2018).
117. Rassi, trans., *The Little Black Fish*, 23.
118. Ibid., 3.
119. In "About the book."
120. In "About the author and illustrator."
121. Link: <https://mirrorswindowsdoors.org/wp/interview-delaram-ghanimifard/> (accessed May 15, 2018).
122. Reprinted on Tiny Owl's website (<http://tinyowl.co.uk/the-little-black-fish-a-message-of-respect-and-tolerance-for-others/>, accessed May 15, 2018).
123. In contrast, my study of translations of Sadeq Hedayat's *The Blind Owl* (*Buf-e Kur*) supports the original retranslation hypothesis and shows that the retranlations have become more foreign. Naveed Noori, the most recent translator (2011), speaks openly of his foreignizing bias. On the other hand, the retranlations do not seem to be affected by market pressure or sociopolitical factors. The translators of *The Blind Owl* and their publishers have their own personal interest and purpose for retranslation. Hedayat's novella also never lost its reputation and scholarly works continue to develop around it. An important conclusion from comparing these two different retranlations is that although retranslation studies benefit from textual and cultural analysis, one cannot assume that a specific hypothesis can be applied to all retranlations.

Bibliography

- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by D. Heller-Roazen. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Amuzegar, Hooshang, trans. *The Little Black Fish*. Rev. bilingual ed. by Samad Behrangi. Illustrated by Allison Remick. 1996. Reprint Bethesda, MD: Ibex, 2007.
- Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Bassnett, Susan, and André Lefevere. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998.
- Behrangi, Samad. *The Little Black Fish*. Illustrated by Farshid Mesghali. Minneapolis: Carolrhoda Books, 1971.
- Behrangi, Samad. "Adabiyāt-e Kudak [Children's literature]." In *Majmu'ah Maqālah-ha* [Collected essays], 120–129. Tabriz: Enteshārāt-e Shams, 1969.
- Behrooz, Maziar. *Rebel Without a Cause: The Failure of the Left in Iran*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2000.
- Bennett, Tony, and Janet Woollacott. *Bond and Beyond: The Political Career of a Popular Hero*. London: Macmillan, 1988.
- Bensimon, Paul. "Présentation." *Palimpsestes* 13, no. 4 (1990): ix–xiii.
- Bensimon, Paul, and Didier Coupaye, eds. "Retraduire." Special issue of *Palimpsestes* 13, no. 4 (1990).
- Berman, Antoine. "La Traduction Comme Espace de la Traduction." *Palimpsestes* 13, no. 4 (1990): 1–7.
- Berman, Antoine. "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign." Translated by Lawrence Venuti. In *The Translation Studies Reader*. 3rd ed., edited by Lawrence Venuti, 240–253. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Brownlie, Siobhan. "Narrative Theory and Retranslation Theory." *Across Languages and Cultures* 7, no. 2 (2006): 145–170.
- Cadera, Susanne M., and Andrew Samuel Walsh, eds. *Literary Retranslation in Context*. New Trends in Translation Studies: 21. Bern: Peter Lang, 2017.
- Chesterman, Andrew. "A Causal Model for Translation Studies." In *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies 1: Textual and Cognitive Aspects*, edited by Maeve Olohan, 15–27. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Clifford, James. "Diasporas." *Cultural Anthropology* 9, no. 3 (1994): 302–338.
- Collombat, Isabelle. "Le XXI^e Siècle: l'âge de la Retraduction. The 21st Century: The Age of Retranslation." *Translation Studies in the New Millennium. An International Journal of Translation and Interpreting* 2 (2004): 1–15.
- Confederation of Iranian Students, National Union, trans. *The Little Black Fish and Other Stories*. By Samad Behrangi. Arlington, VA: RCW Publications, [1972]. Reprint n.p.: Rastakhiz-e Siahkal, [1976].
- Croll, Donald C., trans. *The Little Black Fish*. By Samad Behrangi. *Literary Review* 18, no. 1 (1974): 69–84.
- Deane-Cox, Sharon. *Retranslation: Translation, Literature and Reinterpretation*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.
- DeVries, Gert. "Review of *The Little Black Fish and Other Modern Persian Stories* by Samad Behrangi." *Edebiyat* 2, no. 1 (1977): 121–128.
- Elahi, Babak, and Karim, Persis M. "Introduction: Iranian Diaspora." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 31, no. 2 (2011): 381–387.
- Emam, Ruby, trans. *The Little Black Fish*. By Samad Behrangi. Bloomington, IN: Authorhouse, 2008.
- Farahati, Hamzah. *Az Ān Sāl-hā va Sāl-hā-ye Degar*. Ālmān: Enteshārāt-e Forugh, 2006.
- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Ghahremani, Zohreh. *Sky of Red Poppies: A Novel*. San Diego, CA: Turquoise Books, 2010.
- Ghanoonparvar, M. R. *Prophets of Doom: Literature as a Socio-political Phenomenon in Modern Iran*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984.
- Gürçağlar, S. T. "Retranslation." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2nd ed., edited by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 232–235. London: Routledge, 2009.
- Hakakian, Roya. *Journey from the Land of No: A Girlhood Caught in Revolutionary Iran*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 2006.

- Hakimzadeh, Shirin. "Iran: A Vast Diaspora Abroad and Millions of Refugees at Home." *Migration Information Source*, September 1, 2006. <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/iran-vast-diaspora-abroad-and-millions-refugees-home>
- Hillmann, Michael C. "Review of *The Little Black Fish and Other Modern Persian Stories* by Samad Behrangi." *World Literature Today* 50, no. 4 (1977): 673.
- Hooglund, Eric, and Mary Hooglund, trans. *The Little Black Fish and Other Modern Persian Stories*. By Samad Behrangi. Washington, DC: Three Continents Press, 1976. Reprint, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1987.
- Karimi-Hakkak, Ahmad. "Review of *The Little Black Fish and Other Modern Persian Stories*, by Samad Behrangi." *Iranian Studies*, 10, no. 3 (1997): 216–222.
- Karimi-Hakkak, Ahmad. "Beyond Translation: Interactions between English and Persian Poetry." In *Iran and the Surrounding World: Interactions in Culture and Cultural Politics*, edited by Nikki R. Keddie and Rudi Matthee, 36–60. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002.
- Koskinen, Kaisa. *Beyond Ambivalence: Postmodernity and the Ethics of Translation*. Tampere, Finland: University of Tampere, 2000.
- Lefevere, André. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of the Literary Fame*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Lewis, Philip E. "The Measure of Translation Effects." In *The Translation Studies Reader*. 3rd ed., edited by Lawrence Venuti, 220–239. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Matin-Asgari, Afshin. "Confederation of Iranian Students, National Union." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Online edition. Accessed July 27, 2017. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/confederation-of-iranian-students>
- Mir'abedini, Hasan. *Sad Sāl Dāstān-nevisi dar Iran* [A hundred years of story writing in Iran]. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Tehran: Nashr-e Cheshmeh, 1998.
- Mohammadi, Mohammad Hadi, and Zohreh Ghaeni. *Tārikh-e Adabiyāt-e Kudakān-e Iran* [The history of children's literature in Iran]. 6 vols. Tehran: Chista, 1997–2004.
- Nanquette, Laetitia. "Translations of Modern Persian Literature in the United States: 1979–2011." *The Translator* 23, no. 1 (2017): 49–66.
- Newmark, Peter. *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall, 1988.
- Paloposki, Outi. "Domestication and Foreignization." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 2, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 292–298. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011.
- Paloposki, Outi, and Kaisa Koskinen. "A Thousand and One Translations: Revisiting Retranslation." In *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*, edited by Gyde Hansen, Kirsten Malmkjaer, and Daniel Gile, 27–38. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004.
- Pym, Anthony. "Schleiermacher and the Problem of 'Blending'." *Translation and Literature*, 4 no. 1 (1995): 5–30.
- Pym, Anthony. "Venuti's Visibility." *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies* 8, no.1 (1996): 165–77.
- Rassi, Azita, trans. *The Little Black Fish*. By Samad Behrangi. Illustrated by Farshid Mesghali. London: Tiny Owl Publishing, 2017.
- Ricks, Thomas M. "Bibliographical-Historical Essay." In *The Little Black Fish and Other Modern Persian Stories*. By Samad Behrangi, 95–126. Washington, DC: Three Continents Press, 1976.
- Ricks, Thomas M. "Contemporary Persian Literature." *Literary Review* 18, no. 1 (1974): 4–17.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "On the Difficult Methods of Translating." Translated by Susan Bernofsky. *The Translation Studies Reader*. 3rd ed., edited by Lawrence Venuti, 43–63. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Secor, Laura. *Children of Paradise: The Struggle for the Soul of Iran*. New York: Riverhead Books, 2016.
- Stone, Lucian, ed. *Iranian Identity and Cosmopolitanism: Spheres of Belonging*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.
- Talattof, Kamran. *The Politics of Writing in Iran: A History of Modern Persian Literature*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000.

- Tymoczko, Maria. "Translation and political engagement: activism, social change and the role of translation in geopolitical shifts." *The Translator* 6, no.1 (2000): 23–47.
- Vahabzadeh, Peyman. *A Guerrilla Odyssey: Modernization, Secularism, Democracy, and the Fada'i Period of National Liberation in Iran, 1971–1979*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2010.
- Vanderschelden, Isabelle. "Why Retranslate the French Classics? The Impact of Retranslation on Quality." In *On Translating French Literature and Film II*, edited by Myriam Salama-Carr, 1–18. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. New York: Routledge, 1995.