Retranslations are inevitably read and studied in the context of the translations that preceded them, in other words, as repeat performances. For the retranslators, however, they are often singular occurrences, to which they refer as new work. Indeed the act of retranslation has made an indelible mark on the work of writers worldwide, and many of them have testified to the nature and depth of that marking. Consequently, to read their accounts and their translations is to revise the prevailing assumption that the “re” weighs heavily in all retranslations. Lawrence Venuti has observed that even the most individual translation projects are inevitably affected in some way by “transindividual factors,” which, in the case of retranslations, would certainly include previous versions. Even so, the powerful impact of those retranslations on the individuals responsible for them makes it impossible to address retranslation without acknowledging the primacy of that impact. An inquiry into retranslation in the context of individual experience therefore alters the terms of the usual discussion, shifting the focus away from the relation between or among multiple versions (whether earlier or later) and contributing to the argument (advanced by Sebnem Susam-Sarajeva and Outi Paloposki and Kaisa Koskinen, for example) that retranslations are not necessarily either invariably less domesticating or more accomplished than first translations. With translations and retranslations increasingly available online, the possibility escalates for evermore collaborative intervention, in the form of re-retranslations. An inquiry into retranslation can thereby prompt a consideration of integrity with respect to preceding versions.