

Problems of Editing in the Italian Translation of Noam Chomsky's *The New Military Humanism* — Lessons from Kosovo: A Case Study

Sabrina Fusari

Volume 47, Number 4, December 2002

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/008036ar>
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/008036ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (print)
1492-1421 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Fusari, S. (2002). Problems of Editing in the Italian Translation of Noam Chomsky's *The New Military Humanism* — Lessons from Kosovo: A Case Study. *Meta*, 47(4), 564–574. <https://doi.org/10.7202/008036ar>

Article abstract

In this paper, I discuss a number of problems that arise in the relationship between free-lance translators and in-house editors in the publishing sector. In the first part, I discuss the general problems that may arise when a translation is revised by in-house editors. In the second part of my paper, I analyse the characteristics of translators' mistakes. I then discuss a case study, i.e., problems in the editing of the Italian translation of Noam Chomsky's *The New Military Humanism*. In the fourth and last part, I draw some general conclusions and propose ways to change the relationship between translators and publishing houses in order to improve the working conditions of translators as well as the quality of publications.

Problems of Editing in the Italian Translation of Noam Chomsky's *The New Military Humanism*—Lessons from Kosovo: A Case Study

SABRINA FUSARI

Advanced School of Modern Languages for Interpreters and Translators, Forlì, Italy

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article examine une série de problèmes qui se posent dans le rapport entre les traducteurs qui travaillent «à la pige» et les rédacteurs des maisons d'édition. Dans la première partie de cet article, nous affrontons les problèmes généraux qui peuvent se présenter lorsqu'une traduction est révisée par une maison d'édition. La deuxième partie analyse la nature des erreurs des traducteurs. Ensuite, nous nous concentrons sur un cas spécifique, c'est-à-dire les problèmes liés à la rédaction de la traduction italienne de *The New Military Humanism* de Noam Chomsky. Dans la quatrième et dernière partie, nous tirons des conclusions générales, en proposant des changements dans le rapport entre les traducteurs et les maisons d'édition: nous présentons quelques stratégies pour améliorer non seulement les conditions de travail des traducteurs, mais aussi la qualité des ouvrages publiés.

ABSTRACT

In this paper, I discuss a number of problems that arise in the relationship between freelance translators and in-house editors in the publishing sector. In the first part, I discuss the general problems that may arise when a translation is revised by in-house editors. In the second part of my paper, I analyse the characteristics of translators' mistakes. I then discuss a case study, i.e., problems in the editing of the Italian translation of Noam Chomsky's *The New Military Humanism*. In the fourth and last part, I draw some general conclusions and propose ways to change the relationship between translators and publishing houses in order to improve the working conditions of translators as well as the quality of publications.

MOTS CLÉS/ KEYWORDS

editing, publishing houses, Italian, English, Chomsky

1. Introduction

In recent years, translation studies have focused on the relationship between translators and publishers, especially as regards the working conditions of translators (Noël, 1977; Hermans & Lambert, 1998; Choi & Lim, 2000), their position concerning copyright (Astley, 1977; Fabiani, 1994; Zeller, 2000), and contractual problems, in particular the lack of bargaining power on the part of literary translators (Claxton, 1977; Megale 1994). Most research concerning this issue seems to focus on literary translation: it should be noted, however, that the working conditions of translators in publishing houses do not vary so much depending on whether they translate literature or “non-literature.” The definition of translation as “literary”—as well as the definition of “literature” itself—is problematic, and will not be dealt with in detail

here. Suffice to say that publishing houses typically bring out a wide range of publications: contractual, copyright and working condition problems seem to affect most translators in the publishing sector, not only those who translate literature.

Admittedly, remuneration is poor for translators in the publishing sector and contracts are often more to the advantage of the publisher, especially as regards copyright¹: but there are also other issues at stake. One important aspect of the relationship between translators and publishers concerns editorial intervention,² i.e., the way an editor changes the original translation in view of publication. Should editors be allowed to change the translator's text at will, assuming that, once submitted to the in-house editor, the translated text belongs to the publishing house? Or should changes be discussed and agreed upon with translators, in order to preserve their intellectual property over their own translation? Should there be a limit to the scope of editing, and if so, how should such a limit be established?

As Pautasso says,

there are two possible approaches: the first possibility is to translate the text literally and use the translation as a draft to be revised and rewritten by in-house or free-lance editors, depending on the situation and quality of the text. This is one possibility. The other possibility is to hire a professional translator that you trust and consider capable of producing a reliable translation which might be immediately printed as it is.³

Pautasso seems to connect the extent of editing with the degree of trust between the publishing house and the translator: in fact, if a publisher knows he can trust his translator, there should be no need for extensive editing. Conversely, if the translator is likely to make mistakes, possibly because s/he is not a professional,⁴ significant editing may be necessary.

Publishing houses do not always have a network of professional translators that they regularly hire to translate foreign works: a number of translators work free-lance for the publishing sector, the in-house staff being mostly charged with the editing process. Indeed, some publishers appoint different translators for each of the foreign books they bring out: this might indicate that at least a number of publishing houses tend to see translation as a casual job. This in turn makes it difficult to establish mutual trust between free-lance translators who work on and off and in-house editors who have a secure job and no obligation to work side by side with translators on a short-term contract.

The fact that translation may be seen as an "odd" job for speakers of foreign languages to earn some pocket money, has even more implications. As Zeller (2000) notes, this situation produces a "cultural bias" concerning the authorship of translations: "the reason" in Zeller's words "is that translation is perceived as a mere transfer of an author's vision from his language into another language. It follows, then, that to information specialists translation is little more than a mechanical process" (Zeller, 2000: 134-135). Such bias, however obnoxious, seems to affect a number of publishers, at least those who consider the translation submitted to be a "draft" (as defined by Choi & Lim, 2000: 387-388) that an in-house editor may modify at will without consulting the translator.

2. Translators' errors

Ideally, publishers should probably turn to reliable translators whose work may not even need any editing. Arguably, however, it is difficult to establish the profile of a reliable translator *a priori*: Pautasso himself notes that even the best translators have sometimes proved unreliable, made silly lexical mistakes (“soffitto”—ceiling—instead of “pavimento”—floor; “schifo”—disgust—instead of “scafo”—hull—and so on) or arrived at target texts influenced by the source language. Some of these problems may well depend on the translator’s carelessness or lack of preparation, but it would be simplistic to put all the blame on the translator. In fact, in some cases, the publisher should not be considered to be totally blameless.

As Pautasso notes, translators’ “working conditions are hard, and deadlines are so short that an accurate revision becomes impossible.”⁵ A publisher may indeed prefer to perform extensive in-house editing rather than allow translators to revise their own text under better working conditions: this would first of all require translators to have far more time at their disposal—presumably at a higher cost for the publisher.

Pautasso also notes that minor errors on the part of a professional translator can neither explain nor justify bad editorial practice: he argues further that the real problems with translations are not the ones listed above (i.e., occasional “silly” mistakes), but “inventions, additions and ... cuts, after which the sentence seems to make sense anyway, but is a different thing from the original.”⁶ These examples of serious errors correspond to the categories presented by Hatim & Mason (1997: 202), who classify the “effect of error” as linguistic, semantic and pragmatic. Admittedly, professional translators do indulge, albeit rarely, in such bad practice: but what if defects like these are introduced into the translation by the in-house editor?

In a recent contribution to the Italian daily *La Repubblica*, journalist Corrado Augias seems to rule out the idea. In a letter entitled “Quando il traduttore diventa traditore” (“When the translator becomes a traitor”), a reader of *La Repubblica* had criticized a bad translation. Augias replied:

You are right in being indignant at that translation, but do you know what it means? It means that no editor even had a quick look at the translator’s typescript before the text was printed; afterwards, not a single person cast a glance on the draft. I do know that translation is an obscure and badly paid job, and no-one ever quotes the translator’s name if translations are very good—as it often happens. I myself have been responsible for such omissions when recommending translated books. I am well aware of all this, but nothing can justify such a translation. It is not without nostalgia that I remember when, many years ago, a blunder was found in an Italian translation of Proust’s “La Recherche” by a well-known writer: the phrase “Hôtel particulier” had been translated as “peculiar hotel.” The event was widely discussed, and the few people who were keen on these things considered it to be a scandal. All in all, those were the days.⁷

It seems as if Augias puts all the blame on the translator, and possibly on the failure on the editor’s part to proofread the manuscript. The Italian journalist also seems to infer that the translating profession has somehow deteriorated over time (“bei tempi”), and calls on editors to read texts carefully in order to correct the blunders of translators. Augias’ indignation at the frequency of errors in that particular translation is absolutely legitimate: what the journalist seems to overlook is the fact that under certain circumstances, significant editing may also involve new mistakes.⁸

I will now show some examples of problems of editing taken from the Italian version of Noam Chomsky's book *The New Military Humanism—Lessons from Kosovo*⁹ which I translated last year. It should be noted that my analysis here is intended as a contribution to research on this issue, and is free of value judgement: it is not my intention to comment on the editor's competence or performance. Indeed, it is my belief that editors are important figures in the publishing sector and that they should proofread all the translated material. The editing phase might be considered as an indispensable stage in the translation process, which editors usually perform quite successfully. As Reliant (1995: 54) points out, potential problems lie in the fact that "ce deuxième passage, cette révision, me paraît une phase indispensable du processus de traduction, mais dont il faut fixer les limites."

In this case, some differences appeared between my own translation and the one that was finally published, including disappearance of parts of the original, maintained in my translation. For reasons of clarity, examples will be divided into three categories:

- Syntax
- Style
- Sense

3. The Italian Translation of Chomsky's *The New Military Humanism*: Problems of Editing

Before I start to discuss the editing of *Il nuovo umanitarismo militare*, I should like to say something about the choice of the title. In the first chapter that I had been asked to translate as a sample translation, I decided to render the phrase "new military humanism" as "nuovo umanesimo militare." "Umanesimo" and "umanitarismo" are in fact two possible Italian translations of the English word "humanism." The meaning of the two Italian words is of course different: "umanesimo" may be considered to correspond to the definitions (1) and (3) offered by the *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*¹⁰:

Humanism: [noun, 1832]; (1a) a devotion to humanities: literary culture; (b) the revival of classical letters, individualistic and critical spirit, and emphasis on secular concerns characteristic of the Renaissance

(2) humanitarianism

(3) a doctrine, attitude or way of life centered on human interests and values, *especially* a philosophy that usually rejects supernaturalism and stresses the individual's dignity and worth and capacity for self-realization through reason

The Italian term "umanitarismo" basically covers the meaning of definition (2).

There are two reasons why I preferred the Italian term "umanesimo." The first one is that Chomsky refers to this concept either as "New Humanism," a phrase he borrowed from German intellectual Ulrich Beck, or as "New Enlightenment." There is therefore a clear reference to the two philosophical movements—Humanism and Enlightenment—which, in the author's view, are in contrast with NATO's military rhetoric: in fact, the author might have chosen this title precisely to show that such rhetoric hinges on an oxymoron, "blending the warm-hearted with dealing death" (Herman, 1999). The second reason why I had preferred to translate "humanism" as "umanesimo" is that the revival of human rights and values in politics and science is

usually referred to as “nuovo umanesimo” in Italian: two authoritative sources are Fondazione Marino Golinelli, and political philosopher Danilo Zolo.¹¹ However, this problem was not discussed with the editor, who asked me to replace the term “umanesimo” with “umanitarismo.”

The editing process proper certainly had a number of merits. My own translation was no doubt imperfect: it certainly contained a few inaccuracies—stylistic and lexical—which the editor did improve on. No such thing as a perfect translation exists (as noted by Hermans & Lambert, 1998: 117, among others), and it is easy for translators to make mistakes when they are required to translate hundreds of pages in a short time. However, when I re-read the Italian published version, I realised that whereas my own mistakes had dutifully been corrected, more mistakes—including syntactic and semantic errors—had been introduced.

Regarding in-house editing, my contract contained a clause stating that:

The Publisher reserves the faculty to revise the translation and to introduce all changes that he considers necessary in order to improve on the correspondence with the spirit of the original work, as well as any adjustments that he judges necessary to make the work comprehensible to an Italian readership.¹²

This principle is acceptable, as it is reasonable for a publishing house to check on the work of translators whom they do not know professionally. However, it is important to ask whether editorial changes are really and consistently faithful to the source text and are intended “to make the work comprehensible to an Italian readership.”

I will now show one problematic example for each category of editorial intervention: syntax, style and sense.

On page 105 of the English original, Chomsky writes:

He [Chernomyrdin] warned of grim consequences if events proceed on the current course.

In translating this sentence into Italian, it is important to transform the phrase “of grim consequences” into the main clause, and to emphasise the idea of possibility by using the connective “qualora + subjunctive” in the conditional clause. My translation reads:

Cernomyrdin ha fatto notare che qualora gli eventi procedessero sul percorso attuale, si avrebbero conseguenze inquietanti.

In the edited version, in place of the subjunctive mode, we have the conditional mode; the conditional in the main clause has become an “imperfetto,” and the expression “percorso attuale” has been paraphrased:

Cernomyrdin ha fatto notare che qualora gli eventi *sarebbero* continuati *lungo un tale percorso*, ne *potevano* fuoriuscire conseguenze inquietanti.

The reasons for these changes are not clear, partly because the use of “qualora” with a conditional is syntactically wrong in Italian.

As far as stylistic problems are concerned, on page 10 of the English original, we read:

NATO tolerates Turkey’s ethnic cleansing and terror because it is their “paying ally,” Solzhenitsyn adds, confirming the judgment in the West about the “goodwill Turkey has built up over its actions in the Kosovo crisis” as it pays its dues once again, this time

joining in the “moralistic righteousness” of the rich and powerful over Turkish-style atrocities.

In this passage, Chomsky is suggesting that Turkey joined the Allies' intervention in Kosovo to show its own “goodwill”: according to Chomsky, Turkey behaves as a faithful “friend” of the US, which in turn helps Turkey with ethnic cleansing operations in Kurdistan.

My translation reads:

La NATO tollera la pulizia etnica e il terrore seminato dalla Turchia, in quanto questa è un suo “valido alleato,” aggiunge Solzenicyn, confermando la tesi diffusa in Occidente sulla “buona volontà che la Turchia ha dimostrato coi fatti nella crisi del Kosovo”: ancora una volta, infatti, la Turchia paga il suo tributo, in questo caso con l'adesione alla “moralistica rettitudine” dei ricchi e potenti nei confronti di atrocità in stile turco.

Despite the difficulty of Chomsky's prose, it is quite clear from this excerpt that it is Turkey that is joining the “rich and powerful” (i.e. the United States) in a particularly brutal bombing campaign of Yugoslavia. The phrase “Turkish-style atrocities” is a sarcastic phrase that Chomsky uses to show that there is no difference, in his views, between NATO's deeds and the atrocities that Turkey has performed in Kurdistan and elsewhere. To dispel doubts about the referent of this phrase, I chose to translate the expression literally (“atrocità in stile turco”), as any attempt at over-interpretation was likely to be treacherous.

This is the edited version:

La NATO tollera la pulizia etnica e il terrore seminato dalla Turchia, in quanto questa è un suo “valido alleato,” sostiene ancora Solzenicyn, confermando la tesi diffusa in Occidente sulla “buona volontà che Ankara ha dimostrato coi fatti nella crisi del Kosovo.” Ancora una volta, infatti, la Turchia *ha pagato i suoi debiti, in questo caso con l'adesione alla “moralistica rettitudine” dei ricchi e potenti nei confronti delle atrocità perpetuate nei confronti dei curdi.*

The phrase “Turkish-style atrocities” has been paraphrased in the Italian edited version, perhaps in an attempt to improve on the style: however, an Italian reader of the edited version would probably think that it is the US who joined Turkey in an effort to crush the Kurds. This may well be the case in Chomsky's views, but it does not correspond to the concept expressed in the original paragraph. In translating this passage, it is in fact crucial to understand—and make the reader understand—that Chomsky presents Turkey's participation in the 1999 bombing of Yugoslavia as an exchange of favours: the US has helped Turkey bomb the Kurds, so Turkey is helping the US bomb the Serbs. Furthermore, the repetition in the edited version of the phrase “nei confronti” (“con l'adesione alla ‘moralistica rettitudine’ dei ricchi e potenti *nei confronti* delle atrocità perpetuate *nei confronti* dei curdi”) makes the Italian text somewhat less than clear.

It should be noted that purely stylistic changes had an overall positive effect, if the basic criterion is the adaptation of the text to “an Italian readership,” as stated in the contract. As mentioned earlier, I had been asked to do this translation in a short time (about 2 months), and did not have enough time to brood over stylistic points. On several occasions, the editor did improve on the style, e.g., by changing the punctuation according to Italian conventions and by correcting mistakes that had escaped my

attention. It would therefore be wrong to infer that editing as such is a cause of new mistakes.

However, when the changes involve more than just style and the respect of Italian conventions, some problems may occur, e.g., semantic interference. On page 61 of the English original, we read:

The Human Rights Watch reports are cited in a comment in a footnote, observing that we cannot say that “the army is blameless when it comes to human rights abuses.”

My translation reads:

Le relazioni di Human Rights Watch sono citate in un commento inserito nelle note a piè di pagina, secondo cui non si può affermare che “l’esercito sia senza colpe quando si tratta di violazioni dei diritti umani.”

In the Italian edited version, the negation in “cannot” has disappeared: the phrase “non si può affermare” in my translation became “si può dire” in the edited version. As a consequence, the meaning of the Italian sentence is the opposite of the English:

Le relazioni di Human Rights Watch sono citate in un commento inserito nelle note a piè di pagina, dove si afferma che *si può dire* che “l’esercito sia senza colpe rispetto alle violazioni dei diritti umani”

Another problem worthy of analysis is the disappearance, in the edited version, of two passages in the original text, maintained in my translation.

The first example is on page 46 of the English original. The part that is absent from the edited version is in italics:

“there is a draft resolution in place” for Council approval of the [UN] police, but it cannot be enacted without U.S. authorization, and Clinton must still “give two weeks’ notice to Congress before it can approve the deployment of the U.N. Mission.” Unlike the War Powers Act, this directive must be observed. *At the time of writing, it is unclear whether notice has even been given, though the issue has been on the agenda for months as atrocities mounted, organized by the murderous military forces of the long-time ally of Washington/London.* The U.N. accord calling for a referendum and monitors was signed on May 5, twenty-three days before IPS reported that Clinton had still failed to give the required two-week notice to Congress.

My translation is:

“esiste già una bozza di risoluzione” per l’approvazione del contingente [ONU] da parte del Consiglio di sicurezza, ma non può essere discussa senza l’autorizzazione degli USA: oltre a ciò, Clinton deve ancora dare “una notifica di almeno due settimane al Congresso, prima che si possa approvare l’invio di una missione ONU.” Contrariamente al War Powers Act, questa direttiva dev’essere necessariamente osservata. *Mentre scriviamo, non si sa ancora se tale notifica sia stata data, benché il tema sia all’ordine del giorno da mesi e continuano ad aumentare le atrocità organizzate dalle sanguinarie milizie dell’alleato di vecchia data di Washington e Londra.* La delibera delle Nazioni Unite sul referendum e sull’invio degli osservatori è stata firmata il 5 maggio, ossia ventitré giorni prima che l’IPS riportasse la mancata notifica di due settimane da parte di Clinton al Congresso.

The reason why this passage is absent from the edited version remains unclear.

Another passage that is absent from the edited version is on page 153 of the English original:

Secretary of State George Shultz ... derided those who advocate “utopian, legalistic means like outside mediation, the United Nations, and the World Court, *while ignoring the power element of the equation.*” Clear and forthright, and by no means original.

My translation reads:

il segretario di Stato George Shultz ... ha deriso coloro che invocano “mezzi utopici e legalistici come mediazioni esterne, le Nazioni Unite e la Corte internazionale, *ignorando però l'elemento di potere dell'equazione.*” Chiaro ed esplicito, e niente affatto originale.

The part that is absent from the edited version is in italics. Shultz's reference to the “equation of power” is crucial in order to understand the Secretary of State's stance concerning the balance of power at the United Nations: however, this idea is lost in the edited version.

One last example concerns spelling. The word “Kurd” and its derivatives can be spelt either with a “K” (“kurdo”) or with a “C” (“curdo”) in Italian.¹³ In the edited version, “kurdo” and its derivatives were consistently replaced with “curdo,” which is perfectly correct in Italian. However, the same thing was done with words which were kept in English in the Italian text, e.g., “Turkish *Curdish* Opening” for “Turkish Kurdish Opening” and “Turkey's *Curdish* Question” for “Turkey's Kurdish Question” on page 17 and 83 of the Italian edited version.

It would be unreasonable of translators to expect editors to be infallible, and this paper should not be interpreted as an accusation against editing or editors: rather, my argument is that a number of mistakes may be avoided if editor and translator cooperated. There are basically two issues at stake: authorship and responsibility, and the two are connected.

4. Conclusions and perspectives

In the light of this analysis, one may wonder whether commentators like Corrado Augias, who are rightly indignant at bad translations, may end up blaming the translator for errors that she is not responsible for. A publisher might argue that, once submitted to a publishing house, a translated text belongs to the publisher, especially if he pays for it.¹⁴ He may argue further that in-house staff will be free to change the translation as they deem necessary, if this is what the contract establishes. However, if a publishing house reserves the right to change the translation at will, is it fair that the translator's name should appear on the cover?

The best answer is probably that the translator's name should definitely appear on the cover, but publishers should also mention whether the text reflects purely the translator's work, or has undergone significant editing. This is especially important if parts of the original, maintained in the translation, do not appear in the published work. For such a change in editorial policies to be implemented on a large scale, translators should wake up to the fact that their role in publishing houses is often grossly underestimated, and that it is up to us to take action. We should equally become aware of the fact that we have the right to ask for better working conditions and recognition of our professional status. Trade unions and associations certainly have helped us be recognised as professionals, especially in the technical domain.¹⁵ However, there is still much to be done to improve the condition of translators who

work for publishing houses. In most cases, we have already achieved the right to have our names printed on the cover of books: now we should probably ask for clearer laws concerning our rights to fair remuneration and authorship.¹⁶ At the moment, these issues are usually left to the goodwill of individual publishers (Megale, 1994: 287), but in the future, copyright laws should take translators' authorship into more account. Translators should be given a real possibility to see their work before it is printed, without being effectively obliged to accept the publisher's version. This obligation should be reflected in model contracts (of the type proposed by Claxton, 1977 for Canada, and by Astley, 1977 for Great Britain) that all publishers should conform to: following this reform, not only would literary translators be legally recognised as professionals, but the quality of translated works would no doubt improve.

NOTES

1. Astley criticises the poor quality of translation contracts, and states that "a translator ... should get continuing interest in the success of his work" (Astley, 1977: 222), i.e., claim copyright over his/ her work by means of better contracts. Megale concentrates on a similar issue, arguing that "the reform of translation contracts would entail no obligation on the publisher's part. Indeed, it would fully protect the publisher's freedom to draw up different contracts for each individual case" ("la riforma del contratto di traduzione non avrebbe nulla di obbligatorio per l'editore e salvaguarderebbe inoltre pienamente la sua libertà di stipulare contratti diversi a seconda dei singoli casi." Megale, 1994: 287).
2. Claxton calls for a model contract for translators to obtain more bargaining power, and to stop "often flagrant editorial interference" (Claxton, 1977: 227).
3. "gli indirizzi che si seguono sono praticamente due: di un testo viene fatta fare la traduzione letterale che serve di base, la quale è poi rivista o riscritta, a seconda della specificità e del suo stato, o all'interno della redazione o all'esterno da un esperto. E questa è una strada. L'altra invece consiste nell'affidare subito il testo a un traduttore, con il quale si ha un rapporto fiduciario, in grado di consegnare una traduzione sicura che potrebbe andare difilato in composizione" (Pautasso, 1994: 58)
4. Pautasso also denounces the fact that professional translators in the publishing sector have to face competition by non-professionals. Pautasso lists "wealthy ladies who have much time to spare, retired people who want to supplement their pension, grandchildren of VIPs, people with a degree in foreign languages or interpreting" ("signore che non sanno come riempire il tempo, pensionati per arrotondare, nipotini di personalità, laureati e diplomati in lingue e in interpretariato." Pautasso, 1994: 58).
5. "lavorano spesso in condizioni disagiate, con tempi strettissimi che impediscono una accurata revisione" (Pautasso 1994: 59)
6. "invenzioni, aggiunte e ... tagli, in seguito ai quali magari il discorso fila lo stesso, ma è un'altra cosa rispetto all'originale" (Pautasso, 1994: 59).
7. My translation. The original reads: "Sa che cosa vuol dire la traduzione che l'ha giustamente indignata? Vuol dire che il testo è andato in tipografia senza che nessun "editor" abbia nemmeno sfiorato con lo sguardo il dattiloscritto; che, in seguito, nessun responsabile ha nemmeno sbirciato le bozze. So benissimo che il lavoro dei traduttori è oscuro e mal pagato, che nessuno cita mai il loro nome quando le traduzioni sono ottime come non di rado capita. Io stesso mi rendo colpevole di queste omissioni quando segnalo qualche libro tradotto. So tutto questo ma niente giustifica una traduzione come quella. Ricordo con nostalgia che parecchi anni fa nella traduzione della "Recherche" proustiana fatta da una nota scrittrice, compariva la "perla" di un Hôtel particulier tradotto "albergo particolare." Se ne parlò a lungo e nel piccolo mondo che s'appassiona a queste cose fu considerato uno scandalo. Tutto sommato bei tempi." (Augias, 2000).
8. The best strategy to avoid this is probably co-operation between translators and editors. However, market pressures to perform translation and editing as quickly as possible and at the lowest possible cost often make it difficult for in-house staff to work side by side with free-lance translators. The problem of editorial interference has been raised by Claxton, 1977 and Scarpa, 1992. Noël, in particular, draws a very grim picture of the profession in the literary field, and defines the literary

translator as “un éternel exploité,” because of the difficulties in the relationship with publishing houses. According to Noël, a publisher “se veut agent de la Culture (avec un grand C) ... mais son but premier consiste à vendre ses livres et à faire des bénéfices” (Noël, 1977: 216-217). Undoubtedly, if a translation is essentially seen as “merchandise,” problems of accuracy and faithfulness to the source text may well succumb to extrinsic pressures.

9. Henceforth, I will refer to the Italian translation as *Il nuovo umanitarismo militare*, and to the English text as “the English original.”
10. Electronic Edition 1.00, 1994-5.
11. Conference “Le scienze della vita e il nuovo umanesimo: il linguaggio, l’informazione e la responsabilità,” held by Fondazione Marino Golinelli and the University of Bologna, 18/ 20 May 2000, Bologna, Italy. Zolo (2000: 72), discusses Ulrich Beck’s views about “umanesimo militare.”
12. My translation. The original reads: “L’Editore si riserva la facoltà di rivedere la traduzione e di apportarvi tutte le variazioni che riterrà necessarie per migliorarne l’aderenza allo spirito dell’opera originale o per eventuali adattamenti giudicati necessari per rendere l’opera comprensibile al pubblico italiano.”
13. The standard usage, as shown in the Zanichelli-Zingarelli 2001 Italian monolingual dictionary, is with a “C,” as the letter “K” is not included in the Italian alphabet. However, Italian political texts about Kurdistan sometimes use the spelling “kurdo,” assuming that the word derives from the Kurdish language.
14. The problem of irregular payments has been raised by Choi & Lim (2000: 385-386) and Noël (1977: 215), who writes: “À la question: ‘Dans votre pays, les traducteurs littéraires peuvent-ils, en règle générale, vivre décemment de leur seule activité de traducteur?’ les Associations de la FIT [Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs] interrogés ... ont toutes répondu NON, à l’exception de la Pologne.”
15. According to Pautasso, however, these problems will not be solved by founding a Register of Translators: “I do not believe that we need state-planned solutions like professional registers ... because the relationship between translators and publishers is based on mutual trust and is disciplined by a contract similar to that of authors. As a consequence, the only thing that counts is your own *bar-gaining strength* [my italics] which derives from the quality of your own work, not from your belonging to a guild” (“non credo servano provvedimenti dirigitici come la costituzione di albi professionali ... perché il rapporto tra traduttore ed editore è reciprocamente fiduciario ed è regolato da un contratto assimilabile a quello dell’autore. Di conseguenza, l’unica cosa che conta è la forza contrattuale che deriva dalla qualità del proprio lavoro e non dall’appartenenza a una corporazione.” Pautasso, 1994: 59-60).
16. As Fabiani notes, “the Italian copyright law ... takes translation into consideration and caters for its protection as work of the intellect” ... “it goes without saying that the moral rights stay with the translator, who can therefore oppose any modification, deformation or any other act which might prove detrimental to the translation, or prejudicial to the honour or reputation of the author” (“la nostra legge sul diritto d’autore ... qualifica la traduzione ai fini della sua tutela come opera d’ingegno” ... “va da sé che il diritto morale rimane riservato al traduttore, per cui egli può opporsi ad ogni modificazione, deformazione o ogni altro atto a danno della traduzione che possano essere di pregiudizio all’onore o alla reputazione dell’autore.” Fabiani, 1994: 292 & 295). However, these principles are not always easy to assert in practice, and at least some publishers are ready to react as soon as translators raise the question of their professional rights: “les éditeurs” according to Noël “n’aient pas, mais alors pas du tout, voir ternir leur image de marque ... nous sommes bien placés à l’ATLF [Association des Traducteurs Littéraires de France] pour savoir l’inquiétude que suscite chez eux la moindre initiative dans ce sens!” (Noël, 1977: 218).

REFERENCES

- ASTLEY, G. (1977): “Copyright as affecting the literary translator” in *Actes du VIII^e Congrès mondial de la Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs (FIT)*. Montréal: The Canadian Translators and Interpreters Council. 221-224.
- AUGIAS, C. (2000): “Quando il traduttore diventa traditore,” *La Repubblica*, 14 febbraio 2001.
- CHOI, J. and H.O. LIM (2000): “An Overview of the Korean Translation Market,” in *Meta* XLV, 2: 383-392.

- CLAXTON, P. (1977): "A model contract for literary translators" in *Actes du VIII^e Congrès mondial de la Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs (FIT)*. Montréal: The Canadian Translators and Interpreters Council. 224-229
- FABIANI, M. (1994): "La protezione giuridica della traduzione," in *Atti della Fiera internazionale di Traduzione II*. Bologna: Clueb. 293-296.
- HATIM, B. and I. MASON (1997): *The Translator as Communicator*, London: Routledge.
- HERMAN, E. (1999): "Kosovo and Doublespeak"
<http://www.zoran.net/afp/text/zmag/kosovo_and_doublespeak.htm>.
- HERMANS, J. and J. LAMBERT (1998): "From Translation Markets to Language Management: The Implications of Translation Services," in *Target X*, 1: 113-132.
- MEGALE, F. (1994): "Alcune novità in tema di rapporti contrattuali fra editori e traduttori" in *Atti della Fiera internazionale di Traduzione II*. Bologna: Clueb. 287-292.
- NOËL, C. (1977): "La traduction littéraire: une profession à part entière?" in *Actes du VIII^e Congrès mondial de la Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs (FIT)*. Montréal: The Canadian Translators and Interpreters Council. 213-220.
- PAUTASSO, S. (1994): "Tradurre: tra prassi editoriale e formazione didattica," in *Atti della Fiera internazionale di Traduzione II*. Bologna: Clueb. 57-61.
- RELIANT, M. (1995): "Notes sur la révision," *Traduire* 3/ 1995: 52-55.
- SCARPA, F. (1992): "Traduzione specializzata e revisione: osservazioni sulla non-anglicizzazione di un testo geografico tradotto dall'inglese all'italiano" in *Rivista internazionale di tecnica della traduzione*, Numero zero: 79-86.
- ZELLER, B. (2000): "On Translation and Authorship," in *Meta XLV*, 1: 134-139.
- ZOLO, D. (2000): *Chi dice umanità. Guerra, diritto e ordine globale*. Torino: Einaudi.