Peeter Torop for Italian science of translation[1]

Bruno Osimo[2]

This is not a research paper: it is an abridged version of my preface to Torop's *La traduzione totale* (2010). In my intention, the presence or absence in it of subjects, explications, considerations may be a window on the Italian reception of Torop's work.

Inner speech

In the 1930s Lev Vygotsky explained that the inner language we use to think and to formulate the verbal text is a nonverbal code. This simple fact gives much food for thought regarding the translation process, as it becomes very probable that the three types of translation proposed by Jakobson (intralingual, interlingual, intersemiotic, 1959) are actually intended, among other things, as different facets of the same, only apparently interlingual, process. In "translation proper" intersemiotic processes occur both during the prototext deverbalization when it is perceived (Vygotsky's "volatilization into thought"; Vygotskij 1990: 347) and translated into mental awareness by the translator, as well as during the metatext reverbalization with which words, phrases, and texts are synthesized from the mental magma.

Although the study of Peirce was not widespread in the Tartu School before the 1990s, local semiotics tending to rely more on Morris (1946) and Lotman (semiotics of culture), we still realize when considering the notion of 'interpretant' that it is made of the same nonverbal material as inner speech. Following this path, the sign-interpretant-object triad may be accompanied by the prototext-translatant-metatext triad, where by 'metatext' we mean the translated text and by "translatant" we mean the Peircean 'translatant' (Gorlée

---

[1]   This text is an abridged version of Osimo 2010.

[2]   *Author's address:* ISIT Milano Lingue – Fondazione Milano; via Alex Visconti 18 20151 Milano, Italy; e-mail: osimo@trad.it

1994); translatant meant not as a "word of the metatext which is a translation of a word of the prototext", but as an idea formed in the translator's mind to act as intermediary between the original and the translated text.

Adding a 'mental' passage to the classical simplistic translation process diagram – and a consequent intersemiotic decoding-coding operation from discrete to continuous and back – has obvious important consequences, so that Torop excludes the possibility of a lossless reverse translation (re-translation into the language of the original), and explicitly defines translation as evolution of meaning, not as equivalence:

> the text is a process that takes place between the consciousness of those who created it and the consciousness of the recipient; in other words, the beginning and the end of this process are hidden in human psyche. The birth of the text can be seen as a gradual transition from oral speech to written speech, so in the different stages of this process, we can see the correlation between inner speech and expressive speech (Zhinkin 1964: 36–38). During text generation you have a sense of unity of beginning and end, and also the difficulties associated with assessing this unity. (Torop 2010: 115)[3]

Inner language, as "machine code" of the brain, has a dual function: it is the language in which thoughts are expressed, but also the raw material used to manufacture the "application programs" that run the operations of verbalization/deverbalization. Inner language is the metalanguage of intermediation between the (original) verbal text and the (translated) verbal text; it is the code that allows translation with its interlingual, intralingual, and intersemiotic components. Conceptually related to this metalanguage there is also the disciplinary metalanguage of the science of translation, a most serious and most urgent problem Torop has his own view on.

Metalanguage and method

Semiotics of culture has begun to use the notion of 'translation' in an abstract, metaphorical sense, for reasons internal to semiotics itself – as in the case of Peirce who used it to explain semiosis (""meaning," which is, in its primary acceptation, the translation of a sign into another system of signs" (CP 4.127); "it is no other than the very proposition of which it is the meaning: it is a

---

3   All quotes from Torop 2010 are translated into English by me – B. O.

translation of it. But of the myriads of forms into which a proposition may be translated, what is that one which is to be called its very meaning?" (CP 5.427); "Thought must live and grow in new and higher incessant translations, or it proves itself not to be genuine thought" (CP 5.594)) or in Lotman's case who used it to explain the semiosphere (Lotman 2000: 265) – but this metaphorical use is likely to have ended up having implications on the inner debate within translation science.

Torop speaks of "consciousness of the lack of a comprehensive methodology, of univocity of disciplinary self-awareness" (2010: 5) as an essential first step in addressing any question relating to translation. Each school has developed its own "dialect", not always consisting of exact terms, most often consisting of generic words which are not defined with precision, and the attempt to communicate between the various schools clashes with their mutual (in)comprehension: *a translation problem of the translation metalanguage*!

> On the one hand, the abundance of metalanguages hinders mutual understanding within a single scientific discipline. On the other hand, the over-exploitation of one-two metalanguages into which the results of all analyses are translated, and this very translation into semiotic metalanguage, create the illusion of gaining knowledge, bringing a semblance of scientificity to trivial results, too. (Torop 2010: 6)

After the analysis of conceptual fragmentation, a sharp line should be drawn between the period in which impressionistic words were used and the scientific phase in which exact terms are used.

> One possibility is to re-translate, so to speak, from the metalanguage into an object language, to get out in this way from a self-referential metalinguistic system. (Torop 2010: 7)

Translation of culture and semiotics of culture

In Europe, Peirce's influence was minimal, or at least indirect, in the 20th century. We also have direct evidence that Peirce was little known in Poland:

> Peirce is not well known in my country. My teachers [...] never lectured on his philosophy. Also I do not recall ever seeing a mention of Peirce in works [...] For that matter none of the other logicians of the first half of this century and philosophers of language from the Polish school of logic [...] ever mentioned him

> [...] in the post-war years, Peirce continued to be largely unknown in Poland. (Pelc 1990: 13)

In fact, in "Within thinking worlds" Lotman (2000: 149–390) mentions Saussure but does not mention Peirce, he even refers to the abused signifier-signified dyad, of which he by the way has very little need: it is a dualism in stark contrast with the theory of "bilingual translation filters" he explains in the semiosphere, that instead blends very well with Peircean triadic logic. Based on this, the sign produced by a culture is interpreted by a bilingual filter and sent to an object belonging to a different culture.

In Torop's book, culture is also seen as a pre-translation. Each text (in the broadest semiotic sense: every object, every phenomenon) is perceived by a culture different from the one that produced it, and this (filtered) perception is itself an *a priori* translation. Since each of us belongs to collective and individual cultures, to each of us there are as many pre-translations as there are cultures we feel we belong to:

> Each book can be read, every movie can be seen and each symphony can be played freely, and this freedom of perception (which reaches arbitrary interpretation) is a fact of any culture. But there is also culture as education, memory and perception by the reader of each new text, depending on the cultural experience of the perceiver, so that in a sense any text that ends up in the hands of a reader has already been read; in other words, it is immediately conventionalized. (Torop 2010: 70)

This phenomenon is fundamental also to the study of interlingual verbal translation. It means that the translator, even before she has written the first word of her translation, has pre-translated the text in her own mind (in her own culture). It is easy to imagine what may be the consequences of this imprinting of the text on the translator for the final product that according to someone should be "objective" or "equivalent".

Although some researchers in the humanities twist their nose at the views "too technical for them", the contribution of the mathematical theory of communication (Shannon, Weaver 1949) is invaluable. The notion of 'residue' or loss is the cornerstone of the Toropian view of translation. In terms of semiotics of culture, if by 'culture' we mean an area within which the same things are taken for granted ("the role assigned to the unsaid in communication

is called culture"; Osimo 2002: 35), the relationship between explicit and implicit is essential:

> But in the ontological characterization of the prototext, from the perspective of translatability we should distinguish the characteristics of the relationship between explicit and implicit. The translator, in principle, can not express the syncretism of the author. The metatext, by definition, is a more rationalized text than the prototext, the author's intuition becomes knowledge (or misunderstanding) of the translator, the implied properties of the text often have to be explained. The metatext therefore not only renders the prototext, but it also lays bare the structure, exposes it, shows it. (Torop 2010: 63)

It is a concept similar to that expressed by Leopardi in the *Zibaldone* when he says: "And certainly every major beauty in the arts and writing – comes from nature and not by affection or research. Now the translator necessarily affects in that he strives to express the character and style of others, and to repeat the words of another in the manner and taste of the same" (Leopardi 2004: 319–320). This oxymoron called "translator" must accomplish a rational analysis, processing and synthesis, and in synthesis she must strive to appear spontaneous, natural, casual. The translator is the one who poses in pictures, is never taken by surprise by the lens, but woe to her if you see that her smile is fake, that she is embracing those around her but does not really care for them or, conversely, who is indifferent side by side with someone and it does not transpire that she is in love with him.

In the never vanished debate between homologating and alienating translation, between smooth and readable translation and translation as a magnifying glass on a different culture, Torop takes a clear stance in favour of the latter:

> I consider one of the missions of translation (ideally) the fight against cultural neutralization, levelling, leading in the various societies, on the one hand, to indifference towards the "cues" of man or of the text (especially in multiethnic states), on the other, the fight against neutralization helps searching for national identity and cultural roots. (Torop 2010: 64)

This view is similar to that expressed by Lotman in *Semiosphere* (1984), according to which the membrane (the organic metaphor is that of culture-cells) that acts as a filter between the different cultures passes information that, at the same time, if it increases the entropy within the individual cultures

through the placing of 'other' items, lays the groundwork for the subsequent decrease in entropy due to the greater global dissemination of particular cultures recognizable as such. In Lotmanian terms, therefore, the smooth translation strategy is appropriation of other cultures, while the alienating translation strategy is the inclusion of the culture of others (in part) in one's own. In the beginning, the other element is incorporated in one's own culture but it is not yet semiotized, not understood, as when one eats a ball of polystyrene that the body is unable to digest or assimilate: there are no suitable "receptors". Then the principle of redundancy takes over, however: information redundancy can also decode information encoded in an unknown way, provided that there is some replication of the stimuli such that the receiver can reconstruct the value of the missing information in an indirect way:

> This is also confirmed by the daily language practice. We read (and understand) foreign newspapers and magazines, even when we do not understand a word. In about the same way we read telegrams, whose letter combinations are sometimes quite arbitrary. The human is able to translate these messages into an understandable language. As long as there is the possibility of such a translation and interpretation, communication is possible. In short, the communication process depends on the ability to control language, on the translatability of a verbal or figurative message through the meaning and reason of man. And of course the opening of the communication is possible only up to a certain extent, different in different individuals. On this basis, communication into the framework of a certain culture or between cultures is also a pedagogical problem, since the opening forces the person to orient herself, to be active and to evolve.[4]

Without being rhetorical, how a culture is presented to other cultures depends on the translator (in a broad, semiotic, sense, as any mediator from any culture into any other culture) and her necessary mistranslation. Into this context of the enlargement of the semiotic concept of 'translation' Torop fits the concept of 'metatextual translation' or perception of a text from another culture by indirect means, not perceiving the text itself but its detectable echoes, reflections, cross-references, notes, appendices. 'Metatext' in this sense – a term coined by Anton Popovič – refers to any reflection of a text except the text itself, any "translation" with the exception of the "original":

---

[4]   Miller, Mitchell, Montgomery, in Torop 2010: 161.

metatextual translation indicates the penetration of the prototext into another culture in the form of any metacommunicative tool: author entries in encyclopaedias, manuals, reviews for the translation, publicity, radio broadcasts, publications and citations and so on. Taken together, these metatexts shape the image of the prototext and become a complementary preventive reading, or re-reading. (Torop 2010: 11)

Those layers of the translated text that many despise and some even deplore[5] are considered key elements in intercultural communication by Torop:

The metatext is a cultural phenomenon as the prototext and, in principle, one can say that any version is a translation from one culture into another. In fact language, the text and the text function are different reflections of a same culture. Therefore, from the standpoint of total translation, it is more appropriate to speak of 'translatability of culture'. 'Translatability of culture' is a complementary concept that includes a number of different parameters. (Torop 2010: 62)

Sometimes it is the mere possibility of accessing information about other cultures that triggers intellectual pleasure. So the least embellished translation gives the most pleasure.

The functioning of translation in culture does not always depend on the quality of language, and a translation with low quality standards from the stylistic point of view can be very valuable on a cultural level. (Torop 2010: 61)

Far from justifying those who translate in a sloppy way, this gratifies the translator who has bothered to present a culture outside her own one, striving for the greatest possible care to detail.

Translatability, loss, metatext

Fortunately, there is no longer anyone who wonders abstractly about the possibility and impossibility of translation. Pragmatically it is noted that translations do exist and that therefore the problem of translatability is to be

---

[5]   For example Eco (2003: 95): "There are losses that could be called absolute. There are cases where it is not possible to translate, and if such cases are involved, say, during a novel, the translator uses the last resort, to put a footnote on page – and the footnote on page ratifies her defeat".

seen in relative, not absolute terms, as practical and not theoretical. The problem exists even at the subjective level, for reasons inherent in the very process of understanding, which is not universal:

> The overall concept for each individual person is the designatum 'stone'. And finally, there is a concrete stone with a certain size and shape, with its concrete meaning to the observer, which is the denotatum stone. So thinking of the stone means establishing interrelationships between a sign (the word), designatum (concept) and denotatum (single stone). From a logical point of view they are three aspects of a whole. (Torop 2010: 161)

Strange as it may seem, although there is no more anyone who claims absolute translatability, there are no theories except Torop's that take into account relative untranslatability and provide strategies for comparison; in this, Torop's total translation stands out. Following this vision of the translation process, thinking in simplistic terms with excessive enthusiasm for a given version or railing against another one becomes impossible. Of all versions you tend to see how much of the source culture has been translated and what is left to some extent in terms of its inevitable loss:

> In principle from all approaches follows an indeterminacy of translation, namely the inability to precisely define the meaning of a word, the impossibility of complete univocality both within a single language, and between different languages. Consequently, there cannot be even a universal definition of 'translatability', there can be only types or levels of translatability. (Torop 2010: 61)

You can easily recognize the echo of Quine's (1960) teachings. Widening the spectrum of observation allows us not only to consider the rendering of a verbal text translation, but also to take into account all clues about the text scattered in a given target culture; like it or not, translating basically means explaining. And from the practical point of view it is very rare, if not impossible, that you get an idea of a certain text directly from the text itself, and not through a series of what Torop, with Popovič, calls 'metatexts':

> In the process of making explicit the hidden properties of the text, whose explicitness is essential to the translator or metatext reader, the potential of the book can be exploited: translatability, and the existence of the translated book as an object, are complementary phenomena. Therefore, the bulk of prototext is translated into the metatext, but some parts or aspects can be "translated" into the commentary, glossary, in the preface, illustrations (pictures, maps) and so on. In

my opinion, in such a complementarity you cannot see incompleteness in the metatext: simply, for the reader of the prototext and the reader of the metatext the boundary between textual and extratextual is not the same. (Torop 2010: 64)

This lack of coincidence between textual and extratextual rendering – between the translated text in the text, and elements of the text rendered in a paratextual apparatus, or otherwise physically separated, such as advertising, encyclopaedia entries, reviews, news – does not concern only total translation strategies: it is a universal constant. In any translation, the author decides – whether consciously or not – to explain this or that element the prototext, in some cases he is forced by purely linguistic reasons to explain a given element: "Languages differ essentially in what they must convey and not in what they can convey. [...] Naturally the attention of native speakers and listeners will be constantly focused on such items as are compulsory in their verbal code" (Jakobson 1959: 264, 265). The issues to be clarified and those that can be taken for granted seem obvious to each individual. This is what creates apparent problems in the revision phase when the obviousness of the translator clashes with the editor's:

> The problem of the translatability of one's own works is implicitly solved by each author or each textual current. It is the prototext itself that dictates the conditions of its optimal translation and the translator and editor of the book have only to consider explicit evidence and to explicate implicit evidence. (Torop 2010: 83)

Perhaps one could notice that Torop extends Kantian theory of synthetic *a priori* judgment to the reception of the text. Such a view of translatability also covers the notion of intersemiotic translation, for example the attempt to express in words what happens in nonverbal art forms:

> Man uses language in relation to all types of art, which, of course, says nothing about their translatability into natural language. Any kind of art has its own means of expression, its own language, and an attempt to relate these to natural languages would be an oversimplification. Does it make sense to think that analogues of phonemes, morphemes, words, sentences in film, painting, dance or music can be productive? The language of all art articulates itself in its own way, its elements may be completely different. Natural language, however, can be used to describe them (metalanguage). (Torop 2010: 164–165)

The comfortable but unscientific notion of 'equivalent' is unusable here too; the dialectic between an individual text and an individual interpreter of that

text has to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. We will have as many versions as there are interpreters, each of whom will decide to focus on a given dominant and to sacrifice a certain characteristic of the prototext to render the other ones:

> Lossless translation does not exist. Therefore, at the base of translation activity is the "choice of the element you consider most important in the translated text" (Bryusov 1975: 106) that is an objective analysis of the text that locates the dominant as the peak of the hierarchical structure around which the text finds its unity. (Torop 2010: 99)

There is a direct link between the concept of 'translatability' and the concept of 'dominant'. Each interpreter chooses her own translation strategy (or decoding and recoding strategy) dictated by her own criteria for translatability (or comprehensibility), and this strategy aims at maintaining a dominant over all others:

> You can distinguish between: translatability as a cultural-linguistic and poetic characteristic of the text, translatability of the perceptual or conceptual unity of the text, translatability as predictability of the reception of the text in a given culture. All these different aspects can be considered different dominants, only partially compatible, of the translation activity. (Torop 2010: 71)

This view of translatability as a culture, and therefore dependent on subjective culture, but also on collective cultures of the groups to which the individual belongs, introduces us to the next paragraph.

Dominant

The first scholar to apply Ukhtomsky's psychological notion of 'dominant' to the text was Jakobson in 1935. The application of this notion to translation occurred with Popovič in 1975, and then in Torop 2010. Who has to interpret and choose the dominant? There is no prescriptive answer to this question. There are three poles of signification and communication, and there are three possible origins for the localization of the dominant: source culture, translating culture, receiving culture.

> In the translation process the dominant, as a basis for the conceptuality of the translation activity, may be in the prototext, in the translator or in the receiving culture. In the first case, it is up to the prototext to dictate its own optimal translatability. In the second case the translator as a creative personality realizes herself through the choice of her translation method, and the method indicates the definition of the degree of translatability. In the third case the translator bases herself on the potential reader of the metatext or on cultural (social, political) norms; in other words, she defines the degree of translatability based on the conditions of perception. (Torop 2010: 71)

According to this distinction, translatability is located in the space among these three poles, three cultures. The choice of the dominant implies the preventive choice of loss. In a sense, the choice of the dominant may depend on the choice of loss: choosing in favour of something means choosing to the detriment of something else:

> Locating the element/s which, if necessary, must be sacrificed without affecting too much of the text integrity is, of course, as much important. (Torop 2010: 79)

Integrity which, actually, is one of the many possible integrities, depends on the mediator's strategic choices. Within the notion of 'dominant', it is important to understand that Torop uses the expression 'keyword' in a way very different from the most used one, at least in Italy. We usually think that those words are particularly relevant to the notion they semantically express. But some words are not semantically very meaningful in the context while they are meaningful as intratextual or intertextual links ('bridge words'); the so-called 'expressive fields', typical of an author's macrostyle (for example, the European Commission's jargon); realia, referring to the source culture; deictics, recreating a particular network of individual psychological relationships between text elements; syntactical stylemes, recurring constructs characterizing or marking a given expressive mode (Osimo 2004). The following quote explicitly refers to poetry, but applies to any kind of text:

> In poetry translation, of particular importance is the preservation of the recognisability of keywords, symbols, images, motives, technical tools through which interrelations are set not only among individual poems of a given cycle, an anthology or the whole work of a poet, but also among poems of various members of the same current (in the case of inner unity or conceptuality within it). (Torop 2010: 92)

In Italy, we are used to distinguishing between observations applicable to literary and poetic texts only, and general observations about texts; however, observations about a text often apply to any kind of text, because there are no texts totally immune from connotation, affect, emotion. Which brings us back to the keyword of the book, and its title.

Total translation

'Total translation' was first used by John R. Firth in "Linguistic analysis and translation" (1956); ten years later it was referred to by J. C. Catford with a different intent: Catford in 1965 realized what Cicero had written some two thousand years before. Torop uses it in a completely different way. If viewed from a narrowly terminological point of view, Torop's point is to put an end to translation schools meant as self-referential centres producing material not compatible with papers written elsewhere because it is formulated in an idiosyncratic (untranslatable) way. Hence Torop's invitation to use a scientific descriptive language, with terminologically precise definitions and absence of synonyms and extended semantic fields within the metalanguage:

> Recognizing translation as a total process implies – if we want to find a place to such a totality within translation science – also the need for a scientific description of such a process. (Torop 2010: 9)

Moreover, in this view (following Popovič and the Czechoslovak semiotic school for text analysis) the interlingual translation process is assimilated to a variety of other phenomena having a prototext and a metatext and characterized by a transformation process, i.e. a variant and an invariant component. This is for example the case of the edition. Being an editor of a non-translated book means selecting what has to and what should not be published, deciding how it is to be published, and sometimes even when and why: the editor takes a series of choices and offers the readers a book that has, as compared to the 'original', an invariant and a variant component:

> Translation and edition are equivalent processes and, for example, an edition of Blok in one volume can give the contemporary Russian reader a view of symbolism as incomplete as a translated anthology to an English-speaking reader. (Torop 2010: 83)

In this example, the Russian edition in one volume of Aleksandr Blok's poems gives the Russian-reading reader a partial and distorted idea of Russian symbolism, as much as it could happen to an English-reading reader with a similar translated edition. Translation loss is present in any work of cultural mediation, and the notion of 'translation process' is extended by Torop to all types of imaginable cultural mediation.

> To me the notion of 'total translation' is essential, which implies, first of all, the quantitative enlargement of problems and phenomena endorsed by translation science. Total translation, on the other hand, symbolizes the search for a comprehensive method, the attempts to methodologically translate the experience of different sciences into a single interdiscipline. (Torop 2010: 8)

This interdiscipline, according to Torop, must use semiotic terminology. Semiotics, as a general science of signification, is certainly the fittest. Even because within general semiotics the notion of 'translation' is often used to discuss questions not dealing directly with interlingual translation:

> Difficulties in semiotics, a discipline characterized by greater uniformity and terminological stability, arise from the fact that, using semiotic methods and semiotic metalanguage, the subject of debate is greatly enlarged. (Torop 2010: 6)

Such enlargement is coherent with Torop's intention to investigate translation, a subject that in Italy has been considered unscientific both in practice and in theory, scientifically. There are still many Italian scholars refusing to view translation studies as a scientific discipline, maybe because they fear that, by doing so, the expectations on published papers would be too great. But such a development is inescapable: a researcher is such only if she meets the quality demands of the international academic background.

Translation criticism

Translation criticism is not literary criticism or text criticism applied to translation; it means writing essays whose subject is *the way a text was translated, translation strategy and its results and quality*. It is seldom applied in Italy, also because the notion of 'translation-aimed analysis', complementary to translation criticism, is not well known:

> In works about translation you still feel the inertia of the old polemics between 'linguists' and 'literati'; there are few works dealing with general problems of translation, its method. Until the general bases for translation analysis are not set, a critic does not know what to found himself on. Ultimately, criticism is completely absent, or textual and verbal analysis substitute translation analysis. (Torop 2010: 32)

In most cases, translation criticism is carried out on the metatext alone. In this way, the original is reconstructed by inferences, and mistranslations and good quality of the prototext are considered based not on the comparison of the two texts, but on the translated text only. Sometimes publishers dismiss translations that, according to such a hasty criticism, are 'nasty', but they don't care about the 'nastiness' of the original:

> Understanding the final text implies, if not understanding such channels, at least knowing about their existence, and in this case the final text becomes an architext to the scholar, i.e., a hypothetical text created on the basis of the semantic invariant of the metatexts referring back to a missing (or unidentified or unknown) prototext. (Torop 2010: 116)

On the other hand, precisely the culturological and semiotic view of translation suggests that it is impossible to set a single version as the Right and Perfect version: such a view would look more like a totalitarian than total translation. The comparison between the two texts is not to see if a version is the "right one", but to reconstruct the translation strategy and its consistency. Within a given logic, anyone (as a reader, or as a theoretician) can feel more or less consonant with the translator, which does not prevent him from appreciating a methodologically correct setting:

> The analysis of the translation process and the comparative analysis of prototext and metatext are indispensable both to locate the different typological possibilities in translation activity and to scientifically ascertain that there is no absolute or ideal translation, that on the basis of a single prototext it is possible to create a series of different metatexts of potentially equal value. (Torop 2010: 79)

If such principles were known to Italian editors and project managers, translation quality would improve. The subjective component of translation is inescapable. Translation work, as Lûdskanov (2008) shows, is creative by definition. Any *a posteriori* intervention not accounting for individual principles

guiding such a work is necessarily doomed to be a rape of the text. And accounting for these principles means asking the translator herself, allowing her to metatextually explicitly say what she textually implicitly means. Any other attempt at reconstructing the translator's strategy is doomed to misinterpret her intentions:

> By 'character's expressive aura' I mean that set of characteristics that constantly accompany him in the text, the lexical field defining the character's unity of perception. Strangely enough, in new, reviewed editions of old translations such a unity may be disrupted; in other words, the editor's psychology is different from the translator's. (Torop 2010: 75)

The translator's psychology is different from the editor's, like anyone's psyche is different from anyone else's. Whoever shares Peircean semiotic view, and the notion of 'interpretant' as something subjectively necessary, easily understands that editor's interventions on the text only make sense if they are coordinated with the translator. Future generations of editors, hopefully educated on Torop's and Popovič's thought, will have one more precious working tool which will improve the quality of translation and the relationships with translators.

References

Catford, John C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CP = Peirce, Charles S. 1931–1958. *Collected Papers of Charles S. Peirce.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press. [Hartshorne, Charles; Weiss, Paul (eds.), 1931–1935; vols. 7–8. Burks, Arthur W. (ed.) 1958; In-text references are to CP, followed by volume and paragraph numbers].

Eco, Umberto 2003. *Dire quasi la stessa cosa. Esperienze di traduzione.* Milano: Bompiani.

Firth, John Rupert 1968[1956]. Linguistic analysis and translation. In: Firth, J. R., *Selected Papers of J. R. Firth 1952–59.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 74–83.

Gorlée, Dinda L 1994. *Semiotics and the Problem of Translation: With Special Reference to the Semiotics of Charles S. Peirce.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Jakobson, Roman 1981[1935]. The dominant. *Selected Writings III. Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry.* The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 751–756.

–   1959. On linguistic aspects of translation. In: Brower, Reuben A. (ed.), *On Translation.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 232–239.

Leopardi, Giacomo 2004. *Zibaldone di pensieri.* Milano: Mondadori.

Lotman, Juri 2000 = Лотман, Юрий. Внутри мыслящих миров [Within thinking worlds]. *Семиосфера.* Санкт-Петербург: Искусство-СПБ, 149–390.

Lûdskanov, Aleksandr 2008[1967]. *Un approccio semiotico alla traduzione. Dalla prospettiva informatica alla scienza traduttiva.* (Osimo, Bruno, ed.) Milano: Hoepli.

Morris, Charles 1946. *Signs, Language and Behavior.* New York: Prentice-Hall.

Osimo, Bruno 2002. Traduzione della cultura. In: *Parole, immagini, suoni di Russia.* (Piretto, Gian Piero, ed.) Milano: Unicopli, 35–51.

– 2004. *Traduzione e qualità. La valutazione in ambito accademico e professionale.* Milano: Hoepli.

– 2010. Peeter Torop per la scienza della traduzione. In: Torop, Peeter. *La traduzione totale. Tipi di processo traduttivo nella cultura.* (Osimo, Bruno, ed.) Milano: Hoepli, vii–xxix.

Pelc, Jerzy 1990. Several questions to experts in Peirce's theory of signs. *Versus* 55/56: 13–28.

Popovič, Anton 2006[1975]. *La scienza della traduzione. Aspetti metodologici. La comunicazione traduttiva.* (Osimo, Bruno, ed.) Milano: Hoepli.

Quine, Willard Van Orman 1960. *Word and Object.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Shannon, Claude Elwood; Weaver, William 1949. *The Mathematical Theory of Communication.* Champain: University of Illinois Press.

Torop, Peeter 1995. *Total'nyj perevod.* Tartu: Tartu University Press.

– 2010[1995]. *La traduzione totale. Tipi di processo traduttivo nella cultura.* (Osimo, Bruno, ed.) Milano: Hoepli.

Vygotskij, Lev Semenovich 1990[1934]. *Pensiero e linguaggio. Ricerche psicologiche.* (Mecacci, Luciano, ed.) Bari: Laterza.

Zhinkin, Nikolay 1964 = Жинкин, Николай. О кодовых переводах во внутренней речи. *Вопросы языкознания* 6: 26–38.