

## **Translators, editors, publishers, and critics**

Multiple translatorship in the public sphere

Kristina Solum, University of Oslo

*This chapter examines three recent Norwegian debates on translation sparked off by translation reviews, in which the various agents involved in producing translated texts were granted unusual visibility. The case reflects how discussions on translators' agency may be of interest for the public sphere in three senses: in disputing unfair judgments on translations, in discussing the quality criteria of translations, and in gatekeeping when the publishers' quality control mechanisms have fallen short.*

**Keywords:** translation, multiple translatorship, contextual voices, translation pact, actor-network theory, critics, copy editors, visibility, public sphere

### **1. Introduction**

In this chapter I set out to explore three newspaper debates sparked off by critical reviews of Norwegian translations of English and American literature. These reviews and debates are interesting because of the surprising visibility granted in them to the multiplicity of agents involved in producing translated texts. This chapter has two main aims: first, to account for what the reviews and debates made manifest, in the public sphere, about the role, status, and agency of different translation agents; and second, to account for what may have prompted this focus in the reviews in the first place.

This case differs from previous studies on translation criticism in two respects. First, translation scholars (Fawcett 2000; Vanderschelden 2000) tend to point out that translational aspects are more often than not insufficiently dealt with by critics in press reviews, and translators are often “ignored” or “taken for granted” (Vanderschelden 2000:290), something that is not the case in the material treated in this chapter. Second, previous studies on translation criticism (see Fawcett 2000; Fernández 2011a, 2011b) suggest that when critics *do* comment on the work of the translator, their judgments are frequently based on expectancies derived from the target culture, such as the status of the translator, rather than on the relation between the source and the target texts. Following Chesterman (1997:133–136), such assessments may be referred to as “lateral.” In my material, however, the critics do not primarily resort to lateral assessment but rather compare the translation to the source text, commenting either on the formal relation between the two texts or comparing the effect that the source and target texts are likely to have on their readers. Chesterman (1997:123–133) refers to these two latter modes of assessment as, respectively, “retrospective” and “prospective” assessments.

In making such retrospective and prospective assessments, the critics that I study buck the general trend to write about translations as produced by the source-text author alone. In other words, they challenge what Alvstad (2014) defines as the “translation pact.” According to Alvstad, the translation pact is a rhetorical move in which translations are prepared, in the target context, to be read as though they were originals. Publishers and translators contribute to the pact by forming paratexts in such a way that they foreground the author and downplay the intervention of the translator. This is what makes readers, for example critics, more or less knowingly ignore that the text has been prepared for the target audience by a series of agents other than the author. Likewise, critics may contribute to the pact in their reviews by downplaying or overlooking the intervention of the translator. When translators *do* expose

some clues about their intervention, as in a translator's note or in footnotes, their revelations will conventionally help build an image of them as trustworthy interpreters and renderers of the perceived authorial intention, thus strengthening the pact. Accepting the translation pact is a general tendency, but this is not to say that the pact cannot be challenged or even broken, if readers, including critics, perceive the translator's presence as particularly distorting (Alvstad 2014:282).

In the reviews dealt with in this chapter, the critics discuss the active role of translators and publishers as mediators of translated literature, often in negative terms, highlighting the differences between the source and target texts. As mentioned, I argue that in so doing, they challenge the "translation pact." As for the translators, they engage in a dynamic in which the pact is alternately challenged and strengthened. On the one hand, the pact is challenged by a fundamental wish for visibility as an end in itself, while on the other hand, as we shall see, individual translators refute negative criticism by arguing that they are, after all, trustworthy renderers of the authorial intention, thus attempting to re-establish the pact.

The three debates that my material covers took place in 2011, 2012, and 2013, respectively, and were sparked off by reviews of Norwegian translations of four English-language novels: Thomas Pynchon's *Against the Day* (*Mot dagen*, 2011); Jennifer Egan's *A Visit from the Goon Squad* (*Bølle på døra*, 2012) and David Vann's *Caribou Island* (2012); and Zadie Smith's *NW* (*NW*, 2013, subsequently withdrawn and republished in 2014).<sup>1</sup>

Different agents such as translators, copy editors, and critics contributed. These three debates were similar in the sense that they granted unusual visibility to translation as a social and collaborative process, but they were dissimilar in the sense that they had different outcomes.

Throughout this chapter I will apply theoretical and methodological tools from actor-network theory (Latour 2005) that allow me to envisage individual, human agents, such as the aforementioned professionals, as "actors" interacting in an actor-network with other human or

non-human actors. Following this approach, I will pay special attention to two actors that are not humans with an individual conscience and that did not have a voice of their own in the debates, but that may have played a key role in shaping them. The first potential actor is the Norwegian awareness-raising project *What Can Be Said about Translations? (Hva kan man si om oversettelser)*, initiated and directed by the Norwegian translator and critic Jon Rognlien. The project, which invited critics and translators to discuss translation and translation criticism, ran from 2011 to 2014, a period that coincides with that of the reviews and debates discussed here. The project held workshops in which critics were invited to discuss the conditions for assessing translations qua translations, and to have a go as translators themselves. It also held seminars for translators in which they were invited to read each other's work with the eyes of critics, aiming to increase translators' awareness of literary criticism.<sup>2</sup> An internal report on the project (Rognlien 2014) has been made available to me by the project leader. Rognlien also wrote about the project in an article in *Prosa*, a magazine dedicated to non-fiction literature (Rognlien 2011a). The project was not advertised to the wider public and was never explicitly mentioned in the press reviews or debate contributions included in my material.

The second potential actor is the English language, the global lingua franca and the source language of all the translations discussed here. The commonality of English was essential because it allowed the critics to make assessments where the target text was compared to the source text in a way that Norwegian readers could follow. In fact, most of the debates evolved around claims about so-called "Anglicisms" in the Norwegian language.

The debates being discussed here were highly consequential: they led to a critic resigning from his post as a reviewer of translations, a lengthy discussion on translation quality and translators' working conditions, and a translation being withdrawn from the market. As such, the debates will allow me to discuss how awareness of translations as

publications mediated by several actors in the target culture may be of importance for the public sphere (in this case, the cultural press and their readership) in three respects: in disputing the judgments of critics on translations; in discussing the quality criteria of translations; and in gatekeeping, a term first coined by Lewin (1947:5–41) to designate the ability to decide what is regarded as good enough to enter a certain closed circuit, in this case the Norwegian book market.

## **2. Theoretical and methodological framework**

### *2.1 Translators' visibility in the public sphere*

The open and permeable network for communicating information, opinions, and points of view in democratic countries (Habermas [1992] 2010:185) is often referred to as the “public sphere,” where members of society discuss questions that are of general interest. As noted by Peters ([1999] 2010:238), participants differ markedly in visibility and influence in the public spheres. Many literary translators' associations, including the Norwegian Association of Literary Translators (NO), the Norwegian Association of Non-Fiction Authors and Translators (NFF), and the European Council of Literary Translators' Organizations (CEATL), have long been engaged in activism to enhance translators' visibility. Something that, in addition to the ethical argument that both copyright holders of the text should be credited, must imply a belief that knowledge of translators' agency would benefit translators as a professional group, in terms of higher status and possibly better working conditions. Such activism, however, may be interpreted as risky, as it challenges the “translation pact”: if readers, as the pact suggests, are used to understanding translations as the unmediated and

even objective rendering of the author's voice, the consequences of highlighting the translators' agency (i.e., their "making a difference" or a "change") are unpredictable.

## *2.2 Multiple translatorship*

The term "multiple translatorship" was coined by Jansen and Wegener (2013) to account for the various agents that may be involved in producing and mediating translated literature. Rather than conceiving of translations as the solitary work of a single agent ("the translator"), this perspective takes into account that translations are the result of negotiations between several parties whose values, interests, and aesthetical preferences do not necessarily coincide, such as publishing editors, copy editors, and of course the translators themselves. This process is generally not revealed in the final translation product (the book). As noted by Paloposki (2009:192; see also Venuti 1995:1–9), we often know little of the routines prior to publication, and have little data thereon, a lack that the present volume seeks to remedy.

Copy editors are invisible almost by definition. They normally hold no copyrights to the books to which they contribute, and their names are usually not mentioned on title pages. On the other hand, their actions may be considered to be part of a "publisher function" that provides "the public with a mechanism for organizing and prioritizing books" (Sher 2006:7). When publishing an author or the work of a translator, the publisher is placing its "quality stamp" on the publication and is expected to arrange for the quality assurance of the text. If this does not seem to have been the case, copy editors may become visible "in absentia," as the 2013 case in this study will illustrate.

### 2.3 Latour's actor-network theory

My material concerns public debates between professionals engaged in the critical reception of selected literary translations. Actor-network theory (ANT) provides relevant theoretical and methodological tools to approach such interconnected *agents*, which I understand here as human individuals. Agents may thus be defined as beings “endowed with agency, which is the ability to exert power in an intentional way” (Buzelin 2011:6). Simultaneously, ANT allows me to broaden the scope and envisage interaction between human agents together with interaction with entities that do not induce actions in an intentional way, for example artifacts (computers, books, buildings, etc.) or complex phenomena such as languages, all of which can be referred to as “actors.” Thus, *actors* encompass both humans and non-humans, and may be defined as “anything that can induce, whether intentionally or not, an action” (Buzelin 2005:197). In ANT (Latour 2005:52-58), the question of agency is formulated as whether an entity acts as a mediator that brings about transformation (high agency), or just as an intermediary in which input predicts output (low or no agency). According to Latour, there are very few intermediaries and many mediators involved in social processes, and in his view all mediators have agency but not necessarily intentionality (as some actors are indeed objects or artifacts). In this chapter I use alternately the terms “agent” (human actors endowed with agency and intentionality) and “actor” (agents as well as other actors that do not exert their power intentionally).

Methodologically, ANT invites us to follow the actors. To understand the social world (a world of associations between actors), we must first account for how change is brought about in it, that is, how actors engage in negotiations that make new associations come into being (Latour 2005:65). When actors engage in circulating their interests, for example in texts, transformations come about. The term that ANT employs for these transformations is

“translation,” which is not to be confused with the inter-lingual process that is usually the object of Translation Studies. Rather, the ANT term “translation” has been chosen to describe the processes of convincing other agents because of the uncertainty associated with the transformations that a given actor’s interest will suffer when passed on to other actors. Actors are active mediators, not just passive receptors and re-transmitters of other actors’ interests.

ANT is most often associated with ethnographic fieldwork, but as argued by Nimmo it is also useful in studies that, like the present one, are mainly based on textual material: ANT conceives of texts as “inscriptions,” that is, active artifacts that “assemble, shape and connect practices” (Nimmo 2011:114). An actor’s ability to circulate inscriptions is “crucial and power-inducing in the network” because inscriptions allow the interests of one actor to reach several people, thus “making action possible at a distance” (Abdallah 2012:24–25; see Callon 1987 and Latour 1987).

ANT is concerned with the ways in which power relations come into being by means of inherently unpredictable negotiations: actors can make other actors act, but they cannot predict how (Latour 2005:58–62). In the following I will examine the ability of various actors working with translations to disseminate and negotiate their interests through the press.

### **3. Events manifest in the public sphere**

#### *3.1 The 2011 debate*

In 2011 Gyldendal, one of Norway’s largest publishers, published *Mot dagen*, Fartein Døvlé Jonassen’s Norwegian translation of Thomas Pynchon’s *Against the Day*. As a member of the Norwegian Association of Literary Translators (NO), Jonassen was already an established

translator and had in 2004 received the same association's Bastian Prize, awarded for an outstanding literary translation. His translation of Pynchon's novel received several positive reviews in Norwegian newspapers between February and June 2011 and would later be short-listed for the Bastian Prize.

However, the positive perception of his work was challenged in May 2011 in a review by the rebellious and politically controversial Norwegian author and critic Herman Willis. The review was published in *Morgenbladet*, a weekly newspaper committed to debate-provoking criticism and cultural journalism, which became an important actor because of its provocative reviews and the lengthy discussions that followed on the newspaper's debates pages.

In his review, Willis (2011: 38–39) voiced harsh criticism of the translation, while praising Pynchon's original. Willis's main objection to the translation was that he perceived the language in it as "highbrow" or "posh" compared to that of the source text, and that certain words (Willis listed seven) were mistranslated as either false friends or Anglicisms. Willis is himself an author, and the language in the article was marked by an informal tone, phonetic spelling,<sup>3</sup> and drug metaphors: the translation was disparaged for being low-quality "Moscow drugs" and "really bad merchandise."<sup>4</sup>

Willis alluded only once to the translator (and not by name), choosing rather to name and shame the Gyldendal publishing house. Despite this, his criticism received no replies from publishers, but rather from translators, who responded like a professional guild to what they perceived as unfair criticism of a colleague. The first reply came from the president of the NO, Cecilie Winger, and was printed on the debates pages in the next week's edition of *Morgenbladet*. Winger (2011:19) called for the newspaper to take action against Willis, dismissing his criticism as contemptuous and ill-founded and referring to previous instances in which Willis had incorrectly claimed to have found translation "errors."<sup>5</sup>

A week later, *Morgenbladet* also printed a reply from the translator, Jonassen (2011:19). He rejected Willis's criticism as invalid since, in his view, there was no evidence that Willis had even read the translation, or the original for that matter, in full. Rather, Jonassen suggested that Willis had plagiarized an online text written by Michael Harris (2008).<sup>6</sup> For example, in his review Willis had written about Pynchon's characters the Traverses that *traversene har gruveganger som naturlig habitat og foretrekker ellers undervannsbåter* ('the Traverses have mine tunnels as their natural habitat and otherwise prefer submarines'); similarly, Harris's text states that "the Traverses naturally spend much of their time underground in mines or tunnels or underwater in a submarine." The similarity is all the more striking in that the word "submarine"/*undervannsbåt* occurs neither in Pynchon's original text nor in the Norwegian translation.

This in turn prompted a reply from *Morgenbladet*'s cultural editor, Håkon Gundersen (2011:2), who in the paper's editorial space argued that Willis's unattributed source, Harris, had only influenced Willis's plot summary, that Willis's perspectives on the book and on the translator's style were valuable and the critic's own. The next week, however, the aforementioned translator and critic Jon Rognlien (2011b:21) criticized *Morgenbladet* for allowing the cultural editor to use the editorial space to trivialize Willis's scathing criticism of the translation, which he saw as an insult to the newspaper's readership.

The same edition of *Morgenbladet* featured articles by two other translators, with Hedda Vormeland (2011:21) first arguing that literary translations should be assessed as a whole, and recommending that literary translators' work be appraised as a carefully thought-through "cultural product." Likewise, the translator Erling Skuggevik (2011:21) warned against the simplistic listing of "errors" that are easily held up as "trophies" by reviewers, but that devoid of context give little to the reader beyond Schadenfreude.

A week later, a short article (Gjerstad 2011:18) was dedicated to Willis in *Journalisten*, a professional magazine for journalists. According to the article, Willis had stated that he would no longer review translations, only books in their original form. *Journalisten* quoted Willis as believing that “the attack on him as a critic was part of a pattern in which publishing houses make personal attacks whenever there is a review that they do not appreciate.”<sup>7</sup> This claim is difficult to understand, as only members of the NO, and no publishers, had replied to Willis’s criticism. It is possible that Willis perceived the translator, Jonassen, as working for and hence representing the publisher Gyldendal. In practice, however, literary translators usually work as freelancers and alternate between various publishers. Moreover, as the 2012 debate will show, translators as a professional group often present themselves as being in opposition to the publishers.

In the 2011 debate, the translators acted in tandem as gatekeepers setting the standards for what sort of translation criticism was permissible. This may be interpreted as an act of professional solidarity, that is, a conscious sense of identification with a group and a readiness to show moral support when violations or injustices takes place (Laitinen and Pessi 2015:2–4). The role of the NO is also important. Strengthening translators’ visibility has been a point on the association’s action plan for several years<sup>8</sup> Indeed, the many responses from translators in the 2011 debate increased their visibility in the public sphere.

### 3.2 *The 2012 debate*

In 2012 several reviews of Norwegian translations of Jennifer Egan’s *A Visit from the Goon Squad* and David Vann’s *Caribou Island* sparked off another debate about translations, once again mainly in *Morgenbladet*. As a consequence of the debates, this newspaper also

published an article on how English influences and potentially threatens the Norwegian language.<sup>9</sup>

*A Visit from the Goon Squad* was published in Norwegian as *Bølle på døra* (Bully at the door) in 2012 by Oktober, a medium-sized publisher. The translator, Kyrre Haugen Bakke, was by this time a thirty-year veteran who had won the Bastian Prize in 2009. The translation was reviewed in at least eight newspapers. In the first reviews in the national and regional daily press, the translator was overwhelmingly praised, especially for his Norwegian rendering of the many narrative voices in Egan's novel: for example, "[Bakke] does an exceptionally good job" and "the language varies depending on which character the narration is about" (Lauritzen 2012:28),<sup>10</sup> and likewise, "the colloquial American jargon flows naturally also when translated into Norwegian" (Dolva 2012: n.p.).<sup>11</sup>

Silje Bekeng (2012:12), in a literary supplement to the daily newspaper *Klassekampen*, was the first reviewer to negatively assess the translation, claiming that the translation was full of English expressions and names (such as the Anglo-Norwegian words *bigotteri*, *partyet*, *armyjakka*, *lobby*, and *dealen*) and hence strenuous to read. In a later review in *Morgenbladet*, Bernhard Ellefsen (2012a:42) argued that the Norwegian translation weakened Egan's prose because of what he derided as Anglicisms, for example *Det kunne registreres en svak bølge av interesse fra folk i lobbyen* ('A mild ripple of interest could be registered from people in the lobby'), Bakke's translation of "There was a mild ripple of interest from the lobby." Ellefsen did not explicitly point out the alleged Anglicism, however, and the sentence is not ungrammatical in Norwegian. But in view of Bekeng's aforementioned review, where specific words had been censured as Anglicisms, it could seem reasonable to attribute the claim to this word, which is a loan word in Norwegian (but widely used). No comment was made on the role of the publisher in either of these reviews.

The translator himself, Bakke (2012a:23), wrote a reply to Ellefsen in which he argued that Ellefsen's example did not contain any Anglicisms, and that his use of loan words such as *lobby* was particularly apt for Egan's text, which required a new tone or voice for each chapter because of constant changes in the narrative perspective. Ellefsen (2012b:21) subsequently replied that the Anglicism in the cited example had nothing to do with the word *lobby* but with the syntax of the sentence, which felt too English. On the other hand, he argued that Anglicisms on the sentence level were frequent throughout Bakke's translation.

As in the 2011 Pynchon case, Ellefsen's criticism and justification for it were perceived as unfair by translation professionals, who responded as a group. A week later, *Morgenbladet* printed a reply from Sunnev Gran (2012:21), who signed her contribution as a professional copy editor. She perceived Ellefsen's understanding of translation problems as limited compared to the insights she had gained through her own professional experience: "As an experienced copy editor, I think that Ellefsen is trying to trespass on my professional territory and in so doing he makes two basic mistakes: he gets overexcited, and he forgets to propose something better."<sup>12</sup>

Gran also provided *Morgenbladet's* readership with unusual insights into how the quality assurance of literary translations takes place prior to publication. At this stage, she explained, one is often presented with sentences that at first sight seem impossible to translate – but then "you find a solution after all, frequently after long and tough discussions that delay the publication."<sup>13</sup> She was one of the few participants throughout the debates to refer to translation from languages other than English, arguing that Norwegian and English are "cousins" (*fettere*) that hardly allow us to imagine the magnitude of obstacles between more distant languages.

Another reply from Bakke to Ellefsen was printed in the following *Morgenbladet*. Bakke (2012b:18) especially opposed Ellefsen's picking at isolated words or sentences, rather

than global strategies: “The sentence is detached from the rest and held victoriously up in the air like a dead fish: Look! Inferior goods!” By contrast he pointed to the know-how of translators as a professional community: “‘Context is king,’ we translators say to one another.”<sup>14</sup>

Bakke’s claims can also be interpreted as an attempt to re-establish the translation pact, that is, to present the translation as though it were a trustworthy rendering of Egan’s original text and not (as maintained by Ellefsen) a badly disfigured version. By pointing out weaknesses in the critic’s own prose Bakke could actually imply Ellefsen was the party not to be trusted. Bakke’s reestablishment of the translation pact can also be seen from his emphasis on his own preservation of the authorial intention, as he argues that the sentence that Ellefsen has criticized “was written in a tortuous way *on purpose* by Egan; it should therefore be tortuous in Norwegian too.”<sup>15</sup>

Finally, Bakke agreed with a concurrent suggestion from Ane Farsethås (2012) that publishers should perhaps concentrate on fewer, but better remunerated and quality assured translations. This affirmation adheres to the general tendency that literary translators and their associations frame translators and publishers as distinct and often antagonistic professional groups. This positioning can at least be traced back to the Translators Campaign in 2006 (Oversetteraksjonen 2006),<sup>16</sup> where the two translators’ associations NO and NFF joined forces against the Norwegian Publishers Association for five months and won acceptance for demands for a new standard contract and improved remuneration.

I now move on to the part of the 2012 debate that evolved around the translation of David Vann’s novel *Caribou Island*, published in Norway that year by Gyldendal, in Hilde Stubhaug’s translation. Stubhaug was, at the time, less established than Bakke and Jonassen. She was not yet a member of the NO and not yet a prize-winning translator.<sup>17</sup>

Like Egan's novel, *Caribou Island* was reviewed in several newspapers. Brynjulf Jung Tjønn (2012:53) in the daily newspaper *VG* made a comment on the publisher's contributions in the paratext: "At his best Vann is an exceptionally talented narrator, who probably is not entirely happy with [Norwegian author] Lars Mytting's strange blurb on the cover or Gyldendal's attempt at translating the original back cover text from the American edition."<sup>18</sup> This review did not contain the name of the translator, only that of the publisher. In fact, the reference to Gyldendal's and their role as a publisher seemed more to the point here than in the 2011 debate, as the criticized back-cover translation was not the translator's responsibility but entirely the publisher's.<sup>19</sup>

Most reviews of *Caribou Island* were positive as far as the translator's work was concerned.<sup>20</sup> Ane Farsethås (2012:40) in *Morgenbladet* wrote the first (and only) review that seriously questioned the quality of the translation itself, targeting again Anglicisms on the syntactic level. This happened approximately one month after Ellefsen's criticism of syntactic Anglicisms in Bakke's translation of *A Visit from the Goon Squad*, and the debate on his translation was still running in *Morgenbladet*. In her review, Farsethås compared passages in the translation with the source text. Her main point had to do with Vann's use of incomplete, verbless sentences, which she regarded as a relatively current mode of expression in English, but marked when transferred into Norwegian (doing thus what Chesterman has referred to as "prospective assessments," see above).

Farsethås also made a link between quality and the working conditions of literary translators. She then referred to the debate on Anglicisms in the translation of Jennifer Egan's *A Visit from the Goon Squad*, saying that it was not tempting to "appear as a killjoy picking on underpaid translators" but wondering nonetheless whether "something strange" happens when one translates from English.<sup>21</sup> She speculated whether this was related to Norwegian readers getting so used to English that its syntax was starting to sound as acceptable

Norwegian to many people, or whether it was more about a lack of quality control from the publisher.

Other critics, by contrast, did not get the same impression from Stubhaug's rendering of Vann's syntax. For example, in his review in *Stavanger Aftenblad*, Steinar Sivertsen (2012:20), despite not being entirely enthusiastic about the novel, praised the translator's rendering of its style, stating that by means of "many curt, concise sentence fragments without a finite verb, deftly preserved by the Norwegian translator, the author has created a realistic, everyday story of the intense, rhythmically pounding, fierce sort."<sup>22</sup>

The translators did not raise their voice as a group during this debate, and Farsethås's strong criticism in *Morgenbladet* was contested in only one reply, written by the translator herself (Stubhaug 2012:18). Stubhaug's tone was more modest than the two previously discussed replies by Jonassen and Bakke. She recognized that Farsethås had made her doubt her work, and admitted that fragmented syntax was a bit more "radical" in Norwegian than in English. At the same time, she believed that these passages represented an effective contrast to the more traditional, well-formed sentences in other parts of the book, and she emphasized that she had made an effort to look after the distinctive poetry of Vann's work.

It is possible that Hilde Stubhaug's verbless sentences were assessed negatively by Farsethås because it challenged the translation pact. As argued by Alvstad (2014:280), rendering deviant language – a characteristic feature of many literary works – as deviant in the target text as well may sometimes challenge this pact. Whether the markedness of the language will be attributed to the author's or to the translator's activity may depend on factors external to the text itself and more related to the agents producing it. For example, it may be (unjustly) attributed to the translator's activity if the literary work in question is not known for its surprising language, or if the translator does not already have an established name.

Overall, the 2012 debate was a nuanced debate on translation and translation criticism that revealed to the readers, from different points of view, that translation is a matter of judgment where individual agents propose different solutions. Claims about Anglicisms played an important role, as the English language allowed critics to make assessments comparing the target and source texts and their likely effects. Moreover, the debate brought to light the professional expertise of a copy editor, a representative of a professional group that may potentially have a considerable impact on translations but is usually invisible to the public.

### *3.3 The 2013 debate*

In 2013, Zadie Smith's novel *NW* was translated into Norwegian by Kari and Kjell Risvik, two of Norway's most prolific translators. A couple, they work either individually or together, translating from several Germanic and Romance languages in addition to English and Hebrew. They have been awarded a number of prizes (for example, Kjell Risvik received the Bastian Prize as early as 1975, and the couple received the Brage Honorary Prize in 2006). Their translation of *NW* was published by Aschehoug, one of Norway's largest publishers, with the same title as the original.

Reviews of the novel were published in February and early March 2013, and practically every one severely criticized the quality of the translation. Before taking a closer look at the reviews of *NW*, it should be briefly noted that this was not the first time a novel by Zadie Smith received harsh criticism in the Norwegian press, something that suggests that this author might be particularly tricky to translate. It had happened already in 2001 when a rendering of her novel *White Teeth* by another translator, Torleif Sjøgren-Erichsen, was published in Norwegian, with for example the critic Halfdan Friehow (2001:30) contending

that the translation was full of Anglicisms, errors, clumsy and lofty language, and typographical negligence.<sup>23</sup>

One of the first to review *NW* was Thea Marie Dolva (2013:13) in the daily regional newspaper *Fædrelandsvennen*. While she was the only critic who did not directly place responsibility on the translator or the publisher, she laconically commented that “trillions of things get lost in translation, inevitably,” thus presenting a rather negative view on translation,<sup>24</sup> but, on the other hand, possibly wanting to mitigate her harsh judgment of the translation. After all, according to the pact, critics seldom mention the contributions of the translator at all, and Dolva was writing for the regional newspaper *Fædrelandsvennen* rather than *Morgenbladet*, which by this time seemed committed to breaking the translation pact at leisure.

And true to form, *Morgenbladet*'s reviewer Bernhard Ellefsen (2013:48) did address the translators' work more directly. This time, Ellefsen's arguments were in line with translators' advice about assessing translations as a whole: “Had the translators succeeded in giving the novel a Norwegian language that the readers could have believed in (or at least understood), small mistakes would have been insignificant.” The style, Ellefsen maintained, was not “recognizable as Smith's – or as anyone's style at all.” He also made a comment on the joint responsibility of translator and publisher: “As long as the translators have put their names on the title page and the publisher has decided to bring the work out, we must believe that they vouch for the publication they present to us.”<sup>25</sup>

The next day a review by Susanne Hedemann Hiorth (2013:33) was published in the daily newspaper *Dagens Næringsliv*. According to her, the language in the novel did not correspond with the characters' age, and a number of cultural and linguistic references had been misunderstood. For example, the word “honey” written on a piece of woman's clothing had been translated literally as *honning* (i.e., the food honey) rather than with a word that

would allude to the “sweetness” of the girl. Likewise, Thea Urdal (2013:26) criticized the Norwegian translation in the daily newspaper *Dagsavisen*. In this case the critic was actually wishing for an Anglicism: “It is not often that I find myself longing for the word *fuck* in a book.”<sup>26</sup>

The final review was written by literary critic Leif Ekle (2013a) for NRK, the Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation. He preceded this review with a blog post a few days before that focused on recent translational issues, including *NW* (Ekle 2013b). In this post, he referred to the ongoing debates on translation quality, mentioning a panel debate taking place at Oslo’s House of Literature at that particular time, initiated by the *What Can Be Said about Translations?* project. However, such a discussion on the art of translation was, according to Ekle, only relevant if the task had been taken seriously and was carried out in a conscientious way by the translator. The Risviks’ rendering of *NW* was, in his view, utterly wretched. “Mistakes, misunderstandings, and absurdities are practically piled one on top of the other,” he lamented in his review. On his blog, he claimed to have found all sorts of examples, including “sentences that one cannot understand – not even with considerable goodwill.”<sup>27</sup>

One of the examples that Ekle cited, was a reference in *NW* to the English rock band the Kinks. In a particular sentence where, according to Ekle, the source text said “All Kinks all day,” “Kinks” had been translated literally as *krøll* (‘kinks,’ and by extension ‘a mess’), so that the sentence now read *Bare krøll dagen lang* (‘Nothing but a mess all day long’). This had happened, Ekle contended, even though Zadie Smith had “instructively placed” the band’s album title *Village Green Preservation Society* in the preceding sentence, referenced their “not unknown” verse “You really got me” in the subsequent sentence, and repeated this verse several times in capital letters further below on the same page.<sup>28</sup> Ekle was surprised that such a translation had gotten through the publishers’ quality control all the way to the market, and repeatedly insisted on the publishers’ responsibility: “No, not everyone knows that since

1963 there has been an at times influential band called the Kinks. But in the publishing house? Nobody there either?”<sup>29</sup> Ekle did, however, place some responsibility on the translators themselves: although he asserted that Norwegian translators are badly paid, he believed that this should not excuse the “hack work” (*venstrehåndsarbeidet*) behind the Zadie Smith translation.

Such Anglicisms and mistranslations were also addressed by Karin Haugen (2013:2), the editor of *Klassekampen*'s literary supplement. She referred to Ellefsen's criticism of the translation of *NW* in *Morgenbladet* and drew a parallel to her own reading of Salman Rushdie's memoirs *Joseph Anthon* in Norwegian, translated by Kari Risvik alone. Haugen provided sixteen examples of terms or expressions that she referred to as Anglicisms in the latter book. Anglicisms, she said, “are the worst sort of mistakes, because they weaken the reading experience and can influence the reader, and because the formulations impoverish, rather than enrich, the Norwegian language.”<sup>30</sup> Haugen referred to Kjell and Kari Risvik as “the most famous translators of the guild,” questioning what implications it might have that they of all people were allowed by publishers to get away with such work: “Does this not set a standard for how fast a translator is expected to work, which the publishers take note of?” She especially emphasized the publisher's responsibility: “The problem must be taken back to the publishers. [. . .] Will Aschehoug take responsibility for the situation?”<sup>31</sup>

Almost immediately after Ekle's and Haugen's blistering criticism, Aschehoug announced, as widely noted in the press, that it would withdraw the translation of *NW* from the market and revise *Joseph Anthon* before its release in paperback.<sup>32</sup> In fact, in a comment to *Klassekampen* (Eielsen 2013:26), the publisher took full responsibility for the situation, arguing that the translators were extremely competent and had “become victims of a deficiency in our routines” and that the publishing house had not “reviewed the texts thoroughly enough; neither the editor nor the copy editor nor the proofreader detected the

errors and weaknesses.”<sup>33</sup> It was the only instance in my material in which a publisher made a statement on a given translation.

These events led to a public debate in March 2013 on the translation of *NW* and the role of the publisher. Mode Steinkjer (2013a:29), the cultural editor of the daily newspaper *Dagsavisen*, wrote a commentary about the translation of *NW* and the Risviks’ status as two of the most experienced translators in the profession. He underlined his belief that the couple’s competence was beyond doubt, and therefore believed that the problem was not a matter of competence but of cultural references. He emphasized the publisher’s responsibility to find an adequate translator for each book, and to spot such mistakes during the publication process, and suggested that this should lead to a debate on translation inside the entire publishing sector, and not only at Aschehoug. The danger, Steinkjer speculated, was that the next time Zadie Smith published a novel it would be read in English by Norwegian readers too.

In a reply, Vigdis Lian (2013:5), the secretary general of the NO, asserted that it would be good if Norwegian readers were well-acquainted with several languages, but that it was a fact that the great majority wanted a Norwegian version. She also invited critics to continue committing themselves to translations, no matter their quality, so that they could all be assessed for the readers’ benefit. Her last point reflects the association’s commitment to a policy of translators’ visibility.

*Klassekampen* (Lillebø 2013:24) also printed an interview with Kirsten Hemmer, one of the founders in 2007 of a Norwegian society of copy editors (Norsk forening for språkkonsulenter). Hemmer argued that the publishers’ quality assurance routines had declined in recent years because of rationalization processes in which the copy-editing phase was handled by project coordinators, rather than by text editors, and that the former had tight budgets and little control over the texts. According to Hemmer, experienced copy editors

were abandoning the publishing sector because of the working conditions, which involved tight deadlines and decreasing fees.

In general, Anglicisms played an important role in the 2013 debate too, but this time the concept was used to refer to cultural references rather than syntax, and the problems identified by the critics were perceived as so severe that the translation in question could not be kept on the market. While in the 2011 debate “the publisher” had been a vague entity easily confused with the translator, the 2013 debate revealed a translation criticism where the role of the publisher was taken seriously: the critics expressed their awareness that translations are signed by, and hence the responsibility of, translators and publishers alike. The critics’ recurring emphasis on the publishers’ responsibility could possibly have been dismissed as an excuse, since publishers, as companies rather than individuals, are easier to target than translators. But the outcome of the *NW* debate made it very clear that the publishers’ obligation to assure quality must be taken seriously, and that when the publishers’ gatekeeping falls woefully short, the critics may take over this role, and even enforce, at least indirectly, a change in the literary text itself, as happened when *NW* was revised and released again in 2014.

#### **4. Actors not manifest in the public sphere**

In the following I will account for the impact of two important actors in the actor-network who were not manifest or did not have a voice of their own in the public sphere: the *What Can Be Said about Translations?* project and the English language.

#### 4.1 *The impact of the What Can Be Said about Translations? project*

Running from 2011 to 2014, the *What Can Be Said about Translations?* project aimed to increase awareness of translated literature among both critics and the general public. It also aimed at increasing translators' understanding of translation criticism. The timing of this project should be noted, as its main activities targeting critics (2011–2013) coincided with the reviews and debates that have been discussed here. The project challenged the translation pact, as critics were encouraged to talk about translations precisely as translations and to consider translated works as separate publications mediated by the translator and the target culture publisher, rather than the same book as the original.

As stated above, the project was directed and organized mainly by one person, the translator and critic Jon Rognlien, under the auspices of the NO and with funding from the Arts Council Norway. According to the subsequent report sent to the council (Rognlien 2014), the project held a total of four workshops with critics, publishing professionals, and translators, as well as three panel debates and three conferences, and also led to several article publications. The matters addressed by the project are largely outlined in a lengthy article by Rognlien (2011a) published in the non-fiction literature journal *Prosa* and made publicly available in an online edition. In the article, Rognlien explicitly invited critics to make negative comments on the translator's work if necessary, but warned against two common pitfalls in translation criticism: the biased approach, where critics have previously read the book in the source language and have unconsciously developed a subjective understanding of the book hardly be identical to that of the translator; and the spot-the-error approach, where the critics judge the entire translation on the basis of a few isolated errors. The article also emphasized the responsibility of the publisher to find a copy editor who matches the

translator's qualifications of and encouraged critics to consider the working conditions of translators.

One of the project's initiatives, which was not mentioned in the press debates, was a workshop for translation critics held in Oslo on January 12–13, 2013. The participating critics could discuss questions such as those outlined above and have a go as translators. Most of the critics had limited translation experience themselves and were surprised to find that translation was such a subjective process, leading to very different translations of the same source text. In this context it is worth mentioning that the critic Ellefsen, who participated in both the 2012 and the 2013 debates, attended the workshop in January 2013, shortly before writing his review of *NW* (dated February 22, 2013). It is not unlikely that this experience had informed his assessment of the second translation, which was particularly rich of reflections and examples, and more in line than his 2012 contribution with the translators' recommendations of assessing translations as a whole.

#### *4.2 The impact of the English language*

Social phenomena such as languages can be powerful actors, as they can constitute strong barriers between different communities (Larsson 2006:18). The English language functioned as an actor throughout the debates, since it made a difference in two related but distinct ways: because the critics could, as discussed earlier, compare the translations with the source texts, and because English is not just any language, but the most important language of globalization and mobility. It is a language that denotes power and symbolic capital (Blommaert 2010:28–32; Assis Rosa 2015:214) and that *Morgenbladet's* critics repeatedly resorted to and expected their readers to know. The familiarity with this language invited the

critics to challenge the translators' understanding of the source text of the British and American novels in question.

Anglicisms were thus a recurrent theme throughout the three debates. In general, the reviewers tended to prefer target-oriented approaches, for the sake of clarity and/or protecting the Norwegian language against its hegemonic cousin. As mentioned above, one reviewer stated explicitly that Anglicisms "are the worst sort of mistakes," which suggests that some readers expect translators from English to not only cultivate the Norwegian language, but also to act as linguistic gatekeepers against the menace of English in particular.

As suggested by the debate on Hilde Stubhaug's rendering of David Vann's fragmented syntax and verbless sentences, it may also be difficult for translators, and especially for translators from English, to render marked language. English translators may feel compelled to make an extra effort to create target-oriented translations, as the perceived influence may be judged more severely than from languages seen as less menacing.

On the other hand, the "Anglicism on the sentence level" argument turned out to be a particularly controversial card to play for the reviewers. This argument was most likely to spark off debates on translation poetics that in practice increased awareness of both translation and translation criticism as an exercise marked by individual preferences. It was only when the term "Anglicisms" was applied to cultural references, in the Zadie Smith case, that it had an effect strong enough to enforce a consensus around the quality judgment. This case led to the most vivid public debate in the sense that the highest number of newspapers joined in, and the criticism was perceived as so incontrovertible that the translation was withdrawn from the market. This might be because cultural references stand out as more objective than syntactic and stylistic issues. The perceived objectivity is probably related to what Leppihalme (2011:126) refers to as a "referential link with reality."

## 5. Concluding remarks

In the events discussed in this article, the critics had taken up the invitation from translators' associations and the *What Can Be Said about Translations?* project, to challenge the translation pact and write about translations, translators, and the publisher's role. In general, the claims made by critics pertained to the English language, and they showed a preference for a more target-oriented approach. In terms of working conditions, the critics showed solidarity with translators and copy editors (who, like themselves, are text producers) and expressed their concern about their working conditions.

The *What Can Be Said about Translations?* project and the translators' active role in the debates helped spread the translators' interests in increased visibility. However, as actor-network theory proposes, there is no necessary causal link between an attempt to convince other actors and the effect of this attempt; in fact, attempting to convince other actors may lead to entirely different outcomes than desired. Thus, the translators' interests – as circulated in their invitations to critics to challenge the translation pact – had to be negotiated with the critics, whose reactions could not be foreseen. Challenging the translation pact may be perceived as risky: there was, and is, no guarantee that critics, when encouraged to write about translation matters, will do so according to the understandings of the translators. If translators' insistence on visibility leads to criticism that is ill-founded and produced by a sense of obligation but without any real insight, both the translators and the public would possibly be better off with less translator visibility. Critics do not necessarily have hands-on experience with the *process* by which translations come into being. Indeed, some claims put forward by critics and journalists in the three debates reflected limited insights into translation challenges, even when they were in principle intended to defend translators – as when the

cultural editor of *Dagsavisen*, Mode Steinkjer, argued that the problems related to *NW* were not a matter of the translators' competence but rather a question of getting (or not getting) cultural references. This comment suggests that some readers may regard translation competence as purely a matter of linguistic knowledge.

In more general terms, however, the critics' level of awareness and reflectivity had clearly evolved from the 2011–12 debates to the 2013 debate, when they seemed to have taken the translators' advice about judging translations as a whole, appraising translations as a creative, deliberative process in which several agents are involved and responsible. It is likely that the *What Can Be Said about Translations?* project had an impact on this growing insight, and that it was not limited to the critics who participated in the workshop, but that there was also a spin-off effect when more and more reviews treated translations as independent works mediated by various target-context actors, rather than (as dictated by the translation pact) objective reduplications of the author's text.

The three debates studied here would probably not have been so momentous if the literature in question had been translated from another language than English. Without its position as a global lingua franca, the claims, examples, and debates would not have captivated a wider public. The increased awareness of translation issues discussed in this chapter was also possible thanks to *Morgenbladet's* commitment to engaging provocative critics, and their commitment to printing replies to the criticism, allowing the debates to run for weeks. The debates and discussions were rightly relevant to the public in three regards. First, translators were allowed to respond to what they considered to be ill-justified claims that could potentially scare off readers from a work (or from translations in general). Second, the debates discussed different criteria for quality assessment and raised awareness of translations as (ideally) the joint product of several actors, influenced by factors such as the source language and the agents' working conditions. And third, as the 2013 debate on *NW*

made evident, the way the translator mediates the text has real consequences for how this author is perceived by the target readers, or, phrased in terms of the translation pact, the way the reader reconstructs the implied author. In cases such as the 2013 debate, when publishers have failed in checking the quality of a translation, the critics may have an important role as gatekeepers to fulfill.



---

<sup>1</sup> The reviews, columns, and opinion pieces were collected through exhaustive searches on the four relevant titles in ATEKST, a database that collects Scandinavian press contributions, and free Web searches. Only reviews in which the translator's agency was mentioned directly or indirectly (in comments on the author's voice, style, language, etc.) were taken into account. All translations from Norwegian into English in this chapter are mine, unless otherwise stated.

<sup>2</sup> As a literary translator and member of the Norwegian Association of Literary Translators, I attended one of these seminars myself.

<sup>3</sup> Willis spelled the word *norsk* ('Norwegian') phonetically as *nårsk* when referring to Anglicisms as "det vanlige hva heter det nå igjen på nårsk-tullet" ('the usual what-is-it-called-again-in-Norwegian nonsense').

<sup>4</sup> "Moskva-dop"; "skikkelig dårlige varer."

<sup>5</sup> As an example, Winger cites his review of a translated novel by the American author Joyce Carol Oates (*Black Girl/White Girl*, published in Norwegian by Pax and reviewed by Willis in *Morgenbladet* on December 21, 2007). In it, Willis seemed unaware that American and Norwegian floor levels are the same (as opposed to the British system, which counts the ground floor as a separate level), mistakenly writing that "the publisher is and remains responsible for the publications, and should notice that when 'third floor' becomes *tredje etasje* ['third floor'], there might reasons to look at the rest of the text as well" ("Forlaget er og blir ansvarlig for utgivelsene, og de bør oppdage at når 'third floor' blir til 'tredje etasje' er det kanskje grunn til å se på resten av teksten også").

<sup>6</sup> Harris is in fact a mathematician, and the paper is an unfinished case in which he argues that Pynchon's style is "quadratic." This was however not mentioned in Jonassen's article, which concentrated on how Willis seemed to plagiarize Harris's phrasings.

<sup>7</sup> "Angrepet på ham som kritiker føyer seg inn i et mønster, hvor forlag ofte går til angrep på person når det er en anmeldelse de ikke setter pris på."

<sup>8</sup> See <http://oversetterforeningen.no/handlingsplan/>.

<sup>9</sup> Ane Nydal, "Oversett på maken," *Morgenbladet*, July 6, 2012. The title is a pun on the idiomatic exclamation of surprise, *sett på maken* (lit. '[have you ever] seen anything similar'), and the verbs *oversatt* ('translated') and *oversett* ('ignored').

<sup>10</sup> "Oversetter Kyrre Haugen Bakke gjør en særdeles god jobb. [. . .] Språket forandrer seg etter hvem det skrives om."

---

<sup>11</sup> “Den muntlige, amerikanske sjargongen glir naturlig også oversatt til norsk.”

<sup>12</sup> “Det er en enkel setning på engelsk som er oversatt enkelt og greit til norsk”; “Som mangeårig manusvasker tenker jeg at Ellefsen prøver å gå meg i nærheten, og at han gjør to grunnleggende feil i dette forsøket. Han er overivrig, og han glemmer å foreslå noe bedre.”

<sup>13</sup> “Så finner man en løsning likevel, gjerne etter lange og harde diskusjoner som forsinker utgivelsen.”

<sup>14</sup> “Setningen løsrives fra helheten og holdes triumferende i været som en død fisk: Se! Ikke prima vare! [. . .]  
«Kontekst er konge» pleier vi oversettere å si, sånn oss imellom.”

<sup>15</sup> “Setningen Ellefsen siterer, er, slik jeg leser den, *med vilje* skrevet kronglete fra Egans side; den skal dermed være kronglete på norsk også!”

<sup>16</sup> The campaign still has its own website that includes a presentation in English:

<http://www.oversetteraksjonen.no/english.html>

<sup>17</sup> Stubhaug became a member of the NO in January 2015, and in 2016 she was awarded the Norwegian Ministry of Culture’s prize for her translation of Andrew Smith’s *Grasshopper Jungle*.

<sup>18</sup> “På sitt beste er Vann en uvanlig dyktig forteller, som sikkert ikke er helt fornøyd med Lars Myttings merkelige blurb på omslaget eller Gyldendals forsøk på å oversette den originale baksideteksten fra den amerikanske utgaven.”

<sup>19</sup> According to section 2.4 in the Norwegian standard contract between the Association of Literary Translators and the Publishers’ Association, the publisher’s editing work and further processing of the translation (including graphic design, blurbs, etc.) belong to the publisher and should not be used by the translators if they regain the copyrights to their intellectual property. For discussions on the publisher as a co-translator, see Nergaard (2013).

<sup>20</sup> E.g. Cathrine Krøger (2012:40) and Ørjan Greiff Johansen (2012:9).

<sup>21</sup> “Det er ikke spesielt fristende å fremstå som en grinebiter som hakker på underbetalte oversettere. [Men det er] vanskelig å la være å stille spørsmål som: Skjer det noe spesielt i oversettelser fra engelsk?”

<sup>22</sup> “Mange korthogde, konsise setningsemner uten verbal, fint ivaretatt av den norske oversetteren, har forfatteren utformet en realistisk hverdagshistorie av det intense, rytmisk bankende, barske slaget.”

<sup>23</sup> “[. . .] skjemmet av feil, anglisimer, klønete og oppstyltet norsk samt regelrett korrekturslurv.”

<sup>24</sup> “[. . .] trillioner av ting blir lost in translation, uunngåelig.”

<sup>25</sup> “Hadde oversetterne lykkes med å gi romanen et norsk leseren kunne tro på (eller i det minste forstå), ville småfeil vært ubetydelige. [. . .] Stilen [er ikke] gjenkjennelig som Smiths – eller noens stil overhodet. [. . .] Særegne stemmer [gjøres i oversettelsen] til et ubestemmelig virvar. [. . .] Så lenge oversetterne har satt navnene

---

sine på tittelbladet og forlaget har valgt å anta arbeidet, må vi tro at de står inne for utgivelsen de presenterer for oss.”

<sup>26</sup> “Det er ikke ofte jeg tar meg i å savne å lese ordet «fuck» i en bok.”

<sup>27</sup> “Feil, misforståelser og absurditeter er nærmest stablet på hverandre”; “setninger som ikke lar seg forstå – ikke engang med betydelig velvilje.”

<sup>28</sup> “I setningen «*All Kinks all day*», der bandet Kinks’ relativt velkjente platetittel «*Village Green Preservation Society*» er pedagogisk plassert i setningen før og den ikke ukjente strofen «*You really got me*» i setningen bak, og dessuten gjentatt med STORE bokstaver lenger ned på siden, er Kinks blitt til krøll; «*Bare krøll dagen lang*».” Note, however, Zadie Smith’s actual orthography in the stream-of-consciousness opening to chapter 6 (2012: 23): “We are the village green preservation society. God save little shops, china cups and virginity! Saturday morning. ALL KINKS ALL DAY. Girl. You really got me going.” Hence, not only was the album not signposted as an album (with italics and capitalization), but the all-caps spelling also obscured that “kinks” could, or should, be read as “Kinks.” Indeed, three English-language online reviews (<http://www.sfgate.com/books/article/NW-by-Zadie-Smith-3866733.php>, <http://litrefsreviews.blogspot.no/2013/04/nw-by-zadie-smith-hamish-hamilton-2012.html>, and <http://wsnhighlights.com/2012/11/11/nw-zadie-smith/>) explicitly cite this very passage to exemplify the novel’s tricky prose, seemingly without making a connection to the band the Kinks. I thank the copy editor of this volume, Stig Oppedal, for drawing my attention to this point.

<sup>29</sup> “Neida, alle vet ikke at det siden 1963 har eksistert et i perioder toneangivende band som heter Kinks. Men i forlaget? Ingen der heller?”

<sup>30</sup> “[. . .] er verste sort feil, fordi de svekker leseropplevelsen, kan påvirke leseren, og fordi vendingene forringer, ikke beriker, det norske språket.”

<sup>31</sup> “[. . .] laugets mest kjente oversettere”; “Setter ikke det en standard for hvor fort en oversetter er forventet å jobbe, som forlagene merker seg?”; “Problemet må føres tilbake til forlagene. [. . .] Vil Aschehoug ta ansvar for situasjonen?”

<sup>32</sup> *Nynorsk pressekontor*, March 5, 2013; *Vårt Land*, March 6, 2013; *Klassekampen*, March 6, 2013, etc.

<sup>33</sup> “[. . .] utsatt for svikt i rutinene hos oss. [. . .] Vi har ikke gått grundig nok inn i tekstene; verken redaktør, språkvasker eller korrekturleser har funnet feil og mangler.”