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The focus of this article is the changing role of Anglophone and Francophone literary translators as cultural mediators in Canada since the 1960s. Using a comparative model sensitive to both differences and similarities, I will offer an overview of literary translation in Canada during this period. Drawing from my introductions to two recent edited volumes of portraits of individual Canadian translators, I will examine how translators from both cultures became the purveyors and advocates of their cultural “other”, and within what intercultural traditions they inscribe their own practice. Special attention will be paid to the role these translators have assumed as cultural and literary agents within each literary institution. In more general terms, this analysis from the perspective of translators as cultural agents will provide insights into how English and French-language literary translation in Canada has worked towards building local specificities during a period of global cultural change.

Creating a Tradition of Literary Translation
The decades from the 1960s to the present constitute the founding period of literary translation into both French and English in Canada, for reasons directly related to local imperatives. For both linguistic groups, the 1960s and 1970s were marked by a new determination to free themselves from the imperial yoke of European English and French literatures, and to develop their own forms of writing, reflecting their particular context and priorities. In Quebec, cultural nationalism and political nationalism were closely intertwined. The debate over the literary status of joual, a form of anglicised Quebec-spoken French, confronted both French cultural hegemony and Anglo-Canadian economic domination. For many Francophone writers, the creation of an authentic Québécois literature was intimately linked to Quebec independence. This was the period of the Front de libération du Québec (FLQ), and the birth of the Parti québécois, elected in 1976 as Quebec’s first provincial government with independence as a political platform. In response, among more open-minded intellectuals in English-Canada, there was a growing interest in understanding Quebec, and increased recognition of the importance of cultural duality as a specific characteristic of Canadian identity.
This emerging sense of national identity, whether from the Canadian or Quebecois perspective, led to the creation, in the 1970s, of both uni- and bilingual cultural institutions aimed at recognising and promoting Canadian and/or Quebec literature, or exchanges between the two. The Writer’s Union of Canada held its first meeting in Ottawa in November 1973. The Quebec equivalent, the Union des écrivaines et écrivains du Québec, was founded in Montreal in March 1977. Two important academic associations for the study and promotion of Canadian culture were also founded during this decade, the Association for Canadian Studies/Association des études canadiennes (ACS/AÉC) in 1973, and the Association for Canadian and Quebec literatures (ACQL/ALCQ) in 1974. In increasing numbers, new literary magazines and presses popped up in both English and French, dedicated to the diffusion and analysis of an exciting, new generation of authors writing about life in Canada and/or in Quebec.

This particular political and cultural context was to offer a powerful stimulus for literary translation in Canada. Created in 1957, the Canada Council for the Arts had begun to offer grants for literary translation into English and French on an ad hoc basis as early as 1959. The adoption of the Official Languages Act in 1969 by the Canadian government created a boom in translation activity in general in Canada. In 1972, the Council set up its official Translation Grants Program for the translation of Canadian literary and non-literary works into one or the other of the country’s two official languages. A year later, the Council would inaugurate the first Canadian annual prizes for literary translation into French and English, re-named in 1986 the Governor-General Awards. The Council also encouraged the initial meeting of and Anglophone literary translators that led to the creation of the Literary Translators Association of Canada/Association des traducteurs et traductrices littéraires du Canada (LTAC/ATTLC) in 1975 in Montreal.

The Translation Grants Program has been the single most important impetus to the development of literary translation in Canada. According to Philip Stratford, from Confederation in 1867 until 1920, only some twelve literary works were translated in Canada, ten into English, and two into French. Between 1920 and 1960, the figures improved slightly with some forty-eight translations, thirty-nine into English and nine into French (Stratford, 180-181). As Ruth Martin has observed, in the first twenty years of its operation, the Canada Council Translation Grants Program gave out 1236 grants, 710 of which were for the translation of literary works (Martin 1994, 54). During the early years of the Program, translation activity into each language
corresponded roughly to the population percentage of each group. Sometime in the late 1990s, however, translations into French started to increase proportionately. Every year now, some thirty translations appear in each language.\textsuperscript{5}

In general terms, the institutional context for both Anglophone and Francophone literary translation is roughly the same from 1960 to the present. On both sides of Canada’s “two solitudes,”\textsuperscript{6} literary translation was confronting the arduous task of establishing itself within a nascent, post-colonial literature determined to set up its own, autonomous literary institutions. If we turn to the translators themselves, why they became translators, and how they see the role and practice of translation, several similarities remain, but differences also emerge.

\textbf{Becoming an Anglophone or Francophone Translator}

For those who were to become interested in literary translation in the 1960s and 1970s-and the situation has only started to change in recent years-, literary translation was not an obvious career choice. No tradition or formal training programs of literary translation existed at the time in either language.\textsuperscript{7} In many, but not all cases, translators would appear to have some early awareness of cultural difference. However, how this occurred is not the same in both groups. For Francophones, English was clearly the dominant cultural “other.” Many eminent Francophone translators came from families where English was valued culturally, or grew up in multi-ethnic communities, for the most part in Montreal, where English was a daily presence.

For their Anglophone counterparts, however, early exposure to French was not the norm. Most were raised in Anglophone communities outside Quebec, learning rudimentary French in the traditional secondary school classroom setting. Nor was their primary cultural “other” necessarily Francophone. Those who were exposed to cultural difference were likely to be themselves, the “other.” Sheila Fischman, one of Canada’s most prolific literary translators, grew up in a small Ontario town as a member of the only Jewish family in the community. Canadian-born theatre director and translator John Van Burek spent his childhood in the United States. Dramaturge-translator Linda Gaboriau is an American expatriate. Patricia Claxton, who has won awards for her translation of fiction and non-fiction, lived in pre-partition India until she was almost eleven.

These differences in early experiences are also reflected in the educational profiles of Francophone and Anglophone translators. Ironically, none of the distinguished Francophone
literary translators of the period majored in English at university. They were more likely to study French literature or other languages. English was acquired by osmosis, as a result of living in a bilingual environment. As Helene Rioux succinctly put it, “I could always speak English” (Quoted in Nutting, 248; my translation). Furthermore, for almost all, the introduction to the art of translation as a written activity occurred not through English courses, but through their compulsory Latin and Greek courses in secondary school.

For Canadian Anglophone literary translators, on the contrary, French was a language that had to be acquired deliberately, and the road to linguistic mastery was as likely to start in France as in Quebec. Several, including John Glassco, Philip Stratford, Barbara Godard, Ray Ellenwood and John Van Burek studied in French universities or spent time in France. Linda Gaboriau, on the other hand, chose to learn French in Montreal. For Jones and Fischman, a move to Quebec early on in their professional careers prompted the decision to acquire fluency in French. Similarly, although she had completed her high school studies in Montreal, Patricia Claxton only really decided to perfect her French several years later, when she was married there and raising a young family. Among the eminent Anglophone translators of this period, only three, Joyce Marshall, John Glassco and bilingual Susanne De Lotbiniere-Harwood spent their entire childhood in Montreal.8

Not surprisingly, given these differences in their linguistic experience, Francophone and Anglophone translators do not share the same approach to translation. For Canadian Francophone literary translators, motivated early on by an interest in literature in French, translating was essentially a prolongation of their literary aspirations. The pioneering Francophone translators of the period, playwright Michel Tremblay, poet Jacques Brault, essayist Jean Simard and children’s writer Paule Daveluy, were first and foremost writers in their own right. Translation was part of their writing process, a means of forwarding their goals as a writer.

Although the precise nature of the relationship between writing and translation would shift, this by and large remains the case for the generation of Francophone literary translators starting their careers in the late 1970s and 1980s. For Marie José Thériault, Hélène Rioux, Marie-Andrée Clermont and Yvan Steenhout, translation would be a way of enriching their writing practice and furthering their contacts with the larger, writing community. It would also be a much-needed means of supplementing their income as writers. Recent statistics show that some 9% of Quebec Francophone writers do some literary or non-literary translation for economic
reasons (Fournier and Gauthier 2004, 47). Of the important translators of this generation, Hélène Filion and Charlotte Melançon come closest to having a primary practice as professional literary translators. The spirit of writing nonetheless remains an underlying leitmotiv in their work. Melançon is a poet and author of an essay on Emily Dickinson, and Filion has turned to fiction writing now that she no longer translates.

It is only with the most recent generation of Francophone translators that we see cases where literary translation is linked to a pre-existing or concomitant full-time professional practice of translation. Franco-Ontarian writer Daniel Poliquin, for instance, considers himself first and foremost to be a writer, but he is also a full-time translator and interpreter for the Canadian federal government in Ottawa. Paul Gagne, part of a bilingual literary translation couple with his Anglophone partner Lori Saint-Martin, is a full-time professional translator in Montreal.

For Anglophone translators, on the contrary, the motivation for translating would appear to be predominantly political and/or professional, rather than strictly literary. First-hand experience of the political turbulence in Quebec in the 1960s and early 1970s led Sheila Fischman, Patricia Claxton, and Philip Stratford to a commitment to encourage intercultural dialogue. As Claxton cogently put it, “I knew translation was a way of communicating something important to people who did not speak French. Big changes were happening in Quebec, and English Canadians needed to know (quoted in Whitfield, 2006b, 45).

Other Anglophone translators came to translate in the course of another professional activity. Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood did her first translations as part of her duties as a journalist. For Linda Gaboriau and John Van Burek translation was part of their work in the theatre, Van Burek as director, Gaboriau as cultural commentator. Barbara Godard, Ray Ellenwood, and to a lesser degree, Doug Jones, translated as part of their role as academics. Jones was asked to teach a comparative literature course for which there was a dearth of translated material. Godard and Ellenwood were attracted to the avant-garde and feminist writing in Quebec as part of the focus of their research as academics.9

This is not to say that there are not some connections in the group between translation and literary activity. Glassco authored poems and erotic fiction. Stratford wrote poetry, and Jones is also an award-winning poet.10 De Lotbinière-Harwood has a recognised production as performance artist. But even in the case of Joyce Marshall, the only translator to have earned her
living entirely by writing, the link with translation is not directly literary in the same sense as it is for Francophone translators. Marshall came to translation, not as part of her own writing process, but as a result of her work as reader-editor for a Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) radio program featuring readings of short stories.

**Francophone and Anglophone Translators as Active Cultural Agents**

Given how dynamic the period from the 1960s to the present has been for the development of national literatures in both English and French in Canada, it is not surprising that Francophone and Anglophone translators alike have participated in a broad range of cultural and literary activities. Enthusiastic and untiring cultural agents, they have been regular contributors to literary journals, founded professional associations, edited collections at publishers, sat on juries for literary prizes, or played a role in grass-roots associations for the promotion of literature.

For Francophone translators, the common link between these diverse activities is their fundamental literary focus. Jean Simard, Marie José Thériault, Hélène Rioux, Ivan Steenhout, and Jacques Brault are important contributors to a number of literary reviews, including *XYZ La Revue de la nouvelle, Écrits du Canada français, Liberté, Possibles, Arcade, Moebius, Estuaire, La Nouvelle Barre du Jour*, first of all, as writers. Similarly, Michel Tremblay’s role within the Jean Duceppe theatre company known for its translation repertory, and Robert Dickson’s activism within the Franco-Ontarian literary community are a result of their initial implication as writers. The same can be said of the editorial responsibilities assumed by Paule Daveluy and Marie-Andrée Clermont at Pierre Tisseyre éditeur, Marié Jose Thériault at HMH Hurtubise, and Yvan Steenhout at Pleinc Lune.

For Anglophone translators, on the other hand, such contributions to the literary and cultural sphere are more likely to arise from their other professional activities. Jones, Stratford, Godard and Ellenwood were stimulated by their university teaching duties both to embark on translation and to write about their experience in such reviews as *Open Letter, Exile, ellipse, Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*. Through fellow academics, Frank Davey and Barry Callaghan, Godard and Ellenwood would develop links with Toronto publishers Coach House Press and Exile Editions to print their translations. Connections made through their experience in editorial positions with Toronto presses would assist Fischman and Marshall in finding translation opportunities and in promoting the work of the authors they translate. Van Burek’s
commitment as theatre director to staging successful, new plays, combined with his enthusiasm for French culture, would lead him to found Toronto’s first French-language theatre, *Le théâtre français de Toronto* in 1971.

This different orientation does not undermine the very real intercultural effect of such activities among both Anglophone and Francophone translators. It is important to note that Francophone and Anglophone translators alike contributed to the creation of the Literary Translators’ Association of Canada/Association des traducteurs et traductrices littéraires du Canada, and participated in the Association’s efforts to promote recognition of literary translation and respect for translators’ rights.\(^{11}\) Rather, such differences in intercultural perspective demonstrate that intercultural meditation between two demographically and politically unequal groups cannot take the same form from both sides of the cultural divide. Such variations may also change through time, as the relationship between the two cultural groups evolves.

**Intercultural Trends in Francophone Translation Practices**

While a detailed comparison of Anglophone and Francophone textual approaches to translation in Canada has yet to be carried out,\(^{12}\) the overview of literary translation offered in *Le Métier du double* and *Writing between the Lines* would suggest certain macro-structural trends. In keeping with their literary preoccupations, the dominant orientation among Francophone literary translators has been, and continues to be writerly. Translation is seen primarily as a form of creative activity, as part of an on-going practice of writing.

Within this overall writerly perspective, two distinct periods can be identified. From the 1960s to the mid 1980s, the predominant approach could be qualified as *reflexively intercultural*. In other words, the intercultural component was viewed, assessed, or even solicited, in the context of a predominant need to reinforce specific Quebec literary forms and traditions. Sometime during the 1980s, perhaps due to a sense of greater linguistic security\(^{13}\) and broader recognition of the legitimacy of Quebec literature, the focus would appear to shift to a more explicitly dialogical or *reciprocal intercultural* model.

The initial, reflexive approach is perhaps most clearly demonstrated in the theatre. Michel Tremblay, one of the key playwrights responsible for the development of a national theatre in Quebec, has translated classical Greek, American and even French plays into Quebecois French,
literally playing off one hegemonic power against another to reinforce the legitimacy of a local, Quebecois tradition. While this could be seen as a form of literary pillage, the strategy was effective in establishing the Quebec language, a continental French, as the language of Quebec theatre.\textsuperscript{14}

It must be pointed out that in a context where pragmatic (i.e. federal government and commercial) translation was often linked to the colonial status of Quebec within Anglophone Canada, the notion of translation as subservient obedience to an all-powerful original could hardly resonate with local literary goals. The need to redefine translation as creation, or, as in the case of poet Jacques Brault, as “non-translation”\textsuperscript{15} was paramount. Even Jean Simard, perhaps the most fervently outward-looking Francophone translator of the period, if one can judge by his anti-clerical and federalist positions as essayist, recommended a form of translation bordering on re-appropriation.\textsuperscript{16}

Similarly, while Paule Daveluy’s work as director of the \textit{Deux Solitudes Jeunesse} collection at the Montreal press, Pierre Tisseyre éditeur, was certainly oriented in part by the publishers intention to encourage literary exchange between Francophones and Anglophones, it can also be seen as part of a larger canvas. Repatriating, from France to Quebec, the translations of Canadian (and American) books for young readers, along with Daveluy’s own work to promote literature for children and adolescents, was also part of the process of developing a local tradition of readership and encouraging local, Quebec, authors to write for young Francophones.\textsuperscript{17}

The shift towards a reciprocal intercultural model sometime during the 1980s is best perceived as a gradual evolution of attitude and discourse, rather than a sudden or radical change. The translators of the previous period, those I associate with “initiating translation,”\textsuperscript{18} certainly shared rewarding exchanges with the Anglophone authors they translated. While reflexive in the need to affirm the legitimacy of a Quebec Francophone voice, their translation practice was not by definition anti-intercultural,”\textsuperscript{19} but was concerned with redressing the balance. What changes during the 1980s, within a continued fundamentally writerly orientation, is the intensity of Francophone writer-translators’ translation activity, the nature and variety of their exchanges with the Anglophone “other.”

A few figures offer an idea of the intensity of translation activity during this period. From 1969 to 2003, Michel Tremblay signed 24 translations or adaptations. In comparison, between
1985 and 2003, Marie-Andrée Clermont translated 83 works for adolescents, Hélène Rioux, Marie José Thériault, Yvon Steenhout and Poliquin, 28, 17, 16 and 10 works of fiction respectively. During the same period, Steenhout also translated some 13 works of non-fiction and science fiction, and Thériault, under the pen name of Marie Perron, some 37 non literary works. Poliquin published 10 translations between 1987 and 1999, Gagné/Saint-Martin 12 translations between 1992 and 2003, and Dickson 6 since 1994.

These translators often enter into direct and fruitful exchange with their Anglophone authors. In the increasing number of contexts where the English- Canadian author can speak French, the translation process itself involves collaboration. In a more general way, these translators also contribute to nurturing such exchanges. Steenhout, for instance, created a collection, “Miroirs,” at the Pleine Lune press whose primary goal is to publish translations of Canadian Anglophone writers writing in or about Montreal. Rioux has initiated the first regular French-language column of criticism for translations for the Quebec literary magazine, Lettres québécoises.

A reciprocal dimension also surfaces in how these translators speak of their translation activity. Rioux and Poliquin talk openly of what they have learned as writers, in terms of style, dialogue and voice, by translating works by Anglophone authors such as Mary Maude Montgomery and Douglas Glover. Poliquin even describes Glover as a “brother author” (Cyr, 336; my translation), and in a homage to the late English-Canadian writer Matt Cohen, whose work he translated, evokes their many “luminous misunderstandings” (Poliquin 2002, 211-212). Thériault considers particularly rewarding the experience of translating the multiple voices and neologisms of Robert Walshe’s polyphonic Wales’ Work.

While not necessarily leading to direct reciprocal translation exchanges, such contacts with the Anglo-Canadian literary community and support for translation have undoubtedly played an important role in the translation and circulation of Francophone translators’ own literary works in English. Rioux, Thériault and Poliquin, for instance, have acquired a double vision of translation, as both translators, and translated writers.

For the fluently bilingual Franco-Ontario Poliquin, the Anglophone become Francophone poet Dickson, and the bilingual translating couple Gagné/Saint- Martin, the notion of reciprocity reaches what I call a “constitutive” dimension (Whitfield 2005, 12). For these contemporary translators, bi-directional intercultural communication runs like a thread through their own
identity and practice as writers/translators. Although they are Anglophones, Dickson and Saint-Martin live, work and write in French. Both have won literary prizes for their works in French, Dickson for his poetry, Saint-Martin for her short stories. Their profound identification with the culture of the Francophone “other has informed their translation practice. Saint-Martin and Gagné give priority to translating English-language books with an intercultural dimension. Dickson has chosen to translate authors who write from a minority cultural standpoint, and to make their works visible in the “other” language, whether English or French. He has brought Franco-Ontarian playwright, Jean Marc Dalpé, into English, and translated Manitoban Cri writer Tomson Highway into French. In a particularly touching Ontarian crossover, he has lent a French pen to Franco-Ontarian Lola Lemire Tostevin who, for various cultural and political reasons, chose to write in English.

**Intercultural Trends in Anglophone Translation Practices**

Based on leading translators’ intercultural motivations, two different periods can also be identified in macro-structural trends in Anglophone translation. The initial period, from the late 1960s to the early 1980s, represents a time of intense translation activity, whose motivation, as I have suggested, was political or professional. Stratford, Claxton, and to a lesser degree Fischman, were forceful proponents of literary translation as a way of filling in the gap for English-Canadians often abysmally ignorant of the political realities of Quebec. To encourage more, and more accurate translations, Claxton played a key role in the Literary Translators Association of Canada of which she was the founding president. Stratford campaigned for increased visibility of translated works in Canadian university curricula, and created the first program in Canadian Comparative Literature at the Université de Montréal. Those translators who engaged primarily in translation for other professional purposes were often involved in advancing particular aesthetic values, feminism for Godard and De Lotbinière-Harwood, avant-garde writing or theatre for Ellenwood, Van Burek and Gaboriau. Jones co-founded ellipse in order to publish new English-Canadian and Quebecois voices in poetry, originals appearing side-by-side with their translations for the benefit of unilinguals.

While these differences in motivation will lead to a parting of the ways in the mid 1980s, both groups initially share the view of translation as essentially a means of communicating to unilingual English-Canadians something specific about Quebec or Quebec culture, whether it be
of a political or aesthetic nature. In so far as this view of translation reflects primarily back on
the translating culture, as opposed to the translated culture, both political and aesthetic
tendencies fall under what one could consider a \textit{reflexively communicative intercultural} model.
To acknowledge this interest in communicating information about Quebec to the target language
is not, however, to confirm the narrow “ethnographic” approach Sherry Simon attributes,
incorrectly in my view, to this generation of translators (Simon, 52-55). The translation motives
of these translators were not to recuperate or devalue Quebec politics or culture but rather to
contribute to furthering an understanding Quebec’s difference in English Canada. The
fundamentally communicative dimension of their view of translation is corroborated by the
promotional nature of their numerous cultural and literary activities and publications.

Not surprisingly, in such a context, the 1980s mark a shift in orientation. Following the
intense emotions of the 1980 referendum and the subsequent failure of the Meech Lake and
Charlottetown Agreements, which attempted to bring Quebec back into the Constitution, there
was a certain fatigue, not to say a certain hardening of attitudes in English-Canada towards
Quebec issues. On the political level, public focus moved from bilingual and bicultural matters to
multicultural questions. At the same time, within the university community, global post-colonial
and post-modern discourses were also more conducive to work on multicultural or international
cultural dynamics than on local bi-cultural exchange.

As a result, from the mid 1980s, the reflexive communicative intercultural model
gradually changed in configuration. On the one hand, the most productive translators during this
period moved towards a translation-professional intercultural approach. For Fischman, Claxton,
and Gaboriau, translation became in fact their primary professional activity, and they began to
see it predominantly in professional terms. Significantly, all three have contributed to the
professionalisation of literary translation, Claxton through her efforts to have translations
recognised as literary works for copyright purposes in Canada, Gaboriau through her work at the
Banff Centre for the Arts, and Fischman through her structured promotion of the authors whose
works she translates. On the other hand, those translators with initial aesthetic motivations
generally saw a tapering off of their local translation activity, as their multi- or trans-cultural
aesthetic (or academic) interests took precedence. While she has returned to some feminist
translation latterly, Godard would give priority in the 1990s to developing an international
theoretical discourse on translation. Ellenwood would be one of the steady lobbyists for changes
Effects of Globalisation on Local Translation Practices

These Anglophone trends partially reflect the impact of globalisation. There is no doubt, particularly since the 1990s, that pressures have been hardest on the Anglophone translation milieu, for the simple reason that English-Canadian publishers are not protected by linguistic difference from American commercial products. During the 1990s, when government funding was reduced and the economy weakened, Anglophone publishers tended to reduce the number of translations published, and to concentrate on a smaller range of authors for translation in order to maximise their marketing efforts. At certain presses, notably House of Anansi in Toronto, there was also an attempt to reduce the public presence of translation by removing the translator’s name from the book cover (Fischman’s name was eventually re-instated). Large Canadian presses, such as McClelland and Stewart, virtually eliminated translations of fiction in the late 1990s.

Fortunately, the same financial arguments would appear to have generated a slightly different response at smaller or mid-size regional presses. Such presses have maintained or increased their interest in translation. Developing reciprocal relationships with Francophone presses, or choosing to translate books that have won a prize or been commercial successes in Quebec, have been seen as ways of reducing financial risks and maximising regional markets. Increased contacts between Francophone author-translators and Anglophone authors may facilitate the relationship between presses. This trend may also reflect the fact that under the Canada Council block grants system, publishers are awarded grants on a point system, and receive points for publishing translations, of particular importance perhaps to smaller presses. The result has been positive for intercultural exchange within Canada.

On the Francophone side, the pressures of globalisation have also had a dual effect. Larger publishers such as Boréal and Leméac have sought to develop co-editions with French publishers as a way of sharing production costs and profiting from a larger French-speaking market. While this may bring new opportunities for Quebec publishers, the same is not always true for Quebec translators. French publishers are leary of Quebec linguistic choices, and often prefer translations done in France. Quebec translators may be asked to prepare two different
texts, or to change their vocabulary to accommodate hexagonal readers. This has been a longstanding, and still unresolved issue for Quebec translators, and the effects on the intercultural dialogue between Anglophones and Francophones in Canada can be quite negative. Aiming for two markets often results in dressing English-Canadian texts in an artificial mid-Atlantic, or frankly Parisian style. For Quebec readers, the return to French colonial norms obscures the representation of characteristics they potentially share with their local Anglophone “other,” and may even suggest that English-Canadian writers participate in the devaluation of Quebec culture.25

Globalisation would appear to have provided the opportunity for some Quebec publishers to broaden their brokerage role between the local and the international market. Some mid-size or specialised presses, such as the Écrits de Forges poetry press, have made reciprocal arrangements with publishers in other languages, particularly in Latin America. For translators with a third language, including Rioux and Thériault, such agreements offer further creative opportunities. The recognition that an English translation can help sell international translation rights at the big book fairs such as Frankfurt has encouraged other Quebec mid-size publishers to be more receptive to Canadian Anglophone translations.

**Traditions and Transitions**

This rapid survey of trends in Anglophone and Francophone translation in Canada is by no means definitive. It does serve, however, to draw attention to the specific functioning of translation within a common public space. The fact that Anglophone and Francophone translation activity takes place within a shared environment in Canada and has been promoted by federal programs, has been important in developing trends and traditions that encourage local intercultural exchange.

Viewing this exchange from the point of view of the goals and motivation of the principal translators themselves, rather than from a strictly text perspective, is also helpful in facilitating a broader vision of translation’s role in intercultural exchange. More specifically, it allows for a more nuanced reading of the effect of differences in approaches to translation due to the translator’s positioning within the majority or minority cultural group, and situates these variations within a larger framework, both in terms of time and agency.
From the perspective of ongoing intercultural exchange, it is significant that both Francophone and Anglophone translators have been active participants in the creation of the institutions or institutional supports that would facilitate and promote the development of specifically Canadian Anglophone and Francophone traditions of literary translation. The increasing professionalization of literary translation, more pronounced on the Anglophone side but already present in Francophone trends, along with the Francophone move into a reciprocal intercultural model would appear to indicate a certain, positive, consolidation of literary translation as intercultural exchange in Canada. At the same time, while global economic pressures seem at present to both reinforce and disperse relationships between Anglophone and Francophone translators, their effect in future decades remains to be assessed.

Notes
1. See Agnes Whitfield, ed. 2006. *Writing between the Lines: Portraits of Canadian Anglophone Translators* and Agnes Whitfield, ed. 2005. *Le Métier du double: Portraits de traductrices et de traducteurs littéraires francophones*. These volumes do not offer a complete picture of literary translation activity in English and French in Canada for the period from 1960 to the present. However, they do provide comprehensive portraits of a representative selection of eminent translators. These individual translators have a substantial translation activity recognised by their peers, and, through their writings on translation or contribution to different literary institutions, have played a key role in the development of literary translation in Canada. For this reason, I believe the overview I offer in my introduction to these volumes, based on the translators profiled and their activities, can be considered representative, if not completely, at least to a goodly degree, of the period.
2. For more information on such new magazines and presses in English-Canada, see Norris and MacSkimming.
3. For more information on how the Association was created, and the role of the Canada Council, see Claxton.
4. The Canada Council no longer funds the translation of non-literary works.
5. This situation would appear to reflect an increase in Francophone interest for literary translation, and a decrease in Anglophone activity, particularly on the part of the major
Anglophone presses. The reasons for which would appear to be editorial, financial and political. See Whitfield (2002-03 and 2003-04) for a further discussion of this question.

6. The expression is the title of a book by Canadian Anglophone writer, Hugh MacLennan, published in 1945. The book’s theme is the tension between Anglophones and Francophones in Quebec. Although the expression is taken from a letter by Rilke, where it is used to describe how love and mutual respect can bridge the gap between two different individuals, it has come to be associated in Canada with the misunderstanding and intolerance that have often marred intercultural relations in Canada (see Whitfield).

7. University courses in literary translation were a rarity in the 1960s (see Claxton 1967). While more individual courses were mounted during the 1970s and 1980s, the needs of the pragmatic professional market dominated the curriculum of degree programs in translation. This remains the situation today, although since the 1990s, a greater range of courses in literary translation is available, particularly at the post-graduate level.

8. Susanne De Lotbiniere-Harwood’s situation is exceptional. Although her first language is French, her early exposure to English in Montreal led to a special relationship with that language. In a desire to preserve this dual identification, and not to have to choose one or the other, she in fact translates into both English and French. John Glassco (1909-1981) and Joyce Marshall (born in 1913), grew up in a very Anglophone part of Montreal during a period when there was little communication on a daily basis between the Anglophone and Francophone parts of the city.

9. To capture how different this Anglophone mix between academic and translation activities is from the Francophone model, it is interesting to note that Brault and Saint-Martin, the only eminent Francophone translators who are also academics, inscribe their practice as translators within their activity as writers. Their academic publications do not deal with translation.

10. Notwithstanding the stimulus provided by his academic responsibilities, Stephanie Nutting argues that Jones’ primary motivation for translating was poetic in nature (Nutting 2006, 127), but she does not examine to what degree his parallel practice as translator was integrated in his own poetry. Perhaps Glassco comes closest to the literary model of Francophone translation activity in his incorporation of texts from other traditions into his own writing (see Woodcock and Toye). However, these borrowings did not derive directly from his translation activity, and there is little indication that he saw this inter-textual practice, as did Francophone writer-
translators, as part of their contribution to the development of a specifically local tradition of writing.

11. Of the translators mentioned in this article, Patricia Claxton, Ray Ellenwood and Charlotte Melançon have served as Presidents of the Association. Paule Daveluy, Jean Simard and Joyce Marshall are honorary members. The Association has been active in having translations explicitly mentioned as literary works in Canadian copyright law, in ensuring that translator’s names appear on the covers of the books they translate, and in obtaining an equal share of rights payment to authors under the Public Lending Rights Program. The Association initiated the John Glassco Award for the first published literary translation, and routinely organises readings with translators and authors throughout Canada to promote an awareness of literary translation. For further information on the Association see Claxton 2000.

12. For a comparative overview of theatre translation in Canada, see Louise Ladouceur, Making the Scene: La traduction du théâtre d'une langue officielle à l'autre au Canada.

13. André Bernard relates this growing linguistic security to the effects of Bill 101, or Charte de la langue française, adopted in 1977. Bill 101 affirmed the status of French as the official language of Quebec, and ensured it a dominant place in Quebec public and commercial space (Bernard, 292-293).

14. For a more complete discussion of translation and Quebec theatre see Ladouceur 2005a and 2005b.

15. See Nicole Côté 2005.

16. In his introduction to his translation of Mordecai Richler’s Son of a Smaller Hero. Simard writes: “Je ne puis traduire fidèlement que les sculs livres que j'eusse aimé écrire. Des livres qui me tiennent à coeur, à l'égal des miens. Que je fais miens, en quelque sorte-par osmose” (Simard 1975, 12) [“I can translate faithfully only those books that I would have liked to have written. Books that are dear to my heart. That I have made mine, so to speak, by osmosis”] (my translation).

17. Opening up the notion of re-appropriation to a sense of shared roots, Daveluy considers the translation in Quebec of English-Canadian authors to be a “juste réappropriation du patrimoine” (Lepage 2005, 115) [“fair reappropriation of national heritage”] (my translation).

18. The expression I use in French is “une traduction initiatrice” (Whitfield 2005, 11).
19. Using a descriptive translation studies model based on an antagonistic dichotomy between source language and target language norms, Annie Brisset argues that translation in the Quebec theatre from 1968-1988 is basically anti-Anglophone (Brisset 1990). Using data from his comprehensive reference catalogue, From around the World and at Home: Translations and Adaptations in Canadian Theatre, Glen Nicols demonstrates in fact that “the rate of background translation activity is actually fairly consistent across the country [...] the overall rates of English to French and French to English activity are almost identical when all international sources are considered (Nichols, 132).

20. These figures are based on the bibliographies provided in Le Métier du double. See Cummins, Kellett-Betsos and Collombat.

21. These figures are based on the bibliographies provided in Le Métier du double. See Cyr, Forsyth and Paré.

22. See Nutting and Cyr.

23. See Whitfield 2002-03 and 2003-04 for an analysis of such publishing strategies.


25. See Whitfield 2002-03, 84-85 and 94-95. Some are developing their brokerage role between American books, particularly in the essay category, and France.
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