Author-Publisher-Translator Communication in English-Canadian Literary Presses since 1960

Agnes Whitfield

Working from a translation practice perspective considering the publishing house as the primary institutional frame for translation events, this article examines author-publisher-translator communication at English-Canadian literary presses. Recent empirical research is contextualised through the political, cultural and economic factors conditioning practices at English-Canadian literary presses since 1960, and general questions about understanding author-publisher-translator communication are raised.
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In an insightful article on the sociology of translation, Andrew Chesterman suggests that the notion of practice might fill a gap in Translation Studies “between frameworks based on abstract socio-cultural systems on the one hand, and extensions of text-based frameworks on the other.”

Drawing on Alasdair MacIntyre’s definition of practice as “any coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity through which goods internal to that course of activity are realised in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity,” Chesterman proposes that the “practice of translation (in a given context) is made up of tasks whose performance takes place via translation events (in that context).” Such a concept of translation practice has the advantage, over Descriptive Translation Studies and sociological models, of considering the
institutional context within which the practice occurs in terms of policies and traditions as well as norms and power relations, and of providing flexibility for understanding the different points of view, values and subjectivity of the various agents involved in the translation event. Working from this general perspective of practice, and viewing the publishing house as the primary institutional frame for author-publisher-translator communication, this article will examine the political, cultural and economic contexts that have affected English-Canadian literary presses since 1960 and conditioned their current practices, present the findings of empirical research conducted at the end of the 2000s on how these publishers perceive and carry out their role with respect to communication between agents (authors, translators and editors) during the translation event, and offer an overall reflection on contextual issues related to a general understanding of author-publisher-translator communication. Communication is understood here broadly to include direct or indirect exchanges of information, participation in decision making, completion of tasks with respect to the translation event, and working and contractual conditions. Since many of the presses are relatively small, with hands-on participation of the publisher in company activities, editor and publisher roles have not been separated.

**Changing Institutional Contexts**

Translation Studies research to date has focused predominantly on the role of publishers as mediators in international translation exchange, issues in the revision process and translation networks, leaving many theoretical questions about institutional contexts relatively unexplored, while recognizing their importance. Considered from the perspective of the publication of a literary translation as a local translation event, the publishing company can be viewed as the primary institutional site that frames the translation event. Through its internal practices (including administrative organisation and editorial traditions and policies with respect to editing and translations), the publishing company explicitly and implicitly structures communication
between authors, editors and translators. At the same time, these practices themselves reflect a variety of broader political, cultural and economic contextual factors affecting the publishing company (such as market forces, distribution networks, government policies, financing opportunities, professional and legal obligations, translator-editor-publisher training, school and library sector policies).  

Canadian publishing has been examined from the point of view of the history of the book trade and literary history, but without consideration for the particular situation of literary translations, while research on French-English literary translation in Canada has tended to focus on textual issues from a post-colonial perspective as they relate to the (mis)representation of the linguistic and cultural ‘other.’ As a result, much archival research remains to be done to achieve a precise portrait of the political, cultural and economic contexts for publishers of French-English literary translations in Canada. General studies of Canadian publishing in English, comments by Anglophone translators themselves and recent research on Canadian translators as agents nonetheless offer valuable contextual information on the basis of which some hypotheses can be advanced about the publishing context of French-English literary translations in Canada since 1960. Roughly speaking, three main phases can be tentatively identified: 1) the transitional imperial model of the 1950s and 1960s, during which Canadian presses began to assert their independence with respect to competitor or parent American or British publishing companies and publish more Canadian content including translations; 2) the state-supported commercially-oriented model of the 1970s and 1980s, structured to some degree by an informal commonality of interests among professional agents; and 3) the contractual, commercial model of the 1990s and 2000s marked by progressive streamlining of public funding and mounting inroads by global market forces. These phases are not distinct, but overlapping. New phases tend to start to develop
in the previous phase. Practices and policies can carry over from one phase to another, all the more so since many of the agents (writers, translators and publishers) remained the same. Precisely because of their multiple inter-connections, reference to these different phases is essential for a full understanding of current publisher practices.

The Transitional Imperial Model: 1950-1970

English-French and French-English literary translation on any significant scale is a relatively recent phenomenon in Canadian cultural history. Given the colonial context of Canadian cultural activity, autonomous Anglophone and Francophone literary institutions themselves only developed in the 1960s and 1970s, over a century after Confederation (1867). Up until that time, English-Canadian writing and publishing, as Frank Davey has pointed out, took place “in a marketplace dominated by books written in Britain and the United States.”12 The strategy of Canadian writers was to publish with American or British presses, and that of Canadian publishers to produce British or American titles for sale in Canada, or obtain exclusive agency rights for their Canadian distribution.13 In this respect, the 1950s and 1960s constitute a key transitional phase. Existing Canadian publishers gradually shifted their focus from agency publishing to original Canadian publishing (McClelland & Stewart),14 or moved from a specialised education (Clarke Irwin) or religious mission (Ryerson) to more general cultural publishing. New Canadian literary publishers (Contact Press,15 Harvest House,16 and Klanak Press17) sprung up, and Canadian subsidiaries of American and British publishers (Macmillan Canada, McGraw-Hill, Oxford) began to develop Canadian material geared for Canadian markets.

Understandably in such a context, with a few exceptions, such as international prize-winning novelists Gabrielle Roy and Marie-Claire Blais published in New York, and Réjean Ducharme
translated in London, the few translations of Canadian Francophone works carried out during this period were spearheaded by Canadian publishers. Philip Stratford identifies some 56 Francophone literary works (fiction, poetry, drama and non-fiction) translated. Of the 21 titles translated during the 1950s, 17 were published by Canadian companies (McClelland & Stewart, Ryerson Press, Contact Press and Harvest House), three by foreign publishers (Eyre & Spottiswoode and Evans Bros in London, Harcourt Brace in New York) and one by a British subsidiary (Macmillan Canada). In the 1960s, of the 35 translation titles published, 25 appeared at Canadian presses (McClelland & Stewart, Ryerson, Clarke Irwin, Contact Press, Klanak Press, and Harvest House), two at an American press (Farrar, Strauss & Giroux) and one at a British press (Hamish Hamilton). Canadian subsidiaries of British-based foreign presses were slightly more involved, as part of their move into Canadian content. Oxford Canada published three translations and Macmillan Canada, four. In terms of funding, while the Canada Council provided some ad hoc assistance as early as 1959, publishers relied on their own means, spurred primarily by the growing demand for Canadian books for schools and universities. 

During this transitional period, expectations, customs, arrangements, and policies with respect to author-publisher-translator communication were in flux, varying from press to press and dependent on changing managerial attitudes, yet caught up in the general dynamic spirit of the times. Existing Canadian publishers built on traditions rooted in their initial mandates (Ryerson Press and Clarke, Irwin). New Canadian publishers developed their own way of doing things, both drawing on the publishing experience of American and British subsidiaries, and setting out their own distinctiveness. On the one hand, the predominant role of the publisher in determining the works to be translated, choosing the translator, and editing the translation seems to be consistent with the contemporary American or British publishing model. On the other hand, the
hands-on approach of several Canadian publishers themselves (Lorne Pierce at Ryerson Press, Jack McClelland at McClelland & Stewart, Irene Irwin Clarke at Clarke Irwin, Maynard Gertler at Harvest House) and managers at Canadian subsidiaries (John Grey at McMillan), linked to the general ambient enthusiasm for new Canadian cultural production, opened the door to a kind of cooperative spirit among writers, translators, editors and publishers united in a common interest in promoting Canadian literary activity.

As a result, hierarchical relationships between publisher and translator on an ad hoc fee basis co-existed with more egalitarian associations between writers and translators, and/or writers, translators and publishers. Publishers, such as Jack McClelland, enjoyed a lively and comradely correspondence with many of the writers he published. Professional friendships between writers and translators were not uncommon. Gérard Bessette was translated by his colleague at Queen’s University, Glen Shortliffe. Harry Binsse, who had translated Gabrielle Roy at Reynal and Hitchcock, continued to translate her works for McClelland & Stewart. Canadian writers Joyce Marshall, Gwethalyn Graham and John Glassco, and playwright Mavis Moore, developed amicable connections with Québec writers, and undertook translations. These interconnections between agents and criss-crossing of roles would increase substantially in the second phase as opportunities for translation grew exponentially.

**A Professional Public-supported Commercial Model: 1970-1990**

Changes in government funding in the 1970s substantially transformed the context for author-publisher-translator communication. Thanks to lobbying by the Independent Publishers’ Association (IPA) following the 1970 sale of Ryerson Press to McGraw-Hill of New York, the Canadian federal government instituted the first major funding programs for Canadian publishers, including direct grants from the Canada Council and support for export initiatives
Regulative measures on foreign investment in the book industry were adopted in 1974, and, in 1979, a new funding program, the Canadian Book Publishing Development Program (BPDP), was set up. More specifically for translation, in 1972, following the Official Languages Act (1969), which enshrined equal constitutional rights for French and English as official languages, and growing appreciation of the importance of French-English exchange in the context of Québec demands for autonomy, the Canada Council created a substantial Translation Grant Program. Aimed primarily at making more translations available, particularly from French into English and from English into French, the Program was successful in increasing translation activity approximately ten-fold, from an average of some 25 titles per decade, in the 1950s and 1960s, to roughly the same number per year in the decades following its implementation.

These new funding opportunities had several effects on the overall institutional context for literary translation. The first was to reinforce the publisher’s position as the principal site for inter-agent communication around translation events. The Translation Grant Program covered the full cost of the translator’s fee (at a standard rate determined by the Canada Council), but publishers were responsible for applying for grants, and for distributing funds to translators. The Program did not intervene in any way with the choice of what texts would be translated, which was left for the publishers to decide on the basis of their evaluation of the market. In this sense, the public-funded model retained a commercial dimension, in keeping with the government priority to develop and reinforce the financial viability of the nascent Anglophone (and Francophone) publishing sector. Nonetheless, combined with the growing education market fueled by the “steady increase of post-secondary courses in Canadian literature,” the Program undoubtedly contributed to the creation or expansion of several Canadian oriented literary series,
such as the McClelland & Stewart’s New Canadian Library series, which included translations, Harvest House’s French writers of Canada series, and translation series at Coach House Press and Exile Editions.

At the same time, the role and status of translators were enhanced in several ways. By substantially augmenting the funds available for translation, the Program led to an important rise in the number of translators involved in the process, broadening considerably the range in their backgrounds, expectations, competencies and literary status as agents. Academics teaching Québec or comparative Canadian literature, including Philip Stratford, Barbara Godard, Ray Ellenwood and Doug Jones, began to assume a leadership role, establishing close links with new publishing houses (Coach House Press, House of Anansi, Exile Editions), suggesting works for translation, and translating books themselves. Their role was all the more influential, given the collective force of the newly founded Association for Canadian Studies (1973) and Association for Canadian and Québec Literatures (1974), and their direct link to the education book market. More particularly, as funding administrator, the Canada Council coordinated responsibility between translator and publisher with respect to translation quality, and also contributed to equalizing the contacts between the two categories of agents. Publishers were required to submit sample translations to the Council in order to obtain translation grants, but seasoned translators served as peer reviewers for the applications. All these factors reinforced the translator’s position in communication with publishers during translation events with respect to the choice of titles, and the assessment of translation quality.

At another level, through its range of funding programs and peer evaluation systems, the Canada Council favoured the creation of writers and translators’ associations, including the Writer’s Union of Canada (1973), the Literary Translators’ Association of Canada (1975), and the Union
des écrivaines et écrivains québécois (1977). These professional associations provided a focal point for lobbying efforts to reinforce writers’ and translators’ contractual rights. From the beginning, the Literary Translators’ Association of Canada was particularly concerned by the professional recognition of translators, around such issues as having the translator’s name on book covers, and copyright. In 1986, these efforts would culminate in the “50/50 split of rights payments with authors” under the newly created Public Lending Right Program, and in 1987, in “having translations expressly mentioned as literary works in the Canadian Copyright Act.”

While these actions brought translators into a more equal relationship with writers, it is important to note that authors also saw their role in translation communication expand during this period. Greater access to funding contributed to the rise of new literary reviews and presses, often initiated by groups of authors themselves.

Spurred on by the enthusiasm for developing the Canadian cultural activities and exchange, reciprocal relationships between Anglophone and Francophone authors intensified, particularly since numerous Francophone writers translated works by their Anglophone compatriots, leading to a sharing of literary contacts and communication between authors and translators around French-English and English-French literary exchange.

A Contractual, Commercial Model: 1990 to the Present

The commonality of interests and relative balance of influence that generally characterized the institutional context of author-publisher-translator communication in the 1970s and 1980s would come under considerable pressure in the 1990s due to Canadian political and cultural factors as well as the effects of globalization. Signs of unraveling began already in the mid-1980s. The intense public debate around how to accommodate Québec’s demands for autonomy within the Canadian confederation, and the failure of the Meech Lake (1987) and Charlottetown
Agreements (1992) to achieve the inclusion of Québec in the repatriated Canadian constitution resulted in a certain cultural fatigue in English Canada with respect to Francophone interests. With the adoption of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act in 1985 and changing demographics in English-speaking Canada, Anglophone interest shifted from what Canadian author Hugh MacLennan called Canada’s “two [Anglophone and Francophone] solitudes” towards Canada’s “other” solitudes. In the academic community, post-colonial discourses drew scholars away from French-English literary exchange towards multicultural or international cultural dynamics, resulting in reduced demand from the educational market and a gradual disengagement on the part of academic translators with respect to Canadian French-English literary translations. Under a similar impulse, the Literary Translators’ Association of Canada began to lobby the Canada Council for greater support for translators working in other language combinations, and contributed in 2003 to the inauguration of the Banff International Literary Translation, which has since then hosted translators and writers working in nearly 40 languages.

At the same time, the effects of globalization exacerbated financial pressures on Canadian literary presses, limiting public spending and subsidies, and reactivating the structural weaknesses of the Canadian publishing sector, “buffeted back and forth between colonial and independent markets for much of its history.” The Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the United States, signed in 1987, followed by the North American Free Trade Agreement including Mexico in 1994, deepened the vulnerabilities of the Canadian Anglophone publishing industry to American cultural products. In the 2000s, pressures on the Canadian book trade intensified. With the concentration of commercial mega bookstores and setbacks in local distribution networks, ensuring market access for Canadian-authored books became acutely
problematic. Neoliberal federal economic policies further reduced public support for publishing of Canadian titles, confirming the shift in government focus from cultural to economic goals. In 2009, the Book Publishing Industry Development Program (BPIDP) was considerably streamlined and renamed the Canada Book Fund (CBF). New technologies, eBooks and copyright legislation changes further eroded the Canadian publishing sector.

In terms of the institutional context for author-publisher-translator communication in English-Canadian literary presses, these pressures and transformations led to diverse and sometimes contradictory situations. On the one hand, in a certain continued solidarity of cultural interests, formalized by the creation of the Canadian Arts Coalition/Coalition canadienne des arts in 2007, all agents would continue intense lobbying efforts for public appreciation and assistance, with the goal of limiting government cuts. Translators urged the Canada Council to recognize them as authors, but teamed up with writers’ associations to fight copyright legislation that reduced their revenues. New cooperation between Anglophone and Francophone presses, often on a regional basis, favoured translation ventures, as a way to reduce promotion expenses by piggy-backing on the publicity generated by the original. On the other hand, divergences intensified. Under commercial pressures, several presses progressively limited their translation program, or chose works of a more profit-making dimension for translation, including works by international authors. Recognition for translators declined, and translators reported recurring difficulties in having their names on book covers. To reduce administrative costs, the Canada Council eliminated the revision process in the late 1990s. Revision was left up to ad hoc arrangements within each publishing company, although many seasoned translators were retiring. As a result, much as in the initial transitional period of the 1950s and 1960s, but with the presence of reliable funding for translators’ fees, the institutional context for translation was
again in flux, the extent of which varied from publisher to publisher according to the specific situation and continuity of the agents present.

**Survey of English-Canadian Presses**

Empirical research carried out in 2006-2008 on translation events at Canadian English-language publishers captures some of the heritage from the 1970s-1980s, as well as these recent transformations of the institutional context for author-publisher-translator communication. Data was collected through a national electronic survey of English-language literary presses identified as having published or currently publishing translations. A questionnaire including 177 questions was developed in consultation with publishers to ensure relevance and feasibility of completion. A one-day conference was held in April, 2007 at which publishers, translators and authors participated. To assist in interpreting the data, further follow-up included communication with selected translators, a telephone interview with one major publisher, analysis of sample author-translator and translator-publisher correspondence, and selective assessment of translations. Publishers were informed that the survey was conducted on an independent basis but that the results would be communicated to Heritage Canada, an important funding agency for Canadian publishers. While publishers may have had some interest in adjusting their responses to reflect their own wishes for policy change, the follow-up, which included multiple perspectives, confirmed for the most part the data provided by the publishers.

Out of 27 presses identified, 14 responded for a response rate of 52%. Of the presses responding, 57% self-identified as small companies, 14% as mid-sized, 14% as university presses, and 7% as large companies. In terms of publishing activity, 50% published fewer than 20 titles per year, 36% between 20 and 39 titles, and 14% more than 60 titles. For most, however, translation titles were just a small fraction of their production: 57% published only 1-2
translations per year, 28% from 3-5 translations per year, 7% from 6-9 translations, and 7% did not publish any translations in the year of the survey. All respondents (100%) indicated a concern about added costs, 75% a concern about translation quality, and 67% a concern about sales potential and challenges in marketing a book with a non-Anglophone author.

Perhaps because of the relative low numbers of translations published, Canadian Anglophone Presses tend to consider translations as being a literary genre in their own right, independently of the genre of the original text. Accordingly, the survey assessed publishers’ expectations for translation sales compared to sales expectations for particular literary genres. When asked about their expectations in terms of Canadian sales, 53% of respondents ranked translations in the very high, high or moderate range, compared to 22% for drama, 25% for literary essays, 36% for poetry, 45% for short stories, 54% for anthologies, 75% for children’s literature, 81% for fiction and 90% for biography/autobiography. In general, international sales expectations by literary genre were relatively similar, with the exception of biography/autobiography (down from 90% to 70%) and translation (down from 53% to 36%). Given that the overwhelming majority of translations published are works of fiction or autobiography/biography, the gap between expectations for these genres and translations confirms that publishers do indeed perceive translations at least to some degree as a separate genre.

Almost two-thirds of the respondents (64%) published translations of international works. Of these, 50% were from languages other than French, and 36% were non-literary works. These figures are consistent with the institutional context for translation events in the 1990s and 2000s, resulting in Canadian Anglophone publishers’ apprehensions about profitability and uncertainty about translation quality. The internationalisation of translation events during the 2000s is also confirmed by the number of translations of non-Canadian-authored works, although the fact that
publishers anticipate notably better domestic than foreign sales for translations suggests an import rather than an export orientation to internationalisation.

**Communication around Choice of Texts and Translators**

Author-editor/publisher-translator communication is particularly visible around key moments in the translation event: the choice of the text to be translated, the choice of the translator, the preparation of the translation for publication, and the promotion of the published translation. Data from the survey suggest that all three levels of agents participate indirectly or directly in the choice of texts to be translated. A preliminary analysis was made to identify any differences in how publishers approached translations as opposed to original works. Input related to the original work’s style, reviews of previous works by the same author, sales expectations and author status (had already been published by the press) were associated with the author, and information with respect to the style of the translation sample and expected sales of the translation, with the translator. Assessment of the topicality of the theme of the work was connected with the publisher. To add another interpretative nuance, responses were grouped in two different ways, first by very high and high rankings, and then by very high, high and moderate rankings. This allowed for an assessment of the criteria as being of high importance (very high and high rankings together), or of general importance (very high, high and moderate rankings).

As shown in Table 1: Choice of Text for Publication – Original Works vs. Translations, based on very high and high rankings only, factors associated with the author, especially style (92%) and status as an author already published by the press (63%), are particularly significant in the decision to publish an original, more so than expected sales of the new book (27%) or reviews of previous works by the author (18%). The publisher’s assessment of topicality of theme is important, but not decisive (58%). When very high, high and moderate rankings are considered
together, however, these gaps decrease substantially. Author’s style (92%) and status at the press (90%), as well as topicality (91%) show as very close in priority, followed by sales (79%) and reviews (81%) of previous works by the author. The situation is slightly different for translations. Based on very high and high rankings only, the publisher’s assessment of topicality of theme remains constant (58%), but the style of the translator (69%) retains only some of the priority given to the author’s style. Sales expectations are marginally more important (31%), but reviews of the original (38%) are almost twice as important as reviews of previous works by the same author. When very high, high and moderate rankings are grouped together, both similarities and differences are accentuated. Topicality of theme, author’s style and status even out for both original works and translations. However, expectations for sales (69%) play a lesser role in considering the publication of a translation (perhaps because expectations for sales appear to be generally lower for translations), whereas the importance of reviews of the original (92%) increases substantially. This suggests that while presses tend to prefer to work with authors they have already published, whether in the original or in translation, in the case of translations, authors have to meet a higher threshold of conviction, and are more vulnerable to book reviews.
Table 1: Choice of Text for Publication – Original Works vs. Translations

GL1: General literary titles, based on very high and high rankings
FT1: French-English translations, based on very high and high rankings
GL2: General literary titles, based on very high, high and moderate rankings
FT2: French-English translations, based on very high, high and moderate rankings
TH: Theme
ST: Style
AU: Author
SA: Sales
RE: Reviews

The questionnaire also surveyed other possible factors affecting the decision to publish translations. Of these factors, three reflect directly on author-publisher-translator-communication: the role respectively of editorial staff, translators, and authors’ agents in the decision to translate a work. As shown in Table 2 Factors affecting the Decision to Publish a Translation, based on very high and high responses, recommendations by editorial staff (83%) are more influential than those of translators (54%), while the role of authors’ agents is limited (18%). When very high, high and moderate rankings are grouped, however, the influence of
translators (92%) approaches that of editorial staff (100%), and that of authors’ agents also increases (72%).

Table 2: Factors affecting the Decision to Publish a Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost benef</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table, V/H/H refers to Very High, H refers to High, and M referred to Moderate. It is evident that when very high, high and moderate rankings are considered together, cost of translation rights remains constant (77%), but the effects of publishing translations on publisher’s access to government grants (67%), the possibility of exchange of rights with a Francophone publisher (92%), and cost benefits from promoting an author already published in the original in Canada (38%) all increase in importance. While these institutional
factors generally reinforce the publisher in author-publisher-translator communication, they indirectly also strengthen to some degree the position of translation, if not that of individual translators.

More specifically, survey results suggest that translators themselves are an important source of influence when publishers are looking for a translator. When very high and high rankings are considered, publishers give the premier priority to choosing translators who have already worked for them (100%). Moreover, they are more likely to choose a translator based on the recommendation of a translator they know (84%) than on the recommendation of an editorial staff member (67%) or the author (46%), but, interestingly, accord relatively little importance to recommendations by the Literary Translators’ Association of Canada (15%). Only a small percentage (24%) of respondents compare sample translations provided by more than one translator, confirming that publishers’ relationships with translators are not directly determined by a service requestor-service provider hierarchy.

**Preparing and Promoting the Translation**

The relative prominence of the translator also shows up in data concerning the preparation of the translation for publication. Only just over half the respondents (57%) declared they have a standard process for editing translations, as opposed to original texts in English. When asked whether this process included a revision of the translation by a bilingual editor or professional translator, 25% of respondents indicated always, 42% usually, 25% sometimes, and 8% never, suggesting that once the professional relationship with a translator is consolidated, the publisher tends to adopt a position of trust with respect to translation quality. This was confirmed by the responses to questions about general editing policy (as opposed to specific editing for translations). While translation accuracy was a key factor (91%), based on very high and high
rankings, the other factors rated important by respondents reflect a standard copy-editing approach to editing: readability of the text in English (100%), correct grammar and punctuation (92%), suitability of style and language for the Canadian market (83%), consistency of style with company standards (77%). Moreover, when asked what qualities they sought in a translator, very high and highly ranked factors included quality of the translation (100%), but also the ability to meet deadlines (93%), writing style (93%), and, more significant perhaps, the acceptance of editorial changes (100%). These latter responses demonstrate again the importance of the editor/publisher and translator relationship, but suggest that this relationship is built at least in part on a common conception of writing conventions and style and the ability of the translator to adapt to editor/publishers’ expectations. Factors related more directly to the translator’s role as author of the translation were nonetheless viewed as significant, but slightly less important, including the translator’s reputation with the reading public (46%) and willingness to assist in promoting the book (31%).

Communication among authors, translators and editors/publishers was further surveyed with respect to tasks related to the translation event and translators’ working conditions. As shown in Table 3: Preparation and Promotion of the Translation, 64% of respondents ‘always’ asked translators to proofread their texts, 15% ‘always’ asked the translator to choose the title, and 8% always asked the translator to prepare text for the book cover. These rates increase when the response ‘usually’ is taken into account, suggesting that translators by and large proof-read their text, have significant input into the choice of title, and some input into how the text is presented on the book cover. In contrast, no respondents indicated that translators are always or usually asked to choose the cover illustration or prepare promotional material for the book.
Table 3: Preparation and Promotion of the Translation

In terms of working conditions, the combined always (79%) and usually (21%) responses show that translators are virtually always consulted with respect to the establishment of the timeframe for carrying out the translation. However professional recognition is far from systematic. Translators are likely to have their name on the cover, but this is not guaranteed: responses were 64% for always, 14% for usually, and 7% for never. Translators may have gained an equal share in royalties under the Public Lending Right Program, but their share in royalties for sales of the translation are not likely to be high: only a small percentage of respondents indicated that this was always (7%) or usually (14%) the case. In terms of author–translator communication, 78% of respondents indicated that they encouraged contact between the translator and the author, while
equal numbers of respondents (14%) declared they asked the translator to mediate with the author when changes are required, or asked the author to intervene with the translator when changes are required. No respondent indicated that they discouraged communication between the author and the translator.

**Understanding Institutional Contexts for Literary Translation Events**

This article has focused on the publisher as the predominant site for author-publisher-translator communication in the context of Canadian Anglophone presses since 1960. While not exhaustive, findings from the survey of publishers confirm the complexity of author-publisher-translator communication, and the need to situate this communication within an understanding of the evolution of communication models over time. For instance, the importance of the translator-publisher relationship shown in the survey results would appear to spring primarily from the commonality of cultural goals engendered in the professional public-supported commercial model of the 1970s and 1980s, whereas inroads on translator recognition reflect the negative effect of financial pressures and globalisation on professional contractual conditions under the contractual, commercial model of the 1990s and 2000s. The relative absence of standard editing procedures for translations is surprising, given the extent of literary translation activity since the creation of the Canada Council Translation Grant Program in 1972, but can be understood as a result of the configuration of the Program, which initially assumed some responsibility, through peer-reviewing of sample translations, in translation editing. Under financial pressures, publishers do not seem to have filled the gap left by the Canada Council disengagement from quality assessment, and have not consistently developed specific editing processes for translations, beyond the standard copy-editing for all publications.
In theoretical terms, this study suggests that further empirical research into publishers as the predominant site for author-publisher-translator communication could shed important light on the functioning of institutional contexts. Given the evolution of author-publisher-translator communication over even relatively short periods, it would be essential to set empirical research within an historical perspective in order to gain a more complete understanding of trends and tensions within these contexts. As publishers and promoters of translations, publishers are at the centre of various communication networks about translations, linking translations to readers, critics, bookstores and libraries. In this sense, they also make important contributions to what I have called elsewhere the “la translature,”55 or what could be roughly covered by the concept of local translation eco-system, a system composed not only of agents and translation events, but also of various other non-translative activities, such as language-teaching, government policies, cultural traditions, that help nurture, or not, the circulation, creation and reading of translations.

This study has not sought to examine in depth the effects of public policy on translation events, nor has it attempted to develop in any detail communication among agents with respect to the promotion, distribution and reading of translations. Policies at the Canada Council inform, for instance, the participation of translators as authors in readings to promote their translations, although in practice they always appear with the author. In Canada, grants to publishers frequently include subsidies for book promotion, and grants are also available to cultural magazines and reviews, scholarly journals, and public libraries, which all play an important role in the circulation of translations. Research on these contexts could also contribute substantially to furthering our understanding of the overall impact of institutional policies and practices on literary translation events.
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