DENIAL OF TRANSLATION AND DESIRE TO TRANSLATE[1]

Yves Gambier

Centre for Translation and Interpreting
University of Turku
gambier@utu.fi
Finland

Translating and translation are transformed with Information and Communication Technology (ICT). Yesterday, translation was invisible, denied – as a need, as an activity, as a profession, and as a discipline. Within three decades, a new work environment is shaking up the translators' world. New types of translators are emerging. The balance between supply and demand is changing. However, we still need adequate tools and methods to investigate the new hierarchy which has become established between translators, between different kinds of job markets.

With their arrival, communication, information and computer technologies (ICTs) have brought about certain changes in attitudes and representation with regards to translation. What follows here hinges on a main proposition, i.e. that these changes may well induce a significant break not only in translation practice but also in discourses about translation.

Firstly, and with the goal of putting these changes more clearly into focus, we need to recall that translation and interpreting are but one possible solution among many implemented in international, multilingual communications and relations. Indeed, depending on the historical period and specific power relations, other means and strategies have existed and been valorised in different ways over time (Lambert 1989, 233):

- The language of the Other can be recognized and learned – a long-term investment which may ultimately yield results that are less risky and less costly than translation/interpreting (done by an intermediary) and ultimately favor linguistic and cultural diversity (see efforts to promote multilingualism by the European Union).

---

[1] The present article is based on a plenary talk 'Denial of Translation' that Professor Yves Gambier gave at the international conference 'Translation is the Language of Europe' (Umberto Eco) held on 6–7 October 2011 at Vilnius University.

- Languages can co-exist, with speakers alternating between languages or practicing a passive bilingualism (each one speaking his or her own language, without having to pass through any type of mediation whatsoever).
- A *lingua franca* can be used – and this language can be either an imposed one (for example Russian in the former eastern European countries), or an artificial one (e.g. Esperanto), or a third language (e.g. French in certain African countries, or English as in Belgium or in Switzerland, so as not to have to choose one of the local languages). Today, English fulfills this function in the domains of science, business and commerce (House 2003), as Latin once did for the world of letters. A *lingua franca* can also act as a pivot language, to the detriment of direct bilateral contacts (Gambier 2003). As such, some of the Japanese literature now familiar to Finnish readers is known only after the works have been filtered through Anglo-Saxon publishers, i.e. the works are both selected by them and then translated according to their directives and norms.

In addition to these co-operative strategies, with all the possible difficulties and misunderstandings that they imply, we find at least two other strategies that are exclusionary:

- A barricade can be imposed, closing the Self in behind a wall so as not to be exposed to the Other, effectively a separation from 'them' – and we think here of the Great Wall of China, the Roman walls or ramparts of medieval cities, the Berlin Wall, the so-called Security Fence between Israel and the Palestinians, the enclosures separating the U.S.A. from Mexico, or those erected between the Spanish enclaves and Morocco, and even the surveillance cameras of gated communities or ghettos of the elite!
- The Other can be suppressed, in favor of ethnic purging and purification, and ethnocide. Recent examples (ex-Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Cambodia) clearly confirm that this solution is not one relegated solely to the past.

This little reminder allows us to re-position translation in terms of linguistic policy struggles,[2] and to brush away all specks of naïveté concerning the inexorable growth in demand for translation. In this picture we've sketched out, there is no mention of the diverse possibilities to automate translation; yet, translation automation already satisfies a not insignificant volume of translation, of a more or less urgent nature (see section 2). From this perspective, how and up to what point do these possibilities challenge the place – indeed, even the role – of translation? And above all, how do they transform the perception we have of them?

---

[2]   Translation markets (literary, scientific) are at least doubly structured, both by linguistic borders and by nation-states, and the two do not necessarily coincide. Furthermore, both are respectively structured between center and periphery (for example, Francophone countries constituting *La Francophonie*.)

Our argument will proceed broadly along two lines. Firstly, the denial of translation and of translators has taken on many diverse forms and has lasted for centuries, but, secondly, it has been jolted for almost three decades now by the new work environment. During this time, new types of translators have appeared. What consequences can we draw from this in terms of translation apprehension, translator training, and translator status?

1. DENIAL OF TRANSLATION

Translation, taken in its traditional sense, particularly when applied to sacred and literary texts, has been denied in several aspects all at once – as a need, as effort, as a profession, as a discipline. All languages and societies have not been affected in the same way, to the same degree, at the same time. The thoughts and remarks mentioned below should thus be taken prudently, and not be over-generalized in an abusive way. A historical narrative of practices and discourses in more detail goes well beyond the scope of this article.

1.1 Denial of translation as a need

For a long time, it seemed as though translation only served the governing powers and the established authorities (royal and religious), as if it were inexistent, hidden away, tucked within exchanges of all types – commercial, scientific, and philosophical, to name but a few (Delisle, Woodsworth 2007). Non-translation has been discussed and debated (by Toury 1995, 23–29, for example). This non-recognition of a translation status for some documents, as is largely the case for televised advertising and news, makes it difficult to grasp the actual volume of translation work taking place. In fact, it becomes more difficult to know with any accuracy how markets evolve (see 4.1), according to what logic, and who their entities and agents are, if reliable data on today's supply and demand (current, predicted, latent, potential) cannot be obtained (Gouadec 2002, 87–115; 2007,120–145). Indeed, translation services are not the sole privilege of self-declared translators; some so-called translation agencies propose an array of other services (publishing, language courses, website development), while for other companies specializing in communication, advertising and marketing, translation represents but a minor part of their entire range of services. Finally, sub-contracting and outsourcing make the collected data vulnerable to double calculations, rendering the data concerning supply suspect. In the case of large corporations, for instance, some of their translation needs can be met internally, whereas others must be solicited and purchased externally. A statistical report on translation volume would therefore need to be based on clients. However, it would not reveal the full extent of a potential, latent market – that is to say, the documents which could be translated if the costs were lower, and if the work were to be done more quickly, or if the resources to carry out the translations were better known or more accessible.[3]

---

[3]   http://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/513108

Certainly, there are some international statistics in existence, compiled by Ovum reports (1995), Rose Lockwood (1999), the Van Dijk bureau (1999), the Common Sense Advisory Inc. (2006), as well as some national statistics (for example in Belgium, Finland, and Great Britain, where a new category of economic activities is supposed to include "translation and interpreting"). But in all these cases, the numbers and market indicators are subject to caution. For the time being, we have neither the means nor the tools to draw up a balance sheet that tallies the effect of globalization on translation; nor can we anticipate upcoming needs, or project how the demands for literary translation and technical translation might evolve, with all their possible (media translation, audiovisual translation, etc.) or as yet undetermined (machine translation with speech synthesis) intermediaries.

This penchant to not recognize certain types of translation is taking a new turn today, as seen by the proliferation of labels tending to deny or depreciate "translation" or by the act of not having recourse to the term altogether. This observation does not warrant our stopping now to contemplate the origins of this outbreak in denominations (does it occur in all societies? in all languages?) referring to the transfer, the crossing, the transcultural – work that is paid for, with money, anonymously and often with indifference. We are not thinking here of traditional categories such as specialized or literary translation, conference or community interpreting – categories that have emerged "organically" from within the clan of translators. Rather, we are thinking of the labels imposed from within diverse professional milieus – by sponsors and commissioners of translations, all the while denying the word itself, and opting instead for: localization, adaptation, multilingual documentation, editing, trans-editing, multilingual technical writing, language mediation, versioning, revision, co-writing (legal texts, for example), transcreation (Ray, Kelly 2010), etc. The burgeoning functions to be carried out at the same time (documentation, terminology, project management, website design, editing and proofing, etc.), the advanced specialization required (by domain, tool, document type) "define the sets of knowledge and specific competences for jobs as engineers of multimedia, multilingual communication" (Gouadec 2002, 70). This E2MC could be the future face of the translator.

1.2 Denial of translation as effort

Denial has always been present, and still is, with regard to translation as an activity requiring effort, and this, in part, explains the relative proliferation of denominations mentioned above. Many sponsors, amateurs, self-translators (scholars translating their own articles), and engineers within the language industry continue to consider translation as a mechanical process, the replacement of one word by another, a problem of dictionaries, something they could do themselves if they had the time, but something they prefer to pass on, not without condescension, to a cousin who knows languages,

or to a bilingual secretary, or, worse, to a professional translator, on the condition that he or she does not demand too much financial compensation. Perceiving a text to be translated as nothing more than a linear series of words or phrases (a perception that partly intersects offers with translation memory software constraints, see 2.2) no doubt explains why translation has long been considered as inferior, subordinate, second only to the original.

It shows how the idea of "translation" and the universe of translators still remains archaic at times in the eyes of many who live with archetypes, preferring to conceive language as a static object rather than a dynamic one, preferring to envisage communication as an information packet rather than as an interaction, preferring to retain the notion that a message is but a concatenation of data rather than an expression of an identity.

Thus also the frequent display of examples of "bad translations" or bad lexical choices – errors in the installation instructions of a knee prosthesis, for example, or in the dispatches of information on the acquisition of plutonium by North Korea, or in the number of deaths from an earthquake in China, or in a press release by Renault which causes its shares to tumble, or in a diplomatic document that has a cooling effect on the relations between Israel and the Netherlands, or in the translated re-transcription of a telephone call of a presumed victim in the DSK affair (Dominique Strauss-Kahn), and so on and so forth. We even find frequent mention of the fantastic sums of money that translation supposedly costs the European Union, and recently, the Spanish Senate, the underlying argument being that translation and interpreting are "easy" (word-by-word substitution), and they should not cost so much!

1.3 Denial of translation as a profession

Denial has likewise been present with regard to translation as a profession, notably by translators themselves who have integrated, incorporated and internalized various aspects of the "subaltern" in their work, caught between the sacrificial idealism and the calculating materialism of their activity, all the while taking on the labor and servility of their always precarious "vocation" as if this job or this practice required a certain predisposition towards effacement and docility (Kalinowski 2002; Simeoni 1998), even self-destruction.

Metaphors of translation and images of the translator in the collective imagination are today regularly reproduced in fiction, novels, films and even in the media (Gambier 2012). They verge on the stereotypical and on clichés, with the translator viewed more often as a hardworking hermit, on the margins, an impostor, instead of a mediator, an expert, a creator. The fatalistic discourses and demeaning representations do not date to now; since the end of the Middle Ages (15th c.), one finds mention of imagery associated with reflection, the pale star, the underside of tapestries, the chameleon, etc.

1.4 Denial of translation as a discipline

Finally, denial has long been present with regard to translation as an autonomous discipline and as subject matter worthy of further thought and reflection. Even today, the status of Translation Studies remains an ambiguous one within university institutions, caught between languages and literature. Furthermore, many of the translator training programs emerging and multiplying over the past few years have been reluctant to give Translation Studies a place, reducing translation to a collection of knowledge and tricks of the trade, unfit for self-reflexivity. Such ambiguity reflects the malaise of universities when confronted with interdisciplinary, intercultural communication and linguistic diversity, even when at this very moment the globalization of business and trade and migration, continuously hurl challenges out at most of our societies.

The ruptures between reality and the commentaries that ensue, the double language, the denial of realities, at times the opposite of idealism, often in defense of its interests, are not the exclusive domain of translation, translators and Translation Studies. Recent news bears witness of accumulated examples of denial as a behavior that is actually more frequent than not, for example, denying the links that exist between pollution (mercury, asbestos, atomic, petroleum) and certain illnesses and handicaps, denying the effects of financial constraints and the mediatisation of sports values, denying the need for a common economic policy while creating a common European currency, etc.

The types of denial mentioned with regard to translation needs, the effort expended on translation and the profession of translators, die hard. Will they resist the transformations currently underway (proliferating names, diversifying practices, offers of translation assistance tools) that make the translator an ever more "dematerialized" individual, one no longer reducible to mere pens and dictionaries?

2. A NEW WORK ENVIRONMENT

In less than two decades we have seen computing move through the ranks of the translation world – transforming the translator's resources and making it possible to accelerate the pace of translation. From the denial of translation we seem to have gone to a desire to translate, at times quite frenetically, as can be seen, for instance, with the fansubs and fandubs who appropriate a film in order to subtitle or dub it in the shortest possible delay.

2.1 Virtualization of shared tools

The computerized components of this work environment have proliferated. The software used for creating translation memories, aligning texts, managing terminology, checking spelling and grammar, accessing and searching electronic corpora and machine translation readily come to mind – without forgetting that many differently combined technologies

also exist, such as those integrating translation memories, terminology bases and machine translation, all of which allows bidding for free translation to transpire and circulate on the Web. No less negligible is the sharing of experiences thanks to discussion lists and forums, blogs and various social media like LinkedIn.

From the use of micro-computers exponentially facilitating data-sharing and the creation of local networks, we have now moved to a kind of dematerialized computing (cloud computing) which lifts from the translator's shoulders all the worries and burdens of management, maintenance and reconfiguration of work tools; indeed, infrastructures, platforms, software, services and solutions are now accessible by distance, via the Internet, and invoiced according to use (SaaS, or Software as a Service). This new online distribution model of shared tools no longer belongs to a single entity, nor does it constitute a domain of fixed (static) installations on individual computers; it pushes the translator to become a member of an international virtual and collaborative community, since updates and new versions are immediately available, and everybody benefits. Such services in translation address professional, amateur and occasional translators, as well as agencies, institutions, and companies. They are able to propose such functionalites as project management, revision, terminology or a complete work environment. Among them, whether free or paid for, are the following: Translation Workspace, Wordbee, XTM Cloud, Google Translator Toolkit, Lingotek.

This rapid evolution is not inconsequential for the practice of translation or the organization of its practice, and surely not for its supply. Shared resources accessible in real time are now dynamic; costs are reduced (nothing is bought as pricing is based and calculated on demand or according to use – i.e. by the hour, year, volume of words, etc.), management is minimised (both in terms of time and transparency) and work is shared. Dematerialization favours simplification and productivity. On the other hand, it also creates a certain dependence on Internet connections and poses problems with security and confidentiality breaches. Within resides the paradox of this evolution: it mirrors the challenges associated with the centralized computer systems of the 1950s and 1960s, devourers of energy always at risk of breaking down.

2.2 Translations by the users

Based on the above information, one cannot conclude that the ongoing changes boil down solely to developments in machine translation, offered freely for all on the Web. Here we will differentiate between the following:

1. Machine translation offered through programs available on the Web, and where human intervention is limited, even non-existent. In other words, one can upload content to a machine translation program in order to get the "gist," without being concerned about quality.

2. Amateur translation[4] that is also automatized, but where the user provides his or her feedback and, at times, attempts to improve the performance of the MT results – based on linguistic intuition, without there being any specific translator training involved. Within this category, two types can be differentiated:

a. Translation by fans (fan translation, fan subbing, fan dubbing, scan-trans) who deliberately choose a manga, an animated film, a video game or similar and proceed to translate (subtitle, dub) it in order for others to know about it as soon as possible. These fans are not translation professionals – hence, they transgress certain conventions and respected norms of the profession (for example, for subtitling, this touches on the number of lines, scrolling speed, position, typographical characters used, gloss additions, etc.). Neither are they all "pirates," as some of them do respect the copyright holders and refrain from circulating their translated version on the Web as soon as the book or film has officially been released.

b. Participatory or **collective translation** (crowdsourcing[5]), used, for example, in the localization of software, Web sites or for translating articles, reports, literary texts and interviews. For this collective, unpaid effort, volunteer and anonymous (or sometimes not) participants turn to linguistic competence and during their available time here and there translate a sentence, a paragraph or a page, all of which can be retranslated and revised by others, until the entire project is finished. These volunteers translate once, or can translate hundreds of times, thanks to such tools as Traduwiki, Wikitranslate and Google Translate. Social media or socio-digital networks (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, etc.) take advantage of the passing craze in order to become more accessible to more people.

Collective translation has already been subject to fiercely articulated positions under the pretext of the pitiful quality it offers, or of the unfair competition against professionals it poses, because it can be used just as easily by both the non-profit and profit sectors.

Two remarks can be made here. The volume of potentially available translation work goes beyond the capacity of all professionals put together. Translation does not have equal prestige or the same attraction that music, photography, journalism or cinema has on the Web, with millions of amateurs ready to promote the products they are passionate about as a pastime and without any compensation whatsoever. Denied for so long, translation does not generate the same enthusiasm. Nonetheless, we can discern that the means (and tools) we have today are making translation desirable and feasible. But this desire is not an overwhelming one. These resources do not incite the masses, even if they do allow us to envision breaking certain linguistic barriers in view of the potential quantity of

---

4   The terminology used in English is redundant and vague: community /crowdsourcing /collaborative / citizen /paraprofessional /user-generated /volunteer translations, in addition to the 3CT proposed by "Common Sense Advisory", namely: community, crowdsourced and collaborative translation.

5   The word "crowdsourcing" has been rendered differently in French translation, for example as [back-translated] "crowd information collecting", "crowd supplying", "mass collaboration", etc.

documents to be translated. The impact of crowdsourcing on the translation industry will be limited, despite the current euphoria of the discourse, and it will be most evident in only very visible instances.

3. Collaborative translation (teamwork) that is carried out on the same, single document by professionals places computer resources at the common disposal of all. This includes document research, terminology, re-reading and revision. It is manifest in such sites as Proz, Translator's Café, etc.

4. Translation with open source tools, which are not necessarily free but which can be adapted to certain needs and redistributed to others, can be carried out by professionals and on a full-time basis.

5. Volunteer networked translation can also be carried out by professionals (that is to say, those who have been trained for, and/or have experience in, translation), for example through networks such as Babel, ECOS, Translators Without Borders, etc. (Gambier 2007). These activist translators work for a specific cause and respond to the needs expressed by NGOs and other associations. Their network is aligned with a specific social cause / activity, or allied with actions expressing certain values.

Thus, there is a difference between types 1–2 and 3–5, where (for the latter) professionals share tools, problems and solutions and put an end to individualism or to a romanticized image of the translator, and where their socio-professional enterprise is reconfigured due to the technologies being implemented to meet the challenges of outsourcing, competition, job insecurity, online bidding, international RFPs, etc. For types 1–2, however, their only link is technological in most cases, with their common interest focusing on a site, a network, a product, etc. These "communities" on line are therefore short-lived and limited in breadth and scope. What brings all these groups together is a shift in the direction towards the actor (translator, user), as the producer of content.

Collective intelligence put into the service of translation has diverse motivations. Some Internet users are professionals and are concerned with developing their job profiles, while others are activists clearly oriented by ideology or technophile amateurs, and yet others are freelancers attempting to forge new niches. The evolution is thus not only technical, but also economic and social. It is constrained by outsourcing, but equally pushed forward by multilingual production in need of being rendered accessible as quickly as possible, or by the rallying behind certain causes that have been ignited.

3. DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN TRANSLATORS OR BETWEEN TRANSLATIONS?

Crowdsourcing (i.e. a translation task offered to an undefined group of volunteer translators) has aroused a great deal of concern in terms of the people involved (Are they translators? How are they compensated for their work?), its ethics (What are the

implications of this freely provided work on companies which seek to make a profit?) and the very concept of what translation is, how it comes about and/or how it is perceived.

3.1 Amateurs, "natural" translators?

In order to have a better understanding of the domain of volunteer translators – their motivations, expectations, concepts of translation, their working languages, socio-educational profiles, etc. – certain methodological concerns should be underscored here. How are they to be recognized and contacted? Is it possible to conduct inquiries on the identity and habitus of these online translators?

The so-called *sociologie des usages* has been focused on the usage of ICTs, particularly since the 1980s, when the first telematics networks emerged (see, for example, the journal *Réseaux*). For the time being, this type of sociological inquiry has not really progressed beyond surface studies, as if merely quantifying such practices sufficed for understanding users' social positions, jobs, sociability, the time they devote to the Internet and its myriad practices, etc. The practices observed, the statements collected and the traces recorded must then be correlated with the diverse status and identifying elements of users as well as with the content produced on line. A kind of mystification with regard to words such as "community" has arisen, as if all members were equally competent, tactical and prone to explore by nature, and with the same capacity to interpret. The ideology of empowerment can lead one to believe that all amateurs are, at the same level, autonomous, reactive, thoughtful and masters of their movements. Much of the discourse on collective translation participates in this supposed technophile craze, reducing communication and social uses of the Internet to a kind of mythology of an information society and a participative Web. At this juncture, Translation Studies could join Sociology in searching for new types of inquiry and in questioning the assumptions of statements made about the equal participation of all, the effacing of authorities, the democratization of communication, etc.

The recurring distinctions made with reference to collective translation often focus on the qualifications of the participants. Are they natural translators (Antonini 2011), amateurs, non-professionals, as they are sometimes made out to be? In fact, publications in *Translation Studies* have lingered for some time on weak dichotomies such as novice/ professional, non-professional/volunteer, natural translators/trained translators, amateurs/experts, etc., particularly in studies on translation processes. Similar discussions on professionalism and professionalization have recently been made not only with regard to translators, but also community interpreters (Wadensjö, Englund Dimitrova, Nilsson 2007; Sela-Sheffy, Shlesinger 2009, 2010; Katan 2011; Wadensjö 2011). There are multiple criteria for identifying both: one seeks out competences, knowledge, experience, regular practice, efficacy, precision, ethics and so on, while the other embraces individual

and collective efforts to achieve a certain status, define the norms of best practices, control access to the profession, training and job offers, etc.

Would masses of data eventually gathered and processed not distance us even more from a system of accreditation for translators? Whatever the case may be, a volunteer translating on the Web can be a fan, an expert, an activist, either with experience and/or a formal background in translation, or without it.[6] He or she may even collaborate with a professional. This is not the case, however, for technology providers, who do not stem from the same "community" as users: Google, Facebook and their likes make a profit and are on the stock exchange, above and beyond performing as "social media".

The jury is still open as to how, and to what extent, these new practices might disqualify, or de-professionalize, full-time translators who are trained and replete with experience. Likewise, how and to what extent could they assist in the development of areas of competence in translation? Technologies could offer new opportunities and niches that did not exist before, in addition to the new problems they raise.

3.2 Towards a variegated future?

As suggested by the developments described above, productivity, accessibility, quality and collaborative flux have become all the more tightly intertwined; rather than focusing on debating the tension or presumed opposition between professionals and amateurs, it would seem more urgent and opportune to organize a dialogue among translators and technology providers. Indeed, with some of these tools, we observe a kind of regression, a return to the old concept of translation that is word-based, word-to-word, as if it were (re)becoming nothing but a simple, formal, mechanical, countable transfer, which reverts to why translation has been denied for such a long time (see 1). The line-by-line translations of European Union directives, produced with the constrained aid of translation memories, the practice of live, or direct subtitling, or the subtitles of fans all tend to stick to the source, to become verbatim, with no concern whatsoever for other matters such as the effects on reception and on reading. With changes to the conditions and pace of work, this tendency can indeed demotivate the translator, who becomes dispossessed of all power, always forced to be online and beholden to the tool imposed by the client. The desire for translation, almost compulsive among fans for example, and stemming from a rather well thought-out sharing (of resources) among volunteers, is seemingly plural in nature, with measurable nuances reflected by their different modes of work. In whatever case does this not profoundly transform the image of translators, even when, paradoxically, desire and denial sporadically meet and encounter one another?

The traditional individualism of translators should, however, not hide the fact that they have worked in pairs and in groups since at least the 16th c. This practice still

---

[6]   Graffiti writers, for example, also represent a diverse group which is often neglected (denied), under the pretext that all graffiti is illegal, no matter who authors it: be they young people from a well-to-do background or students in Fine Arts, or self-learners, or professional designers. Street artists, like translators, are not a homogeneous group.

continues, as examples like the new 2001 Bible translation into French, coordinated by Frédéric Boyer (both exegete and writer), and the new 2007 translation of Joyce's *Ulysses* by a team of seven translators meeting on a regular basis, testifies. Of course, localization projects imply teams and a division of labour that is both physical and virtual.

Digital society is not defined as a collectivity structured by mediating organizations (parties, unions, associations); rather, it is an ensemble of micro-units. In this context, translation (see 2.2), as for other products and services, takes on an entirely new dimension thanks to open source software and to the online distribution model of shared tools – giving way to sharing, collaboration, accessibility, and volunteerism, anticipating along the way a most variegated future among professionals, hyper-specialists and amateurs working stroke by stroke but not in continuity with one another. Users and consumers of translation can now also be producers. It is obvious that the status and image of translators will forcibly be changed.

Unable to fall back on any substantial inquiries as to the identity and profiles of these online translators, which are as of now still difficult to conduct (see 3.1), we can consider the future of journalists, who are likewise confronted with computerization and an influx of amateurs. Drawing a parallel between the two groups should not lead to overly hasty extrapolation however. Journalists and translators do have points in common (Gambier 1994, 76–77): they work with written and oral forms, and have a socio-cultural responsibility that goes beyond the immediacy of the statements produced. They require abilities for proper document and terminological research. They need to be able to establish relationships with other experts. The communicational efficiency of media professionals could be useful for translators, while the translators' concern for quality and precision could serve to assist media professionals, who are increasingly asked to translate on-sight, to synthesize their texts more efficiently. In both cases, acquiring skills is more important than garnering knowledge that is rapidly rendered obsolete, and where autonomous decision-making and the capacity to self-evaluate seem primordial. Finally, both professions are confronted with ICTs, facing the transformations they imply within production workflows and in the distribution channels of information.

From the first revelations by WikiLeaks (July 2010) to the closing of *News of the World* (July 2011), we can fast-track through the rapid changes within the domain of journalism. Instead of the pyramidal newspaper office (from the director deciding the line of the paper to the chief editors assisted by reporters, specialized journalists and freelancers, all supported by correctors, typesetters and rotating workers), we find the digital "platform" fed by a flux of circulating information sent and updated on a continual basis, and where fewer journalists work in more formats and for more outlets (weekly magazines, daily newspapers that are free or paid for, websites, mobile telephone applications), handling textual, visual and audio data. Writing cycles are no longer dictated by deadlines but rather

by the ways the news is consumed by readers, who can now participate in the process of producing news. Like the journalists who transform and format the dispatches of press agencies and reporters, they do so by sending in images, videos, commentaries and the like. The press is now in competition with aggregating services providing information online, free or at low cost. This rapid evolution brings along with it a fair number of myths – for example, on the power of social media (as though they were all equally reliable) and on the numbered days of journalism (under the pretext of the seeming democratization of means of access to information). Techno-utopic illusions do not prevent the circulation rates of newspapers from dropping or advertising revenues from diminishing, or the dismissal of writing professionals from occurring (nearly a third of professional journalists in the U.S.A. have been let go over the past ten years, and 3,000 positions were eliminated in France in 2010); neither do they prevent collusion between different media, between power and money, or the replacement of investigative journalism by opinion pages, and challenges to the intellectual, moral and financial rights of journalists, etc. The accumulation of tasks, the tyranny of reactive feedback, the redundancy of content, the multiple formats of articles, the impact of mobile phones and laptops and the emerging new sources of information all create a profession that is not only on constant alert but is a kind of journalism without journalists that is subjected to the dictates of immediacy, speed and the market. Under these conditions, one wonders about the future of any kind of quality press and about the credibility of the information in circulation, and just how much trust to allocate.

The avatars of journalism would seem indeed to cross paths with those of translation. The Internet users contradicting, completing and debating one another about information seem to resemble those who translate on the Web with the goal of making a document or a film known. The contradictions between a minority of journalists in collusion with politicians and a majority suffering from job insecurity would seem to be palpably similar to those between "renowned" literary translators and the mass of little hands translating for their daily bread. The fears brought about by ICTs and changing work conditions seem to be mirrored by journalists and translators alike. Both types of work, undergoing changes due to technological and financial pressures, seem to be forced to re-question their very norms and ethics. Amateurs, who have long been disparaged by professional milieus, would seem to have their revenge. Marginalized and caricaturized (think of the images of radio pirates, alienated fans, irresponsible adolescent hackers, etc.), these amateurs are pushing the limits of redefining the contours and missions of certain professions. Whether one rebuffs them as a (disguised?) form of liberalism or praises them for animating certain practices, do they not reflect the profound mutations induced by the presence of ICTs?

4. IMPLICATIONS FROM THE PLURALITY OF ACTORS AND PRACTICES

In line with the developments mentioned up to this point, two trajectories for thought emerge: the first concerns the economic dimensions of translation, and the second revisits operational competences. In the first case, it is not solely a matter of reinforcing the economic model assumed hegemonic by the social sciences, but more a matter of understanding the specific transformations occurring in translation practice from a perspective traditionally neglected in Translation Studies. Translation, whether it be paid for or free, is squarely located within the commercial sphere, even if it clearly has other facets (ideological, cultural, identity). In the second case, it is a matter of trying to understand under what conditions and minimal expertise translation is actually doable. Between the hyper-specialized professional bound within an international network and the occasional working amateur, is there any convergence at all?

4.1 Towards an economic turn in Translation Studies

Translation Studies have clearly experienced "turns" over the past three decades (linguistic, cultural, ideological, semiotic, cognitive, sociological, etc.) – turns that are somewhat dizzying, as if this bulimia of bends, turns and detours, and this speed to change orientations, were more a condition of driving under the influence. Yet, at the same time, there remains an underlying concern, at times an outright worry, about being recognized by the university and by other disciplines. Against this backdrop, there is still a tangible missing economic link, discussed on other occasions by Pym (Pym 2006, 12), that is to say: the real questions of costs, investments, modes of payment, etc. From the multinational agency often managed today by a non-translator, to the publishing house anxious to conquer new markets (Heilbron, Sapiro 2002; Sapiro 2008, 2009), and from the international or government institution remunerating translation services to the former teacher moonlighting in translation in order to make ends meet, economic and financial dimensions can no longer be neglected. They are relevant factors that orient, even determine, specific choices and decisions. The lacunae evidenced by our (lack of) knowledge of the market have already been recognized here (see 1.1). This multi-faceted market evolves according to demand, to the means used to meet these demands, and to the nature of the relationship that binds the translator to the commissioner of translations (Gouadec 2002, 2007).

 This market may be local, open and accessible to everybody, i.e. to anybody, from the person knowledgeable about the language needed to the person able to manage a given tool or technology. This market is also fragmented, offering small irregularly paced contracts and encompassing a variety of texts of unequal tenor and length – from hotel pamphlets to promotional prospectuses of SMEs. It is equally the domain of freelancers –

of amateurs (with hardly any training), beginners (new graduates, whether in translation or not) and professionals alike, where the latter are solidly established, have one or more working languages and have been successful in gaining the loyalty of a certain number of regular clients. Within this fragmented market, costs are quite random (employers have no or little idea about which rates should be applied, or of the high stakes involved with the quality of a translation). Translation often appears to be considered as a last resort, remunerated at the bare minimum.

A protected market implies a demand that is more concrete, one that touches on issues of quality requirements and on the translation of documents representing financial and commercial stakes, at times bound by security or legal constraints. Clients tend to be more well-informed, wanting their operations and maintenance manuals, marketing brochures, takeover bids, or web-sites to respect certain preferences of terminology and protocol of format. Likewise, within this market we find translation agencies and companies, operating either with salaried in-house translators or functioning as a network of experienced, independent translators. The protected market can be regional, or national, and is configured mainly by medium-sized industrial and business enterprises, drawn in by the export field. In Finland, this type of market demands bi-directional translations, to and from foreign languages.

The global market is more or less concentrated. The management of projects, human resources and technical resources adheres to explicit standards and procedures of quality control, even if the work is outsourced and sub-contracted. Service providers (multinational agencies) are therefore organized along the lines of well-established criteria for reliability and productivity, with a division of labour that is more or less technically and geographically defined. They can respond to requests for huge volumes of translation and to a variety of demands, including diverse document types, languages to be used, and a specific infrastructure to produce the final product. This industrialized market of translation (including localization, multilingual writing and publishing) imposes specific norms, including financial ones, on multiple markets.

Regional and global markets can accommodate beginners on internships or for limited contracts, even if it means that after a certain period of time these beginners might prefer sub-contracts from one or several contractors. Indeed, according to the market size and working languages, this market division can become more complex: in Finland it is rather rare to be able to survive as a literary, legal or technical translator; even agencies hesitate to hyper-specialize in any single domain – medical or pharmaceutical, for example. On the other hand, the arrival of multinational agencies, for instance in the audiovisual sector, has shaken up certain practices and fees. In fact, as long as translation work can be regulated, recognized, and accredited both in terms of access and practice, like other liberal professions (doctors, architects, lawyers, notaries, etc.), these three markets (local

and open, regional and protected, global and concentrated) will continue to be pervious to one another.

Another non-negligible economic aspect: how does competence in foreign languages affect business performance; or in other words, how does a linguistic policy, often implicit, have an impact on the often non-explicitly stated policies of translation? An international survey (2008) conducted by the British National Centre for Languages requested by the European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture reveals that 11% of exporting European SMEs (945,000 firms) lose business due to linguistic barriers, ignoring the fact that Russian, German and Polish are used in eastern Europe, or that French is current in a number of African countries, or that Spanish is spoken in Latin America! Fewer than half of these businesses have contemplated a strategy for multilingual communication (recruiting native speakers, adapting their Web sites, resorting to local agents, offering language courses to personnel, hiring translators and interpreters).

Other analyses on other markets would be welcome, such as, for example, on the linguistic policy and market of video games. However, micro-level studies need to accompany macro-level ones (see Mossop 2006), for whichever domain the translations are done (medical, technical, commercial, audiovisual, literary, etc.), and they should:

- Compare translation and interpreting costs with other means used for taking care of international multilingual communication (see Intro);
- Compare the ecological prints of Western translators with those in India translating the same text, or interpreters who travel versus those conducting videoconference interpreting (costs, productivity and environment);
- Analyze translation as a *bona-fide* business, notably in terms of its cost in relation to turnaround times and quality demands;
- Analyze expenses in terms of the functioning, or non-functioning, of a translation division located within a business, banking or other enterprise;
- Analyze the financial repercussions from translation memory systems in terms of productivity gains, or on the contrary, how they hinder productivity due to *ad hoc* correspondences that emerge between segments and require change and correction, or what happens when they are shared collectively or when substantial revision must be carried out on the translated text after they have been applied;
- Analyze the costs and financial implications of software use in computer-assisted translation, machine translation with or without pre- and post-editing;
- Compare modes of payment among translators (per word, line, page, hour, by the number of readers (of the translated text) or website visitors;
- Document and analyze the economic fall-out when changes are made to the workflow, including new tasks, new procedures, new decision-making

processes, changing relationships to the source document (completed or in the process of being written);

- Analyze the financial consequences of localizing websites, whether successfully or not;

- Analyze the costs for revision, re-reading, in accordance with their place and frequency along the workflow and in terms of expected objectives (for example, revising internally when the translations are outsourced);

- Analyze the financial impact of reverting solely to English for the international communications of a business organization (for example, the effects of a marketing piece or a slogan on actual sales);

- Document and analyze the means of selecting and recruiting independent / freelance translators by translation agencies, or by companies, and the means by which to evaluate the services they have rendered;

- Analyze the costs and effects of community interpreting, whether carried out by a qualified person or an amateur, in medical consultations (see survey by Ribera, Hausmann-Muela, Grietens, Toomer 2008);

- Analyze the relations between financial constraints and the costs incurred for retranslations and/or for adaptations, with cuts and additions, for theatrical pieces, comics, children's literature, advertising, etc.

From markets revolving around supply and demand to the effects of technologization, from daily organizational practices at work to the consequences of corporate mergers (corporate cultures), the territory and range are wide open for including research on the economic and financial dimensions of translation and interpreting. There is an interdisciplinary challenge existing between Translation Studies and Business Studies that has hardly been faced up to the present time, despite its urgency; many of those responsible for configuring the work terrain understand only the language of money.

4.2 Expertise

The different forms and possibilities associated with translation – from the nearly automated to the participative, and including specialized and professional types – mandate that we re-interrogate whether or not we are all working with the same concept of the word. An electronically configured world always demands more links between agents in the process, with pre- and/or post-editing, revision, re-reading, coordination of terminology, all carried out in the interest of the product's final coherence. But, in all these cases, is there a communicational dynamic that would justify the decisions and interventions made by the translator? Is this dynamic, with its objective of possibilities for negotiation, always explicit in some way? Is translating a presentation for the Web,

all while ignoring the conditions in which an event was held, and for which public it was conceived, the same as translating a manual on school harassment where one knows the reasons for which the work was written and needs to be translated?

Is it possible to manage cooperation and trust between anonymous persons, within a system based on efficiency, flexibility and with asymmetric relationships among the people involved, and thus asymmetric in terms of authority and responsibility, like one would manage a team where the competences of each member chosen are known? Can seeking anonymous workers for free really compare to recruiting members according to explicit criteria for a job that is remunerated?

Often, in the context of training, what has been studied in Translation Studies over the past two decades is the passage from novice to professional, or the development of competences and the kinds of knowledge and behavior (especially through decision-making) within these two groups that are not always easy to differentiate. Can one resort to the same methods in order to understand the current diversity found among translators? Should we first concentrate on the processes or on the profiles, habitus, perceptions and self-perceptions of these different kinds of active translators in order to respond to the questions posed earlier? To take up the parallel with media once more, one sees more often a concern for its independence than a concern for the independence of the experts (economists, political commentators, etc.) who intervene, although not exclusively, in the very same media. Does this also occur in Translation Studies? Should we be satisfied with merely observing and describing the actions of translators and neglect the acts of those who intervene both upstream (language engineers, machine translation computer experts, translation service providers, etc.) and downstream (those who decide, for example, to stop a translation mid-way, or to put it online, or to circulate it, etc.) in the process?

Among the diverse competences of the translator, for which this list (linguistic, cultural, technical, etc.) is not nearly exhaustive, there is one that especially stands out in importance, barring the extent of a translator's involvement or the professionalization of the field: competence in reading and understanding what needs to be translated, i.e. a competence that relies on former knowledge, memory (short- and long-term), capacities for logical inference, etc. Once again, we find a number of questions cropping up which could change our behaviors and serve to differentiate translators, according to their socio-cultural milieu of origin, their habits and their abilities to learn. The Web favors a more fragmented reading (by successive links) that is more rapid in nature (search targeting specific information). Likewise, the translations produced by Google Translate, for example, are of good enough quality because they are consulted rather than actually read or assimilated. Some would speak of the "superficial" nature of this reading and writing. Would this imply that the Web obliges the translator to hone expertise in such specific abilities as deep reading and writing relevant texts, in addition to revising and publishing

documents generated by computer? In that case, electronic tools would not suppress the qualified translator at all. A new hierarchy of translators would be imposed, but at the top we might not find the literary translator, as has been the case for decades. What would be disturbing today within the translator milieu would not be so much the fact that automation is becoming increasingly more prevalent, but that the prestige of literature, a reference value of our cultures and the channels of myths like the genius of the writer and creativity, could be lost.

5. IN GUISE OF A CONCLUSION

The denial of translation, violent and reoccurring, is a long-time phenomenon. Might it now be possible to affirm that it has been surpassed by a desire to translate? Rebuffed for so long, translation might be proving itself desirable thanks to all the means available for facilitating its supply. Is it a case of simply being reversed by the stimulus of ICTs, or is it a profoundly transformed dimension of translation, as globalization accelerates and as a dictatorship of urgency is increasingly imposed on the greater part of our activities? A lack of hindsight and means by which to describe and evaluate the situation as comprehensively as possible does not authorize us to respond in a piecemeal way. The totalizing phantoms of all-powerful accessibility and automatic implementation still cast their heavy shadows on the current landscape of this evolution.

Nonetheless, several phenomena seem inescapable:

- The omnipresence of technologies is tangible in almost all scenarios of production and services.
- The heightened demand for translation and interpreting work is felt acutely, even if the work is invisible, non- or poorly recognized, or quickly assumed as a "loss".
- There is a need to emerge from the corporate translator bubble because translation – what it demands, implies, its effects, challenges, etc. – touches more than just translators. A publication like *How to translate for Dummies* would in no way be provocative, since more and more individuals are concerned by data, information, and knowledge exchange, and by the diversity of their possible sources.
- Translation volume clearly surpasses the total work capacities of professionals who have received appropriate training in the field.

REFERENCES

Antonini R. 2011. Natural translators and interpreters. *Handbook of Translation Studies*, vol. 2, eds. Gambier Y., Van Doorslaer L. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 102–104.

Delisle J., Woodsworth J., éds. 2007. *Les traducteurs dans l'histoire* (2ème édition revue et corrigée). Ottawa: PU d'Ottawa. (1ère éd.: 1995)

Gambier Y. 1994. Multimédia et médiation: quel défis? *Problemi e tendenze della didattica dell'interpetazione e della traduzione*, eds. Gambier Y., Snell-Hornby M. Proceedings of the conference held in Misano Adriatico, 28–30.9.1994. Special issue of Koiné IV, 67–79.

Gambier Y. 2003. Working with relay: An old story and a new challenge. *Speaking in tongues: Language across contexts and users,* éd. L. Perez González. València: PU, 47–66.

Gambier Y. 2007. Réseaux de traducteurs/interprètes bénévoles. *Meta* 52 (4), 658–672.

Gambier Y. 2012. Le traducteur défiguré? *Figure(s) du traducteur,* éds. Skibínska E, Paprocka N. (coll. Romanica Wratislaviensia, vol. 59). Wroklow: PU, 13–24.

Gouadec D. 2002. *Profession: Traducteur.* Paris : La Maison du traducteur.

Gouadec D. 2007. *Translator as a profession*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Heilbron J., Sapiro G., éds. 2002. Traduire; les échanges littéraires internationaux. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* 144, 3–5.

House J. 2003. English as a global lingua franca. *Speaking in tongues*: *Language across contexts and users,* éd. L. Perez Gonzáles. València : PU, 19–46.

Kalinowski I. 2002. La vocation au travail de traducteur, *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences socials* 144*,* éds. Heilbron J., Sapiro G., 47–54.

Katan D. 2011. Status of translators. *Handbook of Translation Studies*, vol. 2, eds. Gambier Y., Van Doorslaer L. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 146–152.

Lambert J. 1989. La traduction, les langues et la communication de masse. Les ambiguïtés du discours international, *Target* 1 (2), 215–237.

Mossop B. 2006. Has computerization changed translation? *Meta* 51 (4), 787–792.

Pym A. 2006. On the social and the cultural in Translation Studies. *Sociocultural aspects of translating and interpreting,* eds. Pym A., Shlesinger M., Jettmarová Z. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 5–30.

Ray R., Kelly N. 2010. *Reaching new markets through transcreation. When translation just isn't enough.* Lowell, Mass.: Common Sense Advisory.

Ray R., Kelly N. 2011. *Crowdsourced translation. Best practices for implementation*. Lowell, Mass.: Common Sense Advisory.

Ribera J.M., Hausmann-Muela S., Grietens K.P, Toomer E. 2008. *Is the use of interpreters in medical consultations justified? A critical review of the literature*. Study carried out by Pass International v.z.w <www.passss-international.org> and disseminated by Cofetis (Coordination fédérale de la traduction et de l'interprétariat social, Belgique –<www.cofetis.be>).

Sapiro G., dir. 2008. *Transaltio. Le marché de la traduction en France à l'heure de la mondialisation.* Paris: Ed.du CNRS.

Sapiro G., dir. 2009. *Les contradictions de la globalization éditoriale.* Paris: Nouveau Monde éditions.

Sela-Sheffy R., Shlesinger M., eds. 2009. Profession, identity and status: Translators and interpreters as an occupational group. *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 4 (2).

Sela-Sheffy R., Shlesinger M., eds. 2010: Profession, identity and status: Translators and interpreters as an occupational group. Part II: Questions of Role and Identity. *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 5 (1).

Simeoni D. 1998. The pivotal status of the translator's habitus, *Target* 10 (1), 1–39.

TLC (The Language Technology Centre). 2009. *Study on the size of the language industry in the EU*. DGT-ML-Studies 08.

http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/publications/studies/size_of_language_industry_en.pdf

Toury G. 1995. *Descriptive translation studies and beyond.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wadensjö C. 2011. Status of Interpreters. *Handbook of Translation Studies,* eds. Gambier Y., Doorlaers L. van. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 140–145.

Wadensjö C., Englund Dimitrova B., Nilsson A.-L. (eds). 2007. *The Critical Link 4: Professionalisation of interpreting in the community*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

VERTIMO NEIGIMAS IR NORAS VERSTI

Yves Gambier

Santrauka

Informacijos ir komunikacijų technologijos keičia vertimą kaip veiklą apskritai ir kaip procesą, kurio metu sukuriamas naujas produktas – verstinis tekstas. Dar visai neseniai vertimas buvo nepastebimas, netgi neigiamas – kaip poreikis, kaip veikla, kaip profesija ir kaip studijų dalykas. Tačiau per tris dešimtmečius vertėjų pasaulį neatpažįstamai pakeitė susikūrusi nauja darbo aplinka: atsiranda naujos vertimo ir vertėjų veiklos sritys, keičiasi santykis tarp pasiūlos ir paklausos, o mums reikia tinkamų priemonių ir metodų tarp vertėjų ir įvairių darbo rinkų atsiradusiai naujai hierarchijai tirti. Kartu reikia nustatyti šiandieninių pokyčių pasekmes vertėjų rengimui ir vertėjo statusui apskritai. Straipsnyje daromos tokios apibendrinančios išvados: 1) technologijos neišvengiamai daro įtaką visuose vertimo lygiuose; 2) vertimo raštu ir žodžiu poreikis didėja (net jei šis faktas nepripažįstamas, vertimo paslauga neorganizuota arba iš anksto pasmerkiama („vertimas blogas"); 3) vertimo sritis plečiasi, vis daugiau žmonių turi užsiimti šia veikla nebūdami profesionaliais vertėjais, nes jiems reikia duomenų, informacijos, keistis žiniomis ir idėjomis ir t. t.; 4) vertimo apimtis gerokai viršija profesionalių, atitinkamą parengimą turinčių vertėjų pajėgumus tą poreikį patenkinti.