

Transcreation as a paradigm for new approaches to translator education: defining new roles for humans translators

Juliet Vine

Elsa Huertas Barros
University of Westminster

In this paper we argue that the new conceptualisations of translation that have developed in the last twenty years (Lefevere & Bassnett 1995; Cronin, 2006; Tymoczko 2007) have all contributed to the expansion of understanding of what translation is. For example, the widening focus of translation from word, to text, to context and culture has led to understandings of the role of translators as cultural mediators. We argue that these new conceptualisations recognise that all translation is an intrinsically creative activity (Ho 2004) and that they therefore support a claim that transcreations are translations. Hence definitions of transcreation as translation plus creativity (Benetello 2018) are based on misconceptions and incomplete understandings of translation. We argue that these incomplete understandings of translation continue to inform current translator education. They may explain why a breakdown of all the competences required in the transcreation process is not fully accounted for by the translation competences outlined in the new EMT competence framework (EMT Board 2017). Although the document does not claim to be exhaustive, in this new competence framework, the (inter)cultural competence appears to be a less well-defined competence and translation of advertising is not mentioned, nor is the notion of creativity. Moreover, the prevalence of beliefs about the limited nature of translation in the transcreation industry (Pederson 2014), and also the limited self-conception of translators as 'not being creative' (Katan 2016), demonstrate there is a gap between what translation theorists are theorising and what translator educators are teaching which needs to be addressed. This paper will exemplify how this gap can be filled by explicitly using transcreation projects in translator education, since this not only validates translators as creative, but also provides an opportunity to (re)consider how the new conceptualisations of translation can be accounted for in translation teaching, e.g. by questioning the concept of accuracy and the limits of translation. Transcreation provides a prism through which the evolving understanding of translation and the evolving roles of human translators can be investigated.

References

- Benetello, C. (2018). When translation is not enough: Transcreation as a convention-defying practice. A practitioner's perspective. *JoSTrans*, 29, 28-44. Available at: https://www.jostrans.org/issue29/art_benetello.pdf
- Cronin, M. (2006). *Translation and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- EMT Board (2017). *EMT Competence Framework 2017*. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/emt_competence_fw_k_2017_en_web.pdf
- Ho, G. (2004). Translating advertisements across heterogeneous cultures. *The Translator*, 10 (2), 221-243. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13556509.2004.10799178>
- Katan, D. (2016). Translation at the Cross-roads: Time for the transcreational turn? *Perspectives*, 24(3), 365-381. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0907676X.2015.1016049?journalCode=rmps20>
- Lefevere, A. & Bassnett, S. (1995). *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Cassell.
- Pedersen, D. (2014). Exploring the concept of transcreation - Transcreation as 'more than Translation?' *Cultus Journal*, 7, 57-71. Available at:

http://www.cultusjournal.com/files/Archives/pedersen_5_p.pdf

Tymoczko, M. (2007). *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome.