

Is the Leibnizian quote “all change is a kind of transcreation” also valid in translation?

La citation Leibnizienne « tout changement est une sorte de transcréation » est-elle également valable en traduction ?

Lalia BELABDI 
Valladolid University / Spain
Lalia.belabdi@estudiantes.uva.es

Received: 21/04/2024,

Accepted: 02/06/2024,

Published: 30/06/2024

Abstract

Translation studies and practices show that translation act is binary in nature, known as translation dichotomy. Our study aims to differentiate direct from indirect translations, as standard translation and transcreation. Highlighting the notion of ‘change’ contributes at stabilising transcreation that stills ambiguous in translation. Projecting literature review of different kinds of change on indirect translations and transcreation demonstrate their similar nature, but on varying degrees -depending on the degrees of change-, when translating. Our findings show that transcreation covers the ‘change’ making that happens all along the expression journey from the source to the target. The present study is a milestone in the history of translation studies for investigating and attempting to validate “*all change is a kind of transcreation*” (Leibniz, 42: 1676); as an interdisciplinary concept from philosophy. This investigation is the first of its kind for addressing transcreation as the ultimate representation of all change processes. However, translation remains the umbrella term that refers to the discipline scientifically, the speciality academically and to translation general act practically.

Keywords: translation dichotomy - standard translation - transcreation - change - interdisciplinarity.

Résumé

Les études et pratiques de traduction montrent que l’acte de traduction est de nature binaire, connu par la dichotomie de traduction. Notre étude vise à différencier les traductions directes des traductions indirectes, par traduction standard et transcréation. Etudiant la notion du « changement » contribue à stabiliser la transcréation qui est encore ambiguë en traduction. La revue de la littérature projetée sur différents types de changement des traductions indirectes et la transcréation démontre leur nature similaire, mais à des degrés divers - en fonction des degrés de changement - lors de la traduction. Nos résultats montrent que la transcréation couvre le « changement » qui se produit tout au long du parcours de l’expression, de la source à la cible. La présente étude constitue un jalon dans l’histoire de la traductologie car elle enquête et tente de valider « *tout changement est une sorte de transcréation* » (Leibniz, 42 : 1676) ; comme un concept interdisciplinaire de la philosophie. Cette enquête est la première du genre à aborder la transcréation comme représentation ultime de tous les processus de changement. Cependant, la traduction reste le terme générique qui désigne la discipline sur le plan scientifique, la spécialité sur le plan académique et l’acte général de traduction sur le plan pratique.

Mots- clés : dichotomie de traduction - traduction standard - transcréation - changement - interdisciplinarité.

* Corresponding author: Lalia BELABDI

Introduction

From the general background of the topic in translation field, the terminology mess is a reality. Few decades ago, the term translation studies succeeded earning regularisation and recognition of Academia folk, thanks to the contributions of Holmes (1972/[1988]). The scholar suggested a name that aims to distinguish the act of translating from the act of searching, in translation field. Subsequently, the term did not only establish the distinction of two different activities in translation, but also established a new independent discipline, in the research area. Translation expanded the investigation beyond the language-focused studies and the linguistic discipline. Translation studies, as a compound term, refers to translation scholarly contributions. However, terminology issues still take part. After the abundant contributions and the insistence of many translation scholars on the fact that identifies the act of translating as two types, under the name of translation dichotomies (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1958; House, 1977/[1881], Newmark, 1988; Venuti, 1995/[2008] ..etc), translation has remained the only term that identifies the direct and the indirect processing. Translation dichotomies studies are the second attempt, after validating Translation Studies in translation terminology repertoire, to first, distinguish the two different types of translation processing and, second, to liberate the translational processing from the literal translation, which only takes into account the linguistic background of the expression. We get to the point of realising that it is not a matter of translation terminology shortage, but of the validation of terms, among translation Academia folk, that takes too long to accredit the properly expressing terms.

From the theoretical contextualisation of the topic, transcreation originates from the philosophy field. In translation field, it becomes currently recognised as one of the most sophisticated techniques, included among translation services under the ISO identifier 17100:2015. The philosopher Leibniz (42: 1676) introduced transcreation as a form of incarnation after an annihilation, a new creation and resuscitation of a body, thing or matter, and preferred calling it “*new but very beautiful name transcreation*”, since almost 4 centuries from now. He also recognised that “*all change is a kind of transcreation*” (Leibniz, 42: 1676). The present study aims to highlight the last quote, in particular, because it defines transcreation, much better than any consulted definition, in translation studies records. This definition demonstrates the nature of transcreation concept, illustrated in the change making. Transcreation also designates, properly, the translations of change.

The change making is not that new topic to discuss, in translation studies. We all, translators and scholars, know the kinds of changes, introduced as oblique procedures (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1958), as indirect approaches (Newmark, 1988) and many more. The exploration of kinds of change and the limits of change is very essential to the understanding of the movement of the expression from the source to the target, via transcreation. The link between the source and the target represents a continuity that guarantees effective delivery and reception of the expression, one more time.

Bassnett and Trivedi (02: 1999) see that translation, in general, happens in a continuum. The starting point should always be identified; which is the source. The destination should also, on its turn, be identified; which is the target. Movement/motion, continuity and change are also very familiar terms, in Leibniz’ philosophy (1676), and all these terms are, directly, connected to transcreation concept, in Leibniz’s Dialogue, entitled Pacidius to Philalethes; the first draft where

transcreation has ever been introduced. Transcreation, back then, has been introduced as the theory of motion and the theory of change, to serve the theory of continuity, in Leibniz's philosophy (1676). In other terms, The motion of bodies or matters requires the change making in their states, subsequently, their existence continues thanks to their ability of change and movement from one space-time framing into another.

However, in translation field, we have noticed that there are missing pieces of information and fundamental knowledge regarding transcreation concept. We perceive that transcreation has always been there, in translation studies as in translation practices, but it has never been linked, explicitly, to the change making, when translating. In translation market, transcreation is usually referred to as a "creative translation", authored by Burgner, in the True Language Company website. In Translation Studies, transcreation stills either a not yet consolidated concept (Carreira, 498: 2022) or a subject of research under definition coining (Díaz-Millón and Olvera-Lobo, 2023). Connecting transcreation to the change making, in translation, will solve terminology issues, and eventually, clarify the definition of transcreation, once and for all.

For the study purposes, this research attempts to stabilise transcreation in translation repertoire, translation studies and practices. It targets to demonstrate the evidences, from translation field, that justify "*all change is a kind of transcreation*" (Leibniz, 42: 1676). Moreover, the study also aims to develop the bigger picture of the change making, in translation field, from identifying: the reasons for change, the kinds of change, the degrees of change, the levels of change and, last but not least, the limits of change, in a more elaborative investigation.

To refine the statement of the problem, the main question would be:

- Is transcreation linked to the change making in translation field as it refers to the theory of change in philosophy?

The present study also attempts answering the related questions, and they are as follows:

- Isn't it more accurate to label the two different acts of translation as standard translation and transcreation since the first adopts the direct translation where the second represents the change making?
- Why is the terminology repertoire of translation field not expanding to designate each translational processing differently, if we all acknowledge that there are two different acts?
- When will transcreation be the ultimate representation of any change and all change of the expression rendition?
- What distinguishes transcreation from translation?

1. Literature review

The direct translations do not require substantial changes in the source content. However, the indirect translations require obvious changes, on varying degrees, in the source content. In other words, these two translation directions only refer to measuring the degrees of change when translating. The direct translational processing keeps the elements of the source content untouched. However, the second indirect act requires making changes in the source, in order to deliver a modified expression, on purpose. Therefore, many scholars have introduced several translation dichotomies, where each and every contribution introduces two opposing processes (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1958; Toury, 1978; Newmark, 1988; Venuti, 1995/[2008]...etc.).

Transcreation and the theory of change are, basically, the same thing, in Leibniz's philosophy (1676). Many second-generation theorists, such as Alcantara (1997), have discussed transcreation as the variation theory or the theory of change, in philosophy field. Transcreation, in translation field, refers to recreating/creating the expression (De Campos, 1963; Gaballo, 2012). Recreation and creations are simply kinds of change. In fact, translation dichotomies are also studied from the perspective of change making, when translating. It is true that some translations do not require a deep change, on the source expression; others require a substantial change. To specify, this change goes on varying degrees (furtherly discussed below). From a terminological perspective, translation is a general word that cannot all the time refer to every type of the expression conversion. There are many kinds of translation specialties that are registered in translation glossary, but simply not having a stable position. Transcreation, for itself, designates the particular act of translation whenever any 'change' and 'all change' takes place to produce a translation as another creation.

It is important to note that applying changes to the source expression has boundaries. There are elements of the source expression that can be change-prone, for very rational, emotional and purposeful reasons. As there are situations where making changes is, simply, a mistake. Now, making changes is not a matter of the translators' personal decision, but for very objective factors. Taking the example of P. Lal (1957) and the De Campos brothers (1963) transcreations, these pioneer scholars and transcreators have delivered an unprecedented kind of translation of literature, to the world. The best thing they did to make their masterpieces, is to make changes when translating. Lal (08: 1964) focused on creating literature that preserves the Indianness of the old sacred scripts in modern setting of the contemporary language; English. De Campos focused on creating content that revolutionised the Brazilian literature from the fusion of the Brazilian and the international literature, and of the world's art legacies, regardless of the boundaries of the space-time framing and the leaps from one civilisation into another (Jackson, 2010). Jackson studied the strategy of the De Campos brothers' transcreations and saw that, for them,

“To renew poetic form in another language means to re-create it, re-write it, or as HC [Haroldo De Campos] preferred, transcreate it using equivalent or parallel linguistic forms. His aim was a radical intervention in form and poetic language, with the intention of recognizing and promoting linguistic functions. He sought a new isomorphic version of the original text”. (Jackson, 144-145: 2010)

All of “re-create”, “re-write”, “transcreate”, “radical intervention” and “sought a new ...version”, explicitly, insinuate the change making that was applied. So far, both philosophy and translation fields are identifying the change making as an act of transcreation.

Briefly speaking, it is time to rename concepts, as they should be named. Translation is the main field that manages to transmit the expression from the source to the target. However, this transmission has two paths to take. Standard translation takes the source to the target, by keeping all the source elements untouched. Transcreation takes the source to the target, by making changes on few or many source elements. The theoretical projection, from both fields of philosophy and translation, aims to connect the dots to justify the kinds of change, simply, as kinds of transcreation. This point will help clarifying the definition of transcreation, the distinction between standard translation and transcreation, and, finally, suggest adopting transcreation as the ultimate representation of the change making process.

1.1. Change as motion

From philosophy field, Leibniz (7,16: 1676) said: *“I believe motion to be change of place, and I say that there is motion in that body which changes place. [...] I shall be allowed to define motion as a change”*. The philosopher projected the light on the motion notion, saying that whenever a body changes the place, it is contributing, eventually, to its movement; also called motion. Furthermore, the body is not susceptible for change, only if there is a stimulus and initiators of motion in it. Therefore, *“every change [...] can be explained entirely by the laws of nature – laws like the Principle of Continuity”* (Bender, 637: 2020). It is true that the philosophical standpoint of Leibniz describes more the natural facts; however, the nature of the expression is the same as of bodies and matters, in terms of change and the need for recreation and continuity. Regarding the latter, the change, sometimes, becomes inevitable. If something ever moves, it means that there could be some changes done.

In translation, the change is applicable on varying degrees, during the expression's rendition. Changes are not unthoughtful or non-purposeful. Making changes requires justifications. These modifications in the state of the expressions aim to continue with their second function, in a different destination. Making changes can only defy translation challenges when it becomes difficult to translate a cultural element, for instance. The inter-system translations imply changes making when the content has deeper connections of lingo-cultural features and more others aspects. As a fact, cultures are different. Their reference can be modified to meet the requirement of impactful reception of the expression. *“An element that appears paramount when treating transcreation is culture”* (Gambier, 61: 2014). Therefore, in order to make the expression of variable elements, such as the cultural references, moves with validity, changes should take place.

1.2. Motion as transcreation

In the Leibnizian philosophy, *“motion is nothing but transcreation”*, cited in (Jorgensen, 76: 2013). Moreover, the change in place is *“a kind of motion that we may call transcreation”* (Leibniz, 35: 1676). Transcreation appears, in Leibniz records, under many synonymic terms. One of them is the word motion. Transcreation contributes at, and leads to, the motion of things. In other terms, transcreation guarantees the continuity of the existence of things, as long as they are susceptible for change and movement/motion. Therefore, *“[t]he theory of transcreation reveals the true underlying cause of things”* (Jorgensen, 77: 2013). The cause of things reveals the purposes behind their first existence and also behind their motion, when introduced in new states, to maintain their continuity and validity.

If projecting such philosophical thoughts on translation perspectives, we note that any expression of any system shows its ability to be vehicular. There are dynamic elements in the expression that initiate its motion, from the source to the target. These dynamic elements are, certainly, its flexibility when introduced in a new state and its function for a wider reachability. Therefore, the *“transcreator is a choreographer of semantics, always moving and multi-dimensional”* (Jackson, 144: 2010). Always moving refers to the motion of the source expression when transcreated, despite its various dimensions: lingual, socio-cultural, referential, semiotic, aesthetic, impactful...etc. Therefore, transcreation *“[i]n addition to being an esthetic and creative procedure, transcreation is a constant project in progress, a voyage among world languages and literatures”* (Jackson, 145: 2010). Voyage, simply, describes transcreation as a motion that crosses all boundaries of space

and time that frame languages, literatures or genres, in general. Transcreation actualises the existence of the expression, one more time, in new settings of the new space-time framing.

1.3. Change as transcreation

Leibniz assumed that the “*conservation is perpetual creation; [...] this [...] is related to [...] all change is a kind of transcreation*” (Leibniz, 42: 1676). The philosopher expanded the understanding of transcreation, by connecting the term of transcreation to the concept of change and the perpetual creation for conservation purposes. Transcreation, in both fields, philosophy and translation aims to conserve by creating the thing/the expression one more time. The conservation, sometimes, implies re-creation/creation. Subsequently, re-creation/creation requires changes making.

To summarise, the transitive law demonstrates that if A is B, and B is C, then, A is C. We conclude that: if change is motion, and motion is transcreation, then, change is transcreation. Subsequently, “*all change is a kind of transcreation*” (Leibniz, 42: 1676), in philosophy and translation theoretical background fields, is valid. Our findings will emphasise on how transcreation fits in to represent the change making, in translation practices field.

2. Methodology

The present study is designed to go through a series of investigations that link: (A) former studies with the new findings in translation, (B) interdisciplinary discussions from philosophy and translation fields, (C) theoretical collection and projections of the literature review from the two fields of philosophy and translation and (D) interpretations that demonstrate the nature of the concept ‘transcreation’ and its connection to the notion of change, which is a commonly known approach, in translation field. This study employs the qualitative approach to investigate transcreation and the change making to provide a more nuanced understanding of their intertwined connection all along the study.

The data collection has been gathered under an interdisciplinary scope from philosophy and translation fields. The theoretical concept of the change making when transcreating explained in depth how this approach is adopted in translation practices to provide results that distinguish the standard translation from the transcreation of contents.

The empirical data collection illustrated the theoretical contributions that have practical use on different kinds of contents of mono- or poly-system nature. In other words, the empirical scope highlights the application of the change making approach on the expression dimensions nature for being either lingual, lingo-cultural or poly-system. These practices provide at the end two kinds of translations: standard translation and transcreation, highlighted by a variety of translation scholars since 1950s and on, as demonstrated below.

3. Finding and Discussion

The change is the ultimate indicator that distinguishes the act of standard translation from transcreation. The present study demonstrates that the change has reasons, kinds, degrees, levels and limits.

3.1. Reasons for Change

The change in translation is not a matter of unthinkable choice. The change is applicable only via the target-oriented translation procedures and approaches. Otherwise, the random and the non-purposeful change is a fault, when the content requires the application of the source-oriented translation procedures and approaches.

The nature of the expression to translate demonstrates the reasons for change. The general translational act is two types. The direct processing does not require changes. It is simply a lingual parallelism where words and their meaning are, easily, transmittable to the target expression. The indirect processing requires changes, on varying degrees. Leibniz (42: 1676) justifies the reasons for change, by saying that *“it seems that a reason for the following state can be provided from the preceding state alone”*. The following state refers to the next phase of the transmission. Every change carries its reasons within. Changes are always justifiable. Justifications imply measurements and purposes identification. Therefore, the reason behind changes relies within the first version, only. If it appears not transmittable as it is in the source, changes on its state should take place. In other words, the nature of the first version becomes the indicators of where changes should be applied and to what extent. The reasons for change are two:

3.1.1. Necessity for change: establishing syntactic and cultural parallelism

To avoid the syntactic misconfiguration, the expression becomes subjected to change, when translating from the source to the target. For this purpose, transposition procedure should take place to make grammatical changes (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1958), to establish the syntactic parallelism.

To avoid the cultural reference loss, domestication strategy, adaptation procedure and also as an approach are convenient processes to apply (Venuti, 1995/[2008]; Vinay and Darbelnet, 1958; Newmark,1988). De Giovanni (33: 2008) sees in her study of Translations, Transcreations and Transrepresentations of India in the Italian Media that *“the narration of India through visual and verbal elements implies, in itself, a process of transformation and audiovisual adaptation which will be defined as ‘transcreation’”*. The cultural change is a matter of search and substitution in the target culture repertoire, to make possible the cultural parallelism between the source and the target.

3.1.2. Obligation to change: establishing creational parallelism

To avoid the untranslatability and translation errors, changes must take place. The projection of the source lingo-cultural content on the target one, sometimes, becomes impossible. The combination of the lingual elements to the cultural references seems to be non-transmittable via the search for possible lingo-cultural parallelisms. At this point, it is not a matter of a mere translation. It is not even necessary to change, but obligatory. For such a case, it becomes a matter of content creation that can only be done via transcreation. The reason behind such a kind of change, labelled as creation, is to solve the impossibility of translation or to produce another original version of original impact.

Change is a feature in translation, when aiming to improve the quality of the translated expression, in terms of delivery and reception. The quality here refers to the exclusion of translation processing from the linguistic dominance, which has shown its incapability to transmit all types of

contents multiple times. Some source elements cannot make it through to the target expression, simply because the target expression provides much effective elements, in terms of comprehensibility, sensory experiences and effect. If projecting such perspectives on transcreation application in particular, we find that the reason for transcreating the content can be provided from the preceding source version alone. In other terms, if the source version of lingual and sociocultural elements is incapable of being transmitted to the target, transcreation, by making radical changes, must take place.

Therefore, the Change can be a necessary option, in translation, when aiming to search for - and if it is possible to find - the syntactic and the cultural parallelism, in the target expression. The change can also be the only obligatory option when the untranslatability becomes a situation to handle, from the source to the target expression. We conclude that the change appears having reasons that justify its use.

3.2 Kinds of change

Kinds of change are not a new topic to discuss in translation field. However, it is a milestone, in the history of translation studies, to recognise “*all change is a kind of transcreation*” (Leibniz, 42: 1676). It is important to note that the change in translation has started being a topic for discussion only with the insistence of many scholars’ contributions on multiplying translation dichotomies studies. Jeremy Munday (327: 2016) collected translation dichotomies from several scholars’ contributions. He found that the objective of these studies is one: identifying the two different acts of translation in each contribution. However, the terminology of the two opposing processes was the different part.

The concept of these opposing dualities, in making and not making changes when translating, was unanimously one, but the terms of these dualities were all different. Standard translation implies applying procedures and approaches of direct transfer of the expression, without making any change on the source expression. Transcreation implies applying procedures and approaches of change that modify the source expression. Now, these procedures and approaches have specific names, such as adaptation, modulation, transposition, free translation, idiomatic translation...etc., but by nature and practice, they all are kinds of change.

Before listing these kinds of change, it is important to note that most of them have been developed based on the processing of the lingual, and later, the cultural expression systems conversions. These contributions of translation dichotomies are the result of mono- or bi-system processing: the intra- or inter-lingual and the lingo-cultural translations. Translation dichotomies contributions have introduced opposing processing as procedures, theories, approaches and strategies. All these natures of the kinds of change have imposed one fact: translation can never be done one way, whether the processing is on the level of the word, the sentence, the text or the expression system. The following table demonstrates translation scholars who contribute at multiplying translation dichotomies records.

Table 01: Kinds of change compilation in translation

Kinds of change	Scholars	Numbers and nature of kinds of change by contribution
Transposition. Modulation. Equivalence. Adaptation.	Vinay and Darbelnet (1958)	04 oblique procedures of change
Interpretative theory of translation.	Seleskovitch (1970s)	05 theories of change
Skopos theory.	Vermeer (1978)/ Vermeer and Reis (1984)	
DTS. Descriptive Translation Studies.	Toury (1978)	
Theory of culture.	Nord (1997)	
Communicative translation. Idiomatic translation. Free translation. Adaptation.	Newmark (1988)	04 indirect approaches of change
Sense for sense translation.	Cicero and Horace (1 st century BC)	+17 Strategies/ techniques of change
Naturalising translation.	Schleiermacher (1813)	
Dynamic equivalence/ Functional equivalence.	Nida (1964)	
Covert translation.	House (1977/ [1981])	
Acceptable translation.	Toury (1978)	
Domestication.	Venuti (1995/ [2008])	
Target-oriented translation.	Hermans (1999)	
Expansion/ Amplification/ Addition. Omission/ Abridgment/ Summary Paraphrase/ Reformulation. Re-categorisation. Compensation. Implication. Modification. Substitution. Localisation. ...etc.	Various translation scholars and practitioners	
Transcreation.	Leibniz (1676) -as the first introducer of the concept, in philosophy.	

	Lal (1957) and De Campos (1963) – as the first transcreation scholars in translation field (according to the verified records).	
--	---	--

In total, translation dichotomies studies have accumulated +30 kinds of change, introduced as procedures, theories, approaches and strategies/techniques. The Table demonstrates how accurate it is to project these forms of change on Leibniz’s statement (42: 1676): “*all change is a kind of transcreation*”. Transcreation, at this point, identifies this diverse collection of change. It is true that the technique, in translation studies, as a term and a concept is relatively trendy; however, it has been applied, all the time. Transcreation represents any kind and all kinds of change. It is important to note that translation practices have applied many kinds of change. Translation studies come last only to validate and categorise these kinds of change, from a theoretical standpoint and under a scientific label. As a fact, translation studies are resourced from translation practices.

Shifting away translation studies and practices from the linguistic discipline has validated the use of measurable and justifiable changes, in translation. As noticed, the change, in translation, has evolved on stages. The first stage has liberated translation from the linguistic dominance. The transfer of expressions has been focused on the meaning vs. the form. The second stage has highlighted the fusion between systems. The search, in translation, has been focused on the cultural aspect, for its charge and value vs. the linguistic one. The third stage has broken all translation boundaries and challenges. Currently, there is not such a thing called untranslatability with the application of transcreation. This technique is in charge of creating contents with originality, creativity and effect.

3.3 Degrees of change

Since the change is justifiable for having its reasons, in translation. It is then measurable. We have 03 degrees of change, if measuring the general act of translation.

3.3.1. Zero change: linguistic parallelism

Zero change is applicable when the translation is literal, to establish the linguistic parallelism from the source to the target. For instance, when the expression is introduced in an objective writing style, its translation requires parallel linguistic projections of content and form. At this point, the dictionary is a very handy tool to use via standard translation. Moreover, when the basic mechanisms of the target language do not represent a challenge to the translators, the degree of change turns into zero. This kind of standard translation is qualified as correct for preserving the meaning and the form, and also creative for complying with the choice making task of the most expressing words/signs. The outcomes provide a faithful translation to the source.

3.3.2. Partial change: syntactic and cultural parallelism

Partial change is a degree that demonstrates few modifications done, to establish the syntactic configuration or the cultural reference in the target expression. Transposition, adaptation,

domestication and many others are in charge of executing the partial change. At this stage, the change making becomes necessary, in order to make familiar the foreign cultural element of the source. The necessity for change establishes understandable content with effect, in the target expression poly-system of language and culture. The partial change becomes a solution for inter-systems translations of lingo-cultural elements. Partial change is a sort of search and substitution, in and from the target.

The syntactic substitution is also another degree of partial change, by applying for instance transposition, amplification, abridgement, paraphrase...etc. The degree is partial for modifying the grammar or the writing style...etc. The possibilities of partial change are endless. Even the translation of the religious scripts is not exempt from changes making. By applying interpretative translations, for instance, changes appear between brackets or as side notes. The additions may amplify the volume of the Ur-script, in order to avoid confusion and incomprehensibility of such old or rhetoric contents. For instance, the hard copy of the holy Quran, usually, has 604 pages. Its interpretative version of Benbetka Shahnaz Saïdi (2017), into French, has reached the 650 pages, where 611 pages are the actual interpreted chapters. The interpretative translation is a kind of change, because the necessity for comprehensibility required applying it. This kind of translation is qualified as adequate for finding the corresponding syntactic and the cultural equivalent, and also creative for complying with the choice making task of the most expressing grammatical structure and cultural reference. The outcomes provide a faithful translation to the target language and the target culture.

3.3.3 Total change: creational parallelism

Total change is a degree that refers to making entire modifications and radical interventions in the source content. At this level, the total change is obligatory, in order to face the untranslatability. When the lingual and the cultural parallelism becomes impossible, transcreation creates original contents. The transcreators take into account the target notion; illustrated in the target expression poly-system, the target audience, the target reference, the target space-time framing...etc. Total change has not been discussed, in translation studies, only when transcreation has come into practice. Jackson studied the De Campos brothers' transcreations. He found that:

"In their work as translators, the Brazilian Concrete poets [Haroldo and Augusto De Campos] produced both singular texts that revisit creative masters, those within their synchronic pantheon of world literature, as well as Ur-texts that extrapolate and recapitulate the creative strategies of the founders of inventive poetics. Translation is considered to be parallel creation, and its most challenging application as an amalgam of translation, theory, and criticism is to a library of select, creative texts, both Western and Asian, ancient and modern". (Jackson, 144-145: 2010)

Their transcreations were the result of total changes making. They saw their translations as parallel creation to the Ur-scripts. This kind of translation is qualified as creational for producing another original version, creative for complying with the choice making task of the new content and aesthetic for improvising and illustrating the genius of the transcreators. The outcomes provide a faithful translation to the target notion.

3.4 Levels of change

Change can be on the level of the word, the sign, the sentence, the form, the content, the context, the text, the writing style, the cultural reference, the semiotic element, the meta-semiotic element, the visuals, the aural element, the gesture, the system, the space-time framing...etc. The change can also be an inter-system and an inter-modal processing, in substituting an image with a text or an audio...etc. The levels of change are the different categories of the expression formats that are known as the variables and can be changed into new elements from the target.

3.5 Limits of change

“First, and very obviously: translation does not happen in a vacuum” (Bassnett and Trivedi, 02: 1999). Translation starts from an identifiable source and gets to an identifiable target. Transcreation is a kind of translation. It is also obvious that it has more freedom and flexibility, in dealing with the expression transmission, from the source to the target. This freedom and flexibility refer to the change making. However, this feature of change has boundaries. Transcreation starts from the source, be it an actual source, or only an idea. For transcreation, what is important is not the source content, but its impact. The impact is considered as the core element of the expression.

The transcreators have access to change any element of the source expression justifiably, except for its impact. The latter is kept untouched. It is considered as the nucleus of the expression. From it, a second and many other versions can be created, again. The change is new lingual, cultural, semiotic or meta-semiotic elements, taking place in the target expression. These new elements work on attaching the impact and dressing it with new elements from the target expression poly-system. This is what makes transcreation technique very special, in translation field. It faces all translation challenges, as long as the creation feature is a tool in hand. Such a practice is more noticeable in the advertising field, where the standard translated version appears sometimes as an epic failure. At this point, the transcreation provides the best version to be ever produced and introduced to the new target audience.

Another situation that represents a limit of change is when translating an expository content, for instance. Such a writing style requires the standard translation. The communicative intention behind such a content is, simply, informative. The information delivery only requires a direct transfer to different languages, for the objective language used.

To conclude, the change making as a process has a solid basis from theoretical and practical perspectives. The reasons for change justify its use. The kinds of change identify its forms. The degrees of change measure the reproduction of the new target expression. The levels of change demonstrate the translators’/transcreators’ accesses in where to make changes. The limits of change demonstrate where translators have access or not to make changes. The following table illustrates transcreation bases after investigating and relating any change and all change to transcreation.

Table 02: Transcreation Bases

Change making	Bases
Reasons for change	Syntactic and cultural parallelism. Creational parallelism.
Kinds of change	+30 processes
Degrees of change	Zero change. Partial change. Total change.
Levels of change	The word, the sign, the sentence, the form, the content, the context, the text, the writing style, the cultural reference, the semiotic element, the meta-semiotic element, the visual element, the aural element, the gesture, the system, the space-time framing...etc.
Limits of change	Variables vs. impact.

The change started being discussed since the liberation of translation studies from the linguistic theory dominance. The insistence of many scholars on translation dichotomies opened the eyes of many researchers on wider phenomena of the expression systems, such as: language, culture, semiotics...etc and of the expression modalities, such as: lingual, visual, aural, gestural...etc, and also on the transmission types, between standard translation and transcreation.

Conclusion

We have started our study with the attempt of justifying “*all change is a kind of change*” (Leibniz, 42: 1676), in translation. We conclude that transcreation is a holistic approach, for combing many kinds of change under the transcreational act of partial or total degrees.

“The relevance of transcreation is universal since it can be used as a device to break the myth of ‘untranslatability’. In fact, it is a holistic approach in which all possible techniques like elaboration, interpolation, image transpotation, explaining the cultural value of the original text, image change, image recreation, translative explanations and elucidations, are possible. In such texts, the translator enters into the sole of the original author and then he himself becomes creator”. (Gopinathan, 04: 2006)

Moreover, standard translation is a source-focused processing of the language. No change is required, except for the lingual exchange. Transcreation is an impact-focused processing of the expression. Scholars’ contributions, in general, have appeared only to be academically teachable and, scientifically justifiable, but not to show how to translate. This confusion has raised a terminology question, but not of the application of some procedures and approaches of change. Translation was and is still very clear in its duality nature, and of course, the distinction of the opposing acts is built upon the change making.

Transcreation is the application of any and every kind of change. Many scholars tend to confuse transcreation for adaptation, localisation and many other terms. However, the fact demonstrates that as long as the used process implies making change, it represents transcreation. Any adaptation is a kind of transcreation, but not every transcreation is an adaptation. The same

thing goes for localisation. Transcreation is a “*holistic approach*” (Gopinathan, 2006; Gaballo, 2012). To put an end to the terminology mess, the study keeps on the identification of the term translation as the scientific discipline, the academic major and the general act of rendering the expression, for applying the source- and the target-oriented approaches. Transcreation is an approach of the transcreational act and the ultimate representation of the translations of change, in their partial or total degrees of change. Transcreation should be a specialty of translation academic major, at higher education institutions.

Transcreation is not only a matter of words projection, but of semiotics and meta-semiotics value projection and creation. The transmission of the expression, from the source to the target, is purposeful. Translators and transcreators know best, regarding the way the expression should be transmitted, via the interference of change, or not. Transcreation has gained a wider popularity in the late 3 decades. Many scholars refer to transcreation as a process that creates content (Gopinathan, 2006; Gaballo, 2012). Transcreators have access to make substantial changes on the source expression, for sophisticating the translation services, in translation market. This technique charges the clients extra fees for offering original products of semiotic, semantic and aesthetic features. The effort and the wittedness deserve such remunerations; however, these reproductions of content are, simply, being made thanks to the variety of kinds of change, and they are endless. The transcreators have all the expertise to generate the new target content, based on the clients’ demand. Therefore, the creation feature, within transcreation technique, makes creating content creative, aesthetic and effective.

To set an end to some terminology mess, translation discipline refers to the branch of knowledge of translation, in higher education institutions. Moreover, it refers to the general act of translating. Standard translation refers to zero-change translation. Transcreation refers to the act of partial and total changes making. Transcreation represents the wide collection of the kinds of change.

References

- Alcantara Jean Pascal, (1997), «La Theorie Leibnizienne du Changement en 1676 : une Interpretation du Dialogue Pacidius Philalethi à la Lumiere de la Caracteristique Geometrique », *in*, *Theoria: An International Journal for Theory, History and Foundations of Science*, pp. 225-255.
- Bassnett Susan and Trivedi Harish, (1999), *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. London, UK, Routledge.
- Benbetka Shahnaz Saidi (translation), (2017), *Le Coran*, Noida, India, Goodword Books. ISBN 978-93-5179-072-3. [<https://ia800103.us.archive.org/19/items/quran-trans/french.pdf>].
- Bender Sebastian (2020), «Leibniz and the ‘petites réflexions’», *in*, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 102(4), 619-645.
- Burgner Rob, (n.d), True Language company, *in*, [<https://www.truelanguage.com/transcreation-the-art-of-creative-translation/>]. (Last check: 20/04/2024)
- Carreira Martinez Oliver, (2022), «Is Transcreation a Service or a Strategy? A Social Study into the Perceptions of Language Professionals», *in*, *Babel*, 68(4), pp. 498-516.
- Catford John Cunnison, (1965), *A linguistic theory of translation* (Vol. 31), Oxford, UK, Oxford University Press. [https://www.academia.edu/download/53272946/j._c._catford-a_linguistic_theory_of_translation-oxford_univ._press_1965.pdf].

- Darbelnet Jean and Vinay Jean Paul, (1958), *Stylistique Comparée du Français et de l'Anglais : Méthode de Traduction*, Paris, France, Didier.
- De Campos Haroldo, (1963), «Da Tradução como Criação e como Crítica», *in*, *Tempo Brasileiro*, 4(5).
- Di Giovanni Elena, (2008), «Translations, Transcreations and Transrepresentations of India in the Italian media», *in*, *Meta*, 53(1), pp. 26-43.
- Díaz-Millón Mar, and Olvera-Lobo, Maria Dolores, (2023), «Towards a Definition of Transcreation: a Systematic Literature Review», *in*, *Perspectives*, 31(2), pp. 347-364.
- Gaballo Viviana, (2012), «Exploring the boundaries of transcreation in specialized translation», *in*, *ESP Across Cultures*, 9, pp. 95-113.
- Gambier Yves, (2014), «A Conversation Between Yves Gambier and Jeremy Munday about Transcreation and The Future of The Professions», *in*, *Cultus: the Intercultural Journal of Mediation and Communication*, 7, pp. 20-36.
- Gopinathan Govindapanicker, (2006), «Translation, Transcreation and Culture: The Evolving Theories of Translation in Hindi and Other Modern Indian Languages», *in*, *Translation Today*, 3(5).
- Hermans Theo, (1999), *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*, Manchester, UK, St. Jerome.
- Holmes James, (1972/[1988]). *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies*. In Holmes James *Translated Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam, Holland, Rodopi, 67-80. Reprinted e.g., in Venuti, Lawrence, (ed.) 2000, *The Translation Studies Reader*. London, UK, Routledge, pp. 172-185.
- House Julia, (1977/ [1981]), *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*, Tübingen, Germany, Narr.
- International Organization for Standardization, (2015), *Translation Services—Requirements for Translation Services (ISO/DIS Standard No. 17100)*. Retrieved from [<https://www.iso.org/standard/59149.html>], (last check: 20/04/2024).
- Jackson Kenneth David, (2010), «Transcriacao/transcreation: the brazilian concrete poets and translation», in Frank, M. E., and Tonkin, H, *in*, *The Translator as Mediator of Cultures*, 3, 139.
- Jorgensen Larry, (2013), «By Leaps and Bounds: Leibniz on Transcreation, Motion, and the Generation of Minds», *in*, *The Leibniz Review*, 23, 73-98.
- Lal Purushottam (1964), *Great Sanskrit plays in modern translation (Vol. 142)*, New York, USA, New Directions Publishing.
- Lal Purushottam, (1957), *Preface to Shakuntala. Great Sanskrit Plays*, in *New English Transcreations*, New York, USA, New Directions Publishing.
- Leibniz Gottfried Wilhelm Von, (1676), *The Dialogue Pacidius to Philalethes*. Retrieved from, [<https://www.humanities.mcmaster.ca/~rarthur/phil731/leibnizdialogue.pdf>], (Checked on: 20/04/2024)
- Munday Jeremy, (2001/[2016]), *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, London, UK, Routledge.
- Newmark Peter (1988), *A Textbook of Translation*, New York, USA, Prentice Hall.
- Nida Eugene, (1964), *Principle of correspondence*, In: Venuti, Lawrence. (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, London, UK, Routledge.
- Nord Christine, (1997), *Translating as a Purposeful Activity [translation theories explained]*, Manchester, UK, Saint Jerome.

Reiss Katharina and Vermeer Hans Joseph, (1984), *Grundlegung Einer Allgemeinen, Translation Theorie*. Niemeyer, Tu'bingen, Germany. Renier, F., 1989. *Interpretation: Language and Translation from Cicero to Tyler*, Amsterdam, Holland, Radopi.

Schleiermacher Friedrich, (1813), *Über die Farbengebung des Alterthümlichen in Verdeutschung alter klassischer Prosa (Veranlasst durch Langes Übersetzung des Herodot)*, in, Pudor Carl H. (Ed.), Berlin, Germany, Hitzig.

Seleskovitch Danika, (1976/ [2014]), «Traduire, de l'expérience aux concepts», *Etudes de Linguistique Appliquée*, 24, pp. 64-91.

Toury, Gideon, (1978), «The Nature and Role of Norms in Literary Translation». *Literature and Translation: New perspectives in Literary Studies*, 83-100.

Venuti Lawrence, (1995/[2008]), *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, second ed, London, UK, Routledge.

Vermeer Hans Joseph, (1978), «Ein Rahmen Für Eine Allgemeine Translations Theorie», *Lebende Sprachen*. 23 (3). doi:10.1515/les.1978.23.3.99. ISSN 0023-9909. S2CID 62754751

Author's biography

Lalia BELABDI is a PhD student at Valladolid University, Spain. Her doctoral thesis addresses the application of transcreation technique in translating mono- & multimodal advertisements. Her research area includes the following studies: transcreation, inter-system translation, inter-modal translation, multilingualism, socio-culturalism, communication, translating/transcreating advertisements, interpreting, French language teaching...etc. Her working languages are: English, French, Arabic and Spanish. She has B.A and Master II degrees in Translation & Interpreting (language pairs: English >< Arabic / French >< Arabic).