

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

The contributions to this issue of LINGUACULTURE rely largely on papers that were presented at the seminar for Directors/Coordinators of Translation, Interpreting and Translation Studies Programmes under the generous and stimulating title “Innovation in Translator Education,” in October 2015. The seminar was occasioned by the First Coimbra Group High-Level Policy Seminar on Education hosted by Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi in 2015 to mark the 30th Coimbra Group Anniversary, and brought together representatives and decision-makers from the oldest, most famed universities in Europe. On the initiative of Dr. Rodica Dimitriu, Head of the translation programmes within the Faculty of Letters of the host institution, the seminar joined in fruitful debate, on topics related to translator’s training and education, specialists from the University of Granada (Dr. Dorothy Kelly), University of Leuven – Antwerpen (Dr. Frieda Steurs), the University of Geneva (Dr. Lance Hewson), University of Bologna (Dr. Silvia Bernardini and Dr. Adriano Ferraresi), University of Coimbra (Dr. Cornelia Plag), Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi (Dr. Teodora Ghiviriga and Dr. Sorina Postolea). Discussions and paper presentations revealed that translation programmes face similar challenges and are concerned with similar issues related to adapting students’ training to today’s rapidly changing internationalized environment and to the demands of the labour market, to the emergence of new tools in translation, and how best to put them to use in the teaching and testing of translators; other more general problems relating to the theoretical and even ethical framework in which the training process needs to be viewed were equally approached.

It is always surprising and slightly disconcerting to see the unassuming, self-effacing manner in which translators tend to regard themselves and their work in relation to (or, shall I say, by comparison with?) the authors whose texts they are toiling over—literary and not only—primarily on account of the respect, if not actual awe, with which the creative process is viewed: fading in the background, translators allow the writers to reap the applause for the *original nature* of their work. The paper contributed by **Dr. Lance Hewson** discusses the status of translation as a creative process, along with the interest – or lack thereof – in *creativity* as a useful concept in researching translation. In *Creativity in translator training:*

between the possible, the improbable and the (apparently) impossible, after drawing attention to the paradoxical position of translation at the blurry border between *production* and *reproduction*, the author assesses the various definitions of the concept and offers a balanced interpretation, where the verdict of creativity relies on the presence of a novel solution in response to a problem-solving situation: under this reading, indeed, the translation of official documents or of certain technical genres does not qualify as creative. How this position can become part of the translation class is explored in the second half of the paper. After the main difficulties the trainees face in approaching and understanding the source text are listed, the main methodological suggestion is made regarding the possible exploitation of both source and target language through (intralingual) paraphrasing: this complex process of observation, interpretation and rewriting should look at what is actually said through the lenses of what is not said, and *re-create* multiple versions of the same text, thus exploring other options to express the same content in both the source- and the target language. The result would be the trainee's liberation from what the author calls "the hypnotic effect of the original", and increased awareness of the potentialities and expressiveness of both codes, followed by subsequent avoidance of mechanical translation there where it would hinder the production of better solutions.

Warnings have been issued that extensive use of corpus material for translation purposes can be ultimately conducive to repetitive, standardized products where the same solutions are recycled by the corpus users, especially given the time constraints under which most tasks are completed. The paper on *Using small parallel corpora to develop collocation-centred activities in specialized translation classes* offers a surprising result pointing at creativity as a by-product of class activities meant at enhancing the students' ability to handle collocations in the translation process. Collocations are a particularly complex area in linguistics, hence the attention it has drawn and the considerable research it has spawned, focusing on their description and classification in English and on their acquisition by non-native learners. One of the major problems, identified by the authors based on the specialised literature, is the speakers'/learners' frequent inability to recognize them as distinct entities. An answer to this impediment, the authors **Dr. Sorina Postolea** and **Dr. Teodora Ghivirigă** suggest, could be that of raising the students' awareness to this language phenomenon through task-based activities which can be tailored to a particular domain and the specific needs of the users. The various activities are all based on material extracted from a small-size parallel corpus compiled for research purposes and recycled for didactic purposes—this alone is a strong argument in favour of using corpus material.

The compelling advantages of bringing it to the translation class for various teaching scenarios, presented in the concluding section, are balanced by caveats and doubled by the condition that it does not become the sole instrument at the trainers' disposal and that students are provided with an adequate methodology to use it.

More corpora in the translation student's class, and more teaching material individually devised to adjust to the need of the trade, more specifically: handling collocational material in translation, are presented in *Intermodal corpora and the translation classroom: what can translation trainers and trainees learn from interpreting*. **Dr. Adriano Ferraresi** introduces one of the latest types of corpora, the multimodal corpus, which consists of texts that are both translated and interpreted. The collection used for exemplification is the recently created EPTIC (European Parliament Interpreting and Translation Corpus), an extension of the initial EPIC (European Parliament Interpreting Corpus), which consists of *pseudo-parallel* aligned versions of English and Italian plenary speeches by members of the European Parliament: transcripts of interpreted speeches along with their translated version produced independently, as well as the corresponding source texts. The presence of the written version alongside the spoken one allows the analysis of diverging translations of the same segment in the two modes and engenders insight into the choices made by interpreter/translator and their consequences, some of which are illustrated and discussed in the middle section of the paper: differences in register in either sense, differences in the (consistent) production of more or less conventional phrases, and differences in actual meaning. Starting from examples from EPTIC, an array of activities based on corpus material are proposed, thus proving its substantial pedagogical value and making them an incentive to generate similar materials and activities for translator training classes.

The research presented in *Equivalence of lease and tenancy terminology in English and Lithuanian* starts from the translators' need to address terminological issues in specialized translation and lexicography in a domain where accuracy is crucial. Especially in the case of the pair English – another European language, the problem is compounded by inter-systemic differences, to which phenomena such as quasi-synonymy and pseudo-synonymy may add, encumbering the translation process and altogether altering the meaning of the target text. **Dr. Sigita Rackevičienė, Dr. Giedrė Valūnaitė Oleškevičienė** and **Gabrielė Galkutė** focus on the very compact domain of lease and tenancy, with the purpose of identifying similarities but mainly differences and establish the degree of equivalence between the English and Lithuanian sets, and simultaneously assess the value of the existing lexicographic sources. Through conceptual analysis the characteristics of each term are identified, and very fine distinctions are

detected between what dictionaries and databases indicate as equivalents/synonyms, such as the type of property (real *and* personal or just real) or the role of the two parties in the agreement (*lease* as the act of the owner and *tenancy* as the act of the occupant of property). Once again, the role of the context is emphasized, along with the fact that total equivalence in legal translation is nigh impossible, as it would imply complete identity of the respective legal frameworks: a point that lexicographers should consider when documenting legal terms. Although it was not written with teaching purposes in mind, it is not difficult to imagine how the approach taken in this paper can be used in and transferred to classes on legal translation or ad hoc terminology tailored for the needs of translators.

Even if they come from various areas of interest in translation and translator training, the texts contributed in this issue converge in their ultimate concern for the applicability of various new concepts, instruments or approaches to the process of translators' training. This is very much in keeping with the generous theme "Innovation in Translator Education", the title of the COIMBRA event that 'inspired' most of the contributions in this issue. Above all, these articles could be seen as a reminder that translation itself is, as Ezra Pound thought, a source of education, as well as innovation.