

## **I. Translation and Culture**

The main objective of this research is to examine the issue of transcreation in Rishikesh Upadhyaya's *Prajatantrako Khel*, Nepali rendering of George Bernard Shaw's *The Apple Cart* in English. This study aims to find out the strengths and weaknesses of translation as well. The principle of literal translation, which indicates word to word correspondence, can be adopted in translation but the present research tries to show that the translation of *The Apple Cart* in Nepali *Prajatantrako Khelis* is not mere transference, substitution and total equivalence but, in fact it moves away from source text to translated text. While translating the play in Nepali language the translator reinterprets the source text carrying sociocultural assumption. Therefore it is a new creation or transcreation. Transcreation can offer the best possible solution for the problems of culturally oriented text. Transcreation in this context can be understood as a re-birth or incarnation of the original work. It can be defined as an aesthetic-reinterpretation of original work suited to the reader of the target language in particular time and space. The translator enters into the sole of the original author and then the translator himself becomes creator. It certainly demands an intuitive and aesthetic recreation and the application of creative imagination.

Translation is the transmittal of written text from one language into another. Although the terms translation and interpretation are often used interchangeably, by strict definition, translation refers to the written language, and interpretation to the spoken word. Translation is the action of interpretation of the meaning of a text, and subsequent production of an equivalent text, also called a translation, that communicates the same message in other language. The goal of translation is to establish a relation of equivalence of intent between the source and target texts, while taking into account a number of constraints. These constraints include context, the

rules of grammar of languages, their writing convention, their idioms, and the like.

The translator always targets readers or the translation is always target oriented. As translation is a creative and analytical process the translator must not forget about the essence of the source text. The real translator requires an intuitive and aesthetic reaction and application of creative imagination. But it must be kept in the mind that distortion of the originality of the source text might not take place. Because translation is not all together a new creation, it always carries logical relationship between original and translated text. It is true that language has innumerable importance and plays a key role in translation. We can say that without language translation is impossible. Language is the most powerful, convenient and permanent means of communication which is highly developed and frequently used. Human beings express their feelings, opinions desires and emotions by using it. Therefore it is special gift for human being and a vehicle for human hidden thoughts. To equate with the critic is to equate translation with transcreation, the process of recreating as SL text in the TL taking liberty with it and yet, being field to it. To translate means to translate cultures. Pragmatically translation is 'transculturation' in that the translator is not replacing one language with another but it is a question of translating the whole system as reflected in the element of one culture into the system and pattern of another culture. When a translator faces with the source cultural element absent from the target culture, s/he relies on different procedures that enable him/her to bridge the cultural gaps existing between two speech communities.

Translation is an activity comprising the interpretation of the meaning of a text in one language – the source text – and the production; in another language, of a new equivalent text- target text or translation. Translation transmits the cultural meaning and importance. To translate means translating culture of source language because

exact word - to - word translation cannot be done due to conceptual gap between source language and target language. Universalization of knowledge is painfully slow without any organized means of communication. Translation, as a linguistic and cultural bridge across different speech communities, has contributed to spread out and preserve the knowledge that humanity has acquired at various epochs and added to the most conscious and overt communicative activity and indispensable tool for the survival of billions who inhabit the Earth. Human beings are social animals and the language also evolves in the social context. So, it is social phenomenon. In the past, translation was just a means of communication among the people of different linguistic communities. The concept of translation was viewed on a narrow sense and it was just as an instrument before the Second World War. But in modern time, it is established as a separate discipline of the study. There are many kinds of translation such as literal translation, technical translation, literary translation, mechanical translation and cultural translation; there is no single definition of it. Popularity and importance of translation have been increasing rapidly now- a- days. Not only this, translation has been employed extensively as a more powerful and indispensable vehicle for disseminating knowledge and information.

The Source Language Text, *The Apple Cart* is a political play. In this play, the playwright has presented a realistic picture of the modern political situation of the world. The title of the play is very symbolic, highly meaningful, very much significant and appropriate. The meaning of the title is to make the plot or the evil plan of somebody unsuccessful. This shows that there must be a plot in this drama, which is upset. This play is full of conflicts, crises and the critical situations. The king is honest, wise and devoted to the wellbeing of the country and people. On the other hand, most of the representatives of the people are irresponsible and corrupt. Because

of this, the play has become a great conflict play. It is a play about democracy. The conflict between King Magnus and his Prime Minister Proteus provokes many sided discussion about what democracy means. Shaw's dramatic object is to show a constitutional monarch defying his Prime Minister's attempt to muzzle the king's protest against secret and corrupt government. Shaw had not turned royalist himself but he did not think that the wishes of people could often be more authentically represented by one ruler than by a parliament of politicians swayed by party and monies interests. He wants to satirize the modern corrupt democratic leaders. For him the greatest enemy or the danger of democracy is the capitalism. If plutocracy controls the economy of the country, it can buy the political leaders, the constitution, the laws and the democracy as a whole, in this play, Breakages limited is the symbol of plutocracy which is going to destroy the democracy.

Though, the play was set in socio-political situation of Britain, it was very much resemblance to the socio-political condition of Nepal. Despite the differences in Nepalese and Britain culture, the political leaders and constitutional monarchy's struggle were similar. The play *The Apple Cart* is the bitter reality of Britain and the translated play *Prajatantrako Khel* copies the same picture when there were the conflicts between parliament and constitutional monarchy. The SL text exposes the reality of both democracy and royalty as British's idealists conceive them. British Liberal democrats believed in a figment called a constitutional monarch, a sort of punch puppet who cannot move until his Prime Minister's fingers are in his sleeves. As in Britain, in Nepal as well, our solution of economic problem is the Capital system, which achieves miracles in production but fails to distribute its products rationally, or to produce in the order of social need. In Nepalese context too, all the leaders and king, they used to play dirty politics as a game which pushed our country

back. The SL text represents the history of Britain 300 years ago which is almost similar history of Nepal 70 years onwards. The both play exposed the bitter experience of people that it is impossible to trust factories, private management as well as government. This may be the reason that Upadhyaya selected the text for translation. As the nature of translation, no translation is perfect or faultless. Despite of many lapses, the translator has accomplished his task in creative way. Actually, perfect translation is impossible in real sense; it is also not perfect one. Rather it can be taken as a better translation. Eventhough, there is conceptual gap and semantic approximation, it does not misinterpret or distort the scenario and given justice to the source language text. Moreover, translating the creation of Bernard Shaw, in Nepali *Prajatantrako Khelis* certainly a matter of pleasure for Nepalese readers who have no access to English. There are so many people, who don't know the English language, for them, this translated text makes essay to learn about others literature.

There are three chapters to develop the central argument of this thesis. The first chapter introduces the translation and its culture as well as short introduction of both plays. The second chapter explains the evidences to show the TL text as transcreation of SL text, to prove the evidences this chapter follows the theoretical concept of different theorist such as Mahasweta Sengupta, Sujit Mukharjee, Lawrence Venuti, Anuradha Dingwaney, etc. It also includes the cultural gaps, procedures and strategies used by translators for translation. The third chapter concludes the thesis by giving the definition of translation as transcreation to show the relation between translation and transcreation.

## II. Upadhyaya's *Prajatantrako Khel* as the Transcreation of Shaw's *The AppleCart*

Translation is a process of analysis, reconstruction and transfers. Therefore it is said, to translate serious literature is really very difficult task. Translation of *The Apple Cart* into *Prajatantra ko Khel* by Upadhyaya, has created cultural and conceptual gap taking liberty from the source text. Although one language does not capture the concrete and final meaning of another language but without the help of language process it is impossible. When we target reader read the Nepali version, *Prajatantrako Khel* we find out so many glimpses of translator's personal intuitive interpretation. The title of the play *The Apple Cart* is translated as *Prajatantrako Khel* which is totally different meaning to each other. In the source text, there is not any indication of game of politics in the title but translator has interpreted the message encoded in original text with taking liberty but at the same time being fidel to it. By reading the title *The Apple cart*, we, the target reader, would not have understood whether it is tragic, comedy, love or something else. But when we go through *Prajatantrako Khel*, it is very easy for us to know that it is a political play with full of conflict.

Some scholars have defined translation in various manners. For Walter Benjamin, translation is a single mode of its own, neither source-oriented nor target oriented. In *The Task of the Translator*, he argues:

Since translation gives the original a second life, in some way it is the afterlife of a text-and this does not imply a postmortem so much as a contribution of life. Just, as the manifestations of life are intimately connected with the phenomenon of life without being of importance to

it, a translation issues from the original -no so much from its life as from its after-life. (72)

Relating all these things to the translation of *The Apple Cart* as *Prajatantrako Khel*, is a transcreation in a sense the translator himself has accepted it as are writing and translation. At the first page, he has written rewriting and translation. It indicates that his translations are not merely surrender to the original work but it is a rebirth or reincarnation of the original work. While translating, the writer has adopted the technique like, addition, deletion, and paraphrasing, defining and literary translation. That's why it is crystal clear replacement and substitution of the original text, he has translated the text with creative intelligence giving preference not to closeness of word value but closeness of meaning.

The translator has only targeted to reader. Moreover, he has interpreted it as a worldwide famous political play. There evidences show that there is a space between SL text and TL text which is because of cultural translation recreation and new writing. Instead of only replacing one language with another, the translator demands an intuitive and aesthetic recreation and application of creative imagination. Transcreation is not all together a new creation because there is always a logical relationship original and translated text at the same times it looks like a new creation.

Nepali translator Upadhyaya has translated the text *The Apple Cart* successfully but he has failed to depict the historical meaning of name of characters in TL text. In the play *The AppleCart*, Bernard Shaw has selected the name of characters which are very meaningful by their name, for example Lysistrata, which is very significant name in English history. It is the name of a comic, extraordinary woman who played a role to end the Peloponnesian war. Lysistrata persuades the women of Greece to withhold sexual privileges from their husband and lovers as a means of

forcing the men to negotiate peace- a strategy, however that inflames the battle between the sexes. Same way Magnus is the name of a character which means ‘the great ruler’. So Shaw has given this name to show the powerful person as ‘king’ and Lysistrata to show the nature or intelligence of women in political issues. When the SL text reader read the name of characters, they could easily imagine what the name indicates. But, when the translator translated the same name in TL text it creates gap between two cultures because Nepali reader may not know about the historical background of name of characters. So, exact translation of characters in TL text is impossible. Next scholar, Susan Bassnett, by appropriating some other scholars, writes about the translation:

Theodore Savory defines translation as an ‘art’, other such as Erice Jacobson defines it as a ‘craft’; whilst others, perhaps more sensibly, borrow from the German and described it as a ‘science’. Horst Frenz even goes so far as to opt for ‘art’ but with qualification, claiming that translation is neither a creative art nor an imitative art, but stands somewhere between the two. (14)

That is to say, translation with equal applied of the original is not possible. There must be the manipulation in translation due to the lack of cultural equivalent words, political changes, power relation and the like.

With the development of post structuralism, the way of looking to translation has been changed. Even though, liberty is there, translation should follow sense translation. Translator should be true to the original text. Ralf Klopfer argues:

It is the duty of the academic analyst of literature and culture, who must of course have a large amount of linguistics in him, to grasp and reconstruct the many and various cultural systems and their dynamism



both as an aspect of all embracing phenomenon of culture and as they are concretized and created in individual work of art. (30)

It indicates that total departure from the source text leads towards mistranslation. So, ignoring all futile struggles for findings equivalence between two unique linguistic systems we should prioritize semantic unity of the text which gives second life to the translated text.

Relating these all views with the context of *Prajatantrako Khel*, translator has translated the terms without distorting the meaning of TL text. Cultural categories like ‘turn bonerage inside’(31) as ‘*Andra bhudi khotale Jastai*’(6), ‘Jolly Lumps Children’(82) as ‘*Bhustigre santan*’(67), ‘waiting for massage’(93) as ‘*jagrambasnu*’(83), ‘Methylated spirit’(67) as ‘*Mithil Misayeko Tharra*’(50), ‘at the people’s expense’(53) as ‘*Janatalai nichore jhai*’(32), ‘Silly gigler’ as ‘*silpat*’, ‘edge of a precipice’(49)as ‘*paharako veer*’(28), ‘behead’(97) as ‘*shir chhedan garnu*’(87), ‘greedy schemer’(83) as ‘*vasmasur sadyantrakari*’(70), ‘beast’(72) as ‘*ekalkate*’(56)are the illustrations of sense translation or semantic approximation without distorting the primary meaning of source language terms. Due to personal views, interpretation, personalization, cultural translation, reconstruction and dynamic equivalence, the translated version is not only replacement but a creative work.

Translation is not an easy task. While using language to translate dialogue’s cultural inadequacy creates space and cultural gap between SL and TL. Such space or gaps are resulted from the clack of intimacy of the translator which brings difficulty to concretize meaning of the source language. Same way, intonation, pitch, stress and style of speak cannot be properly translated in TL text, which play vital role in dialogue. Even though, there remains certain fidelity and faithfulness towards source

language text and target language text brings a shift of expression. This 'shift of expression' makes the translation more creative and freshness.

Different countries and place have the different cultural and the homogeneity of people in this world differs from each other. A word which has multi-meaning may carry different sense. So, according to the nature of cultural elements to be translated the translator uses several strategies to fulfill the less incurred in between the cultures.

Regarding the cultural differences, Burton Raffle expresses a similar view:

The differences and among cultures are not simple mechanics are not mere difference in the words by which the identical phenomenon are described. These phenomena are not fixed and unchanging; the world is in fact perceived differently by different people and their language and literature people and their languages and literature express these differences. The literary translation can neither ignore nor fully capture those differences. Again, his (the translator's) job lies in balancing of those and all other claims aid against him. (158)

Raffle means to say; there are always some significant cultural aspects of the source text which are inevitable as well as unavoidable that can't be reproduced in another language. A translated text neither captures the whole culture nor does it ignore in totality.

Due to such differences in language and culture, while translating *Prajatantrako Khel*, the translator has tried to hold his purchase on the SL and TL both, but he has failed to do so in the translation of some of the culturally significant terms used in daily conversations, and the tone that reflects a particular region and register. The literal translation of the word '*nakachcharo*' as 'devil' in the line "*ho ta, kastonakachaharo:maile kam nasakdai malai kina kurama vulai dieko?*"(5), is one

example. *'nakachharo'* is an informal and colloquial word which is close to English word 'shameless', but not equivalent on the ground of cultural function, and it has high currency in spoken Nepali while addressing each other same status. In source language, 'yes, devil takes you' is the expression of anger. Because of its very nature, this term of address requires to be retained in English translation. Similarly next sentence "You are a gentleman, sir."(55), has been rendered as "*yaha bado sajjan hoibaksanchha, rajshri naresh.*"(35). Here, the SL term of address, which is minor for English culture, has been changed into highly respected words in Nepali '*...hoibaksanchha, rajshri naresh,*' which is very respectful address for Nepalese culture. "I will not be deserted for your old Dutch."(85), has been rendered as "*malai chhaderatapaiki tyo budhiya sang ajana dinna.*"(71), since translation gives the original a second life. Here the translator has also gives second to the original text by interpreting with liberty 'Dutch' is translated as '*budhiya*' which is really incomprehensive because there is no correspondence between them.

As above mentioned, in the translation process of *The Apple Cart* into *PrajatantrakoKhel*, the translator has faced difficulties in colloquial language, in tone and manner which creates 'shift of expression' between source language text and target language txt. "*... majasari pes hudaichhu, tyasari nai yahale char haat khutta tekera usko aadar khatir garibakshanthein, Kaam na kaaj ko veda jasto*" (74) is the translation of "you would be crawlingly civil to him as I am going to be, confound him!" (87) The translated dialogue "*kaam na kaaj ko bhedo jasto*" gives the taste of colloquial Nepali Language whereas such address to the queen is not given in the source text. Likewise, "*yahale chaar haat khuttatekera usko aadar khatir garibakshantheyo*" is the translation of crawlingly civil to him as I am not going to be and '*kaam na kaaj ko*' is the translation of 'confound him!' where is no word to word

correspondence. By paraphrasing it the translator has given it proper sense. Though there is no exact correspondence between them, it has been translated with translator's personal perception and creative imagination.

Likewise, "I am your scape goat"(26) is translated as "*ma tapaiharuko dos thuparneachano bhairahanchu.*"(49) Here, the word scape goat means to be safe by blaming other. According to the king all the witness are trying to make him scape goat. Here, this meaning is beautifully paraphrasing into Nepali Language by translating '*dos thuparne aachano*'. Similarly, 'you have hit the nail on the head' is translated as '*Ahile vane yahaharule bilkulnisana marnuvayo*'. Here, hit the nail on head means to point out exact meaning. To make understand to target reader, translator has used his skill tactfully. The next phrase, 'a platform trick' written as '*tuppa bata palayeko manish*' where target readers easily get the point by reading TL text rather than SL text. In the source text there is a line, 'the common man is the superior, not the inferior, of the titled man'.

'The little gem set in a silver sea is translated' as '*bisal samundra ma jedit yo pyaromandi*' which is caroused with the notion of Hindu words. It is Hindu belief that *mandi* is very expensive and sea is compared as large creation of nature. This expression in Nepali language gives proper meaning of surface to reader. '*Suputra*' (88) is translated term of son which is perceived by the two speech communities in different ways and no matter in less similar ways. It means to say that it neither capture the full sense nor ignores the sense. '*Suputra*' denotatively is a perfect son who serves his parents, polite and obedient to them and connotatively a patriot who is ready to sacrifice his life for the country. But instead of that way son puts the TL readers in pure guess work about son of what? Is it of trust, love or hate? Despite the

difficulties or problem, while translating cultural and religious terms the translator has used his skill to make understandable for target reader.

When the passage or sentences have been paraphrased, summarized and in many cases omitted, without being total equivalent. Translator can rewrite the original by adding, subtracting or paraphrasing where he finds it necessary in another language. In *Translation as Discovery* Sujit Mukharjee writes:

I think from proper translation by exercising such freedom without, however achieving the status of transcreation. A translation must necessarily be true to the original and act as a kind of lens, a viewing medium, through which the original may be scrutinized when necessary. (149)

Commenting on the procedures adopted by the Indian translator, Mukharjee further writes:

Even after more than half a century of conscious decolonization, the English language constitutes to hold such a position of authority in modern India that those who translate literary works into English somehow convince that they are doing a favor to the Indian language writer by presenting him or her through translation to wider world. In return for such service, some of our translators feel free to chop and change, omit from or rearrange the original to their own satisfaction. (34)

The procedures such as omission, substitution, deletion of the complex radical cultural elements are evident when the translator thinks s/he should represent the source text in a manner that would be familiar to the culture of the target language. In such a situation, he may alter not only the style but also change the imagery, tone, the

register of the source text to cater to the discursive parameters of the language.

*PrajatantrakoKhel* also tries to give more or less meaning by adding and deleting the words. It happens knowingly or unknowingly by translator while giving more entertaining to reader. Orienthya, in SL text, express her views to Magnus. She insists him to divorce Magnus wife and says, “Nobody can imagine what you do with her, you can see as much of her as you like when we are married” is translated as “*baru usnga sahas garna saknuhuncha. Bibaha paschat panichahe jatisahas garna saknuhuncha*’ may not go on that sense but Nepali translator gives meaning these lines as sexual sense. Where target reader can understand more than T reader.

Similarly, “let us spoil the Egyptian” (71) is translated as “*jau ta masti lutau*” (57). It shows fidelity to SL because it captures the sense and content of SL but ‘*masti lutau*’, which is paraphrasing of spoil, is only added in TL. There is no correspondence between them because the translator, with creative mind has translated the text. Such a next dialogue in SL text is “Or a bungler”, which has been translated as “*kasailai bhalubhute vannu*” where the translator uses his ideas to express the views towards the TR. Moreover, “You flatter me” and “Flatter a king, never. Not Bill Boanerges.”(37) Are translated as “*tapaile mero stuti gaan naigarnu vayo*” and “*rajako stuti gaan garne, aha kahilyei hudaina. Bill Boanerges le testogardaina*”(13), respectively. Nepali it translation of former one makes us clear by explanation. “Such as they are, eh?”(37), is translated as “*je jasto aafno dimagi shakti chha,kaso?*”(13),similarly next dialogue “Oh come sir, really!”(52), is translated as “*oha, rajasrinaresh!Yahako yo kasto kura ho!*”(30),which make us clear for equivalent of words, interpretation, analysis and individual perception has been applied.

Other forms of figurative languages like images are also identified as metaphorical expressions. Multiculturalism has its own language, which is really difficult to represent in another language. Conception and structural differences between two languages compel the translator to adopt the process of literal translation, replacement and deletion while translating metaphorical words has rendered in his own creative way. Metaphor, simile, conceit and images are in fact, figurative language. They are often identified as metaphorical expression. Metaphor is a departure from the literal use of language which serves as an elliptical simile, in which it involves an implicit comparison between two disparate things.

While translating the metaphors, the translator, on the one hand has fidelity with the source on the other hand, he has interpreted the text intuitively. It is quite complex task to translate metaphors because the translator should understand the source culture and target culture completely. Since it is an implicit or hidden comparison, neither replacement nor paraphrasing is possible. Translator's immaturity and lack of knowledge about TL and SL culture may result in mistranslation or meaningless translation. The structural and functional difference between two languages compels the translator to adopt the process of literal translation, replacement and deletion while translating metaphors.

The metaphor 'henpecked darling' (84) has been literally rendered as '*hajur jastojoitingre shrimaan*'(71). Here '*joitingre*' refers to the husband who always follows the instruction of wife. Here, Orinthiya ironically expresses her dislike to the queen to whom King regards a gentle wife, next expression 'old duch'(84), which is also translated as '*budhiya*'(81), a strong comparison between two dissimilar objects. This translation has maintained the fidelity to the source language text. Although, it does not give drastically contrasted meaning, the symbolic assumption can be

different between source language text and target language text that creates conceptual gap and space. “But can I help people seeing what is as plain as the sun in the heavens” has been translated as “*tara ke ma aakas maadekhine suryalai chhopna khojne jasto gri sabaile thaha paayeko kuralai haina vandaihidau?*” (64) Here too come the word heaven, has been translated as ‘*aakash*’. It is an example of interpretation with cognitive imagination. These we can’t see overlay between two languages rather it has carried the sense of content in better way.

Next, “*yiniharulai taat paltine gari aadlatmaa thingryayera yiniharuko karobaarkharej garna sakne vaye ma aafno purai sakti lagauxu*” is the rendering of “I would give my right hand to see these people in the bank raptly court with half their business abolishes. To understand and translate it correctly the translator should be familiar with both cultures. ‘I give my right hand’ is metaphorically translated as “*aafno purai sakti*” and “*thingryayera*” to see as “*taat paltine gari thingryayera*”. In Nepali culture, ‘*thingryayera*’ implies to give punishment and ‘*taat paltanu*’ implies not to have any property or business. Though, it gives us an understandable meaning, the readers may be misled because of unfamiliarity with another culture. That’s why we can say that whether it is substitution, borrowing or literal transaction, they can’t represent the source text completely.

Similarly, “you would be crawlingly civil to him, as I am going to be, confound him!” has been translated as “*yahale char haat khutta tekera usk aadar khatir gari bakshantheyo, kaam na kaaj ko vedo!*” (74). Here king expresses his hatred towards president with queen. The meaning of the translated text is not same as we know in the original text. In Nepal ‘*kaamna kaaj ko vedo*’ means ‘not useful or lazy’ which we can’t get the meaning in SL text. Similarly, ‘Old bird’ (3) has been translated as “*briddha purush*”. Pamphilus compares Sempronius father with old



bird. Here, old bird means strange person in SL text, but target readers can easily get the meaning only by reading TL text. Likewise, “the cabinet of sheep” is also one example of metaphor used in SLtext which has been translated as “*bhedaharuko mantrimandal*” where a group of intelligent people is compared with the group of animal, sheep. The both culture language satire to bad political parties.

A simile is the most common device of metaphorical expression. It is an explicit comparison between two unlike entities. In simile, comparison and resemblance is explicitly reflected by the words ‘like’ or ‘as’. The common heritage of similes in everyday speech usually reflects simple comparisons based on the natural world or familiar domestic objects, as in ‘my love is like red rose’. It is a comparison of a love and rose indicated by the word. A simile in literature may be specific and direct or more lengthy and complex. Different procedures such as literal translation, substitution, conversion of a simile into metaphor and deletion are at the translator’s disposal to translate similes.

The simile “you gathered me like a daisy” (80) has been translated as “*timile malai fulko thunga tipe jhai tipeki na hau!*” Here, the King blames to Orinthiya that she betrayed him in her love, where king compares her attitudes with gathering daisy. But in translated language, translator has written only flower, not name of flower. Another simile “it is like an overcrowded third class carriage” has been translated as “*yo mantrimandal ta bhidaibhid kothird class railkodibba jastai bhayeko chha*”. It is word to word translation but It is difficult to understand target reader by reading SLtext but in TL it is clearly mentioned that the cabinet is full of treat and dishonest. It is like a box of bad game. The translator has reduces carriage and has added *railko dibba* to make clear sense. But the very transcreation cannot capture the completmeaning of a source text. “*Yahata kasto baam machha jastai chiplo*

*hunuhunchha.*” here, ‘*baam machha*’ cannot give one single meaning to all cultural language understanding of ‘*baam machha*’ and fish for source reader cannot be the same because of conceptual gap and its meaning, here the translator neither imitated nor created the text but it stands between two. That’s why we can justify that it is a perfect example of creative writing or reconstruction. Here, the translator has given the name of fish according to Nepali language. Conception of translator and perception of the target language reader may not match which creates gap or space.

The translation similes attest the fact that the translator has slanted towards the SL culture while taking care of the TL readership. For this he has employed literal translation and borrowing that stress on the faithfulness towards the TL culture and resorted to the footnote and context which stresses on intelligibility in the TL. However, in some cases literal translation has made the text more SL oriented which has made English version less idiomatic and less natural.

Literal translation is the most powerful weapon in translating text. But one of the restrictions on using literal translation method is that it should carry the equal sense to the TL reader or it should not be used. Looking at the nature of the cultural items, translator chooses this procedure if they don’t demand any explanations and distribute the equal meaning to the TL reader drawn from the SL text. In Nepali text ‘*Pajatantra ko Khel*’ we find subtitle like *badmas, thito, khel, vaauna*(22), *mahasaya*(18), *maharaja j*(17), *sahajyadi*(10), *srimatee anisriman*(7), *nirjan*(4), *dwabali*(5), *talak*(65), *waiyat*(64), *sudhi*(65), *raja*(82), *khandaani*(83), *guffadi* (96), *fijul*(97), *nindraa*(97), *suputra*(88), *sapana*(81), *parampara* (80), *santos* (70), *tujuk*(64), *dustamurti*(71), *namuna*(49), *aatma*(69), *biraajmaan*(60), *saalo*(49), *kathputali*(49), *naagraaj*(18), *dhokne*(15), *bhakura*(59), *irsya*(64), *parbat*(79), *baithak*(70), *sikshya*(91), *darbar*(57), *chumban*(54), and so on are translated

respectively using the procedure literal translation which gives the equal meaning to both culture as, king(30), sir (38), husband and wife (76), lonely(30), proticoed (31), divorce (81), stupid(81), king(33), superior(94), wop(105), farce(106), sleep(106), son(98), dream(92), tradition(92), satisfaction(84), cheek(79), cruel idol(84), model(66), soul(74), seat(75), brother in law(66), poppet(67), holy snake(41), drinks(39), kicked(74), sick(44), sir(40)jealous (79) , windbag(15) ,mountain(91) meeting(70), education(56), palace(57), kiss(54), and soon are translated respectively using the procedure, 'literal translation which gives the equal meaning to the both culture. The above mentioned words are translated literally nevertheless the meaning shared by the both cultures is same.

Word to word definition is not sufficient in translation since there is a fear of creating conceptual gap. So, sense is the primary factor to be located while translating a text. Discarding the sense equivalence may lead translator to mistranslation. That's why sense and the context should not be violated while transferring meaning from SL to TL text. Focusing on the same matter, Bijay Kumar Das in his *A Handbook of Translation Studies* cites Dr. Johnson and A.H.Smith as "change into another language retaining the sense or to translate is to change into another language retaining as much of the sense as one can" (1). Giving maximum priority to the meaning, Das adds:

If language has been described by linguists as patterned behaviors, the translation is an operation performed on two languages: the Source Language (SL) and Target Language (TL). Translation is the transference of meaning from Source Language to the Target Language. Since meaning is the main goal in translation. There is not

much difficulty in non-literary translation. But his difficulty arises when we are engaged in translation of literature. (3)

It is looked that whether the meaning is conveyed in the translated text equally as the original text or not but this application is difficult in literary text. Translation of dialogue is quite complex task in comparison to the short. In the same way, in translation of *The Apple Cart* in to Nepali texts some dialogues like, '*raja ta prasanna hoibakshantheyo*' (17) as "he was pleased", "*aha haina tara sahajadi jyadai prabhavit hoibakshya chha*" (18) are translated as "No. but the princess Alice happened to drop in. She was greatly impressed by the president." (41) "*tapai chuplagnuhos , ma thikai vandai chhu*" (33) as "you shut up beast, it's true." (53), "*Rajshree Naresh prati dhanyabaad abhhibadan, Rajshreee, maharani dasbarshama darshan garnapaune biswasma chhu* (82)" as "I thank your majesty. Good morning mam. I look forward to presenting myself in court dress soon." Here in all translation versions, the translator has used his cultural language for target reader very tactfully, which shows this work as transcreation and the meaning is understandable.

The procedure 'literal translation' doesnot function well in these dialogues since Nepali languages and it's respect terms are divided into derogatory term '*timi*', full respect '*tapai*' and highly respect '*shreeman*' or '*ta*', '*bakshanu*', '*rajshree*', '*sahajyadi*', '*rajkumari*', '*hajur*' '*maharani*' - but to express all these, English grammar uses a single word 'you' or she or he. So, literal translation in this case has compensated gap but programmatically, still these exists gap.

Adopting post structuralism view as translation is a radical reconstruction of SL and a mankind of liberated activities, the translator also has reconstruction of the SL text.

'Shame' (100) is translated as "*hera ta laaj pani namaneko!*" and hypocrite, humbug as "*hera ta kasto thengrirahechha, tyo sab jaaljhel ra kapat rahe chha*", here only the

single word in SL doesnot give meaning but TL text has reconstructed the text question that connect originality and authorship. Due to fidelity of the translator to sense or content of SL, it is taken as creative writing or new writing rather than mistranslation.

It is argued that translator have the rights to give strangeness and newness to their translation avoiding absolute transference. Adopting the same concept the present translator with his criticism and creativity, has given newness and strangeness to the SL text. “Nobody can imagine what you do with her. But you need not do without her. You can see as much of her as you like when we are married. I shall not be jealous and make scenes.” (79),is translated as “*Baru uh sanga yahale kasari sahawas garna saknu vakochha kasaile panisochna sakdaina, tara uhsanga vetai garna napaine ta hudaina, hamro bibaha vayepachhi paniyahale man lage jati uh sanga sahawas garnasaknuhunchha .Ma bata dahaa garne ra nakhra nikalne kaam hunechhaina.*”(65) Here, ‘*uh sanga yahale kasari sahawas garnasaknuhunchha kasaile ni thaha chhaina*’ is a translation of ‘nobody else can imagine what you do with her.’ Neither there is correspondence, nor gives accurate meaning ‘do’ can be taken as action word, it is not clearly mentioned what to do in SL text but the translation has added words ‘*sahawas*’ to make clear the sense.It creates in betweenness between them that is why it is difficult to stand. Eventhough there is ‘you can see as much of her as you like’ in SL text but there is no any indication of it in translated text. It is transliteration of it in translated text. It is transliteration and interpretation.

In translation, there is loss of the original meaning and basic loss of meanings on a continuum between over translation and under translation, ‘I have no voters to please’ has been translated as ‘*maile kunai matadata/ samuhaharulaikanyaunu pardaina*’.

Similarly I go on forever has been translated as '*malai kasaile ni panchhyauna pardaina.*' Here we can find gap between SL and TL text. How can 'please' represent '*kanyaunu*'. In Nepali context '*arulai kanyaunu*' means to ask for help. But 'please' means to make other happy for something. The SL reader could not find out the meaning of '*kanyaunu*'. Similarly, how can 'go on forever' represent '*kasaile panchhyauna sakdaina?*' In Nepali context '*panchyaunu*' means to take away from anywhere but go on forever means always move smoothly. So, loss of meaning is inevitable in translation which is not imitative art.

The translator has used some proverb in translated text though that cannot be seen in SL text. He has focused to sense or context translation that is why the proverb in Nepali '*euta rau samma pani nahallinu*' (59) has been applied to indicate that without turning a hair. Likewise, next proverb '*tuppabata palayeko manis*' (15) is translation of 'gulling the multitude', here nepali proverb indicates useless people. Sense translation of SL text is recreation writing because instead of seeking equivalent word, the translator, with his cognitive imagination and intuition, has translated the text.

Similarly, Nepali culture is rich of '*Dwitwa*' which is not found in English culture. 'To some extent close but not similar' term is refrain in English where a word is repeated in line, especially of poetry. But '*dwitwa*' is often associated with repetition of the word or a rhyming word in a single phrase in which the latter one does not contain meaning or sometimes meaning. To make the text more unique the translator has used so many '*dwitwa*', here in TL text. The term such as '*khotalkhatal*' (82), *tahasnahas*(52), *tootfoot*(80), *kholkhal*(50), *hisabkitab*(43), *khaskhus*(38), *guffgaff*(37), *sikshyadikshya*(91), *guinguin*(90), *jaaljhel*(41), *chitchit*(71), are some translated term. They are translated term of

dig(68), failure(68), breakable(67), tearing(67), calculate(62), backchat(57), runloose(57), education(101), murmur(100), annoy(84) are some of the examples of *dwitwa*.

'*Dwitwa*' in Nepali is a figurative device but translating it as one way or another, the conceptual gap remains. That is why such expression or word create gap between two language cultures.

While translating a text, the translator uses power and politics. It means he/she avoided total equivalence and reinterprets it in his own way. Then, naturally the translated text gets independence and freedom which causes new writing and transcreation. The power manipulation can't take place not only from the colonizer alone, the writers from colonized respond to the dominating power by rewriting or translating their text so as to make them fit into "image" of colonizer. Mahasweta Sengupta remarks:

'The tyranny and power of these images' construed by the colonizer can only be grasped fully if one examines translation of "native" works done by colonize and see how pervasive colonial hegemony is. By formulating an identity that is acceptable to the dominant culture, the translator selecting and rewrites only those texts that conform to the target culture's "image" of the sources culture, the rewriting often involves intense manipulation and simplification for the sake of gaining recognition in and by the metropole. (34)

When the translators get freedom to add, delete and to re-code it, the translated text enriches with subjectivity, power and politics of translator where there is neither fidelity to the source language text nor total equivalence is possible but the translator imposes his/her power in the text. The most important thing, according to Sengupta,

in translation is: how and why does a translator select a specific text out of the various fields? He further says:

Any choices are guided by certain considerations that are sensibly weighed by the translator-nobody would like to translate a text that would not read by the target language audience. Therefore, when one selects a particular text among many others, there are definitely certain reasons behind that choice which are dictated by the demand of the target culture. Selecting a text to be translated obviously does not happen within a vacuum-the choice is dictated by literary and extra-literary factors, and therefore it is bound to a political decision. (46)

Relating these all views to translation of *The Apple Cart*, translator has added, deleted so many words as his desire or necessity. Addition is the next procedure which gives more artistic equivalence to the TL text; it gives strangeness and newness to the translated text of rendering word to word equivalence but adding something to SL text. Addition is essential in translation to impress and attract the attention of the TL reader that cannot be seen in in SL text but added in translated text. Since, it is a cross cultural activity. By applying these tools, the translator doesn't surrender to the SL text but takes liberty from it only being Fidel to sense or context which is the indications of reconstruction or transcreation.

The translator has added words, phrases, sentences and even paragraphs to avoid confusion and to give clear, impressive knowledge to TL reader. In Nepali translation '*PrajatantrakoKkhel*' the translator has added many words, phrases, and few sentences. '*Kaam na kaaj kovedo*' (74), '*hera ta laaj pani nabhako*' (93), '*yo sab jaaljhel ra kapat rahecha*(93), are the examples of some addition. The sentences are not in source text but the translator has added these sentences to criticize others



behavior or to point out others mistake. Same way '*ti paanchai hajar janatale haasdai usko khilli udaye*'(54) is added to show the shameful situations of Breakages, Limited, here we cannot find the meaning '*khilli udaunu*' in SL text. But the translator has added to give the more reality of situation. Focusing upon its content and sense translation 'the translator sometimes uses words, phrases and whole sentences with his creative imagination and interpretation. Because of bi-lingual activity, total cultural equipment term or literal term is impossible where addition is essential.

Such as "that is drinks", (39) is translated as "*tyo ho jaad rakshi dhokne kaam*". Here, the translator has added "*jaad rakshi dhokne kaam*" in TL text which is not in SL text. It makes easy to understand the text to target reader. "At a pinch, I think they could do without the Christmas crackers." (52), has been translated as "*haad-se-haad malai lagchha uniharule Christmas ma pataaka patkaaunu chhadnu parla, juun sajilal chha.*" (31). Here the translator has given a word '*pataaka*' to 'crackers', to make understand the target reader and has added '*jun sajilal chha*' to focusing the target reader feeling.

The phrase "Right as rain" (41) is beautifully translated as "*ekdumai ramailo sangavayo, mahasaya*" the phrase used in SL text does not gives clear meaning directly, which means to say very good or clean as rain water. To show the same meaning, the translator has added in TL text, another word "*ekdumai ramro vayo*".

And again he has added the pronoun '*mahasaya*' which is not in the real text. Next a word '*ardhangini*' is added to give proper meaning of sentence, which is not mentioned in SL text. Similarly, "*yahale pani mero dimag ma tahalka machaunuvayo*". Here we don't find any meaning like '*pani*', '*mero dimag ma tahalka machaunu vayo*', in SL text. But, to make understand the reader, the translator has added his ideas. Next,

Source text- The Queen: "Nonsense, dear."

Magnus: "Well my dear."

Target text- *Maharani*: "*Kasto tarka garibaksanchha hajur pani*"

*Magnus*: "*He maharani.*"

Here, '*kasto tarka garibaksanchha*' and '*maharani*' are added the translation to make it more easier and comprehensible for target readers, on the one hand, it erases confusion, on the other hand, it gives newness and reconstructs the original text which is the sign of transcreation.

Deletion is another translation procedure which gives strangeness and newness to the translator text without violating meaning of SL text. The translator can delete some words to bring some newness in his writing. In the play "*Prajatantra ko khel*", the translator has avoided many words or phrases to discourage the misunderstanding of target reader. "But, what about twentieth time?"(36), is not translated in SL text.

But, we can get the sense of meaning of SL text in TL text. Likewise, "you know" (39) is deleted in TL text. "Oh! Yes, yes, yes" (98) is translated as "*oho! Tyo ta vannai pardaina*"(88). Here, translator has deleted the meaning of words "yes, yes, yes" from the SL text. But, deleting these words has caused a conceptual gap, pragmatically but to the sense, it has not distorted. The target text readers may not comprehend the expression.

Substitution is a procedure used by the translator if the elements used in the source text could not through the equal meaning in the target text. Since, the images applied in the source texts sometimes will be local that could not participate the target language reader, sharing the same sense. By the same token the translator of "*Prajatantrako Khel*" has substituted many words or sentences. 'Dead' as '*swargabas*' where Nepalese culture accepts that after death people go to heaven so

the used to call 'swargabas hunu' to 'dead', which may not be accepted by English culture, "Wages are too high"(49) is translated as "*talab jyala nikaicharko chha*" semantically, these both expressions give the same meaning in both cultures, and hence substituting the simple expression with the idiomatic expression has worked in manifold ways. Similarly, "she wouldnot give herself any airs with you" is translated as "*unle yaha sanga furti dekhauna khojne kura vayena*"(17) which have the similar meaning no matter the cultural origin is different. The word "*furti*" in Nepali context means to show the attitude and in SL text it is written as "giving airs". Firstly, the expressions are delivered without killing there sense. Secondly, it has glorified the taste of the target text. And thirdly, it shows the creativity and fidelity of the translator towards the source text.

To translate a text is not to translate mere words but cultures, which is original and independent. Translation is not only a bilingual activity but also a bicultural or cross cultural activity. It is more than mere substitution of one language from another or transference of SLT into TLT. Anuradha Dingwaney in her '*Translation as Cross Cultural Text*' clearly opines:

The translator cannot merely search for equivalent words in the target language to render the meaning of 'source' rather, the translator must attend to the contexts (a world, a culture) from which these words arise and which they necessarily evokes and express. Thus, it seems entirely appropriate that translation theory and practice has in recent years turned to both source and target culture as something to be studied before the translation of a work can proceed. (1)

That is to say, similar words in target and source language do not necessarily evoke or express same sense. Rather, one should analyze the background ideas reflected in

those words. But, ignoring the popular notion the translator has to make balance maintaining close fidelity to the original. Regarding the translation of culture, or a politics of translating culture, Dingwaney further opines:

Translation is one of the primary means by which texts written in one or another indigenous language of the various countries arbitrarily grouped together under the “third” or non-western, World are made available in western, metropolitan languages. However, translation is not restricted to such linguistic transfers alone; translation is also the vehicle through which “third world” cultures (are made to) travel-transported or “born across” to and recuperated by audience in the west. ...the process of translation involved in making another culture comprehensible entails varying degrees of violence, especially when the culture being translated is constituted as that of the “other”. (2)

Borrowing other language is frequently used procedure to bridge the gap and compensate the gap. The borrowed words give new taste to target reader. This is also called ‘importation’. Since Nepali language and cultural aspects are to some extent influenced by English language. The play “*Prajatantrako khel*” is also not an exception. Some words such as ‘pound’(2), ‘silly’(11), ‘captain’(13), ‘vote’(15), ‘order’(20), ‘ultimatum’(22), ‘race’(30), ‘paragraph’(38), ‘school’(40), ‘partner’(40), ‘seat’(42), ‘meeting’(53), ‘basket’(58), ‘new team’(79) doormat(70) “Songs of Our Great Great Grandparents”(57) and so on are borrowed terms of English used in ‘*Prajatantrako Khel*’. The translator of the target language text mentioned the same terms to share the equal sense between the SL users and TL users. So, by borrowing these terms as pound, captain, partner, new team, vote, school, paragraph, ultimatum, race, order, silly, seat, ,meeting, uncle(96) etc. so the fidelity of the translator upon the

source text. So the procedure borrowing, functions, good deal of work in TL readership. While translating the SL text into TL text, the translator knowingly or unknowingly borrowed some Hindi words as well. The Hindi words like *'andaj'* (6), *'saaf'* (59), *'talakh'* (65), *'ajmai'* (64), *'bahut'* (49), *'majaak'* (39), *'haad-se -haad'* (31), *'taklif'* (7) etc are some borrowed Hindi words which are very similar to Nepali language. Such borrowed terms give some newness in target text.

The translator is guided by the aesthetic approach stressing on the ethics of difference and it is for this reason there is no conspicuous trace of the erasure of the source political and cultural images. Nevertheless, in some cases the Nepali version of the play suffers literalness because the translator has failed to select the appropriate translation procedures regarding the nature of the source cultural elements and their communicative functions in the context. This has made Nepali Version less idiomatic, losing the balance between differences and intelligibility. All translations are prone to mistranslation, over translation, under translation and manipulation. Hence, one can expect a better translation, not a perfect translation. In this regard, Upadhyaya is not an exception.

### III. Translation as Transcreation

*The Apple Cart*, one of the plays originally written by George Bernard Shaw, is translated in Nepali under the title '*Prajatantrako Khel*' by Upadhyaya. In spite of the translator's endeavor of capturing cultural and literary meaning of the source text, it has not been completely repeated due to two cultures own identity and typicality. In the course of translating title dialogue, metaphors, idioms, proverbs as well as culturally rooted words the translator has employed various translation procedures like paraphrasing, addition and substitution to show the translated text is not mere replacement or total equivalence of the text but it is a reconstruction, rewriting and second independent life of the source language text.

Transcreation expands upon translation by focusing not so much on the literal text, but on discerning the emotional response by readers in the source language and working to elicit the same response from reader in the target market. It is about, 'taking completely recreating it in another'. The goal of transcreation is not to say same thing in another language. Indeed, it is often not possible to say exact the same thing in another language,. The aim of the game with transcreation is to get the same reaction in each language, something that translation is itself won't be able to achieve.

Transcreation can offer the best possible solution for the problems of culturally oriented literary texts. Transcreation in this context can be understood as a rebirth or incarnation of the original work suited to the readers/ audience of the target language in the particular time and space. This re-interpretation is done with a certain

special purpose and is performed with suitable interpolations, explanations, expansions, summarizing and aesthetic innovations in style and techniques.

The relevance of transcreation is universal since it can be used as a device to break the myth of 'untranslatability'. In fact it is holistic approach in which all possible techniques like elaboration, interpolation, image recreation, translative explanations and elucidations are possible. In such text, the translator enters into the sole of the original author and then he himself becomes creator. Transcreation is not all together a new creation because there is always a logical relationship between the original and the translated text. At the same time it reads like new creation.

Absolutely fidelity to the text is secondary to eliciting the desired emotional response by the target reader. Because differences between culture and so many numerous, eliciting the same emotional reaction may also necessitate changes in the context of the message.

The title of the play *The Apple Cart* has been rendered as *Prajatantrako Khel* applying paraphrasing and substitution procedure without clear lexical approximation. A simile like 'third class carriage', (74) has been rendered as '*railko dibba jastai thotro.*' Similarly, a metaphorical expression 'you hit your nail on your head' (22) has been literally translated as '*yahale bilkul nisana marnu vayo*', 'go to the devil' (21) has been translated as '*aafule chaheko garnus*' where paraphrasing procedure has been applied. Same way '*ramrosanga vayo mahasaya*' can't be seen in the source text, addition procedure is used here. Further many colloquial a cultural Nepali words have been added. i.e. '*budhiya*', '*chitikka*,' '*suttukka*', '*sala*', '*swathharu*', '*balubhute*', '*bhustighre*', '*joitingre*', '*jotinu*', etc. while translating the source text.

Moreover, the translator with his creative imagination has replaced many cultural and many religious terms. In the source text, many English cultural words

have been included but they are culturally rendered into typical Nepali terms i.e. ‘holy snake’, ‘the sun’, ‘pound’, ‘pageant’ (27) ‘god’(35) ‘foundation’ etc. but the translation keeping the target reader at the center replaced these words as ‘*naag raaj*’, ‘*suryabhagawan*’, ‘*rakam*’, ‘*jhaki*’ (1) ‘*bhagawanawatar*’, ‘*silanyas*’ respectively. A proverb ‘gulling the multitude’ has been translated as ‘*tuppabata palayeko manis*’(15). This is also an artistic translation keeping no lexical affinity. The idioms ‘hit the nail on your head’ has been rendered as ‘*nisana maarnu*’ where no semantic closeness is found. By employing intuitive forces translator has rendered it in his own creative way.

Same way ‘Gulp it down sir. It won’t get any sweeter by keeping, what?’ has been translated as “*yeslai swatta nilibakaisiyos Rajshree Nares. Samaya parkhera tesko teetoghatne haina. Kaso?*” here paraphrasing technique is used. Such as ‘shut up you gabby’ as ‘*chup lagnuhos buddhu raaj*’ has employed with his creative imagination, it can be taken as reconstructing or rewriting of the source language text. As there is no negligence and superficial knowledge of the translator, it has neither misinterpretation nor distortion but it is a re-writing of the original text.

Translation and transcreation are related process, but they are not identical. Translation in the western world has a century’s long history and has been marked in practice by two ‘ideal approaches- metaphase (word for word translation) and paraphrase. Due to idiom and wide variety of local usages, word for word translation has long been considered inadequate and the best translations take into account the vocabulary, grammar, syntax, idiom and local usages of the target reader while remaining faithful to the text and context of the original document. If everyone trying to diminish the distance between the connection between different countries and



culture in order to gain a worldwide audience or reader, then transcreation may be a good option for their work.

Since the translation is an activity of analysis, reconstruction and creative writing, target language cannot carry old culture of SL term due to conceptual gap. It has indefinite and absence of meaning that's why his purpose should be found out an expression in target not forms. In this multicultural and multilingual world, total equivalence is impossible, different socio-cultural and political assumption differentiates understanding and interpretation that why he discards the logo centric concept in translation but he gives priority to multiple meaning and interpretation.

To define translation as a cross-cultural activity, Hermans further says:

This thick translation as a form of translation studies has the potential to bring about a double dislocation of the foreign terms and concepts, which are probed by means of an alien methodology and vocabulary and of the describer's own terminology, which must be wrenched out of its familiar shape to accommodate both eternity and similarity ...

Thick translation should be able to counter the flatness and repulsiveness of the prevailing jargon of translation studies and their structuralism heritage, and foster instead a more diversified and imaginative vocabulary. (386)

In the name of closest possible approximation both linguistic and cultural between the source language text and target language text, translator may lead towards mistranslation. It is due to the lack of carefulness and sufficient commanding in SL and TL culture, context and language, inappropriate term selection and carelessness. In 'translation as discovery', Mukherjee writes: 'A bad translation is often the result of poor language control as it is the result of poor understanding of the original work.'

It does not hurt the translator as much as it hurts the publisher. But it can damage the author almost beyond redemption' (134).

It is obvious that full accurate translation or total translation is impossible because there is cultural interchange cultural interpretation, and reconstruction. There is no metalanguage to hold the invariant of translational and transcultural comparison. Inter-subjectivity and freedom play a vital role in translation. Kloepfer in "Intra and Inter cultural translation" says:

Good translations serve the study of literature as a reconstruction of the mechanics of cultural systems via aesthetic communication. From the manner in which every day or literary texts for various reasons and in various epochs are translated one can with relative ease, decipher the respective cultural systems and their dynamics. Translation as one of the links with cultural influence control can and must therefore, one again become an object of literary studies. (36)

For them, translation means transcription and transliteration where the translator deconstructs then reconstructs the SL text into TL text with creativity and criticism. Disregarding formal equivalence, they strongly desire for dynamic equivalence. Transculturalism and multiculturalism remain at the heart of translation. In this process, one culture crosses the boundary of its own and mixes with another culture. Since it is a compromise and readjustment, give and take process is natural in translation. Some elements will be left out to make TL reader clear where absence of meaning occurs. It is believed that language swings between two cultures. Indeterminacy of words creates in-betweens and cultural gaps. Lack of total rendering of SL text in TL text, provides independence and freedom that is why it is defined as interpretation intervention and literature three as well.

Disregarding the traditional notion of full accurate representation and total equivalence, it is viewed that translation is an activity of rewriting or creative writing. Such type of translation is freer from of translation, probably closer of translation, probably closer to copy writing. Translator here gets total freedom the text including his subjectivity. Beyond the concept of literal translation, the translators have rights to omit, to add and to give strangeness to the translation. Das argues:

As a critic deconstructs (decants) the text and then reconstructs (re-centers) it, so, a translator decodes an SL text and then recodes it in the target language. If criticism has become creative, for it not only interprets the text but extends the meaning of it, then translation is creative for recreates an SL text in a new way in the target language.  
(58)

We view that transcreation means recreating an SL text in the target language taking absolute liberty with it and yet being fiddle to it. Instead of imitation of SL text, the translator at first deconstructs those reconstructs with subjectivity and intuition. He further says: Translation has become creative-thanks to the concept of transcreation and transliteration. Therefore, the translator has out growth the concept of being taken as a render of an SL text into a TL text and become a creator. (65)

He assumes that translation is a reincarnation of original text where wide departure from the original text takes place. Excessive divergence from the original makes the translator creator, not imitator.

G. Gopinathan “*Intranslation, Transcreation and culture. The evolving Theories of translation in Hindi and other modern Indian languages*” argues:

Transcreation can offer the best possible solution for the problem of culturally oriented literary text. Transcreation in this context can be

understood as a rebirth or incarnation of the original work. It can be defined as an aesthetic-reinterpretation of original work suited to the readers/audience of the target language in particular time and space. This reinterpretation is done with a certain social purpose and is performed with suitable interpolations, explanations, expansions, summarizing and aesthetic innovations in style and techniques. (3)

For him, the translator enters into the sole of the original author and then he himself becomes creator. It certainly demands an intuitive and aesthetic recreation and the application of creative imagination.

According to Samantak Das, “the German theologian and philosopher, Freidrich Schleirmacher asserted that there are only two ways in which to go about translating a text: either translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him” (41). Das quotes Venuti who commenting on Schleirmacher’s assertion writes:

Schleiermacher allowed the translator to choose between a domesticating method, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target language values, bringing the author back home, and a foreignising method, an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to resist the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad. (42)

The foreignising method is democratic, aesthetically oriented and value-preserving, whereas the domesticating method is essentialist, commercially oriented and value-erasing.

It is not merely surrender to the original work and replacement by the available target terms. The translator should replace it with intelligence and cognitive psychology and philosophy. But negligence and superficial knowledge of the translator may lead to misinterpretation, distortion and, over-under interpretation. Sri Aurobindo argues:

The mind of man demands, those new ideas shall be presented to him in words which convey to him some associations with which he should not feel like a foreigner in a strange country where no one knows his language nor he theirs. The new must be presented to him in terms of the old, new wine must be put to some extent in new bottles. (qtd. in Gopinathan, 14)

When the passages have been paraphrased, summarized and in many cases omitted, without being total equivalent, it is defined as transcreation. In *Translation as Discovery Subject* Mukharjee writes:

Though the process of translation the text may have achieved in independent status. If so, then it could be reviewed as an autonomous text and its worth assessed regardless of whether it may be found but then we are no longer judging a translation. (5)

Regarding the violence that occurs in translation, Venuti states the view in this way:

The violence of translation resides in its very purpose and activity; the reconstruction of the foreign accordance with values, belief and representations that pre-exist in the target language, always configured in hierarchies of dominance and marginality, always determining the production, circulation and reception of texts. Translation is the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural difference of the

foreign text with a text that will be intelligible to the target language reader. (209)

So, translation contains violence in its core. One language is transferred into another language. In the process of transference, the translator looks only to the pre-existing or the already laid beliefs of the target readers and mould the text accordingly as their demands. That results the mistranslation.

Apart from the concept of 'shadow' or 'mere copy of an original work', the translation rises up from the state of 'a slave' to 'owner' by getting its independent status. It is taken as literature-3 because there is no total fidelity and correspondence, but gets free identity it is released from subordinate and slave position.

Thus translation is defined as new writing and transcreation because it is taken as a second life or second birth with its independence status. It is often taken as literature three. There is the matter that still needs attention is the more general theoretical aspect of translation and how this relates to transcreation. Jakobson divides translation into three groups that embrace both interlingual, intralingual, and intersemiotic translation, which includes transfers that are not necessarily between two different languages.

As has been illustrated in this research, translation involves cultural and ideological transportation and that translation are often produced under various constraints to serve certain purpose as they are a constituent of a complex literary, social or cultural system. Translation therefore takes the form of rewriting that is carried out within the framework of the target language, culture and ideology on the service of a control factor wielded by the patron or the receiving system.

In the same respect, the translator is a rewriter of the original text as he or she engages in the act of cultural and ideological transportation and distorts the ST to

accommodate it into the TT. Although rewriters or translators are usually considered to be meticulous, hardworking, well read and as honest as is humanly possible, complete equivalence between ST and TT may be impossible due to various constraints. Hence translators are, in some respects, traitors, since to a certain extent they violate the original, which they must do to remain within the boundaries of the target culture.

Rewritings or translations are manipulation, since they reflect the rewriters'/translators' efforts in adapting the text to function in a given society in a given way. Also, they may be controversial because they can create different values and practices. However, while their *power* can be misused sometimes, in the case described herein the translator has employed his/her power positively in introducing the ST while preserving the target culture and public morals, especially with regards to their symbol and pride-the imperial family. Translators have the power to contribute to the preservation or enrichment of the target literature and society, as well as to the enhancement of trust, understanding and respect between different languages, cultures, and ideologies. Furthermore, they may play an invaluable role in bringing the world closer and in enhancing humanity's identification with global citizenship.

This overall theoretical framing of translation might also be applicable when describing transcreation strategies. Target-orientation, which seems to hold a strong position within translation theory, is also an important factor in transcreation. The literature on transcreation is taking a number of directions. The term transcreation has only recently gained considered attention. Acknowledgement of the sacredness of the source has not, it seems, taken away a willingness to make adaptations. So creative, that they are regarded more as transcreation than translation.

### Works Cited

- Bapuji, B.R. "A Short History of Translation Studies." *Theories of Translation*. Ed. Madras: T. R. Publication, 1993.
- Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge 2003.
- Benjamin, Walter. *The Task of the Translator in Illuminations*. London: Fontana, 1992.
- Catford, J. C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: OUP, 1964.
- Das, Bijaya Kumar. *A Handbook of Translation Studies*. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2005.
- Das, Samantak. "Multiple Identities: Notes Towards a Sociology of Translation." *Translation Text and Theory: The Paradigm of India*. New Delhi: Sage Publication, 2002: 35-45.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Positions*. Chicago: university of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Dingwaney, Anuradha. "Introduction : Translating "Third World" Cultures." *Betweenlanguage and cultures: translation and Cross cultural Text*. London: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995.
- Gopinathan, G. *In Translation Transcreation Culture.and The Nature and Problem of Translation*. Allahabad: Lok Bharati Prakashan, 1993.
- Hermans, Theo. *Cross Cultural Translation Studies as Think Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Histography*, Middle Town: Blackwell Publishing for Wesleyan University, 2003.
- Howland, Douglas. *The predicament of Ideas in Culture: Translation and*



- Jakobson, Roman. "One Linguistic Aspect of Translation". In: Venuti (Ed.)  
The Translation Theories. 1959
- Kleopfer, Ralf and Ph. Shaw. *Intra and Interculture Translation*. London: Duke  
University Press. 1981
- Layoun, mary N. "Translation, Culture Transgression and Tribute and Leaden  
Feet." *Between Language and Cultures: Translation and Cross Culture  
Texts*. London: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995.
- Mukharjee, Sujit. *Translation as Discovery and other essays on Indian Literature in  
English Translation*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 1994.
- Raffle, Burton. *The Art of Translating Poetry*. London: Pittsburgh Pennsylvania State  
University Press. 1988.
- Sengupta, Mahasweta. *Translation and Its Politics*. Hyderabad: University of  
Hyderabad, 1994.7-20.
- Sri, Aurobindo. *Collected Works, Volumes, 3, 9, 10, and 12*. Pondichessy,  
*The City Post*. 9 Nov. 2007.
- Venuti, Lawrence, "The Translator's Invisibility". *Criticism*,28.  
New York: Routledge, 1995