

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY**

**Translation as Cultural Manipulation: Reading Larry Hartsell's Translation of**

**Vijaya Malla's *Anuradha***

**A thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**

**Central Department of English**

**in the Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the**

**Degree of Master of Arts in English**

**By**

**Aiti Ghale**

**Central Department of English**

**Kirtipur, Kathmandu**

**April, 2011**

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY  
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Central Department of English  
Kirtipur, Kathmandu

**Letter of Recommendation**

Mrs. Aiti Ghale has completed her thesis entitled “Translation as Cultural Manipulation: Reading Larry Hartsell’s Translation of Vijaya Malla’s *Anuradha*” under my supervision. She carried out her research from September, 2010 to April 2011 A.D. I hereby recommend her thesis be submitted for viva voce.

---

---

Mr. Pushpa Raj Acharya  
Supervisor

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY****Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**

This thesis entitled “Translation as Cultural Manipulation: Reading Larry Hartsell’s Translation of Vijaya Malla’s *Anuradha*” submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Mrs. Aiti Ghale has been approved by the undersigned member of the Research Committee.

**Members of the Research Committee:**

---

---

**Internal Examiner**

---

---

**External Examiner**

---

---

**Head  
Central Department of English****Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

### **Acknowledgements**

First among those whom I have to thank for making this research possible is Mr. Pushpa Raj Acharya, my thesis guide and the lecturer at Central Department of English. He constantly guided me with his valuable suggestions and ideas.

Thanks to my teachers, Dr. Ramchandra Poudel and Rajkumar Baral for their guidance in the submission of proposal. Moreover, my special thanks goes to Dr. Govinda Raj Bhattarai for providing me books related to translation theories and an equal debt is due to all my teachers at Central Department of English.

My very sincere thanks goes to my parents, my husband, Mr. Nandu Kumar Ghale, and all my family members for their constant support and encouragement in my academic pursuit. I am very grateful indeed to my friends, Gokarna Limbu, Sunil Limbu, and Dhurba Gautam for typing this research and for their regular guidance. Last, but not the least, without the constant support of all my friends, this task would never have been accomplished.

**Aiti Ghale**

April 2011

### **Abstract**

Vijaya Malla's *Anuradha*(1961) has been translated into English by Larry Hartsell in 2003. With Hartsell's translation, *Anuradha* got the non-Nepali speaking readers, but the act of translation is not free from the linguistic, cultural, economic, and political violations. Hartsell's translations is manipulated and enhanced by ideologies which are imprinted in the very discursive strategies held by the translator.

## Contents

	Page no.
Letter of Recommendation	
Letter of Approval	
Acknowledgements	
Abstract	
I: Translation as a Cultural-Political Activity	
Introduction	1-5
Translation of Third-World Texts into First-World Languages	5-17
Nepali Literature in English Translation	17-21
II: Politics of Translation in Larry Harsell's <i>Anuradha</i>	
Manipulation in Selection/Publication of Book	25-27
Translator's Introduction/Foreword	27-29
Manipulation and Translation Strategy	29-33
Mediation and Manipulation in Translation	33-38
Intimacy and Inquiry in Translation	38-43
Image/Cultural Identity	43-46
III. Larry Hartsell's Translation: Mystifying Nepali Culture	47-48
Works Cited	

## I. Translation as a Cultural- Political Activity

### Introduction

Translation is the present day world's greatest achievement and especially it gains popularity among the comparative literature and cross-cultural teaching. Though, translation entails so many violences, it makes us familiar with the texts and cultures of the other part of the world and other part of the world with our texts and culture. The translated work of *Anuradha* by Larry Hartsell and its original piece by Vijaya Malla seems quite different. The novel is a psychological one, which consists of the fourteen chapters. The novel weaves the tragic love story of Komalman Singh, who is the narrator of the novel and Anuradha, a passionate beautiful woman who become insane with the evil forces of the patriarchal norms and values. Out of the fourteen chapters, the early chapters consist of soliloquy of Komalman, where he expresses his intense love towards Anuradha who is unknown of his feelings, doomed to roam in her own psychic-world. The emotional intensity of the novel is lost in the translated version. As it is a psychological novel, the essence of the novel lies in the emotional intensity of it. Such a rendering would certainly create the negative image about our writer's intelligence along with our cultural aspects. So, what the researcher found is the lack of knowledge of the context and the very translation strategy adopted by the translator behind such manipulation and mistranslation. As illustrated by Anuradha Dingwaney, Carol Maier and Mary N. Layoun, without the close intimacy with the context of the source texts and its culture, and specific strategy to deal with the "Third-World" text, it is impossible to translate any text.

As Translation is a difficult task, it is not just a linguistic equivalence but along with it, context is an integral part. That is why the translator should have both the linguistic as well as cultural competence. The translation of Hartsell and its original piece by Vijaya Malla displays the ignorance of translator to the context in which original text is situated.

Moreover, the very politics of translator upon choosing the translation strategy further manipulates the text. Is it a justice to the original text when translator appropriates, adds and cuts the terms, sentences and paragraphs as per the convenience of his readers ? Obviously not. This shows that Larry Hartsell maintains his authority over the text *Anuradha* which is exemplified by his indifference and his lack of tribute to the source language and culture. As a result, the original *Anuradha* has been manipulated at many levels: linguistic, cultural, economical and political. Thus, Hartsell's translation of *Anuradha* is a form of manipulation which gives the stereotypical representation of Nepali culture. So, the text *Anuradha* is a cultural manipulation done by the Larry Hartsell.

The primary objective of this research is to show manipulative aspects of the translation processes which include various factors such as selection of text, translation strategy and exercise of power-relations. Moreover, the study also aims to show the detachment of the translator to the source language and culture which enhances manipulation. This study makes significant use of concepts developed in the translation theories. Especially, this research is in line with the theories of Anuradha Dingwaney, Carol Maier, Mary N. Layoun and Lawrence Venuti. These writers on translation emphasize the importance of 'context', cultural aspect, space-between and translation strategies in the translation process. Furthermore, Mahasweta Sen Gupta's ideas about domination of dominant group over the "Third-World" texts, too, in the case of translating "Third-World" text is incorporated here which is very true in the translated version of *Anuradha* by Larry Hartsell. But it does not offer the comprehensive analysis of translation theories. Since the major objective of the study is to demonstrate the violence of translation which is done on the original text, it does not aim to mean that the translation must be the exact reflection of the original one. It does not convey that the translation is a bad task rather it reveals the unacknowledged part of translation process.

Moreover, it does not aim to discourage the honest translation of any text whether it be the “First-World” text or the “Third-World” text.

The text *Anuradha* by Vijaya Malla has received many critical responses since its publication in 1961. Different critics, writers and scholars have viewed it differently. But most of them analyzed its thematic aspects. As Balkrishna says, “Malla is the another novelist of psychoanalytic trend. Malla in his novel *Anuradha* has analyzed the repressed sexual desires and fragmented mentality” (39). Similarly, Indra Bahadur Rai, while analyzing the psychoanalysis of the novel says, “psychoanalysis is the very reality of the novel *Anuradha*. By serving few drops of water of psychoanalysis, Malla has done stream towards the readers” (22-23). Taranath Sharma while preventing the historical introduction of Nepalese literature expresses his views as:

The writer has presented the crazy idiosyncrasy and drunkard characters as he strongly holds the beliefs that human beings’ behaviors and nature can be explored through the portrayal of insane characters in the novel. The novel was supported by Freudian psychoanalysis, social realism and existentialism. (82)

The writer Bashu Rimal ‘Yatri’ analyses it with the lense of trauma as “Abnormal person suffering from traumas a great problem of the society. Thus, *Anuradha* is the same kind of character of Malla’s novel *Anuradha*” (138-139). Likewise, Bashudev Tripathi opines it with different perspective as “*Anuradha* by Malla is not only the portrayal of social rebel but also revolution against the total absurdity and disjunction of life. Thus, *Anuradha* is not only the study of time and space, it is the exploration of total value of life” (128).

Thus, the different writers, critics and intellectuals took it with different perspective. At the most part, it is viewed with psychoanalysis as above writers on

*Anuradha*, but some others opine it with humanitarian, social realistic and proto-feministic approaches too. But none the critics have viewed its translation aspects and the kind of deviations, distortions and manipulation done on it and how this would render the negative image about the source culture. So, the main focus of the study of this research is on the translation and its manipulative aspects. Furthermore, it emphasizes the great role of the knowledge of the ‘context’ in translation activity, which is an interdisciplinary activity as opined by Carol Maier. Also this study encourages the honest translation of the text without any ideologies behind it.

*Anuradha* by Vijaya Malla and its translation into English by Larry Hartsell, in the process of selecting an equivalent images or terms mark the manipulation at two levels: at the level of form and at level of content. The translator does the literal translation of the source text where certain cultural words including metaphors, proverbs and symbols of the source text is preserved at its form but the content or essence of the original is blurred. Due to the cultural differences and gaps, and even the lack of the adequate knowledge of Nepalese culture and the appropriate translation method, the translator has simplified and denuded the cultural difference of the source text which results in a cultural loss on the part of the source text. For example, literal translation of “*maitama*” (Malla 64) and “*gharma*” (Malla 64) as “parents” (Hartsell 91) and “someone else” (Hartsell 91) respectively presents the deviation of its meanings which has the cultural significance. For the equivalent effect of image, the translator should either look for the similar image in target culture or he/she should elaborate its meaning in endnotes or footnotes. The translator has deliberately deleted, added and mistranslated some of the cultural categories for the lack of equivalence in the target culture. The Nepalese cultural images have been domesticated, homogenized and mistranslated in the translated version

of *Anuradha* by Larry Hartsell, and behind such a manipulation various factors play the significant role which this research has attempted to explore.

Finally, this study brings the new outlook on the text *Anuradha* by focusing on its translation process and various manipulations done on it. It has attempted to reveal the hidden ideologies and politics behind the translation of any texts. Because translation is not only the transference and a substitution of meaning from one language to another rather it is exercised within the networks of power-politics which has the power to stigmatize, glorify and simplify the foreign language and culture. Moreover, it has tried to expose that translators as well as publishers are complicit in the institutional exploitation of foreign texts and cultures.

### **Translation of the Third-World Texts into First-World Languages**

There is no agreement in the definition of translation. Translation like poetry is elusive. It is both a substitution and transference of meaning from one language to another. The concept of translation has undergone a sea-change over the years. The theories of translation developed from purely linguistic approach of the sixties to the textual of the seventies have now yielded place to the culture-based theory. It has been described variously by various scholars at different places at different points of time. But it has become a necessity in the multi-lingual and multi-cultural world. Translation is a bridge of communication within as well as across different speech communities, has contributed to spread out and preserve the knowledge that humanity has acquired at various epochs and added to the growing store of the world knowledge. In fact, translation is the reality of today's world.

Frantz Fanon remarks, "to speak a language is to take on a world or culture" (qtd in Dingwaney 1). In this context, translation is not only the matter of language but also of culture too. In accordance to Fanon, language can't be isolated from the "world" or

“culture” within which it is embedded. In the context of translation, in seeking to transport words from one language to another, the translator cannot merely search for the equivalent words in the target language to render the meaning of the source rather the translator must attend to the context from which these words arise and which they necessarily evoke and express.

Translation has undergone a wide change from linguistic approach to the cultural one in the present scenario. Translation activity involves not only the rendering of linguistic terms, but along with it culture of a particular community or country is also rendered. Thus, now the translation process is acknowledged from the cultural perspectives. Jhumpa Lahiri writes, “Translation is not only a finite linguistic activity but an ongoing cultural one” (qtd in Nair 120). Similarly, Vladimir Ivir comments that cultural contact presupposes translation. In the similar line, Casagrande asserts that in effect one does not translate languages, one translates culture.

Thus, the activity of translation involves the transferring of culture too. As it is the primary means to make known the foreign text and culture to the wider readerships, it has a greater significance in this multi-cultural and multi-lingual world. It is also one of the enabling means of cross-cultural teaching. Acknowledging its importance, Anuradha Dingwaney writes, “translation is one of the primary means by which text written in one or another indigenous language of the various countries arbitrarily grouped under the “Third-World” or ‘non-Western’ world are made available in the western metropolitan languages” (2). However, translation is not only restricted to the linguistic transfer alone, translation is also the vehicle through which “Third-World cultures travel-transported or “borne-across” to and recuperated by audiences in the West.

The act of translation not only crosses the boundary of linguistic but of the culture too. It is not only the rendition of the “foreign” into the “familiar” but also the attempt to

make familiar of the strange. Thus, the translation is cultural transgression. But such a process is not devoid of the potential pitfalls – the “violence”. The process of translation involved in making another culture comprehensible entails varying degree of violence especially when the culture being translated is constituted as that of the ‘other’. Talal Asad, locates this violence in specific exercise of power – colonial power, the power of the West as it seeks to reconstitute the “Third-World” as an object of its study.

Furthermore, Asad and Dixon acknowledge the institutional constraints and disciplinary demands of social anthropology and the expectation of the audiences for whom these translations are intended as affecting the translation undertaken( qtd in Dingwaney 2) .

As translation has acquired the wider recognition in global scenario, the “Third-World” is not exception to it. The well known saying, “translate or die” is very true to this scenario. Translation renews and make alive any work of art or literature, otherwise it becomes old and dies. Vijay Kumar Das borrowing Amitav Ghosh’s lines writes, “And the thing about translation is that there is no way around it. In a country as multi-lingual as ours, unless you have really good translations you are doomed” (80). But the very process is not apart from manipulation from power-relations especially in the case of “Third-World” texts translation, theorists have defined translation from the colonial and post-colonial perspectives. Translation which had been a part of colonial discourse (Orientalism) from the late eighteenth century which English people used as a means to get information about the “Third-World” people and its culture. The “First-World” or “colonizer” used translation as a means to oppress the colonized and the colonized used translation as to maintain the indigenous culture and tradition (Das 85). In colonial period, the colonial nations translated the text of indigenous culture and countries. Such translation often resulted in distorted images as pointed out by Mahasweta Sen Gupta.

The very exercise of power is seen in their formulation of the image of the foreign culture that preserves and extends the hegemony of the dominant group. These “images” construct the notions of the “other” and formulate an identity of the source culture that is recognizable by the target culture as the representative of the former – as “authentic” specimens of a world that is remote as well as inaccessible in terms of target culture’s self.

Sen Gupta also makes a point that even an auto-translation by the “Third-World” translator gives the false image of the “Third-World” since the translator is submissive to the hegemony of the power of images created and nurtured by the dominant group as the authentic representation of the “Third-World” culture. The result of such a process of exclusion is that the source (dominated culture) in this context is homogenized and domesticated; the polyphony of its existence obliterated; and a unified, monolithic view of that culture is created as truly legitimate. Here, she gives the example of auto-translation by Bengali-poet Rabindranath Tagore. Tagore himself admits the demands of the English audiences and his own manipulation of the poems in his letter to William Pearson as:

I believe that in English version some portions of it may profitably be left out, for I find that English readers have very little patience for senses and sentiments which are foreign to them; they feel a sort of grievance for what they do not understand and they care not to understand whatever is different from their familiar world. This is the reason why you find translations from oriental works in Germany and France and very few in England. (qtd in Sen Gupta 8)

This shows how prevalent the discursive boundaries of the English language where the “Third-World” writers and translators themselves become submissive to its

homogenization of the “Third-World” text and its cultures. Thus, translation becomes the form of violence or manipulation in such situation where translator or dominant power appropriates only those texts that conform to the pre-existing discursive parameters of its linguistic networks and those texts are then rewritten largely according to certain pattern that denudes them of their complexity and variety, they are presented as a specimens of the culture that is “simple”, “natural”, “spiritual”.

The very power of dominant group is further grasped in their selection of texts along with the strategies used by the translator. As Venuti writes:

[. . .] the greatest potential scandal is the formation of cultural identities. Translation wields enormous power in constructing representation of foreign cultures. The selection of foreign texts and the development of translation strategies can establish peculiarly domestic canons for foreign literature, canons that conform to domestic aesthetic values and therefore reveal exclusions and admissions, centers and peripheries that deviate from those current in the foreign language. And foreign texts are often rewritten to conform to styles and themes that currently prevail in domestic literatures, much to the disadvantage of more historicizing translation discourses that recover styles and themes from earlier moments in domestic traditions. (*Invisibility* 67)

He further makes a point that the calculated choice of foreign text and translation strategy can change or consolidate literary canons, conceptual paradigms, research methodologies, commercial practices in the domestic culture. Whether the effect of translation prove to be conservative or transgressive depends fundamentally on the discursive strategies developed by the translators along with the various factors in their reception including page-design and cover art of the printed book, the advertising copy,

the opinions of the reviewers and the uses made of translation in culture and social institution how it is read and taught.

Furthermore, the translation activity is guided by certain discourses and ideologies which are imprinted in the translation strategies used by the translator. In the contemporary Anglo-American culture, the translator is mostly guided by fluent discourse where the translator takes recourse to the domesticating method which produces the illusion of transparency. According to Venuti, the illusion of transparency is:

A translated text whether prose or poetry, fiction or non-fiction, is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers and readers when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities make it seem transparent, giving appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text- the appearance, in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation but the original. (*Invisibility* 1)

Such an illusionistic effect of fluent discourse is mostly found in domesticating method. Such effect in fact conceals the variety of conditions under which the translation is made, starting with the translator's crucial intervention in the foreign text. The more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator, and presumably, the more visible the writer or meaning of the foreign text. And such domesticating method adopts the foreign text as per the values, beliefs and representations that pre-exist in the target language, always configure in hierarchies of the dominance and marginality, always determining the production, circulation and reception of texts. Venuti remarks that, "Translation is the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text with the text that will be intelligible to the target language readers" (18).

The aim of such a strategy is to bring back a cultural “other” as the same, the recognizable, even the familiar and this aim always risks a wholesale domestication of the foreign texts, often in highly self-conscious projects. Where translation serves and appropriation of foreign cultures for domestic agendas cultural, economic, political. Thus, Lawrence Venuti along with Schleiermacher propose the foreignizing method to the domesticating method. Schleiermacher says:

Domesticating method, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target language cultural values, bringing the author back home, while foreignizing method, an ethno-deviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad (qtd in Dingwaney 5).

Foreignizing method on the other hand does not produce the illusionary effect of transparency. It is not a transparent representation of an essence that resides in the foreign text and is valuable in itself but a strategic construction whose value is contingent on the current target language situation. In this line, Venuti says:

Foreignizing translation signifies the difference of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the target language. In its effort to do right abroad, this translation method most do wrong at home, deviating enough from native norms to stage an alien reading experience – choosing to translate a foreign text excluded by domestic literary canons, for instance, or using marginal discourse to translate it. (*Invisibility* 20)

Foreignizing method seeks to restrain the ethnocentric violence of translation which is highly desirable in the present day. It is a strategic cultural intervention which is directed against the hegemonic English language nations and unequal cultural exchanges

in which they engage their global others. Foreignizing translation in English can be a form of resistance against ethno-centrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations.

So, the translator's choice of strategy shows his dominant stance point toward the text/culture being translated. Dingwaney and Maier, further address the issues of "space-between" in translation which is mostly left out of the discussions by the most translators.

Translation is at the most part characterized by the loss which occurs not due to the lack of familiar categories but the very activity of translation is flawed. Most translator left the "space-between" of the languages which consequently results in the violence. According to Dingwaney and Maier, "between" refers to the space of translation where the self or one culture encounters and more importantly interacts with 'other' or another culture" (6). It is also the space occupied by the translators to the text or culture they translate. In such process, translation can function as a form of resistance or it may result in a hybrid or it may totally assimilated to the domestic culture. Thus, the translator should make their power and vantage point evident. On this Dingwaney says:

This task entails not only that they remain aware of their own locations with respect to the cultures they study, but also that they be constantly aware of "the institutional conditions and disciplinary demands" that impinge on their translations, that they understand fully whom they write for, within what contexts, and more than anything else, the mediated status of their accounts. (7)

She further says that it is important that such self-reflexiveness not 'return' the translating subject to the center he or she has occupied in the past but the cultures and text, being translated should, ideally constrain this move, compelling the translator and

her product to enter into a subtly dialectical interaction with the “source” through which “difference” is both mediated and recorded, not sacrifice or appropriated (8).

Thus, the “space-between” is crucial to the translation. It is decisive to the end “product” of translation and to the consumption of that product. As translator is the one who straddles between the two worlds and its cultures, he must be conscious of his subject position. He is the one who occupy the space-between of the translation which determines the end product of the translation. According to Maier, the “First-World” translation must articulate the specific strategies for working with “Third-World” text as they begin to explore translations “between” in terms of inequality and difference. Maier proposes two requisites for such strategy and practice: intimacy and inquiry. Maier suggests that the translator should be related to the “source” culture in such a way that the translator feels intimate to it. As Gayatri Spivak comments, “if one’s relationship with the language being translated was such that sometimes one preferred to speak in it about intimate things” (“The Politics of Translation” 181). If translations are made quickly and by the translators who are not thoroughly familiar with the language and culture they translate, then such unfamiliarity results in the homogenization of the “Third-World” texts which are being translated. So, for Maier, a translator should be an intimate reader of the text he translates. If the translator is not closely acquainted with the language and cultures he translates, then the possibility of violence remains there.

To address the problem of “space-between,” Maier further suggests that the translator should perform the task of an inquirer. Inquiry is related to subjectivity and identity. According to Maier, when translator acknowledges inequalities that characterizes power relations between the “First” and “Third” World, subjectivity is achieved to the extent that identity is problematized (10). The increase in subjectivity is linked to further investigation of how remarkably the inexplicable things might be

comprehended without making them explicable in familiar terms. Only then, there would not be the unequal cultural exchange between the “First-World” and the “Third-World”.

Edward Said, in the context of unequal exchange of cultures between the “First-World” and the “Third-World” points out the biased attitudes of the West towards the “Third-World” texts in terms of its selection, translation and publication. He criticizes the Western policy in making a kind of “monolithic reductionism” in the case of translating Arabic texts. He is against the western tradition excluding those texts which do not repeat the usual clichés about Islam or Arab. The West takes Arabic language as controversial language and excludes it from translation. Thus, Arabic literature is embargoed. So, western power-politics can be seen in their very selection and publication of text which consequently homogenize the “Third-World” text as per the domestic norms and values.

As Dingwaney and Maier argue, translation is not merely a linguistic process of transferring a word meaning from one language to another but the translator also transmits cultural meaning and an aesthetic beauty of the original text into another language for the readers of different culture and aesthetic value. According to them, it is a means through which the culture of one is “borne-across”. Thus, the translation involves a complex process that involves two cultures and the translator is a mediator who mediates between two languages and cultures. As they say, “the translator must have a foot in each of two worlds and be able to mediate self-consciously between them” (Dingwaney and Maier 2). As translation is a mediation, there remains the possibility of violence. Thus, the translator should show his visibility in the translation which compounds an awareness of translation and brings the act of mediation to the light. If the translator erases the marks of mediation, then he gives continuity to the status-quo i.e. invisibility of the translator to give the readers the sense of fluency, immediacy and familiarity concealing all acts of appropriation, inclusions and exclusions. At the last,

“Third-World” texts are homogenized as per the existing parameters prevalent in domestic culture.

Mary N. Layoun, too like Dingwaney and Maier, believes translation as the vehicle for cross-cultural communication. According to her, it is a process that renders the foreign into familiar and vice-versa. She points out major problem of translation as its situatedness or context. According to her, there is triangular relationship among translator, text and the reader. All of them are caught in the wave of situatedness. The translator is caught between two languages and cultures. On the other hand, the readers who consume translation are situated in their own languages and cultures. The text, too has its own situatedness. The translator should well understand this situatedness. Primarily, the translator should be acquainted with the context of the text being translated. Unless and until, the translator knows the context of the text, translation may result in a domination of foreign culture. Therefore, Layoun insists on the tribute towards the culture being translated. A translator should avoid the spectacle of domination and accept the difference of foreign culture with respect. If the translator is biased towards the culture being translated, he commits the violence upon it. Thus, Layoun sees the necessity to cross the cultural boundary on the part of translator. If he transgresses the cultural limitations, he can acknowledge the sense of multi-culturalism.

Translation, now appears to bridge the global readerships which has both the brighter and darker sides. It does not always result in gain but also in loss. It brings the readers, writers and critics of one nation into contact with those of other not only in the field of literature, but in all the areas of knowledge: science, politics, philosophy, medicine, law, religion etc. Govindaraj Bhattarai in his *Introduction to Translation Studies*, highlights its importance borrowing Congrat Butler’s lines as:

English speaking world could have no Greek epics, no Bible, no Goethe, Heine or Hesse, no Neruda or Beckett without translator. Germany could have no Milton or Wordsworth; France no Edgar Allen Poe or Whitman; the Soviet Union no Shakespeare or Coleridge; Italy no Faulkner or Hemingway, or Bellow without American translators. Foreign readers would remain ignorant of contemporary American, Canadian, British, Irish and Australian writers, and American and other English speaking readers could not read the works of contemporary writers – without translators. (11)

Thus, the translation has got higher significance in today's world. But it has its darker sides too as it manipulates the cultures of foreign texts, though the primary concern of translation is linguistics but along with language, culture, too, transfers. Moreover, it is manipulated by the power-relations which are seen in the very act of selection, translation, publication and the strategies used by the translators. In this respect, Andre Lefevere remarks:

Translation of text from cultures that are not civilizationally linked, and among which exists an unequal power-relationships, manifests extremely complex process. Some recent studies on translation emphasizes the role of culture and history over a purely formal and linguistic approach, they bring into focus the position of a translated text within the intersecting networks of a culture and the manipulations behind a given positioning of translator, her or his culture and the text/culture being translated. (15-27)

So, the certain strategies must be used by the translators to address such translation problems. Mostly, what is analyzed in translation studies is the product only,

the end result of translation process not the process itself. Hence, one must analyze the processes involving translation to acknowledge gain and loss of translation.

### **Nepali Literature in English Translation**

Translation is gaining recognition in the present time. As this is the age of globalization, translation further shrinks the academic and literary world in a narrow space. It is the most powerful and an indispensable vehicle for disseminating knowledge and information. Gentzler quotes its importance from Engle and Engle as:

As this world shrinks together like an ageing orange and all people in all cultures are move closer together, it may be that the crucial sentence for our remaining years on earth may be very simply:

TRANSLATE OR DIE.

The life of every creature on the earth may one day depend on the instant and accurate translation of one word. (2)

Similarly, Evan Zohar says, “marginal, new insecure or weakened culture tends to translate more texts than a culture in a state of relative centrality and strength [. . .]” (108).

Moreover, the English becomes the most translated language worldwide but least translated into. There is a fast growing tendency of translating foreign texts especially English ones into other language. But at the present scenario, the only bridge to reach an island of all language is English. And the world has used the English especially in two ways-as the means of creation and another as the means of translation. German, French, Japanese-texts written in all languages are translated into English. Only then they are widely recognized and rewarded. The Nobel Prize winners of this decade, Hungarian Emaroe Coerteez or German Hart Muller or Latino-American all are translated into

English. Every literature of the world translated their texts to English or in other languages and vice-versa as soon as they appeared. Thus, English has become the dominant means of translation to reach the global readerships now.

In such a scenario, Nepal is not exception to it. Naturally, every young literature and language like Nepali is compelled to choose the medium of translation for the fast enrichment of its treasure because creation is slow and time-taking. There is the tendency of translating foreign texts into Nepali. Masterpieces belonging to many prominent literary figures have been translated. Great scholars like Laxmi Prasad Devkota , Parasmani Pradhan , Ishwor Baral , Rhiddhi Bahadur Malla , Pushkar Samsher , Khadgaman Malla, etc. did a great service to the enrichment of Nepali by means of creations as well as translations and this legacy has been continued until today. However, translations of Nepalese literary texts into English does not bear a long history. Yet the translation both from source language and the target language have been paying attention to the importance of translating Nepalese text into English i.e. exposing the Nepalese text for non-Nepali speaking readers.

Devkota, the great poet of Nepal, wrote the first Nepali modern epics *Shakuntala* and *Sulochana* before 1946. Most important of all Devkota translated *Shakuntala* into English from Nepali version of the same title, but it was posthumously published in 1991. He translated many of his poems into English but only a few of them were published in the *Indreni*, the poetry magazine of Kavya Pratisthan. His famous narrative poem, *Munamadan* has been translated by Madhusudan Devkota in 1970, by Anand Shrestha in 1995, by Michael James Hutt and A.M Shyanden in 1994.

Perhaps the first anthology published in English version is M.B.B.Shah's *Harvest Of the Poems* (1994) translated by Tirtha Raj Tuladhar. Nirala publication's *From the Other Hand* (1987) consists of thirty one short poems of Vijaya Malla translated by

Yuyutsu R.D., a Nepal based Indian poet, P.B.Chakrabarty is another Indian translator who translated Pawan Chamling's *Perennial Dream* (1992) among others;

Prof.Dr.Taranath Sharma has translated *Chandani Shahka Giti Kabita* as *The Lyrical Poems Of Chandani Shah*.

Like poetry, prose translation of Nepalese Literature in English too bears a parallel history. It is assumed that since 1972, Nepali novels are translated into English. Perhaps the first Nepali novel to be translated into English is Dhoswan Sayami's *The Eclipse* (1967) by Dr.T.R.Kamskar. Originally it was written in Nepali. Similarly, Lil Bahadur Chettri's *Basain* as *The Homestead* by Larry Hartsell and as *Mountain Painting with Turmeric* by Michael Hutt, Vijaya Malla's *Anuradha* by Larry Hartsell, Diamond Shamsher Rana's *Seto Bhag* as *The Wake of the White Tiger* and so many others are translated into English both by native and foreign translators

Remarkably, *Parijat's Shirishko phool* is the first novel which had been translated by several translators. With the joint effort of Tanka Vilas Varya and Sondra Zeidenstein, it was first published as *Blue Mimosa* in 1972. Under the same title, Tej Ratna Kanskar translated *Shiriskio Phool* into English.

Like novels, stories are also translated into English and this effort is the recent development. For this, Sajha Prakashan and Pragya Pratisthan has contributed a lot. At the first, Pragya Pratisthan has published eight stories: *Naso* by Guruprasad Mainali, *Maiya Saheb* by Vawani Vikshu, *Pariwandha* by Pushkar Samsher, *Vivah* by Govinda Bahadur Malla Gothale, *Bireki Ama* by Ramesh Vikal, *Dalle Kholo* by Parashu Pradhan and *Samanti Raj* by Manu Bajraki. Manjushru Thapa, a prolific translator and Nepali writer in English, has translated Ramesh Vikal's stories published as *A Leaf in a Begging Bowl* (2000). On "Translators Note", Thapa writes, "Ramesh Dai's stories are often metaphorical in language, richly condensed and filled with local references. My first

translation of these stories were always literal-leading, as all translators can guess to quite few linguistics gaps.”

An important critic, translator, Michael Hutt, a lecturer of Nepali Studies at the school of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London published *Himalayan Voices: An Introduction to Modern Nepali Literature*. His book introduces the two most developed genres of modern Nepali literature. Along with few distinguished poets and their poetry, twenty of the most interesting and best known Nepali short stories are translated into English for the first time by Hutt. On the problems of translating Nepali text into English Hutt admits:

All translation involves loss, whether it is of music and rhythm or subtle nuances of meaning. To translate from one European language into another is no easy task, but when the cultural milieus of the two language concerned as different from each other as those of Nepali and English , are the problems sometimes seem insurmountable. (5)

Exploring the difficulty of translating Nepali poetry into English, he further asserts with instances, “how should one translate the title of Parijat’s ‘sohorera jau?’ ‘jau’ is simple imperative meaning of ‘go away’ but ‘sohorera jau’ is a conjunctive participle that could be translated as “sweeping”, “while sweeping”, “having swept” or “even sweeping” none of which levels itself particularly well to poetic rendering.” (6)

The translation history of Nepalese text into English is comparatively rare than rendering of English into Nepali. But the very process of rendering Nepalese literary works into English needs the appropriate strategy and acquaintance of the translator to the context and culture of Nepal. Otherwise the domesticating translation would homogenized the Nepali texts and its cultures and it would present the stereotypical image of the Nepali culture to the foreign readers. *Anuradha* by Vijaya Malla is

translated into English by Larry Hartsell in the same title in 2003. Since the translation of Nepalese texts into English is the recent effort, it is often characterized by the homogenization of its culture by both the foreign translators and native translators. There seems an unequal cultural exchange between the native and foreign culture. Thus, the close study and development of an appropriate strategies to deal with the “Third-World” texts like Nepali texts must be adopted by translators which enhances the enrichment of our literature along with our texts acquire the global readerships. Furthermore, the translator should avoid any kind of ideology regarding “Third-World” texts and maintain his privileged vantage point visible. He must maintain a kind of intimacy with the context and culture of source language, only then, translation would not result in manipulation, violation and mistranslation.

## II. Politics of Translation in Larry Hartsell's *Anuradha*

Vijaya Malla's *Anuradha* is a brilliant novel that makes use of vivid images about Nepalese culture, religion, society, nature, position of women, psychology of characters and absurdity. The novel is a psychological one which is the first new experiment in literary style in the then society. The novel is a socio-realistic one which presents the post-modernistic characters like Komalman and Anuradha. Komalman's behaviours characterize absurdism whereas Anuradha appears as a proto-feminist in then male- dominated society. The novel portrays the scenes and settings of Kathmandu valley and its surrounding locales with the description of places in India like Calcutta, Kalimpong and Lucknow. It also makes the effective use of similes, metaphors, onomatopoeias, long and witty dialogues, monologues, proverbs and idioms related to the cultural context of Nepalese society and Hindu religion.

Translation of serious literature is the difficult task especially the psychological one. Such work of translation often ends in either loss or gain. Translation of *Anuradha* is not exception to it. As translation is a mediation done by the translator, it often results in a manipulation of source text by the act of addition, deletion by the translator at its most part. Even though he tries his best to find the approximate images to represent the source text, he fails to do due to the cultural as well as contextual gap between the two languages and its contexts. In representing original metaphors, symbols, dialogues, onomatopoeias, characters, cultural as well as geographical settings and the psychological complexities of characters, the translator has failed in the most aspects. In the process of translation, the meaning of the original text has been deviated when the translator takes recourse to the literal or straightforward translation of it. Flashback and stream of consciousness techniques are brilliantly used in the novel. Especially flashback technique is used when

Anuradha recounted her bygone days and story, and the stream of consciousness is used when Komalman expresses his state of mind as if soliloquy in the drama.

The process of literal translation of the original by the translator seems inadequate to bring the essence of the original. The emotional complexity of the novel is blurred and the contextual gap is seen clearly when the translator adopted the literal translation method. The problem of an adequate translation arises when translator faces untranslatability especially in the rendering of culture-bound words. Colloquial expressions, slang, proverbs, jokes, idioms etc. are difficult to translate for there is no one to one correspondence between one culture and another culture. In such cases, the translator should give the prefaces or under notes to elaborate them, by which the reader of target language can be able to grasp the cultural aspects of foreign culture.

The line “*ma una laai chhakka parera herirahe*” (Malla 37) has been translated as “Her words surprised me” (Hartsell 58) is basically mistranslation and here we can grasp an inadequate understanding of the translator to the context of source text. The translator deviated person ‘I’ to ‘her’. It is not that translator does not grasp the meaning of the statement but he does not pay attention to the very movement of the dialogue which produces visual image. As a result the negative meaning is rendered.

Similarly, the translation of “*joginai paryo*” (Malla 36) as “Yogi” (Hartsell 58) is an example of over-translation. Lexically, “*joginai paryo*” denotes “to be safe from something or someone” which is ‘verb’ too but the translator out of the knowledge of context in which it is spoken rendered it as a “Yogi” i.e. sage, an ascetic person who leaves home, family in search of some truth or enlightenment. The term “Yogi” is noun too. But the very meaning of verb is distorted as it happens to be noun in the translated version. In the process of translation, the translator has deleted many paragraphs, lines, words and added as per the convenience of the target readers. This very act shows the

domesticating strategy of translation. Most often such a free act of addition and exclusion lead to the mistranslation and violation of the original text and its essence.

The original *Anuradha* has made the extensive use of cultural categories related to Hindu rituals and customs. In rendering of them, the meanings of them have been blurred. For instance, the rendering of “*sohrashringaar*” (Malla 80) and “*swayambar*” (Malla 82) as “sixteen ornaments” (Hartsell 112) and “*swayambar*” (Hartsell 114) seems quite inappropriate. In Hindu tradition, “*sohrashringar*” is the special kind of make-up usually done by bride in their marriage ceremony but its literal or word-for word translation as “sixteen ornaments” devalued its cultural significance. Similarly, “*swayambar*” is an engagement done before the actual marriage procession which is also the part of marriage ceremony done between bride and bridegroom. The exact transliteration of it resembles mistranslation and the foreign readers cannot understand its ritualistic significance unless the translator gives its elaboration in under notes. The transliteration of “*ghaat*” (Malla 25) also does not evoke its significance. In the Hindu tradition, it is the religious place where people are taken after their death for the funeral procession but its transliteration decreases its significance. Similarly, the transliteration of “*dhindo*” (Malla 67) ignores its importance in Nepali culture which is a traditional Nepali food item made of the flour of the millet but without its elaboration its significance cannot be acknowledged by the target readers.

In the most cases of translated *Anuradha*, the translator does not seem to be attentive in the word order i.e. structure of the sentence with its tense patterns in terms of the original and translation. Furthermore, he seems negligent in the use of punctuation marks in the dialogue of the characters which have greater impact on its meaning. For example, “*ma baulaa hu ra!*” (Malla 8) is the dialogue which connotes question in its meaning but it is simply rendered as “You know, I’m crazy.” (Hartsell 22) which blurred

the movement as well as meaning of the dialogue and its significance with the happenings of the story. The translation of line “*meri bhaauju chaahanuhunchhaki ma Kathmanduma nai grihasti garera basu, ra uhaakai bahinisanga bihe garu daiki salisanga*” (Malla 21) as “would my sister-in-law want me to become a householder in Kathmandu, perhaps by marrying her younger sister?” (Hartsell 39) totally mistranslates its meaning.

Thus, the original and the translated version of *Anuradha* seems different in many respects. The essence of the novel is blurred in many aspects. So, the text is both linguistically and culturally manipulated in accordance with the discursive parameters existed in the target language. The reason behind such manipulation is manifold. The crucial one is the cultural gap i.e. an inadequate knowledge of the culture and context being translated on the basis of translations strategies held by the translator, his selection of text, his mediated stand-point and the exercise of power-relations which creates the stereotypical representation of the eastern culture i.e. Nepali culture and its society. How the original *Anuradha* and its translated version is different and it is manipulated in different respects is elaborated further on the following titles in upcoming pages.

### **Manipulation in Selection/Publication of Book**

The text *Anuradha* was first published in 1961 and it was published by Nepali publishing house, “Sajha Prakashan.” The novel was very much popular among the native readers of Nepal. It is repeatedly published in different editions up to the tenth edition since its publication. It is the best-selling novel in the source culture and has been made into a television drama too. This is the first novel by Nepali writer in which a Freudian analysis of character was employed to its full extent. It was a new experiment in literary style at that time which was quite revolutionary in itself. Thus, it was the innovative literary experiment of the writer and received with much curiosity and enthusiasm at the time.

The novel blends psychology, absurdism and feminism too while portraying the characters. The novel weaves the tale of a tragic love-affair, a collision between a gentle introvert with a passionate madwoman. The translated version of *Anuradha* is brought into market by Pilgrim Publishing House, an India-based publishing house. The text is targeted towards the non-Nepali readers and it is translated into English by Larry Hartsell, the U.S. based translator. The politics of translator as well as publisher can be seen in the very selection of this text.

On the part of publishers, they focus on those foreign text that are commercially successful in their native cultures, allowing the editorial and translating process to be guided by the hope of a similar performance in a different language and culture (Venuti 124). The main focus of publisher is commercial i.e. profit-oriented. *Anuradha* is not exception to it. Pilgrim Publishing House, in this respect chooses this text on the basis its popularity in Nepali-culture. Venuti writes:

The publisher's approach to the foreign text, then, is primarily commercial, even imperialistic, an exploitation governed by an estimate of the market at home, whereas the approach of the domestic reader is primarily self-referential, even narcissistic, insofar as the translation is expected to reinforce literary, moral, religious or political values already held by the readers. (124)

Further, the foreign text has been made to serve domestic interests and appeal of its mass readership. Thus, the text *Anuradha* seems to treat issues that are of interest and concerned to the broadest segment of the reading audience at home. For example, the text *Anuradha* treats the issues like “women and madness”, “patriarchy” which is the stereotypical representation of woman in patriarchy in which “madness” is associated only with woman.

Furthermore, the publishers take authority over its translation and edition process too. They insist on the fluent translation especially in English language translation which produces the illusion of transparency of seeming untranslated. Fluent strategy pursues linear syntax, univocal meaning, current usage, lexical consistency and they avoid any kind of linguistic and cultural difference of the source text to invite readers' identification with the source text. The similar is the case with the translated version of *Anuradha*. For example, “*yesko aaja pujaa nagari kahaa chhodu laa*” (Malla 60) is metaphorical expression which has been rendered as “what am I do to get rid of this mutt?” (Hartsell 87). This shows their simplification of the expression which deleted its metaphorical essence so that such a linear syntax would not interrupt the reader's identification with the source text.

Thus, manipulation can be seen in the selection and publication of the text. The publisher has chosen this text as it is the domestic bestselling novel and appropriates it as per the values and parameters at home.

### **Translator's Introduction/Foreword**

Larry Hartsell, the translator of the text *Anuradha* is writer/translator from the U.S. In association with Pilgrim Publishing House, he has translated this text into English. It is a good that our texts are being translated for the non-Nepali readers with the effort of the foreign translators but what is most astonishing is the politics behind the translation and its consequent manipulation. It obviously creates the certain image about our writer along with native cultures.

The selection of book by translators conform the norms and values of target culture regarding source culture. The book *Anuradha* is a psychological text where psychological complexities of characters are presented. Komalman, the narrator sees life as futile and meaningless whereas the passionate Anuradha sees revenge as the ultimate

motto of her life. The leading characters of novel are quite emotional ones and that very emotions and passions within them lead to their doomed status. Moreover, the translator mainly emphasizes the thematic aspect of the novel, paying little attention to the literary stylistic innovation made by the writer for the first time and its domestic literary history. The novel conforms the prevailing norms and values in the target culture while representing eastern culture i.e. Nepali culture as traditional, inferior, patriarchal, irrational, emotional etc. and such representation is reinforced by the very selection of book.

The translator wrote on the “Introduction” of the book: “the novel provides a window into Nepali social mores [ . . .]” but the very representation translator provides in the translated version does not reflect the true Nepali social mores. Is the representation of Nepali culture as patriarchal, irrational, traditional etc. the sum of Nepali cultural identity? Obviously not, the emphasis of translator on this respect shows his ideology behind the manipulation of the text. He deliberately conceals the other factors of the society prevalent in the Nepalese culture. The issues like kindness, human-relationships, psychological complexity etc. are less emphasized by the translator. Moreover, the translator chooses only those texts that represent the stereotypical image about Nepali culture which is very true in the case of translated *Anuradha*. By portraying and focusing much on the emotional, passionate characters within the periphery of patriarchal scenario which is very core in the eastern culture, the translator has been giving continuity to status-quo prevalent in the target culture on their perception, reception about the eastern culture. For example, Anuradha thinking of her impending arranged marriage says, “They have gone to a lot of trouble to work out the most intimate relationship of my life, but have told me absolutely nothing. They had the audacity to sell me like a sheep or goat [ . . .]” (Hartsell 116). This expression shows the cruelty of patriarchal forces existed in

Nepalese culture. The emotional, psychological complexities upon their own downfall is obliterated and much more focus is paid on the patriarchal values prevalent in Nepalese culture.

Thus, the very representation by translator of the source culture, his representation of the characters shows his tendency towards the translated culture. Moreover, the Nepali writer, Taranath Sharma has commented on the final product of *Anuradha* on foreword writes, “[. . .] shows his remarkable grasp of the language and culture of Nepal. His labor will be amply rewarded if English readers gain some insights into the society and manners of the Himalayan kingdom.”

This shows the Nepali reviewer’s blind submission towards the dominant power and their prevalent hegemonic boundaries. Sharma has highly praised this translation as wonderful translation but he has missed the very process of translation which entails the numerous layers of violence or manipulation. He, too, influenced by the illusionistic effect of fluent discourse adopted by the translator.

In short, the translator’s homogenizing effort can be grasped on his very selection of the text for translation. He centered his translation project on the emotional text to represent stereotypical image of the eastern culture especially the Nepalese culture. Also, the comment of native reviewers on translation shows the hegemony of dominant discursive boundaries as illustrated by the ‘foreword’ of Taranath Sharma.

### **Manipulation and Translation Strategy**

Translation strategies are the directors of the translation process. Often there is the tendency of evaluating the final product of translation not the process itself. And this is mostly determined by the translation methods adopted by the translators. Such strategies are used as per the demands, taste of the target readership.

Domesticating method and foreignizing method are two mostly used in translation process. Foreignizing method makes its appearance recently in the translation process while domesticating method has a long history. Domesticating method is popular among the English language translation, which creates the illusion of transparency. It is a fluent translation which uses the current usage of English than archaic, widely used instead of specialized and that is standard instead of colloquial. It is not so faithful to the foreign text/original text. As Venuti says, “A fluent translation is immediately recognizable and intelligible, ‘familiarized’, domesticated not foreign, capable of giving the reader unobstructed, ‘access to great thoughts’, to what is present in the original” (*Invisibility* 5).

Thus, it conceals the status of translator, hence translator’s invisibility. It appropriates, simplifies and domesticates the terms and images of the source culture. Moreover, it avoids any kind of linguistic and cultural peculiarities that often prefers the linear syntax, not an idiomatic expressions and univocal meanings.

Foreignizing method, on the other hand, evokes the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign texts. It does not appropriates, simplifies the terms and meanings in accordance to the existing values. It does not impose the Anglo-American cultural values on the foreign texts and its readership. It breaks the illusion of fluency or transparent translation. According to Venuti, “foreignizing translation is not a transparent representation of an essence that resides in the foreign text and is valuable in itself, but a strategic construction whose value is contingent on the current target-language situation. It signifies the difference of foreign text” (*Invisibility* 20).

Thus, the present scholars are more inclined towards this method of translation. In the case of translation of *Anuradha*, Larry Hartsell takes recourse to the “domesticating method” to show his invisibility as well as give fluent translation to the domestic readers,

which conceals the numerous conditions and manipulation under which the translation is made including the translator's crucial intervention in the foreign texts.

The literal or simplified translation of soliloquy of Komalman in chapter one: “*koru yo khataraa chhaki yesle kasaiko atyanta niji bektigat jivanmaa kaiyan kisimkaa jaTil uljhan ra anaawashayak samasyaaharu utpanna garidina saktachha*” (Malla 1) as “if I took, it upon myself to write such an account, I would risk falling into a shorts of intricate tangles and intractable problems” (Hartsell 1). Such a rendering simplified the emotional complexity of the lines. The lines read as:

*sustari thapathapaayera, fakaayera shaanta paarne koshish gardachhu ra unakaa aankhaa jasmaa ek prakaarko komaltaa sadhai khelirahanchha ra danyaa paTTiko galama jaha isnigdha muskaan naachirahachha.*

*kalpanaa dwaara srijanaa garera ma unako rupalaai nihaarirahanchhu.*

(Malla 5)

It has been translated as “a kind of gentleness plays in her eyes, and on the right side of her cheek and affectionate smile dances. I carefully examine her from creating it from imagination” (Hartsell 18). This shows the deviation of the meaning of the original lines with its complexities and peculiarities.

Similarly, the rendering of line, “*tyo krurataa ta aru kisaan maanisharuprati nabhayera ma aafaiprati vairaheko thiyo. mero daya, udaarataa tatha kripaaka bhawanaaharu aafubaata mukta hune ek upaaya maatra thiyo*” (Malla 16) as “if that cruelty had not been directed towards them – farmers or others I would have inflicted it on myself. The only direction to expand my feelings of kindness, generosity and pity was away from myself” (Hartsell 32). This soliloquy of the narrator reflected his emotional turmoil in the original while such complexity is avoided in such rendering. No

peculiarities are introduced here so as not to obstruct the fluency of reading on the part of the target readers.

Likewise, the literal rendering of the lines, “*yashari bhaagi-bhaagi hidna parchha bhanne malaai ke patto!*” (Malla 73) is “little did I know I should have run away immediately” (Hartsell 102). The approximate sense of the line is somehow established here but its very colloquialism is avoided by replacing “*patto*” with “immediately”. As the target readers will be familiar with the term “immediately” than the colloquial expression “*patto*”, here we can see the domestication of the original text. Such a process of domestication further detached the original text from its translation. During this process the translator has given negative or somehow other meanings to the lines expressed in the original text. For example, the translation of lines, “*usle Bengaalini bihe garera baseko chha, tesle hatte gareko thiyo*” (Malla 71) as “He married a Bengali woman there, but she died” (Hartsell 100). The meaning of this line in the original is totally blurred in translation. The colloquial term “*hatte*” is rendered as “died” which totally ruins the original meaning. “*hatte*” refers not to “death” rather “it is the act of craziness to something or someone.” The line connotes that the person is very much attracted to Anuradha and tried very hard to influence her who later on married a Bengali woman but the translated version gives meaning as Bengali woman died. Furthermore, simplification can be seen in lines, “*akasmaat Anuradhaako anuhaarko mansapeshiharu kasidai gaye, bhaawabhangi maa pariwartan aayo ra kehi bera kaThorataale unako rupalaai sampurna rupale dhaakyo. Uni kehibera samma yesai monodasaama rahina. ma unalaai niyalera herirahana thaale*” (Malla 66).

When it has been ruptured as “Anuradha’s face abruptly tightened and her expression changed to a cold harness” (Hartsell 91) Similarly the lines:

*jatisukai maanasik bikaarle aankraanta vayepani manusyama yestha  
sthan pani surakshit hunchana jasabaata tinakaa anjaanamai udatta  
bhaawanaaharu pokhina thaaldachana. Jatisukai krura ra nisThur  
bhanaaudaa harumaa pani kunai na kunai prakaarkaa maanaviya  
lakshana biddamananai rahanchhan (Malla 41).*

It has been rendered as, “No matter how much she was incapacitated by the mental instability generous emotiona spillout from behind a guarded place without her realizing it. No matter how many ruthless and hard words she spoke, some kind of human qualities remained” (Hartsell 63).

This provokes the simplification process undertaken to give the impression of fluency and immediacy in the translation. The visual image projected by original and its signification has been blurred.

Thus, the process of domestication adopted in the translation with the means of literal translation creates such a manipulation and mistranslation. The translator has tried hard to be approximate to the original but his translation strategy has ruined the essence and emotional intensity of the source text. Such a strategy also creates the simple image of Nepali-literary treasures. Larry Hartsell is the domesticating translator and his translating act is unethical because he does not expose the cuts, additions and embellishments in prefaces and notes.

### **Mediation and Manipulation in Translation**

Translation is the act of mediation and translator, the mediator. It is the act of mediation done between two languages and its culture. Translator is the person who mediates between the two worlds along with its cultures. Thus, translation is not an easy task. It has to be done very consciously with both linguistic and cultural competence of the source text and the target text as requisite for the translator. Certainly, this act

involves the processes like addition, deletion. But such acts are also determined further by the very purpose and strategy held by the translator. So, the final product may be more source language oriented which depends fully on the translator. If the translator employed domesticating method, he wouldn't erase his mediation in translation to give the impression of his invisibility, thus the fluency of translation. Whereas if he adopted foreignizing method, he would mark the act of mediation not to give the impression of identification to the readers. He would certainly mark the linguistic and cultural differences in such a process.

The translation of *Anuradha* by Larry Hartsell is based on the domesticating strategy. Hartsell, through his act of exclusion and inclusion of certain lines, paragraphs, images, terms, tried hard to erase his mark of mediation. He has attempted to give the sense of un-mediatedness by which some form of identification is produced on the part of readers which is the act of recuperating the unfamiliar "other" in terms of the familiar and reading this way relies on the stereotypes one culture utilizes to understand and domesticate other. As the end product of translation is brought to the readers through translator, manipulation is seen on the very act of mediation which is very true in translated *Anuradha*.

In the process of translation of *Anuradha*, most of the lines and paragraphs of the first chapters are excluded by the translator. Those lines and paragraphs are the soliloquy of the narrator who expresses his emotional, mental turmoil happened to him. As a whole, these soliloquies of the narrator are background to the whole novel which is very important. The intense psychological aspect of the novel is inherent in those lines and paragraphs but the translator has omitted them as they are very complex and difficult to transliterate and rendered literally.

The lines like, “*juna chhaTa paTi ra luchhaaile aaja ma yesari byathita ra pidit chhu, tesko dashanko ek pal maatrai haTe pani malaai sancho hunthyo ki!*” (Malla 3-4) expresses the narrator’s restlessness and pain. He is totally engulfed by the emotional turmoil but the translator simply ignores this part of the text as it is hard to translate the emotional intensity of the lines literally. Moreover, in the same chapter, he almost excluded the whole page of the text which too expresses the pain, restlessness and meaninglessness of life to the narrator in the absence of sanity of the girl who is his only means to survive. But translator omitted this deliberately to avoid its linguistic and semantic complexity as per the convenience of the target reader. The lines read as:

*teso vaye ma ke garu? yehi ranathani, yehi chhaTa paTi, yehi hununai mero zindagi ho. ma yehi hu. ma yesbaTa par paaunna. unisangako chhoTo parichaya ra sambandhannai mero sampatti ho, kahilai narittine, namasine. maile yeslai sahasrou choti dohoraaye pani yesko pravaaba ma baTa hatTne chhaina. yesko pravaaba yestai dharatimaa rahirahanechha. maile unalaai bokera jahaa-jahaa gaye, jahaa-jahaa chahaare teha yesko pratichhaap parirahekai hola..... ma kasari bhanu ki mero jiwanko apurnataa ma ek kshana uni dhappa battijhai balina ani mahaa andhakaar!* (Malla 4-5)

These lines are important because it expresses the importance of Anuradha in Komalman’s life whose life is dull without spirit, direction and apparent meaning and Anuradha is energy to transform Komalman’s despair into life. But the translator excluded it in the process of simplification.

Similarly, the exclusion of these lines “*mero mana ma bijla ya dukha hola vanne aasankaale bolda sadhai satarka rahathyo ra ek abhibhaawakle jhai mero khaanpaan swaasthya ra tandurustiko khyaal nirantara gariranthyo*” (Malla 37) from chapter six

shows that the translator seems ignorant of the human relationship inherent in the text. These lines provoke the very kindness and smooth, respectful and lovable relationship between Hari and Komalman. Likewise, the lines in chapter ten:

*tara malaai ahile lagchha ma jati hurkadai gaye, jawaani ma maa  
chadhai gayo, tyo saundarya bodha ko bikaas pani kramasa hudai gayo ra  
tesle, ghamandako rupapani liyo. maile sima naaghe ra tyo ghamanda  
mero praakitik swabhaaba jattikai prawal pani vayo. mero ek ansha vayo  
ma yesaile baahira baata jati bhadra namrashila thiye, tettikai aantarik  
rupale sachet dridha ra upekshasila ghamanda ko rupa thiye. (Malla 70)*

The lines mentioned above are excluded in the translation. These lines provoke the self-narcissism of Anuradha who takes her beauty as a pride while recalling her bygone days. But her very realization of it as the cause of her doomed life is omitted in the translation.

Thus, such an act of exclusions done by the translator shows his motives or purposes behind translation. Whenever the translator faces lexical ambiguity, semantic complexity, he avoided those lines and simplified the rest of lines. Such act would certainly render the mistranslation.

During the process of translation, addition of certain terms, lines by the translator is also evident in translated *Anuradha*. Moreover, the over translation is seen in the translation. The original *Anuradha* by Vijaya Malla consists of 151 pages while its translated version consists of 209 pages. In the most cases, the translator seems to change the sentence structure, its tenses along with the change in pronouns. For illustration, “*mero aham ko chetanaa nai mero nimti bhisana bojha bhairaheko chha*” (Malla 4) as “Her consciousness, which I have taken on, is a terrible burden” (Hartsell 17). Here, the change of pronoun “*mero*” i.e. “mine” to “her” seems quite inappropriate. The translator has changed the gender aspect too.

Similarly, the change of lines “*mero aama baahak mero snehako bastu aru kohi thiyena*” (Malla 42) as “I felt no affection for anyone except my maternal uncle” (Hartsell 64) illustrates the change of “*aama*” i.e. “mother” to “maternal uncle” which further signifies the change of gender. Not only there is the change of gender but tenses of sentence structure are also changed. For instance, the line, “*una laai hosmaa launa maile jo-je gare, jo takalifa ra maanasika nindaa ra bhanaai haru sahe, jo gardai aairaheko chhu ma tesko ke bayaan garu!*” (Malla 7) as “I would do anything to bring her to consciousness, whatever effort it would take” (Hartsell 20) shows the change of tense from past tense to future tense. Similarly, “*yehi mero jiwana ho*” (Malla 61) is translated as “such was my life” (Hartsell 88) shows the change of tense.

The lines “*akasmaat uni ma baata uchhiTiyera udigna vayera runa, karaauna, ufrana thaldachhina, mero kehi laagdaina*” (Malla 5) is rendered as “suddenly she pushes me aside, falls dejected and begins to sob, to cry out, to jump up and down and I mean nothing to her” (Hartsell 18) shows the very structural change. It is not “she” who pushes “him” aside but “she” is the one who goes away from “him”. The movement of “she” is changed.

The rendering of lines, “*sadayantrakaari haru aafu saammunne dekhaa napari vitra vitra baatai gopyarupale goTi chali raheko hunchhan ra tesailai baliyo aadhar pani samjhinachhan. ma laTi thiyina*” (Malla 110) as “I could not see the conspirator operating in front of me, but they were secretly manipulating me like a game piece and they thought they were doing it well. I was not so stupid.” (Hartsell 154) also violates the structural order. It is not “I” who could not see conspirator rather it is “conspirator” who did not want to appear in front of “I”. Such a negative translation and violation of structure, gender, tense shows the manipulative aspect of translator. Such processes happen in the act of mediation which is evidenced by above illustrations.

Thus, during the mediation such kind of exclusions, inclusions and violation is appeared which is evident in the translation of *Anuradha* by Larry Hartsell. Harsell by means of such act seems more oriented towards the target culture.

### **Intimacy and Inquiry in Translation**

Translation is gaining popularity in the global scenario but it is equally time-consuming and difficult act. It primarily concerns the linguistic aspects but along with language, culture is also associated with it. It is both the transference and substitution of meaning from source language to the target language. Along with linguistic aspects, cultural aspects are also borne across during translation process. Thus, the problem arises when the translator faces untranslatability in terms of culture-bound images or terms. But as opined by Carol Maier, the real problem is not an inadequacy of equivalent categories but the very process of translation itself is wrong.

During translation, the “space-between” is often neglected so there appears the gap between two languages and its cultures. Mostly, the translator assumes “space-between” as an unavoidable loss when they confront untranslatability. Obviously, the gaps between two languages show the cultural gaps but such gaps can be addressed if the appropriate strategies are used. It is the space occupied by translator during translation as he is the one who mediates between two languages and cultures and the final product depends basically on the methods used by the translator. If the translator inclined towards the source text, it will be source-oriented whereas if he inclined to the target, there will be target-oriented. There is also the possibility of hybrid form of translation.

Carol Maier proposes two strategies to address the problem of “space-between”: intimacy and inquiry. When the relation of the translator to the text being translated is intimate enough, then the possibility of violence remains less. If translation is made quickly without acknowledging the language and culture being translated then such act

results in the homogenization of source text. Thus, the theorists like Maier insists on the intimacy with the language being translated. She furthermore insists on the inquiry of the subject position of the translator. If the translator constantly interrogates his vantage point, the possibility of mistranslation and homogenization becomes less.

The translation of *Anuradha* by Larry Hartsell provokes the lack of intimacy with the source culture on the part of the translator. Due to the lack of intimacy, the translator renders the negative or somewhat another meaning in translation. For example, expressions like, “*uniharuko kaakhamaa hurke*” (Malla 75) is translated as “I grew up with them” (Hartsell 105) which reveals the cultural gap between two languages. Manipulation seems when “*kaakha*” is rendered as “them”. It detaches its emotional, affectionate attachment of upbringing when translated simply as “them”. The line, “*uttejit, mohit vayeko belaa ke tesarinai hattayaune koshish nagardu hola!*” (Malla 88) marks the manipulation as “could I have restrained myself from killing her-if I had been provoked like that? My hand would of itself seize her by the throat and tighten around it” (Hartsell 122-123). The translated lines are vastly deviated from the original where *hattayaune*” is mistranslated as “killing.” “*hattayaune*” refers to the forceful act of getting something or crazy of something or someone but it is simply mistranslated as “killing” which marks the translator’s lack of intimacy with the source language.

The rendering of line, “*vinaaju tathaa anya istamitrahara khalabala garera karaairaheko ma sundathe*” (Malla 90) as “I heard my aunt along with her friends and other relatives making a fun and crying out” (Hartsell 124-125). This is the clear example of detachment with the source language and culture where “*vinaaju*” that is “brother-in-law” is mistranslated as “aunt.” Here, not only gender but the whole sense of sentence is obliterated. This is the evidence of cultural gaps too.

Similarly, the context of the story into which characters, dialogues are projected is mistranslated. And the reason behind such mistranslation is the very lack of knowledge of context in the translator. For example, the contextual ignorance is seen in the translator when he mistranslated the line, “*jaba Ratnamansingh raatma kothaa maa pasnechhan ma kehi herdai naheri chhaati maa nai haannechhu*” (Malla 105) as “when Ratnamansingh entered the room in the night he would not be able to see and I would stab him in the chest” (Hartsell 147). Here, not “Ratnamansingh” but “Anuradha” would without any thought stab him in the chest but its rendered meaning meant “Ratnamansingh would not see anything.” Such a blatant mistranslation would obviously devalue its thematic as well as stylistic significance.

The ignorance of context of the dialogue is seen when translator literally translates line, “*ma laai diyeko gahanaaharuko ullekha aafna kaaki harudwaaraa usle aafaile garna lagaayeko thiyo ra tyota mamuli ho, ma aafna jahaanlai ahile ke dina sakchhu ra? vanndai u aafno laachaari bekta gardai thiyo*” (Malla 115) as, “He showed off the jewelry he had given to his won aunt and family and those gifts implied his largesse to me. These are quite ordinary compared to what I give to my own life” (Hartsell 161).

Thus, Larry Hartsell could not maintain the intimacy with the source text which results in its manipulation and cultural violence. While translating the culture-bound words like similes, slang, metaphors, onomatopoeias, proverbs etc. he simply takes recourse to literal translation. Likewise, the translation of setting without the knowledge of its significance in source culture can be seen. The literal rendering of lines, “*dhaanako lahalhaaudo baali ra makaiko ghogaa, hariyaali ra basanta funga udeko maaTo, ghanaa ra bristit jungle, chaar kosko jhaadi*” (Malla 13) as “the green maturing rice, the ears of

corn, the greenery of spring, the bare ground, thick voluminous jungle thickets for eight miles” (Hartsell 27) blurred its cultural images.

The word “*Madheshis*”(Malla 33) refers to the people living in Terai region of Nepal but its transliteration without description devalues its cultural meanings as the foreign readers are unknown to this fact. The rendering of “*dharma*” as “dharma” also give ambiguity to the foreign readers because the word has cultural-religious significance in Nepali culture which refers to the religious act often done on the benevolence of others without any selfishness but its literal rendering would mean nothing to target readers. Similarly, the translation of “*baulaaheki*” (Malla 45) as “respected” (Hartsell 68) seems quite humorous because “*baulaaheki*” denotes the state of madness but it is translated as the “respected.” Similarly, the word “*kaaji*” (Malla 59) has its historical, cultural significance which lexically denotes, “the people of rural aristocratic family” but it is transliterated only.

Similarly, onomatopoeias are also distorted in the translation. Onomatopoeia is a word or phrase that corresponds or strongly suggests size, movement, feel and force as well as sound that are closer to the sense image. Vijaya Malla’s *Anuradha* has made the extensive use of onomatopoeias that has given the kind of effect and movement in the text and has also made the incidents of the novel effective and real-like. Larry Hartsell has ruptured the onomatopoeias in the translation; as a result translated image cannot properly give the sense of original. The onomatopoeic word “*gurraayera*” (Malla 20) marks manipulation when it is translated as ‘roll’ (Hartsell 37). Similarly, the word “*pulukka*” (Malla 51) is the act of looking someone in a fast way but its translation gives sense and image differently when it is translated as “expectantly”(Hartsell 76).. The translation of onomatopoeic word “*khangranga*” (Malla 102) as “force” (Hartsell 43) simply mistranslated it. “*khangrangra*” is the act of sudden shock mixed with the fear,

surprise but its rendering as “force” is quite inappropriate. The rendering of word “*khisrikka*” ( Malla 60) as “fell” (Hartsell 87) is quite inappropriate because the meaning of “*khisrikka*” denotes the visual image of face which is a kind of facial expression without any charm, it is like an unhappy face but its rendering as “fell” could not capture its very essence and visual image.

Likewise the translation of settings like Kathmandu, Birjung, Amlekhgunj, Madhes, Ghat, Gujeshwori, Nepal etc. without any description of this geographical location is futile as the target readers would be unknown about these places. The use of “Nepal” in the dialogue of characters in the novel denotes “Kathmandu Valley” as people generally regard the capital city of Nepal i.e. Kathmandu as “Nepal” but this very fact would be unknown to the target readers unless translators give foot notes. Similarly, the places like, “*ghaat*”, “Gujeshwori” are the religiously significant places in Hindu tradition but its significance is avoided by the act of translator when he does not elaborate its significance in footnotes or somewhere.

In short, the knowledge of language and culture of the source text along with its contextual factors is must while doing translation. To acquire such a knowledge, the translator must be intimate to the text being translated i.e. the translator must be intimate reader of the text. In addition to it, the translator must make his vantage point visible. The translator must not allow his subjectivity to intervene translation process. Larry Hartsell, the translator from the “First-World” i.e. dominant hegemonic culture did not seem to question his authority while doing translation. The lines like, “*ke baahira baata jo sukai manusya pani ustai dekhidaina ra?*” (Malla 73) has been translated as “others outside the family thought the same” (Hartsell 102). The authority of the translator is evident here when he mistranslates these lines as per the convenience of the readers and out of the knowledge of its context.

The line, “*raati sutiko belaama bistaarai uti gardan maa ma chhurile ropidina saktachhu*” (Malla 143) is manipulated as “at night when you are asleep. I would plant this knife in your throat” (Hartsell 199). The addition of “you” and translation of “*gardan*” as “throat” which is deviated in its sense by the translator reveals his authority over the text he is translating. So, Larry Hartsell did not interrogate his vantage point rather he establishes his identity pervasive as dominant group.

Thus, in the translation of the texts especially the “Third-World” texts, translator must inquire his subjectivity so as not to dominate or homogenize it but the above examples have shown his domination, authority over the source text which ultimately resulted in to a manipulation especially cultural manipulation.

### **Image/Cultural Identity**

The process of identity formation is at work in translation and it is the greatest scandal of translation. The primary means of translation is language. As opined by many theorists, ‘to have language is to have power, authority.’ So, translation process signifies the power-relations. Ngugi Wa Thiong’o writes, “language was the most important vehicle through which that power-fascinated and held the soul prisoner. The bullet was the means of physical subjugation whereas language was the means of spiritual subjugation” (“The Language of African Literature” 3).

In such a scenario, English has become the powerful means through which cultures are controlled in global market especially in the case of translation. There seems asymmetries and inequalities in the cultural exchange between the “First-World” and the “Third-World.” Translation as a vehicle transfers not only the language but the culture of the source text too. In this context, Ngugi Wa Thiong’o writes, “Language as culture is the collective memory bank of people’s experience in history. Culture is almost indistinguishable from the language that makes possible its genesis, growth, banking,

articulation and indeed its transmission from one generation to the next” (5). In the similar line, Talgeri and Verma rightly point out that a word is essentially a cultural memory in which the historical experience of the society is embedded.

As hegemony of the Standard English is taking precedence over all languages worldwide in the case of translation, its authority over the source text can be seen in *Anuradha*. The source texts are often manipulated in accordance with the norms existed at home which created the certain image about the source culture which consequently othered the culture being translated. The Standard English language has its own discursive boundaries for the foreign texts which restricts the entry of those texts that do not repeat usual assumption about the source culture. The very process of othering and consequent creation of cultural identity of source text is manipulated by power relations. Especially the developed countries like the U.S, the U.K, the “First-World” manipulates the “Third-World” texts i.e. texts belonging to developing countries. Furthermore, the formation of cultural identity of source culture is also determined by the discursive strategies used by the translator along with the selection of texts. In this respect, Anuradha Dingwaney writes, “Western power has to do not so much with how non-western cultures get translated but rather with what and who gets translated. This has to do with the selection of certain voices, certain views and certain texts” (3).

So, the text *Anuradha* and its translation into English by Larry Hartsell, the “First-World” writer shows the very ideology and purpose of the translator. The translator has chosen this text as it is the one of the bestsellers in the domestic culture at one hand whereas it deals with the issues of passion, emotion and madness on the other hand. Eastern culture and people as regarded by the West as “irrational,” “emotional,” “ignorant”, “passive”, “primitive” and “other” whereas they regard themselves as “rational,” “intelligent,” “modern,” “active,” and “self”. Such discursive boundaries are

still prevalent in western hegemonic culture and they preferred those texts that conform to these values.

*Anuradha* by Vijay Malla, too, falls on that category. It is the psychological as well as emotional novel which basically deals with the issues like “passion,” “emotion,” “madness,” “beauty” and “human relationships”. Moreover, the core of all the conflicts and consequences in the story is the coercing forces of patriarchy. Patriarchy is the very core feature of eastern societies. Thus, the translator chooses this text as this could represent the stereotypical image of the eastern culture while rendering the original text in translation i.e. in English version, the translator takes the domesticating method as his strategy. Such a process involves the simplification, and assimilates the source text in accordance with the codes and norms prevalent in the domestic culture.

Moreover, the translator focuses more on the thematic aspects of the text i.e. “woman”, “madness” and “patriarchy”. In spite of its innovation in literary style, the translator seems focused only on the theme of the novel. This shows the simplification of the depth of Nepali literature along with the indifference to the intelligence of the Nepali writer. The themes like “beauty”, “madness,” “passion” and “patriarchy” conceal the human-relationships, kindness, and humanity prevalent in the original text. The smooth and lovable relationship between Hari and Komalman, between Komalman and Anuradha seems concealed. In addition to this, the issue of humanity is totally covered with those prevalent themes by the translator. Along with “madness,” “patriarchy,” and “humanity” is another existing theme in the novel but the translator does not pay attention to it. The very act of humanity performed by Hari and Komalman upon Anuradha, who is stranger to them and left at the railway station in an unconscious state is lost in the novel.

In nutshell, the exercise of power of dominant or hegemonic culture upon the dominated culture, the discursive strategy held by the translator and moreover, the very

selection and publication of book determines the formation of cultural identities. The domination of the “First-World” upon the “Third-World” i.e. Nepal, the domesticating or fluent discourse adopted by Larry Hartsell, and selection and edition of *Anuradha* in response to the Western hegemonic culture represent the Nepali culture as “simple,” “traditional” (patriarchal), and “irrational”. The very emphasis on the emotional characters and their dialogues, the issues like madness, passion, patriarchy create the stereotypical representation of Nepali culture. Thus, the translator, Larry Hartsell, has given the continuity to the status-quo existed in the West regarding Eastern culture i.e. Nepali culture. As a consequence, Nepali culture is ‘othered’ and homogenized in the discursive boundaries of the West.

### III. Larry Hartsell's Translation: Mystifying Nepali Culture

Larry Hartsell's translation of Vijaya Malla's *Anuradha*, while evaluating its final form is not good. The strategy held by the translator, his attempts to do fluent translation and his very authority over the source text along with his detachment with its linguistic and cultural differences show that his translation is mystifying. As a result, the translation happens to be in a more loss than gain. According to Berman, "Good translation is always de-mystifying: it manifests in its own language the foreignness of the foreign text" (89). In a similar line, Venuti says, "Good translation is minoritizing which aims not to acquire majority, never to erect a new standard or to establish a new canon that rather to promote cultural innovation as well as the understanding of cultural difference by proliferating the variables within English" (*The Scandals of Translation* 11).

As domesticating strategy is prevalent in Anglo-American culture i.e. English language translation, *Anuradha*'s translation into English and the discursive choices made by translator is not free from it. Hartsell, adopting domesticating strategy, did not expose his acts of cuts, adds and appropriations in the prefaces or notes which shows his disrespect towards the translated culture. The greatest flaw with the book *Anuradha* on its translation is the translator's lack of tribute i.e. the due respect to the Nepalese culture and language by the translator. Culture is the very essence and identity of people and it is respectful and of importance to them. Thus, the indifference and disrespect towards the other language and culture make the translation ethnocentric one, which is exemplified by Hartsell's *Anuradha*.

In short, with the close analysis of the various factors interrelated in the translation process of *Anuradha*, its final product is a form of manipulation. Translation activity is the political activity as certain ideologies, discourses and purposes enhanced

the translation processes. Thus, the translated version of *Anuradha* bears more loss than the gain and Hartsell's translation can not represent the true essence of the novel as well as the image of the source culture i.e. Nepali culture. So, Hartsell's translation of Vijaya Malla's *Anuradha* is a cultural manipulation.

### Works Cited

- Berman, A. (1985). "La Troduction et la letter, or l'auberge du lointain," in *Les Tours de Babel: Essais sur la traduction*, Mauvezir: Trans-Europ-Repress.
- Bhattarai, Govindaraj. *An Introduction to Translation Studies*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 2004.
- Congrat-Butler, Stefan. 1979. *Translation and Translators: An International Directory and Guide*. New York: R.R. Bower Company.
- Dingwaney, Anuradha. "Introduction: Translating the Third World Cultures." *Between Language and Culture: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*. Eds. Anuradha Dingwaney and Carol Maier. Delhi: Oxford, 1996: 1-10.
- Dingwaney, Anuradha, and Carol Maier. *Translation as a Method for Cross-Cultural Teaching*. Delhi: Oxford, 1997.
- Engle, Paul and H.N.Engle. Foreword. *Writing from the World II*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1985.
- Evan-Zohar, Itmar. 1987. The position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem. In Gideon Toury (ed). *Translation Across Cultures*. New Delhi: Bahri Publications.
- Ghosh, Amitav. *Indian Express*. March 20, 1994.
- Gentzler, Edwin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Hartsell, Larry. Introduction. *Anuradha*. By Vijaya Malla. Varanasi, India: Pilgrim Publishing, 2003.
- Hartsell, Larry. Trans. *Anuradha*. By Vijaya Malla. Varanasi, India: Pilgrim Publishing, 2003.
- Hutt, Michael James. *Nepali National Language and its Literature*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1987.

- Ivir, Vladimir. 1987. Procedures and strategies for the translation of culture. In Gideon Toury (ed). *Translation Across Cultures*. New Delhi: Bahri Publications.
- Lefevre, Andre. "Translation: Its Geneology in the West." *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter Publishers, 1990. 15-27.
- Malla, Vijaya. *Anuradha*. Pulchowk, Lalitpur: Sajha Prakashan, 2018.
- Nair, Shreedevi.K. 1996. *Aspects of Translation*. New Delhi: Creative Books.
- Pokharel, Balkrishna. *Ek Man Sat Chintan*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 2033. 39.
- Rai, Indra Bahadur. *Bhisleshan Pahilayera Chintaharu*. Ed. Kumar Pradhan. Darjeeling: Nepali Sahitya Parishad,1971. 22-23.
- Rimal, Bashu "Yatri". *Kehi Shayatik Chintaharu*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 2035. 138-139.
- Sharma, Taranath. Foreword. *Anuradha*. By Vijaya Malla. Trans. Larry Hartsell, 2003.
- Sharma, Taranath. *Nepali Sahityako Yatiharik Parichaya*. Kathmandu: Sahayogi Publication, 2029. 82
- Spivak, Gayatri. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Methuen, 1987.
- Tagore, Rabindranath. " Letter to William Pearson." *Rabindra-Bhavan Archive*. Santiniketan, n.d.
- Talgeri, Pramod , and S.B. Verma eds. *Literature in Translation: From Cultural Transference to Metonymic Displacement*. Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1998.
- Thiong'o,Lgugi Wa. "The Language of African Literature." *Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft , et al. London: Routledge, 2009.
- Tripathi, Bashudev. *Bicharan*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Kathmandu: Bhanu Publication, 2028. 128.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

---. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. New York: Routledge, 1995.