

Tribhuvan University

Translation as Cultural Manipulation: Reading Larry Hartsell's Translation of
Govinda Bahadur Malla's *The Window of The House Opposite*.

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts in English

By

Pratigya Acharya

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

February 13, 2013

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Pratigya Acharya has completed her thesis entitled “Translation as Cultural Manipulation: Reading Larry Hartsell’s Translation of Govinda Bahadur Malla’s *The Window Of The House Opposite*” under my supervision. She carried out her research work from 2012 June to February 2013. I hereby recommend her thesis be submitted for *viva voce*.

Jiblal Sapkota

Supervisor

Central Department of English

Date: 2013-02-13

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled Translation as Cultural Manipulation: Reading Larry Hartsell's Translation of Govinda Bahadur Malla's *The Window Of The House Opposite* submitted to The Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Ms. Pratigya Acharya has been approved by the undersigned members of research committee.

Members of the research committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head of

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

It was the most exhilarating moment in my life when I was permitted to work on this dissertation. I would like to express my great sense of gratitude to my respected research supervisor Jiblal Sapkota, Associate Professor the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, for his invaluable supervision, constructive help and guideline, which helped me to give the final shape of this thesis. Had there not been his help and guidance, this dissertation could not have been appeared in its present form.

I am deeply indebted to Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, Head of The Central Department of English, and all other respected professors and of The Department who played vital role in the completion of this dissertation. I also owe the highest level of thankfulness to my father Sushil K. Acharya and mother Mamata Acharya who are the constant source of inspiration for me to go ahead in the completion of any research work. My sincere thanks go to my friend Sabita Sharma, Jayaram Aryal, Prakash Jnawali and my sister Sheela Acharya whose warm enthusiasm boosts me always in my scholarly pursuit.

I also take this moment to thank my sisters, brothers, friends and relatives, and all my friends and colleagues for their moral and academic support. Certain degree of my gratefulness goes to Tyanglaphat Computer for its uninterrupted technical help.

Pratigya Acharya

Feburary 13, 2013.

Abstract

This research analyzes cultural manipulation in the text *The Window Of The House Opposite* by Larry Hartsell which is the translated version of *Pallo Ghar ko Jhyal* by Govinda Bahadur Malla. The translator adopted the techniques like addition, omission, paraphrasing and literal translation. While translating the text, translator tries to capture the socio – political and cultural aspects of Nepali society. The translator shows his loyalty towards the source text in many part but he can not be able to maintain the balance between the sense of source text and target text. This research brings the manipulative aspects of translation.

Content

Page No.

Letter of Recommendation

Letter of Approval

Acknowledgement

Abstract

I. Introduction

Violation of original text in translated text 1-12

II. Cultural manipulation in *The Window of the House Opposite* 13-39

III. Failure of capturing cultural aspects of the source text into translated text 40-41

Works Cited

Introduction

Violation of original text in translated text

Translation is one of the primary means by which one culture transmigrates to another culture. It is a vehicle too. Nowadays, translation is the greatest achievement of the world. It is a process of linguistic exercise. The main focus of literal translation is word to word correspondence but it does not capture the cultural value because of the inbetweenness of the translator in the process of translation. Although, translation makes us familiar with cultures and texts of the world but it also entails so many violence. Thus, translators have command on both languages; source language and target language. Without the command of both languages it is not possible, which create a manipulation. The translation of Govinda Bahadur Malla's *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal* as *The Window Of The House Opposite* entails so many violence due to the ignorance of the translator's about the essence in which original text is situated caused manipulation.

The study focuses on the English version of Govinda Bahaur Malla's "*The Window Of The House Opposite* by Larry Hartsell, a story of female character, Misri, married woman who falls in love with Hiranman. Firstly, she was not happy with her husband, Haribhakta and further she eloped with Hiranman for her happiness. Here, the author shows Misri as a revolutionary female character in the contemporary Nepali society. It depicts the life between a young woman and a man in particular. The emotional intensity of the novel is lost in the translated version. The essence of the novel lies in the emotional intensity of it. This research explores the lack of knowledge of the context and the very translation strategy adopted by the translator behind such manipulation and mistranslation. Thus, translator imposes his own culture and manipulates the text.

Moreover, there are many kinds of translations such as literal translation, mechanical translation, literary translation, cultural translation and so on. In the present time world is multi-cultural, multi-ethnic and multilingual. Nowadays, importance and popularity of translation have been growing rapidly. But the translator's negligence to the context, create manipulation. Thus, translator imposes his own language and culture which create manipulation.

Furthermore, this research excavates the gap between source culture and target culture, which has seen in the process of translation of *The Window Of The House Opposite*. By overlooking the principle of translation Larry Hartsell has imposed his own culture. The cultural violence can be abundantly seen even the words, phrases, Nepali proverbs, onomatopoeias etc. This translated version fails to capture the original context. Thus, the symbolic meaning of one language and culture might have another meaning in another culture which create literal gap between two languages and cultures.

While taking about translation, there is not strict definition of manipulation and there are various understandings of this phenomena. Different thinkers have defined translation in different ways. Some have defined it in cultural way and some defined in literal way. It carries cultural and literal importance. There are many views upon translation. Balram Adhikari posits his view regarding translation as:

Translation is an act of rendering the sense of equivalent of a word, and expression of an entire work from one language to another simple definition. However, any attempt to define translation exhaustively becomes difficult, if not possible when we come to the problem of equivalence as its focus. (1-2)

Thus, translations have cultural importance. Word - to - word translation also

create the conceptual gap between source language and target language. In the book *The English Studies: An Introduction to language Literature and Culture*, Rob Pope defines: “Translation is the realizing of meaning and effects in one language that correspond in some way to the meaning and effects realized in another” (247).

Furthermore Frantz Fanon argues, “to speak a language is to take on a world or culture” (qtd in Digwaney 1). That means, translation not only deals with the language but also of culture too. In the same way Anuradha Dingwaney remarks:

Translation is one of the primary means by which text written in one or another indigenous language of the various countries arbitrarily grouped together under the Third or Non - western world are made available in metropolitan language. However, translation is not restricted to such linguistic transfers alone. Translation is also a vehicle through which ‘third world cultures’ (are made to) travel , transferred or borne across to and a recugeralid by audience in the west.(2)

Therefore, the activity of translation involves the transferring of culture too. As it primary means to make us know the foreign text and culture to the wider readership, a greater significance in this multi - cultural and multi - lingual world. It is also one of enabling means of cross – cultural teaching. In the same way Mary N. Layoun believes that translation is a vehicle for cross – cultural communication. According to her, it is a process that renders foreign into familiar and vice - versa. She further says that the problem of translation as its situatedness or context. In her opinion there is triangular relationship among translator, text and the reader.

Similarly, translation manipulates the text by the power – relations which is seen in the very act of selection , translation , publication and the strategies used by the translators. In this respect, Anddre 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 strategy of translator also manipulates the text. In the same way Mahasweta Sen Gupta pointed out that translation often resulted in distorted images. Mahasweta Sen Gupta argues:

The tyranny and power of these “image” constructed by the colonizer can only be grasped fully if one examines translation of “native” works done by the colonized and see how pervasive colonial hegemony is. By formulating an identity that is acceptable to dominant culture, the translator selects and rewrites only those text that conform to the target culture’s ‘image’ of the source culture, the rewriting often involves intense manipulation and simplification for the sake of gaining recognition in and by the metropole.(34)

Thus, 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 domain group. In the world there are different countries and places, and they have different cultures and

homogeneity of people in the world ,which differ from each other. Even a word carries different meaning and multi – meanings. Therefore according to nature of the cultural elements to be translated, the translator uses several strategies to fulfill the loss incurred in between two cultures. Burton Raffle says:

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

He opines that, inevitable cultural differences between languages ensure that there are always some significant cultural aspects of the source text that cannot be reproduced in another language. In the same manner Prem Bahadur Phyak in his *Translation Theory* posits his view regarding cultural gap:

Culture includes foods, habits, dress, festival, rituals etc. The ease or difficulty on translation depends on the degree of closeness (mutual similarity) of the culture in question . It is the presence or absence of particular elements in one and other culture that concerns the translation,as a translator does not deal with the totality of culture when dealing with the translation of a particular text but rather with its individual elements .cultural gap make the translation impossible and so it needs further explanation to make its readers easy to understand.(83)

According to him, translator does not deal with the entire culture. Rather he only deals with elements of culture. So, one needs further explanation to make the text understandable.

Translation, like language is a social phenomenon. With the arrival of new-critics and post –structuralist the concept of translation has acquired a new dimension as argued by Bijay Kumar Das :

The structuralists believe that work can be peeled off to express a void at center and that makes translation difficult. Derrida and his followers have placed and absence of meaning. They say that words carry with them no definite meaning. Hence, the new theories of criticism have made the act of translation difficult.(22)

It is clear that, the language has plenty and indefinite meanings while translating a text from one language to another. Conceptual understanding creates gap where absence of meaning takes place. Rendering the violence that occurs in every translation. In the book *The scandal of Translation* Lawrence Venuti states the view in this way:

The violence of translation resides in its very purpose and activity; the reconstruction of the foreign text in accordance with values, beliefs and representation the pre – exists in the target language always configured in hierarchies of dominance and marginality always determining the production, circulation and reception of text . Translation is the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text with a text that will be intellectual to the target language reader.(209)

Thus, translations contain violence in its core. In the process of transferring , the translator looks only to the pre – existing of the already laid beliefs of the target readers and shape the text accordingly as their demands that results the mistranslation.

Govinda Raj Bhattarai argues that rendering of the source language takes into target language text is somehow difficult. For him, the translation is a bundle of unpredictable attitude, ability and experience. In his *An Introduction to Translation Studies*, he argues:

As translation involves more than writing the translator should qualify as a perfect reader, interpreter, mediator, thinker and communicator.

Critics have rightly observed that the translator should be enough for a linguistic and literary critics so that he is able to judge all the patterns of the original text.(66)

He believes that , total substitution and rendering of words in another language is not enough in translation . In Bhattarai’s words , a translator is a critic of original text, The translator should have cognitive imagination , knowledge for criticism and interpretative power. Dialectical understanding of both cultures is essential in it.

In the same way, translation means to translate the culture of source language because word-to-word translation is not possible due to conceptual gap between source language and target language. In the book *Predicament of Ideas In Culture: Translation and Historiograph* Douglas Hawland defines translation :

Translation is no longer a simple transfer of words or texts from one language to another , on the model of bilingual dictionary, or the bridging of language , difference between people .Rather than a straightforward operation performed on words .Translation has become

translingual act of transcoding cultural materials- a complex task of communication.(45)

According to him, translation is not mere transferring of words or text from one language to another rather it is a translingual act of transcoding cultural materials. It is a difficult task.

Translation not only renders the foreign into familiar but also makes familiar the strange. When a text of native language and culture are translated into foreign language, it becomes strange to the native. In this regard, Mary N. Layoun says:

Translation is, but not only, this putative transfer from one language and culture to another. It is, but not only, the interpretive representation of the strange and foreign as, if not familiar, at least plottable and arguably comprehensible in more or less familiar terms. (49)

Therefore, translation makes the incomprehensible categories of the source language (culture) comprehensible to target language (culture).

The primary objective of this research is to show manipulative aspects of the translation processes. There are many factors which include various factors which create the manipulation, such as exercise of power – relation , translation strategy and selection of text . Furthermore, this study helps us to understand about the limitation of translationit does not offer a comprehensive analysis of translation theory. This study also aims to show the detachment of the translator to the source language and culture which create manipulateon. Similarly, the politics of translation strategy manipulates the text.

Rather an analysis of violence in translation of *The Window Of The House Opposite* as conceptualized by Anuradha Dingwaney, Carol Maier, Marry N. Layoun and Laurence Venuti. These writers emphasizes, the importance of ‘context’, ‘cultural aspect’, space-between and translation strategies in the process of translation.

Furthermore, Mahaswetasen Gupta’s ideas about domination of dominant group over “Third – world” text . In the case of translating “Third – world” text is incorporated here which is very true in the translated version of *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal* by Larry Hartsell. But it does not offer the complete analysis of translation theories. Since the major objective of the study is only support the violence of translation which is done on 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, translation is a method of cross – cultural teaching and it helps to travel one culture to the people of another. Larry Hartsell, the translator has tried to spread Nepali culture , identity and social behaviors to the people of English culture. But because of the bilingual practice in translation, Hartsell , has not succeeded to capture Nepali concrete meaning in his translation. Larry Hartsell, the translator from English culture so, knowingly or unknowingly has translated the Nepali version of *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal* into English by his own politics and own culture . Therefore, accurate translation is practically impossible because of bilingual practice in translation.

Likewise, Nepali proverbs have been translated into English without any concrete meaning. The Nepali words like ‘*chokho*’(1), ‘*sithil*’(5), have been rendered by the term like ‘fresh’(1), ‘soft voice’(6), respectively which do not carry out the original meaning of those terms .In the same way , some words are not translated

which also shows the lack of knowledge about source language to the translator. For example '*chakali paen paen*' (63), '*mukhiya saheb*'(48), '*puja*'(5), '*ghat*'(45) these words are not translated in to English. Those words have their own cultural importance which translator ignores in the period of translation. Therefore there is cultural manipulation in the translated text.

We know that, Nepali texts have their own culture, identity and social behaviors. Nepali writer, when s/he writes something s/he wants to show his/her own politics and culture in his/her text. We can spread our own cultural behaviors and about ourselves only by means of language. All the people of the world do not know Nepali language. So, we must use another language to spread our Nepali identity and culture. Translation is only one medium to make omnipresent our culture and politics. Translation is not ordinary process rather it is difficult because one language may not capture the concrete meaning of another language. Translation carries cultural importance. To translate means to transfer a culture of source language text to target language text.

Although, in the same some writers have tried to spread Nepali culture to the people of English culture but actual Nepalese culture, politics and so many particular cultural behaviors have not included in their translation . Some of the researchers have tried to explore the literal gap between source and target language. Baikuntha khalal has tried to explore the literal gap between English version of *Romeo and Juliet* and Nepali translated version of *Romeo ra Juliet ko Premkatha* and had made a research in literal violence. Similarly, Aiti Ghale has made a research in the title "Translation as cultural Manipulation: Reading Larry Hartsell's translation Bijaya Malla's Anuradha".

In the novel *The Window Of The House Opposite* there have been done some researches. Larry Hartsell has raised the issue about cultural dualism, hybridity in Govinda Bahadur Malla's consequence of living dual culture. There are many Nepali writers who introduced themselves as psychoanalytical writer in the same manner Govinda Bahadur Malla also becomes successful in psychoanalytical method.

Taranath Sharma too said some words about this text:

The *The Window Of The House Opposite* began as a short story, but as it progressed the writer did not feel that he could do full justice to Misri, the main female character, if he abruptly ended the narration for the sake of producing a short story. Technically the author tried to restrict his emotion flow, but the finished product was an unusually beautiful novella admired and welcomed in the literary world of the country. The novella is a masterpiece of Nepali fiction with its local touches and brilliant illumination of human weaknesses. (Foreword)

All the researchers have raised the different issue and complete their researches but no one has tried to dig out cultural manipulation in that very translated version of *The Window Of The House Opposite*. So, this research is proved to be an innovative study which will make significant contribution for coming researchers.

Finally, this study brings the new outlook on the text *The Window Of The House Opposite* by focusing in its translation process and various manipulations done on it . The present research develops three chapters to justify the main argument of the thesis . The first chapter introduces objectives and significance of this research, and also the methodology with the theoretical modality, which has been used to prove the facts observed in the text. For this the major theorists are Anuradha Dingwaney, Mahasweta Sengupta, and Lawrence Venuti. The second chapter includes the textual

analysis of the selected text, and the conclusion of the research has been included in the third chapter.

I. Cultural manipulation in *The Window Of The House Opposite*

The originality and purity of the primary text gets violated in the translated text. The translators mother languages, culture and practices are unknowingly, somehow intentionally get entered into the translated text. In this way violation as well as cultural manipulation take place in translation.

Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal by Govinda Bahadur Mallla is a story about Newari family and their culture. This text was first published in 2018 B. S. and it was published by Nepali publishing house, "Sajha Prakashan". The novel was very much popular among the native readers of Nepal as well as Nepali speaking community abroad. It is repeatedly published in different editions up to the tenth since its publication. It was quite revolutionary in itself. Thus, it was the innovative literary experiment of the writer and received with much curiosity and enthusiasm at that time. *The Window Of The House Opposite* is the translated version of it. Larry Hartsell, the translator is from English culture. The translator uses his all energy to give same taste on the readership of translation as was obtained on the readership of the original one. In the period of reading the translated version of *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal*, readers can found the inevitable gap between source language and target language. This is the good example of the ignorance of the translator. While translating the source text, the translator has selected the words in his own way to make easier which creates the manipulation.

Govinda Bahadur Malla's *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal* is a unique piece of novel which picturises different images about Nepalese culture, religion, society, nature position of women etc. This novel is socio realistic one which presents the post-modernistic characters like Misri and Hiranman. The novel portrays the scenes and

setting of Kathmandu. It also makes the effective use of similes, metaphors, onomatopoeias and idioms related to cultural context of Nepalese society and Hindu religion.

Translation is very difficult task. Translation often ends in either loss or gain. Its current example we can see the translated text *The Window Of The House Opposite* by Larry Hartsell. As translation is the mediation done by translator, it often results manipulation of source text by the act of addition, deletion by the translator at its most part . Even the translator tries his much best to give the same taste images to represent the source text, but he fails to do due to the cultural as well as conceptual gap between two languages, cultures and contexts. In representing original metaphors, symbols, dialogues, onomatopoeias, characters, culture, idiomatic expressions as well as geographical settings, the translator has failed in many aspects. For doing so there are many reasons, which I have elaborated below.

Translation , in its academic , professional and anthropological meanings, , remaining of the main means through which texts of one culture are made available in another culture. So while translating a text translator also pays attention towards the source culture because translation is not only the matter of language but also culture too. Frantz Fanon remarks, “to speak a language is to take on a world or culture”(qtd in Dingwaney 1). In this regard, translation is not only the matter of language but also of culture too. According to Fanon, language cannot be isolated from the “world” or “culture” within which it is embedded.

In the process of translation, translator does not search for equivalent words in the target language but translator should examine the context from which these words arise and by which they evoke and express.

In the process of translation of *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal*, Larry Hartsell, the translator has overlooked the context. To translate dialogue is obviously difficult. However the translator has tried his best to capture some context of source language but actual context has not been included in the translated text. “*Tyas bakhat misri garba le tankeki thi*” (Malla 12). Has been translated as “that time Misri in a happy mood” (Hartsell 14). Only “happy mood” is translated but it does not capture the original context of “*garba le tankeki thi*”. In Nepali culture that mean “happy with pride” but translation does not capture that context. Here translator seems to have knowledge of Nepali to bring the original context. So he manipulates the text by overlooking the context which is not possible in the very process of translation. Here only language gets translated but not the culture. Thus, it manipulates in cultural aspect.

In past time translation only deals with linguistic approach. But in present scenario translation does not mean only word to word translation. Translation involves not only the rendering of linguistic terms, but also along with culture of particular community or country is also to be rendered.

Nepali culture is a unique culture. It is very hard to translate. An important critic, translator, Michael Hutt, a lecturer of Nepali studies at School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London published *Himalaya Voices: An Introduction to modern Nepali Literature*. Here, he introduces the two most developed genres of modern Nepali literature. Along with few distinguished and best known poets and their poems, twenty of the most interesting and best known Nepali short stories are translated into English for the first time by Hutt and the problems of translating Nepali text into English, Hutt remarks:

All translation involves loss, whether it is of music and rhythm of subtle nuance of meaning. To translate from European language into another is not easy task but when the cultural milieus of the two languages concern different from each other as those of Nepali and English ,are the problems sometimes seem insurmountable.(5)

Here, Hutt wants to explore the difficulty of translation process. The process of translation does not capture the exact cultural meaning. So it creates the cultural manipulation.

Furthermore, he asserts that translating Nepali poetry into English , he says “how should one translate the title of Parijat’s “*sohorerajau?*” is simple imperative meaning of ‘go away’ but ‘*shohorerajau*’ is a conjunctive participial that could be translated as “sweeping”, “while sweeping”, “having swept” or “even sweeping” no one of which levels itself particularly well to poetic rendering” (6).

Here Hutt shows the difficulties of translation mainly which carries the cultural importance. In the same way, in the text, “*Misri ki aama chokho pani liyera vharayang chadhiraheki thi*” (Malla 1). The translator translates as “Misri’s mother was climbing the narrow stairs, carrying fresh water” (Hartsell 1). This proves that translation is cultural manipulation. Here translator translates “*chokho*” as “fresh” which cannot carry the cultural meaning. “*chokho*” defines as a “pure water” or “not touched by untouchable person” but “fresh” does not capture the exact meaning of source culture. Thus, it is culturally manipulated which has done by the translator.

Furthermore, translation involves the transferring of culture too. It is also one of enabling means of cross culture teaching. Translation is not only the replacement of lexical and grammatical units. And it is a vehicle through which culture travels from one language to another language. In this regard 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 metropolitan language. However, translation is not restricted to such linguistic transfer alone. Translation is also a vehicle through which ‘third – world cultures’ (are made to) travel, transferred or borne across to and a reculturalid by audience in the west. (2)

But here in the text translator ignore the translation theory. He does what he feel easy. By translation our culture has to transmigrate to first world culture. Here its not happen. For example *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal* from Nepali culture, but translator translate in English version. By which this non- western text make available in western hand. Here, translator only does the literal translation did not evoke which our exact culture is. This also creates a cultural manipulation.

Here in the text “*u sasulai dhogna mathi gai*” (Malla 29) translated as “she went upstairs to greet her mother- in- law” (Hartsell 35). Here translator translates ‘*dhognu*’ as ‘greet’. In Nepali culture ‘greet’ has many varieties for respected seniors we use ‘*pranam*’ or ‘*dhog*’. For seniors ‘*sadar namaskar*’, for intimate friends we use only ‘*namaska*’, for junior we use ‘*subhs aasish*’. But in English culture the only one word use , that is ‘greet’. Here the cultural value of ‘*dhogna*’ does not render by the word ‘greet’. Here translator manipulates the text culturally.

In the same way ‘*khanubhayo*’ (Malla 34) render as ‘He ate’ (Hartsell 42). This also cannot capture the cultural value of Nepali society. In English only one verb is used for all personalities. But in Nepali there are different verbs according to their position, rank and relation. For example ‘eat’ for highly respected seniors ‘*khaibaksinuvayo*’, for respected senior ‘*khaunubhayo*’ for intimate friend ‘*khau*’. For

junior we use '*kha*'. Such a cultural verities not found in English culture. So, the translator did not understand the cultural value of '*khanuvayo*' which Misri use her husband respectfully. Moreover Jhumpa Lahari writes, 'Translation is not only a finite linguistic activity and ongoing cultural one'(qtd in Nair 120).

Thus, only translation of language does not give the same effect for that we have translate culture too. But here it is no found so. The translator Larry Hartsell translates only language. He ignores the culture. While translating the source text the translator must not forget about the essence of the text. But the translator does not do so.

The line, "*tyo bichari setile matrai ke kati garos!*" (Malla 30) translated as "only poor Seti- and what can she so?" (Hartsell36). The word "*bichari*" is nepali colloquial term that means "an expression of showing sympathy". The expression "*tyo bichari*" is a very typical Nepali term which shows the heart touching sympathy. The tone of that very sympathy is not possible to capture in the meaning "only poor". The conception of the source language text and the perception of the target language text have many different. Therefore, the English language cannot render the Nepali colloquial and typical tone.

Similarly "*yata ke pauchhu bhanera yestari hereko hola!*" (Malla 12) is translated as " he looks as if he's thinking what can I get there?" (Hartsell 14). The expression in source text has ended with exclamation but the translated expression has ended with question. The tone of expression of exclamation cannot capture by the tone of questioning.

The act of translation not only crosses the boundary of linguistic but of the culture too. It is not only the performance of the 'foreign' into the 'familiar' but also the attempt make familiar of the strange. Which a text of native language and culture

are translated in to foreign language, it becomes strange to the native. In this regard

Mary N. Layoun says:

Translation is, but not only, this putative transfer from one language and culture to another. It is, but not only, the interpretive representation of the strange and foreign as, if not familiar, at least plottable and arguably comprehensible in more or less familiar terms. (49)

In the same way, “*tyas bakhat bhaujule chulotira herisakeki thi*” (Malla5), rendered as “at that time her sister-in-law was looking toward the hearth” (Hartsell 6).

This is also making unfamiliar to the native one. “*chulo*” is a typical type of stove which is made by mud but translator rendered as “hearth” which mean ‘the floor at the bottom of fire place’. This also cannot capture the native tone. The translator unfamiliarizes the word to the source reader because of the manipulation over culture.

Moreover, “*gagro bata pani khanyaudai usle bolai*” (Malla 19) translated as “as she dipped water from pot, she said” (Hartsell 23). “*gagro*” is also a native language which carries own cultural importance. But rendering as “pot” it cannot capture the cultural meaning and importance. This also create unfamiliar to native one. Because of the translator, manipulated our culture by his culture in the process of translation.

Furthermore, “*Misrile karayera bhani- ‘ ammai! Tyaha najanus. Tyaha khyak chha*” (Malla 17) translated as “ Misri cried out ‘ Oh! Don’t go there- there’s ghost!” (Hartsell 20). The source text *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal* is the typical Newari people of Nepal. “*Khyak*” is rendered as “ ghost” which does not capture the original meaning of “*Khyak*”. In Newari culture girls are kept in the dark room where light of sun not seen. In this time when girl died she buried in the same place. Newari people worship

them as a God. But translating it as “ghost” manipulate the Newari culture and it also unfamiliar to native one.

Mary N. Layoun, further argues translation as the vehicle for cross cultural communication. According to her there is triangular relationship among translator, text and 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 situatedness. The translator should well understand this situatedness. Primarily, the translator should be familiar 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 insist 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 toward the culture being translated, he/she commits the violence upon it. Thus, Layoun sees the necessity to cross the boundary on the part of translator. If he transgresses the cultural limitations, he/she can acknowledge the sense of multi-culturalism.

In the text “*uslai lagyo u golsan ko muthhima pareko macho jasto bhaisakeki chha, kun bakhat usale muthhi badhera usako satyanash garchhe*” (Malla 75) translated as “it seemed to her that she was flying Golsan’s fist, that if Golsan were to tighten her fist it would mean Misri’s certain destruction.”(Hartsell 89). Here the translator can not succeed to balance the triangular relationship among translator, text and reader. “*muthhi ma pareko makho*” is the striking metaphorical expression of Misri’s. But translating it as “flying Golsan’s fist” can not give the exact meaning of source text. This is not able to give that metaphorical expression like as source text. It

is the translator responsibility but Hartsell ignore the situatedness and commit the violation. This create manipulation over our culture.

It is obvious that, Nepali culture is different from other cultures. Since the language based upon the cultural translation process may become unable to include all the concrete meaning of any source text. Only literal translation may not capture the cultural importance, norms and values. It create conceptual gap. Balram Adhikari posits his view regarding translation as:

Translation is an act of rendering the sense of equivalent of a word, and expression of an entire work from one language to another simple definition. However, any attempt to define translation exhaustively becomes difficult, if not possible when we come to the problem of equivalence as its focus. (1-2)

Thus, translations have cultural importance. Word-to-word translation also create conceptual gap between source language and target language. Here in the text translator translate the metaphorical expression literally. Metaphor is the most important figure of speech in which one subject matter is referred to by a term of sentence that does not literally described it. So, to translate metaphor is very difficult task because the translator should understand the source culture and target culture completely. Since it is an implicit or hidden comparison, neither replacements nor paraphrasing is possible. The metaphor of source text has been used in one way and the translator has translated them literally because of the lack of understanding the source text completely. The use of language related in one culture is not similar to another culture. Therefore, the most important point is that translation requires cultural and linguistic traditions of both source language and target language.

“That man has swallowed me up!” (Hartsell 50) is translation of “*yasle mero masu khayoy*” (Malla 41). This is the Misri’s expression. It is also a metaphorical expression. It is the striking metaphorical expression. Metaphorically “*yasle mero masu khayoy*” which is the irritating expression of Misri by the Hiranman. But translator translates it literally by this it cannot capture which the original text wants to evoke and express. While we go through the translated text, we cannot get the juice of metaphorical use of language. By doing word-to-word translation translator manipulated our culture. Here Misri’s irritating expression blurred by doing literal translation. All expression disappeared in the translated text. It is also one example of translator manipulating over our culture.

Another striking metaphorical expression “*Misri ko babu suddhabuddha Ganesh bhayera baseko chha*” (Malla 57) has been rendered as “Misri’s father had become as simple and naïve as Ganesh” (Hartsell 69). Here the word “*suddhabuddha Ganesh*” metaphorically indicate the simple nature of the Misri’s father as like Ganesh. Ganesh is a simple natured Hindu god in this manner that metaphor is used to the Misri’s father. But here translator translates literally. Only while we go through metaphorically that indicates the qualities of Misri’s father. Therefore, symbolic meaning is hidden in literal translation. And doing literal translation how the target reader can understand our culture and our god because they are from another culture and from another religion. So, the translation is manipulation.

Translation now appears as bridge in the global readerships which have 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. Govinda Raj 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 Whiteman; the Soviet Union, Shakespeare or Coleridge; Italy no Faulkner or Hemingway, or Bellow without 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 translator. (11)

Thus, 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 linguistic but along with language, culture too transfers. So, translating text is a very good task which recognize us in global scenario but when it manipulated it regarded as worse one. Same here in the text "what have I done to you?" (Hartsell 66) is translation of "*maile tapai ko k biraye?*" (Malla 55). Here Nepali word "*biraye*" carries very typical and cultural meaning. That means to say some one "what wrong I have done please forgive me". But here translator does not success to capture the exact meaning of "*biraye*" translating only as "done". It gives another meaning to the target reader because of the translator ignoring the exact meaning or context. Thus, translation commits manipulation.

As translation has get the wider recognition in whole world so, the 'Third-World' is not exception to it. 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 text 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 text 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, Indian, Japanese- texts written in all languages are translated into English. Only then they are widely recognized. So, translation renews and makes alive any work of art of literature; otherwise it becomes old and dies. 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 readership now.

The line “*jaba aama le hatariyera aap ko achar usko thalma rakhidi, usko gardan ekdam fullyora aakha ma aasu dadabauna lagyo*” (Malla 59) is manipulated as “when her mother had hurriedly brought the pickle and put it on Misri’s plate, she

felt a wave of emotion, and tears threatened to drown her eyes.” (Hartzell 72). Here the omission of “*gardan*” and paraphrased it as “felt a wave” which is deviated its sense by the translator. By doing this translator want to recognize our culture and language worldwide. But translator’s lack of knowledge towards source language and culture he can not succeed to capture our culture. Thus, he imposes his own culture and view which creates manipulation.

Furthermore, Bijay 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-relation especially in the case of “Third-World” texts translation; theorists have defined translation from the colonial discourse (Orientalism) from the late eighteenth century which English people used 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 translation (Das 85). That means 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 Mahsweta Sen Gupta, she argues:

The tyranny and power of these “image” constructed by the colonizer can only be grasped fully if one examines translation of “native” works done by the colonized and see how pervasive colonial hegemony is. By formulating and identity that is acceptable to dominant culture, the translator selects and rewrites only those text that conform to the target in culture’s ‘image’ of the source culture, the rewriting often involves

intense manipulation and simplification for the sake of gaining recognition in and by the metropole.(34)

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.

In the source text, “Aama le karayera bhani- ‘ eh: tero mama le madhes bata lyayeko aapko achar tyasai chha, talai bhanera baki rakhichhadeko pakh bhat chado nakha liyera aauchhu” (Malla 59) has been rendered in translated as “That night, as she was eating , her mother said, ‘oh, your uncle brought some mango pickle from the plains. Wait do not eat your rice too fast I’ll bring some to you’ ” (Hartsell 72). The addition of “some “ and translation of “*Madhes*” as “Plains” 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 “The- 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.

Mahasweta Sen Gupta also makes a point that even an auto- translation by the “Third-World” translator gives the false image of “Third-World since the translator is submissive to 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 (dominant culture) in this context is homogenized and domesticated; the polyphony of its existence obliterated; and 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 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 profitable 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 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 40)

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”.

Here Rabindranath Tagore he himself confesses that translators themselves become submissive to “First-World” homogenization of the “Third-World” text and its culture. Being a “Third-World” writer he cannot ignore the monolithic aspect of “Third-World”. How can the western translator Larry Hartsell ignore the

homogenization? So, he also do the same, and submissive the hegemony of the power of image created by the dominant group. Thus, Hartsell also homogenized and manipulated the text culturally.

Here in the text translator render “*Jindagi ko k thegan*” (Malla 51) as “What predicaments there are in life!” (Hartsell 62). This also does not carry the exact meaning of the source text. Translator translates what he feels easy without knowing the original meaning. This is the Misri’s mother-in-laws expression of worried about her life because no one knows destination of life. Translator renders “*thegan*” as “predicaments” which mean “difficult” or “unpleasant situation” but it does not capture the original one. Her mother- in-law saying about future life but translated language denotes the present situation of life. So, it is also a manipulation which is done in our culture and language by the translator because of his hegemonic nature that all think that done translator is right.

Larry Hartsell, the translator of the text *Pallo Ghar ko Jhyal* is from the English culture; he has translated the text into English. It is a good thing that our texts are being translated for the non-Nepali readers with the effort of the foreign translator 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. Rendering the violence that occurs in every translation Lawrence Venuti posits in the book *The Scandals of Translation* as:

The violence of translation resides in its very purpose and activity; the reconstruction of the foreign text in accordance with values, beliefs and representation the pre – exists in the target language always configured in hierarchies of dominance and marginality always determining the production, circulation and reception of text .

Translation is the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text with a text that will be intellectual to the target language reader.(209)

Thus, translations contain violence in its every aspect. In the process of transferring, the translator looks only the pre-existing of the already belief of the target readers and shape the text accordingly as their demands that results the manipulation. The selection of book by the translator conform the norms and values of the target culture regarding source culture. The book *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal* is a classic story of the struggle between social obligations and sexual passion. Misri, a young Newari bride, is setting into arranged marriage to a kindly but weak bureaucrat. So, it reveals typical Nepali society. Where psychological complexities of characters are presented. 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 much such representation is reinforced by the vary selection of book.

The Nepali reviewer Taranath Sharma wrote about the book as:

The *The Window Of The House Opposite* began as a short story, but as it progressed the writer did not feel that he could do full justice to Misri, the main female character, if he abruptly ended the narration for the shake of producing a short story. Technically the author tried to restrict his emotion flow, but the finished product was an unusually beautiful novella admired and welcomed in the literary world of the country. The novella is a masterpiece of Nepali fiction with its local

touches and brilliant illumination of human weaknesses. Larry Hartsell has, as in his former translations, brought this short novel to English readers with most of the Nepali nuances conveyed accurately and successfully. (Foreword)

But the very representation translator provides in the translated version does not reflect the true Nepalese society. Is it the representation of Nepali identity? Obviously not, the emphasis of translator on the respect shows his ideology behind the manipulation of the text. He deliberately conceals the other factors of the society prevalent in the Nepalese culture. These 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 *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal*. By portraying and focusing much on then emotional, passionate characters within the periphery of patriarchal scenario which is very core in eastern culture, the translator has been giving continuity to status-quo prevalent in the target culture on their perception, reception about the eastern culture. Thus, the very representation by translator of the source, his representation of the characters shows his tendency towards the translated culture.

This shows the Nepali reviewer's blind submission towards the dominant power and their prevalent hegemonic boundaries. Taranath 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 of manipulation. He, too, influenced by the illusionistic effect of fluent discourse adopted by the translator. Where Venuti remarks:

A translated text whether prose or poetry, fiction or non-fiction, is judged acceptable by most publisher, 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)

Thus, a translation activity is guided by certain discourses and ideologies which are imprinted in the translation strategies used by the translation. 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. Such an illusionistic effect in fact conceals the variety of conditions under which the translator is made, starting with the translator's crucial intervention in the foreign text.

In the source text “ ‘ *maiti ta ho ni*'- *usle sochi, ra feri aakha banda gari*” (Malla 1) is rendered as “This really is my parents house,” she thought, and again closed her eyes.” (Hartsell 1). The translation of “maiti” as “my parents” presents the deviation of its meaning which has the cultural significance. And also in Nepali culture and society women feel so relief when she with her mother. That shows our society now too in the thought of patriarchal.

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.

Thus, the present scholars are more inclined towards this method of translation. In the case of translation of *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal*, Larry Hartsell takes recourse to the "domesticating method" to show the invisibility as well give fluent translation to the domestic reader, which conceals the numerous conditions and manipulation under which the translation is made including the translation is made including the translator's crucial intervention in the foreign texts.

Translation now gets more popularity but in the same time it is difficult act. It is both the transference and substitution of meaning from source language to the target language. Along with the linguistic aspects, cultural aspects are also carried in the process of translation. During translation, the "space-between" is often ignored so there appears gap between two languages and cultures which resulted violation or manipulation. According to Dingwaney and Maier, "The between of our title refers to the space of translation where the self or one culture encounters and more importantly interacts with 'other' or another culture" (83). Obviously, the gaps between two languages shows the cultural gaps but such gaps can be addressed if translators use appropriate strategies. It is the space occupied by translator during translation h/she is the one who mediates between two languages and cultures.

So, 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 knowing the language and culture being translated then such results in the homogenization of source text. Thus, the theorists like Maier insist on the intimacy with the language being translated. If the translators obtain

information about source language and culture the possibility of mistranslation and homogenization commits less.

The translation of *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal* by Larry Hartsell reveals 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 meaning in translation. For example, “*maile pap gareko chhaina*” (Malla 12) rendered as “I am not guilty of anything” (Hartsell 15) which reveal the detachment of the translator towards the source culture. It also digs out the cultural gap between two languages. Here “pap” translated as “guilty” which create manipulation over our culture. It translated as mistranslation; “*pap*” means “sin” in Nepali culture. Where translator translate it as “guilty” which means “feeling of ashamed” which cannot capture the exact meaning of Nepali culture. This shows the lack of intimacy of translator towards Nepali culture and manipulate by his own culture.

In the same way “*binabi binabi’ ko tal ma Misrinanile bistarai aakha kholi*” (Malla 1) is translated as “Misri slowly opened her eyes to the voice of her mother.” (Hartsell 1) . The translated line is vastly mistranslated from the original one. Here the sound “*binabi binabi*” is “bird’s sound” but translator translated it as the sound of Misri’s mother by which Misri opened her eyes which mark the translator’s lack of intimacy towards source language and culture.

The rendering of line “*Anuhar hererai thaha hunchha aama le bhani*” (Malla 8) as “you look as if something is wrong her mother said” (Hartsell 10). This is the clear example of detachment of translator with the source language and culture where “*Anuhar*” mistranslated as “you look as”. Here, translator modified the meaning of “*Anuhar*” which means “face” as “you look as”. Such a blatant mistranslation would obviously devalue its thematic as well as stylistic significance.

Furthermore, “*Aphno man suddha bhaye pachhi...*” (Malla 20) translated as “when one’s own mind is pure...” (Hartsell 24). This also shows the translator lack of knowledge and lack of intimacy with source language. In Nepali language “*man*” means “heart” but translator replaced it as “mind” which totally blurred the source language image and meaning.

Moreover, translator render the word “*Makal*” (Malla 32) as “stove” and some time as “clay- stove” (Hartsell 37) this also clear that the translator ignorance toward source language. Translator does not know the exact meaning of “*Makal*” that’s why he translates it sometime as “stove” and sometime as “clay- stove”. This is also a good example of translator’s lack of intimacy with the source language and culture. This creates the manipulation.

Similarly, “*achhata kelauda- kelaudai achanak u charaitira herthi*” (Malla 82) translated as “As she was sorting the offerings, she looked up and then all about.” (Hartsell 97) . Here translator ignores the cultural value of “*achhata*” rendering as “offering”. In Nepali culture “*achhata*” denotes the “rice with vermilion powder” but here translator manipulates it translating as “offerings”. This cannot capture the cultural value of “*achhata*”. Here also fund translator’s lack of intimacy and inquiry with source culture, which commits cultural violence.

Thus, Larry Hartsell cannot maintain the intimacy with the source text which resulted in its manipulation and cultural violence.

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 domain group. In the world there are different countries and places, and they have different cultures and homogeneity of people in the world ,which differ from each other. Even a word carries different meaning and multi – meanings. Therefore according to nature of the

cultural elements to be translated, the translator uses several strategies to fulfill the loss incurred in between two cultures. Burton Raffle says:

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

He opines that, inevitable cultural differences between languages ensure that there are always some significant cultural aspects of the source text that cannot be reproduced in another language.

In the same way the word “saraddha” (Malla 53) refers to the annual religious ceremony commemorated remembering the dead ones. But its transliteration without description devalues its cultural meanings as the foreign readers are unknown to this fact. The rendering of “puja” (Malla 5) as “puja” (Hartsell 6) also give ambiguity to the foreign readers to the religious act often done on the attitude of others without any selfishness but its literal rendering would mean nothing to target readers. Similarly, the translation of “*mukhiya shaheb*”(Malla48) has its historical, cultural significance which lexically denotes, “the people of rural aristocratic family” but it is translated only as “shaheb” (Hartsell57). It only transliterated which not success to capture that historical meaning.

In the same manner Prem Bahadur Phyak in his *Translation Theory* posits his view regarding cultural gap:

Culture includes foods, habits, dress, festival, rituals etc. The ease or difficulty on translation depends on the degree of closeness (mutual similarity) of the culture in question . It is the presence or absence of particular elements in one and other culture that concerns the translation,as a translator does not deal with the totality of culture when dealing with the translation of a particular text but rather with its individual elements cultural gap make the translation impossible and so it needs further explanation to make its readers easy to understand.(83)

According to him, translator does not deal with the entire culture. Rather he only deals with elements of culture. So, one needs further explanation to make the text understandable.

The translation of settings like, Nepal Indrochok, Kathmandu, Asan Galli etc. (Malla 35). Without any of this geographical location is futile attempt 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 in past generally regard capital city of Nepal. This very fact unknown by the target readers so, translator have to give foot notes. But translator does not do so he only transliterated it which creates manipulation.

In the same way, “*ghat*” (Malla 45) and “*Indrochok*” (Malla 35) are religious places in Hindu tradition but its significance is avoided by the act of translator when he does not elaborate its significance by foot notes. Similarly the Nepali game “chakali paen paen” (Malla 63) also translated without any foot notes or more explanation. The God and Godess of Hindu religion like as “*Mahadev-parvati*”, “*Shesh-shayi Bishnu Bhagwan*”, “*Betal- Bhairav*”, “*Radhakrishna*”, “*Astamatrika*”,

“Taleju”, “*Saligrams*”, and “*Ganes*” (Malla 23) also translated without any explanation or foot notes. In this situation how can the target reader understand our culture without more explanation? This is the lack of Knowledge about translation theory to the translator which creates violence. Thus, it is manipulation on our culture by the translator.

While translating the culturally related words like onomatopoeias distorted in the translation. Onomatopoeia is a word or phrase that corresponds on strongly suggests size, movement, feel and force as well as sound that are closer to the sense image. Govinda Bahadur Malla’s *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal* has made cover large are to use of onomatopoeias that has given the kind of effect and movement in the text and also made the novel effective and real one. Larry Hartsell has injured the onomatopoeias in translation: as a result translated image cannot properly capture the essence of original one. The onomatopoeic word “*twartwati*” (Malla 35) marks manipulation when it is translated as “rhythmic” (Hartsell 46). “*twartwati*” means “irritating sound” which unknowingly rendered. Similarly, “*hissa*” (Malla 10) as “disappointed” (Hartsell 12). Furthermore, the translation of onomatopoeic word “*tulbul*” (Malla 10) as “anxious” (Hartsell 12) simply mistranslated. “*tulbul*” is act of curiosity of knowing something but its rendering as “anxious” is quite inappropriate. “anxious” means “feeling worried or nervous”. This also creates manipulation over our language.

Similarly, “*Hiraman furung bhayo hola*” (Malla 81) translated as “Hiraman would be overenjoyed” (Hartsell 96). Here “*furung*” means the visual expression of happiness when one become happy” but translated word “overjoyed” cannot succeeded to capture that visual image of source language.

In the process of translation of *Pallo Ghar ko Jhyal* these onomatopoeic words are excluded which give the visual image of the words. And also translator translates ignoring the meaning of these words. “Misri became very tense and her heart seemed suddenly to fall” (Hartsell 89) is the translation of “*Misri ekdam khangranga bhai*” (Malla 75). This onomatopoeic word “khangranga” is the act of sudden shock mixed with the fear and surprise but translator rendered it as “tense” which quite inappropriate. So the translated version could not succeed to capture its very essence and visual image.

Furthermore, “*u aparadhini hoina*” (Malla 46) translated as “she was not immoral” (Hartsell 55). This also can not capture the exact meaning of source text. Here in source language “Aparadhini” means “criminal” but translator translate it as ‘immoral’ which means ‘people having no moral integrity’. Here translator seems not so intimate towards the source language.

Moreover, “*Misri jawaf nadi yantrwat aaphno khotha ma gai*” (Malla 78) rendered as “Misri without giving a reply, went automatically to her room” (Hartsell 93). Here too the word “yantrawat” is translated as “automatically”. “yantrawat” means ‘turn so fast’ but translator translate it as “automatically” which cannot capture the source meaning.

Most popular Nepali dresses “*cholo*” (Malla 11), “*daura*” (Malla 13) have been replaced by the words “blouse” (Hartsell 13) and “vest” (Hartsell 16). There is vast difference in the meaning “daura” and “vest”. These two dresses have no any similarity even in their looks. Similarly, “cholo” is too national uniform of Nepalese women. But the translator keeping his authority and using his own politics has rendered the term as “blouse”. These two dresses are different with each other in their looks, wearing style and their identity. In ‘cholo’ buttons are not used but there are

some laces to tie. Blouse is small in comparison to “cholo” and has the buttons to tie. Therefore, the substituted word “blouse” never indicates even any hint of the essential meaning of our National uniform “cholo”.

During the process of translation , addition of certain terms, lines by the translator is also evident in translated *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal* . Moreover, the over translation seen in the translated text. The source text by Govinda Bahadur Malla consists of 94 pages while its translated version consists of 111 pages. In the most cases, the translator seems to change the sentences , its tenses along with the change in pronouns. For illustration “*yasle mero masu khayo*” (Malla 41) as “That man swallowed me up” (Hartsell 50) . Here, the change of pronoun “mero’ i.e. “mine” to me seems quite inappropriate. The translator has tried to impose his own culture and making himself as superior over our culture, he has selected the words in his own way. He has kept the target reader at the center and tried to make them clear and understand about the source text by changing words and adding words, phrase and even sentences. Thus, by doing word-to-word translation it manipulates our Nepali culture.

III. Failure of capturing cultural aspects of the source text in translated text

Larry Hartsell's translated version of *Pallo Ghar ko Jhyal* was not found so good. The translator exercised much more to capture the cultural and social aspect of the Nepali culture or source culture. But lack of inbetweenness of source culture and target culture translation falls in loss. The strategy adopted 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 shows that translation is manipulation. That's why, the translation happens as loss more than gain. So, here translator manipulated the text culturally.

As domestication strategy, prevalent in Anglo – American culture i.e. English language translation, translation of *Pallo Ghar ko Jhyal* into English and the discursive choice made by translator in to free from it. Hartsell, adopted the domesticating strategy by his act of cuts, adds and appropriations in the notes which shows his disrespect towards the source culture. The great mistake with the book *Pallo Ghar ko Jhyal* on its translation is the translator's lack of respect towards the Nepalese culture and language by the translator. Culture is that very thing which identify the people and it is respectful and more important to them. Thus, the indifference and disrespect towards the other language and culture make the translation ethnocentricone, which is exemplified by Hartsell's *The Window Of The House Opposite*.

Likewise, Nepali proverbs have been translated into English without any concrete meaning. The Nepali words like 'chokho'(1), 'sithil'(5), have been rendered by the term like 'fresh'(1), 'soft voice'(6), respectively which do not carry out the original meaning of those terms. In the same way, some words are not translated which also shows the lack of knowledge about source language to the

translator. For example 'chakali paen paen' (63), 'mukhiya saheb'(48), 'puja'(5), 'ghat'(45) these words are not translated in to English. Those words have their own cultural importance which translator ignores in the period of translation. Therefore there is cultural manipulation in the translated text.

In short, with the close analysis of various factors interrelated in the translation process of *Pallo Ghar Ko Jhyal*, its final product is a form of manipulation. Translation activity is the political activity as certain ideologies, discourses and purpose enhanced the translation processes. Thus, translated version of *Pallo Ghar ko Jhyal* 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 that is Nepali culture.

Works Cited

- Adhikari, Balaram. *Technical and Cultural Translation*. Kathmandu: Kshitiz Prakashan, 2004.
- Bhattarai, Govinda Raj, *An Introduction to Translation Studies*. 2nd Ed. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 2004.
- Das, Bijay Kumar. *A Handbook of Translition Studies*. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2005.
- Dingwaney, Anuradha and Carol, Maier. "Translation as a Method for Cross Cultural Teaching." *Between Language and Cultures: Translation and Cross Cultural Texts. Course Packet of Non – Western Text*. Kathmandu: The Central department of T.U. Kirtipur, 1998. 78-92.
- Dingwaney, Anuradha. "Introduction: Translating "Third World" Cultures " *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross Cultural Texts. Course Packet of Non – Western Text*. Kathmandu: The Central department of T.U. Kirtipur, 1998. 1-11.
- Gentzler, Edwin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Hartsell, Larry. Trans. *The Window Of The House Opposite*. By Govinda Bahadur Malla. Vanarasi, India: Pilgrim Publishing, 2003.
- Howland, Douglas. *The Predicament of Ideas in Culture: Translation and Hystography*. New York: Blackwell Publishing for Wesleyan University, 2003.
- Hutt, Michael James. *Nepali National Language and its Literature*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1987.
- Layoun, Mary N. "Translation, Cultural Transgression and Tribute and Leaden Feet." *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross Cultural Texts*.

- Course Packet of Non – Western Text*. Kathmandu: The Central department of T.U. Kirtipur, 1998. 48-67.
- Lefevere, Andre. "Translation: Its Geneology in the West." Translation. *History and Culture*. London: Printer Publishers, 1990. 15-27.
- Nair, Shreedevi. K.. *Aspects of Translation*. New Delhi: Creative Books. 1996.
- Phyak, Prem Bahadur. *Translation Theory*. 2nd Ed. Kathmandu: Sunlight Publication, 2009.
- Pope, Rob. *The English Studies Book: An Introduction to Language, Literature and Culture*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Raffle, Bhurton. *The Art of Translating Poetry*. London: Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. State University Press, 1988.
- Sajha Prakashan. *Brihat Nepali Shadakosh*. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 2067 B.S.
- Sengupta, Mahasweta. "Translation as Manipulation: The Power of Image and Image of Power." *Between Language and Cultures: Translation and Cross Cultural Texts*. *Course Packet of Non – Western Text*. Kathmandu: The Central department of T.U. Kirtipur, 1998. 33-46.
- Sharma, Taranath. Foreword. *The Window Of The House Opposite*. By Govinda Bahadur Malla. Trans. Larry Hartsell, 2003. ix.
- Tagore, Rabindranath. Letter to William Winstanely Pearson. N.d William Winstanely Pearson file. *Rabindra-Bhavan Archive*. Santiniketan, India
- 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.