

THE PROBLEM OF EQUIVALENCE IN TWO TRANSLATIONS OF MANTO'S SHORT STORY TOBA TEK SINGH

Ravinder Gargesh¹

*Professor & Head, Department of English,
Samarkand State University
named after Shatof Rashidov*

INTRODUCTION

There is dynamic relationship between linguistics and translation which leads to the development of the discipline of translation studies. While linguistics as a discipline studies the structures and functions of language, and since translations exist in and through language, the field of translation studies also falls within the domain of linguistics. It is for a similar reason that Catford (1965) had emphasized that any theory of translation must base itself on a theory of language, i.e. on a theory of linguistics. The activity of translating source language (SL) texts into texts in the target language (TL) offers challenges and lays down not only the foundation for translation studies but also falls back on linguistic theory in order to make it more structurally and functionally viable. The principle of equivalence operating between the structures and functions of SL text and TL text are fundamentally of the greatest importance. Nida (1964 & 1969) had identified two poles of translation equivalence, which are ‘free’ versus ‘literal’, and ‘dynamic equivalence’ versus ‘formal equivalence’. Newmark (1987) views these poles in terms of ‘communicative’ versus ‘semantic’ factors, and the act of translation, for him, involves appropriate choices. The choices made by a translator are generally conditioned by his/her ideology or world-view, nonetheless, the translator’s visibility is minimized, and Venuti (1995) has used the term ‘invisibility’ to describe the translator’s situation and activity. He points out that the illusion of a ‘transparent’ translation is only an effect of fluent discourse, which “conceals the numerous conditions under which the translation is made, starting with the translator’s crucial intervention in the foreign text” (Venuti 1995:1). However, it must be mentioned that a translator’s choices, in addition to his/her world view, also depend on his/her perception of the recipient audience. In order to describe and explain different ways of solving the riddle of effective translation, the scope of translation studies has been much widened by various linguistic explorations, such as by Baker (1992; 2009), Hatim and Mason (1997), Hermans (1999), Malmkjaer & Windle (2011), Munday (2012), Toury (2012), Saldanha & O’Brien (2013), and Pym (2014). Because of lack of space, it may suffice to mention here that all the above-mentioned scholars have highlighted communication-based models which perceive linguistic units of an SL text as functional signs which need to be translated as equivalent linguistic signs in the TL text. The present analysis is also in line with such an approach.

¹ Professor & Head, Department of English, Samarkand State University named after Shatof Rashidov



I. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical perspective is based on the concept of the linguistic sign, merging the Saussurean and Peircean approaches, which provides a semiotic basis for the analysis of language. Since semiotic systems can also be non-verbal, such as gesturing etc., the method followed in this paper is restricted to ‘semi linguistics’ which restricts itself to the semiotic study of a text/ discourse with language as the primary modelling system. The concept of semi linguistics is in consonance with linguistics as a global discipline that studies in totality the structures and functions of language. The present paper utilizes this semiotically conditioned linguistics for the comparative analysis of two English translations of Saadat Hasan Manto’s celebrated story ‘Toba Tek Singh’ which was published in Urdu in 1954 in the collection titled *Phande*. The two translations under study, also titled as ‘Toba Tek Singh’, where the first translated version by Frances W. Pritchett (n.d.) will be referred to as TV1 and the second translated version by Harish C. Narang (2016) as TV2.

II. METHODOLOGY

All translations are events that occur in and through language. Since literary texts are also events in society, the functional semi linguistics approach has been adopted. Since significant linguistic features function as signs, these features are perceived as contextualized semi linguistics signs that not only partake but go on creating world of discourse. The method of analysis perceives the text as consisting of episodes which further comprise functional language structures. The analysis of language structures is conducted at the different levels of language organization, i.e., at the levels of phonology, morphology, syntax, figurative language and larger units of discourse. The linguistic units function as semiotic signs in the socio-cultural context of the text, and the whole text as a semiotic event in the language and culture of a society.

III. SIGNIFICANCE OF EPISODES

The ideological stance of Manto emerges distinctly from the chain of episodes and the characters employed in the short story ‘Toba Tek Singh’. The partition of the country had resulted in massive exodus of populations of Hindus and Sikhs coming to India and of Muslims going to Pakistan. Both migrating populations had to face similar barbarities that were unprecedented in scale in Indian history. This is the backdrop of ‘Toba Tek Singh’ against which the story develops its satirical tone, and that can be inferred from the opening sentence of the text:

“bantvaare ke do-tiin saal baad Pakistan aur Hindustan kii hukumatō ko xyaal aayaa ki axlaakii qaidiyō ki tarah paaglō kaa bhii tabaadlaa hona caahie, yaani jo musalmaan paagal hindustaan ke paagalzaanō mē haĩ, unhē paakistaan pahuñca diyaa jaae aur jo Hinduu aur Sikh paakistaan ke paagalxaanō mē haĩ, unhē hindustaan ke havaale kar diya jaae.”

The story is set a couple of years after partition (‘bantvaare ke do-tiin saal baad’), and the tragedy is highlighted when Fazalidin refers to the migration of Bishan Singh’s family to India, and the suspenseful incomplete reference to the fate of Bishan Singh’s 15 year old daughter adds to the sense of tragedy. Like the

exchange of well-behaved prisoners (*axlaaki qaidi*), the exchange of lunatics gets sharply contrasted with the socio-politically forced migrations. The entire story with its episodes and dialogues relating to lunatics is biting satirical in tone, something that remains unparalleled even to this day in South Asia.

The setting of ‘Toba Tek Singh’ is in a mental hospital in the city of Lahore a couple of years after the Partition. The scene of harmony among the lunatics, Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs, contrasts with the tragic happenings in the ‘sane’ world outside. The lunatics’ manifestation of adverse reactions to the reality of partition is evidenced from the episodes related to four lunatics in the asylum, two Muslims, one Hindu, and one Sikh. In the first example, a Muslim lunatic abruptly leaves sweeping and climbs up a tree and refuses to come down. When he finally comes down he embraces his Hindu and Sikh inmates with grief and sadness. In the second episode a Muslim M.Sc. radio engineer, takes off his clothes and begins to strut around naked in the park. The dejected Hindu lover from Lahore is not willing to go to India, the country of his beloved. Lastly, the central episode of Bishan Singh too shows a total reaction to the political reality of partition. The sequence of episodes that underlie the plot of the story, progressively present a powerful negative reaction to the partition of India.

The string of episodes in their totality, along with the episodes in other of his stories bring out Manto as a rebel who never paid attention to the norms of society but brought into focus the lives of characters who represent people existing on the margins of social hierarchy, i.e. characters who were menial workers, prostitutes, gamblers, pimps, brutes, alcoholics or lunatics etc. He emerges as a sensitive writer who wrote about the sufferings of people during the partition of India, sufferings of victims due to extreme insensitivities of the perpetrators, which often took the form of robberies, rapes, killings, kidnappings etc.

The comparative analysis of the two translations, which henceforth will be mentioned as TV1 (Pritchett’s translation) and TV2 (Narang’s translation) respectively, will be conducted at the different levels of language organization, namely at the levels of graphology, phonology, lexicon, syntax. Figurative language and discourse. The two translators have been chosen for the fact that both have been professors in renowned universities and have translated or dealt with translations over a long period of time.

IV. EQUIVALENCES AT GRAPHOLOGICAL AND PHONOLOGICAL LEVELS

The two translations under study have shown variation in the use of equivalent words in English for the original in Urdu. The below given seemingly meaningless outburst of Bishan Singh, for example, can be taken to be a phonological imitation of spoken English by a more or less illiterate man in British India:

SL: *aupaṛ dii gaṛ gaṛ dii anaiks dii bedhyaanaan dii muung dii daal aaf dii laaltain ...*

TV1: *Upar di gur gur di annex di be dhyana di mung di daal of the lantern.*

TV2: *Opad the gad gad the annexe the bedhyaanaa the mung the daal of the laltain ...*



Both the above translations differ in the spellings of ‘aupar’ which are ‘upar’ in TV1 and ‘opad’ in TV2. The absence of the retroflex flap /r/ is understandable for there is no letter in the English alphabet that replicates this sound- hence the variant use of /r/ and /d/. Similarly the absence of the retroflex voiceless stop /t/ in *laaltain* has been transcribed as alveolar /t/ in TV2. The variation in the use of ‘u’ and ‘o’ for ‘au’ and for the use of ‘u’ and ‘a’ in *gur* and *gad*, are due to the lack of the use of the diacritic markers ‘zabar’, ‘zer’ and ‘pesh’ (representing the short vowels ‘a’, ‘I’ and ‘u’ respectively) in the original SL text. This has led to variant readings and the resulting differences in graphology. Similarly, *Fazaldiin* has been transcribed in TV1 as ‘Fazal Din’ and in TV2 as ‘Fazaludin’,

The most glaring difference in the two translations is the graphological-phonological equivalent for the SL word *dii* which has been transcribed as *di* in TV1 and as *the* in TV2. While TV1 treats *di* as a genitive marker in Punjabi, TV2 has interpreted it as definite article *the* of English. The motivation for the choice of the definite article appears to be drawn from ...*aaf dii laaltain*, where both the translators have transcribed it as *the*. Such graphological/ phonological transcriptions mismatch due to the ambiguities arising in the writing system of Urdu, which result in variant translations in English. The approximations of sounds of SL text in the TL text at best attempt to replicate the local flavor of the SL text. It is difficult to pinpoint whether *di* or *the* are correct, since both can be interpreted, however, *muung dii daal* (mung lentils) favors an interpretation that ‘di’ occurs between Punjabi words, and ‘the’ whenever there is a preceding or following English word.

Another feature that needs to be pointed out is the ‘Toba’ in the title. The onset /t/ of the initial syllable /to/ is often heard as unaspirated voiceless alveolar stop followed by the clear mid-high rounded back vowel. It is, in fact, articulated as a syllable with a falling tone, i.e. as [tòba] meaning ‘pond’ or a water body of the village. This variation occurs since the Urdu script does not have any diacritic to indicate the Punjabi falling tone. As the tale goes, it refers to a water body near which, in the days gone by, one Tek Singh, a Sikh, as charity provided wayfarers free drinking water to quench their thirst. Though Tek Singh is no longer alive, the place has flourished and over the years has become a district in Pakistan. The main character, Bishan Singh, a lunatic, who remembers almost nothing, is a resident from Toba Tek Singh, and is lodged in the lunatic asylum at Lahore. He was brought there in chains by his relatives some 15 years ago.

Further, in this short story, emphasis and raising of pitch, which are expressive of anger and irritation, also are some of the phonological features that represent the state of mind of the speakers. These have no equivalent in graphology and are being left out of consideration since there can be multifarious variations in the different articulations. The anger in raised voices represents unhappiness about the exchange process. The final ‘sky-rending shriek’ represents the emotional tragedy due to unmitigated suffering caused by the partition of the country.



V. EQUIVALENCES AT THE LEXICAL LEVEL

The translation of lexicon poses great challenges between SL and TL texts, particularly if it consists of cultural items. In addition, lexical choices in translation may also vary depending on the choice opted for by the translator, for one translator may retain the original word from the SL text while the other may give an English equivalent. E.g. while TV1 retains the word *Hindustan* in transcription, TV2 translates it as *India*; and while TV2 on the one hand retains the original SL word along with an English translation with a hyphen (e.g. *dafedar-guard*; *bhai-brother* ... *behan-sister*), the TV1 on the other provides equivalents for the same in English (e.g. *custodian*; *brother* ... *sister*). While TV2 retains the word *zindabad*, TV1 translates it as *long live*. The use of some translated forms and also the retention of SL words in both the translations indicates that, probably, both translators have the non-Indian as well as the Indian reading public in mind. Additionally, the retention of SL words provides local flavor.

Further, some words have been translated differently, the word *paagal* and *paagalxaanaa* are translated in TV1 as *lunatics* and *insane asylums*, and in TV2 as *mad persons* and *mental asylums*. The expression *insane asylum* sounds inappropriate due to the inadvertent personification of the word *asylum*. However, the word *lunatics*, a single word equivalent for the single word *paagal* appears to be more appropriate for the class of persons with deranged minds than the expression *mad persons*. Also the translation of *daanishmandon* in TV1 as *learned* is appropriate but not the translation as *seniors* in TV2. The local candy *maronḍa* is translated as *puffed-rice candy* in TV1, and with additional information as *round sweet balls made from jaggery and puffed rice* in TV2. In fact, the native name of the local candy could be retained with an explanation in the footnotes, for the English translations fail to provide the local flavor. The word *cimegoiaan* has been translated in T1 as *major discussions*, and in T2 as *interesting gossip*. Both appear to be off the mark since the expressions refers to ‘whispering’ or to ‘talking in muted voices’. Also, ‘Maulbi saab’ is rendered in TV1 as ‘Molbi Sa'b’ and in TV2 as ‘Maulvi Saheb’. The former captures the colloquial speech while the latter makes it formal, and hence misses the colloquialism.

VI. EQUIVALENCES AT THE SYNTACTIC LEVEL

At the level of syntax, though a number of variations in equivalences can be observed between the two translations, the largest variety can be observed at the level of phrasal constructions. Examples from the original source language text (SL) with two translations (TV1 & TV2) are compared in the discussion below.

(a) Examples of variation in phrasal equivalences

(1) *Axlaaki qaidiḍ* in the SL text has been translated in TV1 as ‘criminal offenders’ and in TV2 as ‘social prisoners’. Both are mistranslations as the expression refers to ‘prisoners with good conduct’.

(2) **SL:** *Paakistaan aur hindustaan kii hakuumatḍ ko xayaal aayaa*

TV1: it occurred to the governments of Pakistan and Hindustan
TV2□ It stuck the governments of Pakistan and India

The verb form form *occurred* in TV1 is more appropriate than ‘stuck’ in TV2.

(3) SL: ... idhar-udhar uunci satah kii kaanfrensẽ huĩ
TV1: ... high-level conferences took place here and there
TV2: ... high level conferences were held –

Translation in TV1 is a literal one, while TV2 deletes any reference to places. The *here and there* misses the idea related to places of meeting on both sides of the border, or in both the countries.

(4) SL: Jo baaki the, un ko sarhad par ravaanaa kar diyaa gayaa
TV1: As for the rest, they were **sent off to the border**
TV2: the rest were **sent across the border**

Here, TV1 is appropriate, for *sarhad paar* is equivalent to *sent off to the border* (TV1), but not to *sent across the border* (TV2).

(5) SL: Jinke riřtedaaron ne afsaron ko kuch de dilaakar paagalxaane **bhijvaa diyaa thaa**

TV1: whose relatives had bribed the officers to **get them sent** to the lunatic asylum,

TV2: whose relatives had bribed the officers and **had sent them sent** to the mental asylum

The force of the causative is missing in TV2, and a better reading would be - *have them sent*.

(6) SL: Phaansii ke phande se bac jaaẽ
TV1: to save them from the coils of the hangman's noose.
TV2: they could escape the gallows

Here, *hangman's noose* is close enough to the original expression, and the use of *coils of* appears to be superfluous in TV1. Hence, while TV1 is a case of over translation, the *gallows* in TV2 is an under translation for it misses the focus on noose.

(7) SL: ... *jinkaa dimaagh puuri tarah se mauuf nahiĩ huuaa thaa* ...
TV1: ... *whose minds were not completely gone* ...
TV2: ... *those who were not mad* ...

Here, TV2 is an instance of mistranslation, for the reference is to inmates who were not fully insane.

(8) SL ... Is se **pahle ki xoon-xaraaba ho jaae** ...
TV1: *it almost came to bloodshed*

TV2: *Before a fight could ensue*

Both TV1 and TV2 are off the mark. The quarrel was surely on, but ‘before a serious turn of events’ or ‘before any physical harm occurred’ the adversaries were separated.

(9) SL: *Jab paakistaan aur hindustaan kii garbar šuru huii*

TV1: *when the confusion over Pakistan-Hindustan began*

TV2: *when the India –Pakistan trouble started*

In TV1, *confusion ... began* is a mistranslation of *garbar šuru huii*, and the TV2 translation as *trouble started* or *began* is appropriate.

(10) SL: *Barii minnat-samaajat se*

TV1: *with much pleading and cajoling*

TV2: *pleaded*

Here, TV1 is more appropriate for it represents reinforcement of pleading and cajoling, which is not so in the case in TV2 where only *pleaded* is used.

(11) SL: *mujhe to hindostorõ kii bolii aati hai, hindustaanii bare aakar aakar phirte hain ...*

TV1: I know the language of those Hindustaggers-- those Hindustanis go strutting around like the devil!

TV2: I know their language; Hindustanis are great mischief makers, sauntering and preening themselves.

While *hindostorõ* has been translated as *Hindustaggers* in TV1, it is omitted in TV2. The SL expression - *hindustaanii bare aakar aakar phirte hain* - has been over translated in TV1 as *go strutting around like the devil!* The comparison (*like the devil!*) with an exclamation mark, is much stronger than the satirical intent which is appropriately captured in TV2 by the expression *sauntering and preening themselves*. In TV2 - *great mischief makers* - appears to have been added to compensate for the untranslated word *hindostorõ*.

(12) SL: *ek paagal to paakistaan aur hindustaan, hindustaan aur paakistaan ke cakkar mẽ kuchh aisaa giraftaar huua ki aur zyaada paagal ho gayaa.*

TV1: One lunatic became so caught up in the circle of Pakistan and Hindustan, and Hindustan and Pakistan, that he became even more lunatic.

TV2: One mad person got so entangled between ‘India and Pakistan’, ‘Pakistan and India’ business that he became more mad.

Here, the *paakistaan aur hindustaan, hindustaan aur paakistaan ke cakkar mẽ kuchh aisaa giraftaar huua* in SL is expressive of the ‘confusion’ due to the repeated



references to Pakistan and Hindustan/Hindustan and Pakistan rather than the *circle of Pakistan and Hindustan, and Hindustan and Pakistan* in TV1, or *entangled between 'India and Pakistan', 'Pakistan and India' business* in TV2. The *cakkar mē* in SL is an idiom, whereas the two English expressions ‘circle’ and ‘entangled between’ are not fully expressive of the sense of confusion.

(13) SL: *kyaa unhē dabal rotii ke bajaay blarīi inḍiyan capaati to zahar maar nahī karnī paregī?*

TV1: *Instead of proper bread, would they have to choke down those bloody Indian chapattis?*

TV2: *Whether they would continue to get bread or would be forced to eat bloody chapatti?*

The expression *zahar maar* in SL has been translated in TV1 as *to choke down*, and as *forced to eat* in TV2. The translation in TV1 is quite appropriate for it expresses the dislike while eating, whereas the *forced to eat* in TV2 does mean ‘dislike’ but also has the additional meaning of ‘forcing to eat’. Further, the *blarīi inḍiyan capaati* in SL has been pluralized as *bloody Indian chapattis* in TV1 and as *bloody chapatti* in TV2. *Chapatti* is a class word and hence the pluralization in TV1 was unnecessary, and the omission of the word *Indian* fails to translate the sense of colonial disgust for Indian food item.

(14) SL: *vo leṭataa bhii nahiin thaa. Albattaa kabhii-kabhii kisii diivaar ke saath ṭek lagaa leta thaa. Har vaqt kharāa rahne se uske pāñv suuj gae the aur pinḍaliāā bhii phuul gai thī, magar jismaani takliif ke baavajuud vo leṭkar aaraam nahiin kartaa thaa.*

TV1: He didn't even lie down. Although indeed, he sometimes leaned against a wall. Because he constantly remained standing, his feet swelled up. His ankles were swollen too. But despite this bodily discomfort, he didn't lie down and rest.

TV2: (Guards said that) he hadn't slept for even a moment during the last fifteen years; nor would he lie down to rest.

While TV1 has attempted to translate the entire expression quite literally, it has wrongly translated *pinḍaliāā* (shins or shanks) as *ankles*. TV2 has omitted the entire description of occasionally leaning against the wall and the swelling of feet and shins due to continuous standing. This has taken away an important pictorial aspect of the major character.

(15) SL: *Toba Tek Singh mē uskii kairi zamiinē thī*

TV1: *he had some lands in Toba Tek Singh*

TV2: *he had land in Toba Tek Singh*

In both the translations the expression *kairi zamiinē* has been under translated either as ‘some lands’ in TV1, and as only ‘land’ in TV2. The fact of ‘many pieces of land’ or of ‘substantial land’ is missing in both the translations. The expressions in both TV1 and TV2 can be taken to be instances of under- translation.

VII. EQUIVALENCE AT THE LEVEL OF DISCOURSE

Features of discourse are an important part of any discourse, spoken or written. Sometimes features of spoken language are used in written forms. When elements of speech or direct speech are used in a narrative they often take the form of free indirect discourse, i.e., the interweaving features of direct speech in a narrative without the use of the reporting verbs and/or without transforming present tenses into past tenses etc. The narrative of ‘Toba Tek Singh’ also manifests this discourse strategy in order to amplify the life-like ongoing events parallel events within the frame of the narrative in the past tense. Some of the examples are briefly discussed below.

(16) SL: *siyaalkoṭ jo hindustaan mē hotaa thaa ab sunaa hai ki paakistaan mē hai, kyaa pataa hai ki laahaur jo aaj paakistaan mē hai kal hindustaan mē calaa jaae. Yaa saaraa hindustaan hii paakistaan ban jaae aur ye bhii kaun siine pe haath rakh kar kah saktaa thaa ki hindustaan aur paakistaan donō ek din sire se raayab hii jo jaaē.*

TV1: *Sialkot used to be in Hindustan, but now it was said to be in Pakistan. Who knew whether Lahore, which now is in Pakistan, tomorrow might go over off to Hindustan? Or all Hindustan itself might become Pakistan? And who could place his hand on his breast and say whether Hindustan and Pakistan might not both someday vanish entirely?*

TV2: *Sialkot that was earlier in Hindustan was now in Pakistan? Who knows the whole of Pakistan may merge into India or the whole of India might turn into Pakistan? And who could say for sure whether both India and Pakistan might not disappear altogether one day?*

The first difference in the two translations is in the use of tense (shown in bold). While the SL text shows the thought patterns beginning with the past tense **hotaa thaa**, and then shifting to the present tense (**sunaa hai; mē hai; pataa hai**) and then reverts to past tense (**kah saktaa thaa**) to close the process. The translation in TV1 too begins with the past tense (**used to be**) and continues with the same tense (**was said; knew; could..say**). Similarly, the translation in TV2 too uses only the past tense (**was..in, was..in, could.. say**). The immediacy of thought dramatized by the shift to the present tense is missing in both the English versions.

The second difference between the SL text and the two translations is in the use of punctuations. While the former does not use any explicit sign of interrogation, the latter two have ended all the sentences with question marks. The doubts in thought have been turned into questions in the translations, thus losing a subtle element of the narrative.

Finally, there is an error in TV2, for the SL expression - *kyaa pataa hai ki laahaur jo aaj paakistaan mē hai kal hindustaan mē calaa jaae. Yaa saaraa hindustaan hii paakistaan ban jaae* - is translated as *Who knows the whole of Pakistan may merge into India or the whole of India might turn into Pakistan?* Here, Lahore has been erroneously replaced by Pakistan.



(17) SL: *Uski badi xahish thii ki vo log aaẽ jo usase hamdardii kaa izahaar karte the aur uske lie phal, miḥhaaiyãã aur kapaṛe laate the. Vo agar unse puuchhṭaa ke Toba Tek Singh kahãã hai ... vah use yakiinan bataa dete Toba Tek Singh paakistaan mẽ hai yaa hindustaan mẽ kyonki uskaa xyaal thaa ki vo Toba Tek Singh hii se aate haĩ jahãã uskii zamiinẽ haĩ.*

TV1: His great desire **was** that those people would come who **showed** sympathy toward him, and **brought** him fruit, sweets, and clothing. If he asked them **where** Toba Tek Singh **was**, they would certainly tell him whether it **was in** Pakistan or Hindustan. Because his **idea was** that they **came** from Toba Tek Singh itself, where his **lands were**.

TV2: He strongly **wished** that they came and **expressed**, as earlier, their sympathies with him and also **brought** him, again like before, sweets and clothes. If they came **he'd ask** them about the location of Toba Tek Singh. They would surely tell him whether Toba Tek Singh **was in** Pakistan or Hindustan. He assumed that they **came** from Toba Tek Singh where he **had** land.

In (20) the SL narrative begins in the past tense using the forms *thaa/thii* (was) and then shifts to the present tense (*kahãã hai; mẽ hai; aate haĩ; zamiinẽ haĩ*). This use of present tense in the SL represents the person's strong identification with the place. This sense of passionate attachment is not captured by the continuous use of the past tenses in TV1 (*was; showed; brought where was; was in; idea was; came; lands were*) and TV2 (*wished; expressed; brought; where was; he'd ask; was in; came; had land*). It is noticeable that the shift from the past tense to present tense occurs in connection with Bishan Singh's stream of consciousness about the location of Toba Tek Singh to which he felt deeply attached. This sense of extreme attachment is missing in the two translations.

(18) SL: *Baaj to baahar nikalte hi nahii the. Jo nikalne par razaamand hote unko sambhaalnaa mushkil ho jaataa thaa, kyõki idhar-udhar bhaag uṭhate the, jo nange the, un ko kapaṛe pahnaae jaate vo unhẽ phaadkar apne tan se judaa kar dete. Koi gaaliyãã bak rahaa hai ... koi gaa rahaa hai ... kuchh aapas mẽ jhagaṛ rahe haĩ ... kuch ro rahe haĩ, bilakh rahe haĩ. Kaan padi aavaaz sunaai nahiin detii thii – paagal auraton kaa shoro-ghoghaa alag thaa.*

TV1: Some **refused** to emerge at all. Those who **were willing** to come out became difficult to manage, because they suddenly **ran** here and there. If clothes were put on the naked ones, they **tore** them off their bodies and **flung** them away. Someone **was babbling** abuse, someone **was singing**. They **were fighting** among themselves, **weeping, muttering**. People couldn't make themselves heard at all-- and **the female lunatics' noise and clamour was something else**.

TV2: Some never **came** out, and those who **did** were difficult to handle because they **ran** helter-skelter. Those who **were** naked **were** made to wear clothes but they **tore** them off their bodies. Some **were hurling** abuses...**some singing**...**some quarreling** among themselves...**some crying, lamenting**—nothing could be **heard**. The shindy raised by the mad women **was** another problem.



Example (21) also reveals the use of present tense forms in the SL within the overall narrative that is in the past tense. In contrast, the translated versions are unable to replicate the alternation of past and present tenses within the same narrative discourse, resulting in their consistent use of past tense forms (tense forms given in bold). Though TV2 uses the forms *singing*, *quarrelling*, *crying*, and *lamenting*, these are without auxiliaries and by default take the past tense from the preceding *were hurling*. The use of present tense brings into sharp focus the actions of the lunatics in the otherwise past tense of the narrative.

VIII. EQUIVALENCE AT THE LEVEL OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE

There are few figurative forms in this narrative. Some of these forms are briefly discussed below.

(19) SL: *Kaun sine par haath rakhkar kah saktaa hai*

TV1: *who could place his hand on his breast and say*

TV2: *who could say for sure*

The translation of the cultural idiom *siine pe haath rakhnaa* in the expression *kaun siine pe haath rakh kar kah saktaa thaa* are also different. While the expression is literally translated in TV1 as *who could place his hand on his breast and say*, the translation *who could say for sure* in TV2 is relatively more appropriate. However, the hand on the breast represents ‘with full faith’.

(20) SL: *Cunaance vo dafadaar se kahtaa ki uskii mulaakaat aa rahi hai ... Uskii ek laddkii thii jo har mahine ek ungalii barhtii-barhtii 15 barson men javaan ho gatii thii.*

TV1: *Thus he used to tell the custodian that his visitors were coming. ... He had one daughter who, growing a finger-width taller every month, in fifteen years had become a young girl.*

TV2: *So he would tell the dafedar – guard that his visit would be coming. ... He had a daughter who, growing up slowly, like nails, every day, had now become fifteen.*

In (20) SL ‘mulaakaat’ (meeting) stands for ‘visitors’, and the expression ‘... har mahine ek ungalii barhtii-barhtii...’ is also figurative, indicating, as translated by TV1, as ‘growing a finger-width taller every month’, and not as in TV2 – ‘growing up slowly, like nails, every day’. First, the comparison is not with nails, and secondly, the rate of growth is monthly and not daily.

(21) SL: *Aur sardii itnii karaake ki paṛ rahii thii ki daant se daant baj rahe the.*

TV1: *And the cold was so fierce that everybody's teeth were chattering.*

TV2: *The weather was so cold that the teeth chattered.*

In (21) the expression ‘daant se daant baj rahe the’ is metaphoric for it stands for ‘teeth were chattering’ (TV1), and even ‘the teeth chattered’. TV1 has, however added an extra ‘everybody’ which dilutes the focus on cold.



Finally, the five ‘meaningless’ utterances of Bishan Singh, as given below in (24), (25), (26), and (27) are in fact very expressive.

(22) SL: “*aupaṛ dii gaṛ gaṛ dii anaiks dii bedhyaanaan dii muung dii daal aaf dii laaltain ...*”

TV1: “*Upar di gur gur di annex di be dhyana di mung di daal of the lantern.*”

TV2: ‘*Opad the gad gad the annexe the bedhyaanaa the mung the daal of the laltain ...*’ – a number of words from Panjabi and English strung together, meaning nothing

Here, TV2 has added to the translation the expression - a number of words from Panjabi and English strung together - meaning nothing’. The expression may appear as meaningless, but it serves as the backdrop for the other three expressions, and hence did not require the verdict ‘meaning nothing’. Now consider examples (23), (24), (25) and (26).

(23) SL: “*aupaṛ dii gaṛ gaṛ dii anaiks dii bedhyaanaan dii muung di daal aaf dii paakistaan gavarnment!*” lekin baad mē “*aaf dii paakistaan gavarnment*” ki jagah “*aaf dii Toba Tek Singh gavarnment*” nē le lii.

TV1: “*Upar di gur gur di annex di be dhyana di mung di daal of the Pakistan Government.*” But later, “*of the Pakistan Government*” was replaced by “*of the Toba Tek Singh Government,*”

TV2: ‘*Opad the gad gad the annexe the bedyaanaa the mung the daal of the Pakistan government ... !*’ Later the words ‘Pakistan government’ were substituted with ‘*of the Toba Tek Singh Government*’

(24) SL: “*aupaṛ dii gaṛ gaṛ dii anaiks dii bedhyaanaan dii muung di daal aaf vahe guru ji daa xaalsaa and vahe guru ji dii fateh ... jo bole so nihaal, sat sri akaal*”

TV1: “*Upar di gur gur di annex di be dhyana di mung di dal of hail to the Guruji and the Khalsa, and victory to the Guruji! Who says this will thrive-- the true God is ever alive!*”

TV2: ‘*Opad the gad gad the annexe the bedyaanaa the mung the daal of Wahe Guru Ji da Khalsa and Wahe Guru Ji di fatah... !*’

(25) SL: “*aupaṛ dii gaṛ gaṛ dii anaiks dii bedhyaanaan dii muung di daal aaf dii paakistaan and hindustaan aaf dii dur fiṭe muūh*”

TV1: “*Upar di gur gur di annex di be dhyana di mung di dal of the Pakistan and Hindustan of the get out, loudmouth!*”

TV2: ‘*Opad the gad gad the annexe the bedyaanaa the mung the daal of the Pakistan and Hindustan of the dur phite moonh...!*’

(26) SL: “*aupaṛ dii gaṛ gaṛ dii anaiks dii bedhyaanaan dii muung di daal aaf toba tek singh and paakistaan ...*”

TV1: “*Upar di gur gur di annex di be dhyana di mung di dal of Toba Tek Singh and Pakistan!*”

TV2: ‘*Opad the gad gad the annexe the bedyaanaa the mung the daal of the Toba Tek Singh and Pakistan...!*’



A simple comparison of the examples in (22), (23), (24), (25) and (26) reveal that - *aaf the laltain*'(22) – has been replaced respectively with ‘*aaf dii paakistaan gavarnment*’ and ‘*aaf dii Toba Tek Singh gavarnment*’ in (23), *aaf vahe guru ji daa xaalsaa and vahe guru ji dii fateh ... jo bole so nihaal, sat sri akaal* in (24), *paakistaan and hindustaan aaf dii dur fiTe muunh* in (25), with *aaf toba tek singh and paakistaan* in (26).

The first noteworthy feature that creates differences in spellings is the ambiguity of the Punjabi ‘dii’ which has been transliterated as genitive *di* in TV1 and as definite article *the* in TV2. This has been due difference in interpretation.

The second important feature is the variation concerning the way the Sikh religious affirmation in SL (24) text - *vahe guru ji daa xaalsaa and vahe guru ji dii fateh ... jo bole so nihaal, sat sri akaal* - has been translated. In TV1, it has been literally translated as *of hail to the Guruji and the Khalsa, and victory to the Guruji! Who says this will thrive-- the true God is ever alive!* In TV2, the first part has been literally transcribed as *of Wahe Guru Ji da Khalsa and Wahe Guru Ji di fatah... !*, while the second part has been completely omitted. Both the translations have in a way under-translated the element of strong Sikh faith that is inherent in the in the SL. Further, the literal translation has not provided any additional information about the religious sanctity of these lines. Similarly, a transcription in English will also does not provide this information to an uninformed English reader. Further, the deletion of the second part of the SL utterance appears to be an error.

The third feature pertains to the translation of *aaf dii paakistaan and hindustaan aaf dur fiTe mūūh* in (25). It has been translated in TV1 as *of the Pakistan and Hindustan of the get out, loudmouth!*, and in TV2 it is simply transcribed as *of the Pakistan and Hindustan of the dur phite moonh...!*. While *of the Pakistan and Hindustan* has been transcribed as such by both TV1 and TV2, in TV1 the Punjabi abuse is translated with an abuse *of the get out, loudmouth!*, and TV2 has merely transcribed it in script of English language. The mere transcription of the abuse without a gloss or explanation could make it quite opaque for a non-Punjabi reader.

In the case of (23) the SL words are rendered as such in English spellings in the two translations. Thus, *aaf dii paakistaan gavarnment !*” and *aaf dii Toba Tek Singh gavarnment* are rendered in both TV1 and TV2 as *of the Pakistan Government* and *of the Toba Tek Singh Government* respectively. The sign of exclamation has been used only in TV2 just as in the SL text. Almost similarly *of Toba Tek Singh and Pakistan!* Has been translated in TV1 as

Since one of the aims of translation is to create in the target audience the kind of effect the original produces on the SL audience, it appears that the two translations are not able to match the effect of due to either the lack of Urdu-Punjabi code-mixing/code-switching, or due to non-availability of the explanations of the transcribed Punjabi forms.

In the case of (23), the SL has been rendered as such in English spellings. Similarly, *aaf Toba Tek Singh and paakistaan* in the SL text is translated as - *of Toba Tek Singh and Pakistan!* And in TV2 it is translated as - *of the Toba Tek Singh and Pakistan!* Unlike in the SL text, both TV1 and TV2 have used exclamation marks at

the end of the expression. Further, TV2 has unnecessarily added the definite article *the* before *Toba Tek Singh*.

Examples (22), (23), (24), (25), and (26) depict the progression in the consciousness of Bishan Singh in relation to the partition of the country and his increasing consciousness about the location of his village Toba Tek Singh. While (23) shows his marginally growing awareness of the problem concerning the location of his village, (24) repudiates faith in another and asserts his own Sikh identity, (25) an abuse concerning the division of the country (meaning thereby the people responsible for the division), and finally, example (26) marks his realization that his village is now a part of Pakistan. The death of Bishan Singh in the no man's land between India and Pakistan dramatizes the emotional repudiation of the division of the country.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

The above comparative analysis shows that translators need to be as close to original as possible. When equivalents are lacking then they can bold enough to create such as *get out, loudmouth! for dur fiṭe mūñh*. It is necessary to know that a word-by-word literal translation does not make a good translation, as literal translation or literally transcribing of some Punjabi expressions in English shows that there is a loss of meaning without a gloss or additional explanation. Translator also should not omit information for that would affect the sense being communicated. A translator needs to translate keeping the context of the text as well his/her prospective readers in mind. That sense and intention are more important are shown vividly in the translation of figurative language. It is appropriate, as far as possible, to translate metaphor by metaphor, idiom by idiom and intention by intention. Similarly, the tone of the text has also to be identified through contextual implications. In order to clarify expression which do not have an equivalent in the TL, translators may add by way of footnotes or endnotes, or by way of additional explanation.

References:

1. Baker, Mona 1992. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
2. Baker, Mona (ed.) 2009. *Translation Studies: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.
3. Bermann, Sandra, and Catherine Porter (eds.) 2014. *A Companion to Translation Studies*. Malden/Oxford: Wiley Blackwell. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Catford, J. C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
5. Gargesh, Ravinder 2007 On Equivalence: Text and Culture. In Ravinder
6. Gargesh & Krishna Kumar Goswami (eds.) *Translation and Interpreting: Reader and Workbook*. Delhi: Orient Blackswan. (Copyright with University of Delhi). Pp. 23-30.

7. Hatim, Basil, and Ian Mason 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London and New York: Routledge
8. Hermans, Theo 1999. *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
9. Malmkjær, Kirsten, and Kevin Windle (eds). 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Manto, Sadat Hasan. 1954. ‘Toba Tek Singh’ (Urdu text) retrieved from - <https://www.rekhta.org/manto/toba-tek-singh-saadat-hasan-manto-manto?lang=ur>) - on March 24, 2018.
11. Manto, Sadat Hasan. 1954. ‘Toba Tek Singh’ (Hindi text) – retrieved from <https://www.rekhta.org/manto/toba-tek-singh-saadat-hasan-manto-manto?lang=hi>) - on March 24, 2018.
12. Munday, Jeremy. 2012. *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*. Third edition. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
13. Narang, H.C. 2016. ‘Toba Tek Singh’. In H. C. Narang (ed. &trans) *Manto My Love: Selected writings of Saadat Hasan Manto*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi. Pp. 102 – 109.
14. Newmark, Peter 1987. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall
15. Nida, Eugene A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden, EJ. Brill.
16. Nida, Eugene A., and Charles Taber 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden, The Netherlands: E. J. Brill.
17. Pritchett, Frances W. (n.d.) ‘Toba Tek Singh’ (trans.) – retrieved from <http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00urdu/tobateksingh/translation.html> - on March 24, 2018.
18. Pym, Anthony. 2014. *Exploring Translation Theories*. Second edition. London/New York: Routledge.
19. Saldanha, Gabriela, and Sharon O’Brien. 2013. *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St Jerome.
20. Toury, Gideon. 2012. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Revised edition. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
21. Venuti, Lawrence 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London, New York: Routledge.