A Stylistic Analysis of Manto's Urdu Short Stories and their English Translations

Muhammad Salman Riaz

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds

School of Languages, Cultures, and Societies

October 2018

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his/her own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

The right of Muhammad Salman Riaz to be identified as Author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Acknowledgements

Abstract

The study conducts an SFL-based stylistic analysis of Urdu short stories written by Manto – an icon in Urdu short story writing – and their corresponding English translations by Tahira Naqvi, Jai Ratan, and Khalid Hasan. Specifically speaking, stylistic profiles are made for the selected literary texts and their English translations, based on which a comparative analysis is drawn to (1) describe how and how successfully the translators render the source text style, and (2) compare the translations with each other to assess the relative success of each translation (i.e. the success of each translation in comparison to other translations) based on the similarities and differences in the translators' approaches towards reproducing the source text style.

For this evaluative study, SFL, especially the register analysis, is used as an analytical model. Under this approach, the context of culture is explored by conducting a field-and-habitus-based exploration of Manto and his style and the selected short stories, as well as that of the translators and their translations, as far as possible.

Results show that, overall, Naqvi follows the ST style closely, whereas Ratan demonstrates a mixed approach by sometimes deviating and sometimes following the ST style and Hasan deviates it from a great extent. Owing to these reasons, we can call Naqvi's translation comparatively most successful, Ratan's translation less successful than that of Naqvi, and Hasan's translation least successful.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abbreviations

ST = Source Text

TT = Target Text

SFL = Systemic Functional Linguistics

Chapter 1: Introduction

The study uses an SFL-based stylistic approach to evaluate a selection of translations of Manto's Urdu short stories by Tahira Naqvi, Jai Ratan, and Khalid Hasan in terms of their success in transferring ST style. SFL suggests exploring two contexts: context of culture and context of situation. For the former, a field-and-habitus-based socio-cultural enquiry is conducted to

- identify some key extra-textual factors that may have affected the literary style of Manto and the selected translators, though only meagre amount of data is available in connection with the latter, and
- introduce the selected texts and explore the specific influence of extra-textual factors on them.

For the context of situation, an SFL-based register analysis is applied to

- explore the stylistic features of literary texts at ideational, interpersonal, and textual levels, and
- draw a contrastive analysis between selected literary texts and their corresponding English translations in order to (1) describe how the translators render the ST style, (2) compare the translations with each other to assess the similarities and differences in the translators' approaches towards achieving the above-said goal, and, finally, (3) discuss the inferences that we can draw from the above two steps in connection with the relative success with which the translators have reproduced the ST style.

Style can be defined and studied differently. Subscribing to the description put forward by Leech and Short (2007), we can define it as patterned linguistic choices reinforcing the subject matter and creating macro-level stylistic effects. At a very basic level, style is a matter of choice between alternating ways of saying something. These linguistic choices are significant, and preferring one to others has meaningful impact. For instance, if we want to say the command *sit down* in Urdu, we can do that in different ways, including the following:

- بیٹھیں
- بیٹھیے
- تشریف رکھیں
- بیٹھو

These choices mainly differ from each other in terms of formality. The first one is a commonly-used polite form of inviting/asking someone to sit. Whereas the second is slightly more polite and formal, the third is highly polite and formal. At the other end of this cline is the informal fourth form. Thus, choosing one over others gives a specific shade of meaning to the utterance. However, it should also be noted that, in order to make a macro-level impact in a text, linguistic choices need to form a pattern across the text or a portion of it. So, if a text consistently prefers informal expressions of the type described above, we can identify a pattern whereby micro-level linguistic choices produce a macro-level stylistic effect of informality. Now it might be that a writer is motivated by their general habit to use informal expressions and it has no bearing on the subject matter. However, it is also possible that the strategy impacts the subject matter, no matter how much or how little. As an example, the subject matter in our corpus story *Hatak* is the emotional damage and agony that a prostitute suffers after being dismissed by a potential customer. The informal register adopted in the story matches the real-life speech of *prostitutes* in the Indo-Pak region and lends a sense of realism to the expression of mental suffering we find in the text.

Now, when it comes to analysing a literary text and its translations in reference to style, we can identify two main trends: cognitive and SFL-based. Practitioners of the former use various mental theories and constructs to explore the implied meanings of a text. On the other hand, adherents of the latter approach explore the primary or surface meanings (see, for example, Fowler, 1995; Baker, 2000; Leech and Short, 2007; Munday, 2008). This allows them to study style systematically and empirically and lessen the impact of subjectivity. In our analysis, we follow this second stance when exploring linguistic patterns and their macro-level effects.

As stated earlier, the model we will use for the purpose of analysis is register-based systemic functional analysis, which is based on two contexts: Context of situation and context of culture. The former is about the immediate context of a text and is realised

through three metafunctions: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. The SFL-based study of these metafunctions is called register analysis. Following the model, we will engage in closely probing the patterns the micro-level lexico-grammatical choices develop across a text at ideational, interpersonal, and textual levels, and see what meanings and stylistic effects are produced. The latter type of context relates to exploring text-external factors, such as genre. In our study, we will widen the scope of this enquiry by exploring several external factors – such as childhood experiences, educational and professional background, contemporary and recent political and literary movements, and work reception – that may have impacted the personality and writing style of Manto and the translators. In the terminology of the field-and-habitus theory, the personality and style of Manto and the translators is explored by looking at several *fields* which the writers belonged to directly or indirectly and which helped shape their *habitus*.

The current research practice in investigating the style of literary translations mainly focuses on identifying the presence and individual style of translators. The present study adds an evaluative component to this purely descriptive research interest, whereby it compares a selection of STs and TTs by conducting an SFL-based register analysis to describe how the TTs reproduce the style of the corresponding STs and evaluate how successful they have been in this pursuit. Also, the current research focus is predominantly on studying narrative style, whereby the macro-level change in narrative point of view brought about by micro-level shift patterns in a translation is explored. However, the focus in our study will be exploring the macro-level impact of translators' patterned choices on the subject matter and associated stylistic effects in the ST.

1.1 Significance of the Study:

The study, an innovative endeavour in certain aspects, attempts at filling the following gaps in the current body of research on translation studies:

- The current research focus in SFL-based stylistic studies of translation is exploring the narrative perspective of texts, whereas the present study contributes an evaluative stance, whereby it studies how successfully the ST

style is transferred in the translated texts on ideational, interpersonal, and textual planes.

- There are hardly any SFL-based contrastive studies conducted on Urdu to English translation (or English to Urdu translation, for that matter). The present study takes an initial step in this regard by applying SFL register analysis on a selection of Urdu short stories of Manto – probably the most important Urdu short story writer – and their translations in English.

- Studies on literary style concerning Urdu are still impressionistic and subjective, and linguistic-oriented and objective analyses of style are a rarity. To address this, the present study demonstrates how an SFL-based analytical model can be applied to probe into the micro-level lexico-grammatical features of an Urdu literary text in order to be able to pass concrete and objective statements – i.e. statements which are quantitatively supported by textual features – about its style. Although the element of subjectivity cannot be ruled out entirely, the present study, nonetheless, presents how SFL can help to reduce the wide-spread impressionistic and subjective criticism of literature in the Indo-Pak region.

- On a general note, there is a severe lack of attention towards research in translation from and into Urdu, which happens to be the 4th most-spoken language in the world (List of Languages), at the Translation Studies departments in Western universities. The proposed study hopes to inspire research and scholarship in this area of study at the UK and other Western universities, thereby contributing to the development of interest in exploring Urdu to English and vice versa translation in Western institutes offering courses and research in translation.

1.2 Research Questions:

The research, located within evaluative and descriptive translation studies and focussing on the English translations of the short stories of Manto, will attempt at answering the following questions:

- How much can a socio-cultural enquiry into the selected writers and their work contribute to exploring their personality and style?

- How well can an SFL-based register analysis of Manto's short stories and the translations add to the current body of critique on the style of Manto and the translators?

- How successfully do the selected translators render the ST style, with a focus on the reproduction of the subject matter or central idea and macro-level effects?

- How do the selected translations compare with each other in terms of their relative success in rendering the ST style?

1.3 A Brief Introduction to the Next Chapters:

Chapter 2 locates the personality and style of Manto and the translators in a socio-cultural context. Depending upon the detail available, the chapter begins with a survey of Manto's biography, moves on to exploring some significant social and literary influences on Manto's writings, and finally briefly and critically describing the critical reception of his work. The same enquiry is conducted on the translators. Through this investigation, we will be able to identify (1) some defining traits of the personality of the writers, (2) their ideologies and approaches towards literature and translation (where available), and, more pertinently, (3) some of the key variables from the extra-textual world that possibly would have impacted their writing style. The detail on work reception will also give us an opportunity to identify some lacunas and gaps in the existing body of literature on evaluating Manto's, as well as any other Urdu writer's, and the translators' style.

Chapter 3 explains the theoretical and conceptual framework of the study. It defines style with different shades of the meaning of the term. It, then, specifies in which way it is used in the present study, and for this purpose, Leech and Short's stylistic approach is described in detail. Finally, it presents how style is predominantly studied in translation studies and how the present study aims to contribute to it.

Chapter 4 describes the analytical model: SFL-based register analysis. It briefly describes the three variants of register: field, tenor, and mode. It moves on to describing the ideational metafunction and transitivity analysis, also briefly noting the overlap and indeterminacy in identifying processes and clarifying our position in this

regard. Moving on to the interpersonal metafunction, the systems of the Mood and the residue are described, and particular attention is paid to delineating the complex system of modality, explaining the various interpersonal roles performed by modal verbs and modal adjuncts. This is then followed by a brief comparison of the modality systems of Urdu and English, highlighting similarities and dissimilarities. Finally, the thematic and cohesive systems are explained, ending the chapter by highlighting some difficulties in comparing the thematic structures of Urdu and English and explaining what positions we take in this regard.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 are dedicated to sharing the findings of an in-depth comparative analysis of the three Urdu STs and their English translations. Based on the findings and related discussion, conclusions are drawn about the success of the translations in terms of reproducing the ST style.

Chapter 8 compares the three translations with each other, but with reference to the ST. A closer look at the contrast between the translations in terms of shift patterns and translation strategies is carried out. It helps us judge the success of each translation in comparison with the other translations in reproducing the ST style.

The last chapter, Conclusion, addresses how the study has answered the questions set out in the beginning of the research. It also mentions limitations of the study and suggestions for future research, and shares the researcher's expectations regarding future research and interest in Urdu translation studies.

Chapter 2: Manto and Translators in Socio-cultural Context

Locating Manto and the translators in a social and cultural context will help us understand what text-external factors may have contributed towards shaping their personality, ideologies, perspective on literature, and writing style. It will also help us explore any critical reception available on Manto and his selected short stories as well as translators and their translations. Such an enquiry will also help us identify and what lacunas are there in the reception of the style of Manto and the translators.

The importance of locating a writer's style in this way has been acknowledged by several literary figures and critics. To quote an example from Urdu, this is how Iqbal (2012, p. 17) points out various forces influencing one's literary style:

اس کی شناخت میں جہاں ماحول، حالات، مقاصد آفرینی اور عصری میلانات و تقاضے اہم کردار ادا کرتے ہیں وہاں خود لکھنے والے کی اپنی شخصیت و کردار بھی اہم عنصر ہے۔ اُس کی ذہنی ساخت، انداز فکر و عمل، تعلیم و تربیت، فطرت و طینت، ذاتی پسند و نا پسند، ذوقِ طبع، دراکی و ذہانت، دماغی و ذہنی حالت وغیرہ سب کھرل ہو کر اُس کے انداز تحریر میں جذب ہو جاتے ہیں جو اس کے لکھنے کے اسٹائل کو دوسرے لکھنے والوں کے اسلوب سے مختلف، منفرد یا ممتاز بنا دیتے ہیں۔

Whereas on the one hand environment, circumstances, purpose and contemporary traditions and demands play a vital role in its [style's] identification, the very personality and character also form a salient determining factor. His/her [the writer's] mental outlook, way of thinking and doing, education and training, nature, personal likes and dislikes, mental inclination, intelligence, disposition of mind, etc., all blend into his/her style of writing, making it different and unique in comparison with the styles of other writers.

Before proceeding, it must be noted that such an enquiry can by no means claim to be comprehensive; however, it can certainly help us locate some of the key factors impacting the literary ideologies and style of the writers.

2.1 Theoretical Basis of the Section:

The theoretical basis of the section is provided by "the sociological approach to translation inspired by the work of Pierre Bourdieu, which opened up new possibilities of exploring the socio-cultural realities of translation" (Hannah, 2016, p 3). Two key concepts in Bourdieu's approach are field and habitus. Field refers to "a structured space" (ibid., p. 21) which has its own rules and regulations, or norms, or in Bourdieu's (1996, p. 214) words, "a universe obeying its own laws of functioning and transformation." Among the various structured spaces within society, we can identify

various professional fields such as publishing field and journalistic field (Lahire, 2015, p. 74), academic fields such as that of philosophy and literature, fields of power, i.e. "politics and economy" (Hannah, 2016, p. 21), and even a family field with its specific traditions and religious, political and other affiliations. The fields that a person belongs to influence their worldview and ideology, and put certain constraints on their thought process. On the other hand, habitus can be understood as an internal regulatory force "which organises practices" (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 170) and ideologies of a person which they have gained from the fields that they are a member of. It should also be noted that the habitus of a person is not static; instead, it evolves with the passage of time, as the person is exposed to new scenarios and experiences. The old experiences and ideologies become a base for the next ones, which, in their turn, become a base for the next set, and this developmental process carries on in this way.

We probably can explain how this cognitive process takes place inside the mind by referring to Piagetian notions of *schemata*, *assimilation* and *accommodation*. According to Piaget (1967, p. 1), "Schemata are the structures at any level of mental development." We probably can explain these cognitive structures as a set of perceptions or observations about an object or an abstract idea. To cite a simple example, a child's perception of its mother as a creature who walks on two legs, speaks a language, shows affection, and takes care of it round the clock, inter alia, can be called a schema or cognitive structure. The formation of these schemata involves the processes of assimilation and accommodation. Whereas the former is defined as "the integration of external elements into evolving or completed structures" (Piaget, 1970, p. 706), the latter is "any modification of an assimilatory scheme or structure by the elements it assimilates" (ibid., p. 708). When a person comes into contact with a new piece of information, their first reaction is to understand it through the perspective of past experiences and fit the new information into the *already-acquired* similar past structures (ibid., p. 707). On the other hand, when the new information has no similar structures in mind, the person modifies the past structures to accommodate the new information. In other words:

Assimilation = association

Accommodation = lack of association, or dissociation

Returning to the example above, we can say that, at first, the child forms a single, basic schema about its mother, say of perceiving her to be a person who looks after it round the clock. To this, it assimilates other related pieces of information, such as that mentioned in the example, thereby developing the schema about the mother into something more complex and comprehensive. Now suppose it sees a woman other than its mother only after it has formed a well-developed schema about its mother. Its possible reaction would be to assimilate the new external element in the schema it already has. However, it would soon start realising the differences, such as the unavailability of this other woman round the clock. At this point, it would modify the previous schema, making necessary changes to accommodate the new information. Alternatively, we can also say that it gradually develops a new schema about women other than its mother first through the process of accommodation, and then though assimilation of related pieces of information in the schema. Similarly, its set of information and perceptions about, say, a pet dog, would form another structure or schema in its mind through the processes mentioned above. This is an ongoing process, which makes a schema bigger and more complex over time.

We, however, must point out that the detail above might give the impression that cognitive development is just a mechanical process of assimilating and accommodating information under the constraints imposed by the fields they come into contact with, and thus one can get the impression of a docile and complete compliance to the rules and norms of the fields. This, nonetheless, is not the case. The constraints imposed by a field do not signify complete "obedience to rules" (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 53) on the part of a member. The possibilities of choice that a field offers to its members are quite wide, and they include both conformity and non-conformity to the norms and rules of the field. As such, we can even explain the divergences, revolting ideas, and individual idiosyncrasies observed in the field members as the choices which are inherent in the field because of the space of possibilities that it offers to its members (cf. ibid., p. 64). Humans are undoubtedly innovative, but they are innovative by means of their exploring the possibilities that have hitherto skipped the attention of others. An illustrative example is Bourdieu's (1996) comprehensive survey of the socio-cultural context of Flaubert, explaining his innovativeness to be within the constraints and the range of possibilities offered by his social space. In Bourdieu's (ibid, p. 104) words he "predisposed him to a higher and

broader view of the space of possibles, and at the same time to a more complete use of the freedoms concealed by the constraints."

Given the determining role played by the notions of field and habitus in shaping the norms and conventions of a society and the feelings, perceptions, and behaviour of an individual, Bourdieu (ibid.), when engaged in explaining various aspects of the field of literature and its members, uses these concepts in surveying the socio-cultural context surrounding literary writers and literary works. Calling it a scientific enquiry, he emphasises the importance of three steps to be taken by a researcher of literature:

> First, one must analyse the position of the literary field within the field of power and its evolution over time. Second, one must analyse the internal structure of the literary (etc.) field, a universe obeying its own laws of functioning and transformation, meaning the structure of objective relations between positions occupied by individuals and groups placed in a situation of competition for legitimacy. And finally, the analysis involves genesis of the habitus of occupants of these positions, which means the systems of dispositions which, being the product of a social trajectory and of a position within the literary (etc.) field, find in this position a more or less favourable opportunity to be realized (the construction of the field is the logical preamble for the construction of the social trajectory as a series of positions successively occupied in this field) (ibid., p. 214).

Following this procedure of investigation, the current section, starting with the third step, will explore the genesis of Manto's habitus by looking at his childhood and later life influences and literary positions (by which we mean the ideas about literature and the thematic preferences of his short stories). Following the first two steps, the influence of the field of power, including both the subfields of (mainly) political and (marginally) economic, on the literary scenario surrounding Manto, and that of the field of literature, will be taken into account. This will include a survey of the socio-political scenario of the Sub-continent, key literary movements, and reception of Manto's style by his critics (who occupy an important place in terms of both the field of power and that of literature). Depending upon the available detail, a similar enquiry will be taken in reference to the translators. Finally, apart from meeting the primary goal, the detail on the reception of the work and style of Manto and the translators will give us the opportunity to identify some lacunas and gaps in the literary criticism tradition in reference to Urdu, which our analysis of the style of Manto and the translators, as manifested in the selected STs and TTs, will demonstrate how to address.

2.2 Manto in Socio-cultural Context:

The section is divided into looking at Manto's biography, major literary and political movements surrounding him, and reception of his style.

2.2.1 Biographical Sketch and Influences:

2.2.1.1 Influences as a Child:

> An understanding of Manto's family history…is enormously helpful in illuminating the complexities of his personality and the context for his development as a writer (A. Jalal, 2013, p. 28).

Famous by his family name Manto, Saadat Hasan Manto was born in Samrala, Ludhiana District on 11 May 1912 and died in Lahore on 18 January 1955. He came from Kashmiri ancestry, something he took great pride in (Flemming, 1985, p. 2; Shahid, 2012, p. 101). His father, Ghulam Hassan, came from a noble family of barristers, and he had earned respect and prestige in the society. He had two wives; Manto, his elder sister, Nasira Iqbal, and two other children, Sikandar and Mehmood Hassan, who died in a young age, were born of his second wife, Sardar Begum. From the first wife, he had nine children in total: three boys and six girls (A. Jalal, 2013, p. 29). All three sons followed in the footsteps of their father and became barristers; they were well-educated and civilised. However, Manto, the youngest son, adopted a disposition different from his stepbrothers. Highlighting the difference, Alvi (2003, p. 15) observes:

> وہ تعلیم یافتہ، دنیاوی اعتبار سے کامیاب اور معزز اور بے حد مذہبی اور پرہیز گار لوگ تھے۔ منٹو عین عالمِ شباب میں انقلابی، باغی مذہب نا آشنا اور آوارگی کا رسیا تھا۔
> *They were literate, successful in worldly affairs, civilised, and very religious and pious people. [On the other hand], Manto, in his youth, was revolutionary, rebellious, and irreligious, and was fond of vagabonding.*

Naturally, such glaring differences between their mental disposition and social status would have diminished Manto's value in the eyes of his family members and other acquaintances.

Manto's father was a true picture of patriarchy – a man having stern looks and imposing strict rules on the family (Flemming, 1985a, p. 3). Manto's nature, however,

did not agree with the strict rules that his father had laid down for the house, and hence he always went against them. His father wanted his sons and daughters to be practising Muslims and industrious students. Manto, on the other hand, took delight in vagabonding, kite flying, and other non-educational activities. He, naturally, had to face his strict father's ire, and he remained fearful of his father all through his childhood. To highlight this, Quraishi (p. 26) quotes his elder sister reporting as follows:

جان خطا ہوتی تھی اس کی میاں جی کے ڈر سے۔ پتنگ اُڑا رہا تھا ایک دن کوٹھے پر میاں جی آ گئے۔ اتنے میں باہر کی چھت سے کود پڑا یہ برابر کے کوٹھے پر۔ چوٹ آئی، مگر کیا مجال جو سی تک کی ہو۔

He had an immense fear of Mian Ji [Manto's father]. One day, Mian Ji came [as he] was flying a kite on the roof. From the roof outside, he jumped on a neighbour's roof. [He] got injured, but [he] did not utter even a single sound of pain.

His activities were thought to defame the family, and were thus condemned. As an example, Flemming (1985a, p. 3) reports how Manto's father once tore down the equipment Manto and his friends were using to practice, and later perform, a play by Agha Hashar, one of the most famous playwrights in the Subcontinent. Instances of this type would have left a profound impact on the sensitive mind of Manto, and it might have contributed in shaping his rebellious nature from an early age (cf. ibid, p. 3).[1] Despite his father's attempts to make him pay attention to his studies, Manto would take an interest in literature and read a lot of English novels (Ijaz, 2004, p. 216).

Lack of compassion from the father might have been compensated if Manto had received affectionate and cordial treatment from his elder (step) brothers. Manto's following reminiscence in an autobiographical sketch (cited in Alvi, 2003, p. 15) implicitly refers to the fact as follows:

---

[1] It would be undue, as we will argue later, to blame his father's strictness as the only cause for Manto's rebellious nature and work. As may be evident from the detail above, he, in a very early age, had the desire to lead a life on his own terms, no matter how conflicting they would be from the domestic as well as social standards and norms of the time. In short, we may say that he was a child with some behavioural issues. The need was to understand his psyche, give him due attention and love, and channelize his energy, thought-patterns, and potential into something positive and productive. This is precisely what we observe in the modern-day world, where the school-goers having behavioural and learning problems are consigned to the mentorship of support workers (which is a usual practice, for example, in British academia), who provide them with one-on-one attention and help them to turn into civilised and useful members of society. This, however, is a facility that Manto seems to lack during his childhood. It seems that no one gave him due attention during his formative years, until he met Mr Bari Alig (see below), but, by then, his rebellious nature had taken firm roots in his psyche.

<div dir="rtl">
اس کے تین بڑے بھائی جو عمر میں اس سے بہت بڑے تھے اور ولایت میں تعلیم پا رہے تھے ان سے
اس کو کبھی ملاقات کا موقع ہی نہیں ملا تھا۔ اس لیے کہ وہ سوتیلے تھے۔ وہ چاہتا تھا وہ اس سے ملیں،
اس سے بڑے بھائیوں ایسا سلوک کریں۔ لیکن یہ سلوک اسے اس وقت نصیب ہوا جب دنیائے ادب اسے
بہت بڑا افسانہ نگار تسلیم کر چکی تھی۔
</div>

He [Manto] never had the chance to meet his three elder brothers – who were much elder than him and were seeking education abroad at the time – which is because they were stepbrothers. He wanted them to meet him and treat him like big brothers, but his desire got fulfilled only when the literary world had accepted him as a great fiction writer.

This void in Manto's life was filled by his mother. She, in contrast to his father, was an example of a typical Eastern woman – loyal, submissive, kind-hearted, and protective – and was full of love for her children (Flemming, 1985a, p. 2). There are no traces of her being harsh towards Manto or any other person ever in her life. Manto, being a sensitive child, was profoundly impacted by the dichotomy that he found in the disposition of his father and mother towards him, and it left lasting marks on Manto's psyche (ibid.); for him, his father's strictness was a symbol of authority and oppression, whereas his mother's submissiveness that of marginalisation. This may have been one of the factors behind his looking at his society as divided into two poles, just like the behaviours of his father and mother, later in his life. He came to view society as a system of patriarchy, where the dominant factions – the males, the colonisers (i.e. the British), the haves, and the mainstream society – marginalised the weak – the women, the colonised (i.e. the people of the Subcontinent), the have-nots, and the *prostitutes* and *pimps*. (Another possible reason for this was an exposure to the Russian socialist literature, which we will detail later.) The result naturally was that he rebelled against the former and developed a soft corner for the factions of the society that he considered marginalised like his mother: the low-caste, the economically deprived, and especially the *pimps* and *prostitutes*. As a curious young man, and a vagabond, he mixed with them, minutely observing not only their physical hardships and psychological problems but also how the upper class, i.e. those occupying the centre-seat of the society, deprived them of their rights. He made these observations the themes of a large number of his short stories, and he proved so adamant that even the constant criticism and pressure from the contemporary society could not stop him from penning the plight of those who resided at the fringes of the society. His stories are about, and are populated by, the marginalised, whether this marginalising is in terms of sex, finance, prestige, or any other variables denoting the binary opposition of the oppressor and the oppressed, such as the poor, the mad (cf.

Toba Tek Singh), rogues (cf. *Dodha Pehalwan* and *Mamad Bhai*), labourers (cf. *Shughal*), *tanga-drivers* (cf. *Neya Qanoon* and *Tangawale ka Bhai*), *prostitutes* and *pimps* (cf. *Hatak*, *Babu Gopi Nath*, *Sharda*, *Mummi*, and *Kali Shalwar*), and the unfortunate victims of the communal violence that erupted at the independence of the Subcontinent in 1947 (*cf. Khol Do* and *Gormukh Singh ki Wasiyat*). It would be far-fetched to say that he produced literature only with the aim of highlighting and decrying the sufferings of these marginalised factions of the society with a reformatory aim in mind. However, the themes of and events in his short stories do implicitly indicate an interest in and compassion for the marginalised.

As Alvi (2003, p. 14) notes, this dichotomy between the behaviour of his father and mother has been vehemently noted by Manto's biographers as the reason for his becoming what he was both as a human being and a writer. Particularly, his father's sternness is blamed for being the primary cause for Manto's rebellious disposition that reflects through his personality as well as work (see, especially, Flemming (1985a) who off and again relates Manto's literary perspective as well as the steps he took in his life with this aspect of his childhood experiences).[2] It seems that the leading cause for Manto's biographers and critics to take his father's strict attitude towards him as the sole reason for shaping his personality and writing is his own following remarks in connection with the art of literature (cited in Usmani, 2012, p. 338):

> منٹو کی افسانہ نگاری دو متضاد عناصر کے تصادم کا نتیجہ ہے۔ اس کے والد خدا بخشے بڑے سخت گیر
> تھے اور اس کی والدہ بے حد نرم دل۔ ان دو پاٹوں کے اندر پس کر یہ دانہ گندم کس شکل سے باہر نکلا
> ہوگا اس کا اندازہ آپ کر سکتے ہیں۔
>
> *Manto's fiction is the outcome of two opposing forces. His father, may God forgive him, was very strict, and his mother very kind-hearted. You can well imagine in what shape this particle of wheat [i.e. Manto] would have come out after being ground between these two parts [i.e. his father and mother] of a grinding mill.*

Although it is true that childhood experiences leave lasting effects on the psyche of a man, it would be far-reaching to consider the binary opposition in Manto's father's and mother's disposition as the only cause for whatever Manto said, wrote, or did as an adult. Other experiences and factors would also have influenced him and his work, one of which seems to be his own mental inclination; obviously, a person's inherent dispositions and individualistic preferences are also critical in shaping their

---

[2] For instance, she (ibid., p. 4), at one occasion, remarks: "Continuing to rebel against his father's conservatism, he attempted to participate, at first in his imagination, later in his earliest stories, in the revolution brewing in the Punjab."

worldview. As noted earlier, Manto was a rebel, a non-conformist, by nature. He wanted to see and experience life with his own spectacles, wishing to have no impediment in his own peculiar view of things, and his father's authoritative attitude and lack of understanding of his son's desires had helped exacerbate it, turning Manto into a stubborn person who would make sure that he follows his desires and likes, no matter how much it would be against social norms and conventions.

An overview of Manto's short stories reveals that almost every other story deliberately touches upon controversial topics, the most significant being that of sex. He talks explicitly about sex (cf. *Thanda Gosht*, *Boo*, *Kali Shalwar*, *Mozail*, *and Khol Do*) – a topic that was considered a taboo in a society where religion was not just an individual concern or limited to offering prayer; instead, it had a lasting influence on the society and its norms, shaping public opinions and behaviours. It is hard to find traces of any events in his childhood which would have triggered this powerful love for depicting sex in his fiction, and we can safely say that Manto's passion for themes related to sex, such as sexual perversion (cf. *Boo*, *Dhuan*, and *Blowse*), was inherent in him. It seems to be more a matter of mental disposition and personal preferences which influenced his belief system more than anything else (see below), not anything else, which made him choose such topics for his stories. The following incident, which is strangely not mentioned by any of Manto's critics, biographers, and academic researchers, may well support the point made above. It is related to Manto's result on an Inkblot test[3] taken when he was admitted to Lahore Mental Hospital for the cure of his uncontrolled alcoholism (see Section 2.2.1.2). Orya Maqbool Jan, an influential Urdu columnist, who happens to have served in the same mental hospital as a trainee for two years, has reported that he once got a chance to see the result of the said test in some Dr Aziz's file (Jaan, 2013). Interestingly, what he found was that Manto could not see anything in the images shown to him other than sexual deeds and organs. The test result supports the idea that his mind had a particular inclination towards sexual thoughts, which manifested in the themes of his short stories. He was so much obsessed with the theme of sex that it found a premier place in his ideology of life:

---

[3] Inkblot test, also known as Rorschach test, was devised by Herman Rorschach (1884-1922), a Swiss psychiatrist (Carducci, 2009, p. 115). The test "consists of 10 inkblots on a white background…The individual is shown each card separately and asked to indicate what the card looks like (e.g., two people dancing) and what factors influence the response" (ibid.).

دنیا کا سب سے بڑا مسئلہ، یعنی تمام مسئلوں کا باپ اس وقت پیدا ہوا تھا جب آدم نے
بھوک محسوس کی تھی۔ اور اس سے چھوٹا مگر دلچسپ مسئلہ اس وقت پردہ ظہور پر آیا تھا جب دنیا
کے اس سب سے پہلے مرد کی دنیا کی سب سے پہلی عورت سے ملاقات ہوئی تھی۔(Manto, 2007c,
p. 684)

*The biggest problem of the world, i.e. the father of all problems, took birth when
Adam felt hungry. And a smaller, but interesting, issue surfaced when this first man
of the world met the first woman of the world.*

He (ibid.) goes on to call these two as the roots of all issues:

یہ دونوں مسئلے، جیسا کہ آپ جانتے ہیں دو مختلف قسم کی بھوکیں ہیں جن کا آپس میں بہت گہرا تعلق
ہے_____یہی وجہ ہے کہ ہمیں اس وقت جتنے معاشرتی، مجلسی، سیاسی اور جنگی مسائل نظر آتے ہیں
ان کے عقب میں یہی دو بھوکیں جلوہ گر ہیں۔

*These two issues, as you know, are two different types of hunger, closely related to
each other. That is why, these two hungers are to be seen behind all social,
communal, political and war-based issues that we see nowadays.*

It is perhaps because of this belief that most of Manto's short stories are replete with
topics such as sexual orientation and a *half-baked* sense of it as experienced by a
twelve-year-old (cf. *Dhuwan*), abnormal and suppressed sexual thoughts and desires
(cf. *Boo*), and an outrageous *burst* of these desires (cf. *Thanda Gosht*).

In conclusion, we can say that it was Manto's personal preference or penchant for an
explicit depiction of sex as well as his rebellious attitude towards any authority that
owed much to his childhood experiences, which predominantly carved him into what
he was as a writer. He was a rebel to the core (Narang, 1997, p. 2; Mufti, 2005, p.
141; Shireen, 2012b, p. 207) and whatever society tried to stop him from, he was sure
to do it. This is manifested in his continuous portrayal of sex in quite explicit terms in
his work even after the court trials, boycotts, and critical denigration that he incurred
on him.

2.2.1.2 Later Life Influences:

Manto's father died in 1932 and the strictness that Manto had felt in the household in
his father's presence was no more there. It is, nonetheless, also true that, when his
father was alive, Manto had the luxury not to worry about household responsibilities,
financial matters, and his future. The situation now was, nonetheless, very different.
Manto (cited in Usmani, 2012, pp. 335-336) mentions the situation that he suddenly
found him in as follows:

قبلہ ام والد ماجد کا سایہ سر سے اٹھ جانے کے بعد خاندانی حالات کے مد نظر چند دشواریاں پیش آ گئیں
جن سے بخوبی عہدہ بر آ ہونا مجھ سے صغر سن کے لیے حد سے زیادہ مشکل تھا۔

The protective shadow of my father having been taken away by his death, the changing family circumstances gave rise to certain hardships which were difficult for me to tackle fully because of my young age.

Manto now realised that he had to meet several serious challenges related to his family, finances, and future. It was perhaps owing to these thoughts lurking in the background of his mind that he decided to receive higher education (ibid, p. 336), enrolling at Ali Garh Muslim University,[4] however he soon left the institute.

In the next few years, he had to face several court cases on the charges of producing pornographic literature. Although he was absolved of the charges of obscenity both the times,[5] but the whole process – charges of pornographic depictions, long travels, cross-examination in the court, etc. – rendered him "not only physically discomfited, but was mentally too taxed for his comfort" (Kumar, 1997, p. 140), leaving deep marks on his sensitive mind (Nagi, 2012, p. 216). These perhaps contributed to the increasingly ironic and sarcastic tone of his later work, which reached its pinnacle in his post-partition stories (see Section 2.2.2.1).

The partition of the Subcontinent into Pakistan and India took place on 14-15 August 1947. Manto's family had already moved to Lahore, Pakistan, but he had stayed in Bombay, India, where he had recently started working for a film company *Bombay Talkies* (Fleming, 1985, p. 16). His family was insistent on his moving to Pakistan, but he wanted to stay. Leaving Bombay was like leaving his heart. However, soon, this romantic side of Bombay shattered, giving way to a living nightmare for Manto. The company started receiving a series of letters which demanded that Manto and all other Muslims who were working in the company be sacked and threatened to set the company on fire in case their demand was not fulfilled (ibid, p. 16). With every passing day, the environment was becoming more and more intense, leaving Manto with no other choice but to say goodbye to his beloved city (Nagi, 2012, p. 212). To

---

[4], though, he had to leave the University soon, leaving his education incomplete.

[5] The detail of these court trials and Manto's written defence that he submitted to the court can be found in his essay *Lazat-e-Sang* (Manto, 2007b, pp. 613-640). The points that he made in his defence highlight his views about literature, sex, and his literary philosophy. This essay, along with his other two essays, titled *Afsana Nigar aur Jinsi Masail* (Manto, 2007c, pp. 684-689) and *Zehmat Mehr-e-Darakhshan* (Manto, 2007a, pp. 351-403), provides valuable insight into Manto's philosophy about sex, literature, and life.

add fuel to the fire, the time since his departure to Pakistan to his death in 1955 was of utmost distress for him. He tried to find a place in the film industry, radio, and newspapers, but nothing materialised in his favour (Fleming, 1985, p. 17). Manto's erotic stories met severe criticism and chastisement, and he had to face further court trials for this. Progressive Writers' Association (see Section 2.2.2.2) boycotted him and friends shunned his company (as the once egotistic Manto had now debased himself to the extent of asking anyone he met to lend him money),[6] and some of the literary magazines refused to publish his stories.[7] It was a time of unprecedented agony and anguish for Manto. He was not able to fend for his family adequately, and he took escape in drinking an excessive amount of a very low-quality local whiskey (Ash'ar, 2012, p. 73).

His constant alcoholism eventually took its toll. In August 1953, Manto was diagnosed with liver cirrhosis (H. Jalal, 1997, p. 17). For the next two years, he tried to give up drinking several times, but all such attempts proved temporary in effect. Eventually, he started spitting blood in the evening of January 1955. In the morning, he was rushed to the hospital, but he died on the way. The date was 18 January 1955.

It seems that the partition and the hardships resulting from it had deeply affected him. He made it a backdrop of most of his post-partition short stories (*Toba Tek Singh*, *Khol Do*, and *Thanda Gosht* are some of the most famous short stories touching on the theme of the partition). Also, his writings became more biting and sarcastic (*Siyah Hashiye* is an excellent example of this), which we can, at least partially, attribute to the traumatic events of his life post the partition.

2.2.2 Socio-political and Literary Influences:

2.2.2.1 A Brief Look at Manto's Literary Career:

A natural writer, Manto started writing in the school magazine when he was in the 8th grade. However, while at college, he, along with his two friends, Hasan Abbas and

---

[6] Manto's grandniece, Ayesha Jalal (2012, p. 207), comments on it: "To the dismay of his family, he borrowed from all and sundry, humiliating himself in the process...."

[7] Just for instance, "Nazir Ahmad Choudhary (proprietor of *Naya Daur* and editor of *Savera*) vowed never to publish Manto ever again" (Kumar, 1997, p. 142).

Abu Said Quraishi, spent time in chatting about movies and spending time in useless wandering (Alvi, 2003, p. 17). However, in April 1933, a life-changing event took place when he met Ahmad Bari Alig (A. Jalal, 2013, p. 37), a journalist, who quickly spotted the literary spark in young Manto. He inspired him and his friends to read French and Russian writers, which they did voraciously. These writings made a lasting impact on Manto and reflected in his stories off and on. It was also Bari who urged him to translate Victor Hugo's play *The Last Days of a Condemned Man* in Urdu, which the young Manto completed in a fortnight (date of publication: 1933). Manto was just 21 years of age at the time. This was followed by his translation in Urdu of Oscar Wilde's *Vera*, published in 1934. This he did with the help of one of his friends at the time, Hasan Abbas (Alvi, 2003, p. 19).

Alig's mentoring shaped the young lad into a new Manto. He was now no more a vagabond, and a movie-lover, who wasted his time in useless activities. It seems he had now realised his focus, i.e. writing, and wanted to excel in it. So, when Alig left for Lahore, Manto continued with his interest in writing and started working for another daily newspaper *Ehsan* on a voluntary basis.

By now, through his voracious reading of French and Russian literature and his translations of them, Manto had well-acquainted himself with the art of literary writing in general and short story writing in particular – which would be his primary vehicle of expression in ensuing years. He wrote his first short story *Tamasha* in 1933, which was published in the weekly *Khalq* (Ijaz, 2004, p. 217). After this, there was no looking back. In 1935, he published his first collection of short stories, *Atish Pare* (Flemming, 1985b, p. 152).

A big turn in Manto's life came when he left Lahore for Bombay in late 1936. From this time to 1948, he worked in the film industry, writing film scripts and, at the same time, radio plays. During this time, he enjoyed wide-scale acclaim, popularity, and prosperity (though there came occasions when he was left with a little money, such a situation never lasted long). Being a prolific writer, he somehow spared time to write short stories as well and got his second collection of short stories, *Manto ke Afsane*, published in 1940, which was followed by another, *Dhuan*, in 1941.

One year after the partition of the Subcontinent, Manto left for Pakistan. The period from this time to his death in 1955 proved the most productive, in that he published several collections of short stories, essays, and personal sketches and a novelette during this period. According to an estimate, he wrote 127 short stories in these years (Alvi, 2003, p. 26; Hashmi, 2013). However, his short stories of the post-independence period are generally considered to be much more satiric and ironic than his pre-partition stories, and the mental suffering he was undergoing at the time is considered, for example by Nagi (2012, p. 212), to be the cause of it.

Died at the young age of 42, Manto, in his short literary career, produced a considerable bulk of literature, which comprised translations, short stories, radio dramas, movie scripts, sketches, essays, and a novel.

2.2.2.2 Major Political and Literary Movements:

From its beginning until around 1800, Urdu literature, "composed according to strict rules of form and content and obeying an elaborate set of conventions,…was designed to provide a sophisticated and complex experience of beauty and pleasure to members of an educated, cultured nobility" (Fleming, 1985, p. 22). Naturally, the linguistic style adopted by the writers of the era was marked by complex morpho-syntax, highly decorative diction, and pedantry, as Bailey (1932, p. 94) notes, "Outward expression, mere cleverness of phraseology or thought, was everything; inner beauty, artless simplicity of idea and true seriousness were absent." A turn, however, came with the foundation in Kolkata of the Fort William College by the East India Company on 4 May 1800 (Qadir, 2011, p. 130). The primary purpose of the college set by the Company was "to teach Urdu to the officials from Britain" (Samiuddin, 2007, p. 164). For this purpose, many works falling under the genre of *Dastan*[8] were got translated (Bailey, 1932, p. 134) from Persian into simple Urdu (i.e. an Urdu which was devoid of pompous and difficult diction). The translations conducted at the college laid down the foundation for a new prose style – marking it off, for the first time, from the highly ornamental style of poetry – and made the language of the ordinary people its

---

[8] Dastans were imaginary epic tales of "the fairies, magicians, and the faithful who could defeat them all in a series of unending skirmishes" (Samiuddin, 2007, p. 459). The protagonists were usually shown to possess extraordinary powers that they used to overcome the evil. As is obvious, such tales, written in a romantic mode, were "far removed from reality" (ibid, p. 162).

vehicle of expression (ibid, p. 149). This type of style is what is technically called a demotic style, i.e. "using the language of the common people rather than the formal style of a priesthood or other educated elite" (Baldick, 2001, p. 63). The idiom used was simple, and there was a tendency to avoid excessive use of complex constructions and diction. The style was further promoted when, soon afterwards, Sir Sayyed[9] laid down the foundation of didactic prose basing it on a utilitarian approach of teaching ethics to society, and thus making literature a part of the social process (Bailey, 1932, p. 366). To note, however, is that, though it was mainly the *Ashrafia* (the elite class) for whose ethical training Sir Sayyed produced literature (Amjad, 2011, pp. 373 & 375) – a trend that was to change in the early 20th century fiction – the language used was simple and straightforward (Bailey, 1932, p. 86). Under Sir Sayyed's influence, this writing style was followed by such eminent contemporary writers as Altaf Hussain Hali, Deputy Nazir Ahmad, Abdul Haleem Sharar, and Muhammad Hussain Azad.[10]

It is necessary to understand that Sir Sayyed's movement, commonly known as the Aligarh Movement (Flemming, 1985a, p. 22), was actually socio-political in nature, whose purpose was to make the Muslims of the Subcontinent re-evaluate and redesign their social lives in the light of contemporary European standards (ibid, p. 22). With this purpose in mind, the reformer Sir Sayyed consciously made prose style subservient to this purpose. This *literature-to-serve-a-(didactic/reformatory)-purpose* approach brought a revolution to the Subcontinental literary conventions. The language that Sir Sayyed introduced perfectly suited the purpose of reforming the society: it was effortless and uncomplicated; and short sentences and paragraphs were used. Whatever the writer wanted to say was said in a direct way; puns, exaggerations, far-fetched metaphors, and intricate construction, thus, were deliberately avoided, as Iqbal (2012, p. 37) quotes Sir Sayyed himself explaining his philosophy of literary style as follows:

---

[9] Sayyed Ahmad Khan (1819-1897), famous by the name Sir Sayyed, was an influential reformist of the 19th-century Indo-Pak subcontinent. It was the time when the British had colonised the Subcontinent, and there was much rage against the loss of freedom among the public. Sir Sayyed, who was a government servant, dedicated his life in bridging the gap between the Muslims of the Subcontinent and the British ruling class, and also to urge Muslims to take an interest in adopting the modern Western educational system and thought pattern to pace along with the contemporary world of science and technology.

[10] Bailey (1932) provides a brief but comprehensive piece of information on the literary contribution of these writers.

ہم نے انشاء کا ایک ایسا طرز نکالا ہے جس میں ہر بات کو صاف صاف جیسی کہ دِل میں موجود ہو
متشابہ تکلفات سے بچ کر راست پیرایہ میں بیان کرنے کی کوشش کی ہے۔

I have introduced such a style for prose where [I] have tried to narrate whatever [I] have in my mind in a right way, i.e. avoiding [linguistic] formalities.

Sir Sayyed, thus, adopted an easy-going, straightforward style of writing, though which he was successful in constructing a way of communication that would make the reader feel that the writer was talking directly to them through the pages. Such a prose style was quite suitable for the purposive literature produced under the influence of Sir Sayyed's movement.

As noted above, Sir Sayyed had started the movement to reform his society. However, there was another important reason as well: lessening the tension between the colonised (particularly the Muslims of the Subcontinent) and the colonisers (i.e. the British rulers) and develop a friendly relationship between the two (Bailey, 1932, p. 85). One of the strategies adopted in this regard was to introduce the local people with the technological and scientific advancement of the West. Sir Sayyed took several steps to achieve this, such as he:

- through his writings, especially his essays published in the magazine *Tehzib-ul-Ekhlaq* which he had founded in 1870 (Muhammad, 2002, p. 41), inspired the Muslims of the Subcontinent to get acquainted with the modern-day scientific and technological knowledge of the Occident, which they should then use to grow economically, socially, and politically;
- founded the Scientific Society in 1864 in Aligarh which "held annual conferences, disbursed funds for educational causes and regularly published a journal on scientific subjects in English and Urdu" (Ekbal, 2009, p. 119), which promoted translation of modern knowledge of science from English into Urdu; and
- established several educational institutes to instruct the Muslim youth of the Subcontinent according to "Western-style scientific education" (ibid., p. 116).

The most important attempt in this regard was the foundation of Mohammadan Anglo-Oriental School in Ali Garh in 1985, which became a college in 1878 and, then, a university in 1920 (Hussain, 2009, p. 186). One of the effects of these efforts

was an influx of Western literature into the Subcontinent through translations, an important result of which was "the absorption into Urdu of genres borrowed from European literature" (Bailey, 1932, p. 22). Put precisely, two major prose genres, i.e. novel and short story, made their way into Urdu, the former in the second half of the 19th century (Samiuddin, 2007, p. 459; Naeem, 2012, p. 283) and the latter at the beginning of the 20th century.[11]

As the genre of novel is not related to the present research, we will not discuss it. As regards short story writing, romanticism and social realism emerged as two main literary trends or movements in the early days of its production (Iqbal, 2012, p. 48). The former, whose founding father was Sajjad Haider Yaldram (Amjad, 2011, p. 375), sprung as a reaction to the purpose-based prose (Baig, 2011, p. 375) which began with Sir Sayyed and, in a way, was carried over to the genre of short story writing by Munshi Prem Chand (see below). Yaldram was impressed with Western romanticism (Jamshedpuri, 2002, pp. 10-11), and, like the Romantic poets, especially Wordsworth and Keats, a flight of imagination and depiction of natural beauty seemed to be the hallmarks of his writings. Owing to this, most of what he wrote had utopian overtones and were cut off from the bitter realities of life. The following excerpt from his work would serve as an illustrative example of it:

بس یہ زمانہ میری خوشی کا زمانہ تھا، میں حسینوں سے گھرا رہتا تھا، ہوا میں پریاں میرے پاس آیا کرتی تھیں اور مجھ سے باتیں کیا کرتی تھیں، اور لطیفے کہہ کہہ کے مجھے ہنساتی تھیں، فرشتے ایک زریں سیڑھی پر آسمان سے اتر کر میرے پاس آتے تھے۔ مجھ سے سرگوشیاں کرتے تھے اور مجھے گدگدا کے بھاگ جاتے تھے۔

In short, this period was the time of my happiness. I remained surrounded by beautiful women. Fairies would come [flying] in the air to meet me, and would talk to me, and would make me laugh with their jokes. Angels would descend from skies through a golden ladder, whisper in my ears, tickle me, and run away (Yaldram, p. 160).

This trend, however, was soon to die down, or to be heavily suppressed, under the increasing influence of the social realism "of late nineteenth-century Russian writers" (Flemming, 1985a, p. 22). These Russian writers were keenly observant of the socioeconomic inequality in society and the oppression of the lower class resulting from this inequality. During the same period, proletariat class in Russia rose against their oppression by the upper class, and both the literary and the political movements

---

[11] Most of the scholars, writers, and critics, such as Baig (2011, p. 379), consider *Naseer aur Khadija* as the first Urdu short story. This story written in 1903 by Rashid-ul-Khairi was published in the literary magazine *Mekhzan* (ibid.).

paved the way for the epoch-making revolution in 1917 whose impact was global in scope (Kalo, 2012, p. 245). With its emphasis on giving equal rights to all members of society, socialism became a revolutionary, political, and literary slogan in several parts of the world, including the Subcontinent where writers were most affected by the revolution and the philosophy that led to it. They took it upon them to propagate the socialist ideology of having a classless social system (ibid, p. 245) – a system based on equality and equity. The most important literary figure in the early days of social realism in the Subcontinent was Premchand (1880-1936), who, assuming a socially-entrenched, purpose-based approach (Amjad, 2011, p. 375), explored the problems and sufferings of the lower echelons of society, seeking to increase social awareness in this regard. He was the first short story writer who featured village life in his short stories, and, in order to give a sense of reality, introduced the register of the villagers in his texts (Iqbal, 2012, p. 49). In fact, his writing style went through modification over time (ibid.). When he started writing around 1900, his short stories and novels demonstrated some influence of the old romantic tradition. Though the stories written under this influence (such as *Duniya ka Anmol Ratan* and *Sheikh Makhmoor*) did not adopt the same highly pompous and ornamented language as a whole, they indeed bore traces of it. Notably, the diction he used contained a good number of difficult and archaic words, which were not reflective of the language used by people in day-to-day conversations. However, he soon came out of the influence of romanticism (ibid.), which seems to be an influence of the increasing impact of Russian socialist politics and literature. He started making realistic portrayals of the sufferings of the lower class his themes. He also modified his style to suit his socialist writings. His language reflected the language spoken by the laymen, his diction became simple, and he started preferring simple, one-clause sentences or multi-clause paratactic sentences to hypotactic sentences. Additionally, he tried to avoid overly using such literary devices as metaphors and puns, and also tried to make brevity a hallmark of his writings. An excellent example of this style is his short story *Kafan* (ibid.), which portrays the miserable life of two lower-class individuals mostly using declarative, simple clauses, parataxis, simple diction, and a to-the-point attitude.

Parallel to the political unrest in Russia, there was political turmoil in the Subcontinent, and the native community was gradually realising the need for gaining back freedom for the country. Strikes and riots against the foreign occupation were

taking place, and different political movements and agitations were going on, such as the movement to defend Usmani Khilafat of Turkey, the movement of no cooperation, and the roundtable conferences in the early 1930s. All these were impacting the lives of the ordinary people as well, who were becoming more and more politically aware of what was going on in the country and were becoming part of the political and military movements against the government. The political and military uprising in Amritsar, where Manto lived, was of much importance and was expedited by a very sad incident that took place on 19 April 1919, when on the order of an English officer, the police opened fire directly at a group of peaceful demonstrators, which resulted in the death of 379 people (ibid.). Young Manto was also affected by these different events, and he even made the 1919 massacre a subject matter of a few of his short stories later, including *Tamasha* and *1919 ka Aik Wakeya*.

Meanwhile, at the literary front, social realism introduced by Prem Chand in his stories was only reflective of an individual perspective and had not developed into a fully-fledged literary and political movement. In the 1930s, a group of young writers expressed their formal allegiance to the socialist movement in Russia and started producing literature with a clear political agenda of raising the laymen against their oppression by the elite and the foreign government. Their first literary attempt in this regard was the publication of an anthology of short stories titled *Angaarey* in December 1932 (ibid.). All the short stories in the book openly talked about the oppression of the less-privileged members of society and conveyed a clear message of rising against it. (Around the same time, Manto, influenced by his reading and translating Russian and French literature, wrote his first short story *Tamasha* (see Section 2.2.2.1), which was about the 1919 massacre as witnessed by a young boy.) The book Angaarey gave rise to an influential literary movement, entitled Indian Progressive Writers' Association, which was announced on 5 April 1933 (Ali, 1974, p. 35), and its first conference was held in 1936 (ibid.). A large number of writers came under the influence of this movement and became formal members of it. As an outcome, most of the fiction produced over the next two to three decades bore socialist themes. It was written with the purpose of highlighting the pitiable condition of the less-privileged and inducing revolutionary ideas in the masses.

It was this philosophical, literary, and political background which affected the literary work of Manto and helped shape his ideologies and style of writing.

2.2.3 Manto's Style of Writing according to his Critics:

It should be noted in the outset that, reading through the critiques of the style of Manto, it is easy to see that most, if not all, of them are written with the perspective of literary criticism, not with a linguistic/stylistic perspective. Hence, much of the criticism of his style is based on personal impressions and intuition - a *not-so-healthy* situation which Darvesh (2012, p. 7), writing the foreword of the only book-length investigation into the style of Manto, describes as follows:

<div dir="rtl">
سعادت حسن منٹو کے اسلوب پر بہت کچھ لکھا اور کہا گیا ہے لیکن اس لکھے اور کہے گئے کی حیثیت دعووں اور قیافوں سے زیادہ نہیں ہے۔ محض منٹو کا اسلوب کہہ دینے سے بات نہیں بنتی اور پانچ سات ستائشی جملوں سے منٹو کے اسلوب کا احاطہ ممکن نہیں ہے۔ اردو کے بڑے اور معروف ناقدین نے بھی منٹو کے اسلوب پر عمومی نوعیت کے تاثراتی مضامین رقم کیے ہیں۔
</div>

Much has been written and said about Saadat Hasan Manto's style, but the status of what is written and said is not more than that of claims and guesses. It is not enough to just mention [something as] Manto's style, and it is not possible to cover his style by writing a few exalting sentences. Even the great and famous Urdu critics have written general, impressionistic articles on Manto's style.

There is one point that needs clarification before furthering the discussion. First, though the remarks above claim that "much has been written and said about Manto's style," the fact is that there are very few articles, and just one book, directly discussing his style; the rest of the commentary on his style comprises individual comments scattered here and there in articles which are otherwise not directly about Manto's style of writing. Just for example, in his book on Manto's life and works (which is actually based on his PhD thesis), Bukhari (2006, p. 177) writes only one sentence about Manto's style: "اختصار ان کے اسلوب کی بنیادی خوبی ہے" ("brevity is the main characteristic of his [Manto's] style"). Similar short remarks are scattered in other works, such as that about Manto's use of first person pronoun in some of his short stories (Saddiqui, 2005, p. 136) and Manto's simple diction and brevity (Shahid, 2012, p. 94); so much so that in his whole article on Manto's art of writing, Alvi (2012, p. 92) explicitly refers to Manto's style only once, when he talks about his brevity; much of the rest discusses Manto's themes of sex and perversion as well as atrocious attitude of men towards fellow human beings; similarly, in her article about the various stages of Manto's art of writing, the famous Manto critic, Shireen (2012a,

p. 115) leaves passing remarks on the brevity of his writing, whereas the rest of her critique is mostly about the meaningfulness of his endings and the development of his characters from being natural human beings to incomplete human beings; still another case is a single remark on Manto's style (which is about brevity) by Tang (2012, p. 225) in his article on Manto's short story writing. Azeem's (1982) short book on Manto's art of writing and Iqbal's (2012) book (which was originally her PhD thesis) on Manto's style of writing are a couple of exceptions. Azeem was the first person who discussed Manto's style in some detail, pointing out a few important aspects of it. About three decades later, Iqbal, in her PhD thesis, assorted the various aspects of his style which were mentioned briefly here and there. Both the books are commendable for their efforts, but the fact remains that, apart from a few exceptions, their discussion is either not directly related to style or is based on impressions and hence written with the perspective of literary criticism. For example, Iqbal (2012, pp. 149-180) dedicates a whole chapter, and Azeem (1982, pp. 11-30) a sizeable portion of his book, about the beginning, middle, and end of Manto's stories, giving such impressionistic statements as the beginning captures the attention of the readers, the middle seems to carry out a single theme, and the ending serves typically to startle the readers. There are hardly any arguments and examples linking all this to the linguistic choices made by Manto and explaining how this relates to Manto's style. In other words, these statements about the structure/components of Manto's stories are based on such obvious impressions that any reader is likely to get quite easily when reading not just Manto's writings but that of almost any short story writer. Another similar example of impressionistic detail is when Iqbal (2012, pp. 107-108) talks about the use of similes and metaphors by Manto and tries to prove that these elements of his style serve different purposes; however, she does not show how exactly the words used in the similes and metaphors serve these different purposes. Anyhow, attempting to cover main points of the critical reception of Manto's style, we are presenting below the features described by both these and other writers (excluding the highly random and impressionistic features mentioned above) as characteristic of Manto's style. We will also try to explain the features, where possible, with some concrete examples.

2.2.3.1 Simple, Conversational Language:

Manto extensively read the social realistic literature produced by French and Russian writers. He was also a keen observant of the lives and issues of the socio-economically less privileged. He, thus, made these people the central characters of most of his short stories and adopted a simple, colloquial writing style which reflected the speech style of these people. Another contributing factor in adopting a simple and conversational style may be his simple, straightforward personality and dislike for the affectedness and mannerism characterising the disposition of the upper class.

His diction was simple and "devoid of all metaphoric excess and sentimental inflections" (Bhalla, 2001, p.19); there were hardly any flowery expressions and pedantry. Remarking on this, Khwaja (2012) says:

> The prose style that Manto inherited was complicated and contrived. It was based on a literary idiom and removed from colloquial speech. He, however, was drawn to the language that the people used in everyday life and developed a style of writing that could carry the energy, immediacy, and spontaneity of ordinary speech. His language sounds neither dishonest nor learned, and yet it is able to express complex ideas and themes. The almost careless simplicity of his prose seems eminently suited to his purposes. Being closer to the language of the characters he writes about, it sounds natural, unpretentious, entirely appropriate.

Iqbal (2012, p. 197) points out that, because of this quality of Manto's style, it is not difficult for his readers to understand what he is saying and that is why Manto has always been attracting a massive number of readers. She (ibid, p. 198) also passes a comment on Manto's strategy of making his characters use a language that is typical of the [socio-economic] faction of the society they belong to and quotes some utterances from his stories, but what she does not show is how the random examples she cites are related to the claim. We need concrete examples, something like the following which we are quoting from one of the short stories from the research corpus, *Toba Tek Singh*:

"مولبی ساب! یہ پاکستان کیا ہوتا ہے؟"
"Maulbi Saab! What is this Pakistan?"

In the question, which is asked by a lunatic to another lunatic, the spelling of the honourific is a twisted form of the standard spelling "Maulvi Sahib." The twisted

spelling is, exceptions aside, mostly used by the Urdu speakers who are illiterate and less privileged. Through this use, Manto seems to copy the way such people speak.

In short, except for a very few cases (for example, the short story *Farishte*, where he experiments with the techniques of symbolism and stream of consciousness), he uses explicit, simple expressions, i.e. expressions which are largely devoid of far-fetched similes, metaphors, and puns. Instead, as explained above, he uses a conversational and colloquial idiom which represents the register of the people who feature in his stories. Among other things, this strategy gives a sense of naturalness and fluency to his work, making it easily readable.

2.2.3.2 Brevity (Economy of Words):

Brevity and conciseness seem to be the heart and soul of Manto's style in most of his short stories. He tries to keep his stories simple and short (Iqbal, 2012, p. 102) and devoid of any unnecessary detail (ibid, p. 103). Alvi (2003, p. 45), in this regard, notes that "منٹو کو بہت شروع سے افسانے کے لیے لفظوں کی کفایت شعاری کا شعور تھا۔" (Manto, since the very early days [of his literary career], was cognizant of [the significance of] the economy of words for short story writing). There are several other critics and contemporary writers who claim and appreciate Manto's deftness in packing his stories with just as much detail as is required (cf. the two writers referred to at the beginning of this discussion about style; Akhtar (1991, p. 22) and Shahid (2012, p. 94) are a couple of further examples). Though the claim seems to be an exaggerated one (since there is no way one can claim that such-and-such is precisely the amount of detail required in a short story), Manto was actually aware of the importance of the economy of words, and he tried to observe it in his work. The following remark by Manto (Qasmi, 1991, pp. 58-59) when giving feedback on a short story written by his friend, Ahmed Nadeem Qasmi, shows how conscientious he was of the significance of brevity:

آپ کا افسانہ میں نے پڑھا ۔۔۔۔۔۔۔۔ میری بے لوٹ رائے یہ ہے کہ آپ بقدر کفایت ضبط کو کام میں نہیں لاتے۔ آپ کا دماغ اسراف کا زیادہ قائل ہے۔ ایک چھوٹے سے افسانے میں آپ نے سینکڑوں چیزیں کہہ ڈالیں، حالانکہ وہ کسی دوسری جگہ کام آ سکتی تھیں۔

I read your short story. My sincere opinion is that you do not pay heed to brevity. Your mind is more prone towards providing excessive detail. You have stuffed your small short story with hundreds of details, which could easily have been used somewhere else.

2.2.3.3 Meaningless Words:

Manto seems to be fond of using noun phrases whose constituent words are randomly collocated, and he also sometimes coins meaningless words. Iqbal (2012, p 186) notes the repetition of the following meaningless sentence in *Toba Tek Singh*:

اوپڑ دی گڑ گڑ دی اینکس دی بے دھیانا دی منگ دی وال آف دی لالٹین۔

The sentence seems to be giving no meaning, as most of the words do not come from the lexicon of Urdu or any other language. These are coined by Manto, a possible reason for which (Iqbal (ibid.) is also of a similar opinion) might be that Manto wants to use them as a representation of the ambiguity and uncertainty of the speaker (who is a lunatic), and also to add to the overall ambiguity and uncertainty surrounding the plot (see the analysis of the story in Chapter 5 for detail). Observing other such examples from Manto's various works, Iqbal (ibid., pp. 187-188) lists the following:

کبابستان کے شہزادے and کبیدہ کاٹج, چپر جہن جہن, سپر سن سن.

2.2.3.4 Repetition:

Repetition is another important characteristic of Manto's style (ibid., p. 203). Iqbal (ibid.) notes that writers typically use this strategy to create rhythm, but Manto uses the technique to reinforce the themes of his stories. Repetition of the meaningless sentence in *Toba Tek Singh* (see Section 2.2.3.3) is an example of it. Another excellent example is the repetition of the word گالی (*swear word*) in the short story Naara (see Azeem (1982, pp. 47-52) for a detailed description of the dynamics of this repetition in the story). The protagonist, Keshu Lal, gets badly insulted by his landlord who swears at him for not being able to pay two months' rent. The two swear words he utters stick to Keshu Lal's mind, popping up again and again. The repeated occurrence of them helps show what mental torment he is going through, the description of which constitutes the plot of the story (ibid., p. 51). The story ends with another occurrence of swearing, but this time by Keshu Lal who tries to subdue his bulging emotions of mental suffering by loudly uttering some swear words.

2.2.3.5 Irony and Satire:

Some critics consider irony and satire basic characteristics of Manto's style (see, for example, Ahmad, 2012, p. 45). Ahmad (ibid., p. 26) mentions *Siyah Hashiye* and *Toba Tek Singh* as the best examples of this. *Siyah Hashiye* is an assortment of short stories or sketches consisting mostly of only two to three lines. It is written in the backdrop of the wide-scale violence that broke out in 1947 after independence and seems to highlight the futility and ludicrousness of it. Ahmad (ibid, p. 27) points out some excellent representative examples of irony from the book, such as the following: ایسے قاتل [بھی ہیں] جن کی چھری پیٹ چاک کرتی ہوئی ناف کے نیچے تک جا پہنچتی ہے تو وہ افسردہ ہو کر کہتے ہیں چ، چ، چ، چ، مشٹیک ہو گیا ([there are also] such murderers whose knife cuts the belly down to below the belly button and they say in a sad voice, ahhhh it was a mistake). It is ironic that the stone-hearted murderers feel no shame in killing a person, but do feel it when they mistakenly cut their bellies down to the private parts, as if cutting the private parts was a heinous act, but not cutting other parts of a person. Similarly, Iqbal (2012, p. 129) considers the repetition of the meaningless sentence in the story cited under Section 2.2.3.3 an ironic commentary on "meaningless and purposeless historical and social circumstances."

2.2.3.6 Third and First Person Pronouns:

Iqbal (2012, p. 115) remarks that narrative style, by which she seems to mean stories written in third person pronoun, is the foremost [interpersonal] technique in Manto's short stories (all three short stories in our research corpus are written in third person pronoun), and mentions that such a technique makes the writer omnipresent; they know each and everything happening with the characters and, thus, do not need to quote events or describe settings. Though it is true that the technique gives much presence to the writer, the claim that they do not need to mention any events or describe a setting seems out of Context. As the analysis of the short stories in the next three chapters, especially that of *Hatak* in Chapter 6, would show, the omnipresent writer does quote events from the lives of their characters to highlight some of their characteristics, and he also describes a setting, such as that of the room of Sugandhi, *Hatak*'s protagonist.

Iqbal (ibid, p. 224) also points out that Manto makes use of first person pronoun as well in some of his short stories, such as *Mumm* and *Babu Gopi Nath*. Writer's participation in these stories gives more authenticity and a sense of reality to the events described in them.

2.2.3.7 Dialogue-based Stories:

Apart from the narrative technique that we have referred to in the section above, Manto, as Iqbal (2012, p. 230) points out, writes some of his short stories in the form of dialogues, whereby the story progresses with two or more characters shown engaged in talking with each other.

2.2.3.8 Free Association of Thought and Stream of Consciousness:

Iqbal (2012, p. 136) also mentions that, in one of his stories, *Phundane*, Manto uses the techniques of free association of thought and stream of consciousness. It is the story of a girl who is shown thinking about various events of her life in a manner which mostly seems disjointed, as she jumps from one thought to the other. Consider the following excerpt:

دلہن کو جانے کیا سوجھی، کم بخت نے جھاڑیوں کے پیچھے نہیں، اپنے بستر پر صرف ایک بچہ دیا____جو بڑا گل گوتھنا، لال پھندنا تھا۔ اس کی ماں مر گئی____باپ بھی____دونوں کو بچے نے مارا____اس کا باپ معلوم نہیں کہاں تھا۔ وہ ہوتا تو اس کی موت بھی ان دونوں کے ساتھ ہوتی۔ سرخ وردیوں والے سپاہی بڑے بڑے پھندنے لٹکائے جانے کہاں غائب ہوئے کہ پھر نہ آئے۔ باغ میں بلّے گھومتے تھے جو اسے گھورتے تھے، اس کو چھیچھڑوں کی بھری ہوئی ٹوکری سمجھتے تھے حالانکہ ٹوکری میں نارنگیاں تھیں۔

It is not clear what transpired to the bride, the wretched gave birth, behind bushes...no, on her bed, to only one child, who was fluffy, and was a red tuft. His mother died – father too – both were killed by the child___ Not sure where his/her [?] father was. If he were there, his death would also have taken place along with them. No idea where the band members wearing red uniforms and big tufts disappeared and never came back. Tomcats roamed about the garden and they stared at him/her [?], they considered him/her [?] a basket full of pieces of flesh, when, in reality, there were oranges in the basket.

Through this haphazard detail, Manto tries to suggest a true, unfiltered representation of the thought process of the character. She starts thinking about the bridegroom (the marriage is taking place between dogs), pauses for a while when she forgets that the child the bitch gave birth to was born on a bed, not behind the bushes. The strange image she has in her mind of the child is that of a red tuft (which is the title of the

story as well). At this point, another thought suddenly pops up, which is that of the death of the mother and the father. We are given no detail when and how this happened; we are just told that she recalls that they were killed by the child. Then she suddenly jumps to another thought: that of someone's father, who would also have been killed if he were there. It is not clear whose father she is talking about; it might be that she is referring to her own father, but it is not clear from the passage. The next thought relates to the drummers, which is followed by the thought of tomcats and finally of a basket containing oranges. Throughout the story, repetition of the word *tuft* serves to give a connection, in a symbolic way (see the section below), to the otherwise disjointed speech.

2.2.3.9 Symbolism:

Iqbal (2012, p. 89) mentions *symbolism* as one of the characteristics of Manto's style. She considers the character of Mangoo, the protagonist of Neya Qanoon, symbolic of the helpless society. Similarly, she (ibid, p. 90) considers the story Toba Tek Singh symbolic of the chaos and uncertainty in society. What she does not do is to give examples from these stories and try to establish how the character of Mangoo and the story of Toba Tek Singh are symbolic. Similarly, she (ibid, p. 135) points out that the title of the story *Phundne* (*Tufts*) symbolises sexuality and violence. Again, we are not told how the linguistic choices in the story make it symbolic, however, reading the story, we can see that the word phundne is used almost every time there is a reference to murder or sex, and we can, thus, infer that it is this linguistic association and repetition that serves as a motivation behind Iqbal's remarks.

2.3 Translators in Socio-cultural Context:

Giving an interview, the translator Ratan commented "a translator has no style of his own. His basic task is to interpret the writer correctly. With every new writer his manner of writing is bound to change" (Sharma, 2004). This remark is reflective of a general trend in the Indo-Pak region whereby translators are considered negligible, so much so that introductions and short reviews of translations available online (in blogs, online issues of newspapers and magazines, etc.) and offline (print issues of newspapers and magazines) mainly discuss the source text author and the source text

with only one or two lines mentioning the translator and the target text, and occasionally not even a word about them, as for example, in a review of Khalid Hasan's book consisting of the translation of Manto's short stories, there is not a single word about the translator or the translation; everything in the review relates to Manto (Review of Kingdom's End, 1988). Consequently, meagre detail is normally available on the life, education, ideologies, literary and translation perspectives, writing style, and translation quality of translators, including the translators in our corpus. In the following, however, we will attempt at giving as much relevant detail as possible.

2.3.1 Jai Ratan:

Jai Ratan (1917-2012) was a prolific translator, who translated "over 600 short stories and more than a dozen novels into English" (ibid.). He translated most of the top-rank Urdu, Hindi, and Punjabi writers including Manto, Tagore, Bedi, Chander, and Bishen Sahni. Considering the enormous volume of his work, he can easily be called the most prolific translator in India (see, for example, Rockwell, 2015).

No detail is available about Ratan's childhood and later-life experiences, and the only information available about his education and profession is that he secured his Master's degree from Foreman Christian College, Lahore, spent some time teaching at a college in Ludhiana, and then joined the Thapar Group in "Kolkata as a business executive" (Sharma, 2004).

From his experience as a professional translator, the present researcher has learnt that literary translation has never been a full-time profession for translators in the 20th century Sub-continent, and the situation is the same in the 21st century as well. Literary translators are not paid enough, and most of the literary translators have other full-time jobs (just like what we have noted about Ratan above) and they translate only as a passion, not as a profession. Ratan's following remark reflects not only his situation, but it is also reflective of the overall situation of the treatment of translators in the Indo-Pak region: "I had a regular job and did translations for the sheer fascination of it. Whenever I read something beautiful, I felt an urge to render it into English (ibid.)."

Because of this situation, there have not been regular or stringent editorial or publisher demands in place for literary translations, and the translators have been enjoying much freedom in treating the ST. As a consequence, we can observe all sorts of translation strategies being applied in literary translations. For example, on a scale of literariness, we can see literal, mixed (that is, both literal and free in the same work), and free translations (as the analysis of our corpus will reveal, all three translators employ these strategies in their translations with varying degrees). However, it appears that, owing to the narrow perspective of conceiving of translators as mere representatives of the ST authors having no writing style of their own, literal translations have mostly been approved, whereas free translations largely disapproved, by the critics in the Indo-Pak region; any omissions and additions have been severely frowned upon (an excellent example of it is the severe criticism of Khalid Hasan's translation of Manto's *Toba Tek Singh* by Asaduddin (1996)). Interestingly, even some foreign critics, academicians, and translators, when working on the sub-continental literature, seem to favour literal translation. The following remark passed by Rockwell (2015) as a reason to announce Ratan's translations bad, reflects this trend:

> If one goes over them word by word, line by line, alongside the original text, one begins to see the mystery of his craft. Whole passages and paragraphs are omitted; poems and songs are paraphrased rather than translated; and sometimes, in a flight of fancy, he's felt moved to insert a few sentences of his own creation.

It is important to note that, apart from these general critical remarks contingent upon mere intuition and impressions, evaluations of Ratan's works have not been based on empirical, systematic, and objective enquiry (and, as we will see below, this has been the case with other translators as well).

2.3.2 Khalid Hasan:

Khalid Hasan (1934-2009) was a journalist, columnist, and translator. Born in Srinagar, Kashmir, he did graduation from Murray College, Sialkot (Renowned Journalist). He, then, did a myriad of jobs, including teaching at a college in Murree, working in the Income Tax department, and serving as the first press secretary of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the late Prime Minister of Pakistan (ibid.). However, all these

were short professional stints, and his permanent professional career has been in the media industry. He served at reporter and columnist for various Pakistani English language journals, and at the time of death, he was working for The Daily Times and The Friday Times, Lahore, while he was based in Washington, USA (ibid.).

As a reporter and columnist he earned much fame and popularity, so much so that, in a blog post, Abbas (2006) placed him at the third place on a list of top ten columnists of Pakistan. Among other things, the language he used in his reports and columns helped establish his ascendancy over many other Pakistani English journalists and columnists. He had a strong command of the English language, and he used it in a near-native and fluent way. It did not give the impression of a non-native writing with a forced style. He adopted a conversational, day-to-day idiom in his columns. Observing these characteristics, Akbar (2009), a fellow journalist, paying tribute to him a couple of days after Hasan's death, commented: "Khalid Hasan wrote one of the best rhythmical-conversational styles in English". Akbar (ibid.) also notes that "he was hardworking, with a nose for the story of the day, sending in half a dozen reports daily plus extremely readable and popular weekly columns for TFT and DT" – a remark that shows Hasan's deep affiliation with his profession. It is but natural that, when he came to translating Manto and other writers, his professional background and style of writing should have influenced his translation strategies and literary style of writing. As a vivid example, his translations of Manto's work (as our analysis of the selected Hasan translations will also reveal) display a conversational style of writing (ibid.). He usually avoided unfamiliar words and long, complex sentences, preferring common words and short sentences. It may also be interesting to note that, as informed by Javed (2009), he even wrote a small book titled "Style Book: A Guide for Writing Simple and Correct English". This general writing style was highly compatible with the language in the Manto stories he translated, since Manto's style, as noted in 2.2.3.1, also had these features. However, when it comes to the style of particular STs, Hasan's translations have met severe criticism (e.g. Ispahani, 1988; Asaduddin, 1996; Bhalla, 2001). Bhalla (2001, p. 20), for example, reviewing one of his collections of Manto translations, comments as follows:

> Unfortunately, his collection, Mottled Dawn: Fifty Sketches and Stories of Partition, by Manto, is deeply flawed. There are two serious problems with the book. One, its translations are highly inaccurate and disfigure the original. Two, it has no recognisable editorial policy.

Having questioned Hasan's selection of Manto's short stories (which he considers editorial mistakes), Bhalla (ibid., p. 21) provides the following reasons for calling his translations inaccurate and disfiguring the STs:

> If Hasan as an editor offers us a Manto whose writings on the partition are considerably diluted, as a translator he recreates for us a Manto who is substantially compromised and damaged as a writer. Not only does he give to Manto's stories English titles which have no recognisable relationships with the original ones in Urdu, he also dismembers and scramble their structures, deletes paragraphs, summarises significant dialogues, omits details about characters, transforms long monologues into comfortable paragraphs, converts broken sentences and hesitant speech into smoothly flowing prose, and adds information about Islamic history and the formation of Pakistan for Kafirs, so as to make Manto both into a communal partisan and a weak storyteller.

What this remark, as well as the discussion that follows in Bhalla's article, suggests is that Hasan has opted for a fluent and free translation by changing ST titles, omitting paragraphs, summarising long detail, and creasing out into fluent English any ST sentences which, in order to reflect the conversation of a hesitant speaker, contain long ellipsis and dashes. Bhalla shows how the normalization, omission, and addition strategies adopted by Hasan when translating change the way the ST expresses the subject matter, which is related to the inhumanity, indifference, cruelty, and senselessness that the killers displayed during the communal violence that erupted post-partition of the Indo-Pak subcontinent in 1947. Instead of retaining the ST effects of cold-blooded indifference, mindlesslessness and ridiculousness in the TT, Hasan reports them like a news reporter, for whom a murder is just a piece of news devoid of any sentiments.

Thinking of the possible reasons, we can probably name the following: (1) Hasan's background as a reporter and columnist, and not as a literary man, (2) his established and distinguished status in his profession coupled with a sense of independence in the absence of any publisher/client demands (see Section 2.3.1 as well), and (3) writing for mono-lingual English readers with the aim of introducing Manto to the countries outside of the Subcontinent. Being a devoted reporter and columnist, Hasan may be influenced by the reporting convention of simply reporting news in an easy-to-understand conversational style, and he might not have the idea how important it is to understand the significance of and retain deliberately distorted ST language. Secondly, he is famous among his readers and colleagues as an excellent reporter and

columnist, and hence it is possible that, under the influence of the powerful position he occupies in his field of profession, he feels entitled to deviate from the ST as much as he wants in order to make his own voice stronger than that of Manto. Apart from this entitlement is the sense of independence conferred upon the Urdu literary translators by the absence of demands from the publishers and source authors. So, it is almost solely upon them to make translation decisions and adopt any particular strategies. As already pointed out, literary translation in or from Urdu is usually done out of mere love for literature and/or a particular writer, and also for introducing a writer to the West. An illustrative example of the last point is Khalid Hasan's (1991, ix) following remark which he puts forward to explain why he adds in his translations of Manto stories religious identity of characters:

> While in the subcontinent the irony of the pieces would be quite clear in every case to the reader, it may not be so **outside the region**. I have, therefore, taken the liberty here and there, of identifying an occasional character by the religion he professes, in order to aid understanding (emphasis added).

As this remark shows, it seems that the main motivation for Hasan to translate Manto's short stories was to introduce the local genius to the English-speaking world, and as his intended audience is these people, he, adopting the strategy of explicitation, adds some detail here and there to make any indigenous cultural and political references clear to his readers.

2.3.3 Tahira Naqvi:

Tahira Naqvi (b. 1945) was born in Abadan, Iran in 1945 (Rustomji-Kerns, 2005). Her parents were Pakistani, who shifted to Pakistan when Naqvi's age was three. Compared to Ratan, her education and profession are related to the study of Urdu and English literature. Rustomji-Kerns (ibid.) notes that she did a B.A. in English literature in 1966 and an M.A. in Psychology two years later. Later, she moved to the USA in 1971 (Ali, 2004) where she earned an M.S. in education in 1983. Since then, she has been teaching Urdu at various American institutes. Currently, she is teaching Urdu as a senior lecturer at New York University (Naqvi, Faculty Profile on NYU Website).

Compared to the other two translators, her involvement with language, literature, and translation seems more wholesome and engrossed, in that she has been engaged with Urdu language, literature, and translation not only as a hobby but also in her profession as an Urdu lecturer, and is currently a member of American Translators Association and is on the Board of Fiction Editors for Catamaran: A Journal of South Asian American Literature (ibid.). She has translated several important literary figures of Urdu, including, but not limited to, Manto, Khadija Mastur, Munshi Premchand, and Ismat Chughtai. Considering her credentials, it is expectable that she has good know-how of the specifics of translation in general and that of Urdu to English translation and the local practices and norms in particular. It is probably because of this cognizance that she tries to remain close to the ST style in her translations. As an example, see the following comment in a blog, dedicated to literary commentary, on Naqvi's translation of Ismat Chughtai's novels: "Tahira Naqvi's translation from the Urdu is top-notch as she keeps all phrases and words intact, where they should be" (The Crooked Line).

The first translation she did was of a selection of Manto's short stories, published in Flemming (1985a). Later, however, she dedicated her life writing for women and translating books authored by women. Under this undertaking, she authored two short story books and translated Khadija Mastur and Ismat Chughtai, especially the latter who she adores to a great extent, probably because of her openly feminist themes (see Ali, 2004).

Before ending the section, it seems pertinent to note that the first collection of the translation of Manto's short stories, which comprised six stories, was carried out by his nephew Hamid Jalal and was published in 1956. Naqvi's collection, which consisted of seventeen short story translations, was only the second collection in this regard, published twenty nine years later. Consdiering that the earliest collection comprised only six short stories in comparison to the seventeen in Naqvi's collection, the latter can be called the first collection truly meriting a book-length representation of Manto's short stories in English. Khalid Hasan's collection appeared two years later and Jai Ratan's still two years later in 1989. The point in making this observation is that the translations were produced at a similar time and the external factors, such as any literary and translation norms and work reception were also similar. Thus, the

major differences, as we have seen above, lie in the professional background of the three translators, as well as individual perspective and preference in regard to translation, and these factors may have impacted their translation style and decisions/strategies. For example, as Naqvi has been teaching, researching, lecturing language and translation, she probably knows that a literal translation would be better to capture the ST style and that it would be more acceptable in the Indo-Pak circle of literary criticism. Both Ratan and Hasan do not seem to have an idea of this acceptability in the local culture, so they deem it fit to digress from the ST at places. Another probable reason for the digressions in their translations may be that they did these translations specifically for native English readers.

2.4 Conclusion:

We have attempted to dig out some possible extra-textual factors which may have impacted the ideology and writing style of Manto and the translators. Particularly, the short survey of the critical reception of the style of Manto and the translators has given us some valuable information about certain elements of their style; for example, in the case of Manto, this includes simplicity of language, economy of words, repetition, irony and satire, and a few narrative techniques. On the other hand, whereas Naqvi tends to remain close to the ST form, the other two translators tend to add, omit, and make other changes. Though there are a couple of good critical research articles available on Khalid Hasan's translation, critical reception of his and other translators and especially that of Manto's style is largely based on intuition and impression. The survey also indirectly highlights the lack of a linguistically-informed micro-level analysis of the style of these writers – i.e. an analysis that would take into account transitivity, modality, and thematic structures and map the findings onto the macro-level stylistic and semantic features of a story. In our pioneering study, we will attempt at filling this gap by drawing a micro-level analysis of the patterns of lexico-grammatical features of Manto's and the translators' style in the selected short stories and translations. By this, we hope to add to the current body of knowledge and bring to light aspects of their style and particular translation strategies which hitherto have not been explored.

Chapter 3: Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

The theoretical and conceptual framework of the study is based on the stylistic approach to literature and translation. Particularly, it is Leech and Short's description of style that informs the study.

On a general note, the basic and most important contribution by theories of style is that they shift attention from *what is said* to *how it is said*. The message in the text can be rendered in several ways, but the author builds the linguistic structure in such a way that it reflects their particular perspective on it; they also have to cater to various linguistic, cultural, and interpersonal constraints, giving the text a particular outlook. So it is not just the message, but this particular way of rendering it which interests stylisticians, who go as far as to say that the meaning of the text is embodied not in the content, but in style, i.e. how the content is rendered in the text (cf. Boase-Beier, 2004, p. 29), and as such "the translator must pay close attention to the style itself and it will reveal the meaning to be transferred into the target language" (ibid., 2006, p. 33).

In the following, we will define style in some detail, also clarifying the position we take in this regard in our study. We will, then, narrow it down to the specific use of it in our study in the light of the particular conceptual stance that we will take. This will be followed by a brief introduction to how style in translation has been studied so far and how our research aims to contribute to it.

3.1. Defining Style:

Style, the roots of which are found in the ancient knowledge of rhetoric (Verdonk, 2002, p. 79; see also Brian (2015) for detail on the relationship between rhetoric and style), is an elusive concept (Enkvist, 1973, p. 11; Munday, 2008, p. 20), one that, like all other abstract linguistic concepts, gives rise to a medley of controversies. In the following, we shall take a brief overview of the main concepts related to this construct and clarify which position we take in our study.

Put simply, "'style' refers to a way of doing something" (Coupland, 2007, p 1). Adopting a particular way, for example in dressing, walking, and talking, signifies the particular style of an individual. Thus, we can say that style, in the social setting, refers to the choices that one makes in the physical world. By the same token, style in writing is the linguistic choices that the author makes (cf. Snell-Hornby, 1995, p. 123). In other words, style is choice. The language in which a piece of literature is produced offers various linguistic options to the author to present a particular point, and it is they who choose an option and dismiss others. These options manifest in specific morpho-syntactic, lexical, semantic, graphological, phonological, and pragmatic choices.

Distinction is usually made between individual, genre, period and group/school styles (Leech and Short, 2007, p. 11), on the basis of which Munday (2008, p. 20) divides it into three categories: individual (which reflects a writer's linguistic habits and is specific to them), collective ("specific to a genre" (ibid.)), to which we can perhaps add a style specific to a group or school of writers, such as the simple, unpretentious and straightforward style adopted by the writers related to the 19th century Aligarh Movement in the Subcontinent (cf. Section 2.2.2.2; see also Marco (2004) which is a study on "the notion of calque as one of the traits that define the translating practices of a group of Catalan translators belonging to the so-called *noucentista* literary movement" (ibid., p. 75)), and the one which is specific to a period (for example the so-called Latin American boom in the 1960s and 1970s (Munday, 2008)). To this list, we can probably add another category, namely, textual style ("style of texts," in Leech and Short's (2007, p. 11) words), which refers to the stylistic features specific to a text, which are not necessarily part of a writer's habitual use across texts. It is this notion of style that the present study subscribes to and that will be explained in some detail in the next section.

An important relevant question is "whether style is an unconscious process or a matter of conscious control among writers" (Butler, 2008, p. 3). When we go by the common definition of style – i.e. it represents an individual writer's linguistic choices (cf. Snell-Hornby, 1995, p. 123) – we obviously are talking about the conscious elements of a textual language. This, however, does not mean that the unconscious (and thus unmarked) textual elements are ignored in all studies of style. There are linguists,

such as Mona Baker (see, for example, Baker (2000) and Jeremy Munday (e.g. Munday, 2008)), who do not just take the consciously made textual choices as representative of style. To them, style also refers to the linguistic habits of a writer spread across their literary aura. In other words, for these linguists, a writer's style of writing consists of both the consciously made choices and the unconscious habitual usage (cf. Baker, 2000, p. 246; Munday, 2008, p. 7). The present study goes by this description of style, assuming both conscious and unconscious linguistic choices as representative of a writer's style (cf. Bourdieu 1996, p. 85).

It is also important to ask if the style of a writer includes one-off instances or develops into a pattern over the course of the development of the text. Following the scholars studying style with a functional perspective, the present study takes style "as a series of patterned lexical [and grammatical] selections" (Munday, 2008, p. 28). The author, consciously or unconsciously, develops a pattern out of their micro-level lexico-grammatical choices, and this pattern reflects their style. This emphasis on *patterned choices* precludes one-off linguistic instances to be taken into account (ibid., p. 28; see also Baker, 2000, p. 245). So, in our pursuit of comparing the texts in reference to style, we will be closely looking at the patterns that the micro-level linguistic choices develop across the text.

3.2 Style as an Expression of Subject Matter or Central Idea:

Leech and Short (2007) distinguish between two types of style, which they call style1 and style2. This is how they (ibid., p. 33) define them:

> Style1 is 'how language is used in a given context' (language use against the background of the language code), and style2 is 'how language renders some subject matter' (language use against the background of referential reality).

The first type refers to the choices that a writer generally makes and which are not related to a specific text. As such, we can call them part of a writer's general style, which they use on habitual basis. The second type, on the other hand, refers to the choices a writer makes in a text to present a subject matter in a specific manner. To illustrate the point, we can take an example from our corpus. The subject matter or the central idea in the story *Toba Tek Singh* is depicting the chaos that erupts as the news

of the exchange of *lunatics* between Pakistan and India reaches a lunatic asylum in Lahore, and presenting the quest of a lunatic to know the whereabouts of his hometown, Toba Tek Singh. When presenting these different strands of the story, Manto uses a battery of patterned choices, including the use of (1) agentless processes or processes not pointing to a specific agent to create a macro-level stylistic effect of anonymity and uncertainty, (2) adjuncts of negation and that of intensity to highlight the idiosyncratic personality of Bishen Singh, the protagonist, and (3) repetition of the question "where is Toba Tek Singh?" to emphasise the salience of the quest for the protagonist. So, through different patterned choices Manto presents the subject matter in a specific way: There is a sense of anonymity and confusion prevalent in the lunatic asylum; in this bewildering environment, the introduction of Bishen Singh by the middle of the story gives a hope that, eventually, the sense of anonymity and uncertainty would diminish. However, he appears no less, if not more, uncertain and confused than the other inmates. He is presented as standing on his legs for the last fifteen years; he does not lie down, he does not sleep, and he does not have an idea of space and time. Influenced by this deliberate portrayal of his character by Manto, we, the readers, are likely to conceive of him as a person who is just another contributor to, or a victim of, the chaotic environment he inhabits. However, we are told that the man is not actually oblivious of everything. The one thing he has some idea about is his home town Toba Tek Singh, about the whereabouts of which he repeatedly asks others. Even in his confused state of mind, he recalls that it is the place where he is from and where he has his land.

From the detail above, what we can discern is that, if the pattern of choices made by Manto is changed while keeping the subject matter more or less in contact, the expression or representation of the text will not remain the same. For example, if Bishen Singh is not portrayed, through the repeated use of adjuncts of negation, as having no sense of things around him, the contrasting information of his having an idea about and attachment with his home town may not have created such a poignant effect. Similarly, if we replace the agentless process in the beginning of the text, a strong stylistic effect of anonymity and uncertainty will not surface.

Style2 is the type of style that Leech and Short (2007, p. 11) announce to be the main focus of their book, calling it "the style of texts." The reason for this preference is that

"the more general the domain, the more general, selective and tentative are the statements about its style," whereas the study of style in a particular text gives us an opportunity to pass more exhaustive, objective, and reliable statements about the style. In Leech and Short's (ibid.) words:

> In a text we, can study style in more detail, and with more *systematic* attention to what words or structures are chosen in preference to others. We can exhibit our material on the page, and examine the interrelations between one choice of language and another. We can thus put our study *on a firmer basis of observation and evidence* than if we took a broader domain…. So if we think of style as 'the linguistic characteristics of a particular text', *we shall be on the safest ground* (emphasis added).

Following Leech and Short, we will engage in exploring style in terms of how the author has presented the subject matter in the selected stories and what stylistic effects are produced in the process (see also Leech and Short, ibid., pp. 5 & 31- 32). At the same time, it should be noted that as the style in a text more likely than not contains elements of individual (i.e. habitual) style as well, they will also be pointed out where necessary but the main focus, as pointed out above, will remain the style particular to the presentation of the subject matter of a particular text.

Before ending this discussion on defining style, we would like to clarify another aspect briefly. Leech and Short (2007, p. 13) point out two major schools of thought as far as the notion of style is concerned: dualist and monist. The former views style or form as different from content, whereby "what a writer has to say, and how it is presented to the reader" (ibid.) are taken as two different things. The basic tenet is that "that there can be different ways of conveying the same content," one of the most basic examples of which is the active and passive forms of a message. Consider the following example:

> He kicked the ball.
> The ball was kicked by him.

For dualists, both the sentences have the same content, and it is only the form which has been changed from the active to the passive (cf. the illustrative examples and criticism on this aspect in ibid., pp. 17-19). In the terminology of generativism, content forms the *deep structure* of a sentence, whereas form manifests in the *surface structure*, whereby the different forms of the surface structure can have the same deep

structure, as displayed by the example above. Monists, on the other hand, postulate that form and content or meaning are not separate from each other (ibid., p. 21) and hence a change in form denotes a change in content (ibid., p. 17). Applying this perspective, both the example sentences above have not only different forms but also different content or meaning.

Having reviewed these two schools of thought, Leech and Short (ibid., p. 24) introduce an approach that they call pluralist. Like monists, it takes both form and content or meaning as the same. Concurrently, like dualists, it makes separation between different linguistic levels; however, the separation is not between form and content but between different functional levels (ibid.), out of which, they choose Halliday's three functions of language, i.e. ideational, interpersonal, and textual (ibid., p. 27 & 109), to study style. It is this pluralist, functional approach to style that our study subscribes to, and hence we will be using the functional distinction proposed by Halliday when analysing the STs for style and comparing them with a selection of translations.

3.3 Primary vs. Implied Meaning:

Boase-Beier (2006, pp. 36-49), reviewing views of several scholars working within and outside Relevance Theory and Reader-Response Theory, points out that a distinction is usually made between two types of meaning: primary and second-order meanings or "weakly implied meanings" (Montgomery et al., 2000, p. 292). The former is the "determinate meaning, embedded in the linguistics of the text" (Boase-Beier, 2006, p. 37) and is detectable from looking at the linguistic makeup of the text. On the other hand, the latter is not visible from the linguistic makeup of the text; it is an implied meaning instead, and is thus not straightforward and easily detectable. Owing to this, it is the readers who draw subjective meanings from them. We can name *irony*, *sarcasm*, *pity*, and *empathy* as a few examples of the implied meaning. Boase-Beier (ibid., p. 48) also notes that studying the first type of meaning, i.e. primary meaning, "is frequently the basis for evaluation of translation," and we must note that our study follows suit, that is to say, our evaluation of the selected translations will be based on the primary meaning. This delimitation of research interest will help us keep our study empirical, recursive, and reasonably objective.

This explanation calls for a need to clarify our study of stylistic effects. Reading through the work of literary and translation researchers, we can see the notion of effect being suggested as manifesting in such aspects as *comedy* and *satire* (Reiss, 2014, pp. 72 and 41 respectively), "*detachment and alienation between an individual and physical faculties*" (Toolan, 2013, p. 95; italics added), "terror and *anxiety*" (Reiss and Vermeer, 2014, p. 104; italics added), and *pity* and *empathy* (Malmkjær, 2004, p. 17 and 18; italics added). These are presented in these works as cumulative macro-level impacts of the linguistic choices made by the author. (Leech and Short (2007, p. 107) call these "'macro-effects' of style," whereas Pekkanen (2007, p. 2) calls them "global, or macro-level stylistic effects, or stylistic value.")

We, too, use the notion of *effect* in the way stated above, but with certain exclusions. Firstly, since the focus of our study is exploring the primary meaning of a text, any meanings and effects produced by implication (which are usually studied as aesthetic effects produced on the reader (Newmark, 1988, p. 48; Nord, 1997, pp. 36 & 76)), such as comedy, satire, and irony, as pointed out above, will not be the focus of our study. In their stead, the effects we explore will be macro-level outcomes of the patterned micro-level linguistic choices in a text; as such, these will be concrete and tangible surface-level effects, which are likely to remain more or less constant for a well-versed literary critic or stylistician. In short, the focus will be on the primary meaning produced by the visible, surface-level linguistic makeup of the text, and on the effects arising out of it – a perspective that will make our study more empirical, objective, and recursive than otherwise.

Summarising the discussion in the chapter by far, we can define style as meaning (1) conscious and unconscious micro-level lexico-grammatical choices which develop into a pattern across the text, or a specific part of it, to present the subject matter in a specific way, and (2) the macro-level stylistic effects that the micro-level patterns produce around the subject matter. Following this definition, we will engage in a systematic attempt to explore style in a selection of literary texts to see how the subject matter is presented and what related stylistic effects are produced through the patterns of micro-level linguistic choices, and how, and how much, these are reproduced by the translators.

3.4 Study of Style in Translation Studies:

Prior to the advent of the 21st century, the studies in translation had very brief mentions of the notion of style (Snell-Hornby (1995) is perhaps an exception), and the theoretical and methodological issues were not dealt with in detail. It is since the dawn of the 21st century that interest in the theoretical and methodological studies in style in reference to translation has relatively increased, and we can identify two main approaches: Cognitive (represented, for example, by Boase-Beier) and functional (see, for instance, Baker, 2000; Malmkjær, 2004; Saldanha, 2005; Winter, 2005; Bosseaux, 2007; Munday, 2008), though some other approaches and methodologies are also identifiable, such as Pekkanen's (2007) grounded theory and cluster analysis and Millán-Varela's (2004) study which is based on insights from Bakhtinian concepts of dialogism and heteroglossia.

A cognitive study of style in translation is not very common, and probably the only full-length book, comprehensively dealing with the cognitive analysis of style in literary translation, is that of Boase-Beier (2006).

The predominant interest in these studies has been locating the voice of a translator or their presence. The interest was triggered by the work of Venuti (1995) and the two influential articles by Hermans (1996) and Schiavi (1996). Baker (2000) is probably the first attempt dealing with the methodological aspects towards exploring the individual styles of literary translators. To this end, Baker (ibid., p. 248) employs the corpus approach to look at "some aspects of linguistic patterning in a subset of the Translational English Corpus: the works of two British literary translators represented in the corpus, Peter Bush and Peter Clark." As the remark shows, the corpus consists only of translations, not their corresponding STs, indicating that Baker is interested in exploring the stylistic features of translators as used in the selected translations without reference to the ST. This line of investigation was, however, not carried out by a majority of the following researchers. Malmkjær (2004), for example, claims that the motivations behind the choices made by a translator cannot be fully understood without considering the relationship between the target and the STs. She calls this *translational stylistics* and engages in exemplifying it by looking at the shifts and

their cumulative effect on her as a reader in Henry William Dulcken's translation of Hans Christian Andersen's *The Little Girl with the Matches*.

Saldanha (2005) aims at discovering the characteristic style of a translator that distinguishes their writing style from that of other translators. For this purpose, she uses "a purpose-built parallel corpus containing works of Spanish and Portuguese fiction and their translations into English by Margaret Jull Costa and Peter Bush" (ibid., p. 1). Her findings reveal that, whereas Margaret Jull Costa makes much more use of italics for emphasis as compared to Peter Bush, Bush makes higher use of words from the source language. In order to discuss her findings, she looks at the background of translators as well as their ideologies gathered from the analysis of their writings and interviews. She also discusses universals of translation and points out explicitation as one of such universals as evidenced in Costa's translations of Spanish and Portuguese.

Like Saldanha, Winter (2005) focuses on exploring the translators' individual styles using a corpus-driven approach. Put specifically, she explores the micro-level linguistic shifts and their macro-level effects in Hans-Christian Oeser's and Renate Orth-Guttmann's German translations of F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Beautiful and Damned*; the undertaking helps her point out the differing choices made by the two translators in connection with modal particles and how these choices change "the narrative point of view and how that affects the macrostructure of the novel, confirming the hypothesis that one translator focuses on the characters while the other presents a societal study" (ibid., ix).

Bosseaux (2007) also sees the presence of a translator in a selection of translations in relation to the corresponding STs (ibid., p. 23). A difference between her approach and the other functionalist researchers of style in translation is that, instead of exploring the characteristic stylistic features of a translator, she concentrates on identifying the shifts in a selection of target texts with an aim to explore the translators' presence in these texts.

Munday (2008) integrates systemic functional analysis and discourse analysis to explore the various voices in a piece of literature and also map the lexico-grammatical

features onto the ideological implications. Explaining his aim of the study in reference to the notion of style, he (2008, pp. 7-8) remarks:

> 'Style' will be discussed in the context of the linguistic fingerprint of an individual translator or of translations, those linguistic elements that make a translated text or series of texts identifiably the work of a particular individual or indeed genre. These linguistic elements, conscious or subconscious on the part of the translator, obvious or concealed, are the result of the translator's 'idiolect,' understood in both the sociolinguistic sense of "speech habits of an individual in a speech community […] the equivalent of a fingerprint" (Wales 2001: 197) and in the sense of "a system of individual stylistic features"(ibid.: 230), more akin to what Hoey (2005) has called 'lexical priming' (see chapter 1).

As is clear from this, Munday looks at the individualistic style of translators, which distinguishes them from other writers and translators. He does this by exploring shifts by translators in the point of view of STs on a large scale, i.e. using corpora to study style in multiple works of a writer. This helps him identify the linguistic characteristics which are part of the habitual use of a translator.

As seen above, style has typically been studied descriptively and with the aim of exploring individual styles of translators. Though, following the functionalist scholars studying style, we also will use systemic functional linguistics (specifically, an SFL-based register analysis) to explore patterned, micro-level linguistic choices, our main focus (see discussion under Section 3.2) is on exploring the stylistic features specific to a selection of translated texts (thus the focus is on the style of a text, rather than that of a translator) in order to evaluate how successfully the translators transfer the style of original texts. This said, it should be acknowledged that individual and habitual characteristics of style can also impact the subject matter of a text, and hence our analysis will also take some of those aspects of the writers' habitual style (such as the use of informal language by Manto) reinforcing the subject matter.

Lastly, it should be pointed out that style can be studied from different angles. One angle could be how the narrative is presented by the writer and how it has been reproduced by the translator. This has been the focus of the studies on style in translation studies, especially the studies using systemic functional linguistics (Saldanha, 2005; Winter, 2005; Bosseaux, 2007; Munday, 2008). Apart from exploring narrative sequence and structure, we can also study style from the perspective of how the subject matter, or the main idea, of a text is rendered (Leech

and Short, 2007, p. 31; see also Halliday, 1971 and Fowler, 1995) and how the translator reproduces it. The present research focuses on the latter, i.e. exploration of the way the subject matter is presented.

Chapter 4: Model of Analysis

4.1 Model of Analysis Explained:

The model of analysis chosen for the research is SFL-based register analysis. Theoretically, SFL bears similarities with some of the tenets of the purpose-based functionalist approach, such as both take language as a communicative and socio-cultural activity and both talk about the function(s) of a text (though the notion is defined differently in both the approaches). However, it differs from the purpose-based functionalist approach in some respects. Most importantly, it puts forward useful notions of linguistic choice and linguistic patterns, which are missing from the purpose-based approach. It, thus, construes each word in the text as a choice made against a set of alternatives (Halliday, 2004, p. 19) and takes the overall meaning of a text as a combination of the patterns of these linguistic choices. In other words, this perspective sees the various linguistic choices as interlinked and contributing to the macro-level collective meanings and effects that the text seeks to convey as a whole, as Halliday (ibid., pp. 19-20) remarks:

> A characteristic of the approach we are adopting here, that of systemic theory, is that it is *comprehensive*: it is concerned with language in its entirety, so that whatever is said about one aspect is to be understood always with reference to the total picture. At the same time, of course, what is being said about any one aspect also *contributes to* the total picture…

Based on the comprehensive nature of the approach, as well as its being well-defined and systematic analytically (see below), we seek to incorporate an SFL-based analytical model (register analysis) in the purpose-based functionalist approach to analyse literary texts and gauge the success of their translations.

Before proceeding, it is important to point out that SFL mentions two contexts relevant to the study of a text: *Context of culture* and *context of situation* (Halliday and Hasan, 1989). The former refers to the broader socio-cultural context in which the text is produced and which shape the perspectives and ideologies of participants (van Dijk, 2008, p. 9), and the latter denotes the immediate context realised through field, tenor, and mode (see, for example, Leckie-Tarry, 1995, p. 18 & 23). As van Dijk (2008, p. 13) points out, the context of culture affects the context of situation, but SFL

does not explain how this happens. It is because SFL theorists avoid cognitive considerations, and it is through the mental constructions of the context of culture that the participants act in a certain way in the context of situation (for more detail, see ibid., Volume 1, Chapter 2). In the present research, we include both the contexts, the context of situation for the analysis and findings of the texts and the context of culture for locating the style of Manto and the translators; however, in order to address the cognitive gap in SFL, we adopt Bourdieu's concepts of field and habitus (see the introduction under Chapter 2).

To explore the context of situation, we have adopted register analysis, a register is a "functional variety of language" - a variety which differs from other linguistic varieties on the basis of "the contexts they are used in" (Halliday, 2004, p. 27). As such, "recipes, weather forecasts, stock market reports, rental agreements, e-mail messages, inaugural speeches, service encounters in the local deli, news bulletins, media interviews, tutorial sessions, walking tours in a guide book, gossip during a tea break, advertisements, bedtime stories and all the other innumerable text types we meet in life are all ways of using language in different contexts" and can thus be called registers (ibid.) or functional varieties of language. Analysing these varieties of language involves analysing three variables of context of situation, called *register variables* (Eggins, 2004, p. 90): *Field*, i.e. the subject matter of the text; *tenor*, i.e. the interpersonal relationship between the writer and the reader, and *mode*, i.e. the linguistic connections between the various parts of the text lending it both cohesion and coherence (Matthiessen, Teruya, and Lam, 2010, p. 176). These three contextual variables correspond to three types of meaning or metafunctions in a text: field corresponds to ideational meaning, tenor to interpersonal meaning, and mode to textual meaning (Halliday, 2004, p. 111). These three types of meaning are briefly described below.

4.1.1 Ideational Meaning:

Ideational meaning in a text consists of the worldview of the writer or characters, or, in other words, an expression of the experiences they go through in the world (ibid., p. 29); put specifically, it constitutes the subject matter or theme of the text. The lexico-grammatical realisation of it is carried out through the transitivity structure of the text,

which consists of "processes (verbs), participants (nouns) and circumstances (prepositional phrases of time, manner, place, etc.)" (ibid., p. 110). Processes denote what sort of experience has been described, participants denote who or what is involved in the experience, either in the capacity of the subject or that of the object of the clause, and circumstances denote certain supporting information surrounding a process, such as at what time and/or place an experience has happened, in which manner it is carried out, and what cause has triggered it. These three grammatical elements, identified in the example below, form specific patterns in the text resulting in macro-level ideational meanings and effects:

Example 4.1:

He	opened	the	book	at page ten
Participant	Process	Participant		Circumstance

He and *the book* are participants and the process they are involved in is opening [the book], whereas the prepositional phrase *at page ten* is providing extra information about the process.

Halliday (ibid., p. 70) points out two types of experience: outer experience and inner experience. Whereas the former refers to our experience related to the outer world, the world that surrounds our physical being, the latter signifies our emotions, feelings, and perceptions that we experience in the inner world of mind. These two types of experience are realised through six process types (resulting in six corresponding types of clauses): material, mental, relational, behavioural, verbal, and existential (ibid., p. 171). These are briefly described below.

Material processes are action verbs that denote *doing* or *happening* (ibid., p. 179). One of the participants in these processes is "that does the deed – that is, the one that brings about the change" (ibid.). It is called the actor or the agent. Eggins (2004, p. 216) points out that there are material processes involving only one participant and then there are those that involve two or three (where one doing the activity is the agent and the one affected by it is the affectee). The former (realised, for example, in *He fell*) are called intransitive, and the latter (realised, for example, in *He wrote a letter*; also see Example 4.1 above) are called effective or transitive. These latter

processes result in two types of clauses: active and passive. In the active clauses, the actor and the subject are the same, whereas in the passive clauses, they are not, as indicated in the example below:

Example 4.2:

He	opened	the	book
Actor/ Subject	Process (active)	Affectee/ Object	

The	book	was	opened	(by him)
Affectee/ Object		Process (passive)		(Actor)

We should note that the alternative use of the two types of voice has semantic or functional value, and significant use of either of them in the text or a section of it is meaningful. At a basic level, a significantly dominant use of material processes in the active voice would suggest that the text contains a lot of action of the type in which participants are openly mentioned, whereas a dominant use of material processes in the passive voice, especially those with the actor omitted, may suggest a deliberate attempt to keep the actor out of focus in an attempt to, say, avoid liability for an action, as Derewianka (1990, p. 80) observes "this is a common ploy of adult writers when they don't want to be explicit about who is involved in or responsible for certain actions." It would be interesting to see how these two forms are employed in our STs and if there is any significant impact on macro-level meaning, and how, and with what effect, they are treated in the corresponding translations.

Halliday (2004, p. 179) points out that the present-in-present (which is commonly known as continuous or progressive) is the unmarked tense form for material clauses; On the other hand, the simple present tense is the marked tense (Eggins, 2004, p. 226). We will see in our analysis if there are any such instances of markedness developing into a pattern in the texts and, if yes, what is the functional and semantic outcome of it.

If material processes represent the actions in the outer world, mental processes do it for the internal world of mind. The actions they represent are the feelings, emotions, desires, and perceptions of human beings, on which basis Halliday (ibid., p. 199)

divides them into emotion, cognition, and perception processes. The first type consists of verbs which are related to emotions such as liking and fearing (Eggins, 2004, p. 225). The second type comprises verbs which are related to such cognitive operations as thinking, knowing, and understanding (ibid.). The third type relates to the perceptive functions of seeing and hearing (ibid.). As for the participants, mental clauses usually consist of two participants (cf. ibid., p. 226) unless they project another clause (see a representative case in Example 4.3 below). Out of these participants, one "must be a conscious being" (ibid., p. 227) – one who "feels, thinks, or perceives" (ibid.). This participant is called the sensor. On the other hand, the second participant is that "which is thought, felt, or perceived" (ibid.) and is called the phenomenon. Example 4.3 identifies these various roles performed by mental processes and participants:

Example 4.3:

He	likes	mountaineering
Senser	Mental process of emotion	Phenomenon

I	know	him
Senser	Mental process of cognition	Phenomenon

I	know	he is in the town
Senser	Mental process of cognition	Projected clause

I	saw	him	in the party
Senser	Mental process of cognition	Phenomenon	Circumstance (location)

In contrast to the case with material clauses, the unmarked tense for mental processes is the simple present tense, and the marked tense is the present-in-present tense (ibid., p. 226).

The third type of processes is called relational processes. These serve to show two types of relationship in a clause, namely, "class-membership and identity" (Halliday, 2004, p. 214), resulting in two types of clauses: attributive and identifying clauses, respectively (ibid).

By definition, attributive clauses are those in which the participant belongs to a class, which is called the attribute, whereas the participant it is attributed to is called the carrier (ibid., p. 219). On the other hand, identifying clauses are those in which an identity is assigned to a participant (ibid., p. 227). In other words, a participant is said to have a specific characteristic. In this relationship, the participant that is identified is called the token, and the participant that acts as identity is called the value (Eggins, 2004, p. 242). Both attributive and identifying clauses can have three types of relationship: intensifying, "where the relationship is expressed by the verb *be* or a synonym" (ibid., p. 239), circumstantial, which signifies a circumstantial relationship of time, location, manner, etc. (ibid., p. 245), and possessive, which refers to a relationship of possession (ibid., p. 247).

The two types might seem easy to identify from their definitions; however, in reality, it is a difficult task to tell one from the other. To help identify them, Halliday (2004) points out a few contrasting features of the two; the most important out of these is that whereas attributive clauses are irreversible (Halliday, 2004, p. 220), identifying clauses are reversible (ibid., p. 228). The following are a couple of illustrative examples:

Example 4.4:

Abdullah	has	two cows
Career	Relational process of possession	Attribute

Abdullah	is	the nicest student in the class
Token	Relational process of intensification	Value

As is easy to see, the attributive clause above cannot be reversed into *Two cows have Abdullah*. However, the intensive clause can be reversed into *The nicest student in the class is Abdullah*.

Halliday (2004) calls the above three processes "the main types of process in the English transitivity system" (p. 171) and the remaining three processes the "subsidiary process types" (p. 248). A brief description of these processes follows below.

The fourth type of processes is the behavioural processes. They typically denote "physiological and psychological behaviour" (ibid.) such as coughing, laughing, listening, and staring. They usually have only one participant, which is called behaver (ibid.). An example is as follows:

Example 4.5:

He	laughed	loudly
Behaver	Behavioural process	Circumstance (manner)

Verbal processes are the fifth type of processes. They denote the verbal action of "saying and all its many synonyms" (Eggins, 2004, p. 235), and the participant carrying out this verbal activity is called the sayer (Halliday, 2004, p. 252). We should note that it is not essential for the sayer to be a conscious human being; instead, it "can be anything that puts out a signal" (ibid., p. 254), as demonstrated in the following example:

Example 4.6:

All religious books ask us to be kind to others.

The participant in bold in the example is obviously not a conscious being; instead, semiotically, it is giving a signal, a message, and hence we should call it a sayer.

Now what the sayer says or signals is called the verbiage, and if another participant to whom something is said is present in the clause, then it would be called the receiver (ibid., p. 255). See the following example:

Example 4.7:

I	told	him	"I love to play cricket"
Sayer	Verbal process	Receiver	Verbiage

Lastly, we have the existential processes. As the name indicates, these are the processes that show the existence of someone or something (see, for example, Eggins, 2004, p. 237). The person or thing stated to exist is called the existent (ibid., p. 238).

In English, existential clauses are easy to identify as they contain the word *there* used as a *dummy subject* (ibid.). See the example below:

Example 4.8:

There	is	a book	on the desk
Dummy subject	Existential process	Existent	Circumstance (location)

In comparison with the other processes, existential processes are very few in a text; Halliday (2004, p. 257) estimates that they usually are as low in percentage as three to four per cent per text. Halliday (ibid.) shares an important observation that there are languages where the subject is not essential to be there in the clause, and for such languages, existential clauses do not have a real or dummy subject (*empty subject*, in Fawcett's (2000, p. 149) words) and are composed only of the process and the existent. In such cases, these clauses may look similar to relational clauses (ibid., p. 171), and it may be very difficult to tell one from the other. This observation is relevant to our research to some extent, as Urdu is one such language where there is no dummy subject in an *existential-like* clause. Also, the existent comes at the beginning of the clause, acting as the subject, and, like the relational clauses, the verb *be* is used. Because of these characteristics, the clause can easily be construed as a relational clause. Consider the following example from *Toba Tek Singh*, one of the short stories from our corpus:

Example 4.9:

European ward mei	dho Anglo-Indian pagal	they
In the European ward,	two Anglo-Indian *lunatics*	were
Circumstance (location)	Existent	Existential process

It should be noted that the circumstantial adjuncts in Urdu can freely move between the beginning and the end of a clause, so the clause can also be rendered as the following:

Dho Anglo-Indian pagal	European ward mei	they
Two Anglo-Indian *lunatics*	in the European ward	were
Carrier	Attribute	Relational process

In the modified version of the clause, the process appears to be of the relational type. However, because of the similarity between the two versions, there is a possibility for the first version to be construed as a relational process as well. Another important point to note is that, unlike in Urdu, the second version is not common in English, where the expected construction of the clause would be *There were two Anglo-Indian lunatics in the European ward*, instead of *Two Anglo-Indian lunatics were in the European ward* (however, the latter can be used in specific contexts, for example as part of a response to the question *Where were the five Anglo-Indian lunatics?*, to which the reply could be *Two Anglo-Indian lunatics were in the European ward, two in the garden, and one in the kitchen*). Because of this difference concerning linguistic conventions or constraints, there is a likelihood that some processes identified as the relational processes in the STs may be rendered as the existential processes in the English translations. Owing to these two reasons, the STs may have fewer existential processes as compared to their English translations. Anyhow, unless the difference is significant – such as in case of, say, the ST having only five existential processes, whereas a corresponding TT having forty such processes – it would be reasonable to not bring any minor differences to the limelight in the analysis, and focus on contrasting the two texts in terms significant micro-level patterns impacting the macro-level meaning and effects instead.

Before proceeding to the interpersonal meaning, it seems in order to address an important issue with the processes, namely, indeterminacy. The following section deals with it.

4.1.1.1 Overlapping and Indeterminacy of Processes:

Gwilliams and Fontaine (2015), in their timely research on process indeterminacy, note "although this allocation [i.e. of verbs into one of the six process types] is often portrayed as clear-cut, in practice process distinction can be unclear, and a single verb may meet the coding criteria of a number of categories." One of the reasons they point out for this lack of clarity is the ambiguous form of certain verbs resulting in its potential to be construed as more than one process types. Taking the example of *got* from Fawcett (2009, pp. 212-220), Gwilliams and Fontaine (ibid.) note that it can realise both a relational process (as in *Ivy got worried*) and a material process (as in

Ivy got to the shop in time). Grammatical metaphors also cause ambiguity. The verb *touched* is mostly used as a material process, but some confusion might arise when we have such instances as *Ivy touched Fred with her words*. A remark supporting claims of indeterminacy comes from Halliday (2004, p. 224) who notes an overlap "between 'mental' and 'relational' clauses, and some clauses, such as I was scared, could be interpreted either way." We also noted above (Section 4.1.1) an instance of ambiguity in the case of differentiating between existential and relational processes in Urdu. Gwilliams and Fontaine (2015) point out the so-called subsidiary clauses (behavioural, verbal, and existential) as highly vulnerable in this regard, the reason being that they are the border-line processes each one of which shares features of one or more other processes. They (ibid.) also point out that "these difficulties in identifying subsidiary processes are further hindered by the lack of consistent classification criteria across SFL guidelines, therefore making it difficult to pin down a definitive definition." These different types of ambiguities have the potential of leading the users of SFL to classify a clause differently when conducting a transitivity analysis.

To Gwilliams and Fontaine (ibid.), the most important reason for the identification issues and the inconsistent allocation of processes by different SFL users is their preference for either grammatical or conceptual/semantic criteria. Citing the example of behavioural processes, they remark that they

> are particularly troublesome to classify as they rely solely on semantic tests since they do not encode unique grammatical criteria in their identification, i.e. they cannot be distinguished from Material processes. This is recognised by Halliday, who suggests they realise "physiological and psychological behaviour" (Halliday 1994:139), but are not a distinct category on their own; instead realising a continuum between Mental and Material processes.

They (ibid.) conducted a study asking the respondents to classify 20 clauses. The outcome was that only one clause received 100% consensus, with the rest of the 19 clauses showing differences among the annotators. On reviewing the annotators' comments about their choices, they were able to identify differing grammatical and conceptual grounds on which the annotators based their responses. The following contrasting reasons put forward by two of the respondents in terms of classifying the verb *reject* provide a pertinent illustration of the case in point:

"Reject" is similar in some ways to "agreed", but on the material/verbal borderline. There are several verbs which encode the transmission of information not necessarily through language by gesture, action, etc. I code these as nonprototypical verbal processes."

"I chose material as it seems "reject" requires action that subsumes any verbal element."

They (ibid.) follow the example with the remark:

Based on these comments, it seems the analysts were aware that the verb they were dealing with did not neatly fit into one category over another, and were aware of the presence of both of these possible interpretations. Similar reflections were also offered for the other two inconsistently analysed verbs, GUARANTEE and CONFIRM, as shown in (11) and (12).

Their (ibid.) detailed study about the issue of inconsistency clearly shows different thought processes behind the different choices made by the annotators, and, on these grounds, we can safely generalise it to be the scenario facing everyone applying SFL to study the transitive structure of texts.

We presented the brief detail above not only to highlight the difficulty that may arise in identifying processes but also to clarify which approach informs our transitivity analysis (namely, the conceptual approach). In the event that the grammatical approach is followed in a particular case, for example when classifying the verbs showing the emotions and feelings of characters as relational, instead of mental, because of their being presented as a relation, we will mention in our findings that these relational processes, along with indicating a relationship in the form of the verb *be*, portray what is happening within the mind of a character. This will be done in the case of the analysis of *Neya Qanoon* and *Hatak*, as in these stories, feelings and emotions of the main characters play a central role in developing the plot around the central idea. Such a *concept/meaning-based* approach is particularly relevant to our research that takes style, among other things, as a particular way of presenting the subject matter and related macro-level effects.

Because of preferring one approach over the other, our transitivity analysis, admittedly, will involve some element of subjectivity. However, what is consoling is that the processes showing the kind of ambiguity and indeterminacy detailed above usually are in the minority, and that the majority of processes are easy to identify (Gwilliams and Fontaine, ibid.). Moreover, as our analysis seeks to identify patterns

(instead of individual occurrences) and macro-level effects, we can safely claim that such a holistic approach will significantly lessen the effect of the subjectivity.

4.1.2 Interpersonal Meaning:

Interpersonal meaning relates to the relationship and interaction between the speaker (subsuming the writer) and the audience (subsuming both the listener and the reader) (cf. Halliday, 2004, p. 106). This interaction involves *an exchange of information* and *that of goods and services*. The former is called *proposition*, and it consists of *statements* and *questions*, whereas the latter is called *proposal*, and it consists of *offers* and *commands* (ibid., pp. 110-111). The grammatical system governing the interpersonal meanings (of exchange of information and that of goods and services) of a clause is called *MOOD* (ibid., p. 106). We can divide it into two main parts: (1) *the Mood*, which comprises *the subject*, *the finite* (ibid., p. 111), and may also contain *modal adjuncts* (Matthiessen, Teruya, and Lam, 2010, p. 146); and (2) *the residue*, which comprises *the predicator*, and can also contain *the complement*(s) and/or *the adjunct(s)* (Eggins, 2004, p. 114), illustrated in the example below:

Example 4.10:

They	can't	catch	the bus	now
Subject	Finite: modal/neg	Predicator	Complement	Adjunct
Mood		Residue		

Put specifically, out of the two parts, the Mood is of central importance in making the interpersonal meaning of a clause (cf. Thompson, 2014, p. 51). Given this, we will concentrate on elaborating on it below, though the discussion will also touch on some other relevant parts, such as the lexical verb. However, before moving to the main discussion, we will very briefly define/identify the constituent parts of the residue here: the predicator comprises the lexical verb(s), the complement consists of what we traditionally call *the object*, and the adjuncts are optional *adverbial* or *prepositional phrases* (Halliday, 2004, p. 159). We should note that the adjuncts are of three types: circumstantial (which give us information about the context surrounding a process), textual (which help to connect various elements of the text), and modal (which reflect

the speaker's attitude towards something), and it is usually the first type that falls in the residue.

The Mood is defined by Halliday (2004, p. 120) as the element "which carries the burden of the clause as an interactive event," and it is because of this that we called it of central importance in making the interpersonal meaning. One of its essential constituents, the subject, is defined by Halliday (ibid., p. 119) as the element "which carries the modal responsibility; that is, responsibility for the validity of what is being predicated (stated, questioned, commanded or offered) in the clause." We can identify it by its usual position as the constituent preceding the finite in declarative clauses and following it in interrogative clauses.

The finite is the second essential element in the Mood which consists of one of a small set of verbs (called *auxiliary verbs* in the traditional grammar (Thompson, 2014, p. 51)), and it gives three types of interpersonal information about the clause:

- Primary tense – through the use of temporal verbs (*does*, *did*, *is*, *am*, *are*, *was*, *were*, *has*, *have*, *had*, *will*, *shall*, *would*, *should*, and *used to*), refers to present, past, or future "at the moment of speaking" (Halliday, 2004, p. 116)
- Modality – refers to the speaker's attitude towards something by expressing probability or obligation (ibid.)
- Polarity – refers to "the choice between positive and negative" (ibid.)

Primary tense tells us whether the speaker is referring to something in the present moment, the past, or the future. For narrations, in English, the default or unmarked tense is the past tense. It is, nonetheless, not a rarity to see literary writers sometimes switch from the past to the present tense when narrating a past event. One of the reasons they use this marked choice might be to emphasise the significance of something by differentiating it from the surrounding detail. Anyhow, what is important to note is that the case in Urdu is a bit different, especially with reference to Urdu literature, where a switch from past to present is not uncommon to find in narratives. See the following examples from our corpus:

Example 4.11:

<div dir="rtl">

اس کا خیال تھا کہ وہ ٹوبہ ٹیک سنگھ سے ہی سے آتے ہیں جہاں اس کی زمینیں ہیں4.11(a)

</div>
He thought that they come from Toba Tek Singh where he has his lands.
<div dir="rtl">

یہ کچھ کچھ سمجھتے تھے کہ ہندوستان کیوں تقسیم ہوا ہے۔4.11(b)

</div>
They had some idea why India is divided...

One may rationalise the choice of presenting the last two clauses in the present tense in 4.11(a) on the basis that the speaker is talking about an ongoing/habitual event. In 4.11(b), however, the event referred to, i.e. the partition of India, has already taken place. Such a choice may seem marked to one, but it should be noted that a switch from past to present seems to be wide-spread in Urdu speech and is commonly considered a routine practice, which means that mixing the present tense with the past tense is not usually a marked choice in Urdu.

As said earlier, polarity is related to the expression of positive and negative. Every clause is positive by default unless we add negation to it. In the finite element, it is presented by adding *not*, or any of its contracted forms, right after the verb showing modality. However, it should be added that this is not the only position and way to show negative polarity. It can also be shown as a mood adjunct, such as *seldom* and *never* in the mood element, or as an inherent part of a lexical verb or adjective, or even as an adjective or conjunction (see Halliday, 2004, p. 143) in the residue.

We finally turn to the system of modality, which we already have mentioned as one of the three types of information provided by the element of the finite. It should be noted that modality is not just confined to the element of the finite. Instead, it can also occur in the mood system (but outside of the finite element), in the residue, and even at the beginning of the clause. It is realised mainly by finite modal verbs and modal adjuncts, but it can also be realised by certain adjectives, lexical verbs, and minor clauses which betray the writer or the character's attitude, such as their feelings, emotions, and opinions. The following is a brief introduction to this rich and complex system, with a particular focus on the primary constituents of finite modal verbs and modal adjuncts, but also touching on some other minor constituents.

4.1.2.1 Modal Verbs:

Modal verbs are of two types: finite modal verbs and non-finite modal verbs. The former fall within the Mood structure and are responsible for much of the modal contribution of the modal verbal group. They consist of the following modal verbs: *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *should*, *will*, *would*, *must*, *ought to*, *is/was to*, and *has/had to*. They show various degrees of *probability* and *obligation* in a text; precisely, they show degrees of *low*, *median*, and *high* probability and obligation. A simple example is that of should and must, where should shows a median degree of obligation, whereas must shows a high degree. They can also show *inclination* (Halliday, 2004, p. 147), as in *I will support this noble cause*. The second type of modal verbs, non-finite modal verbs, is a small set of lexical verbs which fall in the predicator constituent of the residue. As Halliday (ibid.) points out, they either show obligation (*allowed to*, *supposed to*, and *required to*) or inclination (*willing to*, *anxious to*, and *determined to*) in degrees.

4.1.2.2 Modal Adjuncts:

Modal adjuncts are of two types: *mood adjuncts* and *comment adjuncts* (ibid., p.125). Mood adjuncts have the following main types: temporality, intensity, probability, and usuality (Matthiessen, Teruya, and Lam, 2010, p. 140; Halliday (2004, p.127) also mentions inclination and obligation under modal adjuncts, but we should note that they usually are realized through finite and non-finite modal verbs). The following is a short description of the four types of mood adjuncts:

- Temporality adjuncts show the speaker's attitude towards time; they include such adjuncts as still, yet, already, soon, once, and just.
- Intensity adjuncts show the speaker's expectation towards "the content of Processes or Attributes...or also express their counter-expectancy" (Halliday, 2004, p. 141); they include such adjuncts as *totally*, *almost*, *really*, *even*, *hardly*, and *only*.
- Probability adjuncts show the speaker's attitude towards the possibility of something; they include such adjuncts as *probably*, *perhaps*, and *certainly*.

- Usuality adjuncts show the speaker's assessment of how often something takes place; they include such adjuncts as *occasionally*, *usually*, and *never*.

We can identify two further types of mood adjuncts: *polarity adjuncts* and *vocative adjuncts*, which fall neither in the Mood nor in the residue (Eggins, 2004, p. 160). The former refer to an elliptical *yes*/*no* clause serving as the response to a question (e.g. *yes*, instead of *yes, I am happy*, in response to the question *are you happy?*). The latter, i.e. vocative adjuncts, refer to address terms not acting as the subject in the clause. They are used by the speaker to address the listener, and designate "a likely 'next-speaker'" (ibid., p. 162). For example, two vocative terms used in Toba Tek Singh, one of our corpus short stories, are *Sardar Ji* and *Maulbi Saab*. Both, especially the latter, are colloquially used to address a Sikh and a religious (mostly bearded) Muslim, respectively. Such expressions have their significance in the text, as the analyses will show.

We should also add that the speakers can also express their opinions and views by using certain short clauses serving as mood adjuncts. These opinions can be made both subjectively and objectively, such as *I think* vs *it is thought* and *I am certain* vs *it is certain*.

Finally, comment adjuncts show the speaker's attitude towards the whole clause or "on the role played by the subject" (ibid.). *Of course*, *obviously*, *evidently*, *surprisingly*, *luckily*, and *hopefully* are just a few of a wide variety of comment adjuncts.

Modality realised through modal verbs and modal adjuncts is a rich area of micro-level lexico-grammar which develops into various patterns to realise the macro-level interpersonal meanings in the texts, and this will, of course, be the main area of investigation in our analysis of the interpersonal meanings of our texts. We should add that, apart from modality, our analysis will also briefly deal with some other interpersonal aspects, namely, (1) the overall narratorial technique adopted by the writer, (2) formality/informality, and (3) expletives, honourifics, and pejorative/derisive expressions.

We now turn to introduce the modality structure of Urdu and comparing it with English to highlight the similarities and differences between the two. It should be noted that, to the best of our knowledge, this exploration is pioneering in two respects: (1) in terms of introducing some detail which hitherto has not been pointed out in reference to the modality structure of Urdu, and (2) as point out above, in terms of comparing the modality structures of Urdu and English, highlighting similarities and differences.

4.1.2.3 Modality Comparison of Urdu and English:

Like English, Urdu shows modality through certain verbs, adjuncts, adjectives, and nouns. What follows is a brief introduction to each, highlighting similarities as well as differences between Urdu and English modality structures and usages.

Modality is mostly not expressed as obviously through modal verbs in Urdu as it is expressed in English, in that, unlike English, according to Bhatt et al. (2011, p. 48), there are only a few dedicated modal verbs in Urdu. They (ibid.) name سک (*can* or *may*, depending on the context) and چاہیے (*need*) as two such modal verbs. Other than these, modality is realised through the interplay of "the multifunctional verbs 'go, be, fall'" (ibid.). To these, we can add *find* (see below for examples). By this description, Urdu modal verbs can be categorised into three classes:

1. The verbs سک (*can*) and پا (*find*) + Bare verb + Nominative subject

Example 4.12:

وہ سکول نہیں **جا** سکا۔ 4.12(a)
  He could not go to school.
ایسا نہیں **ہو** سکتا۔ 4.12(b)
  It cannot happen.
تم گھر سے باہر نہیں **جا** سکتے۔ 4.12(c)
  You are not allowed to go outside of the home.
وہ سکول نہیں **جا** پایا۔ 4.12(d)
  He was not able to go to school.

جا (*go*) and بو (*be*) in the examples above are bare verbs.[12] The modal verb سکتا gives three meanings: "the ability to perform an action," "the possibility of an event" (ibid), and the permission to perform an action. 4.12(a), 4.12(b), and 4.12(c) above exemplify these three modal readings respectively. پایا suggests the same meaning as by سکا in 4.12(a), namely, "the ability to perform an action" (ibid) as exemplified in 4.12(d).

2. The verbs چاہیے (*need*), پر (*fall*) and بو (*be*) + Infinitive verb + Dative subject

Example 4.13:

4.13(a). اس کو سکول **جانا** چاہیے۔
　　　　He should go to school.
4.13(b). اس کو سکول **جانا** پڑا۔
　　　　He had to go to school.
4.13(c). اس کو سکول **جانا** ہے۔
　　　　He has/wants to go to school.

In these examples, the main verb جانا (*go*) is in the infinitive form (the bare/root verb is جا), and the subject اس کو is the dative form of اُس (*he*). As is evident from the examples, all three verbs show the obligation to perform an action.

3. Inflected form of the verb جا (*go*) "in a complex predicate that looks superficially exactly like the passive" Bhatt et al. (2011, p. 48).

The mood of ability indicated through the modal verbs of چاہیے and سک can also be indicated through the verb جا. However, for جا to function as an indicator of ability, the clause should be in the passive form. It seems in order here to note that the Urdu passive system is different from that in English. In an Urdu passive clause, the subject of the corresponding active clause stays in the clause-initial position, is followed by a postposition سے, and "the perfect participle of the main verb is followed by the verb جا (*go*) which is inflected for tense, aspect, mood and agreement" (Kachru, 2006, p. 176). See the example below:

---

12 Some of their inflected forms are جا+او, *ja+yen*, and بوا.

Example 4.14:

اس سے اخبار نہیں پڑھا **جائے** گا۔[13]
He will not be able to read the newspaper.

We argue that the first two categories (excluding the type depicted in 4.13(c)) can safely be called explicit modal verbs, in that they are commonplace in Urdu speech community, and the native speakers can easily identify these verbs because of the words سکتا, چاہیے, پڑا, پایا etc. Also, all of these are finite modal verbs. As our analysis of the data would show, there is a non-finite verb, اجازت دینا (*to allow*), that we can add to this list of explicit modal verbs. We must also point out that, as depicted in Example 4.13(c), there are cases when it is not so easy to identify modal verbs, and we can call this type of modality implicit modality. Our ST data analysis will reveal further examples of this kind, and when comparing an ST and a TT, we will compare these implicit modal verbs to the equivalent English modal verb in terms of contextual meaning.

Although Kachru (2006, p. 82) mentions the permissive دینا (*give*) and the completive چکنا (*has/had*) as two possible modal verbs as well, it is to note that, at least the latter auxiliary does not indicate the agent's attitude towards the world and hence has nothing to do with modality, as is evident in the example below:

Example 4.15:

وہ گھر جا **چکا** ہے۔
*He **has** gone home.*

As is evident from the example, چکنا is indicating the completion of an action, and it is very difficult to understand how this could be conceived of as a modal verb.

Like English, Urdu uses all four types of modal adjuncts: Mood adjuncts, polarity adjuncts, comment adjuncts, and vocative adjuncts (cf. Eggins, 2004, p. 160). Mood adjuncts serve to express the speaker's attitude or opinion in terms of *usuality* (e.g. کبھی کبھی (*occasionally*) and اکثر (*often*)), *probability* (e.g. شاید (*perhaps*) and غالباً (*most probably*)), intensification or minimalization (e.g. صرف (*only*) and یقیناً (*certainly*)),

---

[13] The corresponding active clause would be وہ اخبار نہیں پڑھے گا (*He will not read the newspaper*).

and so on. The two polarity adjuncts, which are answers to questions in terms of *yes* and *no*, in Urdu are ہاں (*yes*) – or its polite variant جی – and نہیں (*no*). Comment adjuncts "function to express an assessment of the clause as a whole" (ibid, p. 161). These are encompassing comments which usually fall in the clause-initial position in English, but in Pakistan, they are usually used in clause-initial and clause-medial positions, and include such words as عموماً (*generally*), خوش قسمتی سے (*luckily*), and واضح طور پر (*obviously*). Vocative adjuncts in Urdu can occur both in the clause-initial and clause-ending positions, but their normal, unmarked position is the initial position, as shown in the following example:

Example 4.16:

Jamshed	kahan	ja	rahe	ho?
Jamshed	Where	go	ing	are?

Although it is normal to find the variant of the English string as *where are you going, Jamshed*?, it is not so common in Urdu to have the vocative in the clause-ending position, as *kahan ja rahe ho, Jamshed* is rare.

It is noteworthy that, whereas English uses many adverbs (as compared to prepositional phrases) to indicate modality, Urdu, along with adverbs, uses many prepositional phrases for this purpose. Some examples are as follows:

Example 4.17:

> *Luckily* is translated as خوش قسمتی سے (*with luck*).
> *Somewhat* is translated as کسی حد تک (*to some extent*).
> *Consistently* is translated as مستقل مزاجی سے (*with consistency*).
> *Happily* is translated as خوشی سے (*with happiness*).
> *Sadly* is translated as افسوس سے (*with sadness*).

It is also noteworthy that, whereas English has a plenty of adjuncts for the four types of modality, Urdu has relatively fewer, which it compensates for with the help of elliptical as well as non-elliptical short clauses (cf. *modalized pseudo-clauses* (Eggins, 2004, p. 175)) where modality is expressed through modal nouns. See the following examples:

Example 4.18:

> *Hopefully* is translated as امید ہے (*hope is*).
> *Regretfully* is translated as افسوس ہے (*regret is*).

There are also cases when Urdu modal adjuncts consist of more than one word:

Example 4.19:

> The Urdu counterpart of *completely* is پوری طرح.
> The Urdu counterpart of *once* is ایک بار.
> The Urdu counterpart of *already* is پہلے ہی.

Some Urdu modal adjuncts are the same word repeated twice in a row:

Example 4.20:

> Clearly – صاف صاف
> Gradually – آہستہ آہستہ
> Repeatedly – بار بار

Urdu modal adjectives – such as ممکنہ (*likely*) – and modal nouns – such as امکان (*likelihood*) – work in the same way as their counterparts in English do.

4.1.3 Textual Meaning:

Textual meaning is related to "the organisation of the message" (Eggins, 2004, p. 162) that the clause or, at the macro-level, the text or a section of it conveys. It serves to organise the information in the clause and beyond in such a way that enables the ideational and interpersonal meanings to spread across the clause and the text in a coherent manner (cf. ibid., p. 220). This is realised through two resources: thematic and information structure, and cohesion. The former, acting as a structural unit or organiser, organises the text within the clause complex, whereas the latter provides non-structural, or semantic, resources "for creating semantic links across sentences – or rather, semantic links which work equally well either within or across sentences" and hence manages "the flow of discourse" (Halliday, 2004, pp. 87-88). We also have an information system running parallel to the thematic system at the clause level, but it is realised through intonation and is basically the feature of the spoken language (cf.

ibid, pp. 88-94; also see Martin, Matthiessen, and Painter, 1997, p. 22). As such, it is out of the scope of the current research, which focuses on the written language of literature. The following is a brief introduction to the structural and semantic units of thematic and cohesive systems.

4.1.3.1 Thematic Structure:

Thematic structure gives organisation to the message of a clause. It does so with the help of two textual components of the clause, namely, *theme* and *rheme*. Theme is defined as "the point of departure of the message" (Halliday, 2004, p. 64), whereas rheme is everything else in the clause (ibid.). Mostly, theme contains given information, i.e. "information which has already been mentioned somewhere in the text or is familiar from the context" (Eggins, 2004, p. 299), and rheme contains new or unfamiliar information (ibid., p. 300). It is easy to identify theme in English, as it comes at the beginning of the clause (ibid., p. 299).

What elements constitute theme is important to identify, as the choice "contributes very significantly to the communicative effect of the message" (ibid., p. 298). Generally, there are three types of elements that can occupy this preferred position: experiential, interpersonal, and textual (cf. ibid., p. 301). These three form three types of theme: topical (called subject theme in Fawcett (2000, p. 149)), interpersonal, and textual. The former is that element of a clause "to which a Transitivity function can be assigned" (ibid.). More specifically, it includes either a noun group acting as the subject of a clause or a circumstantial adjunct. Interpersonal theme refers to an interpersonal element in theme position "to which we would assign a mood label" (ibid., p. 302), i.e. a finite verb (such as *can*, *do*, *does*, *has*, *have*, *am*, and *are*) or a modal adjunct (such as only, maybe, obviously, *Sardar Ji*, *yes*, and *no*). Textual theme is a cohesive element, especially continuity adjuncts and conjunctive adjuncts (see definitions in Section 4.1.3.3 below), in theme position (ibid., p. 305). We should note that topical theme is an essential constituent of theme structure, whereas the other two are non-essential, so thematic structure of a clause must consist of topical theme. Also, thematic structure of a clause can contain multiple themes, in which case interpersonal and textual themes precede topical theme, as shown in the examples below (ibid., p. 307):

Example 4.21:

Surprisingly	they	won the match
Interpersonal	Topical	
Theme		Rheme

And	they	won the match
Textual	Topical	
Theme		Rheme

And	surprisingly	they	won the match
Textual	Interpersonal	Topical	
Theme			Rheme

Are	you	staying?
Interpersonal	Topical	
Theme		Rheme

So	are	you	staying?
Textual	Interpersonal	Topical	
Theme			Rheme

Well	Ali	I think	you	must visit the site
Textual	Interpersonal	Interpersonal	Topical	
Theme				Rheme

All the clauses above are declarative and yes-no interrogative clauses. It is quite straightforward to label their thematic structure, but there are also a few other clause types – Wh-interrogative, Wh-relative, imperative, minor, and existential clauses – which are not so straightforward in this regard. Let us quickly see how thematic structure realises in these clauses.

In Wh-interrogative clauses, "Wh-elements [what, which, when, why, where, who, whose, whom, and how] serve both as topical theme and as interpersonal theme" (Matthiessen, Teruya, and Lam, 2010, p. 230), whereas in Wh-relative clauses, "Wh-elements serve both as topical theme and as textual theme" (ibid.). Here are a couple of examples:

Example 4.22:

Wh-interrogative

What	is the cost?
Topical	
Theme	Rheme

How	are you?
Topical	
Theme	Rheme

Wh-relative

When	it is not possible
Topical	
Theme	Rheme

Where	I will meet them
Topical	
Theme	Rheme

As for imperative clauses, it is the predictor which often comes at the beginning of the clause (Eggins, 2004, p. 311) and is taken as performing the role of a process in transitivity structure. As such, it is labelled topical theme. In the case of imperatives starting with *let's*, "the let particle is analyzed as Subject, takes a Transitivity role, and is therefore a topical Theme" (ibid.). A couple of illustrative examples are as under:

Example 4.23:

Open	the door
Topical	
Theme	Rheme

Let's	watch the match
Topical	
Theme	Rheme

Minor clauses (such as *Good evening*) are not considered having thematic structure, as they "carry neither Transitivity nor Mood labels" (ibid., p. 312). As for existential clauses, the dummy subject *there*, notwithstanding that it is not assigned a transitivity role in transitivity analysis, is considered topical theme (ibid., p. 313), as shown in the example below:

Example 4.24:

There	is something under the table
Topical	
Theme	Rheme

Finally, we must note that, in our analysis of thematic structure, we will take up a stance about the boundary of theme which is different from that which, under the influence of the so-called Sydney grammar (see, for example, Fawcett, 2000), is followed in the mainstream SFL analysis. The following section deals with it.

4.1.3.2 The Theme-boundary Controversy:

Eggins (2014, p. 302) emphatically advises the readers of her book that:

> an important principle to remember is that every clause must contain one and only one topical Theme. Once you have identified a topical Theme in a clause, you can consign all the remaining clause constituents to the Rheme role.

This *principle* is what we would probably find being followed in almost all mainstream introductory books on SFL (cf. Martin, 1992; Martin, Matthiessen, and Painter, 1997; Bloor and Bloor, 2004; Eggins, 2004; Halliday, 2004; Thompson, 2014). This is how Eggins (ibid., p. 308) rationalises this choice:

> ...we have great freedom of choice in the positioning of topical clause elements, and it is for this reason that we consider the choice of WHICH topical element to put first in a clause to be the most significant choice in terms of the clause's thematic potential. Once that key decision about which of the Transitivity roles will occupy clause-initial position has been made, the Thematic potential (our choice potential) is considered largely exhausted. Hence the principle that once we have identified one topical Theme in a clause, we consign all remaining constituents to the role of Rheme.

From this perspective, a language user is free to choose among different transitivity elements of the clause, especially the subject and the circumstantial adjunct, as to which transitivity element they would like to put first in the clause. Moreover, the preference they make in this regard means that they consider the chosen transitivity element to be the most important one in connection with thematic position. So this preferred topical theme serves as a cut-off point, separating theme from rheme. There are, however, a few dissenting voices as well (cf. Berry, 1987, 1995 & 1996;

Matthiessen, 1992; Stainton, 1993; Davies, 1994 & 1997; Ravelli, 1995). For example, Berry (1987 & 1995) and Davies (1994 & 1997) recommend always including the subject in theme. Mathiessen (1992) also seems to have been partially supportive of the proposition in those cases where the subject seems to have an important role to play in thematic development. The illustrating example he (ibid, 1992, p. 52) cites is as follows:

> **Autumn** passed and **winter** [passed], and **in the spring the Boy** went out to play in the wood. While he was playing, two rabbits crept out from the bracken and peeped at him. (Bold and capitalisation in the original)

To note is the clause *in the spring the Boy went out to play in the wood*, where theme boundary is extended to include the subject *the boy* as well. For an analyst following Halliday, the theme boundary would have reached with the circumstantial adjuncts *in the spring*, but, as noted above, Matthiessen considers the subject worth adding to theme structure in this case. Rationalizing this choice, Matthiessen (ibid.) shares his opinion that, since the very next clause chooses to allot the same subject the position of priority, i.e. theme, the subject is playing some thematic role in the clause under consideration.

Ravelli (1995, p. 225) expresses a similar position when she, having cited and briefly discussing an example clause, remarks that as the subject has not yet been analysed "there is still a sense in which the departure point of the message has not yet been fully elaborated."

After briefly introducing some similar views from past studies, Davies (1994, p. 174) not only stresses the need for considering the subject as an obligatory part of theme, but also regards "all pre-Subject Thematic elements, including dependent clauses in first position, as Contextualising Frames." In this way, she proposes two roles performed concurrently by the theme element. The first is identifying the topic, i.e. what the clause is about, and the second is giving various types of contextual information about the topic. Just for instance, spatiotemporal adjuncts preceding the subject in the theme position provide information about the time and space related to the subject and topic.

We can look at the issue from another angle as well, i.e. from the perspective of non-English languages. Ravelli (1995, p. 220), having presented the Hallidayan perspective, rightly remarks "This is, of course, the description of Theme in English. It is not necessarily true for other languages and is not the functional definition of Theme." A practical example of it comes from Alekseyenko (2013). In her PhD thesis on thematic progression in English and Russian texts, she reports the difficulties she faced in applying the Hallidayan approach to study theme in Russian, and remarks that:

> Halliday's approach fails to relate descriptions of Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) languages with relatively fixed word order, such as English, to descriptions of languages with relatively free word order, e.g., Russian (ibid., p. 27).

Though we consider the wording *fails to* a bit harsh, we have an idea of how difficult it would have been for her to apply the model, since we also have faced difficulties in applying it to compare thematic structure of Urdu, a language with a relatively free word order, with that of English (see the next section below). As we will see in the next section, clause elements in Urdu often can freely move from one position to another in the clause. Similarly, adjuncts, especially circumstantial adjuncts, show much more tendency to fall in the theme position than they do in English. Ellison of the subject is also very commonplace in Urdu. These and some other structural differences between Urdu and English make it difficult to compare them applying Hallidayan approach. Given this fact, and especially the weight of the arguments forwarded by the researchers mentioned earlier, we find it compelling to apply in our analysis the modified approach of considering the topical theme as an obligatory part of theme.

4.1.3.3 Thematic Comparison of Urdu and English:

> ...it is highly unlikely that the categories being compared across two (or more) languages will be identical in either their meaning or their form: at best, one operates on the basis of similarity, with the implication that some sort of compromise is inevitable in the decision to call by the same name a pair of formal patterns identified as the "same" in two different languages (R. Hasan and Fries, 1995, xx).

This quotation above fits well with the agenda of this section: (1) explaining the thematic structure of Urdu and comparing it with that of English to see the commonalities and differences which have the potential of hindering the thematic

comparison between the two languages, and (2) see, where possible, what sort of solution or compromise – based on the commonalities – can be reached on the basis of which the thematic design of the two languages could be compared.

Before proceeding to the discussion, let us share the observation that very few serious studies are available on thematic structure of Urdu (cf. Montaut, 2016, p. 266) who claims that "although significant research has been carried out during the last decades on focus and focalization in Hindi, mainly within the generative frame, practically none is available on the theme"); and, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, there are no studies available on comparing thematic structures of Urdu and English with reference to translation. In the face of it, the following discussion should just be taken as a preliminary attempt in this regard, which should be followed by more research in the area.

The two central questions that would occupy us in the following discussion are:

- What position does a theme occupy in a clause?
- What constituents in a clause get to be a theme?

We will start with a discussion of the first question, and it will include some discussion on the second as well.

Generally speaking, theme falls in the clause-initial position in Urdu (cf. Montaut, 2016, p. 266) who opines that in Hindi[14], and by that token in Urdu, it always falls in the clause-initial position); this is especially true of "transitive and intransitive declarative clauses" where "the subject and theme normally coincide and occur in the clause-initial position" (Kachru, 2006, p. 246). This is consoling for our current comparative purposes, as this is what we see in English as well, i.e. theme falling in the initial position in a clause (Eggins, 2004, p. 299). However, it is also interesting to note that researchers have noted some variations as well (cf. Kachru, 2006; Montaut, 2016). These variations, which will be discussed in a while, owe primarily to the

---

[14] As Hindi and Urdu are almost the same with reference to grammatical construction (see, for example, Bhatt et al., 2011, p. 47) – their status as two separate languages is primarily based on geo-political concerns, rather than any linguistic differences – what Montaut says about Hindi holds for Urdu as well.

relatively free word order of Urdu (Jawaid and Zeman, 2011, p. 88; Haulti-Janisz, King, and Ramchand, 2015, p. 29; and as manifested in the examples below). A single word/phrase can be used in several different positions in a clause. Butt (2014, p. 164), for instance, cites the following three word-order variations for the interrogative کس کو (*who*):

تھا	دیکھا	**کس کو**	دھیان سے	سیتا نے
did	see	**who**	with care	Sita
کس کو	تھا	دیکھا	دھیان سے	سیتا نے
who	did	see	with care	Sita

تھا	**کس کو**	دیکھا	دھیان سے	سیتا نے
did	**who**	see	with care	Sita

Another commonly found variation, not reported by Butt, is

تھا	دیکھا	دھیان سے	**کس کو**	سیتا نے
did	see	with care	**who**	Sita

(The typical English equivalent for all these variations is *Who had Sita looked at carefully?*)

Even the "major constituents [including the subject] can scramble" (Butt, 2014, p. 159; see the examples below). Observing these variations, Montaut (2016) proposes two occasional scenarios: (1) theme falling in a postverbal position, instead of the usual initial position, and (2) a *null-theme* situation.[15]

4.1.3.3.1 Theme falling in a Postverbial Position:

With regard to the former case, i.e. theme falling in a position other than the initial position, Montaut (2016, p. 268) cites the cases in Urdu which she dubs "delayed theme or post rheme," i.e. a situation where theme comes postverbially. She gives the following example, which is a response to the question *Where are my glasses?*

---

[15] Note that this is different from the commonly found situations where "a statement may have no theme nor focus, and be an entirely rhematic content" (Montaut, 2016, p. 266), as illustrated in the following example:

دو بج گئے۔

Literal Translation: Two strike went.
Pragmatic/Idiomatic Translation: It is two o' clock.

Example 4.25:

كل	رات	تم نے	خود	میز پر	رکھی	تھی	عینک
Yesterday	night	you	yourself	table on	put	past	**glasses**
You [yourself] had put them on the table yesterday night, the glasses. (Montaut's translation)							

Here, the object عینک (*glasses*) coming at the end of the clause is a delayed theme or post rheme. Its normal place of occurrence in an Urdu clause is the clause-initial position, but it can come after the rheme and is still grammatical. This situation is normally observed when the word order is SOV and the verb is missing an argument that can be inferred from the context (cf. Lambrecht, 1981, p. 77). This is true for our Urdu example as well, because we can easily omit the argument *glasses* (and the clause would still be considered structurally well-formed) as it is inferable from the question to which this clause is a response:

كل	رات	تم نے	خود	میز پر	رکھی	تھی
Yesterday	night	you	yourself	table on	put	past
You yourself had put on the table yesterday night.						

We should note that it is not just the object falling in the post-rheme position; subjects also fall in this position, as illustrated in the following clauses taken from our research corpus:

Example 4.26:

4.26(a)- ناک میں دم کر رکھا ہے **ان بندروں کی اولاد نے**
*Are a nuisance **these children of monkeys**.*

4.26(b)..شکل دیکھتے ہو نہ **تم اس کی**
*See face **you his**...*

In both the examples, the subjects (acting as themes) *these children of monkeys* and *you* are placed post-rhematically. 4.26(b) is especially interesting since it has both theme (*you*) and genitive pronoun (*his*) at the end of the clause, providing an excellent example of Urdu having free word-order; almost any word can be placed at any place in a clause.

This phenomenon signifies a mismatch between Urdu and English, since the latter is an SVO language (Butt, 2014, p. 159) and it does not usually allow theme to be

placed after rheme. We propose that, for comparative analysis purposes, a compromise can be reached in such cases by re-placing the post-rheme subject or object in its usual position in the given context, i.e. the clause-initial position, when comparing the two languages. However, what should be noted is that in English, it is not usual for the object to come at the beginning of the clause, and hence our strategy of moving a post-rheme object to the clause-initial position will still show some mismatch between the two languages, making a complete interlingual thematic comparison impossible. However, it would at least place the object within theme-rheme construction, bringing about structural similarity (not *sameness*) between the two languages.

4.1.3.3.2 A *Null-theme* Perspective:

Montaut (2016, p. 268) proposes that, in the case of the OSV clauses in Urdu, it is the "subject placed between the object and the verb [that] is in the focus position without necessarily the first constituent being a theme" (ibid.). She cites the following example:

Example 4.27:

عینک	**تو نے**	لگا	رکھی	ہے	یا	میں نے
Glasses	**you**	wear	ing	is	or	I
Is it you who is wearing glasses or I?						

The context is that the speaker claims they have been wearing glasses since childhood, to which the listener responds with *I don't see any around*. The example above is a *polemical answer* (Montaut, 2016, p. 268) to this response. According to Montaut (ibid.), the subject تونے (*you*) carries the focus, whereas the object عینک (*glasses*) placed in the clause-initial position is not a theme and also does not carry focus. In such cases, the clause can be seen as having no theme.

We should, however, question on what basis Montaut does not consider عینک theme. If theme is the "point of departure" (Halliday, 1994, p.37) in the clause and "the element that the clause is about" (Kachru, 2006, p. 246) and rheme is the information about this element, then عینک conveniently fits into this criterion. عینک is the point of

departure, the starting point or the entry into the clause, whereas the rest (*are you wearing it or me?*) serves to provide a specific piece of information about it. Given this, we consider it befitting to treat عینک as theme in the given clause, dismissing the proposition that a clause (having the subject and the verb) can be without theme. (As a passing note, we add that, as the object عینک is in the initial position, instead of its usual place of following the subject تو نے, we should consider it as a marked theme.)

4.1.3.3.3 The Case of Interrogative and Subject-less Clauses:

Somewhat more difficult to account for are the cases of interrogative and *subject-less* clauses. It is a known fact that in an interrogative clause in English, finite and Wh-interrogatives come before the subject (Eggins, 2004, pp. 209-210), and, thus, their default, unmarked position is the beginning of a clause, as shown in the following clauses:

> Where are you going?
> When is the exhibition going to take place?

Now, interrogatives can occur at two different positions in Urdu: right before the noun and right before the verb (Delacy, 1998, p. 46), discussed below.

4.1.3.3.4 Pre-noun Position of an Interrogative:

There are two cases when an interrogative is used right before the noun: it is either used as an adjective or as the polar کیا for yes-no questions (ibid, p. 46). See the following examples for the first case:

Example 4.28:

4.28(a)

تھے؟	آئے ہوئے	**لوگ**	**کتنے**	وہاں
were	present	people	how many	There

4.28(b)

تھے؟	آئے ہوئے	**لوگ**	**کتنے**
were	present	people	How many

4.28(c)

تھا؟	لکھا ہوا	**نام**	**کس کا**	پر	دیوار
was	written	name	whose	on	Wall

4.28(d)	تھا؟	لکھا ہوا	نام	کس کا
	was	written	name	Whose

Whereas the default position for these interrogatives is the clause-initial position in English clauses, there are two possibilities with Urdu (as evidenced in the examples above).

- When there is a spatial and temporal adjunct in a clause – وہاں and دیوار پر in 4.28(a) and 4.28(c) above – it is this constituent which comes at the start of the clause (cf. Kachru, 2006, p. 159) and gets a thematic status, which is not the case in English where these constituents usually are placed at the end of a clause. This preference for spatiotemporal adjuncts to be placed in the thematic position is not exclusive to this situation; rather than this, it is quite common in Urdu (as the analyses in Chapter 5, 6, and 7 would show) is definitely a significant thematic mismatch between Urdu and English having consequences for our analysis. Faced with such a scenario, translators have two options: they can either opt for normalisation, in which case the translation will be deprived of some important thematic points; or they can go for preserving the source-text structure, in which case the result would look unnatural in English. It would be interesting to see what strategy the translators have used and with what impact.

- In the absence of such a constituent – cf. 4.28(b) and 4.28(d) – the noun phrase containing the interrogative adjective occupies the initial position. This is precisely what we find in corresponding English clauses, and hence a comparison will not be a problem in this case.

The case of the yes-no questions is unproblematic as both the polar کیا and the interrogative participles in Urdu fall in the clause-initial position, as is exemplified in the examples below:

Example 4.29:

4.29(a)	ہوں؟	آ سکتا	اندر	میں	کیا
	present	come	in	I	Can

4.29(b)

كيا	آپ	روز	يونيورسٹی	جاتے	ہیں؟
Do	you	daily	university	go	present

4.1.3.3.5 Pre-verb Position of an Interrogative:

In the preverbal position, too, there are two possibilities, explained below.

When used as the subject (i.e. as an interrogative pronoun), the interrogative word comes at the beginning of the clause. See the following example:

Example 4.30:

4.30(a)

كيا	ہو	رہا	ہے؟
What	go (on)	ing	is

In this position, thematic structure of the two languages coincides with each other, leaving no issues for thematic comparison.

If, however, there is an adjunct, or a noun acting as the subject, it is always the adjunct or the subject falling in the clause-initial position, not the interrogative word. See the example below:

4.30(b)

وہاں	**كيا**	ہو	رہا	ہے؟
There	**what**	go (on)	ing	is

An example from the corpus:

4.30(c)

یہ	پاکستان	**كيا ہوتا**	ہے؟
This	Pakistan	**what**	Is

Structurally, this shows a mismatch between Urdu and English.

4.1.3.3.6 <u>Elision of the Subject:</u>

A further difficulty is related to the elision of the subject. In fact, subject-ellipsis is a widespread phenomenon in Urdu, making the subject a non-obligatory constituent of a clause (Kachru, 2006, p. 167). For example, in her seminal article on Urdu semantics, R. Hasan (2015) – naming this phenomenon S-ellipsis and noting that it can occur both endophorically and exophorically, whereby it can be deduced from textual or extra-textual contexts (ibid., p. 223) – cites an extract from an Urdu short story and notes that, out of a total of 17 major clauses, only seven "have an S-segment" (ibid., p. 224). At first glance, this might seem like a problem with reference to thematic comparison of Urdu and English, but what needs to be pointed out in this regard is that the elliptical subject in Urdu is inferable from the context, and hence for comparison purposes, we will supply the elliptical clauses with their respective subjects (cf. Eggins, 2004, p. 309) where the missing clause-initial constituents of an elliptical declarative clause are filled in before analysing it thematic structure). This should make our analysis easy to conduct. See the following example from the research data:

Example 4.31:

ہندوستان میں ایک ایسی جگہ ہے جہاں استرے بنتے ہیں۔ (context: reply to the query as to what Pakistan is)
is a place in India where razors are made.

As is clear from the example, the subject is missing. While analysing such clauses in comparison with their corresponding clauses in English, we will add the subject یہ (*this*) to the beginning of the clause.

Another important point to note is that both the Urdu clauses with S-ellipsis and the English clauses with the subject in the initial position are unmarked clauses, and hence, with our adjustments, it will not be an issue to compare the thematic structure of the two languages in such cases.

Before moving to the next section, we must make a clarification about the scope of the analysis. As, in Chapter 3, we defined style in reference to the central idea/subject matter and related macro-level effects, our analytical interest would be to highlight

the micro-level linguistic features forming patterns reinforcing the central idea (consider it in contrast, for example, with (1) a cognitive-stylistic analysis of the implied meanings of a text, or (2) a systemic-functional stylistic analysis focussing on registering the micro-level shifts in literary translations in an attempt to highlight the individual style or presence of the literary translator). As such, the areas of ideational meaning (showing the worldview of the writer or characters in reference to the subject matter) and interpersonal meaning (showing the attitude or the writer or characters towards the subject matter) would be the primary focus of our analysis. We will analyse the textual part as well, but, again, with a focus on identifying, through a detailed manual analysis of the various aspects of *cohesion* and *theme-rheme structure*, the aspects which would form patterns reinforcing the subject matter, instead of merely performing the typical textual function of grammatically connecting parts of the text.

4.1.3.4 Cohesion:

Cohesion creates relations between different elements of a text both within and beyond the clause boundary. It does so with the help of four cohesive systems: conjunction, reference, ellipsis, and lexical cohesion (cf. Halliday, 2004, p. 533). Depending on their function in the text, these can be divided into grammatical and lexical types, whereby conjunction, reference, and ellipsis constitute the former and lexical cohesion the latter (ibid., p. 538). What follows is an overview of these systems.

The system of conjunction develops a link between whole clauses (ibid., p. 534), realising three types of relation between one piece of the text with the previous piece: *elaboration*, *extension*, and *enhancement* (ibid., p. 540). These are briefly described below.

Elaboration creates two types of relation: appositive and clarifying. In an appositive relation, a piece of text is stated again in a different way or through examples (ibid.). Examples include *in other words*, *for instance*, *for example*, and so on. In a clarifying relation, something is stated again with the purpose of clarifying it or giving it more

clarity than before. This relation is realised by such words as *anyhow*, *in particular*, *to be more precise*, and *in short* (ibid.).

Extension signifies a relation of addition or variation (ibid., p. 543). The former is realised through such words as *and*, *moreover*, *nor*, and *however*, whereas the latter through *contrarily*, *alternatively*, and *apart from that*.

Halliday (ibid., p. 544) notes that enhancement is created by the following four types:

- Spatio-temporal, e.g. *here*, *there*, *meanwhile*, *now*, *and then*
- Manner, e.g. *similarly*, *thus*, *and thereby*
- Causal-conditional, e.g. *therefore*, *owing to that*, *in that case*, *and otherwise*
- Matter, e.g. *here*, *with reference to that*, and *in other respects*

The cohesive system of reference creates links between various participants in the text, where "participants are the people, places and things that get talked about in the text" (Eggins, 2004, p. 33). Generally, we may categorise references into three types: homophoric, exophoric and endophoric. Homophoric refers to something that is outside of the text, and the same is the case with exophoric reference (Halliday, 2004, p. 534). The difference, however, is that the former refers to something that is a shared knowledge among the members of a community. For example, the epithet *Quaid-e-Azam* (literally, *the great leader*) is a homophoric reference in the context of Pakistan, in that it is a common knowledge shared by the members of the community that it refers to Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the founder of Pakistan. On the other hand, exophoric refers to something that we can understand from the surrounding environment of the text. Suppose a Physics teacher enters the class and asks the students *open the book at page ten*. We know from the context that he is referring to their course book of Physics that they use daily in the classroom. In contrast to these two references, endophoric references refer to the participants within the text, and it is this type of references that create what we may call referential cohesion in the text, though the former two types do the same in case they are repeated over and over again in the clause (see, for example, ibid., p. 552). These are of two main types (ibid.):

- *Cataphoric* – it refers forward to a participant in the text; the referent's identity has not yet been disclosed; *two types* two lines above is a cataphoric reference

because it refers forward to the names of the types, i.e. cataphoric, anaphoric, and esophoric.

- *Anaphoric* – it refers back to a participant whose identity already has been revealed in the text, and the participant it refers back to is called *antecedent* (ibid., p. 522); in the example *Ali went to the market; **he** wanted to buy some food*, *he* is an anaphoric reference pointing back to the participant *Ali* which is the antecedent.

The system of ellipsis refers to the elision or omission of some part(s) of a clause which can be inferred from some earlier detail (cf. ibid, p. 535). A common type is the *yes/no* response to questions. To take a significant example from Urdu, as noted in Section 4.1.3.2.6, elision of the subject is quite commonplace in the language, and from the past detail, it is not difficult for the native speakers to infer who or what has been ellipsed.

The last type of cohesion is the system of lexical cohesion, which refers to a variety of lexical relations between lexical items (ibid., p. 562). These relations are developed paradigmatically or syntagmatically (ibid, p. 571). Paradigmatic relations are realised through *repetition*, *synonymy*, *antonymy*, *hyponymy*, and *meronymy*, and syntagmatic relations through *collocation*. As the name is self-explanatory, repetition refers to the repetition of certain lexical items. Just for example, our corpus story *Toba Tek Singh* contains a repetition of the word پاگل (*lunatic*) or that of the key phrase ٹوبہ ٹیک سنگھ کہاں ہے؟ (*Where is Toba Tek Singh?*). Synonymy is the relation of using similar words for an idea across the text or a section of it. Just for example, in our corpus story *Neya Qanoon*, the exuberance of Mangoo, the central character, is shown by using words denoting *happiness*. On the other hand, antonymy is a relation of having lexical items which are opposite to each other in meaning. For example, *happiness* and *sadness* show a relation of antonymy.

Hyponymy is a relation of classification, whereby specific examples of a general category together form a relation of hyponymy. Just for example, *cricket*, *football*, *hockey*, and *baseball*, all belong in the category of *sports*, or we can also say that they are types of sports.

Meronymy is a sort of relation which is developed among the *parts* (contrast it with *type* in the description of hyponymy above; cf. Halliday, 2004, p. 575) of a whole. A simple example is *windows*, *walls*, *cupboards*, *bed*, and floor denoting a mutual relation of meronymy as parts of *room*.

Lastly, we have the syntagmatic lexical relation of *collocation*, which denotes a "co-occurrence tendency" (ibid., p. 577) between items within a clause. What it means is that there are linguistic items which tend to occur with specific other linguistic items, or are conventionally used together. Just for example, we say *tall boy* to refer to the height of a boy; however, when we refer to the height of a tree, we tend to say *big tree*, instead of saying *tall tree*. We do this because of the convention of using *tall* with *boy* and *big* with *tree*.

Above, we have given an overview of SFL as the model we will use to evaluate our corpus texts. We will try to analyse the texts for all the lexico-grammatical elements to discern what sort of patterns develop around the central idea of the texts and what macro-level effects they produce. It should be noted that if the analysis does not show a particular aspect developing into a pattern related to the central idea, it will not be recorded in the findings in the chapters, i.e. Chapter 5, 6, 7, and 8, dedicated to presenting the outcome of the analyses as well as their findings and implications. Just as an example, if the cohesive system of conjunction is found to be merely doing the structural job of linking different parts of the text structurally, that is to say, having no patterned and significant impact on the central idea, then it will be left out of the findings.

4.2 Operationalization:

All three short stories and their corresponding nine translations (three translations for each short story) will be manually analysed. Starting with the first short story, *Toba Tek Singh*, the ideational patterns and meaning in the story will be identified by:

- identifying the process type of each verbal group (or verb phrase),

- conducting frequency analysis to see the relative distribution of each type of process in the text and record which one is used more, in what places, and with what consequence, and

- by closely looking at other relevant aspects, such as agent/agent-less processes, active/passive voice, and the role of participants.

Interpersonal patterns and meaning will be explored by:

- closely studying the modality structure, including making an inventory of the different types of modal verbs and mood adjuncts, looking at each example in context to see what interpersonal patterns emerge around the subject matter (impact on *plot* and *characterisation*, the two integral parts of a short story, are also explored), and

- formality/informality, use of colloquial expressions, and any expletives, honourifics, and derogatory epithets are the other aspects taken into consideration.

Textual patterns and meaning will be explored by:

- analysing various cohesive systems, especially the semantic system of lexical cohesion, to identify patterned lexical relations impacting macro-level effects and presentation of the subject matter in the story, and

- studying the thematic structure by identifying the various types of theme for each clause of the story, identifying any marked themes, exploring the use of spatiotemporal adjuncts in the theme position, identifying the dominant participants in the topical theme position and recording their impact on the whole story.

These steps will enable us to form comprehensive (but, admittedly, not exhaustive) stylistic profiles of the STs. In the same vein, stylistic profiles will be prepared for the translations, and then the style of each translation will be compared with that of the ST to see in which aspects the original style is reproduced in the translations and also identify the shifts. Finally, the findings of the three translations of each ST will be

compared with each other to evaluate how (and in what aspects) successfully each has rendered the ST style.

Chapter 5: Analysis of *Toba Tek Singh* and Corresponding Translations

5.1 Analysis of *Toba Tek Singh*:

5.1.1 A Brief Introduction to the Story:

Toba Tek Singh, published in the anthology *Phundane* (1955), is an account of the reaction of a bunch of *lunatics* on hearing the news of the exchange of *lunatics* between the governments of Pakistan and India two to three years after the partition. The *lunatics* are shown physically engaged in meaningless and ludicrous activities and mentally suffering rage mixed with confusion, uncertainty, and distress. Bishen Singh, the central character, is not concerned with what is happening around or why the exchange of *lunatics* is taking place. His only concern is to know about the whereabouts of *Toba Tek Singh*, the town where he is from. He asks his fellow *lunatics* about it, but they seem to know nothing where it was situated. He does find the answer by the end of the story, but he comes to know that he has to leave Pakistan, i.e. the country where *Toba Tek Singh* is, and this leads to the tragic ending where he is shown lying dead in no man's land between the borders of Pakistan and India.

5.1.2 Ideational Metafunction and Transitivity Analysis:

There are 406 processes in the story, distributed as follows:

Sr. Number	Process	Occurrences
1	Material	191
2	Mental	31
3	Relational	120
4	Behavioural	14
5	Verbal	46
6	Existential	4

Table 5.1 Frequency of Processes in *Toba Tek Singh*

Out of the six types of process, it is the material and relational processes which take the lead – a significant one. The large number of material processes (which are roughly equal to the number that the other five make together) indicates that the text

is "centrally concerned with action and events and the participants who carry them out" (Eggins, 2004, p. 335). Several characters are portrayed as involved in various types of activities revolving around, and impacted by, the central issue of the exchange of *lunatics* between the newly-liberated governments of Pakistan and India, as well as the impact of this decision on the inmates of a lunatic asylum in Pakistan. It should not, at the same time, be forgotten that verbal processes occupy the third place, indicating that we have a good number of dialogue-based sections as well. These are designed in such a way as to reveal the central concern of the *lunatics* – the exchange of *lunatics* between Pakistan and India – and that of Bishen Singh – knowing about the whereabouts of *Toba Tek Singh*, his hometown. Finally, an interesting aspect of the transitivity structure of the text is the fair number of mental processes (mainly of the cognitive type); though the inmates of the lunatic asylum are insane, they are presented as thinking and feeling about the current state-of-affairs and making their opinions about it, no matter how removed from reality they are.

Closely looking at the processes in the story, we can identify an interesting pattern developing early on in the story. There is a remarkable concentration of material processes lacking initiators, the actual doers of action, in the first three paragraphs, i.e. the paragraphs which introduce the decision (of the cross-border exchange of *lunatics*) that would lead to the panic the *lunatics* will be presented as going through later in the story. There are 28 processes in total, out of which 14 are material processes. This significant amount indicates the salience of these processes in the opening paragraphs. Now, out of these 14 material processes, nine are action processes and five event processes. Interestingly, as many as eight action processes, out of which five are in the passive voice, do not mention the agent performing the action. See the following illustrating example:

Example 5.1:

وہ مسلمان پاگل جن کے لواحقین ہندوستان ہی میں تھے، **وہیں رہنے دیئے گئے تھے**۔ جو باقی تھے، ان کو سرحد پر **روانہ کر دیا گیا۔**

*Those Muslim lunatics whose relatives were in India **were left there**. Those who remained **were sent to the border**.*

Both the material processes in the example are in the passive voice and are lacking information about the initiator of the action. Although we can make some guesses

from the context – e.g., that the governments of Pakistan and India would have ordered the relevant administrative departments to carry out the exchange, and it was they, i.e. *the relevant departments*, who made the decision of keeping certain *lunatics* in the asylum and transporting others to the border. However, what specifically is that department? Who were the officers involved in the process? These are the questions which are left unanswered by the writer.

As for the event processes, all of them lack the initiator. Take the case of کانفرنسیں ہوئیں (conferences took place) which presents *conferences* as the doer of the action, but our real-world knowledge tells us that a conference cannot take place on its own; it is human beings who arrange and attend them, and are thus the actual initiators of the action. The ST, nevertheless, does not provide us with any contextual information on these initiators. The same is true of سوال ہی نہ پیدا ہوا (*question did not even take birth*), (خبر) پہنچی (*news reached*), and چہ میگوئیاں ہونے لگیں (*heated discussion started*). We get no information from the text as to who are actually carrying out these actions.

As the findings above show, out of 14, we have a total of 13 material processes not mentioning the initiator. This pattern of the material processes portraying absence of the actual, i.e. human, doer leaves certain information ambiguous for the reader. In other words, there is a sense of anonymity and ambiguity in the paragraphs. This effect is reinforced by the use of a couple of such noun phrases in the initial paragraphs which do not make it clear who, or what, the actual referent (i.e. the extra-textual entity) is. This starts even with the very first word of the story بٹوارہ (i.e. division/separation). It is not made clear what separation is being referred to here. We can partially reason it out by pointing out that it stands as a homophoric reference for the native readers of Urdu that the reference is to the division of the Indian subcontinent in 1947 into two separate states. Inference, nevertheless, is not that straightforward when we move to the next example:

Example 5.2:

دانش مندوں کے فیصلے کے مطابق ادھر ادھر اونچی سطح کی**کانفرنسیں** ہوئیں۔
*High-level **conferences** took place here and there as per the decision of **the intellectuals**.*

There is no reference as to who *the intellectuals* are. We, as readers, can make an educated guess that the reference may be to the government officials of Pakistan and India; but the question is, which governmental officials? And what department are they from? We are at a loss to come up with a definite answer. The case of *conferences* is another example of the lack of contextual information leading to anonymity and ambiguity. We do not know who conducted the conferences and where these took place (see Hatim, 1997, pp. 28-29, where he illustrates a similar technique of ambiguity, and names this *motivated suppression of agency*).

Past these first three paragraphs, we observe *a stylistic shift* (a phenomenon that we may describe as the occurrence of differing patterns displayed by different sections of a text; see R. Hasan, 1989, p. 57; see also Leech and Short, 2007, p. 46, where they discuss "a multiplicity of styles within the same work"). The story now reveals a high number of processes which can be related to actual human agents; event processes become far less and sporadic, and the same is the case with the processes in the passive voice having no mention of the initiator. Given this, one might get the impression that the air of ambiguity and anonymity has dissipated. This, nonetheless, is not the case. No doubt there are now relatable initiators, but whom do they relate to? What we now have is a proliferation of such participants as *a Muslim lunatic*, *a friend*, *some lunatics*, and *a fat Muslim lunatic from Chinyot*. The initiators are no more absent; they are there, but they do not clearly and unambiguously point towards a specific person. The anonymity and ambiguity is still there, first it was manifest in the absence of the human actors, and now it is carried on by only naming a general class (such as *Muslim lunatic*) and modifying it with the Urdu non-deictic expression ایک, which, in English, realizes into *a*, *an*, *one*, and *one of*, or کچھ, i.e. *some*. See the following examples:

Example 5.3:

5.3(a)   **ایک مسلمان پاگل جو ---**
           A Muslim lunatic who was...
5.3(b)   اس سے جب اس کے **ایک دوست** نے پوچھا---
           *When he was asked by **one of his friends**...*

As has been pointed out earlier, use of the non-deictic expression ایک (a/an/one) in the examples does not give us any specific detail about the participants, keeping their

identity hidden. We do not have any information as to who specifically is the Muslim lunatic in 5.3(a) and who is asking the question in 5.3(b).

These *nameless* processes spread down to almost the middle of the story; we are not introduced to a specified name – a concrete character – in the story. This effect of anonymity, as well as the resulting ambiguity and uncertainty, is reflective of the confusing state of mind of the *lunatics*. The sudden news that they will be *uprooted* from the place they have been living since birth and moved to a place they know nothing about makes them to go through panic and confusion. They do not understand why they would be moved to unknown place against their will and who are the ones responsible for the decision. We can also interpret in the sense of a reflection of the general state of mind of a lunatic; confusion, uncertainty, and panic are what we expect an ailing mind going through. Another likely reason reveals itself around the middle of the story when the anonymity and uncertainty surrounding human agency suddenly dwindles when we are introduced to the first concrete character, Bishen Singh (hence, another stylistic shift). From now on, it is he who would be acting as an agent for a good part of the story, with only minor references to some other insignificant characters, such as Fazal Deen and the officers at the border. Juxtaposing this shift to clear human agency to the previous lack of human agency, we can also see the pattern as a deliberate strategy by Manto to confer marked singularity, significance, and centrality to the character of Bishen Singh. We see him as a character giving some meaning to the otherwise confusing and uncertain environment.

In conclusion, we have seen how the transitivity structure of *Toba Tek Singh* presents the subject matter, i.e. the news reaching the lunatic asylum and the confusion of uncertainty it causes, and how the micro-level linguistic choices create a corresponding sense of anonymity, confusion, and uncertainty.

5.1.3 Interpersonal Metafunction:

In literature review, we covered how critics talk about the brevity and directness of Manto's style and about how he tries to keep things as objective as possible. *Toba Tek Singh* is an excellent example of this narratorial technique, whereby Manto tries to remain to the point, avoids any unnecessary detail, and focuses on providing tangible,

external detail. Though there are also references to what is happening in the mind, i.e. the internal world, of the *lunatics*, especially Bishen Singh, these references are quite few in number, and the majority of the detail in the story revolves around the physical actions of the *lunatics* with regard to their impending cross-border exchange. In Fowler's (1986) terminology, we can call this style of writing *external narratorial point of view*. We now look at the system of modality to observe how it works to impact the expression of the subject matter under the overall narratorial technique stated above.

5.1.3.1 Modality:

As noted in Section 2.3.3.9, in one of his letters to his fellow writer Ahmed Nadeem Qasmi, Manto advises him to adopt a style of writing which is based on objectivity and impartiality, and which is devoid of personal feelings, sentiments, and evaluative remarks as far as possible. This is what we see Manto do in *Toba Tek Singh*: he tries to keep himself and his characters from giving positive or negative statements about the partition, exchange of *lunatics*, and other detail in the story. However, as the interpersonal analysis below will show, it is probably impossible to claim that a piece of literature is completely devoid of any subjective and evaluative elements. Even if an explicit occurrence of subjectivity and evaluation is absent, it is hard to imagine a text making no micro-level modality choices and thus not betraying subjective and evaluative stances implicitly. This is what the modality analysis below will reveal. However, as we have been clarifying throughout our discussion on our theoretical framework and analytical model (see Chapters 3 and 4), our focus will be on patterns and not just one-off instances of modality, as it is the patterns which produce macro-level effects.

To begin with, the story contains ten modal verbs: three are equivalent to the English modal verb *should*, six to *can*, and one to *has/have to*. These are not only a few, but they are also distanced from each other in the story, thereby not seeming to develop into a pattern and impact the subject matter. A slight exception is the three occurrences of *should* at the beginning of the story where the governments of Pakistan and India realize that it is their moral obligation to exchange the *lunatics*.

The case with modal adjuncts is not very different; there are 19 of them, with those of intensity having ten occurrences, usuality having five, probability two, temporality one, and obviousness one. With their little frequency, as well as their being used in different contexts, most of them do not appear to be impacting the subject matter, but an exception is certain adjuncts of intensity and usuality used to highlight the peculiar character of Bishen Singh (for which see Example 5.6 below).

A significant exception to what we have noted above is the element of negation (mostly used in the finite part of the Mood along with a finite modal verb), which happens to have 31 occurrences in the text. This comparatively marked (with reference to the significant frequency difference between this and other modal adjuncts) use of the adjunct of negation, at times coupled with locative adjuncts, appears to reinforce the effects of anonymity and uncertainty, especially in the three opening paragraphs. Consider the following two examples:

Example 5.4:

> **معلوم نہیں** یہ بات معقول تھی یا غیر معقول
> *[It is] **not known** if this was reasonable or unreasonable*

Through esualc evitagen eht معلوم نہیں (*[it is] not known*), the writer seems to indicate lack of knowledge and understanding. The juxtaposition of two opposing ideas in the embedded clause, معقول (*reasonable*) and غیر معقول (*unreasonable*), indicates that this lack of knowledge is related to the two governments' sudden decision of removing the *lunatics* from where they have been living for years and sending them to another place they have no knowledge of. No one seems to be in a position to state clearly whether or not it was an appropriate decision. The writer presents the dilemma like the irresolvable Shakespearean question *to be or not to be*, whereby everyone lacks a definite answer. Ambiguity and uncertainty are apparent in the clause. Similarly, the negation in the beginning of the next paragraph ادھر کا معلوم نہیں (*[It is] **not known** about there* (the reference is to India)) also indicates lack of knowledge, and thus serves to reiterate the effect of uncertainty.

The uncertainty, emphasised through the use of the adjunct of negation, continues down to the last occurrence of it by the end of the story. This last occurrence deserves a mention, as it is used in a marked way:

Example 5.5:

سورج نکلنے سے پہلے ساکت و صامت بشن سنگھ کے حلق سے ایک فلک شگاف چیخ نکلی____ ادھر
ادھر سے کئی افسر دوڑے آئے اور دیکھا کہ وہ آدمی جو پندرہ برس تک دن رات اپنی ٹانگوں پر کھڑا رہا
تھا، اوندھے منہ لیٹا ہے۔ ادھر خاردار تاروں کے پیچھے ہندوستان تھا____ ادھر ویسے ہی تاروں کے
پیچھے پاکستان۔ درمیان میں زمین کے اس ٹکڑے پر **جس کا کوئی نام نہیں تھا**، ٹوبہ ٹیک سنگھ پڑا تھا!

*Before the sun came out, a sky-piercing shriek came out of the throat of Bishen Singh. Several officers rushed [to him] from here and there and saw that the man who had been standing on his legs for fifteen years was lying prostrate. There, behind the barbed wires, was India; there, behind the similar wires, was Pakistan. In the middle, on the piece of land **which had no name**, was lying Toba Tek Singh.*

The use of negation appears marked when we compare it to the prior occurrences in the story. Throughout the story, negation has been used as part of the Mood element, and sometimes as an inherent feature of lexical verbs or adjectives (such as *unknown*). Contrarily, here it is serving as an adjective modifying a noun *no name* (cf. Bache's (2007; especially p. 230) relevant discussion on the difference between clausal and limited syntactic fields of negation). As such, it breaks what we may call a *textual norm*; precisely, the norm of using adjuncts of negation in the finite aspect of the Mood in the text, or as an inherent part of a lexical verb or adjective. This is what Boase-Beier (2006, p. 128) notes about such phenomena:

> Pattern is an obvious way of foregrounding particular elements of a text. Breaking the pattern can foreground them even more, if the pattern is first established strongly enough to attract the reader's attention.

The breach of the pattern of negation, thus, gives enormous significance to the last clause complex in the example above. It not only serves to highlight the tragic fate of Bishen Singh but also emphasises the point that the story which started with anonymity and uncertainty ends in (marked) anonymity and uncertainty, i.e. Bishen Singh dying in a place which has no name. Throughout, he has been shown in search of the whereabouts of *Toba Tek Singh* - a place which gives him an identity. The search for identity, however, ends in anonymity and uncertainty when Bishen Singh finds himself in a place which is nameless. (There are some deeper symbolic/ideological interpretations as well, but, as they are out of the scope of the current study, they are not dealt with here.)

Another significant role played by negation is in terms of characterisation; specifically, when the peculiar habits and mental condition of Bishen Singh are introduced in the first seven paragraphs since the entry of the protagonist on the scene. Consider the following example:

Example 5.6:

> **دن کو سوتا تھا نہ رات کو۔** پہرے داروں کا یہ کہنا تھا کہ پندرہ برس کے طویل عرصے میں وہ ایک لحظے کے لئے بھی نہیں سویا۔ **لیٹتا بھی نہیں تھا۔** البتہ کبھی کبھی کسی دیوار کے ساتھ ٹیک لگا لیتا تھا۔
>
> *[He]* ***slept neither during day nor at night****. The guards said that he **had not slept** even for a moment in such a long duration as fifteen years. [He]* ***did not even lie down****. However, [he] would sometimes rest against a wall.*

The negation, here, along with the temporal adjuncts (both circumstantial and modal, the latter comprising *sometimes*) and the adjuncts of intensity (two occurrences of *even*), serves to make a *character-profile* of Bishen Singh, highlighting his idiosyncrasies and thus portraying him as different from others, and as an extremist. We, thus, come to know that the strange man has not slept *even* for a moment for the last fifteen years, and he does not *even* bother to lie down. Bishen Singh's stubbornness and extremism becomes even more prominent when in the next paragraph of the story, we come to know that he is in utter pain because of his peculiar habit, but even then he is not willing to rest. (As a passing remark, we would like to mention that like in Example 5.6 above, this example also contains a marked use of negation in the first clause, in that it is employed as a conjunction, not as part of the finite or that of a lexical verb or adjective.) Later on, we see negation playing a role in introducing further strange characteristics of Bishen Singh, which help develop the plot in a certain way (see discussion under Example 5.13 and 5.14 for detail).

5.1.3.2 Formality/Informality:

Manto has used informal and conversational diction in the story, much of which reflects the way people speak in day-to-day conversation. An extension to this is Manto's use of expressions characterising various social or ethnic registers. An interesting example is the use of a couple of colloquial vocatives reflecting different ethnic/religious groups. When a Muslim lunatic asks a fellow Muslim lunatic about

Pakistan, he calls him مولبی ساب (*Molbi Saab*) – an informal way of addressing a pious Muslim having a beard. Similarly, when a Sikh lunatic asks another Sikh lunatic a question, he addresses the listener with the colloquial honorific سردار جی (*Sardar Ji*) – an expression used by the native speakers to address a male Sikh. Another interesting example is the code-mixing of English when Manto talks about two Anglo-Indian *lunatics*. He uses the English colloquial expression *bloody* in Urdu writing script, so as to copy the way average English people speak.

The technique of informality and conventionalisation maintained in the story not only gives the text a sense of naturalness but also draws the writer and the reader closer to each other. Also, on a general level, it gives Manto an opportunity to reach a wider audience and to make his themes and messages easy to understand and relate to (see Section 2.2.3.1 for a couple of other possible reasons).

5.1.4 Textual Metafunction:

5.1.4.1 Cohesion:

The cohesive device of repetition appears to play an important role in the text. For instance, Manto presents Bishen Singh repeating the clause *where is Toba Tek Singh?* several times across the story (seven occurrences in total), thereby emphasising the central importance of the place in the text. Before moving on to the next point, we should point out that, in the last occurrence of the clause, Manto makes a slight change:

Example 5.7:

> جب بشن سنگھ کی باری آئی۔۔تو اس نے پوچھا: "ٹوبہ ٹیک سنگھ **کہاں** ہے۔۔۔۔ پاکستان میں یا ہندوستان میں؟"
> متعلقہ افسر ہنسا: "پاکستان میں۔"
> یہ سن کر بشن سنگھ اچھل کر ایک طرف ہٹا۔۔۔ پاکستانی سپاہیوں نے اسے پکڑ لیا اور دوسری طرف لے جانے لگے مگر اس نے چلنے سے انکار کر دیا: "ٹوبہ ٹیک سنگھ **یہاں** ہے۔۔۔۔ " اور زور زور سے چلانے لگا۔۔۔
>
> *When it was Bishen Singh's turn…he asked: "**Where** is Toba Tek Singh – in Pakistan or India?"*
> *The concerning officer laughed: "In Pakistan."*
> *Hearing this, Bishen Singh hopped aside…. Pakistani policemen caught him and started taking him to the other side, but he refused to walk: "**Here** is Toba Tek Singh!" and started shouting…*

As is evident from above, Bishen Singh makes a one-word shift in the repetition, replacing *where* with *here*. Throughout, he has been looking for an answer to his enquiry as to where *Toba Tek Singh* is, whereby the spatial adverb *where* has been denoting lack of information and certainty. When he finally becomes sure of its being in Pakistan, he supplants *where* with *here*, indicating certainty and surety. In other words, this marked use of *here* suddenly makes the uncertainty and confusion rampant across the story to disappear. Bishen Singh now has the clarity; he knows where his beloved town is, and he wants to live in no place other than his hometown. This, however, is too late, as we soon find him lying dead in no man's land (see Example 5.5). The contrast between sudden clarity and happiness and the tragedy that follows seems to reinforce the poignancy of the tragedy.

We also find a repetition of the word پاگل (*lunatic*) over and over again, sometimes at places where there seems to be no need for it at all. A clear example is as follows:

Example 5.8:

<div dir="rtl">

بعض **پاگل** ایسے بھی تھے جو **پاگل** نہیں تھے۔
</div>
*There were some **lunatics** who were not **lunatic***.

The repetition of *lunatic* in the example seems redundant, since the clause complex can easily be rendered without the second occurrence of *lunatic* (compare with *There were some inmates who were not lunatic*, or simply *some inmates were not lunatic*), giving it a more fluent and natural look. Anyhow, Manto chooses to repeat the word not only in this clause complex but also throughout the story, which seems to reinforce the subject matter. (See Iqbal's (2012, p. 203) relevant comment that " منٹو تکرار کو کہانی کے مرکزی تھیم کو اُبھارنے کے لیے استعمال کرتے ہیں۔ یہ تکرار کہانی کی فضا معین کر دیتا ہے" ("Manto uses repetition to highlight the central theme of the story. This repetition determines the setting of the story"). To be specific, it seems to serve as a constant reminder to the reader that the story revolves around *lunatics* and their confusion and uncertainty. Another repetition reinforcing this effect is that of the meaningless sentence that Bishen Singh is in the habit of uttering time and again (see Sections 2.2.3.3 and 2.2.3.5 for detail).

5.1.4.2 Thematic Structure:

Manto uses unmarked themes throughout *Toba Tek Singh*; no marked themes are found. As regards the participants occupying the topical theme position, it is interesting to note that, until the middle of the story, most of these participants are anonymous animate beings (see the detail on participants modified by non-deictic expressions under Section 5.1.2) as well as inanimate objects and abstract ideas, such as *question*, *country*, and *change*. However, from the entry of Bishen Singh until the end of the story, it is mostly he who occupies the topical theme position. This is in line with what we have already observed in the case of the transitivity and modality structures above, and it is also in keeping with what is usual to expect as readers: the expectation that the central character is at the helm of activities and happenings in the story.

We should also note that the text contains a substantial number of circumstantial adjuncts in theme position, a good number of which are spatiotemporal references (19 spatial and 34 temporal). Spatial adjuncts are especially important in the story, which is because certain place references seem to play a central role in developing the plot. So, what we observe is a sizeable number of spatial adjuncts in theme position referring to *Pakistan*, *India*, *Lahore asylum*, and *Toba Tek Singh*, i.e. the places around which the story revolves. Several of these circumstantial spatial adjuncts are accompanied by textual spatial adjuncts referring to these central places. See the following example:

Example 5.9:

<div dir="rtl">

ادھر کا معلوم نہیں لیکن **ادھر لاہور کے پاگل خانے میں** جب اس تبادلے کی خبر پہنچی۔۔۔
</div>

About there, *nothing is known*, ***but here in the Lahore asylum***, *when the news of this exchange reached...*

Note that proximal adjuncts یہاں and ادھر (both meaning *here*) are used with Pakistan and the distal adjunct ادھر (equivalent to *there*) is used for India. Throughout the story, these proximal and distal adjuncts are used to point out that the story has been told from the perspective of the *lunatics* in a Pakistani asylum.

We should also note here that some of the circumstantial and textual spatial adjuncts used in theme position are specific to the linguistic conventions of Urdu. 5.9 is an excellent example, where thematic placement of circumstantial adjunct *about there* is natural in Urdu (a search through Google search engine reveals 12,800 hits of ادھر کا in the initial position, whereas a search for *about there* does not yield any occurrence of it used in the clause initial position in a similar context) but would look highly marked when placed in theme in English. Given this, there is every possibility that the selected translators would go for normalising such Urdu-specific spatial adjuncts according to the norms of the English language, and it would be interesting to see in the analysis as to what strategy the translators actually adopt and to what effect.

5.1.5 Conclusion:

We can infer some key points about the ST style from the analysis above:

- Almost all the material processes in the three opening paragraphs of the story keep the identity of the actor anonymous.

- A majority of noun phrases in the story help maintain the air of anonymity.

- The adjunct of negation and those of location, namely *here* and *there*, bolster the anonymity, indicating an environment where lack of certainty is the order of the day.

- The effect of confusion and uncertainty, thus reinforces the subject matter: portrayal of the confusion and uncertainty the *lunatics* go through once the news of the exchange reaches the asylum.

- The adjunct of negation also serves to betray the mental disposition of Bishen Singh, the main character in the story. He is oblivious of the environment and the only thing (see below) he remembers and cares about is Toba Tek Singh.

- Repetition of the clause *where is Toba Tek Singh?* makes it explicit as to what it is that Bishen Singh is most concerned with – even more than his relatives, including his daughter.

- Unmarked themes populate the text, and there is considerable number of spatiotemporal adjuncts in theme position. A significant use of the spatial adjuncts in theme position is emphasising which place and perspective the story is told from.

Let us now turn to make a stylistic profile of the TTs against this ST stylistic profile.

5.2 Tahira Naqvi's Translation of *Toba Tek Singh*:

5.2.1 Ideational Metafunction and Transitivity Analysis:

There are 389 processes in Naqvi's translation, and the distribution of them is as follows:

Sr. Number	Process	Occurrences	Comparison with the ST
1	Material	177	191
2	Mental	25	31
3	Relational	105	120
4	Behavioural	14	14
5	Verbal	62	46
6	Existential	6	4

Table 5.2 Frequency of Processes in Naqvi's Translation of *Toba Tek Singh*

If we compare the frequency of processes in the ST and the TT, we can see close proximity between the two, with the ST having 406 processes and the TT 389. The TT has only 17 processes fewer than that of the ST.

In the ST, we noted the effects of anonymity, ambiguity, and uncertainty realised through the transitivity structure of the opening paragraphs (see Section 5.1.2). The TT more or less maintains the ST structural makeup and the effects thus produced. In comparison to the 14 material processes in the ST, there are 12 in the TT. Out of these, eight are action processes and four event processes. All the event processes and six of the action processes do not point to a specific human agency, thereby suggesting a sense of lack of clarity and anonymity. Interestingly, as the discussion under the example below will show, anonymity is there even in the remaining two action processes indicating a human agency:

Example 5.10:

  5.10(a) One man… was approached by a friend.
  5.10(b) A place in India where **they** manufacture razors.

Modified by the non-deictic article *a*, the agent *friend* in 5.10(a) keeps the identity of the speaker anonymous. We just know that the asker is an inmate of the lunatic asylum in Lahore, but we do not have any specific information about him, such as his name; he is just *a friend*. The same is true for 5.10(b), where the non-deictic pronoun *they* begs the question *who are 'they'?* We have no contextual reference within or outside of the text revealing the identity of *they*. Given this, we can see that these two clauses are as ambiguous as the agent-less processes in the three passages. It is with this scheme that we see an attempt to preserve the air of anonymity and uncertainty that we observed while analysing the ST.

Past the three opening paragraphs, the TT continues with the use of non-deictic expressions, that of *a*, *an*, *one*, and *some* to keep the initiators of the action anonymous, thereby suggesting a sense of ambiguity and uncertainty. Some examples are *a place*, *a Sikh lunatic*, and *a fat Muslim*. As in the ST, this scheme continues down to the middle of the story.

Finally, like the ST, the TT bolsters the anonymity and ambiguity with such ambiguous noun phrases as *the intellectuals*, *partition*, and *conferences*. Through the strategies above, Naqvi retains the ST portrayal of the confusion and uncertainty surrounding the thoughts and actions of the *lunatics*.

5.2.2 Interpersonal Metafunction:

On a general level, Naqvi follows the ST in adopting the narratorial technique of *external narratorial point of view*. Let us now see the lexicogrammatical interpersonal structure of the TT to report the micro-level similarities and differences between the two texts under the overall narratorial technique.

5.2.2.1 Modality:

In comparison to the ten ST modal verbs, the TT contains 15, with the following distribution:

Type	Naqvi's Translation	ST
Can	11	6

Should	3	3
Might	1	0
Has/have to	0	1
Total	**15**	**10**

*Table 5.*3 Frequency of Modal Verbs in Naqvi's Translation of *Toba Tek Singh*

The TT has comparatively more modal verbs than that in the ST, the major difference being that of the TT having more occurrences of *can* as compared to the ST. The TT retains as many as five out of six ST occurrences of *can*, whereas adding six more occurrences. Through these added instances, we see the TT bringing the inability of *lunatics* into a bit more limelight than the ST does. The following is an illustrative example:

Example 5.11[16]:

<div dir="rtl">

لیکن کسی کو بھی معلوم نہیں تھا کہ وہ پاکستان میں ہے یا ہندوستان میں۔

</div>

But no one knew if it [Toba Tek Singh] was in Pakistan or India.
But no one **could** answer that question for him.

Bishen Singh enquires his fellow *lunatics* about the whereabouts of *Toba Tek Singh*, but no one is able to tell him clearly about it. This lack of clarity and confusion on the part of the *lunatics* is present in both the ST and the TT clauses above, but the choice of following the negation *no one* with *could* in the TT clause highlights the inability of the *lunatics* to understand the environment. Apart from this slight emphasis on inability, the two texts do not reveal any significant differences concerning modal verbs.

Modal adjuncts are almost the same in number as in the ST, as shown in the table below:

Type	Naqvi's Translation	ST
Usuality	4	5
Temporality	4	1
Probability	2	2
Intensity	4	10
Obviousness	0	1
Opinion/impression	1	0
Total	**15**	**19**

Table 5.4 Frequency of Modal Adjuncts in Naqvi's Translation of *Toba Tek Singh*

---

[16] Throughout the analysis, the first line of an example would comprise the ST, whereas the next line its literal translation in italics, and the last (where available) the translator's translation (i.e. the TT).

Overall, the two texts seem not too distant from each other in terms of the number of modal adjuncts. However, a small difference is in terms of the adjuncts of intensity, where the TT has less than half of these adjuncts in the ST. This causes lack of emphasis at corresponding places in the TT, as illustrated in the example below:

Example 5.12:

پہرہ داروں کا یہ کہنا تھا کہ پندرہ برس کے طویل عرصے میں وہ ایک لحظے کے لئے **بھی** نہیں سویا۔ لیٹتا **بھی** نہیں تھا۔
*Guards said that he had not slept **even** for a moment in such a long duration as fifteen years. [He] did not **even** lie down.*
According to the guards, he had not slept at all in fifteen years. He did not lie down either.

The stress created by the two occurrences of *even* in the ST clauses above is toned down in the TT. However, does this lack affect the subject matter and the related stylistic effects in the ST significantly? As the example manifests, it does not, and hence the lack of intensity in the TT is not significant. If instead of this adjunct of intensity, the TT had omitted the negation from the example clauses above, we would have a significant case of shift, whereby the ST portrayal of Bishen Singh as a unique personality would have diminished in the TT.

In contrast to the preservation of negation we have observed in the example above, the TT tends to omit the ST negation at several places (to the extent that it altogether omits two clauses comprising negation). The following clause will serve to demonstrate how this impacts an important aspect, namely, the portrayal of Bishen Singh's character:

Example 5.13:

اس کو یہ قطعًا **معلوم نہیں تھا** کہ دن کون سا ہے، مہینہ کون سا ہے یا کتنے سال بیت چکے ہیں۔
*He **did not know** at all as to what the day was, what the month was, or how many years had passed.*
It was apparent he was impervious to the passage of time.

The ST clauses above seem to highlight Bishen Singh's indifference to the running time. For this purpose, Manto adds an introductory clause, adding in it an adjunct of negation *not* and that of emphasis *at all*. This serves to alert the readers that they are going to be introduced to some important, and possibly negative, aspect of Bishen

Singh's mental disposition - which turns out to be a lack of knowledge about the passage of time. This depiction of Bishen Singh as a person having no idea of the running time is important as it helps to build his character as a person detached from the realities of life and the world. The information also serves as a stark contrast to the later information in the story that, despite his inability to keep track of such an important matter as time, Bishen Singh automatically knows when his relatives are going to visit him. This seems to be because they come from his beloved hometown *Toba Tek Singh* – the only thing he remembers and cares about. When translating this significant clause complex, Naqvi merely offers a synopsis, neither mentioning time-units nor the adjuncts of negation and emphasis, thereby downplaying the sense of Bishen Singh's detachment from the world. It is further downplayed by omitting the following ST clause:

Example 5.14:

<div dir="rtl">

بشن سنگھ اس کو پہچانتا **بھی نہیں** تھا۔

</div>

*Bishen Singh did **not even** recognise her.*

This statement should be read as a continuation of the depiction of detachment from the world that we have just observed in Example 5.14 above. Bishen Singh is so indifferent to the real world that he does not even recognise his own daughter; despite this, as mentioned earlier, he is strangely able to remember his hometown and longs for living in it. The TT omits the whole clause, thereby de-emphasising the contrasting effect of *detachment from the important realities of the world* vs. *attachment with a place whose whereabouts are unknown.*

5.2.2.2 Formality/Informality:

The TT presents an interesting mix of informal and formal style, whereby the informal style of the ST is preserved at places and toned down at other places. Perhaps the most interesting example of the first case is the following:

Example 5.15:

<div dir="rtl">

چنانچہ وہ دفعدار سے کہتا کہ **اس کی ملاقات** آ رہی ہے۔

</div>

*So, he would tell the guard that **his visit is coming**.*

Before their arrival, he would tell the guard **his "visit" was coming**.

اس کی ملاقات آ رہی ہے (*his visit is coming*) is a highly informal and conversational expression in Urdu, hardly to be found in any formal piece of writing. A formal alternative would be اس کے ملاقاتی آ رہے ہیں *17* (*his visitors are coming*); that is to say, in a formal text, the personification of the abstract concept *visit* would be replaced with the actual doers of the action, namely, *visitors*. Naqvi preserves this informality with an almost word-for-word translation. She does this at the expense of breaking the natural flow of the English language through the odd construction *his 'visit' was coming*, since personification of *visit* like this is not normal in English (cf. the notion of *negative transfer* in Toury, 1995, p. 275).

Contrary to the above, there are places where the TT substitutes the informal style with a formal one, as the following example will illustrate:

Example 5.16:

ایک دن نہاتے نہاتے---
One day, while taking a bath…
During the course of a bath…

The straightforward, conversational construction of the ST clause is converted into a formal expression by using *the course of a bath*.

The following example is perhaps more telling:

Example 5.17:

یورپین وارڈ رہے گا یا اُڑا **دیا جائے گا.**
*If the European ward will remain or **be blown away**.*
Will the European Ward **be retained**?

اُڑا دیا جائے گا (*blown away*) carries a highly informal tone. Naqvi, however, chooses to replace it with a formal *be retained*.

---

17 A Google search for the expression ملاقاتی آ رہے ہیں (*visitors are coming*) returned three unique results, whereas a similar search for ملاقات آ رہی ہے (*visit is coming*) returned no pages other than those containing the short story *Toba Tek Singh*.

Similar to her mixed attitude towards phrases (as exemplified above), Naqvi sometimes uses familiar and conversational words and sometimes difficult and formal ones. *Interjected*, *deranged*, and *disorientation* are a few illustrative examples of the latter case, adding to the formal tone of the translations noted in the examples above.

As regards her treatment of the ST colloquial vocatives, Naqvi shows the same mixed attitude, retaning some and omitting others. For instance, she keeps the vocative *Sardarji* (this is the spelling she uses for *Sardar Ji* in the TT) but omits *Molbi Saab*.

The mixed attitude adopted by Naqvi towards the informal style of the ST, especially that of colloquialism, devoids her translation of being as accessible to the ordinary people as the ST.

5.2.3 Textual Metafunction:

5.2.3.1 Cohesion:

Naqvi retains all occurrences of the central quest – i.e. the main question by the protagonist *where is Toba Tek Singh?* – and the meaningless sentence Bishen Singh is habitual of using. However, she does not retain all occurrences of the repetition of the word پاگل (*lunatic*). The tendency tones down the *reminding effect* of the repetition.

5.2.3.2 Thematic Structure:

Following the ST, the TT contains unmarked themes. It also closely follows the ST in terms of placing participants in the topical theme position, with only 20 shifts. We have also observed that, if a participant, say, Bishen Singh, is not preserved in the topical theme position at certain places, then its lack is compensated by shifting it from rheme to the topical theme position at other places. However, a small shift pattern is visible concerning thematic position of the word پاگل/پاگلوں (*lunatic(s)*). There are a few places where Naqvi displaces the *lunatics* from theme (*four occurrences*, to be exact) but does not compensate by promoting them to theme position in other places. The following is an example of the displacement:

Example 5.18:

> **ایک پاگل** تو پاکستان اور ہندوستان، اور ہندوستان اور پاکستان کے چکر میں کچھ ایسا گرفتار ہوا کہ اور زیادہ پاگل ہو گیا۔
>
> *One lunatic* *got so entangled in the issue of Pakistan and India, and India and Pakistan that he became madder.*
>
> **For one lunatic**, the entire issue of Hindustan-Pakistan and Pakistan-Hindustan resulted in further disorientation.

As is evident, *lunatic* is in the most prominent thematic position, i.e. it is serving as the topical theme, in the ST clause. On the other hand, it is relegated to being part of the circumstantial adjunct *for one lunatic* in thematic structure of the TT clause. Anyhow, as mentioned above, there are only four occurrences where *lunatic* is displaced from the topical theme position, and hence the macro-level impact of it is negligible.

As Urdu and English have different conventions about the position of adjuncts in a clause, many of the spatiotemporal references which are in theme position in the ST lose this place in the TT. To be precise, the TT omits 12 out of 19 occurrences of spatial adjuncts, and 18 out of 34 occurrences of temporal adjuncts. However, it adds six temporal adjuncts as well, counting which the total number of TT spatial adjuncts would amount to 22. Consider the following as an example of the thematic loss of spatiotemporal adjuncts in the TT:

Example 5.19:

> **ادھر کا** معلوم نہیں
>
> *About there, nothing is known*
>
> What happened **in India** is not known

The spatial adjunct *there* in the ST clause is referring to India. In the given construction, it falls in theme position in Urdu. However, in the TT, following the convention of English, it is not placed in theme position and is converted into a circumstantial adjunct falling in rheme.

These types of shifts occurring due to language-specific constraints or conventions are in plenty across the story. As a natural outcome of this thematic shift, the prominence that the spatiotemporal references enjoy in the ST is downplayed a little in the TT. We

say *a little* because their thematic position in the ST and the non-thematic position in the TT correspond to the linguistic conventions of Urdu and English, and hence they are not serving as marked themes in both the texts. In other words, their not being marked means both the author and the translator do not deliberately put emphasis on them, and hence the difference between the texts in this regard is not very significant.

5.2.4 Conclusion:

The analysis presents a few key findings (which will help us to answer the research questions in the chapter on conclusion):

- Material processes in the three opening paragraphs of the TT more or less maintain the ST effect of anonymity and uncertainty.
- Naqvi uses certain noun phrases, non-deictic and otherwise, to retain the effect.
- The TT displays similar number of modal verbs and adjuncts as in the ST.
- However, the TT tones down the ST element of intensity to some extent, but with negligible effect on the subject matter and the effects of the ST.
- Naqvi omits certain adjuncts of negation which help build the character of Bishen Singh as a man who does not know about the running time and does not even recognise his daughter.
- Compared to the ST informal style, the TT reproduces it partially, shifting from informality to formality at places. This makes her translation as much accessible as the ST.
- The TT treatment of ST lexical repetition follows suit, whereby the repetition and the associated effect of emphasis and reminder are retained partially.
- Like the ST, the TT has unmarked themes.
- Except for the case of *lunatics*, the TT more or less retains the ST topical theme participants in this priority position.
- However, predominantly owing to the linguistic differences, the thematic prominence of the ST spatiotemporal adjuncts is not mostly maintained in the TT, though the effect is not highly significant as the placement or the otherwise of spatiotemporal adjuncts is used following the conventions of the

two languages and hence the choice is thematically unmarked for both the ST and the TT.

5.3 Analysis of Jai Ratan's Translation of *Toba Tek Singh*:

5.3.1 Ideational Metafunction and Transitivity Analysis:

Whereas the ST has 406 processes, Ratan's translation has 442. The distribution of these is as follows:

Sr. Number	Process	Occurrences	Comparison with the ST
1	Material	197	191
2	Mental	37	31
3	Relational	130	120
4	Behavioural	17	14
5	Verbal	54	46
6	Existential	7	4

Table 5.5 Frequency of Processes in Ratan's Translation of *Toba Tek Singh*

Unlike Naqvi's translation, which has fewer processes than that in the ST, Ratan's translation has 36 processes more than that of the ST. This obviously indicates Ratan's tendency to add clauses. However, it is noteworthy that some of the clauses that he adds hardly add any significant new detail. These are small clauses, mostly formed by converting ST phrases into clauses, such as the following:

Example 5.21:

اس نے بڑے غوروفکر کے بعد جواب دیا...
He replied after profound reflection...
A Muslim lunatic...**reflected for a while** and then replied...

The phrase *after great reflection* is turned into a clause, and no new detail is added. (Apart from this, however, there are additions which have some ideational and interpersonal connotations, which we will deal with later.)

With this general note on the overall transitivity structure of the translation, let us now turn to the three opening paragraphs. In contrast to the 14 material processes in the ST, the TT has 17 material processes. Out of these, 14 are action processes and three

event processes. As is obvious, the event processes are not pointing to a human agency; similarly, 13 action processes are in the passive voice, with no mention of who the actual doer of the action is. The following is the only action process having a human agent:

Example 5.22:

> Since almost all the Hindus and Sikhs had migrated from Pakistan...

Interestingly, this is also the only action process having a human agent in the ST – a fact that is suggestive of the TT closely following the ST structure. Through this and the other facts pointed out above, we can detect close proximity between the ST and the TT in terms of producing a sense of anonymity and uncertainty in the opening paragraphs. This is supplemented with noun phrases which do not specify a clear agent, such as *wise men*, *partition*, and *conferences*.

After the three opening paragraphs, we find a proliferation of participants modified by non-deictic expressions of *a*, *an*, and *one* until the middle of the story. A couple of examples are *a Sikh lunatic* and *one inmate*. As is evident, these participants do not point to a specific person, and hence, like in the ST, the technique helps reinforce the stylistic effect of anonymity, ambiguity, and uncertainty. However, like in the ST, with the entry of Bishen Singh on the scene by the middle of the story, we start noticing a predominant use of identifiable participants.

The findings above suggest that the transitivity structure of the TT follows the ST in maintaining an effect of anonymity and uncertainty until the middle of the story). However, we should point out a small pattern of shift regarding agency. There are 17 places in the TT where we see human agents[18] added or transferred to the topical theme position. Though not highly significant in terms of frequency, the pattern, with the agents occupying the prominent position of topical theme, does modify the metafunctional outlook of the ST to some extent. Consider the following examples:

---

[18] We are excluding the non-human agents from this, as they are very few and do not seem to impact the central idea of the text in any significant way.

Example 5.23:

5.23(a) پہرے داروں کا یہ کہنا تھا کہ پندرہ برس کے طویل عرصے میں وہ ایک لحظے کے لیے بھی نہیں سویا۔ لیٹتا بھی نہیں تھا۔ البتہ کبھی کبھی کسی دیوار کے ساتھ ٹیک لگا لیتا تھا۔

The wardens said that he had not slept even for a moment in the long duration of fifteen years. [He] did not even lie down. However, [he] sometimes would lean against a wall.

The warden said that **he had never seen him** having a wink of sleep **since he had come to the asylum** 15 years ago. He would not even lie down **to rest**. **When he felt like it** he would just lean against the wall.

5.23(b) They were not aware of the holocaust that had come in the wake of the Partition.

Example 5.23(a) shows an addition of four clauses. Leaving aside the infinitive clause *to rest* − which, through the strategy of explicitation, seems to only serve as expressing what otherwise is implied in the clause − the three added clauses proffer the agents more visibility and, especially for the two clauses about Bishen Singh, more responsibility and authority. For instance, a later clause in the ST tells us that Bishen Singh's relatives had chained him and brought to the lunatic asylum forcefully. The piece of information clearly shows that the relatives did this against his will. Contrarily, the TT, by assigning Bishen Singh the topical theme position in *since he had come to the asylum 15 years ago*, presents him as someone who willingly decided to come to the asylum; a sense of being responsible for one's actions is visible here. There are ten TT clauses in total which assign Bishen Singh to the topical theme position, thereby giving him more visibility and presenting him as in control of the state-of-affairs. In the same vein, there are five TT clauses, including 5.23(b) above, which place other *lunatics* in the topical theme position, assigning them more visibility and a sense of authority or responsibility.

Above, we have seen how closely the TT tries to maintain the ST effect of anonymity and uncertainty, but, at the same time, we have also pointed out that the TT gives a bit more visibility and authority to Bishen Singh and other *lunatics* by placing them in the topical theme position.

5.3.2 Interpersonal Metafunction:

Like Naqvi, Ratan overall follows the *external narratorial point of view* technique. The following discussion delineates how the micro-level interpersonal structure of the TT actualises this technique, and reports any shifts.

5.3.2.1 Modality:

There are 17 modal verbs in the TT, distributed as follows:

Type	Ratan's Translation	ST
Can	14	6
Should	0	3
Might	3	0
Has/have to	0	1
Total	**17**	**10**

Table 5.6 Frequency of Modal Verbs in Ratan's Translation of *Toba Tek Singh*

As the frequency comparison above shows, there is a significant modality difference between the two texts, with the TT having almost twice as many modal verbs as in the ST. The difference becomes more visible when we compare the frequency of each type of modal verb in the two texts. The omission of all three occurrences of *should* and the comparatively more use of *can* are particularly noteworthy. Consider the following example for the former case:

Example 5.24:

> بٹوارے کے دو تین سال بعد پاکستان اور ہندوستان کی حکومتوں کو خیال آیا کہ اخلاقی قیدیوں کی طرح پاگلوں کا تبادلہ بھی **ہونا چاہیے** یعنی جو مسلمان پاگل ہندوستان کے پاگل خانوں میں ہیں انہیں پاکستان **پہنچا دیا جائے** اور جو ہندو اور سکھ پاکستان کے پاگل خانوں میں ہیں انہیں ہندوستان کے **حوالے کر دیا جائے**۔19
>
> *Two or three years after the partition, it occurred to the governments of Pakistan and India that, just like criminal prisoners, lunatics **should** also be exchanged, so the Muslim lunatics who were in Indian lunatic asylums **should** be sent over to Pakistan, and the Hindus and Sikhs in Pakistani lunatic asylums **should** be handed over to India.*
>
> Two or three years after the Partition, it occurred to the Governments of India and Pakistan **to exchange** their *lunatics* in the same manner as they had exchanged their criminals. The Muslim *lunatics* in Indian lunatic asylums **were to be** sent over to Pakistan, and the Hindu and Sikh *lunatics* lodged in Pakistani asylums **were to be** handed over to India.

Talking about the exchange of *lunatics* from Pakistan to India and vice versa, the ST uses *should* three times, presenting the act as something ethical – something that the two governments should do on moral grounds. The TT omits all three occurrences,

---

19 Both the latter occurrences of *should* in the ST are implied ones and are deducible from the context. That is to say, they do not consist of the explicit finite modal verb چاہیے, which is there in the former occurrence.

simply presenting the exchange as something that is going to happen, i.e. as a piece of information. The sense of obligation is thus lost in the translation.

In contrast to the tendency of omitting *should*, Ratan retains as many as four out of the six ST occurrences of *can*; he also adds ten occurrences of it. These additional occurrences add the modality of *probability* and that of *ability/inability* to clauses which otherwise have been presented in the ST as simple declarative utterances with the primary function of informing the readers about something. In addition to that, some occurrences take part in the pattern of adding human agency to the topical theme position (cf. Example 5.23). Below is an example:

Example 5.25:

اس کو ہندوستان بھیج دیا جائے گا۔
He will be sent to India.
He **could** go to India.

The ST clause is in the passive voice, and the agent (*a lunatic*) is absent. Also, it is the affectee occupying the topical theme position. The TT shifts the clause from the passive voice to the active voice, turns the affectee to the agent in the topical theme position, and adds *can*. The scheme shifts the lunatic from the passive role of one who will be shifted to a new place (probably unwillingly, as we are later told that he does not want to leave) by others to one who now has the opportunity (the modality of *probability*) plus the ability to take the action on his own.

Let us now look at the TT modal adjuncts. There are 29 occurrences, with the following distribution:

Type	Ratan's Translation	ST
Usuality	10	5
Temporality	6	1
Probability	0	2
Intensity	11	10
Obviousness	2	1
Opinion/impression	0	0
Total	**29**	**19**

Table 5.7 Frequency of Modal Adjuncts in Ratan's Translation of *Toba Tek Singh*

On the surface of it, the TT seems to have deviated from the ST structure in terms of adding several modal adjuncts, especially those of *usuality* and *temporality*. It should, however, be noted that a close, context-based examination at individual cases reveals that both types of modal adjuncts do not seem to develop a pattern, because they are away from each other in the story and most of them seem to be used in different contexts. In other words, their modal contributions are reserved to individual clauses. Take the following example:

Example 5.26:

<div dir="rtl">

۔۔۔اس نے دوسرے پاگلوں سے پوچھنا شروع کیا کہ ٹوبہ ٹیک سنگھ کہاں ہے۔
</div>

...He started asking others where Toba Tek Singh was.

...Bishen Singh **often** asked the other inmates where *Toba Tek Singh* was.

The TT clause complex adds a modal adjunct of usuality, whereas the ST clause complex is a simple statement about what Bishen Singh started doing once he found his fellow *lunatics* talking about the exchange between Pakistan and India. Apart from this individual context, the adjunct does not seem to contribute anything significant to the macro-level effects and the subject matter of the story.

With regard to the adjuncts of negation, the TT shows no omission. A slight shift, however, is that the TT reproduces four occurrences of ST negation in an indirect way; that is to say, without using such explicit lexical items as *not*, *no*, *nothing*, *neither...nor*, and *never*. The following are a couple of illustrative examples:

Example 5.27:

<div dir="rtl">

5.27(a) اخباروں سے کچھ پتا نہیں چلتا تھا۔
</div>

Nothing was learnt from the newspapers.

The newspapers **hardly** ever gave the true picture.

<div dir="rtl">

5.27(b) بشن سنگھ اس کو پہچانتا ہی نہیں تھا۔
</div>

Bishen Singh did not even recognise her.

Bishen Singh **failed** to recognise her.

In the examples, both *hardly* and *failed* imply negation.

Apart from preserving the ST adjuncts of negation, the TT adds 11 occurrences of it, including a case where Ratan makes one of his characters take a clear ideological stance towards the partition:

Example 5.28:

میں ہندوستان میں رہنا چاہتا ہوں **نہ** پاکستان میں۔
*I want to live **neither** in India **nor** in Pakistan.*
I **don't** want to live in Hindustan or Pakistan. They mean **nothing** to me.

One of the *lunatics* climbs up a tree and when asked by the guards to come down, tells them that he does not want to live in Pakistan or India. The TT, using the strong, negative word *nothing*, adds an expression of open dislike for the countries by the speaker. Though the ST does refer to the lunatic's decision about not living in either of the countries, it does not explicitly say that the countries have no value for the lunatic. In other words, it might be something that some readers can infer from the context, but the fact remains that it has not been pronounced in the ST.

5.3.2.3 Formality/Informality:

The TT follows the ST in producing informality at some places, for example by using such informal lexical items as *dud*, *measly* and *bloody* and such contracted forms as *I'm* and *don't* when reporting direct speech from a participant. Apart from such few instances, the TT shows a pervasive tendency to adopt a formal language. For example, it uses such formal lexical words and phrases as *at the behest of*, *custodian*, *transpire*, *inveterate*, *contrive*, *rigmarole*, *vestige*, *harangued*, *erstwhile*, *spurn*, and *dispensation*. Similarly, it uses well-structured and formal clauses, replacing any ST expressions that would look informal in English with formal ones, as exemplified below:

Example 5.29:

ہندوستان میں ایک ایسی جگہ ہے جہاں استرے بنتے ہیں۔
A place in India where cut-throat razors are made.
This is a place in India known for its excellent cut-throat razors.

The subject is missing in the ST clause, but Ratan, employing the translation strategy of normalization shifts it to a formal English structure, instead of following the ST structure that would look informal in English.

Finally, except for using such culture-specific and/or colloquial lexical items as *salaams* (an Urdu greeting word), *Sardarji*, and *Maulvi Saheb*, Ratan is careful in localising all other such ST lexical items, thereby maintaining the formal appearance of the TT.

5.3.3 Textual Metafunction:

5.3.3.1 Cohesion:

Just like Naqvi, Ratan retains all occurrences of the question *where is Toba Tek Singh?* and that of the meaningless sentence that Bishen Singh is in the habit of using off and on. Contrarily, Ratan chooses to omit several occurrences of پاگل (*lunatic*) as well as replacing some with the neutral expression *inmate*. These omissions and substitutions lessen a little the ST effect of the constant reminder to the reader about the central issue of the story.

5.3.3.2 Thematic Structure:

Like Naqvi's translation, the present TT consists of unmarked themes. A total of 30 shifts are noted in terms of placing participants in the topical theme position. We have already noted that the TT has 17 cases where a human participant is added to the topical theme position. This serves to give these participants, i.e. Bishen Singh and other inmates of the lunatic asylum, a bit more prominence than they had in the ST.

As regards the spatiotemporal adjuncts in theme position, the TT preserves 23 out of 34 occurrences of temporal adjuncts. In addition to it, it adds or shifts from rheme to theme eight occurrences of temporal adjuncts, leading the total number of these adjuncts in the TT to 31. These figures indicate that, despite the preference of Urdu to place spatiotemporal adjuncts in theme position, the TT maintains an amount of temporal adjuncts in theme position which is similar to that in the ST. However, when

it comes to spatial adjuncts, we find the TT preserving only four out of 19 occurrences of the adjuncts. It should be noted that most of the ST occurrences of spatial adjuncts in theme position are usually kept in non-theme position in English by convention, and hence the significant frequency difference between ST spatial adjuncts and that of the TT owes primarily to the linguistic conventions of the two languages. The following is an example of the case in point:

Example 5.30:

ادھر کا معلوم نہیں
About there, *nothing is known*
Nobody knows what transpired **in India**

As is evident, the spatial adjunct *there* is in theme position in the ST clause, but the corresponding spatial adjunct in the TT, i.e. *in India*, comes at the end of the clause, which is the formal position for it in English. This strategy of formalising ST thematic structure at some places tones down the level of prominence spatio-temporal adjuncts enjoy in the ST thematic structure.

5.3.4 Conclusion:

The analysis presents a few key findings, which will help us in answering the research questions in the chapter on conclusion:

- Compared to the 14 material processes in the three opening paragraphs of the ST, the TT has 17 material processes, and all except one help maintain the ST effect of anonymity and uncertainty.
- Ratan reinforces the effect by using certain non-deictic noun phrases and those noun phrases which do not refer to an explicit human agent.
- There are 17 cases where human agency is either added or shifted to the topical theme position; the pattern suggests more activity and responsibility assigned to human agents, particularly Bishen Singh and other *lunatics*, in the TT.
- The TT adds several modal verbs and adjuncts apart from those in the ST; particularly noteworthy shift patterns in this regard are (1) the toning down of

the sense of obligation in the introductory paragraph of the ST, and (2) an increased sense of probability and ability/inability.

- The TT retains all ST occurrences of the adjunct of negation, thereby maintaining the effects of Bishen Singh not knowing about the running time and her daughter and knowing only that *Toba Tek Singh* is the town where he comes from.

- Compared to the ST informal style, the TT displays a tendency to use a formal style.

- Like Naqvi, Ratan partially retains ST lexical repetition and the associated effect of emphasis and reminder.

- Like the ST, the TT has unmarked themes.

- The TT ascribes comparatively more prominence to Bishen Singh and other *lunatics* by shifting them to the topical theme position.

- The TT maintains the ST placement of temporal adjuncts in the topical theme position to a reasonable extent; however, it omits or shifts from theme to rheme, a large number of spatial adjuncts.

5.4 Analysis of Khalid Hasan's Translation of *Toba Tek Singh*:

5.4.1 Ideational Metafunction and Transitivity Analysis:

In comparison to the 406 processes in the ST, there are 363 processes in the TT. The distribution of these is as follows:

Sr. Number	Process	Occurrences	Comparison with the ST
1	Material	163	191
2	Mental	20	31
3	Relational	111	120
4	Behavioural	9	14
5	Verbal	55	46
6	Existential	5	4

Table 5.8 Frequency of Processes in Hasan's Translation of *Toba Tek Singh*

The difference between the two texts in terms of the frequency of processes, with the TT having 43 fewer processes, seems somewhat significant. As we will note later, Hasan shows a tendency of adding clauses, which carry information absent from the ST. If we exclude these clauses from the count, comparing the processes on the basis

of the content or information common between the two texts, the TT would appear having even fewer processes. This indicates that he omits considerable ST content or information.

Apart from the cases of clause deletion, addition of a few clauses is also noted. *Some were perfectly normal*, *he dropped everything*, and *who had an MSc degree* are just a few examples of the case in point. Some of the additions are carried out by converting phrases into clauses (the last example above reflects this), but a large number of additions are *pure* additions, in that they add information which is not there in the original text.

Despite the frequency difference described above, the TT transitivity structure maintains the ST effect of anonymity and uncertainty to a good extent. To begin with, in the opening three paragraphs of the TT, Hasan uses 11 material processes, with nine action and two event processes. Both of the event processes and eight action processes do not point to a specific human agency. The only material clause comprising an action process with a human agent is *the entire population of Hindus and Sikhs had already migrated to India*. Proximity is also noted in regards to the technique of using non-deictic expressions of *a*, *an*, and *one* with various participants in the story in order to avoid specifying a clear agent. Such expressions, as exemplified in *a Sikh lunatic* and *one inmate*, frequent the text until the mid story. Lastly, as regards the use of certain noun phrases to reinforce anonymity and ambiguity in the opening paragraphs of the story, the TT follows the ST in using such ambiguous noun phrases as *important officials*, *partition*, and *conferences*.

5.4.2 Interpersonal Metafunction:

Hasan, like both Naqvi and Ratan, follows the *external narratorial point of view* technique.

5.4.2.1 Modality:

The TT contains 16 modal verbs and 19 modal adjuncts. The tables below show their distribution with reference to their different types:

Type	Hasan's Translation	ST
Can	10	6
Should	4	3
Might	2	0
Has/have to	0	1
Total	**16**	**10**

Table 5.9 Frequency of Modal Verbs in Hasan's Translation of *Toba Tek Singh*

Type	Hasan's Translation	ST
Usuality	9	5
Temporality	3	1
Probability	2	2
Intensity	18	10
Obviousness	0	1
Opinion/impression	0	0
Total	**32**	**19**

Table 5.10 Frequency of Modal Adjuncts in Hasan's Translation of *Toba Tek Singh*

As the tables above show, Hasan has added a significant number of modal verbs and adjuncts. A close analysis of the modality structure reveals that, as well as the additions, there are several omissions as well. Anyhow, what appears to be more prominent in terms of the shifts in modal verbs and adjuncts are (1) the frequent use of *can* as well as the addition of *might* to add ability and probability to the otherwise simple, declarative clauses and (2) the comparatively more use of the adjuncts of usuality and intensity. The following examples illustrate this:

Example 5.31:

5.31(a) جو بتانے کی کوشش کرتے تھے وہ خود اس الجھاؤ میں گرفتار ہو جاتے تھے کہ سیالکوٹ پہلے ہندوستان میں ہوتا تھا پر اب سنا ہے کہ پاکستان میں ہے۔ کیا پتا ہے کہ لاہور جو اب پاکستان میں ہے کل ہندوستان میں چلا جائے، یا سارا ہندوستان ہی پاکستان بن جائے، اور یہ بھی کون سینے پر ہاتھ رکھ کر کہ**سکتا** تھا کہ ہندوستان اور پاکستان دونوں کسی دن سرے سے غائب ہی ہو جائیں۔

*Those who tried to tell [about the whereabouts of Toba Tek Singh] became caught up in the confusion that Sialkot was in Pakistan earlier, but it is heard now that [it] is in Pakistan. Who knows that Lahore, which is now in Pakistan, goes to India tomorrow, or the whole India becomes Pakistan, and who **could** say putting their hand on their chest that both India and Pakistan someday **completely** disappear.*

Those who had tried to solve this **mystery** had become **utterly** confused when told that Sialkot, which used to be in India, was now in Pakistan. It was anybody's guess what was going to happen to Lahore, which was currently in Pakistan, but **could** slide into India any moment. **It was also possible** that the entire subcontinent of India **might** become Pakistan. And who **could** say if both India and Pakistan **might** not **entirely** vanish from the map of the world one day?

5.31(b) البتہ **کبھی کبھی** کسی دیوار سے ٹیک لگا لیتا تھا۔

*However, he would **sometimes** lean against a wall.*

Occasionally he **could** be observed leaning against a wall, but the rest of the time, he was **always** to be found standing.

In 5.31(a), there is one modal verb of ability and one modal adjunct of intensity in the ST. However, the corresponding TT uses as many as seven modal verbs and modal adjuncts, as well as a modal noun, *mystery* (which is adding a personal, evaluative view about the situation – a view which is not there, at least visibly, in the ST).[20] *Utterly* and *entirely* are adding intensity to respective clauses, and the two occurrences of *could* and *might* each, and that of the short clause *it was also possible* are adding a sense of possibility and ability. The addition of *could* and that of the adjunct of usuality, *always*, in the TT clause in 5.31(b) is adding a sense of ability and that of emphasis.

Apart from modal verbs and adjuncts, Hasan has added several modal adjectives as well as some modal nouns. The different purposes for which the additions seem to be introduced include (1) adding intensity, (2) attempting at creating a dramatic, scenic, and poetic environment, and (3) betraying ideological stances. Here are a couple of examples to illustrate the point:

Example 5.32:

5.32(a).یہ جواب سن کر اس کا دوست مطمئن ہو گیا۔
Hearing this answer, his friend became satisfied.
This **profound** observation was received with **visible** satisfaction.
5.32(b).ایک مسلمان پاگل جو بارہ برس سے ہر روز باقاعدگی کے ساتھ "زمیندار" پڑھتا تھا۔
A Muslim lunatic who had been reading "Zamindar"[21] regularly everyday for twelve years...
One Muslim lunatic, a regular reader of the **fire-eating** daily newspaper *Zamindar...*

The context for 5.32(a) is that a Muslim lunatic enquires another Muslim lunatic where Pakistan is. The funny reply by the latter, that it is a place in India where razors are made, satisfies his curiosity. Whereas Manto, a significant characteristic of whose style is brevity and being to-the-point (see Section 2.2.3.2), chooses to avoid any evaluative adjuncts here, Hasan modifies the nouns with evaluative adjectives. The choice of these seems to be motivated by his attempt to intensify the ludicrousness of the conversation between the two *lunatics*: Considering the inmates being mad, words

---

[20] There is also an addition of a couple of clauses, and a shift from tomorrow to any moment which gives more immediacy and suspense to the situation. However, as these are not directly related to the modal structure, and are not developing into a pattern beyond this passage, they are not being dealt with in detail here.

[21] A popular newspaper representing the sentiments of the Muslims of the Indian subcontinent towards the British rule in the first half of the twentieth century.

like *profound observation* and *visible satisfaction* produce an effect of *dramatic irony*, making the scene funny for readers. The latter adjective, i.e. *visible*, also serves to create a scenic atmosphere where readers can see/imagine the satisfaction on the interlocutor's face. Some other modal adjuncts which together create a scenic, dramatic and poetic environment are *a **pretty** young girl*, ***suddenly** stopped*, and *the **old man's** hair* (in place of the original *this Sikh lunatic's hair*).

In 5.32(b), the addition of the modal adjective *fire-eating* manifests Hasan's ideological stance towards the newspaper *Zamindar*, presenting it as a fiery, defiant, biting, and sarcastic publication.

Hasan's interference is also visible in his treatment of the ST adjuncts of negation, where he chooses to omit several of them. Consider the following examples:

Example 5.33:

دن کو سوتا تھا نہ رات کو۔ پہرہ داروں کا یہ کہنا تھا کہ پندرہ برس کے طویل عرصے میں وہ ایک لحظے کے لیے بھی نہیں سویا۔ **لیٹتا بھی نہیں تھا۔** البتہ کبھی کبھی کسی دیوار کے ساتھ ٹیک لگا لیتا تھا۔

[He] slept neither during day nor at night. Guards said that he had not slept even for a moment in such a long duration as fifteen years. [He] did not even lie down. However, he would sometimes rest against a wall.

Guards said he had not slept a wink in fifteen years. Occasionally, he could be observed leaning against a wall, but the rest of the time, he was always to be found standing.

The context is that Manto introduces the protagonist for the first time in the story and, through the adjuncts of negation, reveals the strange and extremist nature of him – something that plays a significant part later in the story. Whereas Hasan chooses to omit the first clause altogether, he omits the negation in the second boldfaced clause by introducing a state which is opposite to the one in the ST. We soon find him avoiding the negation again when he introduces the protagonist's only daughter.

Example 5.34:

بشن سنگھ اس کو پہچانتا ہی **نہیں** تھا۔

*Bishen Singh did **not** even recognise her.*

In the strange world that he inhabited, hers was just another face.

The negation in these and the other neighbouring clauses in the story plays an important role when juxtaposed with another detail. So what we find out is that a person having no idea of such important realities as the passing time and his own daughter clearly knows about *Toba Tek Singh*, his hometown. Also, he does not sleep, does not lie down, does not bother about his physical pain, but what he does do is asking repeatedly asking questions about the whereabouts of his beloved hometown. Hasan's omission of the adjunct of negation, as shown in the examples above, downplays this effect to some extent.

5.4.2.3 Formality/Informality:

It is interesting to note that Hasan seems to have the realisation that the lexical and grammatical structure of the ST is conversational and informal. Given this, he tries to preserve this textual atmosphere in the translation. So, exceptions aside, the TT clauses are conversational and informal. Consider the following example:

Example 5.35:

> If they were in India, **where on earth** was Pakistan? And if they were in Pakistan, then **how come** that until only **the other day** it was India?

The expressions in boldface are colloquial, giving a conversational and informal outlook to the clauses they are part of. Out of the plenty of other examples, some are *caboodle*, *all the way*, *mumble*, and *dead set*.

Elision seems to be Hasan's favourite technique to give a conversational and informal atmosphere to the translation. We can, thus, find frequent occurrences of elision of pronouns, verbs, and so on, at places where it would be normal to have them present in a formal writing. Consider the following examples:

Example 5.36:

5.36(a) When [he was] asked his opinion, he observed solemnly...
5.36(b) Say [to them that] I think of them often...
5.36(c) Lists of *lunatics* from the two sides had been exchanged between the governments, and the date of transfer [was] fixed.

The words in square brackets have been elided by Hasan, which, in a formal piece of work, would normally be explicitly mentioned.

As regards diction, except for a few formal or difficult words – such as *rigmarole*, *preoccupied*, and *pell-mell* – Hasan predominantly uses simple and conversational diction. This is in line with what we see in the ST where Manto chooses to use an informal and easy-to-use-and-understand vocabulary.

As for the translation of the colloquial and culture-specific words of the ST, Hasan again tries to stick to the ST in most of the cases, to the extent of retaining a number of such expressions as they are used in Urdu. He sometimes does this even at the expense of clarity of expression and explicitation which he otherwise tries to maintain throughout the story. Words like *Sardarji*, *Hindostoras*, *bhai*, and *behain* are a few illustrative examples of this practice.

5.4.3 Textual Metafunction:

5.4.3.1 Cohesion:

Just like Naqvi, Hasan maintains the repetition of the question *where is Toba Tek Singh?* but chooses to omit the word پاگل (*lunatic*) altogether at several places or shifts it with the indefinite general *inmate*. This robs the story a little of the constant reminder to the reader about the central issue.

5.4.3.2 Thematic Structure:

Like the previous two translations, the present TT displays unmarked themes. There are 35 shifts in terms of placing participants in the topical theme position. Out of these, there are five occurrences where Bishen Singh, the central figure of the story, is replaced by someone or something else in the topical theme position and seven occurrences where he replaces someone or something else in this prominent position. This indicates that, in this regard, there are no drastic shifts which could have impacted the thematic structure as well as the subject matter of the story.

As regards spatiotemporal adjuncts in theme position, the TT preserves 19 out of 34 ST temporal adjuncts and only three out of 19 ST spatial adjuncts. The predominant reason for such a big difference between the two texts in terms of thematic placement of spatial adjuncts is the linguistic or conventional differences between Urdu and English. Consider the following example:

Example 5.37:

> **ادھر** کا معلوم نہیں
> ***About there***, *nothing is known*
> While it is not known what the reaction **in India** was

The spatial adjunct *there* in the ST clause above conventionally falls in thematic position in Urdu. However, the TT shifts it to rheme owing to the conventions of English, where placing the phrase *about there* in theme position would have looked highly marked. In the same vein, the TT, adopting the strategy of normalisation or formalisation, shifts several other spatio-temporal adjuncts from theme to rheme position.

5.4.4 Conclusion:

The analysis of Hasan's translation presents the following key findings:

- Compared to the 14 material processes in the three opening paragraphs of the ST, the TT has 11 material processes, and all except one help maintain the ST effect of anonymity and uncertainty.
- Hasan, like the other two translators, reinforces the sense of anonymity and uncertainty through the use of certain non-deictic noun phrases and ambiguous (in terms of not denoting a clear human agent) noun phrases.
- The TT contains modal verbs and adjuncts which are significantly more than that of the ST, the main effect being an increased sense of ability, probability, and intensity ascribed to participants and events.
- The TT also uses a considerable number of modal adjectives and noun phrases for various purposes, including that of adding personal opinions and ideologies.

- The TT omits several adjuncts of negation, thereby only partially maintaining the effects related to characterisation and the subject matter.

- Hasan uses straightforward and conversational language, thereby maintaining the ST style of informality.

- Like the other two translators, Hasan partially retains ST lexical repetition and the associated effect of emphasis and reminder.

- The TT has unmarked themes.

- The TT does not deviate much from the ST in regard to placing participants in the topical theme position.

- The TT does not retain most of the ST spatio-temporal adjuncts in the topical theme position.

Chapter 6: Analysis of *Neya Qanoon* and Corresponding Translations

6.1 Analysis of *Neya Qanoon*:

6.1.1 A Brief Introduction to the Story:

Neya Qanoon, published in the anthology *Manto ke Afsaane* (1941), betrays the beliefs and emotions of a tanga-driver, Mangoo. He interprets everything that he hears from his passengers according to his world knowledge and ideology and is adamant enough not to change it, come what may. He hates the English people ruling his country, and when he comes to know that a new law is going to take effect on 1 April, he believes it will bring freedom to the people of the Indo-Pak subcontinent and the objects of his hatred, i.e. the Englishmen, will no longer be their masters. Under this impression, he starts a fight with an Englishman on 1 April and beats him severely. The police put him behind bars, and he learns from them that the law is the same. As can be sensed from this brief introduction, there are two central strands in the story: the beliefs and emotions of Mangoo and his personality traits.

6.1.2 Ideational Metafunction and Effects:

There are 519 processes in the story, distributed as follows:

Sr. Number	Process	Occurrences
1	Material	241
2	Mental	89
3	Relational	96
4	Behavioural	17
5	Verbal	57
6	Existential	0

Table 6.1 Frequency of Processes in *Neya Qanoon*

Starting with a mental process:

منگو کوچوان اپنے اڈے میں بہت عقلمند آدمی سمجھا جاتا تھا۔

Mangoo, the tanga-driver, was considered a very intelligent person in his tanga stand.

the story seems to centre on the mental world of its protagonist. The very high number of material processes apparently seems to suggest the otherwise, but a closer look at the transitivity structure reveals that:

1. almost all the scenes in the story (with an exception of one or two) either start with a clause containing a mental process – سنی (*heard*), نفرت تھی (*hated*), پتہ چلا (*came to know*), etc. – or a mental process coming somewhere in the middle of the event has central importance; the rest of the surrounding detail mostly serves as narrating the real-world realization, or the consequences, of Mangoo's thoughts and feelings; and

2. apart from the mental processes, there are some relational, behavioural, and verbal processes which also portray what is happening in the mental world of Mangoo, such as خواہشمند تھا (*was desirous [of]*), یقین تھا (*was sure*), مسرور تھا (*was happy*), قیاسات داخل ہو رہے تھے (*conjectures were entering [his mind]*), etc. (see Example 6.1 for this).

So what we see in the ST is that it begins with an introduction of Mangoo who, though having no formal education, was *considered* a knowledgeable person; all the tanga-drivers who *were desirous of knowing* what was happening in the world were *aware of* the vastness of Mangoo's knowledge. We are then told that when Mangoo once *heard* that there was a possibility of war in Spain, he let his fellow tanga drivers know about it. When his prediction came true, and all the tanga drivers *came to know* about it, they *admitted in their hearts* that Mangoo was a great man. When Mangoo came back to the tanga stand the same evening, he told that he had *heard* from his elders that the constant disturbances in Hindustan were a result of a saint's curse.

The next scene opens up with the remark that Mangoo *hated* the British. The rest of the scene explains why and how much he hated them. Next, we come to know that he *heard* about a new law which was going to implement in Hindustan on 1 April. The news *gave rise to indescribable happiness in his mind*. When he returned to the stand that evening to tell his fellows about it, he found no one there. This distressed him a

lot. All alone, he started *thinking* about the new law. *A wave of happiness* ran through his body when he recalled a passenger's remark about the new law, and he was *overjoyed*. The *thought* that the white men will disappear once the new law comes into force made him even *happier*.

The pattern goes on until the last scene where we see some real action: exchange of hard looks and words and a resulting fight between Mangoo and an Englishman. Even here, the writer is quick to let us know the mental processes triggering the incident: Mangoo's overarching *hatred* for the British and the Englishman's *recollection* about the past incident with Mangoo where the latter had suffered quietly. In short, walking along with the writer, we visit the mental world of the protagonist; we come to know that

- he is stubborn, impulsive, and curious;
- overhears disjointed pieces of information from his passengers and links them, as he wishes, in his mind, and no one in the world can change the image/ideology he has thus created; and
- detests the British, and once he hears about the upcoming new law, he is overjoyed, thinking that the new law will bring freedom for the people of the Indo-Pak subcontinent and hence the British will no longer be able to keep them under their rule.

As pointed out earlier, apart from these mental processes, certain *non-mental* processes also serve to portray the mental world of Mangoo, let us see a couple of such processes in context:

Example 6.1:

6.1(a) اڈے کے وہ تمام نوجوان جن کو یہ جاننے کی **خواہش ہوتی تھی** کہ دنیا کے اندر کیا ہو رہا ہے استاد منگو کی وسیع معلومات سے **اچھی طرح واقف تھے۔**

*All the young men at the stand who **had a wish for** knowing what was happening in the world **were well aware** of the vast knowledge of Ustaad Mangoo.*

6.1(b) اس کا سارا چہرہ **ہنس رہا تھا** اور اپنے اندر اس نے اس گورے کی آگ میں جلا کر بھسم کر ڈالا تھا۔

*His whole face **was laughing** and, within himself, he had flamed the white man to ashes.*

The two processes boldfaced in 6.1(a) are relational processes but, as is clear, they, apart from showing relations between objects, refer to the mental processes of *wishing* and *knowing* as well. Similarly, the boldfaced process in 6.1(b) is apparently a behavioural process of laughing. But, we know from context, it is a metaphorical expression of the emotions of derision and loathing lurking in the mind of Mangoo.

The number of these *non-mental* processes displaying the inner world of Mangoo is 31, and if we add these to the actual mental processes, we get a sizable amount of 118 processes in total. These processes are like nodes, or central points, which connect the various strands of the story, and around which the other processes revolve.

6.1.3 Interpersonal Metafunction:

In contrast to the narratorial technique Manto adopted in *Toba Tek Singh*, he switches to *internal narratorial point of view*, i.e. a style which focuses on detailing the thoughts, opinions, and feelings of characters. In the text, this narratorial style manifests in a large number of mental and *non-mental* verbs (processes) which depict the thoughts, feelings, and emotions of Mangoo. These processes let the reader peep into the mental world of Mangoo and see how his mind reacts to the events happening around him. Now, a writer can choose to portray the internal world of their characters either explicitly, i.e. by giving explicit detail of what the characters are thinking or feeling and what the causes or outcomes are, or implicitly, i.e. by just hinting at the feelings and emotions and letting the readers draw inferences for themselves. Manto, as we have already observed in the case of the analysis of *Toba Tek Singh*, likes to keep details implicit (see Chapter 5 for the analysis), avoiding any explicit comments on what one is feeling, or what is happening; he normally leaves it to the readers to decode the implicit message and understand things for themselves. In other words, he does not try to overtly intrude by passing explicit comments on what is going on in the story. Thus, the characteristics and ideologies of the characters in his stories normally emerge out of the characters' thoughts, actions, and other related detail; he seldom openly comments on these. The case of Bishen Singh in the story *Toba Tek Singh* is a vivid example of this. We come to know from his habits and behaviour that he (1) is stubborn and adamant by nature, (2) has no sense of what is happening around him, and (3) suffers from memory loss, remembering only his hometown *Toba*

Tek Singh. None of these details is explicitly mentioned by Manto. It is up to the readers to comprehend these from the events and dialogues reported in the story. In the current story, too, Manto keeps detail about the behaviour implicit. For example, he leaves it to his readers to realise from the detail of various events that the protagonist is a credulous person, loves to dominate his fellow tanga drivers, and is easily irritable. But then, deviating from his this style, he, on occasions, passes explicit comments on the personality of Mangoo and his feelings (especially as we near the end of the story). An illustrative example is as under:

Example 6.2:

<div dir="rtl">

استاد **منگو طبعاً بہت جلد باز واقع ہوا تھا۔**وہ ہر سبب کی عملی تشکیل دیکھنے کا نہ صرف خواہشمند تھا بلکہ متجسس تھا۔

</div>

Ustaad Mangoo was very impetuous by nature. He was not only desirous but also curious to see the practical outcome of every cause.

The clause in bold is an explicit comment the former on a personality trait of Ustaad Mangoo. Though it is not clear what triggers Manto to deviate from his usual implicit style at these places, at least it seems apparent that these points are somehow so important in his eyes that he does not want them to escape the attention of the readers.

6.1.3.1 Modality:

To begin with, there are only six occurrences of finite modal verbs in the story, i.e. two of چاہیے (*should*) and four of سکنا (*can*). Though the quantity may seem insignificant, the last three occurrences of the modal verb *can* deserve a mention, as they serve to throw some light on Mangoo's personality. The context for each is described below:

- Until 1 April, Mangoo had heard many arguments in favour of as well as against the new constitution, but he *could not change* (بدل نہ سکا) the favourable portrait of it he had already created in his mind.
- When his wife was expecting a baby, he knew the baby would be born someday, but he was *unable to wait for the time to come* (انتظار کی گھڑیاں نہیں کاٹ سکتا تھا).

- At last, he lost his temper, taunting his wife that she was always lying on the bed and that *nothing could be done* (کچھ نہ ہو سکے گا) because of this.

Whereas the first shows his adamant nature, the latter two hint at his being intolerant and impetuous. These implications about his personality are important, as these explain why he picks up a fight with an Englishman and consequently has to face insult and imprisonment.

The personality traits of Mangoo, and some other points related to the subject matter of the story, come to light better with the modal adjuncts (especially that of probability) in the story. Generally speaking, there are 24 modal adjuncts in the story: six of usuality, four of intensity, four of temporality, and ten of probability (including the small clauses showing probability). Those of intensity and temporality are not only a few but they occur quite far from each other and do not seem to have any significant impact on the meaning-strands of the story. The case for the mood adjuncts of usuality is not very different, save one point in the story where three of them come in close proximity:

Example 6.3:

جا تیرے ہندوستان میں **ہمیشہ** فساد ہی ہوتے رہیں گے...لیکن ہندوستان **سدا** غلام رہے گا۔ ہاں میں کہنا بھول ہی گیا کہ پیر نے یہ بد دعا بھی دی تھی کہ ہندوستان پر**ہمیشہ** باہر کے آدمی راج کرتے رہیں گے۔
*Go, in your India, there will **always** be riots...But India will **always** remain enslaved. [And] yes, I forgot to tell you that the saint had also cursed India for **always** being ruled by foreigners.*

Mangoo is telling his fellow tanga drivers about the curse of a saint for India. The three occurrences of سدا، ہمیشہ (*always*), i.e. *high-level* usuality, show the saint's as well as Mangoo's conviction that India will always remain enslaved and there will always be unrest in it. Later in the story, however, we come to know that the news of a new law gives a 180-degree turn to his opinion and he is shown cherishing his unflinching conviction that the new law will bring freedom and happiness to India. This contrast serves to stress the overpowering effect of the news on Mangoo.

In contrast to the above mood adjuncts, the adjuncts of probability have some significant impact on the meaning of the story. Most of them are the *high-level*

probability of *certainly* and the short clause *he was certain*. The use of these adjuncts helps create an image of a man who is firm and unflinching in his beliefs, and once he starts believing in something, he shows blind faith in it. Consider the following example:

Example 6.4:

یہ روس والا بادشاہ کچھ نہ کچھ **ضرور** کر کے رہے گا۔
*This Russian king will **certainly** do something.*

Mangoo believes the happenings in India are a direct result of the influence of the king of Russia. He has no firm basis for his belief, but he sticks to it wholeheartedly. He goes as far as to believe that the new law which is going to implement in India on 1 April is also somehow related to the Russian king, who will *certainly* play a role in the implementation of the new law.

Much more telling is the following example:

Example 6.5:

پہلی اپریل تک استاد منگو نے جدید آئین کے خلاف اور اس کے حق میں بہت کچھ سنا۔ مگر اس کے
متعلق جو تصور وہ اپنے ذہن میں قائم کر چکا تھا بدل **نہ سکا۔ وہ سمجھتا تھا** کہ پہلی اپریل کو نئے قانون
کے آتے ہی **سب** معاملہ صاف ہو جائے گا اور **اس کو یقین تھا** کہ اس کی آمد پر جو چیزیں نظر آئیں گی
ان سے اس کی آنکھوں کو **ضرور** ٹھنڈک پہنچے گی۔
*Until 1 April, Ustaad Mangoo heard a lot both against and in favour of the new constitution, but the picture of it that he had made in his mind **could not** change. **He was of the view** that **everything** will become clear once the new law comes into effect on 1 April, and **he was certain** that the things he would see on its arrival would **certainly** delight him.*

The modal نہ (*not*), along with the modal verb سکنا (*can*), shows Mangoo's adamant nature and his unwillingness to change the positive (and highly exaggerated, as we later come to know in the story!) expectations he had attached to the new law. This effect is reinforced by the short clauses وہ سمجھتا تھا (*he was of the view*) and اس کو یقین تھا (*he was certain*) – which specify the expectations he has with the new law – and the adjective سب (*all*, *every*) and the mood adjunct ضرور (*certainly*), which express the height of his expectations. He comes across several arguments against the new law, including those when a barrister expresses his opinion that he *does not* understand the part of the new law dealing with the federation, that such a federation

was never heard in history before, and that it *would not* be a federation at all. Even such a strong statement against the new law (note the three occurrences of negation as well) coming from a qualified lawman do not change his conviction about the new law.

6.1.3.2 Formality/Informality:

Generally speaking, as his characters are normally from the lower echelons of the society, Manto presents them as speaking a language that is ordinary and colloquial and a vocabulary that is made up of simple words. Surprisingly, however, Mangoo, the tanga-driver in *Neya Qanoon*, speaks a sophisticated Urdu, an Urdu which has a formal vocabulary and which is imbued with idioms and other figurative expressions, a practice that is commonly seen in the speech of the educated. Likewise, he uses such formal and/or unfamiliar lexical items which are not common to the people of his social class, such as بابت, instead of the more common بارے میں, باوا instead of باپ or والد, and اکثرفوں, instead of اکثر. This is not just limited to Mangoo's speech; Manto peppers the whole story with formal Urdu expressions.

It seems difficult to understand why Manto chooses to deviate from his trademark style of employing simple, conversational language and adopt a formal language in the story. One reason might be that, as he portrays the character of Mangoo as one who presents himself as a very knowledgeable man to others, he decides to put such words in his mouth which usually characterise the speech of the educated.

6.1.3.3 Expletives, Honourifics, Vocatives, and Derogatory Epithets:

What helps make Mangoo's emotional world clearer to the readers is his habitual use of such expressions which manifest his inner feelings towards others. The majority of such expressions are used for the Englishmen:

- Expletives and Derogatory Epithets: بندروں کی اولاد (*offspring of monkeys*), ملعون (*cursed*), مردود (*wretched*), لاٹ صاحب (a derogatory address term), and سفید چوہے (*white rats*).

- (Ironic) Honorific: صاحب بہادر (literally, *courageous sahib* – an honorific used by the people of the Subcontinent for their English rulers; here used with an ironic tone, meaning that what he really means is opposite to that of the exulting honorific).

These expressions help make explicit Mangoo's profound anger and hatred towards the Englishmen. Besides, Mangoo makes use of a noteworthy vocative:

Example 6.6:

پہلی اپریل کو بھی وہی اکڑفوں۔۔۔پہلی اپریل کو بھی وہی اکڑفوں۔۔۔۔اب ہمارا راج ہے بچہ۔
*The same arrogance even on the 1st April…The same arrogance even on 1 April…It is now our rule, **child**.*

Mangoo utters these words while severely beating an Englishman on 1 April. His calling him بچہ (*child*) is quite meaningful. It is a derogatory and diminutive expression and means that the listener is powerless, helpless, and hapless in the eyes of the speaker. By the use of the vocative, Mangoo is shown to express how insignificant the Englishmen are to him, and also that he cares a damn for them.

6.1.4 Textual Metafunction and Effects:

6.1.4.1 Cohesion:

Looking at the cohesive structure of the story, we find Manto using the technique of synonymy/antonymy and lexical repetition to highlight the feelings and emotions of Mangoo. How delighted he is about the upcoming new law is emphasised by the use of such nouns, adjectives, and verb phrases as خوشی (*happiness*), مسرور (*glad*), مسرت (*ecstasy*), ہنس (*laugh*), ٹھنڈک پہنچتی (*would be chilled*), and تسکین (*contentment*). All these words come from the same semantic field of *happiness*, and they serve to reflect Mangoo's being out of joy at the prospect of the promulgation of a new law. It should also be noted that the various words denoting happiness are not used just once. مسرور is used twice, خوش/خوشی four times, and ٹھنڈک پہنچتی twice. Through the use of these synonyms and their repetition, Manto not only skilfully creates an atmosphere which depicts the happiness of Mangoo but also uses the technique as a reminder of the same to his readers. It is also worth noting that Manto punctuates some of these words

with such evaluative adjuncts as *extremely* and *very*, thereby attempting to reinforce the effect created by the semantic field of *happiness*: ناقابلِ بیان خوشی (*incredible happiness*), غیر معمولی طور پر مسرور (*unusually glad*), بے حد مسرور (*extremely glad*), and بہت خوش (*very happy*).

Another point, which is linked to the above, is that the new law is like something *new and sparkling* to him. He expects it to *shine* so brightly that it will *dazzle* him. Also, he likens the *new* law with the *new* plume of his horse which *shone* like gold; he expects the new law to be as *dazzling* and *fresh* as this plume. As we can see, the example words in Italics are all from the same semantic field of *new and sparkling*.

Soon, however, comes into play the technique of antonymy which serves to shatter this aura of happiness, newness, and brightness. To be specific, the semantic field of new gives way to that of old. We are told that on the day he has been waiting for so impatiently, he fails to find anything new, refreshing, and bright, only finding out that everything was *old*: سب چیزیں پرانی نظر آتی تھیں (*everything looked old*). There was nothing new to be seen in the shops, and the cloths college students were wearing were *old* and *dirty*.

Use of such words as exemplified above helps Manto efficiently describe the transition of the feelings of the protagonist from the height of happiness to that of dismay.

6.1.4.2 Thematic Structure:

Just like *Toba Tek Singh*, the current story has unmarked themes. As for what occupies theme position, we can easily see Mangoo, the central character in the story, acting as a point of departure in most of the clauses. Also, as many as 93 spatiotemporal adjuncts are used in theme position (59 temporal and 34 spatial). Most of the temporal adjuncts are general in nature, in that they do not seem to play an active role in connection with the subject matter of the story. For instance, جب (*when*) and جب کبھی (*whenever*), which are as many as 21 the former and three the latter, mostly seem to be performing the simple function of referring to an anonymous period of time when something happened or happens, such as جب ہندو مسلم فساد کی بات

جب کبھی وہ کسی کو‍ (when the discussion on Hindu-Muslim riots came up…) and چھڑی‍ (whenever he called someone Tody Bacha in a whispering voice…). Contrarily, there are some temporal adjuncts which seem to play an important role. To be specific, these are proximal temporal adjuncts, such as اب (*now*) and ابھی (*yet/right now*), referring to the day, i.e. 1 April, when the new constitution is supposed to be promulgated. These adjuncts help Manto depict what changes that particular day brings to the behaviour and expectations of Mangoo, and also how the day contrasts with the past. Consider the following illustrating example:

Example 6.7:

"وہ دن گزر گئے **جب** خلیل میاں فاختہ اڑایا کرتے تھے۔**اب** نیا قانون ہے میاں۔۔۔ نیا قانون!"

*"Gone are the days **when** you swayed your hold on us. **Now** it's a new law, Mr... A new law!"*

While fighting with the Englishman on 1 April, Mangoo utters these words, taunting him that the time when the English ruled the country and used oppressive measures to bolster their reign is a thing of the past; the new law (which he thinks has become effective on the day) has brought an end to their rule, and the Indians are free now. It should be noted that apart from these proximal temporal adjuncts, there are four occurrences of thematic temporal adjuncts referring directly to 1 April in the story. In conjunction with the proximal temporal references mentioned above, these help to highlight the exceptional salience of the day to Mangoo.

As for spatial adjuncts in theme, a consistent pattern is difficult to find; in terms of frequency, the most dominant are spatial references to body parts (11 occurrences), such as chest, skull, etc., and the subcontinent of India (five occurrences). However, as the focus of the story is the feelings of Mangoo towards the new constitution and the rulers and, as a consequence of these feelings, his brawl with an Englishman, these references to the body parts do not seem to play a significant role in this regard.

As Urdu tends to have much more spatial adjuncts in thematic position than English does, we can naturally expect a lower number of these adjuncts in the translations. It would, nevertheless, be interesting to see if there are any occurrences of spatiotemporal adjuncts in the translations where the translators, following the source

language structure, keep an adjunct in theme position, and what significance such a choice has.

6.1.5 Conclusion:

We can infer some key points from the analysis:

- A portrayal of the mental world of Mangoo and reflection on his feelings and emotions seems to be the central issue in the story and, apart from the mental processes, many material and relational processes serve to reinforce this central strand of the story.
- These processes as well as the modality structure of the story highlight certain traits of Mangoo's personality, such as his stubbornness, credulity, impetuousness, and his having an angry disposition. They also show his immense hatred towards the British rulers of India and his unflinching faith in the new law being a harbinger of freedom for the country.
- Cohesive and thematic structures of the story (especially the former) also help highlight the main strands of the story: portrayal of Mangoo's feelings and emotions and the traits of his personality, which lead to the final catastrophe.
- We have also talked about the aspects where Manto deviates from his usual style of writing.

Let us now see how the translators deal with these aspects.

6.2 Analysis of Tahira Naqvi's Translation of *Neya Qanoon*:

6.2.1 Ideational Metafunction and Transitivity Analysis:

In comparison to the 519 processes in the ST, it has 515 processes; the distribution of these is as under:

Sr. Number	Process	Occurrences	Comparison with the ST
1	Material	257	275
2	Mental	74	73
3	Relational	101	96
4	Behavioural	12	17

| 5 | Verbal | 69 | 58 |
| 6 | Existential | 2 | 0 |

Table 6.2 Frequency of Processes in Naqvi's Translation of *Neya Qanoon*

As is clear from the table, the processes in the two texts match very closely in terms of number. Obviously, then, we do not have many occurrences of shifts. We do see some process additions – such as *he brought the information to his friends at the stand that very evening* (material), *I wish* (mental), and *he heard the Marwaris talk* (mental and verbal) – but at the same time, we see some omissions as well – such as that of the verbal clause سبب وہ یہ بتایا کرتا تھا کہ (*the reason he would tell was that*) and the material clause نئے قانون کے آتے ہی (*as soon as the new law came*). Overall, these additions and omissions are neatly balanced to give us close proximity between the transitivity structures of the two texts.

Following the ST, the TT contains not only a sizeable amount of mental processes (74) but also several other processes (36, to be exact) giving us an entry into the mental world of Mangoo. In terms of exact numbers, these are 17 relational, one verbal, and 18 material processes; some of these are highlighted in the examples below:

Example 6.8:

6.8(a) The news of the new law had **transported** him to a different world. (Material)
6.8(b) It's the same man, Ustaad Mangoo **admitted** to himself. (Verbal)
6.8(c) He **was overjoyed**. (Relational)

These *non-mental* processes aid the mental processes in laying open the mental world of Mangoo, helping us to understand what is happening inside in connection with the news of a new law; they also lay bare his strong emotions of anger and hatred towards the English rulers.

The findings above show proximity between the transitivity structures of the two texts. It makes it possible for the TT to follow the ST closely in highlighting the two pinnacle points of the story, namely, the feelings, emotions, and ideology of Mangoo and certain traits of his character which help pave the way for the sad incident at the end of the story.

6.2.2 Interpersonal Metafunction:

Closely following the interpersonal structure of the ST, the TT adopts the technique of *internal narratorial point of view*. There are a sizeable number of processes depicting the mental condition of the protagonist and directing the different scenes in the story. Under this broader narratorial framework, Naqvi keeps implicit and explicit the details which are respectively kept implicit and explicit in the ST. For instance, she does not try to add any explicit comments on the credulous nature of Mangoo; instead, she employs implicit hints at this trait of the protagonist by narrating how he overhears the possibility of a new law and, building on it, creates a set of ideas in his mind which are all based on hearsay. Apart from this, she is, as reported earlier, also careful in keeping any ST explicit information explicit in her translation. Just for example, this is how she translated an explicit ST comment mentioned under example 6.2 in the ST analysis:

Example 6.9:

استاد منگو طبعاً بہت جلد باز واقع ہوا تھا۔
Ustaad Mangoo was very impetuous by nature.
Ustaad Mangoo was by nature an impatient man.

Putting aside the minor differences of omitting the ST adverb بہت (*very*) and shifting the relational clause to a verbal clause, Naqvi manages to retrain the explicitness that is there in the corresponding ST clauses.

6.2.2.1 Modality:

The TT contains the same number of modal verbs, i.e. six, as the ST does. The table below shows the detail:

Type	Naqvi's Translation	ST
Can	3	3
Could	1	1
May	0	0
Should	1	1
Must	0	0
Might	1	1
Total	**6**	**6**

Table 6.3 Frequency of Modal verbs in Naqvi's Translation of *Neya Qanoon*

As the table above demonstrates, there is remarkable similarity between the two texts in this regard. However, it should be noted that there are only two modal verbs which are a translation of the corresponding ST modal verbs: one occurrence of *should* (when Mangoo thinks that he *should* reclaim from the *white man* the money he spent to buy his horse's plume) and one occurrence of *can* (when Mangoo taunts his pregnant wife that she keeps lying all the time and that this *can* yield no benefit). The rest of the four ST modal verbs are omitted in the TT, and as compensation, four are added at other occasions. The two occurrences of *can* that we noted in the ST as highlighting the adamant and intolerant disposition of Mangoo are omitted in the TT. So, *he could not change his view about it* is changed into *the impressions he had already formed in his mind remained unchanged* and *he could not wait [for something to happen]* into *he found the waiting difficult*. Though the translations seem to be suggesting a similar sense, the TT clauses are much more direct than the ST clauses in doing that and are devoid of the sense of the ability (of doing/not doing something) that we find in the ST clauses. Other than this, the addition of modal verbs at other places does not seem to have any significant impact on the subject matter of the story.

As for the modal adjuncts, they are a bit more in number than those found in the ST. To be specific, in comparison to the 24 modal adjuncts in the ST, there are 32 in the TT, with the following distribution:

Type	Naqvi's Translation	ST
Usuality	8	6
Temporality	9	4
Probability	9	10
Intensity	6	4
Total	**32**	**24**

Table 6.4 Frequency of Modal adjuncts in Naqvi's Translation of *Neya Qanoon*

The major numeric difference is associated with the modal adjunct of temporality, with the TT having nine such adjuncts, whereas the ST four. However, this ostensible difference does not look so potent when we consider the context, whereby the ST, through different lexicogrammatical features, displays similar meanings. In particular, on three occasions, the ST either uses circumstantial adjuncts in place of the modal adjuncts or adds the Urdu emphatic particle ہی which serve to communicate a

meaning similar to that suggested by the corresponding modal adjuncts in the TT, as illustrated in the example below:

Example 6.10:

> "قانون **وہی** ہے پرانا"
> *"Law is **that same** old one."*
> "The law is **still** the same."

In the example, the TT uses a temporal adjunct (*still*), which we do not see in the ST. However, the ST serves this purpose by combining the demonstrative وہ (*that*) with the Urdu emphatic particle ہی (*the same*).

Like the example above, the quantity and sense of the other modal adjuncts are also more or less preserved in the TT, indicating an affinity between the two texts regarding modality.

6.2.2.2 Formality/Informality:

Naqvi, following the ST, maintains formality in relating the story. Though we see a tendency of omitting the formal ST idioms at some places, the overall canvas of the story is painted by a formal language and diction. Phrases like *swayed by this thought*, *used the denunciation appropriately*, *a prelude to the birth...*, and *embarked on a lengthy discourse* are a testimony to this.

As regards the ST terms specific to Urdu language and culture, such as لاٹ ,گورا ,حقہ ہی ,لسی ,حلوائی ,کچہری ,صاحب and گنجا, Naqvi chooses to keep the Urdu words, even when there are common English equivalents available. For example, کچہری can easily be translated into *courthouse*. Likewise, گنجا is translatable to *bald*. There does not seem to be an obvious reason for this interesting move, but it might be that it is part of her strategy to follow the ST lexicogrammatical structure as closely as possible. In any case, it should be pointed out that her translation is likely to create problems for the target readers: (mostly) the English-speaking readers not familiar with these Urdu terms. It would be interesting to see if the other translators opt for the same strategy or translate them into English.

6.2.2.3 Expletives, Honourifics, Vocatives, and Derogatory Epithets:

Naqvi shows a mixed approach in this regard. She maintains some of the expletives and derogatory remarks, such as *sons of monkeys*, *the bastard*, *the white rats*, and *the lat-sahebs*. However, she chooses to omit the honorific صاحب بہادر and the derogatory vocative بچہ. As noted in the analysis of the ST (see Section 6.1.3.3), these are significant in that they betray how much hatred the protagonist holds for the English rulers, so choosing to omit them results in a small degree of semantic loss.

6.2.3 Textual Metafunction:

6.2.3.1 Cohesion:

We noted in our analyses of the ideational and interpersonal structures of the TT above that Naqvi tries to follow the ST lexicogrammatical structure closely, and this is what she tries to maintain in this case as well. Except for one occasion, where the word *chilled* from the semantic field of happiness is omitted, Naqvi tries to preserve the ST aura of happiness. However, it is also to be noted that there is only one instance where we see her doing that directly, i.e. by using TT equivalents of the ST words denoting happiness; other times, she does that indirectly. See the following examples:

Example 6.11:

6.11(a) وہ **بے حد مسرور** تھا۔
*He was **extremely happy**.*
He was **elated**.

6.11(b) وہ دل ہی دل میں **بہت خوش** ہوتا تھا۔
*He was **very happy** in his heart.*
He was **overjoyed**.

6.11(c) ان مارواڑیوں کی بات چیت استاد منگو کے **دل میں ناقابلِ بیان خوشی** پیدا کر رہی تھی۔
*The conversation of these Marwaris **was producing incredible happiness in Ustaad Mangoo's heart**.*
Ustaad Mangoo's **spirits rose** as he heard the Marwaris talk.

In both 6.11(a) and 6.11(b), there is an obvious shift of omitting the adjuncts of *extremely* and *very*. However, the ST clauses and their corresponding translations seem to display close affinity in pragmatic terms. Naqvi's choice of using the word *elated*, i.e. a word subsuming both *happiness* and *extremely* in itself, in 6.11(a) leaves

out the need to use the evaluative adjective *extremely*. The same is the case with the compound word *overjoyed*, which obviously subsumes the meanings of both *very* and *happy*. Unlike these two examples, 6.11(c) shows a significant shift. Apart from the structural shifts of bringing the ST rheme to thematic position in the TT and avoiding to explicitly show that the feelings of happiness Mangoo was going through were a direct result of the conversation of the Marwaris, the TT clause shows a lexical shift by leaving out the noun *happiness* and the intensifying adjective *incredible*. Again, however, a pragmatic affinity can be seen between the two texts, as *spirits rose* also, though indirectly, suggests the sense of being extremely thrilled and happy.

Unlike what we have noted above, Naqvi preserves all references to the new law being *new and sparkling*. There is no omission found in this case. Instead, using the technique of antonymy, she even adds to the effect created by the lexical repetition of *newness* and *brightness*:

Example 6.12:

آخرکار مار پڑ کے اکتیس دن ختم ہو گئے اور اپریل کے شروع ہونے میں رات کے چند خاموش گھنٹے باقی رہ گئے۔

At last, the 31 days came to an end somehow and a few silent hours were left before the start of April.
The thirty-one days of March came and went. April was now only a few **dark**, silent hours away.

The addition of the word *dark* for the hours before 1 April, i.e. the day which is supposed to usher brightness and newness, has a slight, metaphorical indication that the time before the *much-awaited* day is associated with darkness in Mangoo's eyes, whereas the time starting with 1 April is linked to brightness and newness.

In contrast to the above, however, when it comes to the ST instances of antonymy indicating what is opposite to this *newness* and *sparkle*, she displays a mixed attitude by choosing to show this directly at places but indirectly in the following case:

Example 6.13:

اسے ہر چیز پرانی نظر آئی——آسمان کی طرح پرانی۔

Everything looked old – old like the sky
Everything seemed to be the **same**, just as the sky was the **same**.

A slight shift is visible here: the explicit word *old* is replaced with the indirect reference *the same*. Other than this, Naqvi remains true to the ST.

6.2.3.2 Thematic Structure:

Just like the ST, the TT shows a tendency to use unmarked themes. Except for the following instance where Naqvi makes the theme marked by using a mental process in the progressive tense, all other themes are unmarked: *Perhaps that was so because he was expecting to see a blinding vision this morning*.

There are a total of 31 shifts in thematic position. However, most of the objects occupying the thematic position because of these shifts are not much related to the central strands of meaning in any significant way. So, for instance, we see shifts from *interest* to *things*, *child* to *pregnancy*, *leaders* to *marigolds*, *someone* to *a deep, sharp cut*, and *eyes* to *laughter*. Also, there are only six occurrences where the TT displaces the central figure of the story, i.e. Mangoo, from thematic position by replacing him with someone/something of much less importance. This is suggestive of close proximity between the two texts in terms of the participants/noun phrases in thematic position. However, significant differences surface when we look at the thematic treatment of spatiotemporal adjuncts in the two texts. In contrast to the 59 temporal adjuncts in the ST, we have 38 in the TT (31 are the same as in the ST and seven are added by Naqvi). It should be noted that all ST occurrences of the temporal adjuncts اب (*now*) and ابھی (*yet/right now*) are omitted in the TT, and we, hence, see a lack of emphasis on the day of promulgation of a new constitution as well as a lack of opportunity of contrasting the special day with Mangoo's past. The lack of emphasis we have just referred to is extenuated by the fact that all, except two, temporal adjuncts specifically mentioning *1 April* are shifted from theme position or omitted altogether in the TT. Consider the following example:

Example 6.14:

پہلی اپریل کو بھی وہی اکڑفوں------**پہلی اپریل کو** بھی وہی اکڑفوں ----**اب** ہمارا راج ہے بچہ۔
*The same domineering attitude even on **1 April**! The same domineering attitude even on **1 April**! **Now** it is our rule, child.*

> "Giving orders to us **on April first**!" he kept repeating over and over again as he slugged the Englishman. "It's our rule **now**," he added.

There are several shifts in the TT clause. But before delving into them, we should say a few words about the choice of lexical items in the ST. There are two temporal references to *1 April*, along with one of *now*, in theme; the significance of the day is emphasised by following it with بهی (*even*) – a modal adjunct of intensity; the choice of the Urdu word اکڑفوں/ (roughly equal to the English phrase *domineering attitude* or *pride*) is significant, since it is used by the native speakers as a satire for someone who is assuming a proud demeanour when they, actually, are insignificant and worthless (at least, in the eyes of the speaker); then, the satiric effect is extended by adding the satiric vocative بچہ (*child*) at the end of the clause complex; finally, the phrase *the domineering attitude even on 1 April* is repeated twice. The cumulative effect of these choices is a highly satiric and derisive chastisement to the Englishman who is being foolishly (in the eyes of Mangoo) *pompous even* on *the day* when everything is supposed to change in favour of the Indians. The attitude of ridicule and hatred in the ST clause complex is lost to a great extent in the translation. The satiric phrase *domineering attitude* is shifted to a general *giving orders to us* in the TT; the derisive vocative is omitted; repetition of the phrase at the beginning of the clause complex is reduced to one occurrence, resulting in a loss of the adjuncts in the clause as well as the emphasis that the ST repetition brings to the clause. Not only that, both temporal adjuncts, *on 1 April* and *now*, are shifted from theme to rheme.

As regards spatial adjuncts, all, except two, of 34 ST spatial adjuncts are omitted in the TT, including all references to *body parts* and *Hindustan*, with one exception where the spatial adjunct consisting of the word *Hindustan* becomes the subject and thus retains its position in theme. Although, from the point of view of frequency, these shifts in the ST seem conspicuous, but as the spatial adjuncts do not occupy central importance in the plot (see Section 6.1.4.2), the displacement or omission of the adjuncts does not seem to lay a significant effect on the meaning strands of the story.

6.2.4 Conclusion:

- Like the ST, the TT uses a significant amount of mental and other relevant processes to portray what is happening in the mind of Mangoo in reference to the rule of the English people and the positive changes the new law would bring with it.

- The TT does not appear to deviate much from the ST in terms of the number of modal verbs and adjuncts and the effects produced by them.

- Naqvi follows the ST in maintaining a formal style of writing; however, her decision of keeping certain words in Urdu in the translation induces some informality in the TT.

- Naqvi partially retains some ST honourifics, expletives, and derogatory epithets.

- Naqvi, through her literal translation, retains most of the ST lexical items belonging to the semantic fields of happiness, newness, and brightness.

- Except for one instance, the TT displays unmarked themes.

- The TT more or less retains the ST topical theme structure.

- The TT does not retain most of the temporal adjuncts in theme position, which results in the loss of meanings associated with them, including less prominence given to the day the new constitution is expected to come into effect.

6.3 Analysis of Jai Ratan's Translation of *Neya Qanoon*:

6.3.1 Ideational Metafunction and Transitivity Analysis:

The breakdown of the processes in Ratan's translation, and how they compare to those of the TT, is as under:

Sr. Number	Process	Occurrences in Ratan's Translation	Comparison with the ST
1	Material	254	275
2	Mental	112	73
3	Relational	81	96
4	Behavioural	21	17
5	Verbal	61	58
6	Existential	10	0
7	**Total**	**539**	**519**

Table 6.5 Frequency of Processes in Ratan's Translation of *Neya Qanoon*

As can be seen from the table, the TT shows some additional processes compared to the ST. These additions, which are from all process types, except existential, are of two types: (1) those which do not display a pure semantic addition, in that they are either indicative of a shift from a phrase (in the ST) to a clause (in the TT) or the information provided in them is implicitly present in the ST, and (2) those which add to the ST meaning. The following may serve as a fine example for both these types:

Example 6.15:

پچھلے دنوں جب استاد منگو نے اپنی ایک سواری سے اسپین میں جنگ چھڑ جانے کی افواہ سنی تھی۔۔۔
Some days ago, when Ustaad Mangoo heard from one of his passengers the rumour of breakout of war in Spain… (literal meaning)
The other day **he was carrying two passengers in his tanga** who **while talking among themselves feared** that there may soon be a civil war in Spain. (pragmatic meaning)

We can see that three processes have been added in the TT: one material, one verbal, and one mental. Out of these, the material and verbal processes of carrying the passengers and the passengers talking with each other are implied in the ST; we can infer them from the detail provided to us: when the ST tells us that Ustaad Mangoo heard something from one of his passengers, we can safely assume that he is carrying the passenger in his tanga and that the passenger was either talking to another passenger or him. The addition of the mental process *fear*, however, is something that is not at all inferable from the ST; the process is clearly adding to the meaning of the ST clause complex, ascribing a feeling of fear to the passenger regarding the civil war that he thinks is going to take place in Spain (which did take place in 1936).

The mention of the addition of the mental processes in the example above leads us to share the fact that the mental processes in the TT (see Table 6.5 above) are overall far more than that of the ST; the amount of 112 TT mental processes, indeed, looks quite significant compared to the far fewer, 73, TT mental processes. A closer look at the mental processes in the TT reveals that with this many mental processes – the addition of which owes to the same reasons as those noted above in connection with the increase in the total number of processes in the TT – the text has one, or more, addition after every few lines, especially in the first half of the story. Starting with *to know* in the opening paragraph of the TT, we encounter a sizeable amount of mental

processes which include, but are not limited to, *fear*, *think*, *see*, *hear*, *feel*, *make of*, *wait*, and *make any head or tail of*. The significance of these mental processes may appear more prominent when we compare them with the other processes in the translation, especially with the relational processes. The relational processes usually are expected to be more than mental processes in a narrative text, but here they are far fewer than the mental processes.

With this scheme of foregrounding the mental processes, the TT seems to have made the portrayal of the mental world of Mangoo a bit more conspicuous and pervasive than that in the ST. Owing to this more exposure to the inner world of Mangoo, the readers get a more explicit view of Mangoo's mind and see his beliefs, emotions, as well as cognitive reactions to the external stimuli in a more detailed way.

6.3.2 Interpersonal Metafunction:

Like Naqvi, Ratan retains the ST technique of *internal narratorial point of view*. The significant amount of mental, as well as 11 relational, processes narrate what thoughts are there in Mangoo's mind, what is his ideological stance, and what he feels about the English rules and what are his expectations about the new law, and all this information helps us understand why he acts in certain ways in the story. As we have seen in the transitivity analysis, the TT even tries to be more active in trying to depict this internal narratorial point of view. Now, in regards to the matter of explicitness/implicitness, Ratan seems to preserve the implicitness but shows a mixed attitude towards explicitness. On the one hand, he preserves a few explicit remarks, but, on the other, chooses to leave out certain important ones. For example, he retains almost all remarks about how elated and out of the world Mangoo feels when he hears about the possibility of a new law and also the remark telling the reader that the first question Mangoo asked the Englishman was full of irony and sarcasm. But, then, we also find him omitting a few other important comments. For example, Manto, when talking about Mangoo's impatience while his wife was expecting a child, comments that Mangoo was very impetuous by nature and that he wanted to see everything in a concrete form. It appears from the context that making this comment has some significance, since, very soon, we are told that, unlike his typical behaviour, he shows some calm and tolerance on the day when the new law was supposed to take effect.

This unusual behaviour is probably because of the self-created consolation that the new law would have been implemented when he would go out to see *it* that morning, and everything would have changed for the better. Ratan, however, chooses to omit this remark.

6.3.2.1 Modality:

When it comes to modality, Ratan's translation reveals a significant number of shifts of various types. If we look at the frequency of modal verbs and modal adjuncts, we see that whereas the TT contains 17 modal verbs, the ST contains only six; similarly, whereas the TT contains as many as 44 modal adjuncts, the ST has only 24. The following tables present the detail:

Type	Ratan's Translation	ST
Can	5	3
Could	7	1
May	2	0
Should	1	1
Must	2	0
Might	0	1
Total	**17**	**6**

Table 6.6 Frequency of Modal verbs in Ratan's Translation of *Neya Qanoon*

Type	Ratan's Translation	ST
Usuality	9	6
Temporality	16	4
Probability	5	10
Intensity	14	4
Total	**44**	**24**

Table 6.7 Frequency of Modal adjuncts in Ratan's Translation of *Neya Qanoon*

The added modal verbs and modal adjuncts, as we will see shortly, show an implicit intrusion from Ratan, whereby he adds subtle meanings and effects. Particularly, enfeeblement of the certainty found in several ST clauses and an increased sense of close temporal proximity of important events are discernible. Contrarily, there are also places where he makes an overt entry in the story, adding clauses laden with evaluative judgements, particularly about various characters' attitudes, feelings, and beliefs. The following seems to be a good example, as it may illustrate both of these points:

Example 6.16:

پچھلے دنوں جب استاد منگو نے اپنی ایک سواری سے اسپین میں جنگ چھڑ جانے کی افواہ سنی تھی تو
اس نے گاما چودھری کے چوڑے کاندھے پر تھپکی دے کر مدبرانہ انداز میں پیش گوئی کی تھی "دیکھ
لینا چودھری، تھوڑے ہی دنوں میں اسپین کے اندر جنگ چھڑ جائے گی۔"

Some days ago, when Ustaad Mangoo heard from one of his passengers the rumour of breakout of war in Spain, he patted Gama Chaudhry's broad shoulder and predicted "You'll see Chaudhry, there will be war in Spain in a few days" (literal meaning)

The other day he was carrying two passengers in his tanga who while talking among themselves **feared** that there **may soon** be a civil war in Spain. Back at the hackney stand, Ustaad Mangoo thumped Gama Chowdhury on his shoulder, "Chowdhury, I **can** safely predict there will **soon** be a civil war in Spain," he said **giving the other man a knowing look**. (pragmatic meaning)

From the example, we can gather that:

1. the ST presents the passenger sitting in Mangoo's tanga as very confident and certain that there is going to be a war in Spain. Ratan, however, chooses to add the modal verb *may*, thereby shifting the certainty to the possibility (though a strong one compared to *might*) and, thus, weakening the sureness and conviction that we see in the ST clause to some extent. The effect is reinforced by the addition of *can* in Mangoo's prediction about the war based on what he had heard from his passenger. Again, the ST presents Mangoo having complete belief in his prediction with an unqualified, straightforward statement, but the addition of the modal verb in the TT seems to weaken the certainty apparent in Mangoo's remark. Other relevant examples from the TT include, but are not limited to, the addition of *surely* and *should* in *surely, it is the result of some pir's curse, he said, otherwise why should there be constant stabbings between Hindus and Muslims?* and of *just* and *can* in *I just can't make any head or tail of it*;

2. the modal verb *may* is followed by the addition of *soon*, which is then echoed in Mangoo's statement later. Through this subtle use, the TT seems to produce a sense of imminence here, a sense that something important is going to happen in no time. This is then carried out further down the story, especially in reference to the detail about the new law. The ST simply informs us that Mangoo overhears his passengers talking about the possibility of a new law; there is no mention as to when it would take effect. Ratan, however, adds temporality when he presents Mangoo learning from his passengers that *soon a new constitution would be promulgated in the county*. When back at the

station, Mangoo tells his friend, Nathu, about the new law, and Ratan, making an overt entry in the story, remarks *which according to him was just round the corner*. Finally, Ratan shares Mangoo's thoughts by remarking *he would soon witness the advent of the New Order in all its glory; he would surely discern its signs everywhere*. These additions of *soon*, *just*, and the modal adjunct of intensity, *surely*, suggest a sense of imminence – as if something very important is going to happen soon – and feature the remarkable strength of Mangoo's belief in the new law taking effect soon and eradicating all problems in his life; and

3. by adding the mental processes *fear* and *giving a knowing look*, Ratan makes an overt entry into the translation. Looking at the ST, we find no attempt from Manto at modifying the passenger's prediction about war with any evaluative judgements; the statement is presented as a simple, straightforward expression of what he believes to be the case. The TT, however, adds a feeling of fear, a sense of something ominous to happen, in the passenger's statement, which, to reiterate, has no traces in the ST. Again, at the end of the paragraph, Mangoo's non-verbal expression of indicating to his friend that he is in the know-how of things, that he knows information that his fellows are not aware of, is an addition by Ratan, indicative of his personal judgement about the emotions, feelings, and opinions of the characters in the story.

A couple of other interesting examples of the observation made in point #3 above are the addition of exclamatory clauses explicitly manifesting Mangoo's feelings of anger and hatred. When referring to the event of the English rulers coming to India for trade and then usurping the whole country, Mangoo is presented in the translation explicitly remarking *Oh, how cruel they are!* The exclamatory nature of the remark makes it more salient than a simple declarative statement. It makes Mangoo's feelings of detest towards the English rulers appear stronger than the ST does. The TT, later, points out that his aversion is so strong that he even hates those whom he thinks are in favour of the rulers. This is clear from the addition of the following exclamatory remark that Mangoo is presented to pass for the two lawyers whom he thinks are against the new law: *These servile people who licked the foreign government's shoes!*

Particularly important are the remarks that Ratan puts in Mangoo's mouth about the new law. These show how important the new law is for him and how high the expectations that he has associated with it are. To him, it is something that is *replete with tremendous possibilities*, and *it would indeed be an event of far-reaching importance* (note the addition of *indeed* – a modal adjunct of high intensity).

Through these additions, Ratan adds to the feelings, attitudes, and beliefs of his characters, and also presents them expressing opinions which have no traces in the ST.

6.3.2.2 Formality/Informality:

Predominantly, Ratan uses a formal language, mixing it with a difficult and unfamiliar diction at places. *He would launch forth on a long harangue*, *labouring under the impression*, *our new constitution is bristling with so many lacunae*, *would take recourse to him*, *manifest*, *impose upon*, *profusion*, *sanguine*, *interspersed*, *reminisce*, and *trepidation* are a few examples of this practice. Perhaps as an attempt to add to the effect of formality, he uses some archaic/dated words as well, such as *henceforth*, *pate*, and *wrought*. Also, though he chooses to either omit the ST idioms or simply transliterate them, such as *lighting up all the lamps of his mind*, he uses several English idioms, such as *at loggerheads*, *to lend ears*, and *to make a head or tail of*. However, it should not be taken to mean that Ratan is as formal in his language as Manto (or Naqvi, for that matter) is. There are words and phrases in his translation which are informal, such as *throw up* (to vomit), *wretch*, *the ins and outs*, and *drubbing*. These seem to lessen the effect of the (overall) formality of the TT to some extent.

We have observed earlier how Naqvi, employing the strategy of foreignization, keeps the language and culture-specific terms in Urdu (Section 6.2.2.2).Ratan, however, chooses to employ a mixed approach. For instance, he translates such terms as لاٹ صاحب and حلوائی into the near equivalents of *the overlords* and *sweetmeat seller*. Then, there are two occurrences where, though keeping two terms in Urdu, i.e. *vilayat* and *heera mandi*, he glosses them with the equivalent English terms *England* and *the red light area*, respectively. It is, nonetheless, interesting to note that, contrary to above,

he chooses to keep some Urdu word in Urdu and does not gloss them with their English equivalents; examples include, but are not limited to, *annas*, which can easily be translated into *pennies*, and *pir*, which is translatable to *the saint*. There is also an interesting instance where these two contrasting strategies are used together. This is where Ratan translate آدھ سیر دہی کی لسی into *half seer whipped curds*. Both آدھ سیر and دہی کی لسی are terms specific to the areas of Pakistan and India. The former is a unit of measurement equal to 1.25kg, and the latter is a drink, prepared by mixing and whipping water and sugar with yoghurt and is specific to Pakistan and India. As is evident from the English translation above, Ratan chooses to keep the former in Urdu, but immediately follows it with a somewhat clumsy translation for the latter– *clumsy* because the odd mix of keeping in Urdu and translation in English likely makes it difficult for the English readers to comprehend what type of food item is meant here. He could have easily translated both in English, and it is difficult to see why he chooses to keep one the two in Urdu and localise the other. Another strange example is where he thrice uses the Urdu word بادشاہ but chooses to translate it into English *king* twice. In one instance, the two are used in a single paragraph.

6.3.2.3 Expletives, Honourifics, Vocatives, and Derogatory Epithets:

Ratan largely follows the ST in this case. No omission is observed here, even in the case of the derogatory vocative بچہ. There is no direct equivalent of this term in English, and an easy solution may be to omit it, as we have seen in Naqvi's translation. However, Ratan tries to maintain some of the sarcasm implied in the Urdu vocative by translating it as *you braggart*, a term not very similar to the meaning of the original Urdu source word, but which, nonetheless, tries to preserve the sarcastic sense implied in the Urdu word.

6.3.3 Textual Metafunction:

6.3.3.1 Cohesion:

This is another area where Ratan is careful to maintain all references to happiness and newness/oldness. *Ustaad Mangoo was overjoyed*, *Mangoo bubbled with joy*, and *the new constitution...stood for new things* are a few examples of this.

6.3.3.2 Thematic Structure:

Just like the ST, the TT shows a tendency to use unmarked themes. However, in terms of thematic position, 41 shifts are found. A good number of these are shifts of a relatively insignificant nature (*insignificant* because they are not directly related to the main strands of meaning in the story), such as from *many places* to *it*, *words* to *talk*, and *customers* to *sweetshops*. Mangoo, the central figure of the story, is found to replace other characters or things in thematic position 13 times. This, however, is somewhat balanced by the ten occurrences where thematic position enjoyed by Mangoo in the ST is taken away from him in the TT.

When it comes to the thematic treatment of spatiotemporal adjuncts, the two texts show remarkable differences. For example, out of the 34 ST thematic spatial adjuncts, only one is preserved in the TT. The omissions include all references to *body parts* and *Hindustan*. As regards temporal adjuncts, in contrast to the 59 temporal adjuncts in the ST, there are 42 in the TT (32 are the same as in the ST, and ten are added by Ratan). Also, just like Naqvi (see Section 6.2.3.2), Ratan does not preserve any of the ST instances of اب (*now*) and ابھی (*yet/right now*). Moreover, like Naqvi, Ratan preserves only two out of the seven ST temporal adjuncts specifically mentioning *1 April*; as for the rest, one is shifted to another temporal adjunct, three are omitted altogether, and one is shifted from theme to rheme. Consider Ratan's treatment of the same clause complex that we discussed in the case of Naqvi's translation (ibid.):

Example 6.17:

> **پہلی اپریل کو** بھی وہی اکڑفوں-----**پہلی اپریل کو** بھی وہی اکڑفوں -----**اب** ہمارا راج ہے بچہ۔
> *The same domineering attitude even on **1 April**! The same domineering attitude even on **1 April**! Now it is our rule, child.*
> **"You braggart, even on this first of April!"**

Like in Naqvi's translation, there are several shifts in Ratan's translation as well. In an attempt to preserve the derisive connotation of اکڑفوں to some extent, Ratan uses the phrase *you braggart*; however, this shift into the vocative makes the translation a bit unclear, in that we cannot infer from it what Mangoo is talking about here (which, as is clearly shown in the ST clause complex, is the pompous and domineering attitude

of the Englishman). Also, the past reference *the same*, which serves to point out that the Englishman's behaviour is the same as in the past, is omitted. Moreover, whereas one occurrence of both the adjuncts پہلی اپریل کو (*on 1 April*) and بھی (*even*) is preserved, the repetition is omitted. Ratan goes to the extent of omitting the whole last clause, which results not only in a loss of ideational information (that is, according to Mangoo, the day has taken the reign from the English and given it back to the Indians) but also a loss of the derision as well as the temporal proximity.

The spatiotemporal shifts discussed above obviously refer to the inability of the TT in preserving the spatiotemporal outlook of the story at thematic level.

6.3.4 Conclusion:

- The TT adds mental processes which bring the emotions and feelings of Mangoo in more limelight than in the ST.
- The modality structure of the TT reveals a shift from more certainty and conviction in the ST to less certainty and conviction.
- The TT induces a sense of immediacy and imminence in reference to the day the new constitution is expected to come into force.
- Ratan adds evaluative judgements to the speech of his characters.
- Ratan, overall, maintains a formal style, but occasionally punctuates it with informality.
- Ratan retains ST honourifics, expletives, and derogatory epithets, thereby retaining the stylistic effects produced by them.
- Ratan retains much of the ST lexical and semantic repetition that highlights Mangoo's feelings of exuberance and his expectations for the new law to be something new and scintillating.
- Like the ST, the TT displays unmarked themes.
- The TT shows comparatively more number of times Mangoo is placed in the topical theme position; however, the overall topical theme structure of the ST is followed in the TT.
- The TT does not retain the ST spatio-temporal outlook.

6.4 Analysis of Khalid Hasan's Translation of *Neya Qanoon*:

6.4.1 Ideational Metafunction and Transitivity Analysis:

The breakdown of the processes in Hasan's translation is as under:

Sr. Number	Process	Occurrences in Hasan's Translation	Comparison with the ST
1	Material	158	275
2	Mental	93	73
3	Relational	116	96
4	Behavioural	10	17
5	Verbal	52	58
6	Existential	18	0
7	Total	447	519

Table 6.8 Frequency of Processes in Hasan's Translation of *Neya Qanoon*

There is a significant reduction of processes in Hasan's translation (72 fewer than that of the ST). He tends to not only omit single clauses here and there but also goes as far as to omit whole paragraphs. An extreme example is the omission of three paragraphs near the beginning of the story. These paragraphs, which are about Mangoo overhearing one of his passengers about a possible war in Spain and relating it to his friend, serve as the first event in the story implicitly introducing us to the personality of the protagonist: he is credulous by nature and blindly believes in things he overhears from his passengers. However, for some reason, Hasan does not consider the detail to be worth preserving. There are several other places where Hasan chooses to omit clauses in bulk. A clear tendency is to omit some of the descriptive detail about the protagonist's feelings and reactions and some detail from the events and incidents narrated in the ST. The following are a couple of illustrating examples of the latter case:

Example 6.18:

اپنے سامنے کھڑے گورے کو یوں دیکھ رہا تھا گویا وہ اس کے وجود کے ذرے ذرے کو اپنی نگاہوں سے چبا رہا
ہے اور گورا کچھ اس طرح اپنی پتلون پر سے غیر مرئی چیزیں جھاڑ رہا ہے گویا وہ استاد منگو کے اس
حملے سے اپنے وجود کے ہر حصے کو محفوظ رکھنے کی کوشش کر رہا ہے۔

[He] was looking at the white man standing in front of him as if he was chewing every bit of his body through his eyes, and the white man was brushing off imaginary things from his pants as if he was trying to save every part of his body from this onslaught by Ustaad Mangoo.

Both these examples are from the incident when Ustaad Mangoo comes face to face with an Englishman he had a quarrel a year ago, and are descriptive of Mangoo's facial expressions on seeing the Englishman. These non-verbal expressions, in turn, are reflective of what is happening inside Mangoo's mind, and how much hate and anger he is feeling. Again, Hasan chooses to omit this detail in his translation. This might not seem conspicuous at first sight, but when we look deep into the connection of these clauses with the subtle strands of meaning the story conveys, i.e. those about the protagonist's disposition and his feelings and emotions, we can realize the salience of these clauses as well as the loss of meaning their omission causes in the translation.

From the table above, we can also see that the material processes in the TT are much fewer than that in the ST, whereas the relational and existential processes are higher in number. A good number of these relational and existential clauses are the result of a shift from other clauses, whereas others are additions by Hasan. The following are a couple of illustrating examples:

Example 6.19:

6.19(a).وہ اپنے گھوڑے کو ہمیشہ گالیاں دیتا تھا اور چابک سے بہت بری طرح پیٹا کرتا تھا۔

> *He always swore at his horse and would beat him severely with a whip.*
>
> Normally, he **was in the habit of** abusing his horse for being slow and **was not averse to** using the whip, but not today.

6.19(b)۔ویسے بھی بہت سی جگہیں اور نکلیں گی۔

> *By the way, several other vacancies will come up.*
>
> Oh! There are going to be many openings and much confusion, of course.

Two small relational clauses are added in the first example. Other examples from the TT include, but are not limited to, the addition of *that was why*, *he was convinced*, and *he was of course quite convinced*. In 6.19(b), the ST material clause is shifted to an existential clause in the TT. Some other examples of the shift to the existential clauses include *his whole face was laughing* to *there was a smile on his face* and from *Ustaad*

Mangoo was standing between these two policemen to *there stood Ustaad Mangoo with one policeman to his left and one to his right*.

The shifts illustrated under Example 6.19 above are an indication of comparatively less action in the TT and a description of things and events as simply existing or showing a relation.

6.4.2 Interpersonal Metafunction:

Following the ST, the TT – consisting of a good number of mental processes and 38 relational processes which, like the mental processes in the story, throw light on the inner, mental world of Mangoo – preserves the technique of *inner narratorial point of view*. Also, in regards to the explicitness/implicitness techniques under this overall narratorial outlook, the TT does not show much difference as compared to the ST, except omitting the explicit comment جیسا کہ بیان کیا جا چکا ہے، استاد منگو کو گوروں سے بڑی نفرت تھی (*As has been described, Ustaad Mangoo immensely hated the Englishmen*).

6.4.2.1 Modality:

A simple frequency analysis reveals that, whereas the TT contains 22 modal verbs, the ST contains only six; similarly, whereas the TT contains as many as 38 modal adjuncts, the ST has 24. The following tables display the distribution of these:

Type	Hasan's Translation	ST
Can	8	3
Could	9	1
Have/Had to	1	0
Should	1	1
Might	3	1
Total	**22**	**6**

Table 6.9 Frequency of Modal verbs in Hasan's Translation of *Neya Qanoon*

Type	Hasan's Translation	ST
Usuality	8	6
Temporality	9	4
Probability	13	10
Intensity	8	4
Total	**38**	**24**

Table 6.10 Frequency of Modal adjuncts in Hasan's Translation of *Neya Qanoon*

The modal verbs and modal adjuncts in the TT are much more than in the ST, which indicates addition of interpersonal meanings and effects by Hasan. For example, he adds *can* and *could* at places to turn simple statements of information into that of ability, as illustrated in the example below:

Example 6.20:

جدید آئین کا دوسرا حصہ فیڈریشن ہے جو میری سمجھ میں ابھی تک نہیں آیا۔
The second part of the new constitution is [related to] federation, which still doesn't make sense to me.
It is section two of the Act that I still **can't** make sense of.

Apart from this, we can also note the modality toning down the certainty of several of the ST clauses. See the following examples:

Example 6.21:

تیری اس گنجی کھوپڑی پر بال اگ آئیں۔ (a)6.21
Hair would grow on this bald head of yours.
It's so good that it **might** make your hair grow up.
ابھی بہت سویرا ہے۔ (b)6.21
It is too early in the morning.
Perhaps it was too early in the morning.

Without any modality, all the three ST clauses/clause complexes above are simple statements, informing of what Ustaad Mangoo thinks is happening or will happen. By adding a finite modal verb in 6.21(a) and modal adjunct of probability in 6.21(b), Hasan lessens the effect of certitude present in the ST.

Apart from these instances of implied intrusion, Hasan manages to avoid explicit evaluative judgements in his translation.

6.4.2.2 Formality/Informality:

Unlike the ST, Hasan does not show a tendency to give a formal language and structure to his translation. Though a few formal words are certainly there, such as *perturbed*, *diatribe*, *proceedings*, *dispensation*, and *demise*, the translation, overall, has a conversational and informal style. The diction is predominantly neutral, i.e.

neither formal nor informal, with a tinge of informal expressions such as *lay hands on*, *wretch*, *the big day*, *get it in the neck*, and *cockiness*. Apart from this, the structure has a good amount of informality, which owes to a good number of contractions, such as *I'm*, *couldn't*, and *wouldn't*, and elliptical clauses. A few of these are given below:

Example 6.22:

6.22(a) 'Look at them,' he would say, shaking his head, 'come to the house to fetch a candle and before you knew, they had taken over.'
6.22(b) The way they order you around as if one was their father's slave.
6.22(c) 'What about interest?' asked one.

The first example is missing a subject, whereas the second is missing a verb. The third is also an informal expression whose formal alternate would be something like *what do you think about interest?*

Another interesting choice made by Hasan is to preserve/use several Urdu words in his translation, such as اڈّہ (*tanga stand*) انگریز (*Englishman*), بادشاہ (*king*), and راج (*kingdom*). He even goes to the extent of mixing the two languages in a single word by using English stem and an Urdu inflection والا (which is used to indicate possession or belonging), including *tongawala* (i.e. one who drives/possesses a tanga), *Russiawala* (i.e. one from Russia) and *Italywala* (i.e. one from Italy). These words are neither culture-specific nor technical, and it is easy to find their English translations. It is difficult to understand why Hasan makes these choices, but these certainly add to the informality of the translation, at least for those bilingual readers of Urdu and English who know that such words are uncommon to be seen in texts written in English.

6.4.2.3 Expletives, Honourifics, Vocatives, and Derogatory Epithets:

Hasan not only tries to translate all the ST expressions of this type, but even adds a few expletives, including *you fool*, *this swine*, *bastard*, and *wretched*. These are reflective of Mangoo's pent-up emotions, his deep-felt hatred, towards the English rulers.

6.4.3 Textual Metafunction:

6.4.3.1 Cohesion:

The TT leaves out several ST references to happiness, newness/oldness, and brightness. For example, the word *new* is omitted at several places, of which the following is a notable example:

Example 6.23:

<div dir="rtl">

ان میں سے کون سی چیز **نئی** تھی؟ **ظاہر ہے کہ کوئی بھی نہیں** لیکن استاد منگو **مایوس نہیں تھا۔**

</div>

*Which of this was **new**? **Obviously nothing**, but Ustaad Mangoo was **not disappointed**.*

This is an important clause complex, since it shows that Mangoo, contrary to his high expectations, was unable to see anything new on 1 April, i.e. the day when he expected the new constitution to take effect; the situation was disappointing, portrayed by Manto by first asking a rhetoric question and then answering with a strong negative phrase. The next clause, however, clarifies that, in spite of the dismaying scenario, Mangoo is not willing to lose hope. The TT leaves out the clause complex, and obviously the important word *new* is also omitted. We also lose the strong connotation emerging from the modal adverbs of *obviously* and *nothing*, as well as the consoling effect of the phrase *not disappointed*.

6.4.3.2 Thematic Structure:

Just like the ST, the TT shows a tendency to use unmarked themes; no marked themes are found in the TT. Now regarding the participants in theme, we see 53 shifts in total, out of which as many as 38 involve Mangoo. He displaces others in theme 22 times and is displaced by others 16 times. This difference does not seem conspicuous; however, in contrast to this, thematic shifts in the case of spatiotemporal adjuncts are quite significant. In contrast to the 59 temporal adjuncts in the ST, there are 34 in the TT (21 are the same as in the ST, and 13 are added by Hasan). Also, none of the thematic occurrences of proximal adjuncts اب (*now*) and ابھی (*yet/right now*) are preserved. As for the temporal adjuncts mentioning *1 April*, out of seven, three are omitted, three shifted from theme position, and only one preserved. The shifts are

even more widespread when it comes to thematic spatial adjuncts. Out of the 34 ST thematic spatial adjuncts, all, except one, are omitted in the TT, including all references to *body parts*. However, as regards *Hindustan*, it should be noted that, whereas one occurrence is omitted, the remaining four are turned into the subject, retaining their position in theme. The following example illustrates the point:

Example 6.24:

درویش نے جل کر یہ بددعا دی تھی، **جاتیرے ہندوستان میں** ہمیشہ فساد ہی ہوتے رہیں گے--- اور دیکھ لو جب سے اکبر بادشاہ کا راج ختم ہوا ہے**بندوستان میں** فساد پر فساد ہوتے رہتے ہیں۔

*The saint had cursed him as follows, **in your Hindustan**, riots will always take place… And see, ever since King Akbar's reign has come to an end, **in Hindustan**, riots after riots keep taking place.*

[The saint said] "Your **Hindustan** will always be plagued by riots and disorder." And you can see for yourselves, ever since the end of Akbar's Raj what else has **India** known but riots!

The translator had three options before him: (1) keep the spatial adjuncts in theme, which would have looked a bit unusual or, at least, highly marked in English; (2) shift the adjuncts to the end of the clauses, which would have resulted in the loss of their thematic prominence; and (3) change the adjuncts into subjects and thus retain their thematic position, but which would have resulted in *riots* losing its thematic position in both instances. He opted for the third solution which, based on the following two reasons, seems to be a judicious act. Firstly, it seems to be motivated by the realisation that, in the ST, the references to the place *Hindustan* are more important than that of *riots* and, hence, displacing the latter from theme will not cause much harm. Secondly, the choice enabled the translator to strike a balance between the ST requirement of placing *Hindustan* in theme position and the linguistic constraints of the target language. In any case, other than this last point, the TT has been unable to preserve the spatiotemporal outlook of the ST at thematic level.

6.4.4 Conclusion:

- Hasan omits a number of ST clauses, and even some paragraphs, thereby omitting some detail about Mangoo's character and his emotions and about the events narrated in the text.

- The TT displays comparatively less action, presenting things as simply existing or showing a relation.

- The modality structure of the TT reveals a shift from more certainty and conviction in the less certainty and conviction, and from simple statements to ones showing ability.

- Ratan adopts a conversational and informal style.

- Hasan retains ST honourifics, expletives, and derogatory epithets, thereby retaining the stylistic effects produced by them.

- Hasan chooses to omit several words related to the semantic fields of happiness, newness, and brightness, thereby toning down the associated effect.

- Like the ST, the TT displays unmarked themes.

- The TT shows comparatively more number of times Mangoo is placed in the topical theme position; however, the overall topical theme structure of the ST is followed in the TT.

- The TT does not retain the ST spatio-temporal outlook.

Chapter 7: Analysis of *Hatak* and Corresponding Translations

7.1 Analysis of *Hatak*:

7.1.1 A Brief Introduction to the Story:

Published in the anthology *Manto ke Afsaane* (1941), it is the story of a simple, contented sex worker who is happy with the low-profile life she is spending – a life which revolves around a small room, a limited number of customers, small wishes, and a contented soul. The peace in her life is shattered by an incident when, one night, a potential customer (the Seth) disapproves of her uttering an insulting expression بونہ. The word leaves the world of his mind upside down, causing profound agony and an unquenchable desire of avenging the insult. Manto gives a vivid description of what she goes through in her mind after the incident, leading to an outburst against her so-called lover, Madhu, and the consequent sense of loneliness and emptiness.

7.1.2 Ideational Metafunction and Transitivity Analysis:

There are 1230 processes in the story, distributed as follows:

Sr. Number	Process	Occurrences
1	Material	543
2	Mental	252
3	Relational	248
4	Behavioural	46
5	Verbal	136
6	Existential	5

Table 7.1 Frequency of Processes in *Hatak*

From the detail above, the short story seems to present a balanced distribution of processes. As we have seen when analysing the previous stories, and as might be typical with most narrative texts, material processes are more in number than the other processes in the story. However, we should also note that other processes also seem to be more or less in proportion. So, there are things happening in the story and plenty of action taking place. There are also a reasonable number of relational processes

showing attributive and possessive relations. Emotions and perceptions are also given a fair share of description, and a good number of dialogues and other verbal activities are also there. In short, unlike the previous two short stories, in this case, it is difficult to put one's finger on a process and claim it has been given more prominence and foregrounded. Also, Saugandhi, the leading participant of the story, is given a mention in all six types of processes and is found in all process roles, including the contrasting *agent* vs. *affectee* (for material processes) and *sayer* vs. *receiver* (for verbal processes). Let us have a look at the frequency of these different roles:

Participant Role	Frequency
Agent	207
Affectee	21
Senser	135
Phenomenon	11
Sayer	53
Receiver	38

Table 7.2 Frequency of Participant Roles in *Hatak*

Saugandhi's active role as an *agent* and *senser* is visible from the table above. There are only very few instances where she is seen in the role of *affectee* or *phenomenon*. Also if looked closely, even the sayer/receiver divide, which apparently may not seem to be very conspicuous, has Saugandhi in a dominant role. Out of the 36 receiver occurrences, only 13 are those where she has been mentioned by her name or the third person pronoun *her*. The rest are the cases where she is not mentioned and it is the context which makes it clear that it is Saugandhi being spoken to. So if we leave out these instances on the ground that Saugandhi has not been mentioned in them, the dominant role of her as sayer would become visible. A few examples are as under:

Example 7.1:

7.1(a)   وہ ہولے ہولے موٹر کی طرف بڑھے۔ موٹر کے اندر سے ایک ہاتھ بیٹری نکالے اس کے چہرے پر روشنی پھینکے۔ "اونہ" کی آواز آئے اور وہ۔۔۔ سوگندھی اندھا دھند اپنے دونوں پنجوں سے اس کا منہ نوچنا شروع کر دے۔۔۔

*She [desires that she] would slowly approach the motor [car]; a hand from inside the motor [car] would pull out a battery (i.e. a flashlight) [and] throws[its] light in her face; a sound of "unh" would come and **she**...Saugandhi would start scratching his face...*

7.1(b)   پلنگ پر وہ اکیلی تھی۔

On the bed, she was alone.

7.1(c)   اس سے پہلے اسے اس بات کی اتنی شدت سے ضرورت محسوس نہ ہوئی تھی۔ آج کیوں وہ بے جان چیزوں کو بھی ایسی نظروں سے دیکھتی ہے جیسے [وہ] ان پر اپنے اچھے ہونے کا احساس طاری کرنا چاہتی ہے؟

*Before this [time], **she** had not felt the need of it [i.e. being admired] so vehemently. Today, why is **she** looking at even inanimate things as if [**she**] wants to impress upon them the impression of her being a good person?*

In 7.1(a), Saugandhi is presented in the role of agent, and in 7.1(b), she is the attribute. In 7.1(c), she is first presented as senser (*she had not felt*), then as behaver (*she is looking at*), then, again, as senser (*wants to impress upon them*), and finally as carrier (*her being a good person*). The story is replete with similar clauses, giving Saugandhi a pervasive role.

From the figures and discussion above, we can see that the short story hardly shows any foregrounding or prominence.

7.1.3 Interpersonal Metafunction:

Unlike the last two stories, *Hatak* seems to oscillate between external and internal narratorial points of view. The story starts with a vivid description of Saugandhi's room and, as can be expected, is replete with relational processes. Next, we see Saugandhi in communication with Ram Lal, the pimp, and Jumna, her fellow sex worker. Apart from the obvious verbal processes, material processes dominate the scene. Then there is a shift to exposing the idiosyncratic feelings and desires of Saugandhi and hence to the internal narratorial point of view. As expected, a proliferation of mental processes, especially that of emotive and desirative types, is found here. Apart from these processes, there are also some relational processes – such as اسے خوش (*she was happy*), وہ خوش تھی (*how peaceful it is*), کتنی مزیدار ہوتی ہے (*she had to remain happy*), and کبھی کبھی جب پریم کیے جانے کا جذبہ اس کے اندر رہنا پڑتا تھا بہت شدت اختیار کر لیتا۔۔ (*sometimes, when the desire to be loved became very strong in her...*) – which, like mental processes, betray the feelings of Saugandhi.

7.1.3.1 Modality:

In sharp contrast to the last two stories in our analysis, *Hatak* contains a considerably higher number of modal verbs (31 occurrences) and modal adjuncts (88 occurrences). This is a significant number and is indicative of substantial semantic potential at the interpersonal level of the story, as discussed below.

Modal verbs (of which 30 are finite modal verbs, and one, that of permission, non-finite modal verb) are both explicit and implicit in nature, the former being those where a modal verb is mentioned in the clause by its name (سکنا, پڑنا, and چاہیے, to be specific) and the latter being those where a modal verb is not mentioned, and the modality is identifiable from the structure/context of the relevant clause. A few illustrative examples of implied modality are as under:

Example 7.2:

7.2(a)   مجھ سے ہنسی **نہ رکی**۔
*From me, laugh **not stopped*** (literal meaning).
I **could**n't stifle my laugh (original meaning).

7.2(b)   دیکھ تو آج تیری ناک کتنی لال ہو رہی ہے **کہیں** زکام **نہ ہو جائے**۔
*See how red your nose is getting today, **lest cold happen*** (literal meaning).
See how red your nose is getting today; you **might** catch a cold (original meaning).

As can be discerned from these examples, the verb forms themselves are not pointing towards a modal stance; it is the construction, context, and convention which imply the modalities shown in boldface in the corresponding English clauses. Just for example, *not stop* in 7.2(a) does not have a meaning of *could not* or *not being able to*; however, when read in conjunction with the preceding *from me*, the clause implies an inability of stopping the laugh by the speaker, and hence there is an implied sense of *could not*.

The table below shows the distribution of these (explicit and implicit) modal verbs in the story:

Type	Category	Explicit	Implicit	Total
سکنا/پانا (Can)	Finite Modal Verb	16	2	18
سکنا (May)	Finite Modal Verb	0	2	4
پڑنا (Has/Have to)	Finite Modal Verb	4	0	4
چاہیے (Should)	Finite Modal Verb	0	3	3
چاہیے (Must)	Finite Modal Verb	0	1	1
اجازت دینا (to allow)	Non-finite Modal Verb	1	0	1
				31

Table 7.3 Modal Verbs in *Hatak*

We can see from the table that the frequency of the modal verb of ability/inability, *can* (18 occurrences), is quite significant. 12 of the occurrences involve the main

character *Saugandhi* and seem to have a role to play in characterisation. Manto, in an attempt to create a likeable image of her, off and on comments on the kind and loving nature of Saugandhi, and also narrates a couple of events highlighting this trait of her personality. In this, *can,* at certain places, helps to emphasise Saugandhi's compassionate nature. In addition to characterisation, the modal verb is also used in certain remarks passed by the characters, whereby it seems to have a meaningful role to play in plot development. See the following illustrative examples:

Example 7.3:

<div dir="rtl">

پریم کر سکنے کی ابلیت اس کے اندر اس قدر زیادہ تھی کہ ہر اس مرد سے جو اس کے پاس آتا تھا وہ
محبت کر سکتی تھی اور پھر اس کو نبھاہ بھیسکتی تھی۔

</div>

*The ability to love [someone] was so profound in her that she **could** love every man visiting her, and even **could** maintain it as well.*

In the example, there are three occurrences of the modal verb, emphasising Saugandhi's outstanding ability to love others. (The literal English translation beneath the example shows only two instances of the modal verb, which owes to the linguistic difference between English and Urdu.) Seeing these clauses in context, we can appreciate that Manto is trying to create Saugandhi's image as a very loving and caring person. She is portrayed as having the ability to extend love and care towards multiple people. Later in the story, to support this point, Manto cites an example where he presents Saugandhi financially helping a woman whose husband has recently died and who has no money to return to her hometown. Establishing this impression seems to have a meaningful impact on the later events in the story where she is seen maltreated by her so-called lover, Madhu, and by her potential customer, the Seth. Showing the contrast between the loving and caring Saugandhi and the stone-hearted, negative-minded people around her, Manto seems to be trying to induce in his readership feelings of empathy and sympathy for her.

Apart from modal verbs, there are 97 modal adjuncts, including ten of usuality, 43 of intensity (42 adjuncts and one short clause), 34 of temporality, five of probability, one of obviousness, and four of opinion/impression (all four are short clauses). A closer look at the dynamics of these adjuncts reveals that they too play an important role in characterisation and plot development.

We have already seen in example 7.3 above how Manto tries to construct a positive image of Saugandhi, and we have also noted how bad the world treats her in return. In this, as demonstrated in the examples below, modal adjuncts join hands with modal verbs to play a salient role. Manto uses a variety of these adjuncts, sometimes accompanying them with the modality of negation, to pass evaluative comments on Saugandhi's character and portray Saugandhi's perspective on how the world treats her. Consider the following examples to appreciate the role played by the adjuncts in this regard:

Example 7.4:

7.4(a) ان پانچ برسوں کے دوران میں**شاید** ہی کوئی آدمی اس سے نا خوش ہو کر گیا ہو۔

*In these five years, there was **perhaps** no one who had left [Saugandhi's place] unhappy with her [behaviour].*

7.4(b) **کبھی کبھی** جب پریم کیے جانے کا جذبہ اس کے اندر بہت شدت اختیار کر جاتا--

***Sometimes** when her inner desire to be loved grew so intense...*

7.4(c) مہینے میں **ایک بار** مادھو پونے سے آتا تھا اور واپس جاتے ہوئے**ہمیشہ** سوگندھی سے کہا کرتا تھا
"دیکھ سوگندھی اگر تو نے پھر سے اپنا دھندا شروع کیا تو**بس** تیری میری ٹوٹ جائے گی--- اگر تو نے **ایک بار بھی** کسی مرد کو اپنے یہاں ٹھہرایا تو چٹیا سے پکڑ کر باہر نکال دوں گا۔"

***Once** in a month, Madhu came from Puna and, when leaving, **always** said to Saugandhi "Look Saugandhi, if you started your business again, then it would **only** be an end of the relationship between you and me. If you made a person stay here with you **even for once**, then I will grab a lock of your hair and show you out [of your home]."*

7.4(d) ---اور سوگندھی یہ جان بوجھ کر بھی کہ وہ جھوٹ بول رہا ہے**بس** موم ہو جاتی تھی۔

*...and Saugandhi, even when she knew he was lying, **just** melt.*

7.4(e) **ایک بار** آئینہ دیکھتے ہوئے بے اختیار اس کے منہ سے نکل گیا تھا "سوگندھی تجھ سے زمانے نے اچھا سلوک نہیں کیا۔"

***Once**, when looking [at herself] in a mirror, it unconsciously came out of her mouth "Saugandhi, the world has not treated you in the right way".*

7.4(f) ---ایک آدمی نے اس کی**ابھی ابھی** بتک کی ہے۔

*A man has **just** insulted her...*

7.4(g) لعنت یہ تو وہی "اونہہ" تھی جو اس کے اندر**کبھی** سکڑتی تھی اور **کبھی** پھیلتی تھی۔

*Damn, it was the same "unh" [sound of bah] that **sometimes** shrank inside her and **sometimes** expanded.*

7.4(h) کوئی۔کوئی۔۔۔اس وقت اس کے کاندھوں پر ہاتھ رکھ کر**صرف** اتنا کہہ دے "سوگندھی کون کہتا ہے تو بری ہے، جو تجھے برا کہے وہ آپ برا ہے۔" نہیں یہ کہنے کی کوئی ضرورت نہیں تھی۔ کسی کا اتنا کہہ دینا کافی تھا "سوگندھی تو بہت اچھی ہے۔"

*Someone...someone place their hand on her shoulders and **just** say "Saugandhi, who says you are bad. Whoever calls you bad is bad themselves." No, there is no need to say this. It was enough to say "Saugandhi, you are very good [by nature]".*

7.4(i) اس کے اندر یہ خواہش بڑی شدت سے پیدا ہو رہی تھی کہ جو کچھ ہو چکا ہے**ایک بار پھر** ہو۔**صرف ایک بار**۔۔۔ وہ آہولے بولے موٹر کی طرف بڑھے۔ موٹر کے اندر سے ایک ہاتھ بیٹری نکالے اس کے چہرے پر روشنی پھینکے۔ "اونہہ" کی آواز آئے اور وہ۔۔۔ سوگندھی اندھا دھند اپنے دونوں پنجوں سے اس کا منہ نوچنا شروع کر دے---

*A very intense desire was developing inside her that what had happened, happens **once again** – **just once**. She would slowly approach the motor [car]; a hand from inside the motor [car] would pull out a battery (i.e. a flashlight) [and] throw [its] light in her face; sound of "unh" would come and she...Saugandhi would start scratching his face...*

7.4(j) انتقام کے نئے نئے طریقے سوگندھی کے ذہن میں آ رہے تھے۔ اگر اس سیٹھ سے**ایک بار۔صرف ایک بار** --- اس کی مڈبھیڑ ہو جائے تو یہ کرے، نہیں یہ نہیں یہ کرے--- یوں اس سے انتقام لے، نہیں یوں نہیں---

*A variety of ways of taking revenge were coming in Saugandhi's mind. If [she **may**] come face to face with this Seth **once** – **just once** - then she would do this; no, not this [but] that. [She would] take revenge like this; no, not like this...*

Saugandhi is so good by nature that, as she recalls, *perhaps no one* (though the mood of probability apparently shows some uncertainty in the statement, the negation *no one* comes to rescue, giving strength to the statement and making it notable) of her visitors has been unhappy with her (7.4(a)). She desires to be treated by the world the same loving way that she treats them, and *sometimes* the intensity of the desire becomes very strong (7.4(b)). Overpowered by it, she even makes a compromise pretending to love, and be loved by, Madhu. Though his visits are not very frequent – just *once* in a month – he stays for a few days each time. During this period, he pretends to be caring towards her, *always* (the modality is indicative of his persistence, and also serves to emphasise, as we later realize, how confident and shameless a liar he is) asking her to leave the business of selling herself and promising that he would fend for her (7.4(c)). Also, although Saugandhi knows that he is lying, she *just* (the modality emphasises her helplessness in front of Madhu) cannot stop herself from being mesmerised by the charm of his words (7.4(d)). She has a helpful nature, and she never hesitates in extending a helping hand to others. However, she does not seem to receive the same compassion from the people around her. She also seems to have a realisation of it, as she complains about it when looking at herself in the mirror *once* (7.4(e)). What comes to her consolation is the fact that, until now, no one has openly said this to her. One day, however, a potential client is rude enough to reject her and utter a dismissive and pejorative *unh*. The insult sticks to Saugandhi's mind. She wants to forget it, but the sound of *unh* reverberates in her mind (7.4(g)), not letting her forget that a person has *just* rejected and insulted her (note the repetition of the modal adjunct کبھی (*just*) for emphasis in 7.4(f). The rejection and the insult make her wish for approval; she wants someone to place their hand on her shoulder and console her. Even if they *just* (the modality implies how much she longs for approval) say to her that she is a good-natured person, it would console and satisfy her (7.4(h)). Not finding any compassionate person around, her desire deteriorates into feelings of hatred and revenge. She desires that the wheel of time would take a reverse turn, and somehow the whole incident with the Seth would happen *once – just once –* again, so that she could satiate the yearning of revenge burning inside her (7.4(i) and (j)).

From the examples and discussion above, we can discern how a medley of modal adjuncts is used to attach evaluation to what is going on, and also to link the various strands of meaning and information to develop the plot in a certain way.

7.1.3.2 Formality/Informality:

As the characters in the story come from the world of prostitution, Manto seems to be at pains to use a register that is characteristic to this class, including colloquialism and informal use of lexicon and grammar. So, the lexicon is mostly informal and colloquial - بیوڑا, مروڑیاں, پونے (instead of the formal پونا), چھوکریوں, دارو, لونڈیا, منشی - پالٹی, and دھندا are just a few examples of it. There are also certain nouns, verbs, and adjectives which are not informal or colloquial on their own but become so in the context, as illustrated in the examples below:

Example 7.5:

7.5(a)   "ایک **کلاک** (گھنٹے) سے باہر کھڑا دروازہ کھٹکھٹا رہا ہوں، کہاں **مر گئی تھی**؟"
*"[I] have been knocking at the door for the last one **clock** (hour), where **had you died**?"*
"I have been knocking at the door for the last hour, where **had you been**?"

7.5(b)   "بھئی بڑے لوگوں کی باتیں بڑی **پکی** ہوتی ہیں۔"
*"Bei (a term of address), the sayings of the great people are very **firm**."*
"Bei, what the sayings by great people are very **true**."

In 7.5(a), کلاک (*clock*) is an informal counterpart of گھنٹہ (*hour*)[22], and the expression کہاں مر گئی تھی (*had died*) in 7.5(b) is an informal equivalent of کہاں رہ گئی تھی (*had been*).

Apart from the lexicon, the grammar of the story also shows plenty of informality. We can note quite a widespread use of the informal forms of three types of second person pronouns and certain verbs. To begin with, it should be noted that the forms used in the story are not just informal; they are *very informal*. In fact, Urdu has three forms of these pronouns, which we can label and describe as follows:

- *Formal forms*, which indicate respect or formal relations
- *Informal forms*, which indicate frankness

---

[22] As a side note, Manto himself provides the meaning in brackets for clarity.

- *Most informal forms*, which indicate a high level of intimacy and are usually used by the members of the low echelons of the society, such as those that populate the story *Hatak*

The following table shows these forms:

Formal Form	Informal Form	Most Informal Form (used in *Hatak*)	English Equivalent
آپ	تم	تو (nominative case)	You
آپ کو	تمہیں	تجھے (oblique case)	You
آپ کا/کی/کے	تمہارا/تمہاری/تمہارے	تیرا/تیری/تیرے	Your

Table 7.4 Informal Second Person Pronouns in *Hatak*

It is remarkable to note that, almost each time the characters in the story speak to each other, they use the most informal form of the second person pronoun. The pronouns in bold in اب **تو** میرا منہ کیا دیکھتی ہے؟ (*now what are you staring at me for?*), پسند نہیں کیا (he] did not like you), and کیا بھول گئی ابھی ابھی **تیری** صورت کو پھٹکارہ گیا ہے؟ **تجھے** (*have [you] forgotten that your face has just been looked down upon?*) are a few examples of the case in point.

Urdu imperative verbs, and such compound declarative, negative, and interrogative verbs that comprise a noun or adjective and the auxiliary ہے/ہو/ہیں, also have similar three forms on the formality/informality scale, and most of them, just like the pronouns above, are used in their most informal form in the story almost every time. The following table displays only a handful of such verbs from the story:

Form	Formal Form	Informal Form	Most Informal Form (used in *Hatak*)	English Equivalent
Imperative	رکھا کریں	رکھا کرو	رکھا کر	Keep
	دبا دیا کریں	دبا دیا کرو	دبا دیا کر	Bury
	چھوڑیں	چھوڑو	چھوڑ	Give up
	ٹھہریں	ٹھہرو	ٹھہر	Wait
Declarative	بری ہیں	بری ہو	بری ہے	Is bad
Interrogative	جانتی ہیں	جانتی ہو	جانتی ہے	Do [you] know

Table 7.5 Informal Verbs in *Hatak*

It is noteworthy that a few formal and informal forms of verbs are also used in the story, and we can discern the following pattern:

- Most informal forms are used when Saugandhi, her so-called lover Madhu, the pimp Ram Lal, and her friend Jumna, speak with each other and are indicative of their close mutual intimacy and frankness; an exception is the verb اَوُ (two occurrences) used in the informal form, a choice which does not appear to have an obvious reason, when Saugandhi and Ram Lal are talking about a potential customer.

- Informal forms are used when the speech is not directed at a person in the close circle mentioned above, but at some unknown person or inanimate thing, such as when we are told about the advice that Saugandhi frequently gives to other *prostitutes* (eight occurrences of the informal form); another example is when the informal auxiliary بر is used in conjunction with the informal تم to express Saugandhi's esoteric thoughts about her existence and non-existence (three occurrences).

- Formal forms are used only by the pimp for the potential customer (seven occurrences), the Seth (it is important to note that *Seth* is a type of honorific used for the rich to show respect for them), the obvious cause of which is his status as a rich person and a potential customer.

Since these formal/informal forms of pronouns and verbs are not used in English, it is but natural not to find corresponding forms in the English translations, and hence some interpersonal semantic loss is natural to be found in the translations. It will be interesting to see if the translators compensate it by using other informal and conversational forms (such as the contracted forms *I'll* and *we've*) from the lexical and grammatical repertoire of English.

7.1.3.3 Expletives, Honourifics, and Pejorative Expressions:

Along with informal forms, the TT presents several colloquial and culture-specific expressions. For example, as mentioned above, Ram Lal uses the honorific سِیَّھ (*Seth*), which indicates the higher socio-economic status of one of Saugandhi's potential customers. Apart from the honorific, Manto punctuates the story with expletives, two types of which are recognisable considering their semantic value. First, there are expletives which are characteristically used in the profession of prostitution, and are probably indicative of a speech habit, and, as such, can be construed as having an

insignificant semantic value. These include موا (three occurrences), سالا (three occurrences), سالی (two occurrences), and مردود (one occurrence). (All of these are more or less similar to each other in meaning and can roughly be translated as *rogue*, *rascal*, or *scoundrel*.) Second, there are expressions which are expressive of characters' feelings of hatred, indignation, and derision, and are thus semantically laden with intense negative emotions/feelings. Examples include چھپکلی (*lizard*), کمینہ (*rascal*), کتا (*dog*), بھک منگا (*beggar*), and چور (*thief*), and گٹھ کترا (*pickpocket*). The first is what Saugandhi imagines the Seth to mean when he disapproves of her. The rest are uttered by Saugandhi for her so-called lover Madhu. She is mentally tormented by the insult she has suffered at the hand of the Seth, but the Seth has left in a hurry not leaving her with a chance to retaliate. Frustrated, she takes revenge from Madhu by passing belittling remarks and throwing expletives at him.

7.1.4 Textual Metafunction and Effects:

7.1.4.1 Cohesion:

The cohesive structure of the story reveals a proliferation of words from the semantic field of body parts. Particularly frequent are references to Saugandhi's دل/جی/دماغ (*heart/brain/mind* – 24 occurrences), آنکھیں (*eyes* – 13), and چہرہ/شکل/منہ (*face* – 17 occurrences). These body parts, a good number of which are accompanied by the second person possessive pronoun تیرا, are significant because they are linked to the feelings, thoughts, desires, and perceptions around which the different strands of the story revolve: the Seth disapproves of Saugandhi's *face*, her *eyes* weep and also see (different things such as the Seth's car disappearing in the darkness after turning her mental world upside down), her *mind* is full of hatred and anger, and it harbours a craving for revenge, and so on. (Before moving on, it seems relevant to clarify two points. Firstly, references to the heart and the mind/brain are put in the same category above because, as a custom, thoughts, feelings, and emotions are presented in Urdu as not only occurring in the mind/brain but also in the heart. Secondly, the expression *he/she thought* is sometimes rendered as اس کے جی میں آیا (*it came to his/her mind/heart*) in Urdu and there are several instances of this usage in *Hatak*. As this is not common in English, we naturally expect less frequency of references to the heart, mind, and brain in the target texts.)

The story reveals other lexical repetitions as well, the most important probably being the repetition of words from the semantic field of *hatred*. For example, there are as many as 13 occurrences of اونہہ, which is an expression of disapproval, similar to the English *bah*, and is probably the most important word in the story, as it is this disapproving word that leads to Saugandhi's mental torment and a tragic end. Other similar words from the story include پھٹکار (*reproach*), دھتکار (*revilement*), and ہتک (*insult*), as well as the disapproving words specific to Saugandhi's face بری ,بدصورت بھونڈی, and صورت, all meaning *ugly*.

7.1.4.2 Thematic Structure:

The overall thematic structure of the story is carved by unmarked themes, with only two marked themes:

Example 7.6:

7.6(a)	چلو چلو دیر کیوں **کرتے ہو؟**
	*Come on, **why do** you delay?*
7.6(b)	"تو دروازہ کیوں نہیں **کھولتی؟**"
	*"Then why don't you **open** the door?"*

Both the clauses above are material verb clauses and are usually used in the past progressive tense in Urdu. However, here they are presented in the simple present tense. The first clause is uttered by Saugandhi when talking to a customer, and the second is said by Ram Lal to Saugandhi when he knocks at her door and she opens only a bit of it to inquire who it is outside. Else than these two random examples of marked theme, the story has unmarked themes, which is a partial indication of the ordinary, straightforward language in the story that is characteristic to Manto's style of writing.

If we look at what comes in theme position, Saugandhi seems to dominate the topical theme position, be it in the role of agent, sayer, senser, possessor, or attribute. The only time she is not in the limelight is when Manto, at the beginning of the story, spends some time describing the condition of Saugandhi's room in detail. At the end

of the description, there are 26 clauses in a row where Saugandhi is neither in theme nor in rheme.

Looking at adjuncts in theme position, we see a clear dominance of spatiotemporal references. To be specific, there are 59 spatial adjuncts and 68 temporal adjuncts in theme position. It must be noted that thematisation of most of the spatial adjuncts in the story seems language specific and hence the translations are likely to have far fewer occurrences of spatial references. Another aspect to note is that a considerable number of spatial adjuncts in theme position refer to Saugandhi's body parts, which, as we have already noted in Section 7.1.4.1, have a vital role in developing the plot. The following examples illustrate the observations made here:

Example 7.7:

7.7(a) پلنگ پر وہ اکیلی تھی۔
On the bed, she was alone.

7.7(b) گھر کی طرف سوگندھی کے قدم اٹھے ہی تھے کہ رک گئے۔
Towards home, as soon as Saugandhi's feet stepped, they stopped.

7.7(c) سوگندھی کے بھنچے ہوئے لب کھلے۔ان پر ایک پیلی مسکراہٹ نمودار ہوئی۔
Saugandhi's pressed lips opened. **On them**, a yellow smile appeared.

By putting a place adjunct in theme position in 7.7(a), Manto gives prominence to the place where the activity (sleeping) is being carried out. Similarly, 7.7(b) puts a directional reference in the limelight, making it prominent that it is *towards home* that Saugandhi starts travelling. While these may look a bit awkward or highly marked in English (with *she was alone on the bed* and *as soon as Saugandhi started walking towards home* as the expected, unmarked choices), such spatial prominences are normal, rather customary, in Urdu, whereby spatial adjuncts usually come in clause-initial position. Some other similar ST examples are کنڈی میں تالہ نہیں تھا (*in the latch, there was no lock*), دو منزلوں سے، فریم زمین پر گرا (*from two storeys, the frame fell on the floor*), and دروازے پر دستک ہوئی (*at the door, there was a knock*). These ST structures show a tilt of the text towards highlighting references to places and directions. Probably more important than these is the case exemplified in 7.7(c) where a part of Saugandhi's body is placed in theme. As we have observed above, these occupy an important place across the story, and hence putting a handsome amount of them in theme position certainly gives them more prominence. Also, as putting

adjuncts containing body parts is not usually the case in English, it would be interesting to see how translators deal with them.

Regarding temporal adjuncts in theme, we can identify two trends. Up until the day when Saugandhi bears an insult by a potential client, the story is imbued with neutral (i.e. neither distal nor proximal) temporal adjuncts in theme, such as کبھی (*sometimes*), ہر روز (*everyday*), ایک بار (*once*), and جب (*when*), as shown in the following example:

Example 7.8:

کبھی ایسا ہوتا ہے کہ تم ہو اور کبھی ایسا معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ تم نہیں اور اس ہونے اور نہ ہونے کے بیچ میں کبھی کبھی ایسا بھی محسوس ہوتا ہے کہ تم ہوا میں بہت اونچی جگہ لٹکی ہوئی ہو۔

Sometimes, *it happens that you are there and sometimes it feels as if you are not, and in the middle of these [feelings of] being and not being, **sometimes** it also feels that you are suspended high in the air.*

However, once we are introduced to the unfortunate day on which Saugandhi had to bear the insult, we see, as is logical and expected, proliferation of proximal temporal adjuncts in theme position up until the end of the story, including اب (*now*), ابھی ابھی (*just a moment ago*), آج (*today*), and اس وقت (*at the moment*). The circumstantial temporal adjunct آج is especially used several times in this part of the story (five in total) seeming to bring that particular day in focus and, implicitly, tell it apart from the past: the past has seen her as a naive and happy person, but the present day suddenly unmasks the cruel face of the world she lives in, changing her from an idealistic person to a realistic one. Unlike the ST spatial adjuncts in theme, these temporal adjuncts are not specific to the Urdu language and, hence, it is expected that the translations would preserve most of them.

7.1.5 Conclusion:

We have seen how the transitivity and modality structures of the story construct a positive image of the central figure and the maltreatment she receives at the hand of the people in her social circle. We have also seen how the insulting behaviour of the Seth shatters her apparent peace of mind and torments her. In addition, we have noted the informality and colloquialism of the language, which is characteristic of the register of the professional world the characters come from, as well as the expletives

employed to expose Saugandhi's feelings and desires. Finally, we have seen how the cohesive devices reinforce the depiction of Saugandhi's thoughts, feelings, and desires, and we have also noted a proliferation of unmarked themes in the story with only a couple of counterexamples, as well as the dominance of Saugandhi and spatiotemporal adjuncts in theme position.

7.2 Analysis of Tahira Naqvi's Translation of *Hatak*:

7.2.1 Ideational Metafunction and Transitivity Analysis:

The following table shows the number and percentage of the processes in Naqvi's translation and how they compare to those of the TT:

Sr. Number	Process	Occurrences in Naqvi's Translation	Comparison with the ST
1	Material	451 (37.89%)	543 (44.14%)
2	Mental	247 (20.75%)	252 (20.49%)
3	Relational	300 (25.21%)	248 (20.16%)
4	Behavioural	41 (3.44%)	46 (3.73%)
5	Verbal	122 (10.25%)	136 (11.05%)
6	Existential	29 (2.43%)	5 (0.4)
7	Total	1190	1230

Table 7.6 Frequency of Processes in Naqvi's Translation of *Hatak*

With only 40 processes fewer than that of the ST, the TT seems to be quite similar to the ST in terms of transitivity makeup. Also, overall, like the ST, the TT appears to have a more or less typical distribution of the processes (cf. Section 7.1.2). However, there are a couple of differences which beg some description. There are 90 (i.e. around six per cent) fewer material processes in the TT in comparison to that in the ST. One of the reasons for the difference is the addition of a few material processes, such as that in *surrounded on all sides by nothing but air*. However, the predominant reasons are as follows. Firstly, a considerable number of material processes are omitted, for example, کھودا تھا (*had dug*), پلنگ پر آیا (*came to the bed*), and اٹھی (*stood up*). Secondly, there are several instances of shift from material to another process, mostly relational (which also partially explains the higher number of relational processes in the TT), such as from سو گئی (*went to sleep*) to *she was now asleep* and منہ رکھے (*resting his face on*) to *(on which) rested the head of*.

From the table above, we can also identify Naqvi's tendency of using considerably more existential processes than Manto does in the ST. The prominent reason for this is the shift from other processes to existential processes, as exemplified in the shift from تیرا میرا ناطہ ہی کیا تھا؟ (*what was the relationship between you and me*) to *what is there between us?* and from پہلے تیرے اور میرے بیچ میں دس روپے بجتے تھے (*at first, ten rupees jingled between you and me*) to *at first there were ten rupees between us*. It should be noted that these small-scale shifts in the transitivity structure do not develop into a macro-level pattern to modify the subject matter of the story in a significant way.

Like the ST, the TT presents Saugandhi in an active role, as shows in the table below:

Participant Role	TT Frequency	ST Frequency
Agent	191	207
Affectee	20	21
Senser	145	135
Phenomenon	12	11
Sayer	50	53
Receiver	39	38

Table 7.7 Frequency of Participant Roles in Naqvi's Translation of *Hatak*

As is evident from the table, there is a remarkable similarity between the two texts in terms of frequency of these various roles for Saugandhi, with only a few shifts and omissions/additions. For example, Saugandhi is ascribed the role of affectee in the TT clause *One day he'll deprive you of these clothes on your back*. However, in the corresponding ST clause, تیرے انگ پر سے یہ کپڑا بھی **اتار کر لے جائے گا** (*[he] will even take off and take away these clothes on your body*), it is the clothes on her body which are directly affected by the action. On the other hand, some ST short clauses presenting Saugandhi in the role of an agent have been omitted, including ان کی مالش (*[she] massages them*), صندوق کھول کر (*[she] opening the box*), and لیٹتے ہی (*as soon as [she] lie down*) are a few examples of it. Notwithstanding these few instances, overall, the two texts are more or less similar in terms of assigning active roles to the central character, i.e. Saugandhi.

7.2.2 Interpersonal Metafunction:

Following the ST narratorial structure, Naqvi employs the technique of switching between external and internal narratorial points of view. This is accompanied by the corresponding shifts from the types of processes characterising the two different types of narratorial techniques (cf. 7.1.3).

7.2.2.1 Modality:

There are 127 modal verbs and modal adjuncts, including the short modal clauses of permission and opinion, in the translation. The following tables provide the detail:

Type	Naqvi's Translation	ST
Can	29	18
May	5	4
Should	4	3
Must	1	1
Might	2	0
Has/Have to	4	4
To allow	1	1
Total	**46**	**31**

Table 7.8 Frequency of Modal Verbs in Naqvi's Translation of *Hatak*

Type	Naqvi's Translation	ST
Usuality	4	10
Temporality	37	34
Probability	5	5
Intensity	31	43
Obviousness	1	1
Opinion/impression	3	4
Total	**81**	**97**

Table 7.9 Frequency of Modal Adjuncts in Naqvi's Translation of *Hatak*

Unlike in the ST, all the modal verbs in the TT are overtly mentioned, and hence there are no implied modal verbs.

Comparing the total number of modal verbs and modal adjuncts in the translation, 127, with those in the ST, 128, we can see the overall similarity between the modal structure of the two texts. Even when comparing the individual cases, we can see this point holding for most of the modal verbs and modal adjuncts (consider, for example, the similar number of *may*, *has/have to*, *usuality*, and *temporality*). But, then, there are

also a couple of cases which have a marked difference in terms of frequency. Let us consider them in some detail to appreciate their semantic impact.

The frequency of the modal verb of ability *can* is relatively higher in the translation. The added instances of the modality induce a sense of ability to the otherwise simple, straightforward statements. Particularly interesting are the cases where Saugandhi's strange desires are presented. A couple of illustrative examples are as follows:

Example 7.9:

7.9(a)پریم۔۔۔۔۔کتنا سندر بول ہے۔ وہ چاہتی تھی اس کو پگھلا کر اپنے سارے انگوں پر مل لے، اس کی مالش کرے تاکہ یہ سارے کا سارا اس کے مساموں میں رچ جائے۔

Love…what a beautiful word it is! She wanted to melt it down and rub it on every part of her body, [and] massage with it so, that all of it permeates into her pores.

"Love...what a beautiful thing!" She wished she **could** melt it down and rub it all over her body until it had penetrated her every pore, or that she **could** disappear into it and drag whatever remained with her and then shut the lid after her.

7.9(b)سوگندھی چاہتی تھی کہ اپنی ساری زندگی کسی ایسے ہی صندوق میں چھپ کر گزار دے جس کے باہر ڈھونڈنے والے پھرتے رہیں۔

Saugandhi wished that she spend all her life hidden in a box like this one, outside of which the seekers keep seeking.

She wished she **could** spend all of her life in a box like that so that those on the outside **could** continue looking for her.

The ST in 7.9(a) shows Saugandhi cherishing a strange intention. We, as readers, are aware of the fact that the intention is related to something impossible in the real world, but this is not the case with Saugandhi. She is presented as actually desiring to melt the word *love* and rub it all over her body or go inside it. The addition of *could* in the translation, however, weakens the conviction in that we see in the ST clause complex, suggesting that what is being desired is not a real intention on the part of the speaker, but just a desire for something which is impractical. The same is the case with 7.9(b). Saugandhi, as presented in the ST clauses, seems to actually believe that she can spend her life in a box and play hide and seek with her lovers. With two occurrences of *could*, the TT seems to remind us that the desire is not realisable and that Saugandhi is aware of it.

We noted in Section 7.1.3.1 that the modal verb *can* plays a role in characterisation and helps to develop the ST plot. The TT displays a mixed attitude towards it, whereby it preserves some of the occurrences of the modal verb and omits some. Take the following illustrative example (cf. Section 7.1.3.1):

Example 7.10:

پریم کر **سکنے** کی اہلیت اس کے اندر اس قدر زیادہ تھی کہ ہر اس مرد سے جو اس کے پاس آتا تھا وہ
محبت کر **سکتی** تھی اور پھر اس کو نباہ بھی**سکتی** تھی۔

*The ability to love [someone] was so profound in her that she **could** love every man
visiting her, and even **could** maintain it as well.*

Her desire to love was so intense that she **could** easily fall in love with any of the
men who came to her and she was also able to sustain her feelings over a long period
of time.

Apart from the preservation of one occurrence of *could*, the TT displays some shifts
and omissions. Firstly, the noun *ability* in the ST is shifted to *desire* and the
occurrence of could right after the ST noun (not shown in the literal translation as it is
not feasible because of *grammatical co*nstraints), owing to the linguistic differences
between Urdu and English, omitted. Now, with three occurrences of the modal verb of
ability and one of the noun *ability*, we can see a clear slant in the ST clauses towards
emphasising the outstanding ability in Saugandhi to love more than one man at the
same time. In the TT, on the other hand, the shift of the noun to *desire* tones down
this effect. However, it is compensated in part later when the second occurrence of
could is preserved, and the third occurrence is shifted to something similar in
meaning: *was able to*.

Now as regards the use of modal adjuncts, as the table above indicates, the TT, by
having more or less the same number of modal adjuncts, seems to share similarities
with the ST. We have also seen (Section 7.1.3.1) what role these modal adjuncts play
in inducing evaluative perspectives along the development of the plot. Naqvi seems to
be mindful of this, as she, by preserving a good number of these modal adjuncts, as
well as by adding, and even by deleting, some, tries to create similar impressions in
her translation. We are told that Saugandhi has a loving nature, so much so that *in the
last five years **not a single man** had gone away from her displeased* (note the
preservation of the negation as well as the omission of the ST *perhaps* and the choice
of modifying *man* with *a single*, which all help to intensify the certainty and
conviction in the remark).Unfortunately, she has not received the respect and love
from others that she has for them, as she *once* complains in a monologue as well:
Saugandhi, life has not been fair to you!, where by *life* she means the people around
her. She finds an exception in Madhu who comes *once* every month, stays for a few

days, and *just* (mood of intensity added in the translation) before leaving, he always warns her not to sell her body to *even* a single person anymore. He also always promises to send her monthly expenses. Saugandhi is captivated by his words and is happy with how her life is progressing. Her peace of mind is shattered by a potential customer who disapproves of her countenance by uttering the derogatory expression *bah*. He then leaves suddenly **even** *before Saugandhi had a chance to collect her thoughts* and retaliate. She wishes that the whole event take place *once more – just once* – so that she could take her revenge on him. Under her desperate desire to take revenge but not finding the potential customer around, she throws massive insults on Madhu, making him leave in deep shame and embarrassment. Finally, Saugandhi is left with nothing but *a silence she had **never** known before* and a mangy dog.

7.2.2.2 Formality/Informality:

Though English does not have the grammatical tools of informality that we observed Manto applying in the ST (Section 7.1.3.2), Naqvi tries to maintain the effect of informality by employing a few grammatical and lexical strategies from the linguistic repertoire of English. For example, she uses various contracted forms such as *I've*, *he'll*, *aren't*, *it's*, and *don't*. She also uses clauses which lack in a verb or subject; *No ugly face on this wall – isn't that right, Madhu?*, *waiting for me?*, and *didn't like her – well I'd better be on my way* are just a few examples of it. Her strategy of preserving some colloquial and other Urdu terms – *beora* (*local wine*), *dalal* (*procurer*), *unh* (*bah*), *kholi* (*small house*) *anna* (*a unit of currency*), *havaldarni* (*lady inspector*), and *Saugandhi ke bache* (*son of Saugandhi*) – instead of translating to their corresponding terms in English, may also be seen as adding to the lack of formality in the TT. She employs some other strategies as well, including the interesting move of preserving the local, distorted pronunciation of English words and using continuous dots between phrases as are found in the ST. The following example is a fine illustration:

Example 7.11:

سوگندھی نے بائیں ہاتھ کی پہلی تصویر کی طرف اشارہ کیا جو میونسپلٹی کے داروغہ صفائی کی تھی۔
"اس کی۔۔۔۔۔منشی پالٹی کے داروغہ کی۔۔ذرا دیکھ تو اس کا تھوبڑا۔۔۔ کہتا تھا، ایک رانی مجھ پر عاشق ہو گئی تھی۔۔۔۔۔ اونہہ! یہ منہ اور مسور کی دال۔"

Saugandhi pointed to the first picture on the left which was that of the municipality sanitation inspector. "His..... munshipalty inspector's... Just look at his face... He said

> *a princess had fallen in love with him...... Bah! He is just nothing, but he talks big things."*
> Saugandhi pointed to the first picture on the right; it was the sanitation Inspector. "Inspector... belongs to the Munshee palty...just look at his stupid face – he told me a princess once fell in love with him. Ugh! What hopes with a face like that."

Manto presents Saugandhi pronouncing the word *municipality* as *Munshee palty*, which is how less-knowledgeable Urdu-speaking people (typically belonging to the lower echelons of the society as well) typically pronounce it, and it is reflective of their difficulty to pronounce words of a foreign language (English, in this case). We know that Manto tries to present his characters speaking a register which is typical of the people belonging to the same social or economic class as his characters, and the mispronunciation of the word *municipality* in the ST is an example of this. Interestingly, Naqvi chooses to keep the mispronunciation in her translation, probably as an attempt to follow the ST in producing informality. Apart from this, note the small dotted lines in the ST clauses; Manto uses a lot of these in his short stories, usually indicating pauses in a speech. Deviating from the normal orthographic makeup of the English language, Naqvi tries to keep this ST-specific orthographic practice in her translation. Additionally, the idiom used by Manto at the end of the passage in the ST, یہ منہ اور مسور کی دال, is translated with a clause which is devoid of a verb; also, it starts with the word *what* but ends neither with a mark of interrogation nor with that of exclamation. All this makes the structure highly informal and conversational.

A strange thing to note is that, in contrast to all her efforts to make the TT look close to the ST and maintain a similar informal ambience, even by breaching the typical structure of English clauses, Naqvi interposes some formal words here and there. *Confines*, *intoxication*, *remains*, *petrified*, *perturbed*, *interposed*, *disconcerted*, and *invective* are a few representative examples. It might be that, as we have noted in the case of her two other translations, it is part of her writing style and has, thus, sneaked into her translation unconsciously. In any case, it does lessen the overall effect of linguistic informality.

7.2.2.3 Expletives, Honourifics, Vocatives, and Derogatory Epithets:

It is remarkable to note that Naqvi tries to preserve almost all instances of expletives, honourifics, and derogatory epithets. Apart from preserving all occurrences of *sahib*, she even adds two more occurrences of the honorific and one occurrence of *sir* for the Seth. In the same vein, she uses a very strong translation for ST expletives: سالا is translated into *bastard*, ماں کا یار (*mother's lover*) into *son of a bitch*, and موا (*rogue*) also into *son-of-a-bitch*. As is evident from these examples, she uses a very strong language in the translation. A possible motive might be that she uses the words which she thinks are typical of the register used in the profession of prostitution in the English communities. In any case, her choices of adding honourifics and translating expletives with a more biting target language terms intensify the impact of the honourifics (the impact of high respect for a potential upper-class customer) and expletives (the impact of high level of degradation) in the story.

Naqvi also preserves all ST pejorative expressions, including *lizard*, *dog*, *beggar*, *thief*, and *pickpocket*.

7.2.3 Textual Metafunction:

7.2.3.1 Cohesion:

Though there is a slight difference between the two texts in terms of frequency of words related to the semantic field of body parts, with 17 occurrences of *heart, brain and mind* in contrast to 24 in the ST, nine of *eyes* in contrast to 13, and 21 of *face* in contrast to 17, the TT more or less preserves the emphasis on the words. It should also be noted that a major reason for the fewer occurrences in the translation is a shift to some related body part or word, such as from *eyes* to *stare*, *mind* to *head* (two occurrences of the shift), and *coming into her mind* to *occurring to her*. This shift pattern also partially explains the added instances of *face* in the TT, whereby the TT shifts some other body part or related word to face; shift from گال (*cheeks*) to *face* is one such example.

Another important repetition in the ST is that of the insulting word اونہہ (literally translated in the TT as *unh*). The recurrence of the word indicates how much the insulting expression has wounded Saugandhi mentally and what mental hell she now finds herself in. The TT preserves 12 out of 13 ST occurrences of it. Similarly, all the words from the semantic field of *insult* and *hatred*, such as *scorn*, *reject*, *repulsed*, and *ugly*, are preserved in the translation, except for one occurrence of بھونڈی (*ugly*) which is omitted in the TT. This is indicative of how closely Naqvi tries to follow the ST.

7.2.3.2 Thematic Structure:

To begin with, unlike the ST, which has only two instances of marked themes (Section 7.1.4.2), the TT has a few of them (for a brief detail, see the description of thematic spatial adjuncts below).

There are 101 occurrences of theme shift in the TT. Out of these, 30 shifts involve Saugandhi displacing someone/something else in theme position, and 19 shifts present Saugandhi displaced by someone/something else. With 11 more occurrences of Saugandhi displacing others, she seems to be given slightly more space in theme than does the ST.

Owing to the language-specific nature of most of the ST spatial adjuncts in theme (Section 7.1.4.2), we see only 12 of these adjuncts preserved in the TT. It is noteworthy that more than half of the preserved instances are from the beginning of the story where a description of Saugandhi's room is given. Here, the ST has 11 instances of circumstantial adjuncts falling in theme position, and the TT shows seven such instances. To preserve the thematic position of circumstantial adjuncts, Naqvi adopts an interesting strategy, whereby the subject and the spatial adjunct exchange positions: the subject moves to the end position and the spatial adjunct to the initial position. *Close to the bed was a cane chair*; *to the left of the chair, on a beautiful table, stood a portable His Master's Voice, gramophone*; and *directly above the table, on the wall, hung four framed photographs*, are a few examples of it. The structure in the examples above is not usual in English, where we would normally expect the subject fall in theme position, and hence the structure makes the theme marked. We

should point out here that, if we exclude the above-mentioned thematic occurrences of circumstantial adjuncts at the beginning of the ST and the TT, we would be left with only five TT thematic occurrences of circumstantial adjuncts against the massive 57 occurrences in the ST. As noted earlier, it owes to the differences between Urdu and English, as the following example demonstrates:

Example 7.12:

دروازے پر دستک ہوئی۔
On the door, *there was a knock.*
There was a knock **on the door**.

Whereas in Urdu, the usual position for the circumstantial spatial adjunct *on the door* is the beginning of the clause (i.e. theme position), in English, it is the end of the clause. So, it would have been highly marked if Naqvi had chosen to place the adjunct in theme position in English. For these language-specific reasons, it is but natural and expected that the TT has fewer spatial adjuncts in theme. However, in sharp contrast to it, the temporal adjuncts in the two texts are not too distant from each other in terms of frequency, with the TT having 58 occurrences against the 68 ST occurrences. This suggests that these adjuncts are not as much language specific as their spatial counterparts are. However, notwithstanding the apparent similarity, a closer look at individual occurrences reveals some significant differences; especially visible is the TT not preserving references to the nearness of time in theme position that we noted for the ST in the second part of the story (Section 7.1.4.2). In total, out of the five occurrences of *today* in theme in the second part of the story, only one is preserved in the TT. By displacing the remaining occurrences of the proximal temporal adjunct in theme, the TT tones down a little the effect of proximity and emphasis that we observed a particular day in Saugandhi's life have in the ST.

7.2.4 Conclusion:

The following are the key findings:

- The frequency of processes in Naqvi's translation is not very different from that in the ST, and the small shifts found in this regard do not impact the subject matter in a drastic manner.

- Like Manto, Naqvi assigns an active role to Saugandhi as an agent, senser, and sayer.

- The frequency of modal verbs and adjuncts in the TT shows remarkable similarity with that in the ST; an exception is relatively more occurrences of the modal verb *can*, which is indicative of the TT adding a sense of ability to the clauses which otherwise are simple declarative clauses in the ST.

- The TT partially maintains the role of *can* in the development of plot and characterisation.

- The TT more or less maintains the evaluative perspective induced in the development of plot and characterisation by the ST modal verbs and adjuncts.

- The TT maintains an informal style.

- Naqvi retains all occurrences of ST expletives, honourifics, and derogatory epithets; a small shift is using a bit more harsh swear words.

- Naqvi, under the constraints of the English language, retains the ST emphasis on body parts to a good extent; similarly, Naqvi retains as many as 12 out of 13 occurrences of the insulting expression اونہہ (*bah*) and all occurrences, except one, of words from the semantic field of insult and hatred.

- The TT appears to give comparatively more prominence to Saugandhi by placing her in the topical theme position 11 times more than the ST.

- Naqvi uses seven instances of marked themes in the translation in the beginning of the story – a strategy which helps retain the thematic position of spatial adjuncts in the corresponding ST clauses.

- Apart from the above unique case, Naqvi omits a large number of ST spatial adjuncts.

- Naqvi also tones down the effect of proximity and emphasis the ST displays by placing proximal temporal adjuncts in theme position.

7.3 Analysis of Jai Ratan's Translation of *Hatak*:

7.3.1 Ideational Metafunction and Transitivity Analysis:

The following table shows the number and percentage of the processes in Ratan's translation and how they compare to that of the TT:

Sr. Number	Process	Occurrences in Ratan's Translation	Comparison with the ST
1	Material	456 (44.57%)	543 (44.14%)
2	Mental	185 (18.08%)	252 (20.49%)
3	Relational	213 (20.82%)	248 (20.16%)
4	Behavioural	40 (3.91%)	46 (3.73%)
5	Verbal	114 (11.14%)	136 (11.05%)
6	Existential	15 (1.47%)	5 (0.4)
7	Total	1023	1230

Table 7.10 Frequency of Processes in Ratan's Translation of *Hatak*

The TT contains 207 fewer processes than the ST, indicating the frequent omission of processes by Ratan. There are several places where he chooses to omit a number of clauses in a row. Just for example, 33 clauses have been omitted at one place, 19 at another, and as much as 61 at still another. One possible reason might be the length of the short story (note that the story is almost double the size of the last two stories in our corpus). It might also be that the detail he chooses to omit is what he does not consider to be important enough to be retained. Consider the following example:

Example 7.13:

ہر روز رات کو اس کا پرانا یا نیا ملاقاتی اس سے کہا کرتا تھا "سوگندھی میں تجھ سے پریم کرتا ہوں"
اور سوگندھی یہ جان بوجھ کر بھی کہ وہ جھوٹ بولتا ہے بس موم ہو جاتی تھی اور ایسا محسوس کرتی
تھی جیسے اس سے سچ مچ پریم کیا جا رہا ہے۔۔پریم۔۔کتنا سندر بول ہے! وہ چاہتی تھی، اس کو پگھلا کر
اپنے سارے انگوں پر مل لے اس کی مالش کرے تاکہ یہ سارے کا سارا اس کے مساموں میں رچ بس
جائے۔ **یا پھر وہ خود اس کے اندر چلی جائے۔ سمٹ سمٹا کر اس کے اندر داخل ہو جائے اور اوپر سے**
ڈھکنا بند کر دے۔ کبھی کبھی جب پریم کیے جانے کا جذبہ اس کے اندر بہت شدت اختیار کر لیتا تو کئی
بار اس کے جی میں آتا کہ اپنے پاس پڑے ہوئے آدمی کو گود ہی میں لے کر تھپتھپانا شروع کر دے اور
لوریاں دے کر اسے گود ہی میں سلا دے۔ پریم کر سکنے کی اہلیت اس کے اندر اس قدر زیادہ تھی کہ ہر
اس مرد سے جو اس کے پاس آتا تھا وہ محبت کر سکتی تھی اور پھر اس کو نباہ بھی سکتی تھی۔

Every day, at night, her old or new visitor would say to her "Saugandhi I love you", and Saugandhi, though knowing that he is telling a lie, would just melt and felt as if she was really being loved…Love…What a beautiful word it is! She wanted to melt it down and rub it on every part of her body [and] massage with it, so that all of it permeates into her pores. **Or, she herself goes into it, get into it by compressing her body and place a lid on it. Sometimes, when the desire to be loved became very intense in her, it often occurred to her mind to carry the man lying beside her in her lap and start patting him and sing lullabies to him to make him sleep in her lap.** *The ability to love [someone] was so profound in her that she* **could** *love every man visiting her, and even* **could** *maintain it as well.*

Every night her new or old lover would say, "Sugandhi, I love you". And Sugandhi, although she knew that the man was telling a lie, would melt like wax, deluding herself into the belief that she was really being loved. Love...what a beautiful word it was! How she wished that she **could** dissolve the word and rub it over her skin, letting it seep into her being.

The aim of the passage is to highlight the loving nature of Saugandhi, who has the uncommon potential of loving every customer. She even loves the sound of the word *love* and has the strange desire of using the word as oil and massage her body with it.

These feelings indicate how infatuated she is with the word and the idea behind it. The clauses highlighted in the boldface serve as an extension of these feelings. Ratan, however, omits these clauses in his translation. The motivation might be the consideration that the detail omitted is not adding much to the ideational meaning conveyed by the passage. In any case, there are places where omission of clauses in a row does seem to have a significant bearing on the overall meaning potential of the detail surrounding the clauses omitted. For example, Ratan omits the clauses which detail how Saugandhi once had not taken her fees from a customer who had lost his wallet. The detail shows how compassionate she is by nature and helps create a positive and loving image of her. It also sets the stage for her later feelings about not being treated the same loving way by the world. The omission of this, as well as some similar, detail at other places in the story seems to tone down the effect (i.e. the effect of the image of Saugandhi as a loving and helpful person) that the writer is trying to create. A graver instance is the omission of 61 clauses, the first portion of which details how intensely Saugandhi desires to come face to face with a potential customer who had rejected and insulted her. She wants to scratch his face like a wild cat and then drag him out of his car and give him a severe beating. Considering the subject matter of the story, i.e. the insult of Saugandhi and the aftermath, the significance of this appears quite obvious. However, Ratan somehow decides to omit this important detail.

Apart from this difference, there is an important point of similarity in transitivity between the two texts which deserves mention before ending this section. Although there is a significant reduction of processes in Ratan's translation, if we compare the percentages of these processes with that of the ST, it is easy to observe that, as far as the frequency of the processes within the stories is concerned, both the texts show a striking similarity. This similarity is also there in reference to the active role played by Saugandhi, as demonstrated in the table below:

Participant Role	TT Frequency	ST Frequency
Agent	164	207
Affectee	29	21
Senser	87	135
Phenomenon	7	11
Sayer	37	53
Receiver	33	38

Table 7.11 Frequency of Participant Roles in Ratan's Translation of *Hatak*

Fewer appearances of Saugandhi in the roles of agent and senser in Ratan's translation can easily be attributed to the overall fewer processes in the translation. However, despite the fact that the translation has fewer processes on the whole, Saugandhi is given comparatively more space in the role of affectee in the translation. This owes partly to the addition of processes portraying Saugandhi in the role of affectee, such as *treated her kindly*, and partly because of the shift of the role of agent or senser into that of affectee, such as اسے بے آرام کیا (*disturbed her*) into *had jerked her out of her bed*. What is important to note is that, despite these shifts, the TT, like the ST, overall assigns a much more active role to Saugandhi as agent, which is something that we typically expect for the main character of a story.

7.3.2 Interpersonal Metafunction:

Following the ST, the TT employs the same (1) scheme of switching between external and internal narratorial points of view and (2) the accompanying practice of changing between the types of processes which are characteristic to the two different types of narratorial techniques.

7.3.2.1 Modality:

There are 123 modal verbs and modal adjuncts, including the short clauses indicating the speaker's opinion or impression, in the TT; the distribution of various types of these is detailed in the tables below:

Type	Ratan's Translation	ST
Can	25	18
May	3	4
Should	8	3
Must	7	1
Might	1	0
Has/have to	4	4
Need not	1	0
To allow	1	1
Total	**50**	**31**

Table 7.12 Frequency of Modal Verbs in Ratan's Translation of *Hatak*

Type	Ratan's Translation	ST
Usuality	6	10
Temporality	18	34
Probability	2	5
Intensity	42	43
Obviousness	1	1
Opinion/impression	4	4
Total	**73**	**97**

Table 7.13 Frequency of Modal Adjuncts in Ratan's Translation of *Hatak*

On a general note, all the modal verbs and short modal clauses in the TT are overtly mentioned, and, in contrast to the ST, there are no implied and contextual modal verbs.

Overall, the number of modal verbs and adjuncts is similar; however, there are a few individual cases which show noteworthy difference. One of the relevant cases is the relatively higher frequency of *can* in the translation. Like in Naqvi's translation, a good number of the added occurrences of the modal verb seem to play an important role where Saugandhi's strange desires are described. One of the examples is the same as discussed in Section 7.2.2.1. Just like there, Ratan's translation *Love...what a beautiful word it was! How she wished that she **could** dissolve the word and rub it over her skin, letting it seep into her being* enfeebles the conviction in the corresponding ST clause, instead giving the impression that Saugandhi is mindful of the impracticality of her desire. Another relevant example is as follows:

Example 7.14:

> سوگندھی نے کئی بار اس درد کو اپنے خیالات کے نیچے سے نکال کر اوپر لانا چاہا مگر ناکام رہی۔
> *Sugandhi wished many times to extract this ache from underneath her thoughts and bring it up but failed.*
> She wished she **could** extract the ache from under those thoughts and holding it before her eyes give it a good look.

What we noted about the example just before this one is the case with this example as well. There is no mention in the source clause complex that Saugandhi has any doubts about the practicality of her desire. In fact, the words *but failed* in the ST suggest that Saugandhi *actually* tried to materialise her desire, as if digging into one's mind and bringing up the ache is an actual physical act. But, by adding *could*, Ratan gives the impression that Saugandhi is aware of the improbability of her desire.

Concerning *can* playing some part in the development of the ST plot and characterisation (see Section 7.1.3.1), the TT preserves this role at some places but omits at other places. An example of omission is that of the entire clause complex in example 7.3, replacing it with *she tried to put up with the vagaries of all the men who came to her*. Semantically, these clauses are important because these help in the development of a positive image of Saugandhi, which we already have seen as one of the primary focuses of the story. But the shift from three occurrences of *can* emphasising the outstanding ability of Saugandhi to love to *tried to put up* enfeebles the effect.

Should and *must* are also significantly more in number in the TT, which is suggestive of relatively more emphasis on the modality of obligation in the TT as compared to that in the ST. The following are just a few illustrative examples:

Example 7.15:

7.15(a)- بس بس اب جانے دے، تھکن کچھ زیادہ نہیں ہے
       Stop, stop, let it go, tiredness is not that much.
       And stop pressing my feet... I am not so tired that you **should** pamper me.
7.15(b)--تو اگر شام تک سب سب انسپکٹر کو سو پچاس نہ تھمائے
       If [I] did not give fifty [or] hundred [rupees] to the sub-inspector by the evening…
       I **must** shell out fifty rupees to the police inspector before it's too late.

Evidently, the addition of the modality in the examples above presents the matters, such as bribing the sub-inspector, as if they are obligatory in nature, which is something absent in the source clauses.

When it comes to modal adjuncts, we have already seen (Section 7.1.3.1) how they supplement the various meaning strands in the story. By preserving a good number of ST modal verbs and adjuncts, as well as adding some (which, in a way, serve as a compensation for the ones he omits), Ratan tries to maintain the evaluative perspective in the story. Madhu visits Saugandhi *once* a month, and when he visits he uses the charm of his words to mesmerise her. He pretends to be very caring towards her, warning that if she entertains *even* one more customer, he will throw her out of the house. He also bragged about sending her money when he returned to Puna. However, he ***never*** *sent her a money order*, but Saugandhi was content because *one who* **cannot** *get genuine gold is content with glittering tinsel*. She is content with how

her life is proceeding, but one day a potential customer humiliates her. She tries her best to forget about it, but she finds his words *still* ringing in her ears. Frustrated, she starts thinking that she is still attractive and longs for *a confirmation of this*. This is how the TT tries to maintain the detail and corresponding evaluative perspectives found in the ST. However, we can also detect a couple of lacunae as well. Ratan omits some detail which highlights Saugandhi's kind nature – such as the remark that *perhaps no one* of her customers has ever been unhappy with her, and also the detail of her waiving off her fees for a customer who has lost his purse. He also chooses to omit the clauses which present Saugandhi yearning for an opportunity to face the Seth *once– just once* so that she could take revenge for her insult.

In short, we can see that, on the whole, the tendency is to maintain the modal structure of the ST, but there are some noteworthy shifts as well.

7.3.2.2 Formality/Informality:

In an attempt to maintain the ST informality, Ratan employs a few strategies. At the grammatical level, he uses contracted forms such as *I've*, *you're*, *aren't*, *I'll*, *what's*, and *won't*. In addition, he uses expressions which do not have a verb, such as *now light, now dark, now dark, now light*; *why gloss over plain facts*; and the colloquial expression *what for?* At the lexical level, he makes use of several informal expressions, including, but not limited to, *doze off*, *shell out*, *fishy*, *bloke*, *bloody*, *scram*, *go off the rails*, and *have something up one's sleeve*. With these strategies, he seems to have maintained a reasonably informal ambience in the translation.

An interesting aspect of the TT, which also adds to the informality of it, is the preservation of Urdu words, such as the colloquial expressions *chokri* and *cowrie*, the expletives *sali* and *sala*, the honourifics *seth* and *saheb*, the vocative *behan*, as well as *satta*, *havildar*, and *amavas*. These expressions give an exotic and informal impression and are very likely to pose comprehension problems for the non-Urdu speaking readers of the translation. Another obvious interpersonal implication is that these distant the writer from the readers.

7.3.2.3 Expletives, Honourifics, and Pejorative Expressions:

Ratan tries to maintain the expletives and honourifics used in the ST. For example, he keeps both the honourifics *seth* and *sahib*, and also keeps the expletives, such as *sali*, *bloke*, *lecher*, *stupid girl*, *rascal*, and *scoundrel* with one occurrence apiece and *sala*, *bloody*, and *rogue* two occurrences apiece. He also takes care of using all the pejorative expressions employed in the ST, including *lizard*, *dog*, *beggar*, *thief*, and *pickpocket*.

7.3.3 Textual Metafunction:

7.3.3.1 Cohesion:

The ST profusion of words related to the semantic field of body parts is not maintained in the translation, as there are considerable omissions of such words across the TT. In contrast to the 24 occurrences of *heart, brain and mind*, and 13 of *eyes*, there are only 13 occurrences of the former and four of the latter in the TT. A major reason for this conspicuous difference is Ratan's recurrent omission of several clauses in a row describing how the heart and mind of Saugandhi are affected by the insult, how her eyes weep and what they see, and what feelings she goes through about her face, as well as others', once her face is rejected by the Seth. Just for example, there is an omission of 61 clauses in a row, which includes omission of four occurrences of eyes, four of heart and mind, and three of face. Soon afterwards, 33 clauses are omitted, including three references to eyes.

As for the ST repetition of the insulting word اونہہ, the TT preserves seven out of 13 occurrences of it, toning down the effect of emphasis produced by the frequent occurrences of the word in the ST to a small extent. However, as regards the other words associated with the semantic field of insult and hatred, the TT keeps almost all of them, including *disgust*, *repulsion*, and *hideous face* (two occurrences).

7.3.3.2 Thematic Structure:

Like Naqvi (Section 7.2.3.2), Ratan makes a few themes marked by placing spatial adjuncts in the initial position in the clauses describing the condition of Saugandhi's room. Put specifically, he preserves six out of 11 occurrences, including *near the bed stood a cane chair*, *by the side of the chair rested a beautiful teapoy*, and *right above the gramophone hung four framed photographs*. However, this tendency of preserving around half of the spatial adjuncts diminishes as the story develops and, in total, only nine out of 59 ST spatial adjuncts across the story are preserved. This is indicative of the lack of thematic emphasis on spatial adjuncts in the TT. The situation gets better with temporal adjuncts, since the TT has 41 temporal adjuncts in theme as opposed to the ST having 68 thematic occurrences of temporal adjuncts. However, like Naqvi, Ratan omits all occurrences of the temporal adjunct *today* in theme except the following:

Example 7.16:

پہلے تیرے اور میرے بیچ میں دس روپے بجتے تھے،آج پچاس بج رہے ہیں۔
*Earlier, between you and me, ten rupees jingled, **today**, fifty rupees are jingling.*
In the beginning ten rupees jingled between us and *today* it is fifty rupees.

There are 76 thematic shifts in the TT. Out of these, there are 11 occurrences where Saugandhi is displaced from thematic position and 13 where she replaces other characters or things in thematic position. This indicates that the translation places the most important character in the story in thematic position almost the same number of times as the ST does.

7.3.4 Conclusion:

Here are the key findings:

- Ratan omits a large number of processes, including those related to depicting Saugandhi's feelings of rage and hatred and highlighting her loving personality.
- Ratan assigns an active role to Saugandhi.

- The frequency of modal verbs and adjuncts in the TT shows remarkable similarity with that in the ST; however, the relatively more occurrences of the modal verb *can* in the TT enfeebles the conviction and belief that we find Saugandhi having in the ST.

- The TT partially maintains the role of *can* in the development of plot and characterisation.

- The TT overall maintains the ST evaluative perspective in the development of plot and characterisation; however it does not retain a couple of important points related to characterisation and development of plot.

- The TT maintains an informal style.

- Ratan retains most of the occurrences of ST expletives, honourifics, and derogatory epithets.

- With considerable omissions, the TT does not retain the level of emphasis on body parts that we see in the ST; by preserving only seven out of 13 occurrences of the insulting expression اونہہ (*bah*), it also tones down the ST effect of insult and hatred.

- The TT maintains the prominence Saugandhi enjoys in the topical theme position in the ST.

- Ratan uses six instances of marked themes in the translation in the beginning of the story.

- Ratan omits a large number of ST spatial adjuncts.

- Ratan tones down the effect of proximity and emphasis the ST displays by placing proximal temporal adjuncts in theme position.

7.4 Analysis of Khalid Hasan's Translation of *Hatak*:

7.4.1 Ideational Metafunction and Transitivity Analysis:

The following table shows the number and percentage of the processes in Hasan's translation and how they compare to those of the TT:

Sr. Number	Process	Occurrences in Hasan's Translation	Comparison with the ST
1	Material	292 (39.94%)	543 (44.14%)
2	Mental	109 (14.91%)	252 (20.49%)

3	Relational	191 (26.12%)	248 (20.16%)
4	Behavioural	30 (4.1%)	46 (3.73%)
5	Verbal	91 (12.44%)	136 (11.05%)
6	Existential	18 (2.46%)	5 (0.4)
7	Total	731	1230

Table 7.14 Frequency of Processes in Hasan's Translation of *Hatak*

Overall, we have a more or less typical distribution of processes in the TT. Apart from this general tendency, however, there are significant differences between the two texts, detailed below.

In comparison to the ST, there are 499 fewer processes in the TT. This points to a significant amount of reduction in the processes, and like Ratan's translation, the major reason is the omission of several passages from the translation; so much so that Hasan omits 64 clauses at one place, 54 at another, and 41 at still another place. It should be noted that all these clauses relate the thoughts and emotions Saugandhi is going through once she is rejected by one of her potential customers. However, it should also be noted that, unlike Ratan, Hasan tries to keep the detail related to the development of the plot and/or the message of the story intact. For instance, he keeps the clauses which show how badly Saugandhi wishes to see the whole incident happen again so that she could take her revenge; he also keeps the detail which highlights Saugandhi's kind and compassionate nature. The table also shows some difference between the two texts in terms of percentage of processes; the TT contains a relatively lower percentage of material and mental processes and a higher percentage of relational processes. A significant reason for this is the omission of them in some places. Just for example, the following passage containing several material and mental processes, along with a few other processes, is omitted in the TT:

Example 7.17:

اس سے پہلے اسے اس بات کی اتنی شدت سے ضرورت **محسوس نہ ہوئی تھی**... اس کے جسم کا ذرہ ذرہ کیوں "ماں" بن رہا ہے۔۔۔۔۔ وہ ماں بن کر دھرتی کی ہر شے کو اپنی**گود میں لینے** کے لیے کیوں تیار ہو رہی تھی؟۔۔۔۔ اس کا **جی کیوں چاہتا تھا** کہ سامنے والے گیس کے آہنی کھمبے کے ساتھ **چمٹجانے** اور اس کے سرد لوہے پر اپنے گال **رکھ دے** ... اپنے گرم گرم گال اور اس کی ساری سردی **چوس لے**... سوگندھی کو بھی ایسا **لگتا تھا** کہ وہ تاروں کا ٹمٹمانا **سمجھتی ہے**۔ لیکن اس کے اندر یہ **کیا گڑبڑ تھی؟**۔۔۔۔ وہ کیوں اپنے اندر اس موسم کی فضا **محسوس کرتی تھی** جو بارش سے پہلے دیکھنے میں آیا کرتا ہے؟۔۔۔۔ اس کا **جی چاہتا تھا** کہ اس کے جسم کا ہر مسام **کھل جائے** اور جو کچھ اس کے اندر **ابل رہا ہے** ان کے رستے **باہر نکل جائے**۔ پر یہ **کیسے ہو**... **کیسے ہو؟**

*Before that, she had never **felt** the need of it [i.e. of being admired by someone] with such intensity...Why was every part of her body becoming a "mother" [?] Why was she becoming ready **to carry** everything of the earth in her lap? Why did she **want** to*

cling to the metal pillar of gas in front of her and *lay* her cheeks on its cold iron…
her warm cheeks [...] and *suck* all its cold… Saugandhi also *felt* that she
understands the twinkling of the stars. But what was this *happening* inside her? Why
did she *feel* an environment in her which is usually *seen* before rainfall? She *wanted*
that every pore of her body would *open up* and what is *boiling* inside her *gets out*
from them. But how would it *happen*…how would [it] *happen*?

Because of the omission of the passage in the TT, all eight mental (*what was this
happening inside her* is apparently a material process, but, since it refers to the
feelings and emotions rising in Saugandhi's mind, it is, in fact, a mental process) and
eight material processes are omitted. Omissions of this kind do not let the TT provide
as much window into the mental world of Saugandhi and share her agony as the ST
does. Also, the comparatively less percentage of material processes as well as more
percentage of relational processes in the TT indicates a slight reduction in the action.

Another interesting way in which Hasan manipulates the ST transitivity structure is
related to agency. There are places where he chooses to omit an agent or initiator
involved in an activity. The following is a representative example:

Example 7.18:

پونے میں تجھ پر کیس ہو نہ ہو یہاں تو تجھ پر ایک کیس کھڑا کر دوں۔
*There may or may not be a case against you in Poona, but **I** would cause a case*
against you here.
There may or may not be case against you in Poona but **there** will be a case against
you here in Bombay.

Saugandhi is clearly mentioned as the agent in the second ST clause; however, the
agency is omitted in the corresponding TT clause. Cases of this kind create an effect
of anonymity at the relevant places in the TT.

Now, if we look at to the role of Saugandhi in the TT, we see the following frequency
of the different transitivity roles she performs and how they compare to that in the ST:

Participant Role	TT Frequency	ST Frequency
Agent	144	207
Affectee	24	21
Senser	48	135
Phenomenon	7	11
Sayer	40	53
Receiver	35	38

Table 7.15 Frequency of Participant Roles in Hasan's Translation of *Hatak*

Fewer appearances of Saugandhi in the roles of the agent, senser, phenomenon, and sayer are easily attributable to the overall fewer number of processes in the TT. However, the occurrences in the role of the receiver are almost the same as that in the ST, the reason being that the conversational portions of the ST are largely preserved by Hasan. In other words, the omissions that we see in the purely narrative parts of the story are not there in the case of the verbal parts. Saugandhi is also given more space in the role of the affectee. The major reasons for this are a shift from active voice to passive voice and addition of passive clauses, which leads us to another significant difference between the transitivity structures of the two texts. There are 14 passive voice clauses in the ST, but as many as 31 in the TT, i.e. more than double their ST counterparts. These either avoid mentioning the agent altogether or shift the agent to the role of the affectee. An example is shifting Saugandhi from the role of the agent in the ST in دروازہ جب زور سے کھٹکھٹایا گیا تو چونک کر اٹھ بیٹھی (*when the door was knocked forcefully, **she got up** startled*) to that of the affectee in the corresponding TT clause: *this was followed by a succession of knocks, **which woke her up***.

7.4.2 Interpersonal Metafunction:

Following the ST, the TT employs the same (1) scheme of switching between external and internal narratorial points of view and (2) the accompanying practice of changing between the types of processes which are characteristic to the two different types of narratorial techniques.

7.4.2.1 Modality:

The following tables show the frequency of TT modal verbs and modal adjuncts in comparison to that of the ST:

Type	Hasan's Translation	ST
Can	18	18
May	2	4
Should	4	3
Must	2	1
Might	2	0
Has/have to	2	4
To allow	0	1
Total	**30**	**31**

Table 7.16 Frequency of Modal Verbs in Hasan's Translation of *Hatak*

Type	Hasan's Translation	ST
Usuality	21	10
Temporality	15	34
Probability	5	5
Intensity	22	43
Obviousness	2	1
Opinion/impression	1	4
Total	**66**	**97**

Table 7.17 Frequency of Modal Adjuncts in Hasan's Translation of *Hatak*

On a general note, all the modal verbs and short modal clauses in the translation are overtly mentioned and, in contrast to the ST, there are no implied and contextual modal verbs.

On the face of it, the frequency of modal verbs in both the texts may appear very similar, but a closer look reveals that there are only six ST modal verbs preserved in the TT. The rest are either additions – which shift ST clauses from simple statements to that of ability, possibility, obligation, or probability, as is exemplified in the translation of مادھو کو سوگندھی کے منہ سے شراب کی باس آئی (*Madhu smelled liquor from Saugandhi's mouth*) as *Madhu **could** smell liquor…* – or shifts from some other ST modal verb, as is exemplified in the translation of دوپہر کی گاڑی سے واپس جانا پڑے گا (*[I'll]**have to** go back by the train leaving at noon*) as *I **must** take the afternoon train*, where compulsion is changed to obligation. There is also an instance similar to that discussed under Example 7.10 where Hasan changes Saugandhi's conviction in the ST into the realisation that what she is intending to do is not practicable: *Oh, if only one **could** rub love like a balm into one's body*. As for omissions, some of them are very significant, especially a case where Hasan omits all ST clauses referring to Saugandhi's outstanding ability to love multiple men at the same time (cf. Example 7.3 and the discussion that follows it).

Unlike modal verbs, modal adjuncts show stark differences even in terms of frequency. For example, in comparison to the ST, the TT has more than twice the modal adjuncts of usuality, out of which Hasan seems to be especially prone towards adding the adjunct *never*. These additions, such as in *you can have it free, but you'll **never** be able to reach the woman who is inside this body!* and *if you resume that old business of yours, you'll **never** see me again*, add emphasis and conviction to what the speaker says. Another significant difference is that both the adjuncts of temporality

and intensity are more or less half in the TT in comparison to that in the ST, obviously indicating a massive omission in the TT in terms of modal adjuncts. For instance, except for one occurrence, all ST occurrences of temporal adjunct کبھی (*sometimes* or *often*, depending on the context) are omitted in the TT. Similarly, a large number of modal adjuncts of intensity *only/just* (realised as both بھی and ہی in Urdu) are omitted. The following examples illustrate some dynamics of modal omissions in the TT:

Example 7.19:

اگر تو نے **ایک بار بھی** کسی مرد کو اپنے یہاں ٹھہرایا تو چٹیا سے پکڑ کر باہر نکال دوں گا۔
*If you let a man stay at your house **even once**, [I] will grab you by the lock of your hair and throw you out.*

The clause complex in the example is from Madhu's usual speech which he delivers on every visit to Saugandhi and it is this which helped him won Saugandhi's trust in the first place. The emphasis that Manto adds to his speech by using an adjunct of temporality and an adjunct of intensity, *even once*, lends sincerity and conviction to his words, and we can imagine how impressive these would have sounded to Saugandhi. However, this is lost in the translation.

Apart from the examples above, the overall impact of Hasan's massive omission of modal adjuncts on characterisation and plot development can be gauged from the fact that, out of the 19 occurrences of modal adjuncts in Example 7.4, where we have seen what role various modal adjuncts play along the development of the plot, only three are preserved in the TT.

7.4.2.2 Formality/Informality:

Overall, Hasan maintains an informal and conversational tone. Expressions such as *here she is, a sweet-tempered girl, very new to the business*; *Madhu was flinching away from her, his back against the wall*; and *what did he mean by "Ugh"? That he did not like me* are a few representative examples of it. Similarly, the diction contains several informal words, such as *pint (of brandy)*, *bra*, and *scout around*. There are also instances of informal verb forms, such as *he'll*, *can't*, *where'd*, and *what's*. However, it should be noted that Hasan does not maintain consistency in this regard,

as he uses a good number of formal verb forms as well, just as the use of *did not*, instead of *didn't*, in one of the examples cited a few lines above.

Like Naqvi and Ratan, Hasan uses Urdu words, which add to the informality, but he uses a lot fewer than the other two translators. Some examples are the colloquial expressions *chhokris* and *kholi*, the expletives *sali* and *sala*, the honourifics *seth* and *sahib*, and the epithet *Rani*.

7.4.2.3 Expletives, Honourifics, and Pejorative Expressions:

Whereas Hasan keeps both the honourifics *seth* and *sahib* and the expletives *sali* and *sala*, he omits all occurrences of مردود and موا (*scoundrel*), thereby toning down the intensity of foul words a bit. As for the ST pejorative expressions, Hasan preserves all occurrences, such as *reptile*, *dog*, and *beggar*.

7.4.3 Textual Metafunction:

7.4.3.1 Cohesion:

Hasan chooses to omit a large number of references to body parts, so much so that, out of 24 occurrences of *heart, brain and mind* in the ST, he omits 21; and out of 13 ST occurrences of *eyes*, he omits 11. Just like in Ratan's translation, the major reason for this considerable reduction is the omission of a large number of ST clauses. In the same vein, Hasan preserves only four occurrences of the insulting word اونہہ. He even goes to the extent of omitting the word بَتک (*insult*) – a word around which the whole story revolves. Most of the words associated with the semantic field of insult and hatred are also omitted, including all occurrences of دہتکار and پھٹکار (both roughly mean *repulsion*).

7.4.3.2 Thematic Structure:

Concerning the passage describing the condition of Saugandhi's room, Hasan preserves four out of 11 ST instances of spatial adjuncts in the clause-initial position. In the remainder of the story, he preserves only three out of 57 ST spatial adjuncts in

theme position. The case with temporal adjuncts is comparatively better, with the ST preserving 30 temporal adjuncts in theme position as opposed to 68 in the ST. Looking at individual cases, we can detect some trends in the TT which make the outlook of its temporal adjuncts in theme different from that of the ST. For example, it should be noted that, save one thematic occurrence of کبھی (*sometimes*), all occurrences of it in the ST are omitted in the TT (cf. discussion on temporal adjuncts under section 7.4.2.1 above). Similarly, except two, all thematic occurrences of proximal adjuncts in the ST in the second part of the story are omitted in the TT, as shown in the following example:

Example 7.20:

اس وقت تو میرے مکان میں کرنے کیا آیا ہے؟
At this time, what are you doing in my house?
Why do you come here?

As is evident from the example, the ST temporal adjunct of proximity, *at this time*, is omitted in the TT. Such omissions in the TT lessen the ST effect of temporal proximity and emphasis to a large extent.

Finally, there are 75 thematic shifts in the TT. Out of these, there are 13 occurrences where Saugandhi is displaced from thematic position and 20 where she replaces other characters or things in thematic position. This is indicative of a slightly more space given to Saugandhi in theme position in the TT.

7.4.4 Conclusion:

The key findings are as follows:

- The TT has a sizeable amount of processes less than the ST (499, to be exact), which indicates that Hasan has omitted a significant amount of ST content. Unlike Ratan, however, his omission does not constitute omission of whole events; rather, they are kind of summaries of the various events in the ST.

- With relatively lower percentage of material and mental processes and a higher percentage of relational processes, the TT shows relatively less action than the ST.

- Hasan, at times, omits a human agent, creating an atmosphere of anonymity; contrarily, there are places where the ST avoids naming the Seth as the doer of an action, but the TT does the otherwise.

- Hasan assigns an active role to Saugandhi.

- Hasan adds a large number of modal verbs and adjuncts in his translation, thereby adding senses of probability, ability, and obligation to the otherwise simple declarative ST clauses; we have also reported him adding emphasis and conviction to what the speaker says.

- Apart from adding modal verbs and adjuncts, Hasan omits a large number of ST modal verbs and adjuncts as well; by virtue of these omissions, the TT only partially maintains the ST evaluative perspective along the development of plot and characterisation.

- Though the TT displays formal diction at some places, it overall maintains an informal style.

- Hasan omits a significant number of ST expletives, honourifics, and derogatory epithets, thereby toning down the strong ST language.

- With considerable omissions, the TT does not retain the level of emphasis on body parts that we see in the ST; also by preserving only four out of 13 occurrences of the insulting expression اونہ‍ (*bah*), and omitting a large number of words from the semantic field of insult and hatred, it also tones down the intensity of the emotions of insult and hatred we see in the ST.

- The TT shows comparatively more occurrences of Saugandhi in the topical theme position, thereby giving the character comparatively active role.

- Hasan uses four instances of marked themes in the translation in the beginning of the story.

- Hasan omits a large number of ST spatial adjuncts.

- Hasan tones down the effect of proximity and emphasis the ST displays by placing proximal temporal adjuncts in theme position.

Chapter 8: Comparative Analysis of the TTs

8.1 Translations of *Toba Tek Singh*:

8.1.1 Ideational Metafunction:

Beginning with the frequency statistics, Ratan's translation has more processes than that of the ST, whereas the other two translations have fewer processes. This is shown in the following table:

Sr. Number	Process	ST	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
1	Material	191	177	197	163
2	Mental	31	25	37	20
3	Relational	120	105	130	111
4	Behavioural	14	14	17	9
5	Verbal	46	62	54	55
6	Existential	4	6	7	5
7	Total	406	389	442	363

Table 8.1 Frequency of Processes in *Toba Tek Singh* and the TTs

In the analysis of the three TTs in Chapter 5, we pointed out that Naqvi seems to follow the ST transitivity structure closely, and she tries not to modify or add to the ST content. The other two translators, however, tend to move away from the ST structure and content. For a closer investigation, the following example may be an appropriate starting point, as it will help us identify and see the dynamics of the major patterns:

Example 8.1:

ST	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
پہرے داروں کا یہ کہنا تھا کہ پندرہ برس کے طویل عرصے میں وہ ایک لحظے کے لیے بھی نہیں سویا۔ لیٹنا بھی نہیں تھا۔ البتہ کبھی کبھی کسی دیوار کے ساتھ ٹیک لگا لیتا تھا۔	**The guards said** that in the long duration of fifteen years, he had not slept even for a while. [He] did not even lie down. However, sometimes, [he] would lean against a wall.	**According to the guards**, he had not slept at all in fifteen years. He had not lain down either. Sometimes he leant against a wall.	The warden said that **he had never seen him** having a wink of sleep since **he had come to the asylum** 15 years ago. He would not even lie down **to rest**. **When he felt like it** he would just lean against the wall.	Guards said **he had never slept a wink** in fifteen years. Occasionally, **he could be observed** leaning against a wall, **but the rest of the time, he was always to be found standing.**

Naqvi's translation begins with shifting the ST verbal clause *the guards said* to the phrase *according to the guards*, whereas the two other translations retain it. Though the content of the ST clause remains similar in Naqvi's translation, there is a shift from the ST assigning an active role of sayer to the guards to the TT choosing to lessen their active role by presenting their verbal action as news or report from the writer. It should be noted that this instance of shifting from clause to phrase is not a one-off occurrence; rather, it exemplifies Naqvi's strategy of shifting from phrase to clause at several places across the TT, as represented in the shift from

1. جب تبادلے کی خبر پہنچی (*When the news of the exchange reached*) to *The news of the transfer*,

2. کوئی اس سے پوچھتا کہ **اس کا کیا خیال ہے** (*When someone asked him **what his opinion was***) to *when a fellow-inmate solicited his **opinion about the matter***, and

3. اس سے جب ایک روز بشن سنگھ نے پوچھا کہ **ٹوبہ ٹیک سنگھ پاکستان میں ہے یا ہندوستان میں** (*When, one day, Bishen Singh asked him if **Toba Tek Singh is in Pakistan or India***) to *Bishen Singh asked him **about Toba Tek Singh***

The tendency appears to indicate a meaningful pattern of shifting the agents from an active, thematic role to a passive/inactive role. However, it is worth noting that we have observed counter-examples as well. For example, the clause next to the ST clause complex in the first example cited above reads وہ بڑی سنجیدگی سے جواب دیتا (*He replied **with profound solemnity***). This is shifted to **he assumed a solemn air** and *replied* in the TT, whereby Naqvi, proffers an active role to Bishen Singh in the TT. Considering this, as well as other, counterexamples in the TT, we can infer that there is the translation strategy of compensation at play, whereby any loss of an agent's active role is compensated at other places. However, it is difficult to say that it is a deliberate decision by Naqvi, and it seems more probable to consider it an unconscious pattern.

Now except for shifting the verbal clause to a phrase in Example 8.1, Naqvi manages to follow the ST clause complex closely at the ideational level. Compared to Naqvi's attempt to remain close to the ST, Ratan demonstrates a tendency to add. Put

specifically, he adds three clauses to the passage. Firstly, where the ST reports merely what the guard has said about Bishen Singh, Ratan adds a mental clause *he had never seen him*, ascribing a role of senser to the guard. This active role is absent in the ST. Also somewhat notable is the modal adjunct of usuality *never* used for the guard instead of Bishen Singh as in the ST. Speculatively, Ratan had other options available as well. For example, he could have followed the ST and reported what the guards say without giving them an added agency through a mental clause. Or, he could have rephrased the clause as *he [the guard] had not seen him [Bishen Singh] **ever** having a wink of sleep*. This option would have retained the ST use of the adjunct of usuality *ever* for Bishen Singh. However, the choice made by Ratan gives more responsibility and visibility to the role of the guards. Secondly, Ratan chooses to shift the phrase *in the long duration of fifteen years* to a subordinating clause *since he had come to the asylum 15 years ago*. This time, it is Bishen Singh who is presented in an active role. Later in the story, we are told that Bishen Singh's relatives had got him admitted to the lunatic asylum by force. The added clause in the TT *since he had come to the asylum*, on the other hand, portrays him doing the act willingly, as if he voluntarily came to the asylum, instead of being chained and brought by force by his relatives. Thirdly, Ratan treats the simple ST narration of Bishen Singh sometimes leaning against the wall in the same way as above. He adds a cause, an impetus, for the act, namely, Bishen Singh feeling like it (i.e. feeling like taking rest), thereby assigning a more active role to him as compared to the ST.

It should be noted that these three occurrences of adding human agency in an active, thematic role in the passage under consideration are indicative of a general pattern across the TT. The pattern – realised not only by adding clauses but also by replacing non-human, anonymous, or passive participants in theme by clearly named, active human participants – helps assign somewhat more visibility and activeness to the participants than in the ST. The shift from جب اس کا دورہ سرد پڑا (*When **his fit** cooled down*) to *When **he** regained his lucid moments*, اسے ہندوستان بھیج دیا جائے گا (*He will be sent to India*) to *Now **he could go** to India*, and لیکن بعد میں 'آف دی پاکستان گورنمنٹ' کی جگہ 'آف دی ٹوبہ ٹیک سنگھ گورنمنٹ' نے لے لی (*But later on **the place** of "of the Pakistan government" was taken by "of the Toba Tek Singh government"*) to *But later on **he** started substituting "Pakistan government" with "Toba Tek Singh"* are a few further illustrative examples.

We have reported some shifts in Naqvi's and Ratan's translations above; however, these do not appear to be as many as that in Hasan's translation. For instance, in Example 8.1 above, he changes the clause order, with the effect that the last information about Bishen Singh, i.e. *[He] would lean against a wall*, changes places with the information second in the order, i.e. *[He] did not even lie down*. The modal adjunct of usuality *sometimes* is shifted to *occasionally*, thereby reporting Bishen Singh's action as less frequent. Then, his habit of not lying down is put in an opposite manner, i.e. by reporting that he was always found standing, and the phrase *the rest of the time* is added. Finally, like Ratan, Hasan adds clauses. However, whereas the clauses added by Ratan name clear human agents, those by Hasan anonymise agency through the use of passive voice. So, in comparison to the ST straightforwardly narrating Bishen Singh engaged in peculiar activities, the TT presents the activities as being observed by others. However, those *others* are kept anonymous. We can make guesses about their identity (such as their being the other *lunatics*, the doctors and nurses, and the visitors) but the fact remains that they are not identified in the TT.

Hasan's tendency of shifting from the active to passive voice as reported above is not just limited to this passage. He does so at several places in the TT, and even adds a couple of short clauses in the passive voice (*When told* and *followed by fights*). A couple of examples are shifting یہ جواب سن کر اس کا دوست مطمئن ہو گیا (*Hearing this answer, his friend became satisfied*) to *This profound observation was received with visible satisfaction* and اور ان کی گفتگو سے بھی وہ کوئی نتیجہ برآمد نہیں کر سکتے تھے (*And they could not drive anything from their conversations*) to *Nor was there anything to be learnt by eavesdropping on their conversations*. Consider the following example for a closer, contextual inspection and comparison with other translations:

Example 8.2:

ST	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
بڑی مشکلوں کے بعد اس کا دورہ سرد پڑا تو وہ نیچے اترا	After considerable difficulty, when his fit cooled down, he climbed down.	He descended from the tree when his fever cooled somewhat...	After some time when he regained his lucid moments he climbed down the tree.	When he was finally persuaded to come down...

Whereas Naqvi follows the ST, Ratan's and Hasan's translations show a shift in agency by replacing the ST agent *fit*, a mental/medical condition, by *he* (i.e. the lunatic*)*, a human agent. With regard to Ratan, this seems to be part of his overall strategy to add human agency (see discussion under Example 8.1 above) – a strategy that assigns more visibility and responsibility to human agents in his translation. Hasan, on the other hand, chooses to turn the active clause into a passive clause, thereby presenting the lunatic's act of coming down as something not done out of sheer volition but through convincing by others.

Hasan's translation also shows an omission of the mention of the fit cooling down, which the other two translators have been careful in retaining. This is indicative of Hasan's tendency to omit information provided by the ST here and there – something that we have already noted under Section 5.4.1. Under the same section, we also hinted at his tendency to add. A distinguishing type of addition that he uses consistently in the translation is pragmatic explicitation (Klaudy, 1998, p. 83) whereby he explains political, cultural, and historical references specific to the region of the Indo-Pak subcontinent. For example, when the word واہگہ (*Wahga*) comes up in the text, Hasan supplements it with the explanation *the dividing line between India and Pakistan*. Similarly, for the name تارا سنگھ (*Tara Singh*), he adds *the leader of the Sikhs*. Though these small omissions and additions do not bring about any significant change in the ideational meaning, they show that Hasan likes to take liberty with the ST content.

Occasionally, Hasan takes as much liberty as to introduce information which is factually incorrect. Translating ٹوبہ ٹیک سنگھ یہاں ہے (*Toba Tek Singh is here*) as *This is Toba Tek Singh* is one such example. When Bishen Singh utters these words, he is standing at Pakistan-India border. *Here* in his remark in the ST is referring to Pakistan, meaning that Bishen Singh believes that Toba Tek Singh is in Pakistan. Hasan, however, shifts the locative adjunct *here* to the proximal pronoun *this*, thereby presenting Bishen Singh as saying that the place where he is standing is Toba Tek Singh. The small distortion of ST information is factually incorrect, as the place Toba Tek Singh is not located at the Indo-Pak border.

8.1.2 Interpersonal Metafunction:

The following tables show the frequency of the modal verbs and adjuncts in the ST and the TTs in comparison with each other:

Type	ST	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
Can	6	11	14	10
Should	3	3	0	4
Might	0	1	3	2
Has/have to	1	0	0	0
Total	**10**	**15**	**17**	**16**

Table 8.2 Frequency of Modal Verbs in *Toba Tek Singh* and the TTs

Type	ST	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
Usuality	5	4	10	9
Temporality	1	4	6	3
Probability	2	2	0	2
Intensity	10	4	11	18
Obviousness	1	0	2	0
Opinion/impression	0	1	0	0
Total	**19**	**15**	**29**	**32**

Table 8.3 Frequency of Modal Adjuncts in *Toba Tek Singh* and the TTs

The figures indicate that Naqvi manages to follow the ST modal structure closely, introducing only a few shifts, whereas Ratan and Hasan introduce much more shifts. Let us consider an example closely:

Example 8.3:

ST	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
بٹوارے کے دو تین سال بعد پاکستان اور ہندوستان کی حکومتوں کو خیال آیا کہ اخلاقی قیدیوں کی طرح پاگلوں کا تبادلہ بھی **ہونا چاہیے** یعنی جو مسلمان پاگل ہندوستان کے پاگل خانوں میں ہیں انہیں پاکستان **پہنچا دیا جائے** اور جو ہندو اور	Two or three years after the partition, it occurred to the governments of Pakistan and India that, just like criminal prisoners, *lunatics* **should also be exchanged**, so the Muslim *lunatics* who were in Indian lunatic asylums **should be sent over** to Pakistan, and the	Two or three years after Partition, it occurred to the governments of India and Pakistan that along with the transfer of civilian prisoners, a transfer of the inmates of lunatic asylums **should also be made**. In other words, Muslim *lunatics* from Indian institutions **should**	Two or three years after the Partition, it occurred to the Governments of India and Pakistan **to exchange** their *lunatics* in the same manner as **they had exchanged** their criminals. The Muslim *lunatics* in Indian lunatic asylums **were to be sent over** to	A couple of years after the partition of **the country**, it occurred to the respective governments of India and Pakistan that inmates of lunatic asylums, like prisoners, **should also be exchanged**. Muslim *lunatics* in India **should be transferred** to

سکھ پاکستان کے پاگل خانوں میں ہیں انہیں ہندوستان کے **حوالے کر دیا جائے۔**	Hindus and Sikhs in Pakistani lunatic asylums **should be handed over** to India.	**be sent over** to Pakistan and Hindus and Sikhs from Pakistani asylums **should be allowed to go** to India.	Pakistan, and the Hindu and Sikh *lunatics* lodged in Pakistani asylums **were to be handed over** to India.	Pakistan and Hindu and Sikh *lunatics* in Pakistani asylums **should be sent** to India.

These opening clauses in the ST contain three occurrences of the modal verb *should*, one explicit چاہیے and two implicit, in حوالے کر دیا جائے and پہنچا دیا جائے, presenting the decision of the exchange of *lunatics* as a kind of moral obligation. Naqvi's translation retains all three occurrences, but, concurrently, shows a small shift by adding *to go* at the end of the passage. The ST material clauses *lunatics should also be exchanged*, *the Muslim lunatics...should be sent over to Pakistan*, and *the Hindu and Sikhs in Pakistani lunatic asylums should be handed over to India* all present the *lunatics* in the role of the affectee. Their willingness or unwillingness to move to the other country does not seem to play any role. This sense is retained by Naqvi in the translation of the first two clauses, however, by adding *to go* in the translation of the last clause, she shifts the responsibility of the act of moving across the boundary from the concerned officials to the *lunatics* themselves, as if they can choose for themselves whether or not they would like to go to India. Ratan, on the other hand, though retaining the *lunatics* in the role of affectee in all three clauses, chooses to omit all occurrences of the modal verb *should*. The strategy of omission shifts the sense from obligation to something that is simply going to happen. Contrary to both Naqvi and Ratan, Hasan chooses to stick to the ST transitivity and modality structures in this case.

Moving down to the text, however, we observe the translators adopt different, or it may be more pertinent to say *opposite*, tendencies. Hasan, for example, does not retain any ST modal verbs until late in the story, including the modal verb *of ability as shown* in the following example.

Example 8.4:

ST	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
اور ان کی گفتگوؤں سے بھی وہ کوئی نتیجہ برآمد نہیں کر **سکتے تھے۔**	And from their conversations, they **could not** derive anything.	Little information **could be** gained by talking to them.	From whose conversation they **could not** glean anything.	Nor was there anything to be learnt by eavesdropping on their conversations.

We just observed Ratan deviating from the ST to the extent of omitting all occurrences of *should*. In the present case, however, it is he who follows the ST most closely. Following the ST clause structure, he fronts the circumstantial adjunct *from whose conversation*, retains the *lunatics* in the role of the agent (*they (i.e. the lunatics) could not glean anything*), and, finally, retains the modal verb *of abil*ity and the adjunct of negation following it. The outcome is that, like the ST clause, Ratan's translation reports that the *lunatics* were unable to understand anything about the exchange by listening to the guards. In contrast, Naqvi chooses to shift the clause from active to passive, thereby not mentioning the *lunatics* as agents, or initiators of the mental action of comprehension. Hasan, on the other hand, chooses to divide the ST clause into two clauses and adds a personal view, *eavesdropping*, which has no traces in the ST clause. In the same vein, like Naqvi, he does not mention the agent, and he even goes to the extent of omitting the modal verb of ability. He does not retain this ST modal verb at further two occasions in his translation, meaning that, out of the six ST occurrences of the modal verb, he retains only three – which indicates that the ST modality of ability is toned down a little in his translation – including the one in the following case:

Example 8.5:

ST	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
مجھ سے جتنی مدد ہو **سکی** میں نے کی۔	"I helped as much as I **could**."	"I helped them in whatever way I **could**."	"I helped as much as I **could**."	I did what I **could** to help.

Ratan again sticks to the ST structure, to the extent that he does not show any shift in this instance. Naqvi and Hasan, though retaining the modal verb, show some other shifts. Naqvi, using the strategy of explicitation, adds *them* and shifts from *quantity* (*as much*) to *means* (*whatever way*), thereby shifting from quantity. Hasan also deviates from the sense of quantity replacing it with a reference to the steps Fazal Deen says he took to help Bishen Singh's relatives. In the two examples above, Ratan's strategy of avoiding shifts in modality is apparent, but a significant counterexample is as follows:

Example 8.6:

اس کا **شاید** یہ مطلب تھا کہ تم مسلمانوں کے خدا ہو____سکھوں کے خدا ہوتے **توضرور** میری سنتے۔

*He **perhaps** meant that **you** are a god of Muslims____If **you** were a god of Sikhs, **you** would **certainly** have listened to **me**.*

What Bishen Singh meant was that **the fellow** was **after all only** a God of the Muslims. Were **he** a God of the Sikhs **he** would have **surely** helped **him** out with the information.

The first noticeable difference is the ST using the second person pronoun *you* and the first person pronoun *me* as well as an absence of the double inverted commas around *you are a god of Muslims____If you were a god of Sikhs, you would certainly have listened to me* to indicate a reported speech, whereas the TT using the third person pronoun forms *he* and *him* and also the noun *the fellow*. This indicates a shift from free direct speech to the conventional indirect speech. In other words, the narration shifts from Bishen Singh to the writer. Then, the modal indicating weak probability *perhaps* is absent in the TT, indicating that the uncertainty in the ST is changed to a conviction that what is being narrated is really what Bishen Singh meant by his meaningless remark that he is so fond of using off and on. Also, Ratan shifts the modality of high probability (*certainly*) to that of obviousness (*surely*).

The point in presenting examples of close translation and shifts above is to indicate that all three translators sometimes choose a translation that is close to the ST interpersonal structure and other times introduce shifts with various effects, such as a shift from uncertainty to conviction in Example 8.6 above. However, as the examples above reveal, compared to Naqvi and Ratan, Hasan introduces more shifts, including the omission of modal verbs and adding personal views.

8.1.3 Textual Metafunction:

With regard to the thematic structure, the translations show similarity in terms of using unmarked themes. However, there are notable shifts in the placement of the essential and most important type of theme in a clause, i.e. topical theme (see Section 4.1.3.1 for a brief discussion on topical themes). On a general note, Naqvi's translation demonstrates 20 shifts, Ratan's 30 shifts, and that by Hasan 35 shifts in this regard. In terms of shifts involving human agency only, Naqvi's and Ratan's translations show 15 shifts each and Hasan's translation shows as many as 30 shifts.

There are four places where Naqvi chooses to replace the topical theme *lunatic(s)* with an inanimate or abstract thing, including *transfer*, *little information*, *issue*, and *confusion*. Ratan chooses to replace lunatic once by *governments* and once by *relatives* (in contrast to Naqvi, both times involving a shift to other human agents). Hasan replaces it six times, twice, like Ratan, by other human agents (*relatives* and *authorities*) and four times by inanimate things (*some*, *tears*, *many fights*, and *slogans*). The figures obviously indicate more topical theme shifts by Hasan than the other two translators involving *lunatics*. Similarly, he shows more shifts than others involving the central figure, Bishen Singh. There are eight places where he replaces another participant by Bishen Singh in the topical theme position and five places where he does the otherwise.

From another Participant to Bishen Singh	Strange words to BS
	Someone to BS
	His mind to he (BS)
	His relatives to BS
	Thought to BS
	Turn to BS
	Guards to BS
	Scream to BS
From Bishen Singh to another Participant	BS to something
	BS to Toba Tek Singh
	BS to it
	BS to many efforts
	BS to guards

Through these shifts, we can see a tendency in Hasan's translation to (1) shift the *lunatics* from topical theme position and (2) replace other participants in this priority position by Bishen Singh. In order to consider some of these shifts in context, see the following example:

Example 8.7:

ST	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
جب بشن سنگھ کی **باری** آئی اور واہگہ کے اس پار **متعلقہ افسر** اس کا نام رجسٹر میں درج کرنے لگا۔۔۔ یہ سن کر بشن سنگھ اچھل کر ایک طرف	When Bishen Singh's **turn** came and the **concerned officer** from the other side of Wahga started to enter his name in a register... Hearing this Bishen Singh	When Bishen Singh's **turn** came to cross the border, he asked the official **who** was entering his name in a register... On hearing this, Bishen Singh	When Bishen Singh's **turn** came **an officer** proceeded to jot down his personal details in a register... Hearing that Bishen Singh jumped with	When **Bishen Singh** was brought out and asked to give his name so that **it** could be recorded in a register…. Bishen Singh tried to run, but [**he**] was overpowered by

بٹا۔۔۔ **پاکستانی سپاہیوں** نے اسے پکڑ لیا اور دوسری طرف لے جانے لگے۔۔۔ **اسے** بہت سمجھایا گیا کہ دیکھو اب ٹوبہ ٹیک سنگھ ہندوستان میں چلا گیا ہے۔ اگر نہیں گیا تو **اسے** فوراً وہاں بھیج دیا جائیگا۔ مگر **وہ** نہ مانا۔	leaped back... **The Pakistani guards** caught hold of him and started to take him to the other side... **He** was tried to be convinced that look, now Toba Tek Singh has gone to Hindustan. If [**it**] has not gone there, then **it** will be sent there at once. But **he** was not convinced.	leaped back... **The Pakistani soldiers** caught him and tried to force him back to the checkpoint... **The authorities** attempted to reason with him. "Look, Toba Tek Singh is in Hindustan now—and if **he**'s not there yet, **we**'ll send him there immediately." But **he** was adamant...	excitement... **The Pakistani guards** caught hold of him and dragged him to the other side... **They** tried to set his thinking straight. "Look, Toba Tek Singh has gone to Hindustan...If it is not there we'll see to it that **it** is despatched there at once." But **Bishen Singh** was adamant...	the Pakistani guards who tried to push him across the dividing line towards India…**Many efforts** were made to explain to him that Toba Tek Singh had already been moved to India, or [**it**] would be moved immediately, but **it** had no effect on Bishen Singh.

Manto starts the ST passage placing an abstract idea *Bishen Singh's turn* in topical theme position. Naqvi and Ratan follow suit. However, Hasan chooses to place Bishen Singh in topical theme position. He also changes the clause from active to passive voice, presenting Bishen Singh as brought out of the bus by others. Through this, he adds an implicit sense of unwillingness by Bishen Singh to come out – something which the ST clause does not suggest. Hasan continues with the strategy of shifting clauses from active to passive voice, which results in another topical theme shift whereby *concerning officer* is replaced by *it* (i.e. Bishen Singh's name). In the same vein, *Pakistani guards* is replaced by *Bishen Singh*. Naqvi and Ratan, on the other hand, stick to the ST topical theme structure in these cases. However, they also show a shift when they replace *Bishen Singh* with *Pakistani guards*. Other than this single shift, however, Ratan closely follows the ST topical theme structure in the passage. Contrarily, Naqvi introduces a couple of further shifts. Firstly, she uses *he*, instead of *it*, for the town Toba Tek Singh, thereby ascribing some animacy to it. At first sight, this may look strange and possibly be taken by some readers as an unintended topographical error, but we argue that it may be a deliberate move by Naqvi in order to somehow preserve a sense of animacy of Toba Tek Singh implied in the corresponding ST clauses. Her next shift is that of shifting from an active to a passive structure, replacing *he* (*Toba Tek Singh)* by *we* (*authorities in Pakistan*).

The last shift by Hasan is replacing *he* (*Bishen Singh*) by *it* (*the efforts by the officials to convince him to move to the other side of the border*). It should be pointed out that, except for this last case, all other shifts by Hasan involve shifting from an active to a passive structure. A couple of further representative examples from his translation

include shifting the clause ان کی گفتگوؤں سے بھی وہ کوئی نتیجہ برآمد نہیں کر سکتے تھے (*they* *could not drive anything from their conversations*) to *Nor was there **anything** to be learnt by eavesdropping on their conversations* and یہ جواب سن کر **اس کا دوست** مطمئن ہو گیا (*Hearing this answer, **his friend** became satisfied*) to ***This profound observation** was received with visible satisfaction*. The tendency, spread across the TT, does not reveal any pattern whereby we can, for example, say that Hasan strategically gives thematic prominence to any one participant or a type of participants, such as animate, human, and inanimate. It may be that it is part of Hasan's individual style to use passive voice every now and then; at least, in the present translation, this is what we find to be the case. Anyhow, whether conscious or unconscious, the practice somewhat changes the ST topical theme structure, whereby several participants placed in the topical theme position in the ST are shifted to the less prominent rhematic position.

In Example 8.8 above, we observed Naqvi introduce a couple of shifts. However, it should be noted that, overall, she tries to remain close to the ST thematic structure in her translation, occasionally at the expense of the natural flow of the target language, i.e. English. The following will serve to be an interesting example in this regard:

Example 8.8:

ST	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
چنانچہ وہ دفعدار سے کہتا کہ اس کی ملاقات آ رہی ہے۔	So he would tell the guard that **his visit** is coming.	Before their arrival he would tell the guard **his "visit"** was coming.	He would tell the chief warden that **he** was expecting his relatives.	Omitted

The *coming* of visit (where animacy is ascribed to *visit*, as though it is an animate being coming to see Bishen Singh) is used as a colloquial expression in Urdu. However, a literal translation of it in English would probably look uncommon (a search for the expression *visit is coming* and that for *visit was coming* in British National Corpus does not return any results). It is probably because of this that Ratan normalises the expression as *he was expecting his relatives*. Naqvi, however, chooses to stick to the ST thematic structure by placing *his visit* in the topical theme position. Her literal translation might not look natural in English but it does retain the prominence ascribed to *visit* in the ST clause. She repeats the same strategy once

more when she translates اب ملاقات بھی نہیں آتی تھی (*Now the visit was also not coming*) literally as *His "visit" was also not coming any more*, whereas Ratan again normalises it to *Now even the visitors had stopped coming*.

8.1.4 Concluding Remarks:

Through the analysis above, we can deduce the following:

- At ideational level, Naqvi manages to stick to ST ideational structure most of the times. We have also noted her employing the strategy of compensation to more or less balance the effect of the shifts her translation demonstrates. In contrast to her, Ratan tends to add clauses. He also shifts the ST transitivity structure a little by assigning active roles to human agents at places where they are either presented in a passive role or are not mentioned in the ST. We noted in Section 5.1.1 that the ST tends to anonymise agents, especially in the first part of the story. Considering this, we can see that Ratan's strategy mentioned above tones down the ST macro-level effect to some degree. Compared to Ratan, Hasan's interference seems more conspicuous as he tends to add to the ST content at places. A visible strategy adopted by him in this regard is adding detail to disambiguate any local socio-cultural and political references. A risky move by him is to add pieces of information which are factually incorrect. Lastly, contrary to Ratan, he tends to shift active voice into passive voice. The strategy brings shifts not only at ideational level but also at textual level (see below). Given these findings, we can conclude that Naqvi's translation is more successful than the other two translations in rendering ST style at the ideational level. Ratan's translation is comparatively less successful, and Hasan's translation, with the writer's interference at various places, is least successful.

- Naqvi's and Ratan's translations demonstrate a mixed approach at the interpersonal level, whereby they sometimes stick to the ST modal structure and sometimes introduce shifts. Naqvi, for example, employs the strategy of explicitation to add to the interpersonal meaning of the text. However, we have also seen her retaining most of the ST modal verbs and adjuncts, thereby maintaining meanings produced through modality in the ST to a large extent.

Ratan, on the other hand, shows some more conspicuous modal shift patterns. For example, he chooses to omit a sense of obligation at the beginning of the text and shifts weak probability to high probability. As regards Hasan, he again demonstrates considerable interference by omitting several modal verbs and adjuncts. Apart from omission, he makes use of the strategy of addition to insert evaluative and personal perspective (5.4.2.1). There is one aspect, nonetheless, where Hasan's translation seems more successful than the other two translations. This is where he tries to maintain the effects produced by the use of negation in the ST, whereas both Naqvi and Ratan omit some important clauses containing the adjunct of negation (5.2.2.1, 5.3.2.1, and 5.4.2.1). Given these facts and figures, we can conclude that Naqvi's translation, with fewer shifts and an overall tendency to stick to the ST structure, is more successful than the other two translations in producing the ST style at the interpersonal level. Ratan's translation, adopting the opposing approaches of preservation and shifts at various places, is comparatively less successful, whereas Hasan's translation, with massive linguistic interference from the translator, is least successful.

- At textual level, the translations display several shifts. However, the shifts are quite fewer in Naqvi's and Ratan's translations as compared to Hasan's translation, where there are several instances of change in ST topical theme structure. Particularly mentionable is Naqvi's translation where, through literal translation, she preserves ST agents in theme position in cases where the other two translators choose to normalise or formalise the ST thematic structure to the conventions of the TT language, i.e. English. Taking the findings here and in Section 5.2.3.2, 5.3.3.2, and 5.4.3.2 into account, we can conclude that both Naqvi's and Ratan's translations, though only semi-successful in preserving the thematic structure of the ST, are comparatively more successful than Hasan's translation.

8.2 Translations of *Neya Qanoon*:

8.2.1 Ideational Metafunction:

The following table shows the frequency of the various processes in *Neya Qanoon* and its translations:

Sr. Number	Process	ST	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
1	Material	241	257	254	158
2	Mental	89	74	112	93
3	Relational	96	101	81	116
4	Behavioural	17	12	21	10
5	Verbal	57	69	61	52
6	Existential	0	2	10	18
7	**Total**	**519**	**515**	**539**	**447**

Table 8.4 Frequency of Processes in *Neya Qanoon* and the TTs

The frequency comparison suggests that Naqvi manages to avoid shifting from the ST transitivity structure to a large extent, whereas Ratan tends to add and Hasan tends to omit clauses. However, we need to look at individual cases closely to get a clearer picture. For this, let us consider a passage near the beginning of the text:

Example 8.9:

ST	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
پچھلے دنوں جب استاد منگو نے اپنی ایک سواری سے اسپین میں جنگ چھڑ جانے کی افواہ سنی تھی تو اس نے گاما چودھری کے چوڑے کاندھے پر تھپکی دے کر مودبرانہ انداز میں پیش گوئی کی تھی "دیکھ لینا چودھری، تھوڑے ہی دنوں میں اسپین کے اندر جنگ چھڑ جائے گی۔"	A few days ago, when Ustaad Mangoo heard from one of his passengers a **rumour** about a war to break out in Spain, he had patted Gama Chaudhry's broad shoulder and **predicted** in a **philosophical way** "You will see Chaudhry, in a few days, in Spain, a war will break out."	Once Ustaad Mangoo heard a passenger mention the **possibility** of war in Spain. **He brought the information to his friends at the stand that very evening.** "You'll see, Chaudhry," **he declared confidently**, patting Gama Chaudhry's broad back as he made his **prediction**. "There will be war in Spain."	The other day **he was carrying two passengers in his tonga** who while talking among themselves **feared** that there **may** soon be a civil war in Spain. Back at the hackney stand, Ustad Mangoo thumped Gama Chowdhury on his shoulder, "Chowdhury, **I can safely predict** there will soon be a war in Spain" he said **giving the other man a knowing look**.	Omitted

Naqvi's translation looks reasonably close to the ST at the beginning, as it, like the ST, talks about Mangoo hearing something from a passenger. Ratan's translation, on the other hand, demonstrates shifts from the beginning, as he adds the clause *he was carrying two passengers in his tonga*, whereby replacing *one passenger* with *two*

passengers. The first main shift in Naqvi's translation is when she adds a verbal process *mention* and then translates افواه (*rumour*) as *possibility*. Though someone can argue that rumour itself refers to a possibility, we should be mindful of the difference between the [+value] associated with the word possibility (there are chances that something will happen) and the [-value] associated with the word rumour (it is said that something is going to happen, but it more likely than not seems not to be happening). Naqvi's choice, thus, shifts the ST sense from negative to positive, or, in other words, from less probability to high probability. Ratan, on the other hand, translates the clause *Mangoo heard from one of his passengers* as *who [passengers] while talking among themselves*, thereby he shifts the mental process *hear* to the verbal process *talk*. Looking closely, we can also discern the strategy of implication at play here, whereby the detail of Mangoo hearing a news from one of his passengers is made implicit in the TT; when Ratan mentions Mangoo sharing the news with his friends, we understand that Mangoo must have heard it from his passengers, but this is not explicitly mentioned in the TT. Ratan follows this shift with an interesting shift when he translates افواه (*rumour*) as *fear*. Addition of this mental process presents the rumour of a future war in Spain as something frightening to the passengers. We know that Spain is far away from the Indo-Pak region, and the civil war that broke out in Spain did not affect the people of the region. Considering this, the addition of the mental process seems to be a bit out of context.

The discussion above shows both Naqvi and Ratan introduce micro-level ideational *shifts in meaning*. Another example of it is when Naqvi translates *predicted in a philosophical way* as *declared confidently*. The combinational use of the words *declare* and *confidently* lends a sense of authority which is not so visible in the corresponding ST phrase. The ST word *predicted* indicates confidence, but only implicitly. *Predicted* is also suggestive of Mangoo's ability to foresee the future in the light of the events happening around – a meaning which is lost in the ST. Naqvi compensates this loss of meaning by adding the word *prediction* in the next (verbal) clause (*he made his prediction*). It seems that Naqvi deliberately adds the clause for the sake of compensating the above-said meaning loss, since there does not seem to be any other motivation for adding it. In any case, the sense of being a thinker and a knowledgeable person (which, if we consider the tragic end of the story, appears ironic) inherent in *in a philosophical way* is lost in the TT. The same clause

[Mangoo] predicted in a philosophical way is translated by Ratan as *I can safely predict*, where we can discern two types of meaning shifts. First, by changing the narrator from writer to Mangoo, Ratan lends more directness and emphasis to the TT clause as compared to the ST clause. Second, just like in Naqvi's translation, the sense of Mangoo being a thinker and a man with knowledge is left out. Ratan's translation ends with another addition – that of the clause *giving the other man a knowing look*. This non-verbal eye gesture suggests the probability that Mangoo, instead of merely stating his prediction, tries to leave an impression of his being a knowledgeable man to his listener. From this perspective, we, as the readers, can construe the activity of patting Nathu's shoulders and stating the prediction as an implicit attempt by Mangoo to establish, or maintain, his ascendency over his fellow. However, this meaning is absent in the ST. Now as for Hasan, he chooses to omit three passages near the beginning of the text including the passage under discussion.

Though the shifts we have reported in the example above do not bring about a macro-level meaning shift, they do serve to show which translation is more successful in comparison to other translations. For example, Ratan's shifts seem comparatively more potent since he shifts a mental clause with a verbal clause, adds a sense of fright in the passenger's comment about the possibility of war in Spain, and implicitly suggests the possibility of Mangoo trying to use language as a tool to establish power. In contrast to Naqvi and Ratan, Hasan goes to the extreme of omitting the whole passage. We should note here that the passage is part of Manto's scheme to build a character profile of Mangoo from the beginning of the text. By omitting this, as well as surrounding introductory passages, Hasan skips the opportunity of setting the scene by establishing some important detail about Mangoo's character at the beginning of the text.

It is mentionable that, apart from small ideational-level shifts we have observed above, Naqvi occasionally resorts to a highly literal translation, bordering on word-for-word translation, thereby following the ST transitivity structure closely. Ratan, on the other hand, continues with introducing micro-level ideational shifts; the main strategies he adopts for this purpose are addition and implicitation. On the other hand, Hasan, through his extreme decision of omitting the whole passage, brings about more

significant ideational-level meaning loss than does Ratan. Let us consider another example:

Example 8.10:

ST	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
اس گفتگو نے استاد منگو کے دل میں جدید آئین کی اہمیت اور بھی بڑھا دی اور وہ اس کو ایسی "چیز" سمجھنے لگا جو بہت چمکتی ہو۔ "نیا قانون"۔۔۔ وہ دن میں کئی بار سوچتا "یعنی کوئی نئی چیز" اور ہر بار اس کی نظروں کے سامنے اپنے گھوڑے کا وہ نیا ساز آ جاتا جو اس نے دو برس ہوئے چودھری خدا بخش سے بڑی اچھی طرح ٹھونک بجا کر خریدا تھا۔	**This conversation** enhanced, **in Ustaad Mangoo's heart**, the importance of the new constitution even more and **he began to regard it as a "thing"** that shone brilliantly. **"New law,"** he used to think several times a day, **"like something new"** and each time, before his eyes, **the new harness of his horse** came which he had bought from Chaudhry Khuda Bakhsh **after checking it closely** [for its quality] two years ago.	**This conversation** helped to enhance, in Ustaad Mangoo's eyes, the importance of the new law and **he began to regard it as a "thing"** that shone brilliantly. "New law," he repeated to himself several times during the day, **"like something brand new!"** **The image of his horse's new harness** rose in his mind; he had bought it from Chaudhry Khuda Bakhsh two years ago.	**In the light of this discussion Mangoo** saw the New Constitution **in a new perspective**. It greatly enhanced its importance in his eyes. **It seemed to be something scintillating, replete with tremendous possibilities**. **The New Constitution according to Mangoo stood for new things**. He thought of the trappings of his horse, bought two years ago from Chowdhury Khuda Buksh's shop **which were now in need of urgent replacement**.	**This conversation was most thrilling as far as Ustad Mangoo was concerned**. **The new constitution now appeared to him** to be something bright and **full of promise**. **The only thing he could compare the new constitution with** was the splendid brass and gilt paraphernalia he had purchased a couple of years ago for his tonga from Choudhry Khuda Bux. **The new constitution gave him the same nice, warm feeling**.

The opening ST clause *this conversation enhanced* becomes *this conversation helped to enhance* in Naqvi's translation, *in the light of this discussion* in Ratan's translation, and *this conversation was most thrilling* in Hasan's translation. The addition of *helped to* in Naqvi's translation is a minor deviation, showing Naqvi using somewhat indirect language. She occasionally shifts directness in ST to indirectness across the text. She does so by either preceding the process with something like *seemed to* (as manifested in *but no one listened to him* to but *no one **seemed to** pay much attention to what he was saying*), *supposed to* (as manifested in *where this so-called Spain was supposed to be located?*), and *helped to* (as in the example under discussion), or shifting an active process into a passive process (as manifested in *I have heard from my elders* to *I **have been told** by my elders*), or by replacing a human agency with an abstract thing

(as manifested in *because of certain consideration, he kept quiet* to ***a serious consideration*** *had prevented him from such a move*). These occasional shifts change the directness in ST to indirectness to some extent. Past the opening clause, however, Naqvi shows striking similarity with the ST structure when she translates *he began to regard it as a "thing" that shone brilliantly* as *he began to regard it as a "thing" that shone brilliantly*. She continues with the strategy of literal translation until the end of the passage (except for the minor omission of the ST phrase *after checking it closely*) - a strategy that helps her avoid significant meaning loss.

In Ratan's translation of the opening clause, the ST status of *conversation* as an agent, as well as a topical theme, is lost (since it is made part of a circumstantial adjunct) and its place is taken by Mangoo. The strategy creates a sense of direct responsibility, whereby Mangoo is presented as actively involved in making impressions regarding the conversation about the probable implementation of a new law. However, contrary to the shift above, Ratan dethrones Mangoo from the primary position of topical theme and agent in the next clause (***he began to regard it as a "thing"*** to ***it seemed to be something***). This mixed attitude towards agency is representative of a tendency across the text, whereby Ratan replaces others with Mangoo as an agent at places and does the otherwise at other places. A couple of examples are ***his mood*** *remained sullen the whole day* into ***he*** *remained sullen the whole day* but *he was talking as if **he would kill me*** into ***a word*** *from his mouth is enough to kill me*. At the end of the passage, Ratan adds a relational clause *which were now in need of urgent replacement*. The addition seems to change the sense conveyed by the ST passage a little, since there is no reference, whether explicit or implicit, in ST of the trappings being *old* or *worn-out*. Instead, they are mentioned as something bright and new, thereby appearing as a befitting simile for the new law. The additional clause in the TT, nonetheless, seems out of context and creating a sense opposite to the ST sense. Ratan adds clauses at other places as well, a majority of which fall under the category of explicitation, such as *1ˢᵗ April, **the day on which the New Act was to be enforced*** and *Heera Mandi (**the red light district**)*. However, though leaving some minor impacts on ST denotational meaning and transitivity structure, the shifts introduced by Ratan do not develop into a pattern to change the macro-level ideational meanings and stylistic effects in the ST.

In Hasan's translation, we see a conversion of the opening ST mental clause to a relational clause *this conversation was most thrilling*, which is then followed by the addition of another relational clause *Ustad Mangoo was concerned*. This instance is representative of Hasan's text-wide strategy of adding relational processes and shifting other processes to it. A couple of examples include the addition of *who were responsible for Ustad Mangoo's rather low opinion of the British* and a shift from the verbal clause *the saint had cursed that...* to the relational clause *part of the saint's curse on Akbar was that...*. These shifts, coupled with the eighteen existential clauses (which appears very conspicuous when seen in comparison to no existential clause in the ST), create a macro-level effect of reduction of action, and a corresponding portrayal of things and events as simply existing or showing a relation with other things and events.

8.2.2 Interpersonal Metafunction:

The following tables show a frequency comparison of the modal verbs and adjuncts of the ST with that of the translations:

Type	ST	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
Can	3	3	5	8
Could	1	1	7	9
May	0	0	2	0
Should	1	1	1	1
Must	0	0	2	0
Might	1	1	0	3
Have/Had to	0	0	0	1
Total	**6**	**6**	**17**	**22**

Table 8.5 Frequency of Modal Verbs in *Neya Qanoon* and the TTs

Type	ST	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
Usuality	8	6	9	8
Temporality	9	4	16	9
Probability	9	10	5	13
Intensity	6	4	14	8
Total	**24**	**32**	**44**	**38**

Table 8.6 Frequency of Modal Adjuncts in *Neya Qanoon* and the TTs

In terms of frequency, Naqvi's translation again shows far fewer shifts than the other two translations; however, we need to consider individual instances to see what patterns emerge. Consider the following examples:

Example 8.11:

Sr. #	ST Modality	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
1	تھوڑے ہی دنوں میں اسپین کے اندر جنگ چھڑ جائے گی۔	In a few days, in Spain, war will break out.	There will be war in Spain soon.	**I can safely predict** there will soon be a civil war in Spain.	Omitted
2	"لا ہاتھ ادھر۔۔۔ایسی خبر سناؤں کہ جی خوش ہو جائے۔۔۔تیری اس گنجی کھوپڑی پر بال اگ آئیں۔"	"Give me your hand...Let me tell you news that **will** make your heart happy...On your bald head, hair will grow."	"I have news that will thrill you...You'**ll** have hair growing on that bald head of yours!"	"There's some good news for you. Hair **will** again grow on your bald pate when you hear the news."	'I have great news for you. It's so good that it **might** make your hair grow back.'
3	"تو دیکھتا رہ کیا بنتا ہے۔ یہ روس والا بادشاہ کچھ نہ کچھ **ضرور** کر کے رہے گا۔"	"you keep seeing as to what happens. This Russian king will certainly do something."	"You just wait and see! This Russian king **will certainly** do something."	"You just watch!".... "The Russian King **is going to** wrought some miracle."	'You just wait and see. Things are going to happen. **You have my word**, this Russian king **is bound to show them** his paces.'
4	"ابھی بہت سویرا ہے۔۔۔"	"It is too early..."	"It is still early..."	"It's rather early."	**Perhaps** it was too early in the morning.
5	وہ آج نئے قانون کو دیکھنے کے لیے گھر سے **نکلا تھا** ٹھیک اسی طرح جیسے وہ گاندھی یا جواہر لال کے جلوس کا نظارہ کرنے کیلئے نکلتا تھا۔	He **had left** his house to see the new law, just as he used to go out to see the procession of Gandhi or Jawaharlal.	He **had left** the stand as usual, just as he would to witness a mass meeting led by Gandhi or Jawaharlal.	He thought he **could go out** to witness the impact of the New Act in the same way as he used to go out to see Mahatma Gandhi or Jawaharlal's procession.	He **had come out** early to view the new constitution with his own eyes, the same way he used to wait for hours to catch a glimpse of Gandhiji and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

In the first example, whereas Naqvi tries to stick to the ST structure, Hasan omits the clause. Ratan, on the other hand, chooses to add the clause *I can safely predict*. In the ST and Naqvi's translation, Mangoo is presented as speaking straightforwardly and with conviction. However, the addition of the above clause by Ratan tones down the conviction. Though the clause presents Mangoo attempting to put assertion and conviction in his statement, the fact is that the direct and straightforward ST clause shows more conviction, where the speaker does not have to take recourse to any words – *safely* and *predict* in this case – expressing assertion. In the third example, the same strategy is adopted by Hasan when he supplements Mangoo's claim *this Russian king is **bound to** show his paces* with *you have my word*. This additional

attempt to put conviction to the statement actually weakens. Other examples from the translation include *well, **you take my word**, they will get nowhere...*, *Hindustan, **I can assure you**, will always remain enslaved*, and ***I mean** it would have been below my dignity to hit the wretch*. Save for the first of these examples, the rest are spoken by Mangoo where he is shown to be trying to convince others about the veracity or validity of his claims. The cumulative effect, nonetheless, is opposite to the intended, as these added statements give the impression that the speaker is not entirely sure about his statements, and that is why he is resorting to these statements in an attempt to put force in what he is saying. The second example again shows Naqvi and Ratan use the same strong modality, represented by *will*, as in the ST. Contrarily, Hasan chooses to weaken it by using *might* – that is, a modal verb expressing the least possibility of the statement to come true. Some other examples from the translation include adding modal adjuncts *maybe*, *no doubt*, and *perhaps* to the otherwise direct and straightforward ST statements. These example clauses are *you will get **maybe** the Italywala or the Russian*, *they were **perhaps** money lenders*, and *it is **no doubt** the result of a holy man's curse....*

A further illustration of the case described above is provided by the fourth example in the table above: ***perhaps** it was too early in the morning*. Mangoo comes out on 1 April, i.e. the day on which the new law, according to him, is going to be enforced, with a conviction that he will see a new world, where everything will have turned in favour of the natives of the subcontinent; the Indians will be free and there will be light, colour, and newness everywhere. The above statement is uttered by him as an excuse when he sees nothing of the sort he had expected to see. The ST and the translations by Naqvi and Ratan present Mangoo so full of confidence and self-assuredness that he actually believes that the brightness and newness he is missing on 1 April owes to the early hours of the day. He is sure that, as the shops and offices will open, he will see all that he expects. The conviction in this statement as well as in other similar statements not only indicates Mangoo's blind belief that 1 April will turn the tables in favour of the natives but also create a severe ironic macro-level effect when we see them in contrast to the unexpected ending.

The fifth example shows Ratan toning down the conviction in Mangoo's statements and beliefs about 1 April and the new law. The Mangoo of the ST clause and that of

the translated clauses in Naqvi's and Hasan's translations is not a hesitant person; he has no doubts whether or not the new law will promulgate on 1 April or if it will really change the state of affairs in the subcontinent. He comes out of the house having full belief that he is going to see the new law in all its glory. However, the addition of *he thought he could go out* instils an overtone of doubt and uncertainty in Ratan's translation. Another example of the case in point is shifting *certainly* in the ST by *sanguine* in the corresponding TT clause *He was **sanguine** that everything would work to his advantage making life easy for him*. Addition of some other modal adjuncts and verbs in Ratan's translation, as manifested in clauses such as *it would **indeed** be an event of far-reaching importance*, *he would **surely** see its signs everywhere*, and *if **only we could** enact some new law to seek salvation from these people*, also serve to tone down the conviction in Mangoo's statements in the ST.

As illustrated in the examples above, Naqvi retains the conviction in Mangoo's statements and beliefs. Though a counterexample is also found – manifested in adding the modal adjunct *maybe* to the ST clause *some Italian would come or that Russian*, thereby toning down the conviction in the corresponding TT clause *someone from Italy or **maybe** that Russian person* – Naqvi overall shows a tendency to maintain the ST conviction by preserving the ST modal verbs and adjuncts of probability.

8.2.3 Textual Metafunction:

We noted in Chapter 6 that the ST and the translations hardly use marked themes. We also noted that, in terms of placing participants in topical theme position, Naqvi's translation shows 31 shifts, Ratan's translation 41 shifts, and Hasan's translation 53 shifts. These frequency statistics give us a general impression, but we need to go deeper to see what is happening at the micro-level linguistic arrangements of the ST and the corresponding translations. For this purpose, consider the following examples:

Example 8.12:

Sr. #	ST Topical Theme	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
1	منگو کوچوان اپنے اڈّے میں بہت عقلمند	**Mangoo** the tonga-driver was considered a very	**Everyone at the tonga stand** regarded	Among the people at the hackney stand **Mangoo**	**Mangoo the tongawala** was considered a

#					
	آدمی سمجھا جاتا تھا۔	wise person in his [tonga] stand.	Mangoo as a man of wisdom.	**coachman** passed for a wise man.	man of great wisdom among his friends.
2	اس شام کے قریب جب وہ اڈے میں آیا تو **اس کا چہرہ** غیر معمولی طور پر تمتمایا ہوا تھا۔	By that evening, when he returned to the stand, **his face** was flushed unusually.	When he returned to the stand in the evening, **his face** shone strangely	That evening when he returned to the hackney stand **his mind** seemed to be highly exercised over some grave matter as was apparent from his flushed face.	That evening when he returned to the adda, **he** looked perturbed.
3	**اس کی نگاہیں** آج خاص طور پر نیا رنگ دیکھنا چاہتی تھیں۔	**His eyes** especially wanted to see a new colour today.	**His eyes** eagerly sought new color.	Omitted	**He** wanted to see colour and light.
4	اس کے سینے میں **ایک عجیب و غریب طوفان** برپا ہو گیا۔	In his chest, **a strange storm** was brewing.	**A storm** was brewing within him.	[**He**] felt bad about it.	**He** felt bitterly disappointed.
5	اور **اس کو** حوالات میں بند کر دیا گیا۔	And **he** was put behind bars.	And **Ustaad Mangoo** was put behind bars	**They** pushed him into the lock-up	Then **they** locked him up.

The first clause above is the opening clause of the text. Whereas both Ratan and Hasan retain Mangoo, the central character, in the topical theme position, Naqvi assigns this priority position to Mangoo's fellows in the tanga-stand. This is a strange move because, as the story unfolds, we see Mangoo play a very active role when conversing with his fellows and thinking over his expectations with the new law. He is also at the centre of the scene when the writer narrates his inner thoughts and actions. In any case, past this clause, Naqvi retains the ST participants in the topical theme position in the second clause. Contrarily, Hasan chooses to replace *his face* with *he* (i.e. Mangoo), thereby giving human agency a conspicuous place in the clause. Although Ratan, like Naqvi, does not replace it with human agency, he makes a small change of replacing *his face* by *his mind*. The third example in the table again shows Naqvi retaining a body part in the topical theme position, whereas Hasan again chooses to replace it with *he*. Again, the fourth example shows Naqvi retaining the emotion of restlessness and (perhaps) anger, metaphorically called *storm* by Manto, in theme position. On the other hand, both the other translators choose to replace the emotion with a human agency, i.e. Mangoo. In the last example, which happens to be the last sentence of the text, Naqvi retains Mangoo in theme, whereas both the other translators replace him with *they*, i.e. the policemen.

These examples illustrate a tendency by Naqvi to follow the ST thematic structure closely, which helps her avoid the possibility of any drastic structural and semantic changes to the ST topical theme organisation. Though we do find some shifts, such as from *Mangoo* to *everything*, *child* to *Mangoo*, *well* to *Mangoo*, and *he* (i.e. Mangoo) to *fire*, but the overall topical theme organisation is marked by closely following the corresponding ST organisation. Hasan, on the other hand, shows a tendency to replace other elements in the topical theme position with Mangoo. As a considerable portion of the text revolves around depicting Mangoo's emotions and the body parts (such as face, brain, and eyes) involved in producing or betraying these emotions, it is nothing but natural to see these put in the theme position in the ST. Hasan, however, chooses to replace a number of these references with Mangoo, that is to say, with the person who is using or hosts the relevant body parts. For example, *his face*, *his mood*, *his anger*, *his chest*, *his eyes*, *fist*, *ironic expression/manner*, all are replaced by Mangoo in theme position. The pattern tones down the prominence enjoyed by the body parts and emotions in the ST. Apart from this, Mangoo is Hasan's preferable choice to put in the topical theme position, thereby he puts more responsibility and ascribes a more active role to Mangoo. He is (predominantly) presented as directly responsible for his actions and emotions. Though there is no denying the fact that one is responsible for one's actions, it is probably impossible to dismiss the role played by the unconscious mind or what we can call the intrinsic nature of a person. Mangoo of the ST and Naqvi's translation is, indeed, responsible for the tragic end, but he is presented as being overcome by his characteristic emotions of impetuousness and rage, to which he sometimes seems helpless. Under the influence of these emotions, *his mood* remains bad throughout the day whenever he has a fight with an Englishman, *his eyes* look at the Englishman by the end of the story as if they are going to cut him into pieces, and *his fists* clench and hit the Englishman in the chin. The Mangoo of Hasan's translation, on the other hand, is presented as doing all this on his free will, as if his emotions and movements are under his full control.

Before ending the section, we would like to point out that, as our examples above show, Ratan seems to adopt a mixed approach, whereby he sometimes follows the ST thematic structure closely and other times demonstrates significant shifts.

8.2.4 Concluding Remarks:

Through the analysis above, we can deduce the following:

- At the ideational level, we see Naqvi introduce small shifts in meaning at places. For example, on one occasion, she shifts ST low probability to TT high probability (8.2.1). However, these shifts are specific to individual clauses and do not develop into a pattern to bring about any wide-scale, macro-level shift in ideational meaning. However, a small shift pattern the analysis of her translation reveals is occasionally giving the text a touch of indirectness (8.2.1 for detail). We have also seen her applying the translation strategies of compensation and literal translation, both of which help her retain the macro-level ST ideational meaning to a large extent. Compared to Naqvi, Ratan adds to or modifies the ST ideational meaning more frequently. The strategies he uses for this purpose include implicitation, explicitation, and addition. We have, for example, seen him adding emotions of fear, making explicit ST detail implicit, and adding a non-verbal eye gesture indicating that Mangoo consciously tries to leave an impact of his ascendancy on his fellow tanga-drivers. Like in Naqvi's case, these individual changes do not develop into a pattern to have a major impact on macro-level meaning, but for the sake of comparison, these indicate more frequent micro-level shifts than in Naqvi's translation. It is also noteworthy that Ratan shows a mixed attitude towards agency. He sometimes promotes Mangoo to the topical theme position as an agent. The move gives Mangoo more active role in the relevant clauses than ST does. However, there is no dearth of counterexamples, where the active role of Mangoo in ST clauses is shifted to a passive role. Because of moving randomly from one strategy to the other, his treatment of agency does not develop into a pattern. As regards Hasan, two tendencies are clearly visible in his translation. Firstly, he tends to omit clauses and even omits the three paragraphs at the beginning of the story. Since the paragraphs relate to Manto's scheme of building a character profile of Mangoo, omitting them brings about significant meaning loss. Secondly, Hasan tends to both add relational processes and shift other processes to them. This makes the text have less action as compared to the ST. Given these findings, we can conclude

that, although both Naqvi's and Ratan's translations do not impact the macro-level ideational makeup of the ST to a significant way, Naqvi's translation is more successful in translating the ST style at the ideational level because of its fewer shifts and a tendency to translate literally. Ratan's translation is comparatively less successful, and Hasan's translation, because of significant omissions, is least successful.

- At the interpersonal level, both Ratan and Hasan tend to present the text having less conviction than in the ST. Naqvi, on the other hand, except for one case, retains the level of conviction in the ST, with the effect that we see Mangoo talk about the new law and the positive changes it will bring with conviction and certainty. Considering these patterns, we can conclude that, whereas Naqvi's translation is more successful in retaining the ST style at the interpersonal level, both the other translations are less successful.

- At the textual level, though we see some shifts in Naqvi's translation as far as topical theme position is concerned, she overall retains the ST structure. Ratan's translation reveals a mixed approach, whereby we find him sometimes retain the ST structure and sometimes change it. His arbitrary decisions to retain or shift the ST thematic structure do not develop into a pattern. Hasan's translation, on the other hand, shows a remarkable shift pattern, whereby he replaces body parts and emotions in topical theme position by Mangoo, thereby presenting him as consciously responsible for all his actions. He is not like the Mangoo of the ST who is sometimes overwhelmed by emotions of impulsiveness and rage and thus commits mistakes which he otherwise would have avoided when not overpowered by negative emotions. We can, thus, conclude that Naqvi's translation is again most successful in retaining ST thematic organisation, Ratan's translation maintains his second place, whereas Hasan's translation is least successful.

8.3 Translations of *Hatak*:

8.3.1 Ideational Metafunction:

The following table shows the frequency of the various processes in *Hatak* and its translations:

Sr. Number	Process	ST	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
1	Material	543 (44.14%)	451 (37.89%)	456 (44.57%)	292 (39.94%)
2	Mental	252 (20.49%)	247 (20.75%)	185 (18.08%)	109 (14.91%)
3	Relational	248 (20.16%)	300 (25.21%)	213 (20.82%)	191 (26.12%)
4	Behavioural	46 (3.73%)	41 (3.44%)	40 (3.91%)	30 (4.1%)
5	Verbal	136 (11.05%)	122 (10.25%)	114 (11.14%)	91 (12.44%)
6	Existential	5 (0.4)	29 (2.43%)	15 (1.47%)	18 (2.46%)
7	**Total**	**1230**	**1190**	**1023**	**731**

Table 8.7 Frequency of Processes in *Hatak* and the TTs

The frequency comparison suggests that, whereas Naqvi again follows the ST transitivity structure closely, Ratan omits a considerable amount, and Hasan a considerable amount, of clauses. The percentage of the processes also indicates that, in comparison to the ST, both Naqvi and Hasan use relatively fewer material processes and relatively higher relational processes. This indicates comparatively less action in the two translations. A closer analysis, however, would unearth more, not-so-visible, patterns. To this purpose, let us consider some examples in detail.

Madhu, the charmer, uses captivating words to keep Saugandhi attracted to him. The following is how the ST and the corresponding translations portray this:

Example 8.13:

ST	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
مہینے میں ایک بار **مادھو** پونے سے آتا تھا اور واپس جاتے ہوئے ہمیشہ سوگندھی سے کہا کرتا تھا "دیکھ سوگندھی اگر **تو** نے پھر سے اپنا دھندا شروع کیا تو بس **تیری میری** ٹوٹ جائے گی۔۔۔ اگر **تو** نے ایک بار بھی کسی مرد کو اپنے یہاں ٹھہرایا تو چٹیا سے پکڑ کر باہر نکال دوں گا۔۔۔۔ دیکھ اس مہینے کا خرچ **میں** تجھے پونا پہینچتے ہی منی آرڈر کر دوں گا۔۔۔"	Once a month, **Madhu** would come from Puna, and when leaving, [he] would always say to Saugandhi, "look Saugandhi, if **you** again start your business, the [**bond** between] you and me will break… If **you** let a man stay at your place even once, **I** will grab you by your hair and show you out… Look, **I will** money-order you [i.e. **I** will send you by MO] this month's expenditure as soon as **I** reach Puna…"	**Madhu** came from Poona once a month and just before he left **he** would warn Saugandhi not to go back to prostitution. "Look, Saugandhi," **he** said, "if **you** start the business again, **we**'ll break up! If **you** take in another man ever, **I**'ll drag you out of here by your hair! I **promise** to send you money for this month's expenses as soon as **I** get back to Poona."	**Madho** came from Pune every month and before leaving **gave Saugandhi a stern look**. "Saugandhi, if **you** again start this **nefarious** business of yours **it** will mean the parting of the ways between us. **I'll have nothing to do with you**. Even if **you** entertain one more visitor **I**'ll throw you out. As for your monthly expenses **I** will send you money by MO the moment **I** reach Pune."	**He** would come once a month from Poona and before going back **he** would say, 'Saugandhi, if **you** resume that old business of yours, **you**'ll never see me again. Yes, about this month's household expenses, **the money** will be on its way as soon as **I** get to Poona.

The first minor shift in Naqvi's translation is the addition of the verbal clause *he would warn Saugandhi not to go back to prostitution*. Moving forward, we see the inanimate agent in the ST *the bond between you and me* replaced by human agency *we* (i.e. Saugandhi and Madhu). The replacement manifests a shift from suppressed agency to explicit agency, whereby both Saugandhi and Madhu are explicitly presented as responsible in case there is a break-up between them. This act of adding human agency to the topical theme position and thereby presenting them as more responsible for their actions than does the ST is illustrative of a text-wide strategy by Naqvi. To be specific, there are 17 additions of this type in the TT; examples include translating **a yellow smile** *appeared on her [i.e. Saugandhi's] lips* as **she** *smiled*, **it** *[i.e. Madhu's picture] had concealed your faults* as **you** *can't see your faults in it*, and **Saugandhi's scream** *was heard* as **Saugandhi** *screamed*. These shifts make Saugandhi, Madhu, and other characters involved in an activity or event more visible. In other words, events and actions are not merely reported as occurring on their own; rather, the human agency responsible for them is made visible and responsible through these shifts.

The next shift in Naqvi's translation is adding the verbal clause *I promise* in *I promise to send you money for this month's expenses*. The corresponding ST clause *I will money-order you [i.e. I will send you by money order] this month's expenditure* is a straightforward narration of what Madhu will do once he reaches Puna. The Madhu of the ST clause does not need to try to add emphasis his statement by promising that he will send Saugandhi money from Puna. He is straightforward and direct in his approach here, which indicates his confidence that Saugandhi, as usual, will believe his lies (sending her money, in this case) without question. On the other hand, the addition of the said clause in the TT not only makes the narration indirect but also weakens the conviction that the clause enjoys in the ST. Another example from the TT is translating *for a moment, her heart shrank and then expanded* as *for a moment* **it seemed** *that her heart was shrinking and expanding alternatively*, where the addition of it seemed makes the narration indirect and tentative. Naqvi also adds a few modal adjuncts for this purpose, which will be discussed in the next section on interpersonal metafunction.

In Ratan's translation also, there are a few additions, including that of an angry mood for Madhu (*gave Saugandhi a stern look*), an evaluative adjective *nefarious*, and the explicitation *I'll have nothing to do with you*. Apart from these, the translation appears to follow the ST transitivity structure closely. Ratan tries to maintain this closeness at other places in the translation as well; however, we do find a shift pattern whereby he, like Naqvi, turns ST conviction and directness into tentativeness and indirectness. Addition of *seemed to* in **so, that red spot was the 'Huh' which seemed to be piercing through her chest like a screw-driver** and *professed to* in *He would have liked to stay back for more, but his wife, with whom he **professed to** be madly in love…* are a couple of examples of the case in point. A further strategy adopted by Ratan on one occasion is shifting a statement into a question: *Ram Lal, bring that man in* to *Look, Ramlal, can't you ask that man in the car to come here?* The shift gives the impression that Saugandhi is somewhat hesitant in asking Ram Lal to bring the Seth in; she probably has the idea that the demand may offend Ram Lal and hence decides to resort to an indirect and polite way. However, this indirectness and tentativeness is not there in the ST clause, where we see Saugandhi making the demand in a direct and to-the-point manner.

As regards Hasan's translation, a visible shift is the omission of the clause complex *if you let a man stay at your place even once, I will grab you by your hair and show you out*. This is indicative of a text-wide strategy whereby Hasan keeps the basic message intact (in the present case, for example, the basic message is Madhu's warning to Saugandhi to not go back to prostitution) but omits some detail from it. Another important aspect of Hasan's translation of the ST passage is to avoid clearly mentioning the human agent (Madhu) involved in an activity (sending money to Saugandhi). Thus, instead of *I will send you the money*, we have *the money will be on its way*, whereby Madhu, the human agent involved in the activity, is not mentioned. A couple of other examples of this tendency to anonymise human agency, or making it less visible, include translating *as soon as **someone** said a soft word… a soft phrase…to her she at once melt and spread in other parts of her body* as ***it** only took a few sweet words, softly cooed into her ear, to make her melt* and *I have come to take something that **I** cannot take* as *I have come looking for something **which** really cannot be had*. Apart from replacing human agency by an abstract thing in the examples above, Ratan also adopts the strategy of shifting active voice to passive

voice to anonymise or passivise the human agency involved in an activity. There are as many as 31 occurrences of this shift in the translation, including the shift from *Madhu was going to come from Poona* to *Madhu was expected from Poona* and *no one with an ugly face will stay here* to *no one with a mug like his is allowed on this wall*. This suppression of human agency somewhat (we say *somewhat* because there are also a number of places where, following the ST, human participants are presented as actively engaged in activities and events) shifts the portrayal of human agents as active, responsible participants to the portrayal of them as passive participants in, or even absent from, activities and events.

8.3.2 Interpersonal Metafunction:

The following tables show a frequency comparison of the modal verbs and adjuncts of the ST with that of the translations:

Type	ST	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
Can	18	29	25	18
May	4	5	3	2
Should	3	4	8	4
Must	1	1	7	2
Might	0	2	1	2
Has/have to	4	4	4	2
Need not	0	0	1	0
To allow	1	1	1	0
Total	**31 (2.52%)**	**46 (3.86%)**	**50 (4.89%)**	**30 (4.06%)**

Table 8.8 Frequency of Modal Verbs in *Hatak* and the TTs

Type	ST	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
Usuality	10	4	6	21
Temporality	34	37	18	15
Probability	5	5	2	5
Intensity	43	31	42	22
Obviousness	1	1	1	2
Opinion/impression	4	3	4	1
Total	**97 (7.89%)**	**81 (6.81%)**	**73 (7.13%)**	**66 (9.02%)**

Table 8.9 Frequency of Modal Adjuncts in *Hatak* and the TTs

The frequency statistics above suggest that Naqvi uses more modal verbs and adjuncts than the other translators. However, as the translations by Ratan and Hasan, especially by the latter, are quite shorter than Naqvi's, it is expectable to have a reduced number

of modal verbs and adjuncts in them. However, to have an exact estimation for the sake of comparison between the translations, we have divided the number of modal verbs/modal adjuncts in each translation with the number of clauses in the translation and multiplied by 100:

Number of modal verbs / number of clauses * 100
Number of modal adjuncts / number of clauses * 100

The resultant percentages shown in the row t*otal* in the table above indicate that both Ratan's and Hasan's translations actually have more density of modal verbs and adjuncts than Naqvi's translation. This also indicates that both the translations tend to add modal verbs and adjuncts to the text. This is especially the case with Hasan's translation which has the highest percentage of modal adjuncts. We, thus, need to see the individual occurrences of additions more closely to appreciate the patterns and meanings emerging from the micro-level linguistic makeup of the translations.

In Ratan's translation, for example, *do you know what you are bargaining with me about?* becomes *do you **really** know what you are bargaining over?* and *I drank a lot* becomes *it's the drink, **perhaps**, **I think** I took a little too much*. The ST clauses, without any modal verbs and adjuncts, indicate conviction on the part of the speaker. However, the modality added in the corresponding TT clauses makes the statements tentative and reflects the speaker's lack of conviction and certainty. We find this tendency in Naqvi's translation as well, where, for example, *Saugandhi was not as clever as she pretended to be* becomes *Saugandhi was not **really** as clever as she thought she was*. Similarly, *what is the relation between us? Nothing* becomes *what binds us together? Nothing, **really*** and *he did not say anything about my face* becomes *he **never really** said anything about my appearance*. In these examples, the addition of *really* and *never* makes the text less certain than in the corresponding ST clauses. Looking closely at the added modal verbs and adjuncts in Hasan's translation, we see that this tendency of making statements tentative is more frequent and varied in his translation than in other translations. It is *varied* because Hasan does not only use *really* (3 occurrences in Hasan's translation) to show a lack of conviction; he does so by adding other modal verbs and adjuncts as well, such as *perhaps* (3 occurrences), *might*, *I think* (2 occurrences), *maybe*, *obviously*, *in fact*, and *almost* (2 occurrences).

Just as an example, the phrase *just ten rupees* is translated as *ten rupees, perhaps*. The use of the modal adjunct of intensity *just* in the ST induces stress and intensity in the statement and shows the speaker's conviction and confidence. However, by shifting it by the low probability *perhaps*, Hasan makes the statement tentative and lacking conviction. These shifts across the text change the the ST perspective to some extent, whereby the text is presented as demonstrating less conviction on the part of the speaker.

8.3.3 Textual Metafunction:

In Section 8.3.1 above, we observed Naqvi shift the ST passive agency to a more responsible and active human agency and Hasan shift it to a more suppressed and anonymous human agency. Placement of participants in the topical theme position plays a key role in this regard, and this is what we will further elaborate here. Consider the following two clause complexes:

Example 8.14:

ST	Literal Translation	Naqvi's Translation	Ratan's Translation	Hasan's Translation
اس میں شک نہیں کہ **اس کا رنگ روپ** اب وہ نہیں رہا تھا **جو** آج سے پانچ سال پہلے تھا جب کہ وہ تمام فکروں سے آزاد اپنے ماں باپ کے ساتھ رہا کرتی تھی۔	It is without a doubt that **her complexion** was not what **it** used to be five years ago when **she** used to live with her parents free from any worries.	It was true **she** was no longer as attractive as **she** had been five years ago when **she** lived with her parents.	True, **her complexion and her face** were not what **they** used to be five years ago when **she** used to live with her parents without a care in the world.	While it was true that **the bloom of her early youth** was gone, nobody had even said she was ugly.
میں ایسی چیز لینے آیا جو **میں** لے ہی نہیں سکتا۔	"**I** have come to take something which **I** cannot really take."	"**I**'m here to take something **I** cannot really take."	"**I**'ve come to ask for something **which does not even exist**."	"**I** have come looking for **something which** really cannot be had."

In the first clause complex, Naqvi replaces *her complexion* by *she* (i.e. Saugandhi) two times, thereby presenting the human agent in the theme position. The shift gives Saugandhi more visibility than she has in the ST clause complex. Ratan, however, chooses to keep the ST lack of human visibility intact by following the ST thematic structure closely. Hasan's translation offers another case where Hasan chooses to summarise the ST information, with the effect that the main message of Saugandhi's

complexion losing its bloom is retained in the TT but the last two clauses *it used to be five years ago* and *when she used to live with her parents free from any worries* are omitted. Apart from this visible shift, the translation, like the ST and Ratan's translation, keeps the mention of Saugandhi's complexion in the topical theme position. In the second clause, Naqvi keeps the human agent (Saugandhi) in the topical theme position as in the ST. However, both Ratan and Hasan keep Saugandhi in the topical theme position in the first clause but replace it with *which* (i.e. *something*) in the next clause. With this shift, the visibility and responsibility that Saugandhi has in the corresponding clause complexes in the ST and Naqvi's translation are lost.

The translations of both the clause complexes above indicate Naqvi's preference to keep human agency in the theme position. This thematic organisation in the TT, as mentioned earlier, assigns more visibility and responsibility to human agency than in the ST.

As the examples above show, Ratan adopts a mixed approach towards agency. Sometimes, he replaces non-human agents in the topical theme position by human agents, as manifested in the shift from *money* to *you* (Saugandhi) and *goodness* to *me*n. Sometimes, he does the otherwise, as demonstrated in the shift from *Saugandhi* to *a stale bitterness*, *I* (Ram Lal) to *two hours*, and *Saugandhi* to *her eyes*. As regards Hasan, the examples above show him prefer non-human agents in the topical theme position, as manifested in the shift from *Madhu* to *every visit by Madhu*, *he* (Madhu) to *his remarks*, and *Saugandhi* to *everything*. The strategy leads to suppression of agency, which we noted in 8.3.1 as well.

8.3.4 Concluding Remarks:

Through the analysis above, we can deduce the following:

- At the ideational level, contrary to what the frequency statistics say, we see Naqvi engaged in introducing a few significant shifts. Firstly, she changes the agency by replacing ST suppressed agency by explicit agency; human agency is given more visibility and responsibility in the TT. Secondly, she shifts direct

narration in the ST to indirect narration, and she also enfeebles the conviction that we see the ST display. Thirdly, she comparatively reduces the action in the story by using more relational processes and fewer material processes than the ST. Ratan, like Naqvi, shifts ST directness and certainty to indirectness and tentativeness to some extent. However, he does not demonstrate many shifts with regard to agency. However, a visible tendency in his translation is to omit clauses and passages, including those which help build a character profile of Saugandhi. Hasan, like Naqvi, reduces action. However, in contrast to Naqvi opting for more active human agency, Hasan tends to shift active agency into suppressed agency. He does so by (1) replacing a human agent by an abstract idea and (2) turning active clauses to passive clauses. Finally, he, though keeping the main message largely intact, tends to omit clauses, and even passages, mostly related to highlighting the feelings and emotions of Saugandhi. In other words, he mostly presents a gist of how the surrounding events impact the inner world of Saugandhi, instead of detailing it as much as the ST does. Considering these finds, we can conclude that all three translations change the ideational meaning to a significant level, and hence all of them are not quite successful in retaining ST style at the ideational level. However, Naqvi's translation, with much fewer omissions, is comparatively more successful than the other two translations. Comparing the effect of omissions by Hasan and Ratan, we can conclude that Hasan's translation, by at least presenting a gist of the events and activities in the text, is comparatively more successful than Ratan's translation.

- At the interpersonal level, all three translators tend to shift ST conviction into tentativeness. Hasan does this more often and uses not only *really* (the main tool for Naqvi and Ratan to show less conviction than the ST) but also several other modal verbs and adjuncts (8.3.2). The shift pattern identified in all three translations makes it clear that all the translations are only semi-successful in retaining the ST style at the interpersonal level. However, Hasan's translation, with more shifts, is least successful, Ratan's translation is more successful than Hasan's, and Naqvi's, with the least shifts, is more successful than the other two translations.

- At the textual level, Naqvi's tendency of placing human agency in theme gives the various characters, including the main characters *Saugandhi* and *Madhu*,

more visibility and responsibility than in the ST. Ratan and Hasan adopt a mixed approach in this regard, whereby they sometimes replace a non-human agent in the topical theme position by a human agent and sometimes do the otherwise. Considering these tendencies, as well as the findings in Chapter 7 regarding the success of translations in terms of transferring ST style at textual level, we can conclude that, although all three translations are not quite successful at the textual level, Naqvi's translation is comparatively more successful in comparison to the other two translations; in turn, Ratan's translation is comparatively more successful than that of Hasan.

In this chapter, we have discussed the relative success of the three translations in rendering the ST style at ideational, interpersonal, and textual levels. In the next chapter, based on these findings, as well as those in Chapter 5, 6, and 7, we will share some general trends and conclusions inferred from the analysis.

Chapter 9: Conclusion

The present research is original and pioneering in a few aspects. One aspect of its originality relates to the current practice of research on style in translation. Whereas the translation style researchers using the SFL-based approaches have been focusing on exploring narrative style, the present study shows how SFL can be used to explore style in terms of expression of the subject matter as well. Also, in reference to the current body of research in Urdu translation studies, the research is a pioneering SFL-based investigation of style.

The first question that we sought to answer through our study was what aspects of the personality and style of Manto and his translators we can learn from their fields and habitus, including biography, personal inclination, contemporary and recent political and literary movements, education and profession, and work reception. In Chapter 2, we saw brevity, conversational and informal style, simple diction, repetition (our analysis also testifies these four to be more or less the characteristic style of Manto; also, the traces of these were also found in our enquiry into the biographical, educational, professional, politico-literary influences on Manto), free association of thought and stream of consciousness, symbolism, use of first-person narration, and sarcasm and irony (these four aspects of his style were either not present in our corpus or were out of the scope of our study) reported by critics as constituents of Manto's style. As our analysis shows, there are aspects of his style related to the transitivity, modality, cohesive, and thematic structures of his short stories which hitherto have not been explored. In our limited corpus, we have identified some of these aspects of Manto's style specific to the texts under discussion, but a future corpus-based study with a bigger corpus than ours would be helpful in exploring his style across a number of texts and thus identifying any characteristic or habitual features. Now, as regards the translators, we have noticed that meagre detail is available in reference to the personality and style of the translators. However, we have been able to identify some external factors which may have influenced their style and translation choices. These factors include their professional background, lack of stringent publisher and editorial requirements, and purpose of translating Manto. These may have provided an impetus for Ratan and Hasan to freely add and omit ST detail. Both of them were not professional translators and did not seem to have a strong literary background or

training. They started translating writers seemingly with the predominant aim of introducing them and their work to the English-speaking world outside the Indo-Pak region. Contrary to them, Naqvi read literature as a subject at university level and has been teaching Urdu language at the universities in the USA for decades now. Considering her strong relevant background, she is likely to have a good know-how of the local demands of the literary and translation industry, which probably is why she tries to stay close to the stylistic features of the ST.

Our second question was how an SFL-based analysis contributes to the available body of critique on Manto's and the translators' style. As we pointed out in 2.4, the critique of Manto's style is largely based on impressions and subjectivity, and a linguistic-oriented, objective analysis has not been conducted. Particularly, in-depth analysis of micro-level of linguistic choices and their macro-level stylistic impact is completely missing from the available body of critique. The same is the case with the critique of the translators. The analysis in the present study shows how an SFL-based exploration of the micro-level linguistic choices and macro-level patterns gives us the opportunity to study style objectively and empirically. As our analysis reveals, our claims about Manto's style in the selected short stories are based on quantitative, frequency analysis and a close reading of individual examples. For example, when we pointed out in Chapter 5 that Manto creates an atmosphere of anonymity and uncertainty in his short story Toba Tek Singh, we came at this conclusion through a close analysis of patterns at the ideational, interpersonal, and textual levels. At the ideational level, for example, we noted a proliferation of agent-less material processes in the three opening paragraphs, consistent use of non-deictic noun phrases not clearly specifying an agent, and certain inanimate nouns acting as agents (where the actual, human agents are not mentioned). This statistics-based close analysis enables us to defend our claims with the help of objective and sound arguments. Following the same line of enquiry, we explored the micro-level linguistic choices made by the translators and their macro-level stylistic effects. This helped us to discern how the translators rendered the ST style and identify the various translation strategies, including normalization, addition, omission, and explicitation, they adopted in the process. Such an objective and systematic line of investigation of style in reference to Urdu has been missing from literary and translation criticism, and the present study not only fills this gap but, hopefully, will also inspire relevant future research. Finally, another advantage of our

SFL-based analysis over the past research and criticism on Manto's style is that it helps to identify elements of style (just for example, use of non-deictic nouns in a way to avoid explicitly mentioning a human agent) which the traditional literary criticism does not identify.

The third question motivating our study was how successfully the translators render the ST style in reference to reproducing the subject matter or central idea and macro-level effects. In Chapter 5, 6, 7, we assessed the success of each translation separately against the corresponding ST. On the basis of this analysis, we can draw some conclusions, as discussed below.

9.1 Success of the Translations of *Toba Tek Singh*:

Through the use of agent-less processes, non-deictic noun phrases, and certain inanimate nouns not referring to a human agent, the ST creates a stylistic effect of anonymity and uncertainty. This effect reinforces the subject matter of the story which is related to the confusion and uncertainty that erupts in a Lahore lunatic asylum once the news of an impending exchange reaches there. Slight variations aside, all the translators follow the ST in using agent-less material processes, non-deictic noun phrases, and anonymous nouns to retain the effect of anonymity and uncertainty. Considering this, we can conclude that all three translations are successful at the ideational level.

At the interpersonal level, Naqvi's translation, with retaining most of the ST modal verbs and adjuncts, but omitting some important adjuncts of negation as well as partially retaining the ST informal style, is semi-successful. Ratan chooses to add modal verbs and adjuncts, which give an increased sense of probability and ability/inability to the TT. Similarly, he tends to use a formal style, instead of retaining the informal ST style. However, he retains all adjuncts of negation, thereby retaining the meaning and effects they help produce in the ST. Given these findings, we can call Ratan's translation semi-successful. Hasan's translation reveals a tendency to (1) have an increased sense of probability, intensity, and ability, (2) add personal opinions and ideologies which shift ST objectivity and neutrality to partiality, and (3) omit certain important adjuncts of negation. Based on these findings, we can conclude

that Hasan's translation is more or less unsuccessful in retaining the ST style at the interpersonal level.

At the textual level, all three translators partially retain ST lexical repetition. Similarly, all three use unmarked themes. However, the translations demonstrate a mixed approach towards ST topical theme structure and the placement of spatiotemporal adjuncts in theme. Considering these findings, we can say that all three translations are only partially successful in this regard.

9.2 Success of the Translations of *Neya Qanoon*:

Naqvi's translation displays a striking similarity with ST transitivity and modality structures. The tendency helps her retain ST treatment of the subject matter at both ideational and interpersonal levels to a large extent. As for Ratan, though he tends to add mental and relevant non-mental processes, he overall retains ST style at the ideational level. At the interpersonal level, however, his translation demonstrates some shifts, such as from conviction to tentativeness, and he also adds evaluative judgements. Hasan tends to omit clauses and even paragraphs, including those which help build a character profile of Mangoo. Also, with more relational, and fewer material processes, he slows down the pace of action in his translation. As regards modality, Hasan, like Ratan, shifts from conviction to tentativeness and also adds modality of ability. Considering these findings, we conclude that Naqvi's translation is successful in retaining ST style at both ideational and interpersonal levels; Ratan's translation is successful at the ideational level, but semi-successful at the interpersonal level; and Hasan's translation is not successful at the ideational level, but semi-successful at the interpersonal level.

At the textual level, whereas both Naqvi and Ratan retain most of the ST lexical items from the semantic fields of happiness, newness, and brightness, Hasan omits most of them. Then, all three translations follow the ST in keeping themes unmarked. Similarly, all translations more or less retain the topical theme structure; however, Ratan and Hasan show a tendency to promote Mangoo to the topical theme position. As for spatiotemporal adjuncts in theme position, none of the translations retains the

ST structure. Considering this mixed approach adopted by the three translators, we can conclude that all of them are semi-successful at this level.

9.3 Success of the Translations of *Hatak*:

At the ideational level, Naqvi's translation shows similarity with the ST transitivity structure, and hence it overall retains the ST treatment of the subject matter in this regard. Ratan, on the other hand, tends to omit clauses and even passages, and doing so does not retain some important detail, especially that related to picturing Saugandhi as a loving personality and depicting her inner suffering and anguish when the Seth rejects her. It is noteworthy that similar observations have been made by certain critics of his other translations. Particularly, commenting on his translation of the Urdu short story *Lajwanti* written by a contemporary writer Rajinder Singh Bedi, Francisco (M.U. Memon's "An Epic Unwritten") remarks that Ratan has omitted several paragraphs which

> not only flatten the picture of Sundar Lal's imagination of Lajwanti's suffering, but also the dimensions of Lajwanti's sorrow. Indeed, the omitted sections contain some of the story's most poignant descriptions--of the humiliation and shame of women made into chattel by the "cold-blooded people who traded in human merchandise, in human flesh" during the Partition (Memon, p. 24).

Considering our findings as well as those by others, an omission of important detail bearing on the subject matter seems to be a habitual aspect of Ratan's style.

Hasan also omits a number of clauses and passages, but he is careful not to omit any important detail altogether. What he does is give a summary of lengthy passages. Another tendency he shows is reducing action in his translation as compared to the ST and also changing the ST human agency at some places. Given these findings, we can conclude that, whereas Naqvi's translation is successful at the ideational level, Ratan's and Hasan's translations are only semi-successful in this regard.

At the interpersonal level, though Naqvi's translation only partially retains the ST role of the modal verb can, it more or less keeps the overall ST evaluative perspective along the development of plot and characterization intact. Ratan also partially retains the ST role of can. Moreover, unlike Naqvi, he shows some significant omission in reference to the ST evaluative perspective. Hasan, heavily using the opposing strategies of addition and omission, introduces several shifts at the interpersonal level, including shifting ST declarative clauses into those showing probability, ability, and obligation; adding conviction; and partially retaining the ST evaluative perspective. He also tones down the strong language and swearing used in the ST. As these findings reveal, Naqvi's translation overall retains the ST style at the interpersonal level, Ratan's translation is semi-successful in this regard, and Hasan's translation is not successful.

At the textual level, whereas Naqvi overall retains the ST emphasis on body parts and lexical words reflecting insult and hatred, both Ratan and Hasan tone down these effects. With regard to thematic placement of spatiotemporal adjuncts and the corresponding effects on the subject matter, all three translations overall fail to retain the effects. A slight exception is when Naqvi uses seven, Ratan six, and Hasan four marked themes by the beginning of the respective translations in an attempt to retain the thematic position of some of the spatial adjuncts. Considering these findings, we can conclude that, whereas Naqvi's translation is semi-successful in rendering ST style at the textual level, both the other translations are not successful.

As the conclusions above reveal, translations mostly show different levels of success at ideational, interpersonal, and textual planes. So, if a translation is successful in rendering the ST style in terms of, say, ideational metafunction, it may not be that successful in reference to, say, textual metafunction. It thus seems difficult to declare a translation fully successful or fully unsuccessful (though, ideally, we can have such a translation) as a whole. What seems more realistic is to assess the ideational, interpersonal, and textual structures of a translation separately, and also draw separate conclusions about the success or unsuccess of a translation. Of course, if the conclusions for the three metafunctions match, we can then draw a unified or holistic conclusion as well.

Our findings show some general trends adopted by the translators. For example, Naqvi more often than not opts for literal translation. The strategy makes it possible for her to retain much of the ST style at the three metafunctional levels (the case of thematic placement of spatiotemporal adjuncts is an exception, and is largely dependent on language specifics). Hasan, on the other hand, generally tends to omit clauses and paragraphs, because of which he usually does not render the ST style successfully. This is especially the case with his translation of *Hatak*, where we find his translation unsuccessful at both the interpersonal and textual levels and only somewhat successful at the ideational level. As for Ratan, he oscillates between close and free translation. The obvious outcome is that he translates the ST style sometimes successfully and sometimes unsuccessfully. Another general tendency we have observed in our analysis is that Hasan tends to use informal style, because of which his translations have a number of colloquial words, contracted forms (such as I'm, you're, and you'd), and clauses without the subject. It should be remembered that these general trends are based on our analysis of the translations in our corpus, and a study based on a bigger corpus and computer-assisted corpus tools would help identify whether or not these trends reflect the general writing style of the translators.

Our last research question was how to gauge the relative success of the translations, that is to say, the success of the translations in rendering the ST style in relation to each other. To this aim, we took a closer look at contrasting shift patterns and translation strategies, and as a result, we were able to draw conclusions about how successful the translations were in comparison to each other. Our conclusions are more or less in line with the findings and conclusions for Chapter 5, 6, and 7. We have found Naqvi's translation to be more successful than the other translators and Hasan's translation the least successful, whereas Ratan's translation is mostly less successful than Naqvi's but more successful than Hasan's.

Through the contrastive analysis, we were also able to identify the main contrasting strategies used by the translators. Naqvi mostly uses literal translation and compensation, and she often gives comparatively more visibility and responsibility to human agency than the ST. In the case of Hasan, omission and informal, conversational language are the main tendencies. Ratan, as noted earlier, oscillates between different strategies.

9.4 Limitations and Further Research:

As clarified in 3.3, our analysis was limited to evaluating the primary meaning. This was carried out to make our analysis more rigorous, objective, and recursive. However, a future study can aim at exploring both the primary and implied meanings by supplementing SFL analysis with cognitive approaches. Also, the stylistic effects we explored in our analysis were intra-textual, in that they were an outcome of the micro-level lexicogrammatical patterns of the text and were explorable from the primary meaning. However, a future research can incorporate a reader-response approach to explore the effect of a literary translation on its readers. This line of enquiry would also help the researcher compare the findings of the researcher's systematic analysis with the interpretation of the actual readers.

It should also be pointed out that our research aimed at conducting a comprehensive manual analysis of the selected short stories and their translations, so that the texts could be studied minutely and comprehensively. However, it is unlikely to do the same with bigger texts, especially novels, and hence for such texts, it would be logical and helpful for researches to incorporate a computer-based corpus approach.

Finally, we should point out that no research, no matter how systematic, can be devoid of subjectivity, as Fowler (1987, p. 72) comments:

> But there is a common misconception that linguistics -any linguistics- is a kind of automatic analyzing device which, fed a text, will output a description without human intervention.... linguistic analysis is a flexible, directed operation completely under the control of its users, who can direct it towards any goals which are within the scope of the model being used. Complete human control is possible if you carefully theorize the nature of your objective, and the nature of the object you are studying.

The present research is no exception. Some of the visible subjective elements in the research include construing authorial intention as the primary meaning, considering the subject an integral part of the theme in all cases, and mostly basing identification of processes on semantics or meaning, instead of grammar. However, in spite of the subjectivity, the model of analysis is well-defined, systematic, and reasonably

objective, and hence the findings can be supported with facts and figures and sound arguments.

9.5 Expectations:

The researcher expects that this pioneering research in reference to Urdu will inspire further systematic and SFL-based stylistic analyses of Urdu literary texts and their translations or vice versa. We also hope that this first PhD research in Urdu translation studies produced outside of the regions of Pakistan and India will inspire more researchers to carry out postgraduate research in this highly under-researched area at Western universities. We also hope that, through the increased interest in studying translation in reference to Urdu, translation studies departments at Western universities will, along with other major languages, be able to offer Urdu expertise to potential undergraduate and postgraduate translation studies students.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Flemming, L. 1985a. *The life and works of Saadat Hassan Manto: Another lonely voice*. Lahore: Vanguard Publications.

Hasan, K. 2008. *Bitter fruit: the very best of Saadat Hasan Manto*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.

Jalal, H. trans. [1956] 1997. *Black Milk*. Lahore: Sang-e-Mil Publications.

Manto, S.H. *Manto ke Afsaane*. 1941. Lahore: Maktaba Urdu.

Manto, S.H. *Phundane*. 1955. Lahore: Maktaba Jadid.

Ratan, J. 1989. *The best of Manto: a collection of his short stories*. New York, NY: Sterling Publishers.

Secondary Sources:

Abbas, H. 2006. "Pakistan's Top Ten Columnists." [Online]. [Accessed 20 January 2019]. Available from: https://pakistaniat.com/2006/08/15/pakistans-top-ten-columnists/

Ahmad, A. 2012. Saadat Hasan Manto, Bare Saghir ka takhliki zameer. In: Saleem, A. comp. & ed. *Manto—hamare ehad ka takhliki zameer*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, pp. 11-45.

Akbar, M.S. "Khalid Hasan, great journalist, great man." [Online]. [Accessed 20 January 2019]. Available from:
https://gmcmissing.wordpress.com/2009/02/07/khalid-hasan-great-journalist-great-man/

Akhtar, S. 1991. Manto khatut k aine me. In: Qasmi, A.N. comp. *Manto ke khatut Nadeem ke naam*. 3rd ed. Lahore: Pakistan Books and Literary Sounds, pp. 09-25.

Alekseyenko, N. 2013. *A corpus-ba.sed study of theme and thematic progression in English and Russian non-translated texts and in Russian translated texts.* Ph.D. thesis, Kent State University.

Ali, Z. 2004. Writing for women. *Mehraab*. **4**(2). [Online]. [Accessed 18 January 2019]. Available from:

http://www.mehraab.com/Article.asp?FilePath=Feb2004\Writingforwomen.htm

Alvi, W. 2003. *Manto: ek mutaleya*. Islamabad: Alhamra Publishing.

Alvi, W. 2012. Manto ka fun .... heyato maut ki awezish. In: Saleem, A. comp. & ed. *Manto—hamare ehad ka takhliki zameer*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, pp. 92-110.

Amjad, R. 2011. Urdu afsana aur asri agahi. *Takhliqi Adab*. **8**, pp. 373-378.

Asaduddin, M. 1996. Manto flattened: an assessment of Khalid Hasan's translations. *The Annual of Urdu Studies*. **11**, pp. 129-139.

Ash'ar, M. 2012. Sab se bari hasti hai shaitan. In: Farkhi, A. ed. *Manto ka aadmi naama*. Karachi: A. G. Printing Services, pp. 166-173.

Azeem, S.W. 1982. *Manto ka fun*. New Dehli: Ijaz Publishing House.

Bache, C. 1997. *Mastering English: an advanced grammar for non-native and native speakers*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baig, M.H. 2011. Urdu afsane ke asaleebe beyan. *Takhliqi Adab*. **8**, pp. 379-387.

Bailey, T.G. 1932. *A history of Urdu literature*. Calcutta: Association Press.

Baker, M. 2000. Towards a methodology for investigating the style of a literary translator. *Target*. **12**(2), pp. 241-266.

Baldick, C. 2001. *The concise Oxford dictionary of literary terms*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Berry, M. 1987. The functions of place names. In: Turville-Petre, T. and Gelling, M. ed. *Leeds studies in English: new series xviii: studies in honour of Kenneth Cameron*. Leeds: School of English, University of Leeds, pp. 71-88.

Berry, M. 1995. Thematic options and success in writing. In: Ghadessy, M. ed. *Thematic Development in English Texts*. London: Pinter, pp. 55–84.

Berry, M. 1996. What is Theme? A(nother) personal view. In: Berry, M., Fawcett, R. & Huang, G. eds. *Meaning and Form: Systemic Functional Interpretations*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Company, pp. 1-64.

Bhalla, A. 2001. The politics of translation: Manto's partition stories and Khalid Hasan's English version. *Social Scientist*. **29**(338-339), pp. 19-38.

Bhatt, R., Bogel, T., Butt, M., Hautli, A., & King, T. H. 2011. Urdu/Hindi Modals. In: Butt, M. & King, T.H. eds. *Proceedings of the LFG11 conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, pp. 47-67.

Bloor, T. and Bloor, M. 2004. *The functional analysis of English*. 2nd ed. London: Arnold.

Boase-Beier, J. 2004. Translation and style. *Language and Literature (special edition)*. **13**(1). pp. 5-95.

Boase-Beier, J. 2006. *Stylistic approaches to translation*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Bosseaux, C. 2007. *How does it feel? Point of view in translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, Massatussets: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The logic of practice*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1996. *The rules of art: genesis and structure of the literary field*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Brian, R. 2015. *Style: an introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy*. Anderson, South Carolina: Parlor Press and The WAC Clearinghouse.

Bukhari, A.S. 2006. *Saadat Hasan Manto (tehqiq)*. Lahore: Manto Academy.

Butler, P. 2008. *Out of style: reanimating stylistic study in composition and rhetoric*. Utah: Utah State University Press.

Butt, M. 2014. Questions and information structure in Urdu/Hindi. In: Butt, M. & King, T.H. eds. *Proceedings of the LFG14 conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, pp. 158-178.

Carducci, B.J. 2009. *The psychology of personality: viewpoints, research, and applications*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Coupland, N. 2007. *Style: language variation and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Darvesh, S. 2012. Manto, usloob, aur Tahira Iqbal. In: Iqbal, T. *Manto ka usloob: afsanon ke hawale se*. Lahore: Fiction House.

Davies, F., 1994. From writer roles to elements of text: interactive, organisational and topical. In: Barbara, L. & Scott, M. eds. *Reflections on language learning*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, pp. 170-183.

Davies, F. 1997. Marked theme as a heuristic for analysing text-type, text and genre. In: Pique, J. & Viera, D. eds. *Applied languages: theory and practice in ESP*.

Universitat de Valencia: Servei de Publications Universitat de Valencia, pp. 45-71.

Delacy, R. 1998. *Hindi & Urdu Phrasebook*. 2nd ed. Victoria: Lonely Planet Publications.

Derewianka, B. 1990. *Exploring how texts work*. Newtown NSW: Primary English Teaching Association.

van Dijk, T.A. 2008. *Discourse and context: a sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eggins, S. 2004. *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. 2nd ed. New York and London: Continuum.

Ekbal, N. 2009. *Great Muslims of undivided India*. Delhi: Kalpaz Publications.

Enkvist, N.E. 1973. *Linguistic Stylistics*. The Hague: Mouton Press.

Fawcett, R.P. 2000. *A theory of syntax for systemic functional linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fawcett, R.P. 2009. Seven problems to beware of when analyzing Processes and Participant Roles in texts. In: Slembrouck, S., Taverniers, M. and van Herreweghe, M. eds. *From will to well: studies in linguistics, offered to Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen*. Gent: Academia Press, pp. 209–224.

Flemming, L. 1985b. Manto bibliography. *Journal of South Asian Literature*. **20**(2). pp. 152-160.

Fowler, R. 1986. *Linguistic criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fowler, R. 1987. Studying literature as language. In: Barry, P. ed. *Issues in Contemporary Literary Theory*. Houndmills: Macmillan, pp. 70-81.

Fowler, R. 1995. *The language of George Orwell*. London: Macmillan Press.

Francisco, J. [n.d.]. "M.U. Memon's "an epic unwritten" -- a review essay." [Online]. [Accessed 18 January 2019]. Available from: http://jasonfrancisco.net/review-essay--mu-memons-an-epic-unwritte.

Gwilliams, L. and Fontaine, L. 2015. Indeterminacy in process type classification. *Functional Linguistics*. [Online]. **2**(8). [Accessed 11 July 2018]. Available from: https://functionallinguistics.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40554-015-0021-x.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1971. Linguistic function and literary style: an enquiry into the language of William Golding's 'The Inheritors'. In: Chatman, S. ed. *Literary style: a symposium*. New York: Oxford University Press. 330-368.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2004. *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. 3rd ed. New York and London: Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. 1989. *Language context and text: aspects of language in a social semiotic perspective*. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press.

Hannah, S. 2016. *Bourdieu in translation studies: the socio-cultural dynamics of Shakespeare translation in Egypt*. London: Routledge.

Hasan, K, trans. 1991. *Partition: sketches and stories*. New York: Viking.

Hasan, R. 1989. *Linguistics, language, and verbal art*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford Universtiy Press.

Hasan, R. 2015. Ways of saying: ways of meaning. In: Cloran, C., Butt, D., and Williams, G. Eds. *Ways of saying: ways of meaning: selected papers of Ruqaiya Hasan*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 191-242.

Hasan, R. and Fries, P.H. 1995. Reflections on subject and theme: an introduction. In: Hasan, R. & Fries, P.H. eds. *On subject and theme: a discourse functional perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. Xiii-Xlv.

Hashmi, A.M. 2013. Manto's world – part II. *The Friday Times*. **XXIV**(51). [Online]. 1-7 February. [Accessed 30 April 2013]. Available from: http://www.thefridaytimes.com/beta3/tft/article.php?issue=20130201&page=22

Hatim, B. 1997. *Communication across cultures: translation theory and contrastive text linguistics*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Haulti-Janisz, A., King, T. H. and Ramchand, G. 2015. Encoding event structure in Hindi/Urdu VerbNet. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on EVENTS at the NAACL-HLT, 2015*. Denver, Colorado: Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 25–33.

Hermans, T. 1996. The translator's voice in translated narrative. *Target*. **8**(1), pp. 23-48.

House, J. 2015. *Translation quality assessment: past and present*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hussain, S.E. 2009. *Urdu adab ki tanqeedi tareekh*. 7th ed. New Delhi: National Council for Promotion of Urdu Language.

Ijaz, A. comp. 2004. *Top 10 classic afsana nigar*. Lahore: Haider Publications.

Iqbal, T. 2012. *Manto ka usloob: afsanon ke hawale se*. Lahore: Fiction House.

Ispahani, M. 1988. Saadat Hasan Manto. *Grand Street*. **7**(4), pp. 183-193.

Jaan, O.M. 2013. Saadat Hasan Manto kay ashiqe zar kay liye. *Daily Duniya*. [Online]. 23 September. [Accessed 20 April 2013]. Available from: http://www.columnpk.com/ saadat-hasan-manto-kay-ishq-e-zar-kay-liye-by-orya-maqbool-jan/

Jalal, A. 2013. *The pity of partition: Manto's life, times, and work across the India-Pakistan divide*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jamshedpuri, A. 2002. *Taraqipasand Urdu afsaana aur chand aham afsana nigar*. Delhi: Modern Publishing House.

Javed, I. 2009. *Manto, Faiz and Zamurrad are in good company*. [Online]. 22 February. [Accessed 20 Jnuary 2019]. Available from: https://www.punjabics.com/Punjab%20Gallery/Manto%20Faiz%20and%20Zamurrad%20are%20in%20good%20company.htm

Jawaid, B. and Zeman, D. 2011. Word-order issues in English-to-Urdu statistical machine translation. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics*. **95**, pp. 87-106.

Kachru, Y. 2006. *Hindi*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kalo, P. 2012. Ishtaraki adab aur Krishen Chander: tajziati mutaleya. *Takhliqi Adab*. **09**, pp. 244-255.

Khwaja, W. 2012. Poetics of storytelling. *Herald*. [Online]. 18 May. [Accessed 20 April 2013]. Available from: http://herald.dawn.com/2012/05/18/poetics-of-storytelling.html

Klaudy, K. 1998. Explicitation. In: Baker, M. ed. *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 80-84.

Kumar, G. 1997. *The book on trial: fundamentalism and censorship in India*. New Delhi: Har-Anand Publications.

Lahire, B. 2015. The limits of the field: elements for a theory of the social differentiation of activities. In: Hilgers, M. and Mange, E. eds. *Bourdieu's Theory of Social Fields: Concepts and Applications*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 62-101.

Lambrecht, K. 1981. *Topic, antitopic and verb agreement in non-standard French*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Leckie-Tarry, H. 1995. *Language and context: A functional linguistic theory of register*. London and New York: Pinter.

Leech, G. and Short, M. 2007. *Style in fiction: a linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. 2nd ed. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

List of languages by number of native speakers. [Online]. [Accessed 20 August 2018]. Available from:
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
List_of_languages_by_number_of_native_speakers.

Malmkjær, K. 2004. Translational stylistics: Dulcken's translations of Hans Christian Andersen. *Language and Literature*. **13**(1), pp. 13-24.

Manto, S.H. 2007a. Zehmat mehar darakhshan. *Mantonama*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, 351-403.

Manto, S.H. 2007b. Lazat-e-Sang. *Mantonama*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, pp. 613-640.

Manto, S.H. 2007c. Afsana nigar aur jinsi masail. *Mantonama*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, pp. 684-689.

Marco, J. 2004. Translating style and styles of translating: Henry James and Edgar Allan Poe in Catalan. *Language and Literature*. **13**(1), pp. 73-90.

Martin, J.R. 1992. *English text: system and structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Martin, J.R., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. and Painter, C. 1997. *Working with functional grammar*. London: Arnold.

Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. 1992. Interpreting the textual metafunction. In: Davies, M. and Ravelli, L. eds. *Advances in Systemic Linguistics: Recent Theory and Practice*. London: Frances Pinter.

Matthiessen, C.M.I.M, Teruya, K. and Lam, M. 2010. *Key terms in systemic functional linguistics*. London and New York: Continuum.

Millán-Varela, C. 2004. Hearing voices: James Joyce, narrative voice and minority translation. *Language and Literature*. **13**(1), pp. 37-54.

Montgomery, M., Durant, A., Furniss, T., and Mills, S. 2000. *Ways of reading: advanced reading skills for students of English literature*. 2nd Ed. London: Routledge.

Montaut, A. 2016. The discourse particle to and word ordering in Hindi: from grammar to discourse. In: Fernandez-Vest, J.M.M. and Valin, R.D.V. eds. *Information structuring of spoken language from a cross-linguistic perspective.* Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 263-282.

Mufti, M. 2005. Saadat Hasan mar geya, Manto zinda hai. In: Saleem, A. ed. *Saadat Hasan mar geya, Manto zinda hai*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, pp. 140-142.

Muhammad, S. 2002. *Education and politics: From Sir Syed to the present day (the Aligarh School)*. New Delhi: A.P.H Publishing Corporation.

Munday, J. 2008. *Style and ideology in translation: Latin American writing in English*. New York and London: Routledge.

Naeem, M. 2012. Uniswin saddi me Urdu ke islahi novel: islah, qaumi shanakht aur istamariat. *Takhliqi Adab*. **9**, pp. 283-313.

Nagi, A. 2012. Manto, fasadaat aur hijrat. In: Saleem, A. comp. & ed. *Manto— hamare ehad ka takhliki zameer*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, pp. 211-224.

Naqvi, T. Faculty profile on New York University website. [Accessed 19 January 2019]. Available from: http://as.nyu.edu/faculty/tahira-naqvi.html

Narang, G.C. 1997. Manto reconsidered. In: Bhalla, A. ed. *Life and Works of Saadat Hasan Manto*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, pp. 1-12.

Newmark, P. 1988. *A textbook of translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Nord, C. 1997. *Translating as a purposeful activity: functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Pekkanen, H. 2007. The duet of the author and the translator: looking at style through shifts in literary translation. *New voices in translation studies*. **3**, pp. 1-18.

Piaget, J. 1967. *Six psychological studies*. New York: Vintage Books.

Piaget, J. 1970. Piaget's theory. In Mussen, P.H. ed. *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology*. Vol. 1. 3rd ed. New York: Wiley.

Qadir, M.H. 2001. Fort William College: tarikh k ainey me. *Takhliqi Adab*. **8**, pp. 126-151.

Quraishi, A.S. [n.d]. *Manto (sawanh)*. Lahore: Idara Faroghe Urdu, pp. 13-74.

Rao, V.V.B.R. 2005. Practicing literary translation: a symposium by mail-- second round. *Language in India*. **5**(11). [Online]. [Accessed 18 January 2019]. Available from:

http://languageinindia.com/nov2005/literarysymposiumnov2005-1.html

Ravelli, L. 1995. Metafunctional interaction from a dynamic perspective: implications for the description of theme. In: Hasan, R. & Fries, P.H. eds. *On Subject and*

Theme: From the Perspective of Functions and Discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 187-234.

Reiss, K. 2014. *Translation criticism – the potentials and limitations: categories and criteria for translation quality assessment*. London and New York: Routledge.

Reiss, K. and Vermeer, H.J. 2014. *Towards a general theory of translational action: skopos theory explained*. London and New York: Routledge.

Renowned journalist Khalid Hasan passes away. 6 February 2009. *The Dawn*. [Online]. [Accessed 19 January 2019]. Available from: https://www.dawn.com/news/955761/renowned-journalist-khalid-hasan-passes-away

"Review of kingdom's end and other stories." 1988. [Online]. [Accessed 23 Jan 2019]. Available from: https://www.publishersweekly.com/978-0-86091-183-8

Rockwell, D. 2015. Five timeless translations to read and what bad translations are. [Online]. [Accessed 19 January 2019]. Available from: https://scroll.in/article/743830/five-timeless-translations-to-read-and-what-bad-translations-are

Rustomji-Kerns, R. 2005. Tahira Naqvi. In: Davidson, C and Wagner-Martin, L. eds. *The Oxford companion to women's writing in the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Online]. [Accessed 18 January 2019]. Available from: http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195066081.001.0001/acref-9780195066081-e-0565

Saddiqui, M. 2005. Khud pasand. In: Saleem, A. ed. *Saadat Hasan mar geya, Manto zinda hai*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, pp. 134-138.

Saldanha, G. 2005. *Style of translation: an exploration of stylistic patterns in the translations of Margaret Jull Costa and Peter Bush*. Ph.D. thesis. Dublin City University.

Samiuddin, A, ed. 2007. *Encyclopaedic dictionary of Urdu literature*. Volume II. New Delhi: Global Vision Publishing House.

Schiavi, G. 1996. There is always a teller in a tale. *Target*. **8**(1), pp. 1-21.

Shahid, M.H. 2012. Urdu afsana, Manto aur nei tabeer --- magar Manto zinda hai. In: Farkhi, A. ed. *Manto ka aadmi naama*. Karachi: A. G. Printing Services, pp. 89-104.

Sharma, A. 2004. Interview of Jai Ratan. *The Tribune*. [Online]. [Accessed 19 June 2019]. Available from:

Shireen, M. 2012a. Manto ka taghayyur, irtaka aur funny takmeel. In: Saleem, A. comp. & ed. *Manto—hamare ehad ka takhliki zameer*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, pp. 115-29.

Shireen, M. 2012b. Manto aik ekhlaki funkar. In: Saleem, A. comp. & ed. *Manto—hamare ehad ka takhliki zameer*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, pp. 206-210.

Snell-Hornby, M. 1995. *Translation studies: an integrated approach*. Revised edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stainton, C. 1993. *Metadiscourse and the analytical text- a genre based approach to children's written discourse*. Ph.D. thesis. University of Manchester.

Tang, M.Y. 2012. Saadat Hassan Manto ki afsana nigari. In: Saleem, A. comp. & ed. *Manto—hamare ehad ka takhliki zameer*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, pp. 225-34.

"The crooked line by Ismat Chughtai: Translated from the Urdu by Tahira Naqvi." *Of Books and Reading*. [Online Blog]. [Accessed 1 May 2013]. Available from: https://thehungryreader.wordpress.com/2017/08/11/the-crooked-line-by-ismat-chughtai-translated-from-the-urdu-by-tahira-naqvi/

Thompson, G. 2014. *Introducing functional grammar*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.

Toolan, M. 2013. *Language in literature: an introduction to stylistics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Toury, G. 1995. *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Usmani, S.H. 2012. Manto bakalam khud (aik assemblage). *Fikr-o-Tahqeeq*. **3**(15), pp. 333-382.

Venuti, L. 1995. *The translator's invisibility: a history of translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Verdonk, P. 2002. *Stylistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Winter, M. 2005. A corpus-based study of translator style: Oeser's and Orth-Guttmann's German translations of F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Beautiful and Damned*. Ph.D. thesis. Dublin City University.

Yaldram, S.S.H. [no date]. *Kheyalistan*. Delhi: Maktaba Jamia Delhi.