

# Foreignizing And Domesticating Strategies In Translations Of Saadat Hassan Manto's Thanda Gosht By Khalid Hassan And Alok Bhalla

Mr. Asher Ashkar Gohar<sup>1</sup>, Mr. Mubashir Ahmad<sup>2</sup>, Mr. Irfan Ullah Khan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Lecturer in English at Edwardes College Peshawar.

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer in English at Edwardes College Peshawar.

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor in English at Edwardes College, Peshawar.

## Abstract

This paper analyzes English translations of Saadat Hasan Manto's short story Thanda Gosht by Khalid Hasan, a Pakistani journalist and renowned translator of Manto's works, juxtaposed with translation of the same work by Alok Bhalla, also a well-known Indian author and translator. Through this analysis, the research examines the Source Text (SL), and compare it with both of Target Language (TL) translations. Primarily, the paper probes into how far 'sense-for-sense transmission' from SL to the TL occurs in these translations, along with the lexical choices that the aforementioned translators make in order to deliver the essential socio-political meaning that dwells in Manto's satiric writings. In doing so, this study investigates the accuracy of the intended satiric transmission towards TL audience in carrying almost equivalent satiric emotions. As both translators belong to countries, differing widely in their ideological narratives; therefore, the element of 'national ideology' holds, as characters in the short story belong to different religious and social cliques. Hence this paper attempts to illustrate the 'translation strategies' (i.e., foreignizing and domesticating), 'religious' and 'cultural' prejudices, as well as 'equivalence' ratio, of both these translated TL texts in the light of SL text. For this comparative analysis, my theoretical framework will incorporate translation stipulations from Mona Baker's Routledge Encyclopedia for Translation Studies (2005) namely: 'Equivalence'; 'Ideology and Translation'; 'Strategies of Translation'; as well as Susan Bassnett's Translation Studies (2005). The analysis will show how close each translator comes to the SL culture, keeping in view of Manto's judiciously chosen lexical terms, and their cultural significance in the Indo-Pak pre- and post- independence subcontinent.

**Keywords:** Translation strategies; Foreignizing; Domesticating; Equivalence; Ideology.

## Introduction

Foreignizing and Domesticating Strategies in Translations of Saadat Hassan Manto's Thanda Gosht by Khalid Hassan and Alok Bhalla

Saadat Hasan Manto is recognized throughout the subcontinent, and also all over the English-speaking world as one of the masters of Urdu Fiction. Although he has written sketches and dramas as well, but he has been particularly known for his sharp-edged short stories. Manto

being a rational man of who loved his country most, saw the India's partition of 1947 as a smear, with bloodshed across the country of countless human lives. The pain of this partition, and all the massacre it brought along, had a great impact on Manto's mind, and consequently on his writings. In her research article titled Saadat Hasan Manto (published 1988), Mahnaz Ispahani states that Manto wrote in "ugly times... the years of tumultuous and despairing aftermaths... his two

hundred stories... [Where] sanity dances with madness" (Ispahani 183). To capture this "blend" of "sanity and madness" is a mammoth task for any translator of Manto's, who wishes to make Manto speak in his desired Target Language (TL). The reason for this task being so challenging, lies in the very core of what Ispahani notes. Manto's stories are full up to the brim with socio-political satire directed mainly at the partition movement that if, on the one hand, delivered independence, but on the other hand, shed loads of blood across the subcontinent in a struggle between religious ideologies. This paper, therefore, compares Manto's short story *Thanda Gosht* (meaning Cold Meat) (Source Text) with translations of this story by Khalid Hasan, a Pakistani author-translator, and Alok Bhalla who is an Indian professor-author.

The motive behind choosing these two translators is precisely to examine the "Indian-ness" and "Pakistani-ness" (to say more appropriately, their respective post-partition cultural ideologies) that although unintentionally, yet dominates the translators and renders their respective translations into Pro-Pakistani or Pro-Indian in nature, tampering with Manto's neutral outlook in his original. As Susan Bassnet notes in her book *Translation Studies* (published 2005) while describing the mark of a good translator, states: "The translator [...] has to reassemble it in such a way as to incorporate the mode of signification of the original." (Bassnet 13). In this sense, what Bassnet means is that, the translator has to come out of his predetermined notions and his cultural-specific ideology, and transmit the original meaning of the ST author from SL to his translation in the TL. But culture and ideology are, without a doubt, overwhelming entities that shape the minds of the individuals who dwell among them. In this regard, Mona Baker in her *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (published 2005) states that when "linguistic considerations" come across "ideological considerations", the latter often win out over the former. She further

states that "Translations... produce strategies of containment... by employing certain modes of representing the other... reinforces hegemonic versions" (Baker 106). These kinds of hegemonic versions can be seen in the translations of both afore mentioned translators (of course with a difference of ratio) as distinct from Manto's original story in SL. Even though, if we grant that both translators intend not to be moved by their predetermined ideological motivations, still there is a chance of this very ideological interpellation in their translations. Relating to this argument Baker quotes Lefevere, who states that "faithful translation is just another translation strategy that results from the collocation of an ideology..." (Baker 107). From this idea it can be concluded that ideological interpellation is inevitable. It is just a matter of resistance and resilience that a translator puts forth to avoid as much influence of this interpellation as possible, which proves to be the dividing line between a 'good' and a 'bad' translator.

Saadat Hasan Manto wrote in times of great tumult and mayhem. Although, following the partition of the subcontinent into India and Pakistan, he left (or rather was forced to leave) Bombay for Lahore, which happened to be in Pakistan now, he was one of the few people in that newly divided society who craved for unity amidst diversity. He is one of the few lot (especially among his contemporary authors) who tends to elude political and religious didacticism. Alok Bhalla in his article notes Manto's translations by Khalid Hasan notes that Manto "[as] a storyteller... never retreats from the complexity of lived experience to find easy refuge in political posturing or moral and religious sermonizing" and his narrative style remains to be "precise, bare-boned and conversational" (Bhalla 19). In this paper, our focus remains on one of his most controversial (nonetheless widely acclaimed) short story *Thanda Gosht*, which was published in his collection under the same name. The title (apart

from the story) holds great significance, as it tends to deconstruct the so-called piety and religious-political atmosphere, which was predominantly held as the essence of the Partition campaign in years approaching 1947. The story revolves around two characters namely Eeshar Singh, a Sikh 'activist-cum-looter' and his partner Kalwant Kaur. Though, there are a couple of other characters mentioned (the dead girl and Sardar Nihal Singh), but they are introduced only through the conversation between Eeshar Singh and Kalwant Kaur. The entire story is set in a single hotel room where both these partners (spouse or just lovers is not clear in the story) discuss the ongoing outburst of partition struggle and their loot. Eeshar Singh returns to the hotel room where Kalwant Kaur awaits him. He stands in the corner for a while unravelling his tangled thoughts, while Kalwant Kaur appears to entice him to make love to her, as he has been away to her for eight days straight. Although, Eeshar Singh seems to be quite disturbed by something and is not able to speak or even reply to Kaur's inquiries, still he manages to gather himself up apparently and indulges in a sexual frenzy with Kaur. Regardless of his extreme efforts to please Kaur, he is unable to make it up to her expectations. This falling out of Eeshar Singh triggers doubts about his loyalty in Kalwant Kaur's mind and initiates the main argument that encompasses the whole story. Kalwant Kaur, upon insisting multiple times assumes that there is indeed another girl behind this due to which Eeshar could not perform sexually, and attacks him in anger with his Kirpan. She wounds him well enough at his neck that blood gushes out. But as Eeshar Singh clarifies that she had not heard his explanation properly and had acted too quickly, she begins to listen. The grimness of Eeshar's face since his arrival is in fact due to a horrifying experience that he had come across during one of his frequent looting ventures in the city. Like every other person who took advantage of this commotion, he too breaks into a house

with seven people in it. Eeshar Singh tells Kalwant Kaur that he had killed six of them, but could not kill the seventh who appeared to him a very beautiful girl. So instead of killing her too, he abducts her in order to rape her out of lust. As he reaches a railway track near a canal-bridge, he lays her behind the bushes and begins to rape her. But the moment he comes into contact with her body, he is horrified. She is dead, her body gone cold already, which Eeshar Singh refers to, in narrating his experience to Kaur, as "Thanda Ghost" (cold flesh/meat). At the end of the story, we witness that Eeshar Singh's hand is held by Kalwant Kaur, who feels it as if it were "colder than ice". Here Manto, like in most of his stories comes out in brimming suspense, as we are made known that the girl whom Eeshar Singh sought to rape was a lying no less as a mere piece of cold meat/flesh. And so, it could very well be possible that Eeshar Singh might also have died. This assumption can be supported by the fact that once Eeshar was wounded by Kalwant, his eyes began to dim, his voice began to sink, and finally his hand felt "colder than ice". Still, it is a matter of assumption, which springs out of Manto's thrilling suspense that he leaves (be as it may) in the end for the reader.

Manto as a writer is at his very best in this story in particular, as he employs only a couple of characters to illustrate the whole tension that runs deep throughout the subcontinent in his time. This is because Manto's prime motive in his stories remains to portray life as it was in his time, and not as it ought to be. He felt the pain of (Muslim-Hindu) humans alike in this time of great commotion, and would not take sides with any community, not even with the notion of the so-called "freedom", regardless of the fact that he himself was a Muslim. In this regard, Alok Bhalla states that "...Manto wants to suggest that the partition has nothing to do with freedom or religiosity. He is sure that those who want partition are only concerned with might – with all its intoxication, pride and humiliation" (Bhalla

24). From Alok Bhalla's appreciation of Manto as an author who tries to stay as neutral (or rather is naturally neutral) in his approach to the tumultuous upheaval of the partition struggle, we can assume that Manto can be called a pure artist, who remains unmoved by the biases that linger around in the minds of the majority of minds, both in pre- and post-partition era of the subcontinent.

To do justice to the work of such an artist like Manto, any translator who ventures to transmit his thoughts and imagination to another desired culture and language, has to bear the burden of being almost (if not as much as) neutral in his approach of translating Manto into that language and culture. As Walter Benjamin remarks in his seminal work *The Task of a Translator* that a translation does not exist to give readers an understanding of the information content of the original text, rather a translation exists separately but in conjunction with the original (Benjamin). In this sense, it becomes evident that in any translation, the task of its translator is to try his best, not to inculcate his own understanding and ideological narrative into the translation, avoiding as much his subjectivity as possible. The problem of 'equivalence' between the ST and the TT arises along with the issue of subjectivity. According to Susan Bassnet, "[no] two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached" (Bassnet 22). Now, in accordance with this notion, as any two languages are indispensably interconnected (with the respective cultures that they are a part of). In Whorf's formulation this notion becomes clearer, who states that not any language is able to exist independent of a context of a culture, and similarly, no culture can be present unless it possesses as its kernel, a natural language. Keeping this idea as our light in the exploration of equivalence, we might be tempted to stray from our current position. We might be enticed

by the fact that since no language is independent of culture and vice versa, there can be no equivalence between a ST and a TT in the act of translation. But, as Bassnet states that "any 'equivalence'... cannot be 'found' but will have to be 'created'" (Bassnet 33). This of course does not mean that a translator should try to push in certain expressions that distantly tend to give a similar meaning in the TT. What it means is that translation is an act of creation, an art in itself. Therefore, the translator can be considered at liberty to mold certain expressions that tend to produce the desired meaning in the TT, but in "conjunction" (in Walter Benjamin's sense) with the ST's expression in utmost sincerity. But one must wonder, is it possible for art to transcend its cultural boundaries? According to Alan Sinfield in his article *Art as Cultural Production*, he quotes Althusser's notion of 'internal distantiating', through which he says art is able to transcend the bounds of a specific culture. According to this notion, art draws attention to the ideology in which it is constructed, thus occupying a distinctive position outside culture (Sinfield 78). Therefore, it becomes essential for any translator, as an artist, to transcend the boundaries of culture and ideology, and elude as much subjectivity in translating an author from one language to another.

On this note, we move to our central analysis of two translations of Manto's short story *Thanda Gosht* by Khalid Hasan and Alok Bhalla, respectively. Let us start our discussion with Khalid Hasan's translation first. Before digging deep into the ST compared with the TT, we are at first, confused by the title of the ST and how it has been translated by Khalid Hasan in the TT. The original story by Saadat Hasan Manto is titled as "*Thanda Gosht*" which in Urdu, literally means 'cold meat' or 'cold flesh'. But Hasan translates it as "*Colder Than Ice*" in his collection *Bitter Fruit: The Very Best of Saadat Hasan Manto* (published 2008). The story is full of references to the human body, both in a sexual approach, as

well as in an existential manner. This makes it evident that Manto utilizes the idea of human body and of a piece of any flesh, and molds them into an interdependent unit. In this sense, he uses the Urdu word *Gosht* (Flesh/Meat) as pun and tries to arouse the feelings of his readers about the nothingness of 'Man'. This idea takes concrete form in the repeated expression of Manto's character Eeshar Singh, who says: "Insaan bhi maa ya ajeeb cheez hai..." (Manto). The repeated references to Kalwant Kaur's body parts, as well as the emphatic mention of love bites, pinching etc throughout the love-making scene between Eeshar and Kaur, it becomes evident that Manto wants to emphasize the meatiness of a human body, and so objectifies it in order to equate it with any piece of meat. So that, when the reader tends to ponder over the title of the short story, they might also understand immediately, the pun intended by Manto. In his article, *Manto Flattened – An Assessment of Khaild Hasan's Translations*, M. Asaduddin writes that most of the translators, like Hasan, tend to translate the title as "Colder than Ice", and he wonders at what makes them do so. His first assumption is of course the final phrase in the story which refers to Eeshar Singh's hand: "Kalwant Kaur placed her hand on Ishwar Singh's which was colder than ice" (Hasan). M. Asaduddin further explicates that:

"...comparative euphemistic phrase does not evoke the rawness and immediacy of Ishwar Singh's experience as does the phrase "cold meat" or "a lump of cold flesh." The keyword here is "meat" or "flesh," serving as a metaphor which brings out the horrifying implications ...for conquest, violence, and sexual assault that lies at the core of the story." (M. Asaduddin 133)

From this excerpt, it becomes evident that "Colder than Ice" is a mere euphemistic expression used by Khalid Hasan in order to appeal more to an upper-class audience with so-

called sophisticated taste for literature. But, as we see from this example, that Khalid Hasan, in taking this liberty, does great harm to the rawness that Manto puts forth in his original title.

Moving on to the story, Khalid Hasan is again seen to take unsanctioned liberties at various places in the story in order to inculcate his own euphemistic approach, charged with the "Pakistani Ideology" of post-Zia-ul-Haq Pakistan. Alok Bhalla says that "[a] story of violence requires a certain degree of asceticism of language; it is precisely Manto's restraint which makes the original so disturbing" (Bhalla 25). In *Thanda Gosht*, we see the same severity of language which not only delivers an authentic sense of commotion that was happening at the time of partition: all the violence, bloodshed etc.; moreover, it also makes credible the rural setup, with a loot and his lover conversing all along. This makes Manto's work original and sound. Khalid Hasan on the other hand, is seen to tamper with Manto's language in the ST and makes it euphemistic at several occasions. Not only does this stunt move by Hasan distort the severity of the original text, but also makes Manto look lethargic in building-up of those scenes. For instance, in the scene where Kalwant Kaur enquires Eeshar Singh about the other night when he left without saying anything, she asks what had happened to him. To this Eeshar Singh replies:

Burray ki maa ka wo hogaya tha. (Manto)

Which is a frisky slang by a Punjabi who wants to avoid something or some argument, again in a playful manner. Khalid Hasan does not alter this in his translation. He simply omits it altogether. And a reader who has read the ST first, is left un-catered midway, when he does not see this typical Punjabi expression of playfulness. By robbing "his" Manto (translation) and the readers of this original expression, he commits a great felony against Manto's legacy, by misrepresenting him in front of those who have only read Manto in Hasan's translations. Moreover, as Bhalla states that Hasan does not

even bother to explain his “radical transformations” of the structures within the ST in his translation (Bhalla 20). Then again we see Khalid Hasan omitting words from the ST on yet another occasion. Kalwant Kaur’s physical description is quite vivid and generously illustrated through Manto’s command over Urdu language. This is again due to the fact that Manto wants his readers to stay focused on the title of the story, which refers to Meat, Flesh, and by extension the objectified body of humans. But Khalid Hasan misses out on the detailed percussions in the form of Kalwant’s physical description. In the ST we can see how Manto clearly illustrates Kaur’s body:

“Kalwant Kaur bharay bharay hath pairon wali aurat thi. Chaurray Chalkay Kohlay, Thal thal karnay walay gosht se bharpoor kuch zyada hi upar ko uttha hua seena, tez aankhein, baalayi hont par baalon ka sursur mui ghubaar...” (Manto)

Khalid Hasan omits most of the details and renders a superficial edition of the original again:

“Kalwant Kaur was a big woman with generous hips, fleshy thighs, and unusually high breasts.” (Hasan 16)

One must wonder how and why it that Manto’s original description with illustrative vividness could be reduced to what Khalid Hasan makes out of it. Manto’s use on this vividness cannot be demonized because of censor objection. He does it precisely to achieve the effect that he carries along throughout the story. Kalwant description is so vividly illustrated in order to emphasize her each body part, as though describing an animal (e.g. a cow, goat etc.) at an animal market. This again puts the emphasis of the story on Manto’s title, and his mastery throughout the story in which he relates every nuance to the title of the story. Because Hasan has already taken much liberty in decentering the emphasis of the story by changing the title, he

does taken liberties upon liberties yet again, producing a new avatar of Manto for his audience.

Khalid Hasan, along with numerous other omissions, ventures a number of additions not present in the ST. For instance, when Kalwant Kaur asks him where had Eeshar Singh been all these days, he replies:

“Burray ki maa ke ghar” (Manto)

In Punjabi culture, “burra” is usually referred to one’s father. So, when someone uses it, it actually refers to the father. And in this expression, the meaning essentially becomes “Grandma’s house”, domesticating the expression for the English readers, as well as keeping the playfulness of the slang intact. But Khalid Hasan molds Manto’s original expression and adds another expression. He translates it as:

“In the bed of my enemy’s mother” (Hasan 17)

This not only distorts the intended meaning in the ST. It also inculcates in the readers’ minds that Eeshar Singh is a villain. It is evident in the following paragraphs of the story in the ST that Eeshar Singh is a loot who murders people and steals their belongings. Khalid Hasan uses this very evidence, and turn it against him, with apparently no other reason but ideologically bound to a certain kind of Pakistani-ness that has to portray Hindus and Sikhs as inherently evil. Similar is the case with India on ideological grounds. The so-called post-partition “Pakistani-ness” under the banner of a single nation-state demands every “Pakistani” to stand against “Indian-ness”, as does India against Pakistan. Therefore, Khalid Hasan apparently to get a wide readership, or even critical acclaim tries to make Eeshar Singh look as if he is pure evil. Kinship between two languages is demonstrated by a translation that conveys “the form and meaning of the original as accurately as possible” (Benjamin 72). Khalid Hasan under the influence of the state ideology takes necessary step in order to portray a Sikh in the partition era as evil as

possible, which is never the case in Manto's original text. The idea of Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) in Althusser's philosophy is explained by Mary Klages in her book *Literary Theory – A Guide for the Perplexed*. She states: "Althusser's... Ideological State Apparatuses ...are institutions which generate ideologies which we as individuals (and groups) then internalize, and act in accordance with." (Klages 131). For Althusser, Ideology is 'unconscious', similar to Freud and Lacan's concept of the 'unconscious', and it is also eternal. No one can escape its influence (Klages 132).

In ideological investigation of how the Manto's original text gets altered through Khalid Hasan's TT can be seen in the following excerpt. In the ST Manto writes:

"Kalwant Kaur thorri daer ke liye khaamosh hogai, lekin foran hi bharrak uthi. "Lekin meri samajh main nahi ata, us raat tumhe kya hua. Achay bhallay meray sath letay thay, mujhe tum ne wo tamaam gehnay pehna rakhay thay jo tum shehr se loot kar laaye thay." (Manto)

Khalid Hasan translates this statement as: "She was silent for a while, then she exploded, 'Tell me what happened to you the last night you were here. You were lying next to me and you had made me where all those gold ornaments you had looted from the houses of the Muslims in the city..." (Hasan 17)

This addition by Khalid Hasan makes it manifest that he tends to demonize the Sikh community by falsely making Manto's statement as if it were against non-Muslims. Moreover, it clearly shows that Hasan tries to imply that during the time of partition, only Sikhs and Hindus were the oppressors and looters, and their common prey was Muslim houses and shops. On another occasion, we see Hasan again committing the same crime against Manto. In the scene where finally, Eeshar Singh starts to tell Kaur the truth about what happened to him which stun him

silent, we see the same addition of the word "Muslims" not present in the ST that makes the Hasan's intention more obvious. Manto writes:

"Shehr main loot machi to sab ki tarhaan main ne bhi us main hisa liya. Gehnay paatay aur rupay paisay jo bhi hath lagay wo maine tumhe de diye" (Manto)

Khalid Hasan again adds the word "Muslim" in this scenario, and plays with the words in generating his own fiction further otherizing the non-Muslims as the only looters there were at the time of partition. He writes:

"When they began to loot Muslim shops and houses in the city, I joined one of the gangs. All the cash and ornaments that fell into my share, I brought back to you." (Hasan 19)

It is not so difficult locating every single addition by Khalid Hasan in this scene which is present nowhere in the original by Manto. Firstly, Manto writes "Shehr main loot machi to maine bhi sab ki tarhaan", which means that Eeshar Singh did what everyone was doing at that time regardless of their creed or community. Hasan specifies in his version that "When 'they' began to loot Muslim shops", implying and incorporating in the word "they" everyone but Muslims, and there for demonizes and otherizes every other community. He also implies that as if not a single Muslim was, or could be involved in any such activities.

Two more instances that testify Hasan's ideological incision would suffice our discussion on the so-called "Pakistani" ideological state apparatus active in Hasan's translation. The first is how he translates Eeshar Singh's name in his TT. Manto purposely writes the name "Eeshar" which is a deformed usage of the Hindi name "Eeshwar", commonly used as Eeshar in rural areas where the population is mostly illiterate (especially during the partition era), and therefore, cannot pronounce the exact nuances of either Hindi or Urdu, as the literate could. This argument can be more palpable when we pay

close attention to the conversation going on between Eeshar Singh and Kalwant Kaur that they are rural people, with a typical accent. Khalid Hasan tries to accentuate the name “Eeshar” in the original with “Ishwar” in his translation in order to clarify that the man is in fact a Sikh with a “proper” Hindi title that would testify his “evil being”. And therefore, all the crimes that Eeshar Singh has committed could easily be thrown upon the shoulders of every non-Muslim. The other instance is that of the repetitive mention of the “Kirpan”, a holy dagger, rather instrument in Sikhism, more than it is being used in the ST by Manto. Manto does use the word “Kirpan”, but only because it is after all a weapon, and is at all times in possession by practicing Sikhs. Khalid Hasan capitalizes upon Manto’s mention of the word, and reiterates it out of context from the original in places where it has only been mentioned once. For instance, Manto writes:

“Us main saath... Us main saath aadmi thay... Chhay main ne katal kar diye... Isi Kirpan se...” (Manto)

In Khalid Hasan’s translation, this statement becomes:

“There was this house I broke into... there were seven people in there, six of them men whom I killed with my Kirpan one by one...” (Hasan 19)

It can clearly be seen that in Manto’s original, there is no sense of predetermination in murdering the people in the house. Moreover, it can also be seen that Eeshar Singh’s utterance is full of ellipses, which is again purposely employed by Manto in order to show Eeshar Singh’s pain and reluctance as a result of his wound. Finally, the way Eeshar utters the word “Isi Kirpan se” translates as “with this very Kirpan”, which consequently implies a sense of remorse in Eeshar Singh of using such a holy instrument for such a terrible crime. But Hasan, firstly removes the following ellipses to make his utterance appear as if in a single breath with

determination. And more, he translates the expression as “I killed with my Kirpan” implying Eeshar Singh’s pride in this act, and that also with his Kirpan. These excerpts manifest Althusser’s ‘Ideological State Apparatuses’ in Hasan’s predetermined otherization of Eeshar Singh and all non-Muslims with him.

Ispahani notes in her article that “Manto was a bitter, withering humanist... he did not glorify any class or any ideology nor talk rhetorically about exploitation nor even about hope” (Ispahani 192). Hasan, therefore, brings his own ideological prejudices and actively distorts Manto’s work and his legacy. With this discussion, we now move towards the second translator of the same work by Saadat Hasan Manto. Like Khalid Hasan, Alok Bhalla is also a renowned scholar on Manto’s works. But unlike Khalid Hasan, Bhalla’s has been applauded on his translations on Manto’s stories. In this respect, Jason Francisco in his review article on Bhalla’s translations writes:

“To his credit, Bhalla has selected stories which appeal to the moral imagination of his readers, stories which treat Partition as a human event, a psychological event, not a political occurrence unified over and above personal experiences, but drawn out, fragmented and discontinuous in the way experiences often seem as they happen.” (Francisco 208)

Alok Bhalla has translated Manto’s works with utmost care, in accordance with the aforementioned appreciation by Francisco. However, his translation is flawed at certain places in other respects different than Khalid Hasan’s. Bhalla only transliterates the title of the story (as I have done throughout this discussion) from Urdu script to English Romanization. This could be considered as a ‘foreignizing strategy’ in translation. Mona Baker quotes Friedrich Schleiermacher, who states: “On the Different Methods of Translating, Schleiermacher argued that there are only two. Either the translator



leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him. Or he leaves the reader in peace... and moves the author toward him” (Baker 242). Although in most of Alok Bhalla’s translations of Manto, we see that he tends to move the author closer toward him, more than the readers, as can be seen in the title of the story, left as it is in Bhalla’s translation (unlike Hasan). This may be because, he has been actively criticizing Khalid Hasan’s translations in his articles, therefore, would be aware of the damage done to Manto’s intended ‘meaning’. Nonetheless, there are many translation theorists who have shown their reservations upon ‘foreignizing strategy’ in translations. For instance, Friedrich Holerlin explains the risk of “incomprehension” involved in employing foreignizing strategy in translation that the text might be deviating so much from the reader as if seemingly obscure and even unreadable for some of the readers.

Apart from the title, Alok Bhalla tends to employ ‘domesticating’ rather than a ‘foreignizing strategy’. A domesticating strategy, in contrast to foreignizing strategy, refers to a translator conforming to the dominant cultural values present in the target language culture (TLC). Bhalla in the start of his translation describes the sitting position of Kalwant Kaur as “...sitting on the bed yoga-style” (Bhalla). Although, Bhalla tries to domesticate the sitting in crisscross leg position, which in Urdu Manto writes as: “aalti-paalti maar kar” (Manto). The problem with Bhalla’s attempt to domesticate the foreign term lies in his foreignizing term choice itself. Yoga is a wide discipline, which is quite rightly known almost all over the world. But the word choice by Bhalla i.e., “yoga-style” refers to numerous styles of just sitting while doing yoga, let alone other styles. Rather than explaining the position, Bhalla makes it even more oblivious to the reader, who is left saying: which yoga-style? In this case, Khalid Hasan’s translation, in which he employs also a domesticating strategy, the

concept is clearer in his choice of the expression: “sat crossing her legs” (Hasan 16)

Next, we see Bhalla again employing an apparently domesticating strategy by translating Manto’s term “Kirpan” as “dagger”. Here, it seems a better translation than Khalid Hasan in terms that it is self-explaining term. However, referring “Kirpan” as “dagger” certainly mystifies Bhalla’s motive here. One may think as if he hides the word Kirpan behind dagger in order to allude what Khalid Hasan wants to emphasize by capitalizing it negative impact relating to the Sikh community. Bhalla therefore, seems being defensive about the Sikh community, as well as being reluctant in mentioning Kirpan with a looter and a murderer. Nonetheless, his attempt distorts the original, which has a clear mention of Kirpan, not just some dagger. Another apparently defensive move, which could very well be another domesticating strategy manifests itself in Bhalla’s use of the term “headgear” for Manto’s word “paghri”. Still, provided the fact that “paghri” can easily be translated as “turban” in English makes us wonder yet again, why has Bhalla employed a rather ambiguous term for a word which has an exact equivalent in English. The answer appears to be that Bhalla intentionally utilizes the term “headgear” for Eeshar Singh’s “turban” in order to make the word “turban’s” affiliation to Sikh community predominantly throughout the world. He therefore, purposely uses a rather ambiguous term “headgear” to defend the otherization on which Khalid so capitalizes. Still, a “headgear” could easily refer to any and every kind of hat, cap, a piece of cloth, or even a war or sport helmet. Hence, Bhalla’s use of the term “headgear” for “paghri” mystifies, and so distorts the clarity present both in Manto’s original and Khalid Hasan’s translation. This also echoes the notion of Althusser’s, mentioned above, that no individual escapes the power and influence of ideology (Klages).

Furthermore, Bhalla's translation of the scene where Kalwant Kaur mentions the ornaments that he had looted and made her wear them is more credible and closer to the ST than Khalid Hasan's addition and interpolation of the word Muslim in this context, absent in Manto. Bhalla, similar to Manto, does not take sides with any specific community. He translates it in the sense much closer to Manto. Bhalla translates: "You were fine lying with me and had me wear all that jewelry you had looted the other day..." (Bhalla). This is where we see Bhalla as a better translator than Hasan (particularly in Walter Benjamin's sense). But following this, we encounter yet another translation of Bhalla's which does not quite capture Manto's intended meaning. In the scene where Kalwant Kaur demands the truth from Eeshar Singh about his venture away from home, she makes him swear repeatedly. In this instance, Kaur utters a specific Hindu expression i.e., "Mujhe apnay haathon se jalao agar jhut bolo" (Manto). This expression entails a trail of connotative meanings. It refers to the Hindu funeral where the dead person is cremated, and not just random normality. Kaur makes him swear that if he will not tell her the truth, may he be the one who witnesses his beloved Kaur's death, and may he be cursed to carry the life-long burden of cremating a loved one with one's own hand. Bhalla translates Manto here as: "Burn me with your hands if you lie." (Bhalla). Here also, Khalid Hasan comes up triumphant, as he translates this expression as: "...may you cremate my body with your own hands if you lie to me" (Hasan 17), as he judiciously captures Manto's intended connotative meaning in Kaur's expression.

In comparing the overall effort of both these translators, however, Alok Bhalla appears to be a better translator. First of all, his translation strategy up to a greater extent is closer to the ST, which extracts out a TT that delivers the essence of Saadat Hasan Manto's work. Bhalla's translation comes much closer to Manto's

original story as he tends to act like an artist, and not as a forger of political polemic, as does Khalid Hasan. Moreover, his overall view of the Indo-Pak partition is similar to Manto's as he sees the event as a human tragedy, and not as a triumph of some community over the other at the cost of a million lives. The only place where he seems a little bit polemical is where he concentrates his criticism on the Pakistani historians, who seek to justify the event of Indo-Pak partition as an inevitable act of destiny (Francisco 214). Khalid Hasan, on the other hand, brings forth a Manto in his translations that seems to be writing about partition in a pro-partition and a pro-Pakistan manner, and dilutes his writings on the event of partition. (Bhalla 21). M. Asim Siddique notes that Manto's "refusal to be coopted into the system and his active resistance to dominant ideologies of his time distinguish his life and his poetics" (Siddique 19). Therefore, keeping this in mind about Manto's poetics, as well as conforming to Walter Benjamin's notion that "kinship [between languages] is demonstrated by a translation that conveys "the form and meaning of the original as accurately as possible" (Benjamin 72), Alok Bhalla comes much closer to be considered a better translator of Saadat Hasan Manto than Khalid Hasan, who actively distorts Manto's pain form humanity evident in his works.

### Works Cited

1. Alter, Stephen. "Madness and Partition: The Short Stories of Saadat Hasan Manto." *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics*, no. 14, 1994, pp. 91-100. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/521767](http://www.jstor.org/stable/521767).
2. Asaduddin, Mohammad. "Manto Flattened: An Assessment of Khalid Hasan's Translations." *Annual of Urdu Studies* 11 (1996): 129-39.
3. Baker, Mona. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Routledge, 2005.

4. Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. Vol. 241. No. 2. Random House Digital, Inc., 1968.
5. Bhalla, Alok. "The Politics of Translation: Manto's Partition Stories and Khalid Hasan's English Version." *Social Scientist*, vol. 29, no. 7/8, 2001, pp. 19–38. JSTOR, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/3518123](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3518123).
6. Bhalla, Alok. "THANDA GOSHT and KHOL DO by Saadat Hasan Manto." *TREASURE CHEST*, 28 May 2012, [zjeddy.wordpress.com/2012/05/11/thanda-gosht-by-saadat-hasan-manto/](http://zjeddy.wordpress.com/2012/05/11/thanda-gosht-by-saadat-hasan-manto/).
7. Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. Routledge, 2005.
8. Franscisco, Jason. "Stories about the Partition of India, Ed. Alok Bhalla." *The Annual of Urdu Studies*. Review, 1994.
9. Ispahani, Mahnaz. "Saadat Hasan Manto." *Grand Street*, vol. 7, no. 4, 1988, pp. 183–193. JSTOR, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/25007150](http://www.jstor.org/stable/25007150).
10. Klages, Mary. *Literary Theory: A Guide for the Perplexed*. A&C Black, 2006.
11. Manto, Saadat Hasan, and Khālid Hasan. *Bitter Fruit: The Very Best of Saadat Hasan Manto*. Penguin Books India, 2008.
12. Rekhta. "Saadat Hasan Manto, Afsana", [www.rekhta.org/manto/thanda-gosht-saadat-hasan-manto-manto?lang=ur](http://www.rekhta.org/manto/thanda-gosht-saadat-hasan-manto-manto?lang=ur).
13. Siddiqui, Mohammad Asim. "Saadat Hasan Manto's Poetics of Resistance." *Social Scientist*, vol. 40, no. 11/12, 2012, pp. 17–29. JSTOR, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/23338867](http://www.jstor.org/stable/23338867).
14. Sinfield, Alan. *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain*. A&C Black, 2007.