

## **Identifying Issues in Translating Hindi Novels into English: A Critical Analysis of Anand's Translation of Yashpal's Divya**

Mustafa Masihuddin Siddiqui<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of English, Shaqra University, Dawadmi, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia  
Email: mustafamasihuddin@gmail.com

DOI: 10.53103/cjlls.v2i2.36

### **Abstract**

Most experts believe that the practice of translation is an accord between the linguistic and the cultural aspects of the source language text and that of the target language text. In translating Hindi fiction into English and vice versa, there arises a major challenge as both of these languages originate from completely different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The differences lie at various levels viz. phonological, morphological, semantic, syntactical, contextual, social and the like. This paper attempts to outline certain issues in the translation of Hindi novels into English by critically analyzing and acclaiming the work of the translator with due examples from the texts.

Keywords: Hindi to English Translation, Translating Novels, Critical Analysis

### **Introduction and Literature Review**

Translation is a process which has gained importance not only as a practice but also as a subject of study for the scholars in the last few decades. Traditional approaches regarded translation as the process of the replacement of the Source Language text (SLT) with the Target Language text (TLT). However, the modern approaches consider it to be the process of the replacement of the meaning of the SLT with the TLT. Catford (1965) defines translation as “. . . the replacement of textual material in one language by equivalent textual material in another language” (p. 20). Translation is directly associated with the language, and language as Sapir (1963) claims, is “a guide to social reality” (p. 162). It is highly unviable to comprehend language without its socio-cultural context. Translation is hence regarded as both—linguistic activity and cultural activity. The translator has a big responsibility of being faithful to the linguistic and cultural qualities of the original text. It relies on the shoulders of the translator to carry over the feel and spirit of the original text to the translated text. If the translator fails to retain these in the TLT, it is considered to be, as many scholars say, a “bad translation” (Das, 2005, p. 31).

Translation of literary texts is complicated and difficult as compared to the non-literary texts. Among the problems which Rai (2005) has highlighted, the Herculean

demand on the translator to know the linguistic as well as the “cultural norms” of the SL is the first one. Also, the differences between the SL and the TL at the “grammatical, stylistic, lexical and socio-cultural level” challenge the translator. Besides, the source culture features like “objects, customs, mythical, historical and literary allusions” that are unfamiliar to the TL readers pose a problem. Moreover, finding equivalents in the TL, transmuting the phonology of the proper nouns and “transposing the literary genres, forms, proverbs and metaphors” trouble the translator. In addition to these, the subjective “cultural interpretation” of the SL and the translation of the minority culture SLT with respect to its “mythical, historical and cultural contexts” to a “dominant culture audience” intimidates the translator (p. 10).

Although, at the top level of the linguistic hierarchy, English and Hindi seem to have arisen from the same family i.e., the Indo-European family, their development on the course of time has diverged considerably. Hindi, like Urdu, has its origin in Khariboli dialect, and it has emerged from within the sub-continent. It is written in the Devnagri script. On the other hand, English has its origin in Anglo-Frisian dialect, and it has its roots in the language of the Anglo-Saxon settlers. It is written in the Latin script. This brings about a massive difference in the linguistic and the cultural properties of these two. The existence of these diverse aspects exasperates the translator as the translation of Hindi to English or English to Hindi is not just interlingual but also intercultural.

Many scholars have identified the issues in translating Indian fiction into English by Indian translators. For instance, Kalyani (2001) feels that “. . . in choosing English as the TL the Indian translators are violating every important principle of translation that the TL should be one’s mother tongue. The best translations in the world are often made in the translator’s first language” (p. 111). On the other hand, Mukherjee (2004) contradicts this notion as he says, “The English language has got so domesticated that Indians not only translate Indian language texts into English but they are also writing poetry, fiction and drama in English even when they have lived much of their lives in India” (p. 46). Anand, son of Yashpal, is one such Indian writer and translator. Among Yashpal’s novels, he has translated epic historical novel *Divya* and an arduous *Jhootha Sach*. *Divya*, a story about the quest for identity of a young aristocratic woman from a Brahmin family, was originally published in the year 1945 while its English translation was made available to the readers in the year 2006. Although Anand might have faced some hindrances while translating texts that were written more than half a century ago, one obvious advantage that he had as the translator of *Divya* is the culture that he has gained from the author as a legacy.

### **Critical Analysis**

A thorough comparison of Yashpal’s Hindi novel *Divya*, published by Lokbharti Paperbacks in 2012 (onwards referred to as SLT in this paper) and its English translation by Anand titled *Divya*, published by Penguin Books in 2009 (onwards referred to as TLT

in this paper) has shown several variations at the linguistics levels. In the light of the aforementioned discussion, a critical analysis of this translation is presented in the following sections along with select examples from SLT (transliterated) and TLT.

### **Analysis of Phonology**

At the phonological level, there are some occasions where the onomatopoeic words of the SLT have lost their feel in the TLT. For instance, “hoon-hoon” (p. 90) sound of air in SLT has been rendered in TLT as “howling” (p. 152). Similarly, the singing notes from SLT “mm-aa-aa-aa” (p. 132) and “aa-aa-aa” (p. 132) have been rendered in TLT in phrases like “began to sing” (p. 224) and “stretched his last note” (p. 223). Moreover, some SLT reduplicative expressions which carry along with them the alliterative effect does not have the same charm in the TLT. For example, “mai-mai-mai” (p. 34) is translated as “I” (p. 52), “mandhi-mandhikya” (p. 58) as “precious stones” (p. 95). Although the translator has done a praiseworthy task by equating the meaning to the nearest in the TLT, the supplementary characteristics of these SLT expressions could not be retained. Similarly, some reduplicative phrases like “aate-jaate” (p. 83), “tadak-bhadak” (p. 28), “khand-khand” (p. 54), “chin-bhinn” (p. 106) have been translated in a non-duplicative form as “travelled” (p. 138), “expensive” (p. 40), “crushed” (p. 88), “shattered” (p. 179) respectively. Another noteworthy translation is of the SLT reduplicative phrase “shaneh-shaneh” (p. 58 and p. 79) which has been translated differently on different occasions as “slowly” (p. 94) and “trailed” (p. 132). At the same time, it must be appreciated that the translator has been able to carry the alliterative effect of some reduplicative expressions. For example, “jahan-tahan” (p. 36) and “kahin-kahin” (p. 37) are translated as “here and there” (p. 56 and p. 57) and “baar-baar” (p. 121) as “again and again” (p. 204). The sounds of all the SLT proper nouns have been exactly reproduced in the translation except for couple of occasions. One occasion is when Devi Mallika tries to wheedle Madulika by calling her as “madulike” (p. 133) which displays some signs of affection in her call. On the other hand, in its translation as “Madulika” (p. 225), no such signs are visible. The other occasion where a difference is noticed regarding the sound of proper noun is in the translation of SLT “babhru” (p. 25) as TLT “Vabhru” (p. 36). Here, the difference is in the initial consonant sound of the name.

### **Analysis of Morphology**

At the level of morphology as well, many differences were comprehended. Many expressions have been rendered in the TLT in a different part of speech. Although the type of word changes, as a whole, the meaning of the discourse does not get hampered. For example, in the translation of SLT “prithusen ko veh aayojan keval kolahal jaan padte” (p. 61) as the TLT “But these distractions only jarred on Prithusen’s senses” (p. 100), the noun “kolahal” which means buzz or turmoil is conveyed using the verb “jarred.” Similarly, an

adjective “udaaseen” is put across using verb “took no interest” in the translation of SLT “. . . sena ke prati udaaseen the” (p. 130) as “. . . took no interest in the army” (p. 221).

In TLT, the translator has been successful in communicating the literariness of the SLT to a great extent. Apart from some occasions where the literary expressions are expressed using ordinary words like “peedhiyo ki paudh” (p. 32) as “generations” (p. 48), the literariness of the SLT is well maintained in the TLT. For example, the SLT expression “divya ke shareer me bhaye ki sihran daud gai” (p. 71) has been rendered in TLT using an equivalent idiomatic expression as “A shiver ran through Divya’s body” (p. 117). In fact, in some cases the translator has enriched the literariness of the text. For instance, the SLT phrase “atyant vatsal” (p. 13) has been expressed in TLT using an idiom “apple of his eyes” (p. 15). Similarly, “keval teevrata se hi use santosh hua ki anshu par us kathan ka prabhav hua” (p. 115) has been expressed in TLT as “. . . in the bitterness of her words Marish sensed anguish and knew that his words had hit home” (p. 193). Here, the idiom “hit home” adds to the literary flavor of the text.

### **Analysis of Grammar**

At the grammatical level, several variations have been noticed with respect to the tense, voice type, speech form, and person type of the texts. Some sentences have been rendered in the TLT in a different tense. For example, the SLT sentence “vradhawastha ke kaaran mere netro ki jyoti mand ho chuki hai” (p. 9) is in present perfect tense; whereas, in TLT, it is stated in simple present tense as “In my old age my eyesight is not what it used to be” (p. 8). Similarly, the present continuous tense of SLT sentence “taat dharmasth kumarika smaran kar rahe hain” (p. 15) has been expressed in TLT in the present perfect tense as “Grandsire has asked for you, my lady” (p. 18). In the same way, the simple present tense of SLT sentence “mann ki ugrata ichchaein aur vyakulta hi manushya ke veh sanskaar hain jo mrityu ko peedamay bana dete hain” (p. 54) has been rendered in simple past tense as “. . . it was the keen desires and restlessness of mankind that made death so painful” (p. 88). Using this sentence, the SLT suggests a fact which is still true; whereas, the TLT refers to a fact that prevailed once and does not exist anymore. Some cases have been noticed in the TLT where its grammatical voice does not correspond to the grammatical voice of the SLT. One of such cases is when the active voice of SLT sentence “Shvetketu apne sainiko ko lekar is samay prestha prasad ko hastgat kar chuka hoga” (p. 139) is expressed in passive voice in the TLT as “Prestha’s palace must have been surrounded by Shvetketu and his soldiers by this time” (p. 235).

Some differences are also observed between SLT and TLT with respect to the type of the grammatical person. On some occasions, in the TLT, the object or the subject in the speech of the characters is represented using different grammatical type. For example, Divya refers to herself as third person as “kumari” in her dialogue to Chhaya in the SLT:

“mahadevi se nivedan kar, kumari devi mallika ke samaaj mei ja rahi hain” (p. 24); whereas, in the TLT, she refers to herself in the first person as “I”: “Tell Mahadevi that I am going to Devi Mallika’s” (p. 34). In the same way, the maidservant’s reference to Divya is represented in TLT in the second person as opposed to the third person in SLT: “daasi ne sandesh nivedan kiya— ‘taat dharmasth kumari ka smaran kar rahe hain’” (p. 15) is translated as “A maidservant approached her and said, ‘Grandsire has asked for you, my lady’” (p. 18). Another instance where the reference marker has a different person-type in TLT is when the slave-girl brings a message for Prithusen: “swami ne aayushman ke mangal ke prati jigyaasa ki hai. ayushman ka swasth theek hai . . . chitt prasann hai?” (p. 41) of SLT has a third person marker; whereas, the TLT has a second person marker, “The master has enquired after your health. He hopes that you are well and in good cheer” (p. 64). Although, this change in person type does not bring about a change in the meaning, the portrayal of the characters and inter-personal relations get thwarted. The third-person reference markers in SLT reflect the aristocratic culture; on the other hand, the TLT does not provide any such information.

In some cases, differences in the speech form are also noticeable between the SLT and the TLT. Some direct speech expressions of SLT have been represented in the reported speech in the TLT. For example, “mallika ne ungli hontho par rakh kar indradeep ko sanket kiya, ‘na aarya, daasi ko trast na karein!’” (p. 34) is put across in TLT as “Mallika put her finger to her lips indicating that he should not frighten the girl!” (p. 51). Also, a dialogue of Ratnaprabha has been represented as a narration in TLT where the SLT “marish ke anumati prakat karne par ratnaprabha ne daasi dugdha ko aadesh diya — ‘sakhi anshumala aur mukhatvali ko bhi aayushman ki kalakriti ka darshan-sukh pane ke liye nimantrit karo’” (p. 117) is translated in TLT as “Marish nodded his consent and Ratnaprabha asked Dagdha, the maidservant to bring Anshumala and Muktavali to see the sculpture” (p. 197). This change in speech form restricts the readers from delving deep into the psyche of the characters. At the same time, the translator’s act of rendering indirect speech into direct speech deserves appreciation. By translating the reported speech into direct speech, the narrator has granted the readers with a deeper vision. To give some examples, the SLT narration “apni jeewan nauka ko usne ghatnaao ki teevr dhaara mei swayam thel diya hai . . . veh jaane kahan jaakar rukegi?” (p. 85) is unwrapped in TLT as “She was thinking to herself, ‘I have, with my own hands, pushed the boat of my life in fast current. . . Who knows where it will carry me?’” (p. 142). Also, by the representation of SLT “veh nirantar aatmahatya aur prithusen ki hatya ki baat sochta raha” (p. 48) in TLT as “‘I should kill Prithusen and thereafter kill myself,’ he kept repeating to himself” (p. 77), an added advantage is enjoyed by the TLT readers.

### **Analysis of Syntax**

In addition, the differences that are recognized at the level of syntax demand

discussion. A difference in the type of some sentences is noted in TLT; although, their function has remained the same. For instance, the declarative sentence of SLT “. . . wah ji, tum badhe chhaliya ho” (p. 37) is translated as a rhetoric question in TLT with the use of question mark as “You are a clever one, aren’t you?” (p. 57-58). Similarly, an imperative utterance of Prithusen in SLT “anumati dijiye” (p. 61) is rendered as an interrogative one in TLT “Do I have your Permission to do so?” (p. 100). Here, the TLT utterance of Prithusen makes him appear even more obedient towards his father as compared to the SLT. Similarly, by the translation of an interrogative SLT “swamini ki nidra kis prakar bhang kare?” (p. 68) as a declarative TLT “She had no heart to awaken her” (p. 113), the translator has made the message clearer by highlighting the slave’s feelings for her mistress. By the translation of an imperative SLT “putri, abhyagat ki abhyarthna kar kushal-kshem aur aane ka kaaran poocho” (p. 15) as an interrogative TLT “Can you go and receive the visitor and enquire from him the purpose of his visit?” (p. 18), the order given by the Grandsire to his granddaughter Divya changes to a request. This diminishes the portrayal of the authoritative power of the Grandsire. One of the SLT rhetorical questions “parantu ek daasi ke hi kaaran veh kitne samay tak shoorsen me tika reh sakta tha?” (p. 86) is translated as a TLT declarative “But Pratool could not afford to stay on indefinitely in Shursen for the sake of one female slave” (p. 144). Here, the SLT expression involves the readers by, in a way, eliciting responses from them; whereas, the TLT states a fact and involves the readers only as recipients. Another kind of difference can be observed in the rendering of negative SLT questions as affirmative TLT ones and vice versa. For example, SLT question “kya arya kala ka veh ratn swayam chal kar dikhaenge?” (p. 117) is in affirmative form; whereas, the TLT question “Won’t you show the masterpiece that you have created?” (p. 198) is in negative form. This change in type of question, displays a slight change in the mood and intention of the speaker of SLT and of TLT.

### **Analysis of Semantics**

At the semantic level, there are several variations between SLT and the TLT. In most of the cases, the variation is minor and does not weaken the sense of the text. The meaning of some words does not seem to have exact equivalence with the SLT counterparts and are worth consideration. Besides, some words of SLT have been corresponded in TLT using single equivalent. For example, the SLT words “budhiya” (p. 37) and “krapne” (p. 39) have been translated using a less casual TLT word “Grandma” (p. 58 and p. 61) respectively. On the other hand, a single recurring SLT word “taat” (p. 36, p. 38, p. 41 and p. 46) has been rendered in TLT differently as “Great Grandfather” (p. 56), “Uncle” (p. 59), “Father” (p. 64) and “Young Uncle” (p. 73) respectively.

Another interesting finding that deserves discussion is related with the measuring units of time that has been used by the author in SLT. As the novel is based in an ancient

setting, in SLT, Yashpal has often used the traditional units of time—pahar and ghardhi—to refer to the time of the day. The translator, however, has chosen to represent these using familiar and present-time units. For example, “suryaasthra ki do ghardhi pashchaat” (p. 56) is translated as “an hour after sunset” (p. 91), “dherdh ghardhi” (p. 67) as “a long time” (p. 110) and “raatri teen peher” (p. 45, p. 46 and p. 146) which has been translated differently at different places as “past mid night” (p. 71), “the third watch of the night” (p. 72) and “till late in the night” (p. 249) respectively. This choice of the translator has undoubtedly enhanced the readability of the text; however, the ancient feel of the original text has been compromised with. Apart from this, the translation of some other quantifiers has been slightly incongruent with the SLT counterparts. For example, SLT “do-dhai maas” (p. 65) as “two or three months” (p. 107), “ek sau bees varsh” (p. 106) as “more than a hundred year” (p. 178), “beesiyo” (p. 67) as “dozens of” (p. 111) and “aayu saatth varsh ke sameep pohuch jane ke chihn” (p. 131) as “Signs of age” (p. 222). This incongruence has formed a slightly different image in the minds of the TLT readers.

Some TLT words and phrases seem to have been translated differently with respect to their meaning. The translation of SLT “ardhaangini” (p. 56) which is closer in meaning to wife as TLT “beloved” (p. 91), “chinta” (p. 57) which is closer in meaning to tension as “shame” (p. 92) and others show slight divergence. At the same time, in the translation of some SLT words, fair meaning is also gained. For example, in the translation of “aawastha” (p. 68) as “so called indisposition” (p. 112), “so called” is an addition; in “ratnjatit aabhooshan” (p. 6) as “ornament studded with diamonds” (p. 2), “diamonds” is an addition which makes it specific. On the other hand, in the translation of SLT “uthe hue neutr” (p. 138) as “eyes” (p. 234), the state of eyes is dropped; in “nirbhay Sagal Nagri” (p. 58) as “The city of Sagal” (p. 95), the idea of fearlessness is dropped; and in “vijayi baldhikrat daas” (p. 73) as “the slave born” (p. 120), the reference to the triumph is missing.

Some differences can also be seen in the translation of longer utterances like clauses and sentences. Here again, the sense of the TLT as a large entity is in equivalence with the SLT, but considerable meaning variations are observed in isolation. A quick review of these SLTs and their TLTs will sufficiently suggest the noticeable variations. The dialogue of Marish in SLT “kya tumne ye sweekar kiya?” (p. 110) has been translated as “Is this what you wanted from life?” (p. 184). Here, Marish refers to Divya’s acceptance of the hardship in the SLT; whereas, Marish’s question in TLT refers to Divya’s desire. By the translation of SLT “dhata aur divya shithil pado se is vidhi se us vidhi aur us path se is path ghoom rahi thin” (p. 75) as “Though extremely tired, they went on” (p. 124), the translator has reduced the reflection of the helplessness and the efforts made by Divya and Dhata.

### **Analysis of Discourse**

Another interesting finding is the difference caused due to the textual

rearrangement. For example, the following SLT sentence and its translation have a different textual sequencing:

unki udaarta mei brahmalok aur nirvana dono ki hi avgya karne wale, sagal ke dharmagya, vipr-samaj dwara lanchit aur tathagat ke abhidharm dwara abhishapt, lokayakt ke samrthak, keval sthool prtayaksh ihlok ke satya aur jamantar mei karmphal ko asatya batane wale chaarvaak marish ke liye bhi sthaan tha (p. 14).

The doors of the house were open even to the atheist Marish, who held in contempt the Vedantic concept of salvation and of Nirvana. Marish had been censured and denounced both by the Brahmins and the votaries of the Buddhist faith for his views. He believed that there was no world beyond the visible one, regarded the palpable world as the true one and dismissed the belief that reward for one's deed awaited one in the next life (p. 16).

Here, in SLT, the noun (Marish) follows its description, and hence it has a cataphoric feature. This develops some suspense in the minds of the readers. On the other hand, in TLT, the description follows the noun (Marish); hence, it has an anaphoric feature, which does not have any scope for suspense. Apart from this, another surprising difference is observed between SLT and TLT. Three paragraphs from SLT have been rearranged and placed few pages later in the TLT. The rearranged SLT discourse delineates the thoughts of Divya concerning Rudradhir and Marish:

divya praay prati sandhya hi prasad ke udyaan mei prapitamah, pitravya aur mahilaa ki gishthiyo mei upasthit rehti thi. [. . .] voh sochne lagti- sarvshreshth khadagdhaari aarya prithusen ne meri kala ke vishay mei mat prakat nahi kiya . . . shivika ke prasang mei unka khadag kheench lena . . . wahi unka mat tha (p. 19).

Almost every evening, Divya was present at the gatherings in the garden of the palace, which were attended by her great-grandfather, her uncles and the ladies of the house. [. . .] She would say to herself: 'The best swordsman, Prithusen, had not expressed any opinion about my art . . . That he should have drawn his sword to lend a shoulder to my palanquin . . . that itself was an expression of opinion' (p. 29).

In SLT, these paragraphs are placed in between the incident of Vishnu Sharma's agitation at Divya for attending Prithusen and Divya's conversation with the Chief Justice about Prithusen. The translator, however, has chosen to place these paragraphs after the entire conversation of Divya with her great-grandfather, Chief Justice of Republic. Had the translator not opted to rearrange this text, the aforementioned TLT paragraphs would have been five pages earlier. The choice of textual arrangement of the translator is more appropriate as it brings the two linked events together and makes it more meaningful



without distracting the readers.

In order to keep intact the cultural aspect of the original text, the translator has wisely transliterated many SLT words in the TLT. Furthermore, so as to facilitate the readers, he has supplemented the transliterations with their meanings in the footnotes. Some of the apparent transliterations in TLT are “shataji raga” (p. 9), “alakta” (p. 3), “chandrika” (p. 3), “dharma-chakra” (p. 21), “gopis” (p. 38), “Rajasuya yajna” (p. 43), “tilak” (p. 43). At the same time, some transliterated words in TLT which have not been explained in the footnote are also noted. These include “uttariya” (p. 57), a piece of dress popular in Indian context; “gandhari” (p. 37), a type of raga; and “chhalika” (p. 37), a type of dance. In other cases, the translator has placed the explanation of the transliterated words within the TLT just after the transliterated word; such as, “raas” (p. 37) which is followed by “the circular dance performed by Lord Krishna with gopis” (p. 37-38), “Lakshmi” (p. 210) followed by “my goddess of good fortune” (p. 210). Also, to maintain the warm essence of “Amma” (p. 121), the translator has transliterated it instead of translating it.

### **Errors**

Before discussing the modifications that have taken place in the TLT, some visible errors can be talked about. These errors are noted in both—SLT and TLT. Among the errors encountered in TLT, one is with the translation of SLT “gadhna ke do sau rajullon se ek raja ka shasan kahin bhala” (p. 39) as TLT “The rule of one king is better in every way than that of the hundred kinglings of a republic” (p. 61). Here, the error or variation is caused due to the translation of “do sau” which means two hundred as “the hundred.” Another perceptible error is in the translation of SLT “unke shamshru mundhe hue thei” (p. 5) as TLT “Their heads were clean shaven” (p. 2). While SLT “shamshru” refers to facial hair, the TLT refers to the hair on the head. Likewise, SLT phrase “do sainik” (p. 139) is inappropriate; whereas, the TLT phrase “two hundred soldiers” (p. 236) seems to be appropriate in the context.

The translator’s dexterous skills can be identified from the verity that the feel of the TLT seems no less as compared to the feel of the SLT. As a matter of fact, the end product (TLT) seems more varnished than the SLT, at the cost of the original flavor though. At the first consideration, the TLT is supplemented with a detailed “Foreword” by Namita Singh which helps the readers in getting acquainted with the context; at the same time, it, however, allows them to anticipate the plot of the novel. The translator has rightly helped his readers in knowing more about the author and the TLT by providing “Translator’s Note.” Furthermore, in the preface of the SLT, Yashpal does not talk about any footnote, and he also does not provide any in the novel; whereas, in the TLT, there is a seemingly additional idea which talks about footnotes:

To preserve the atmosphere of classical times, it has been necessary to use some

unusual words and the verbal forms. The meanings of these words are explained in footnotes and may add to the reader's comprehension. (xxx)

### Modifications

Numerous textual components have been either added to TLT or dropped from the SLT. Mostly, this modification is laudable as it has left out the unnecessary or superfluous content of the SLT, but it has adversely affected the matter on some occasions. The TLT has not carried over SLT sentences or group of sentences at times. For example, "sanyam ki mudra mei . . . ho gaye" (p. 52); "uske pusht rakt . . . ugr ho gaya" (p. 60); "haye-haye, dekho toh" (p. 76); "kya hona tha? kya ho gaya . . . anshu ne drishti pher li" (p. 110); "parantu kaumdi ki . . . hokar reh gaya?" (p. 100); "acharya ke maun se jan samaj adheer hone laga" (p. 155) and many others are missing from TLT. Furthermore, an important discourse which suggests the similarities between Prithusen and Divya leading to their attraction towards each other is found missing in TLT:

prithusen kuch bhatka sa, aashray ki khoj me khinn sa jaan padhta.  
divya swayam bhi usi prakar anubhav karti thi. tab bhare-poore  
prasad mei bhi soonapan lagta. us samay mahapritavyo, pitravyo  
aur pitravyaoo, bhaiyo aur behno ka sneh bojha sa jaan padhta (p.  
22).

The presence of this discourse in SLT helps the author in setting the background for the attraction between Prithusen and Divya that follows. On the other hand, its absence in the TLT makes it appear an abrupt affair.

At the same time, there are some instances where the translator has added minor details so as to elaborate the content. For example, "veh adhik bol napaaye" (p. 46) is extended as "He could not speak more and fell silent" (p. 74); "divya leti thi. sehsa usne prashn kiya — 'kya? kab?'" (p. 55) is extended as "'What? When did she come?' exclaimed Divya jumping up from bed" (p. 90); New sentences can also be seen in the TLT. For example, "He held the liberal views" (p. 17) is an addition. Surprisingly, a new concept is noticed in TLT as opposed to SLT, when Dara goes to the monastery to seek refuge:

The young monk appeared with a small mat of Kausheya grass, which he spread on a stone platform in the shade of a papal tree opposite the door of the monastery. The elderly monk sat on the mat, and making a sign to Dara to sit in front of him, enquired, "Tell me what is in your mind, my daughter" (p. 152-153).

Lastly, a drastic upliftment in the portrayal of the protagonist Divya is observed in TLT as opposed to the SLT when she decides to go to the inn, towards the end of the novel:

us sheedhn aalok mei divya ne poorv disha mei diganth tak phaile

marg ki or dekha or shanti ka ek nishwaas lekar nagar dwaar ke bahar bani panthshaala ki or drishti ki. ratri mei deergh path par akele yaatra karne ki duvidha me divya kshan bhar par khadhi rahi phir raatri paanthshaala mei vyateet karne ke vichaar se uss or mud gai (p. 155).

Divya looked at the road leading towards the eastern horizon. Heaving a tired sigh, she turned her eyes towards the inn, which stood outside the city gate. For a few moments, she stood undecided; then with firm steps, walked towards the inn (p. 264).

The SLT phrase “ratri mei deergh path par akele yaatra karne ki duvidha me” seems to impart weakness, insecurity and dependency to the character of Divya by conveying that she hesitates to travel alone at night. On the other hand, the translator has done exceptionally well in opting to modify it in such a way that the power of Divya, which she earns during her agonizing journey of life, does not get shattered. In place of it, the translator has made use of “For a few moments, she stood undecided; then with firm steps.” This modification in TLT portrays her as an independent and self-reliant woman who makes decisions about her own life. Also, the replacement of SLT “shanti ka ek nishwaas” with TLT “a tired sigh” justifies her decision of going to the inn: out of tiredness—a normal human tendency—she decides to go to the inn.

### Conclusion

Translation is a multidimensional process which involves the harmonization of two sets of languages and discourses. The credibility of the translation depends on how accurately the translator has been able to translate the SLT in terms of both—form and function. Although, at a glance, the TLT discussed in this study seem to be equivalent to the SLT, a closer investigation reveals that the TLT differ to a small extent at the functional level and considerably at the formal level.

Moreover, translating Hindi novels which were written at a completely different temporal and socio-political setting is a massive challenge for the translators as they have to transmit themselves as well as their audience to the time and space of the SLT. Despite all the issues identified, Anand has accomplished the task of retaining the original sense without causing any damage to the impact of the text. The findings outlined in this paper is a proof that a successful translation of Hindi novels into English requires the translator to serve not only as an interpreter but also as a co-creator.

### References

- Anand. (2009). trans. *Divya*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.  
 Catford, J. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Das, B. K. (2005). *A handbook of translation studies*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors.
- Kalyani, P. (2001). *Translation studies*. New Delhi: Creative Books.
- Mukherjee, S. (2004). Translation as recovery. (M. Mukherjee, Ed.) New Delhi: Pencraft International.
- Rai, R. (2005). Indian fiction in English translation: Problems and perspectives. In S. Tiwari (Ed.), *Indian fiction in English translation* (pp. 6-13). New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors.
- Sapir, E. (1963). *Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture and personality*. (D. G. Mandelbaum, Ed.) California: University of California Press.
- Yashpal. (2012). *Divya*. New Delhi: Lokharti Paperbacks. 1945. Lucknow: Viplava Karyalaya.