

MANIPULATION IN TRANSLATION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF “THE FUTURE OF PAKISTAN” BY COHEN AND ITS URDU TRANSLATIONS

Dr. Muhammad Javed Iqbal¹Umme Sadia²Saadia Khan³

ABSTRACT

The paper analyses the phenomenon of manipulation in two Urdu translations of the political historical text “The Future of Pakistan” written by Cohen (2011) and translated by Akhter (2011) and Somro (2012), hereinafter be abbreviated as TT1 and TT2 respectively. Lefevere’s theory of manipulation is employed to investigate the ideological manipulation in Urdu translation. Findings reveal that different perspectival and ideological positions of the translators are involved in the manipulation of the source text. The translation produced by TT1 assimilates to the original text and does not show any change in the depiction of political condition of Pakistan as described by the source text author. Unlike TT1, TT2 uses ideologically embedded choices of words and strategies of omission and addition to manipulate the text in order to lessen the intensity of the political matters. This research paves the way for future researchers to probe the idea of manipulation in other genres.

Keywords: manipulation, political, historical, ideological, perspectival position

Introduction

Translation is a complex and heterogeneous process affected by certain factors i.e. time, place, historical and socio-cultural aspects as well as the ideological position of a translator. Lefevere (1992) states that translators work in a particular given culture and a time instead of creating a product in a vacuum. A translator, as an individual belonging to a particular society or state, has different ideological perspectives. This ideological position determines the translator’s style, choices and strategies which shape the world views of the audience (Al-Mohannadi, 2008). The decisions made by the translator in his/her work on the basis of his/her ideology leads towards manipulation in translation. This paper examines the ways of manipulation in presenting distinct ideological positions of the translators in Urdu translations of a political historical text *The Future of Pakistan* by Cohen.

Manipulation is usually viewed as a linguistic manifestation of different strategies in translation in order to hide or alter true intentions (Kramina, 2004). The translator manipulates under the various constraints influenced by the political as well as literary constructions of power in order to create a natural and acceptable text for the target audience. Manipulation generally occurs due to the target language culture as well as the creator of the translation. It is also determined by the Ideological considerations of the translator. In this context, Majeed and Janjua (2019) assert that contextual factors especially ideologies influence the translation process and urge the translators to alter the text accordingly.

The idea is discussed by numerous scholars i.e. Hermans (1999), Lefevere (1992), Toury (1995) who represent an approach of manipulation in translation for particular readers in conformity with the norms of the target language and culture. It takes different forms as stated by the scholars i.e. Zauberga (2004), Dukate (2007) and Kramina (2004). They classify manipulation in various forms as external and internal manipulation of the text, deliberate and unconscious, and conscious and unconscious manipulation.

¹Lecture, Centre for Languages and Translation Studies, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

²Visiting Lecture, Centre for Languages and Translation Studies, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

³M. Phil Scholar, Centre for Languages and Translation Studies, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

<http://epistemology.pk/>

Similarly, Sertkan (2007) and Kramina (2004) believe that manipulation is an intentional or unintentional effort of the translator who manipulates the original text according to his/her ideology and the target culture values by adopting various strategies e.g. addition, omission or adaptation, etc. Similarly, in Lefevre's (1992) view, there are different strategies used by translators to manipulate, alter, or reinterpret the text i.e. addition, omission, and explanation. This paper analyzes such types of strategies employed by Urdu translators in translating "The Future of Pakistan" a historical text in English and reveals their ideological positions.

Literature Review

Manipulation is seen in the perception of such strategies return to ordinary circumstances to cover one's actual intentions, either evil or good. Manipulation rises up due to economic, ideological, political and social contemplations that continue deliberately, and hence are named as conscious manipulation. Manipulation attributed to the human psychological features and manipulation due to obliviousness (deficiency in a language or world information) is named as unconscious manipulation. It is apparent that manipulative manifestation finds its way in the field of Translation Studies and since the area is all-embracing due to the dynamic perspectives in it, it is hard to come to a strict definition of manipulation. Different researchers have endeavored to depict it, examining the two of its positive and negative perspectives.

As it is often perceived that translation is also manipulation as the original and translated versions are never the same. Rabassa (1984) talks about the inconceivability of translation. If one anticipates that the source and target texts perfectly equivalent, in light of the fact that even phonemes, also words, use to indicate certain concepts and phenomena, contrast in different dialects. Even if the parallel words in two dialects are discovered, the undertones these words convey would be unique. It is Lefevre's (1992) claim that being "the most obvious recognizable type of manipulation" (p.9), translation can never liberate itself from the clinches of literary and political structures existing inside a given culture. As a general rule, if translators need their work to be recognized and published globally in a target audience, they certainly are not allowed to disregard those threads.

Katan (1999) believes that Manipulation is an integral part of translation. He starts the argument by citing Collins English Dictionary (1991) where the verb 'to manipulate' is characterized as follows: 1) to deal with or use, particularly with some ability; 2) To bargain, control, or impact (on someone or something) skillfully, cleverly, deviously. He accepts that "the very act of translating involves skillful manipulation" (Katan, 1999, p.140), and that apparently faithful translation is underhanded with free translation. As an example, he quotes President Nixon who visited Japan, and was misdirected precisely because of exact translation. Holman and Boase-Beier (1999) clarify that a translator is always available in the text s/he has deciphered "Like the original author, the translator, too, will have hierarchies of aims and agendas, some conscious, other less so, and in different ways, these will all constrain and color the recreated SL text" (p.9).

From the few views given above, it can be said that manipulation or the awareness regarding translation as manipulation carries some serious impacts. In the meantime, everything is claimed to be manipulative either in everyday conversations, sermons, political speeches, or most common among them; advertisements. But in this havoc, the translation is always targeted by comparing it with the original. Translations even tend to contend, as Hermans (1999) does, that translation is intriguing to some extent because of manipulation as an index of the hidden ideology, the structures of power, and struggle of power.

The concept of manipulation in translation is the main concern of numerous studies, commencing from the pivotal the "School of Manipulation" in translation (Bassnett (2001), Hermans (1999), Lefevre (1992) & Toury(1995)). This new turn in this field is being researched in many areas i.e. in translation (Kramina (2004), Dukate 2007, Schjoldager 1995, Kornaukhova 2011, Farahzad 1998), in mass media (Holiday), in screen translation (Fawcett, 2003) and ideological censorship that occurs when politics and culture of source language influence the target language or vice versa (Shuping 2013; Chung-ling 2010, al-Qinai 2005).

<http://epistemology.pk/>

The researchers from USA, Belgium and Israel are the first who applied the idea of manipulation on literary translations (1980s) under the broly of a new school of thought; the manipulation school (Lefevere, 1992). To them no or lack of bias in translation is a fairy tale and translation is innately manipulative, consequently they view 'translation as manipulation'.

Manipulation, in its ordinary sense, is perceived more negatively by different scholars than positively due to its prejudiced, abusive and illegitimate (van Dijk, 2006, p.360) properties, concealing the negative and truth (Wilson, 2001, p.400) and especially in translation as distortion, mediation or negotiation (Hatim & Mason 1990, 1997; Katan 1999; Munday 2007). However, manipulation, in its plus definition is viewed as inevitable. Farahzad (1999, p.155) claims in her 'Gestalt approach to unconscious manipulation' that the translator adopts manipulative strategies when he is to bridge the two apart pictures. Baker (2005) sees manipulation in translation as a necessary element when there is a time of conflict before the translator. She exemplifies Guantanamo, Iraq, The Mission Song as the intervention and manipulation by the translator/interpreter whose works are strongly manipulated. Hitherto, others appreciate the multifunctionality of manipulation. For instance, Dukate (2007) asserts that manipulation is used for discourse perfection, control and distortion because of linguistics, culture, psychology and ideology of L1 to L2. Yet there are some who are still in middle state of neither-nor. Manipulation is neither a good nor a bad, but simply magnifies what the translator favors and directs to the background and what s/he does not. Manipulation is textual, contextual or para textual manifestations. In translation, it is rendered as forms of translational shifts including omission, addition, substitution and replacement (ibid).

As the recent trends in Translation Studies (Snell-Hornby, 2006) do not admit equivalence as the essential element in translating. This claim is revised by many theorists as linguistics is never considered a secluded portion in translation in general and translation of history in particular. Dik (1997), a functionalist linguist, shares his views about translating and claims that syntactic and pragmatic structures are dominating factors in any analytical section of history. If the translator intends to preserve the structure of L1 into L2, in one hand and he finds no operative equivalent on the other hand, the translation would just be "a cosmetic character" (Kalisz & Roman 2017). This recalls the cognitive extension of translation as Hejwowski (2004) sees this process as operative projection on minds of both the translator and reader. Here, the equivalence is beyond language, particularly, centered on human mind and cognition. Thus, the manipulative function is achieved through inter-cultural, political and historical cooperative cognition of the receiver or by maintaining equally or maximally closer adherence to the source text. This kind of recognition is important in understanding of a text (as in this research historical text) which is the ultimate goal of translation in the modern its sense.

Manipulation was once used to be an extent of politics, but now it is tumbled into the discipline of translation studies as well. It is usually believed that ideology is inseparable aspect of translation. Some scholars assert that all translation activities are ideological and the relationship between translation and ideology is also ideological (Schaffner, 2003). According to Liu (1995), translation is not a neutral act rather it is influenced by political and ideological struggles. In the same way Lefevere (2001) also links translation with ideology and asserts that translation is a form of rewriting and a manipulated form of the original text. He defines ideology as certain opinions and attitudes that are considered acceptable in a particular society in a particular context. These beliefs and opinions provide the way to readers and translators to approach different texts (Bassnett & Lefevere, 2001). In other words, translators are obliged by certain ideological factors that involve dominant ideology, translator's self-ideology, readership's ideology etc. Their ideological attitudes ae revealed in their translation acts.

The ideological attitude of translators is a political doctrine (Vincent, 1992). Political ideology is set of principles, myths or signs of a class, social group or a social movement that defines the social order of a society. Translation acts are certainly affected by these political ideological attitudes. These ideological concerns are the reasons for the translator to manipulate the original texts for the target readers by using various strategies.

<http://epistemology.pk/>

Numerous researches are conducted to analyze manipulative acts in translation. Majeed and Janjua (2019) conduct a study on manipulation in translation by focusing on the contextual factors involved in the manipulation. By using Shi's (2004) approach of translation as accommodation and Dijk's method of text analysis, they investigate the contextual factors which lead the translator towards accommodation strategy. The results show that the major factor responsible for manipulation in translation is ideology. Similarly, Sanatifar (2013) explores the phenomenon of manipulation in the translation of a political text that explains the Iran's nuclear program conflict. The data is analyzed by drawing on four reframing strategies introduced by Baker (2007). Findings of the study reveal that manipulation in translation totally changes the narrative of the story. It concludes that translation unveils a different image of the original story and a different set of values from that of the original text. Sanatifar (2013) asserts that this alteration and reinterpretation of the story is way of social movement based on certain ideology.

Another study conducted by Razumovskaya and Klimovich (2016) demonstrates the occurrence of ideological manipulation in literary translations. The research examines the manipulative strategies in literary writings and their Russian translations carried out in the Soviet period. The study reveals that the Russian translations of that particular era are manipulated under the ideological influence and due to the existing political system by employing deletion and substitution as manipulative strategies.

Scales (2016) investigates the phenomenon of manipulation in translation by adopting corpus-based approach to examine different translations of different authors. The study takes Caribbean texts and their translations to observe the instances of manipulation and the factors responsible for the manipulation in translation. It reveals that the translators manipulate the texts in order to appeal the target language readership as well as the market.

The current research investigates the ways of manipulation in presenting distinct ideological positions of the translators in Urdu translations of a political historical text by taking its theoretical underpinnings from Lefevere's theory of manipulation and rewriting in translation.

Research Methodology

The data for the current research comprises a historical and political text *The Future of Pakistan* by Cohen (2011) and its two translations by Akhter (2011) and Somro (2012), TT1 and TT2 respectively. The text is based on the description of the political, educational, economic as well as the military condition of Pakistan. It depicts a detailed picture of the historical background of the country by linking it with the current situation. Different extracts are taken from the source text by using the method of purposive sampling to analyze the text. The source text and target texts are compared to examine the phenomenon of manipulation in translation. The paper takes its theoretical underpinnings from Lefevere's (1992) idea of manipulation first introduced in his book *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. He states that translation is the closest form of manipulation and a social as well as an ideological phenomenon. The translator manipulates under the various constraints influenced by the political as well as literary constructions of power in order to create a natural and acceptable text for the target audience. Thus, it affects the historical, political and religious image of the source text author as well as the translator. According to Lefevere, there are different strategies used by translators to manipulate, alter, or reinterpret the text i.e. addition, omission, and explanation. These strategies are employed by the translator depending on his/her ideology, perspectival position, and social and political factors. This paper deals with the notion of manipulation in a historical text and examines different filtering manipulative strategies in the translation of political discourse.

Data Analysis

This section deals with the analysis and discussion of the selected data. Different extracts are taken from the source text by using the method of purposive sampling to analyze the text. The data is presented in tabular form and the source text and target texts are compared to examine the

<http://epistemology.pk/>

phenomenon of manipulation in translation and the choices made by the translators to manipulate the text.

Extract no. 1

ST	TT (1)	TT (2)
The most pessimistic of Pakistanis feel that the battle has been lost, and some seek refuge elsewhere. (Cohen, 2011, p.30)	حالات سے بہت زیادہ مایوس پاکستانی سمجھتے ہیں کہ جنگ باری جا چکی ہے اور ان میں سے کچھ کہیں اور پناہ لے چکے ہیں۔ (اختر، 2011ء، صفحہ 54۔)	بیشتر رجائیت پسند پاکستانیوں کا خیال ہے کہ جنگ باری نہیں گئی۔ (سومرو 2012ء، صفحہ 64۔)

The selected source text in extract 1 shows the pathetic circumstances of Pakistani people, they faced at a specific time. The challenging situation and internal and external problems are described in the text. It conveys the idea that Pakistanis are exploited in the name of terrorism and Islam. A particular ideology about them is set by the US after the attack of 9/11, so they are considered as terrorist and a negative image of Muslims has constructed by the whole world. Pakistan was also under the attack of terrorism, and hopelessness was at its peak among the people, so, they felt that they have lost the war against terrorism and failed to protect their religion. Because of these circumstances, they seek refuge in another place to fight against terrorism and to protect their religion. TT1 follows the source text by presenting the same story while TT2 manipulates the idea given in the source text. He manipulates the text and adds some positivity and hope in his translation. He uses the strategy of omission to show a positive image of Pakistani people. For example,

بیشتر رجائیت پسند پاکستانیوں کا خیال ہے کہ جنگ باری نہیں گئی۔ (سومرو 2012ء، صفحہ 64۔)

The word pessimistic is translated as رجائیت which means optimistic and (رجائیت پسند) means the people who believe in an optimistic approach. Somro substitutes the term pessimistic with completely opposing term referring to optimism. So, he translates in the sense that most people who lives in Pakistan are optimist and they do not lose hope and they want to fight against terrorism to protect their country as well as their religion. This represents the positive image of the Pakistani nation to the world and reveals the ideology of the translator which is constructed about Pakistan and Islam by manipulating the source text.

Extract no.2

ST	TT (1)	TT (2)
When asked before her death, Benazir told me that the PPP was not ready for internal democracy, and that it needed a strong leader (herself) to keep its factions together and to develop strategies to protect the party's integrity from assaults by state intelligence agencies. (Cohen, 2011, p. 31)	بے نظیر کی موت سے پہلے جب میں نے ان سے اس بارے میں پوچھا تو ان کا کہنا تھا کہ پیپلز پارٹی اندرونی جمہوریت کے لیے تیار نہیں اور اسے ایک طاقتور قیادت کی ضرورت ہے جو کہ اسکے مختلف دھڑوں کو آپس میں ملائے رکھے اور ایک ایسی حکمت عملی تیار کر سکے جس سے پارٹی کو ریاستی انتہیلی جنس ایجنسیوں کے حملے سے محفوظ رکھا جاسکے۔ (اختر، 2011ء، صفحہ 56۔)	بے نظیر بھٹو مرحومہ نے اپنی وفات سے کچھ عرصہ قبل ایک ملاقات میں مجھے بتایا تھا کہ پیپلز پارٹی داخلی جمہوریت کے لیے تیار نہیں ہے اور جماعت کے مختلف دھڑوں کو باہم متحد رکھنے نیز جماعت کو اپنی اصابت پر ریاستی انتہیلی جنس اداروں کے حملوں سے بچانے کے لیے ایک مضبوط رہنما (بے نظیر بھٹو) کی ضرورت ہے۔ (سومرو 2012ء، صفحہ 66۔)

The given extract is another example of manipulation by using the strategy of omission. The source text author describes Benazir Bhutto's statement before her death. She was the first elected woman Prime Minister of Pakistan. She was the leader of a democratic political party of Pakistan. After the death of his father, the former Prime Minister of Pakistan Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, she took charge of the party, and started her political career. In the given statement of Benazir Bhutto, she shows great concern for her party and its future. She says that her party needs a true leader who saves her party from internal and external threats. The source text author mentioned 'herself' in brackets to emphasize and point out Benazir Bhutto. The term is translated differently in TT1 and TT2. TT1 omits the said term and TT2 uses a substitution strategy to highlight the term and to give it a specific meaning.

TT1 omits the translation of 'herself' in order to hide the particular person and to give a general statement. He can literally translate the specific term as (خود) but he avoids translating it, and gives

<http://epistemology.pk/>

a general statement. This omission results in a very ordinary statement that shows the concerns of Benazir Bhutto about her party, but the person she wants to point out for making her party strong is mentioned as a ‘stranger’ and not her. The TT2 translator Aqeel Abbas Somoro uses manipulation, and avoids literal translation of the ‘herself’ that is (خود) rather uses a proper name ‘Benazir Bhutto’ to highlight her position and to construct her specific ideology. The translator wants to emphasize the name because of the strength, ability and concern of Benazir Bhutto towards her party and depicts her as a strong party leader, who is capable of doing all essential actions herself, and no other party members need to interfere in this major matter of the party. This manipulation in translation leads towards persuasiveness and influences the readers in a certain way. In other words, the addition of the name of Benazir Bhutto is also used to persuade the audience about the courage and strength of Benazir Bhutto.

Extract no. 3

ST	TT (1)	TT (2)
In 2006, the concerns were evident, even as President Pervez Musharraf was still riding towards his non- rendezvous with a Nobel Peace prize. (Cohen,2011,p.7)	2006ء میں جیکہ پاکستانی صدر جنرل پرویز مشرف امن کا نوبل انعام حاصل کرنے کے خواب دیکھ رہے تھے اس وقت بھی تشویش کے عوامل صاف دکھائی دے رہے تھے (اختر، 2011ء،صفحہ 10۔)	2006ء میں بھی تشویش نمایاں تھی (سومرو، 2012ء،صفحہ 19۔)

Extract 3 presents a fine example of manipulation by using the strategy of omission. One translator follows exactly the source text and translates it into the meaning as given in the source text, while the other translator omits the whole structure even the sense and meaning of the original text. TT1 translates the source text as a whole. He uses the same structure and follows the same meaning of the original text. TT2 uses the strategy of omission and skips the whole structure. He manipulates the text and translates the whole expression as:

2006ء میں بھی تشویش نمایاں تھی

TT2 conveys the theme of the original text, but omits the other information. This kind of omission leads toward a loss in translation, and if it is done by the purpose, it leads toward manipulation. The source text writer is a foreign writer and has written about the circumstances of Pakistan in 2006 for example, war, terror, economic instability and argues that Parvaiz Musharraf as a President of Pakistan was dreaming about the Nobel Prize. This portrays the negative image of Pakistan and its leaders. The TT1 translates the ideology of source text author in the same way without any alteration. However, TT2 completely omits the part where the image of the President of Pakistan is portrayed negatively. Lefevere (1992) names this kind of omission as ideological omission because translator deliberately uses this strategy either to construct a specific ideology or to manipulate a particular ideology. TT2 portrays a good image of the President of Pakistan General Parwaiz Musharraf as he skips the specific structure which constructs a negative ideology of Pakistani President. This also shows the subjectivity of the translator and a particular perspectival position.

Extract no. 4

ST	TT (1)	TT (2)
Benazir Bhutto’s security, and a U.N. report holds him responsible in part for her murder. (Cohen, 2011, p.11)	اقوام متحدہ کی ایک رپورٹ میں مشرف کو اس قتل میں جزوی طور پر ذمہ دار قرار دیا گیا ہے۔ (اختر، 2011ء،صفحہ 21۔)	اقوام متحدہ کی ایک رپورٹ نے بھی انہیں بے نظیر کی سیکورٹی کے حوالے سے غفلت کا مرتکب قرار دیا ہے (سومرو، 2012ء،صفحہ 28۔)

Extracts 4 shows the instance of manipulation that constructs a political ideology. Omission and addition in the process of translation affect the ideology of a text both in positive and in a negative way. Political ideologies are important factors for the survival of democracy in a country. Addition in a translated text constructed a specific discourse, which shows a positive or negative image of a specific political party or person. The given text also presents the same kind of ideology constructed in both TT1 and TT2. The way of writing and the choice of words also matters a lot in

<http://epistemology.pk/>

the construction of ideology. Source text gives the information about the death of Benazir Bhutto and people who are responsible for her murder. TT1 uses the strategy of addition and translated 'him' as 'Musharraf'. TT2 uses the word انہیں as the equivalent of 'him' which is suitable and exact translation of the specific term while TT1 uses a proper name instead of using exact translation of a pronoun to highlight the entity. In the next line, TT1 translates exactly the same way as source text author describes the situation. He translates responsible as ذمہ دار , in a part for as جزوی طور پر , and murder as قتل that depicts Musharraf as murderer. On the other hand, TT2 substitutes these expressions with different word choices constructing a particular ideology. He translates murder as سکیورٹی and responsible as غفلت کا مرتکب and omit the translation of 'in a part for'. The word choices lessen the intensity of the matter and avoid holding one person responsible for the incidence. He manipulates the translation to consider Parvaiz Musharraf less responsible for the murder of Benazir Bhutto. It has two major reasons. The first reason is subjectivity of the translator. The translator might have influenced by Musharraf and did not want to drag him this specific situation and he wants to construct a positive image of Musharraf to the people despite using harsh words in source text. The second reason might be not to add fuel to fire. This was a very sensitive matter because the leader of a strong political party was murdered publicly. The translator does not want to hold one person responsible, so he manipulates the expressions minimize the extremeness of the matter.

Extract no. 5

ST	TT (1)	TT (2)
The usual question is “whither” Pakistan, but the real one is “whether” Pakistan: what kind of Pakistan will emerge from the present chaos. (Cohen,2011,p.9)	عمومی طور پر جو سوال پوچھا جاتا ہے وہ یہ ہے کہ پاکستان کدھر جا رہا ہے جبکہ اصل سوال یہ ہے کہ آیا پاکستان کہیں جا بھی رہا ہے۔ موجودہ بدامنی اور بے چینی سے کس قسم کا پاکستان ابھرے گا۔ (اختر، 2011ء، صفحہ 12)	عمومی سوال "پاکستان کہاں" جبکہ حقیقی سوال "آیا پاکستان" ہو گا۔ (سومرو 2012ء، صفحہ 21)

The given extract is also an example of manipulation by employing the strategy of omission in translation. Source text author writes about the circumstances of Pakistan and uses two important terms “whither” and “whether” for a question about the existence and progress of Pakistan. TT1 translates the terms into کدھر and یا نہیں جا بھی رہا ہے یا نہیں. TT2 translates these terms as exactly given in source text without adding other words or phrase for example "پاکستان کہاں" and "آیا پاکستان". TT1 translates the source text exactly same as source text and he also adds further words and phrases to make the text communicative. He uses the strategy of addition to add the meaning in the text, but he omits nothing in the sentence. He portrays same ideology of source text author and conveys the original meaning. He translated it as;

عمومی طور پر جو سوال پوچھا جاتا ہے وہ یہ ہے کہ پاکستان کدھر جا رہا ہے جبکہ اصل سوال یہ ہے کہ آیا پاکستان کہیں جا بھی رہا ہے۔ موجودہ بدامنی اور بے چینی سے کس قسم کا پاکستان ابھرے گا۔

In his translation, he explains that the most frequent question that is being asked about Pakistan is where Pakistan is? But the actual question which should be asked is, whether Pakistan is on the way of progress or not? And the next line is again about the circumstances of Pakistan that what kind of Pakistan will be there because of the present chaos. Translator does not change anything from the source text to construct the positive image or hide the negative image of Pakistan.

On the other hand, TT2 omits a whole structure to construct a specific ideology and to convey a specific meaning by manipulation in translation. He omits one whole structure where Pakistan is presented in the situation of chaos. He translated the first sentence of the text without adding another wording or explaining the situation of Pakistan. He translated it as:

عمومی سوال "پاکستان کہاں" جبکہ حقیقی سوال "آیا پاکستان" ہو گا۔

This statement is not clear in its meaning. He translated it in an ambiguity to hide the negative image of Pakistan and to cover the bad circumstances of Pakistan. This is done deliberately and

<http://epistemology.pk/>

due to his subjective approach towards his own country. The manipulation in translation is done deliberately to hide a specific ideology of the author about Pakistan.

Conclusion

The above-discussion unveils that different perspectival as well as ideological positions of the translators are involved in the manipulation of the source text. TT1 translates the ideas same as they are described by the source text author. He translates the ideological conceptions of the source text author without altering or manipulating them. In contrast, the translation by TT2 does not necessarily reflect a faithful and straightforward reproduction of source text, rather; it shows the image of TT2 as a social actor having subjective approach towards his state, and reframes the source text due to his particular ideological position. In other words, TT2 tries to avoid the negative aspect of the political issues and overcome the element of hopelessness as depicted by the source text author. To cut short, ideologically embedded choices of words and different strategies are frequently used by TT2 to manipulate the text and to construct positive image of particular entities and affairs of the state.

This research is an aiding tool for future researchers to enhance the idea of manipulation by applying it on other genres i.e. film translation, religious texts, literary texts etc.

References

- Al-Mohannadi, S. (2008). Translation and ideology. *Social Semiotics*, 18(4), 529-542.
- Al-Qinai, J. (2005). Manipulation and censorship in translated texts. In *Actas del II Congreso Internacional AIETI 2005. Formación, investigación y profesión.*(Madrid, 9-11 de febrero 2005) (pp. 488-525).
- Approaches Explained, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing
- Baker, M. (2005). Narratives in and of Translation. *Skase Journal of Translation and Interpretation*, 1(1), pp.4-13.
- Baker, M. (2007). Reframing conflict in translation. *Social semiotics*, 17(2), 151-169.
- Bánhegyi, M. (2014). Translation and political discourse. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, 6(2), 139-158.
- Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (2001). *Constructing cultures: Essays on literary translation* (Vol. 11). Multilingual Matters.
- Chung-ling, S. (2010). Ideological interference in translation: Strategies of translating cultural references. *Translation journal*, 14(3).
- Cohen, S. P. (2011). *The future of Pakistan*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Dictionary, C. E. (1991). Glasgow. UK: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Dik, S. C. (1997). *The theory of functional grammar: the structure of the clause*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Dukate, A. (2007). Manipulation as a specific phenomenon in translation and interpreting. PhD thesis, Latvijas Universitate. Riga: University of Latvia.
- Farahzad, F. and Allameh, T. (1999). A Gestalt Approach to Manipulation. Museum Tusulanum Press University of Copenhagen.
- Fawcett, P. (2003). The manipulation of language and culture in film translation. 2003, 145-163.
- Hatim, Basil & Mason, Ian (1990). Discourse and the translator. London: Longman.
- Hatim, Basil & Mason, Ian (1997). The translator as communicator. London: Routledge.
- Hejwowski, K. (2004). *Translation: a cognitive-communicative approach*. Olecko : Wydawnictwo Wszecnicy Mazurskiej
- Hermans, T. (1999). Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented
- Holman, M., & Boase-Beier, J. (1999). Introduction: Writing, Rewriting and Translation. Through Constraint to Creativity. *The Practices of Literary Translation: Constraints and Creativity*. Manchester: St Jerome, 1-17.
- Zauberga, I. (2004). *Theoretical Tools for Professional Translators*. Latvijas Universitāte
- Kalisz, M., & Roman, K. (2017). Some Aspects of Translating History. *humanistica* 21, 1, 67-78.
- Katan, D. (1999). *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. St. Jerome Publishing.

<http://epistemology.pk/>

- Kornaukhova, N. G. (2011). Perevod vs. versii: vidy manipuliatsii v khudozhestvennom perevode [Translation vs. Version: Types of Manipulation in Literary Translation]. *Bulletin of Irkutsk State Linguistic University*, 176-183.
- Kramina, A. (2004). Translation as manipulation: Causes and consequences, opinions and attitudes. *Kalby Studijos*, (6), 37-41.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. Routledge.
- Liu, L. H. (1995). *Translingual practice: Literature, national culture, and translated modernity--China, 1900-1937*. Stanford University Press.
- Majeed, A., & Janjua, F. (2019). Translation as Accommodation: Influences of Contextual Factors on a Translator. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(2).
- Munday, J. (2007). Translation and ideology: A textual approach. *The translator*, 13(2), 195-217.
- Sanatifar, M. S. (2013). Translation, Manipulation and Social Movement. *American Journal of Translation Studies*, 5(2), 95.
- Rabassa, G. (1984). The Silk Purse Business: A Translator's Conflicting Responsibilities. In Frawley, W. (ed.) *Translation: Literary, Linguistic and Philosophical Perspectives*. Newark: University of Delaware Press. pp. 35-40.
- Razumovskaya, V. A., & Klimovich, N. V. (2016). Manipuliatsiia pri perevode intertekstual'nykh elementov v khudozhestvennom tekste [Manipulation in Intertextual Elements Translation in Fiction]. *Bulletin of Moscow State Pedagogical University, Philology. Theory of Linguistics. Linguistic Education*, 2(22), 55-63.
- Scales, S. V. (2016). *Shifting Identities: An Examination of French Caribbean Texts in Translation* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick).
- Schäffner, C. (2003). Third Ways and New Centres. Ideological Unity or Difference? Teoksessa *Apropos of Ideology. Translation Studies on Ideology–Ideologies in Translation Studies*. Toim. Pérez, María Calzada. St. p.21-23
- Schjoldager, A. (1995). Interpreting research and the 'manipulation school' of translation studies. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 7(1), 29-45.
- Sertkan, K., & Gülperi, S. E. R. T. (2007). The ideology of lexical choices in the Turkish translations of Oliver Twist. *Department of Translation Studies, Dokuz Eylül University, Turkey*.
- Shuping, R. (2013). Translation as rewriting. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(18), 55-59.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* (Vol. 66). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse and Society*, 17, pp.359-383.
- Vincent, A. (2009). *Modern political ideologies*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Wilson, J. (2001). Political discourse. In: Schiffrin, D., Deborah, T. & Hamilton, H. E. eds. *The Handbook of discourse analysis*. Blackwell Publishing.