

## RECONFIGURING LINGUISTIC STRUCTURES THROUGH TRANSLATION: A CATFORDIAN EXAMINATION OF CATEGORY AND LEVEL SHIFTS IN THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF SAADAT HASAN MANTO'S *THANDA GOSHT*

**Babar Riaz**

Visiting Lecturer and PhD scholar at Department of English, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

[briaz064@gmail.com](mailto:briaz064@gmail.com)

**Maryam Zahra**

Superior University Campus, Mandi Bahauddin

[marygondal843@gmail.com](mailto:marygondal843@gmail.com)

**Invish Tehreem**

Post Graduate College for Women, Mandi Bahauddin

[imirahaider96@gmail.com](mailto:imirahaider96@gmail.com)

### Abstract

*This paper explores the linguistic and structural shift involved in translating Saadat Hasan Manto's "Thanda Gosht" into English, applying J.C. Catford's model of translation shifts. Focusing specifically on category shifts (class, unit, structure, intra-system) and level shifts (grammar-to-lexis and vice versa), the study conducts a comparative analysis of selected source and target text segments to identify how meaning, tone, and cultural nuance are restructured during translation. The findings reveal that while the English translation captures the overall narrative intent, it frequently involves syntactic compression, lexical substitution, and the omission of culturally embedded expressions. These shifts, though functionally motivated, often dilute the emotional and cultural resonance of the original text. The study argues that Catford's model remains relevant for identifying structural disparities between languages, especially in literary contexts, but must be complemented by contextual and cultural considerations. This research contributes to the fields of translation studies and comparative literature by demonstrating how linguistic shifts reshape cross-cultural textual experience.*

**Keywords:** Catford's translation shifts, Intra-system shift, Category Shift, level shifts, Substitution

### Introduction

In his discussion of the art of translation, Bell states that translation is the process of expressing ideas in a target language or dialect while maintaining semantic and complex equivalencies. Furthermore, "the interpretative and open nature of translation is most evident in deciphering dramatisation," according to the Anglo-American and Russian schools of translation studies, which guarantee that translation is the kind of literary activity that aims to deliver the equivalent open impact by methods for understanding the source content (Alenkina, 2007). According to Larsen (1984), translation is a process that relies on the theory that it is possible to determine the meaning of a piece of information in the target language. (Nida, 1964) emphasizes that the ST and TT readers' responses should be almost the same. Since the goal of playing out different types of short tales is to get a somewhat similar response, show reactions are of extraordinary, if not the most significant, relevance. Folk tales are not the same as short stories, which are a different kind of art. "Translation is rendering of a source language (SL) content into the target language (TL) in order to guarantee that the surface importance of the two will be around similar and the structures of the source language will be saved as intently as could reasonably be expected but not all that intently that the objective language structures will be genuinely distorted," according to (Bassnett, 1988).

(Baker, 1998) defines perfect equivalence as "the relationship between a source text ST and a target text TT that has allowed the TT to be treated as a translation of the ST in any situation." In translation, shifts are urgently important to attain this goal. By all accounts, the kind of interpreted material is somewhat related to the number of changes in interpretation that

occurred. Given the aforementioned facts on the salient features of translations and the definition of "show," there is, by all accounts, a more fertile ground for movements to occur in the case of a short narrative. Shifts are used in plays not just to standardize the text but also to communicate the highlights that the author wants to be performed. In this way, given the current situation, many types of motions that are yet unknown take place.

The many types of motions that Catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) and Kitty van and (Lueven, 1989) have described will be fully explained in the literature review section. In any case, the question is to what extent these motions clear up confusion and accomplish the task of evaluating an interpretation, especially when a decrypted play is being examined. To put it another way, the current study has looked at a few units or, conversely, parts of them where some modifications have been found but no names or categories. In contrast, the model is assumed to be in control of every conceivable modification or move in the aforementioned motion display. It should also be examined that there is a significant disparity in the breadth of events for each kind of movement.

There are many instances where the interpreter has had to supervise the first content, and in the majority of those instances, there seems to be a justification for the control because the goal is to provide the performers with the same setting as the audience. Furthermore, the approach is quite wasteful when one considers the movements that Catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) offered in plays. This research looks at Manto's "Thanda Ghost" and its translation as a precedent. This short story uses Catford's (2000) approach of shifts and randomly selected words to estimate the well-reasonably manipulatives. However, as previously mentioned, the model does not account for the motions in this interpretation. Are the current motion models sufficient for show translation at this time? Does not it seem like another strategy is necessary? In any case, the goal of the current analysis is to draw attention to those flaws by providing a few randomly selected phrases from the play in question, not to address these questions.

### **Aims/Objectives**

1. To systematically identify and categorize the instances of level and category shifts in the English translation of "*Thanda Gosht*" using J.C. Catford's model of translation shifts.
2. To critically examine how these shifts reconfigure the syntactic, lexical, and stylistic elements of the source text, and assess their impact on the narrative tone, cultural specificity, and functional equivalence.

### **Research Questions**

1. What are different Catford's category and level shifts manifested in the English translation of Manto's *Thanda Gosht*, particularly in terms of structural realignment and lexical substitution?
2. How does these translational shifts influence the stylistic fidelity, cultural nuance, and semantic integrity of the original Urdu narrative?

### **Scope and Limitation of the Study**

This study is limited to short story "Thanda Ghost" by Manto. The study is also limited to the types of translation shifts proposed by Catford.

### **Literature Review**

Every living species communicates with one other in a variety of ways to convey messages and express emotions. Language is how people communicate their thoughts and feelings to one another. Language is a wholly human and non-instinctive way of expressing thoughts, feelings, and wants via a system of intentionally created symbols, according to Sapir (1921). Therefore, language is not intrinsic; rather, it is a tool that people learn from their surroundings in order to communicate with one another in the same language. Furthermore, humans all over the world interact with other speakers of the same language using a variety of unique languages that are

characteristic of each culture, in contrast to other species that employ a universal form of communication.

When two speakers of different languages try to converse, misinterpretation happens because people speak different languages all over the globe. This emphasizes how important the art of translation is in bridging this communication gap. The word "translation" has been defined in a variety of ways by linguists. (Nida, 1964) defines translation as "the transferring of a message from one language to another" (p.3) in his book *Towards a Science of Translating*. According to him, translation is the act of substituting words from one language for those from another in order to convey the desired meaning and facilitate communication.

One of the most important ways to spread ideas, culture, and information is via translation. It acts as a conduit for cross-cultural communication across many civilizations. As a result, one might say that it is an art of living with people. The process of translating a text from one language to another without sacrificing its meaning is known as translation.

(Nida, 1964) defines translation as "the transferring of a message from one language to another" (p.3) in his book *Towards a Science of Translating*. According to him, translation is the act of substituting words from one language for those from another in order to convey the desired meaning and facilitate communication.

A prominent language in many fields, including science, technology, education, employment, business, travel and tourism, press and media, and entertainment, English is an international language that is always changing (RAO, 2019).

In essence, a literature review is an analysis of earlier writings in this topic that open up new avenues for future authors and scholars to draw inspiration from. This section has read a number of scholarly texts and discussed their primary ideas. According to some translation scholars (Baker 1995, 1996, Toury 1980, 1995), deciphered texts will typically deviate from distinctive target language messages in various ways. For example, it may be possible to identify highlights that are specific to the translation or occur at a higher or lower level of the translation process than in the originals. According to this perspective, a thorough, large-scale, quantitative examination of the features common to all interpretations may lead to the distinctive evidence of interpretation universals. However, research conducted on a smaller scale, limited to translation processes of a specific type of content in a particular socio-social context and possibly from a particular source language, can provide information about translational standards, which have been declared the most important items of inspection within the field (Chesterman 1993; Delabastita 1991; Hermans 2011; Toury 1995).

Some translations, like Catford's works, Vinay and Darbelnet's transpositions, and others, focus more on form modifications than message. This is in contrast to the vast majority of translations. As a linguistic exercise, translation necessitates switching from the SL to the TL. Translation is essentially a change in structure (Larson, 1984), and this formal transformation occurs at several levels within a piece of text. Studies conducted here have given the marvel unique names, such as shifts (Catford, 1965), skewing (Larson, 1984), and transposition (Vinay, 1991, 1997). Some of them were prescriptive, practice-based, and trying to figure things out.

In literature, the phrase "shift" is used to refer to alterations that occur or might occur throughout the translation process. Despite being a kind of language usage, the idea of move belongs in the field of linguistic performance rather than conceptions of competence. Based on the fundamental differences between the source and target languages and civilisations, translation shifts may then be identified (Baker, 1992). Catford (1965) coined the word "move." Munday (2001, p. 55) said in *Interpretation Studies* that "move is, tiny semantic changes occurring in interpretation of source text." According to Catford (1965), there are two types of moves: level moves and class moves. According to him, a level move is anything that is

expressed using lexis in one language and syntax in another. The term "transposition" is one of the four techniques of angled interpretation, according to Vinay and Darbelnet (1995). They define accompanying transposition as a change of one grammatical component for another without altering the meaning (Vinay, 1985).

Though Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) did not use the word "move" in their definition of the formal alterations, they made reference to a comparable translational miracle as (Catford, 1965), the leading expert on "shifts." Dimension movements and class shifts are the names given to the motions, which Catford describes as "the takeoffs from formal communication during the period spent travelling from the SL to the TL" (Catford, 1965).

(Leuven-Zwart, 1989) of Amsterdam made the most detailed attempt to deliver and apply this item of shifts. Their model applies some of the classifications put forth by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) and (Levy, 1976) to the unmistakable investigation of translation, attempting to cover the sentence level in a talk structure as well as to structural examinations (Munday, 2001). Another comparative descriptive model is Leuven Zwart's (1989) approach, which separates selected items into plausible printed units.

Many studies have looked at translation changes, which undoubtedly occur throughout the interpretation process (Catford, 1965; Al-Zoubi and Al-Hassnawi, 2021). Catford (1965, p. 73) introduces the word "moves" and defines it as "takeoff from formal communication during the period spent travelling from SL to TL" in his book "A Linguistic Theory of Translation." Accordingly, it is attributed to a "static similar etymological methodology" that ignores practical, extra printed components. Conventional studies of translational shifts, particularly Catford, are conducted within the framework of formal and contrastive semantics (Munday, 2001, p. 6). Various studies link translation shifts to other phonetic aspects, such as printing, interpretation style, and content type (Popović 1976; Levy 2011); Al-Zoubi and Al-Hassnawi (2001) link them to commercial and expressive components. These investigations, which take into account either static relative semantic or practical extra printed components, have one thing in common: they use a hypothesis-based, prescriptive technique to examine all inclusive highlights and global models of interpretation alterations. However, the aforementioned investigations need real results to support the range of interpretation changes, therefore a precise, captivating analysis is required to provide quantifiable evidence. Furthermore, while discussing the significance of interpretation movements to phonetic elements, literary capabilities, and other relevant factors, the aforementioned enquiries suggest a comprehensive interpretation method rather than concentrating on the translation of a single explicit etymological element. Accordingly, it is also necessary to limit an analysis of the processes involved in word class interpretation. Since the 1950s, there have been many diverse linguistic approaches to the study of translation, each formed in specific assertions or classifications with a unique approach to dealing with the translation process and various literary works. "Shift in translation" is one of the best and most eloquent mediators in the explaining process.

This stretch "shift" is used in the works to describe changes that may or may not take place throughout the translation process from the source language to the target language. The concept of shift belongs in the realm of linguistics act rather than capability, even if the process of translating is a kind of language usage. The full contrasts between the source and target languages and cultures may now be used to identify translation shifts (Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies, p.

1).

Catford was the first to use the word "shift" (1965). "Shift is tiny linguistic changes happening in translation of source material," according to Munday (2008, p. 55) in Translation Studies. As Catford (2000, as referenced in Munday, 2008) outlines, there are two sorts of shifts: level



shift and category shift. Grammar in one language and lexis in another, according to Catford, contribute to level shift.

Additionally, Catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) states that categorical shifts are divided into four types: structural, class unit, and intra-framework shifts. Catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) fully explains these shifts as follows: "The most notable ones are the ones in syntactic structure. Basic movements are the most extreme ones."

Since Catford prefers a logically semantic-based approach to translation management, which is based on the semantic work of "Firth" and "Halliday," his method of managing translation is obviously distinct from Nida's (Nida and Taber, 1969). Introducing the idea advances, also known as translation movements, is his primary duty in the system of interpretation speculation.

Catford describes types of translation in ways of three criteria:

- 1) The degree of translation
- 2) The linguistic position at which the translation comparability is built up
- 3) The points of linguistic involved in translation

Different factors impacting occasion of stylistics shifts the activity of the translator stays most huge viewpoint. The vast majority of critical developments happening in translation can be credited to the differences between the main writer and the translator as two compositions producers. In any case, the impacts of these refinements are regularly covered by the insightful principles of the TL and the gauges of the interpretation activity itself. Progressively fundamental is the translator's association with the substance given.

Another scholar in this area is Kitty Van Leuven-Zwar (1989, as cited in Munday, 2008). The comparative model by Leuven-Zwart (1989, as cited in Munday, 2008) has been viable one proposed for contemplating syntactic, semantic complex, and down to pragmatic shifts inside sentences, provisions, an expressions of artistic writings and their interpretations.

#### **Author's focus:**

The focus of author has been to find to the different shifts by applying the Catford model. Author has founded different types of shifts: like structural shifts as well as one or two examples of unit or rank shifts. On the other hand less focus was given to level shift. Furthermore we can see that works of different writers has been taken in order to look at the past studies.

#### **Similarity and difference**

Researcher at various point has founded similarities as well as differences while writing literature review as well as doing the textual analysis of short story. Vinay and Derbalent model of Translation Strategies seems to have little bit similarity with Catford shift as they look at the changes in the formal aspects.

#### **Research Methodology and Theoretical Framework**

This study employs a qualitative comparative textual analysis to examine the category and level shifts in the English translation of Saadat Hasan Manto's *Thanda Gosht*, using J.C. Catford's theoretical framework as the primary analytical tool. A selection of ten source-text (Urdu) sentences and their corresponding target-text (English) translations are purposively sampled to ensure representation of various linguistic structures and stylistic features. Each pair is analyzed in detail to identify instances of structure, class, unit, and intra-system shifts, along with grammarto-lexis level shifts, as defined by Catford. The analysis focuses on how these shifts affect the syntactic organization, lexical choices, and cultural nuances of the original text. By applying a descriptive-analytical approach, the study aims to evaluate the extent to which the English translation preserves or reconfigures the stylistic, emotive, and narrative dynamics of the Urdu source.

### Research design

The research design used by the researcher is descriptive in nature to investigate that which types of translation shifts occur in the short story

### Data collection method

In order to collect the data a short story is by Manto "Thanda Gosht" is selected and selection of sentences is done randomly in order to analyze the shifts by using the model of Catford.

### Definition of term

Catford (1965) made his true contribution to the area of translation hypothesis when he introduced his translation shifts technique in his book *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Catford's dedication has earned him the title of "Father of Translation Shifts" (Al-Hamed, 2016). The "takeoffs from formal communication during the period spent transiting from the SL to the TL" are what he refers to as "shifts" (p. 73). Two significant types of interpretation shifts—specifically, "level movements" and "classification shifts"—were introduced by Catford (1965). Structure shifts, class shifts, unit shifts, and intra-framework shifts are the four categories into which category shifts fall.

In this part, each is characterised suitably.

### Level Shifts

Level movements are the progressions that occur when "a SL object at one linguistic dimension has a TL identical at an alternative dimension;" that is, when a word in the target language is used to convey a sentence structure in the source language, or vice versa, according to Catford (1965).

### Structure Shifts

Structure changes are "among the most common category shifts at all tiers in translation," according to Catford (1965) (p. 77). These are the modifications to a sentence's grammatical structure, or word order, at any linguistic rank (words, phrases, and sentences).

### Class Shifts

A class shift happens "where the translation equivalent of an SL object is a member of a different class than the original item," according to Catford (1965) (p. 78).

### Unit Shift

"By unit-shift we imply shifts in rank— that is, deviations from formal correspondence in which the translation equivalent of a unit at one rank in the SL is a unit at a different rank in the TL," according to Catford (1965) (p. 79).

### Intra-system shift

When a "translation entails selection of a non-corresponding word in the TL system," modifications known as intra-system shifts take place (Catford, 1965, p. 80).

## Data Analysis

### Example-1

#### Source Text

ایشر سنگھ جونہی ہوٹل کے کمرے میں داخل ہوا،

#### Target text

"Soon as Eesher Singh entered the room".

### Interpretation

The sentence "ایشر سنگھ جونہی ہوٹل کے کمرے میں داخل ہوا" and its English translation "Soon as Eesher Singh entered the room" reflect a number of significant translational modifications when analyzed through J.C. Catford's model of shifts, specifically his concepts of level shifts and category shifts (structure, class, unit, and intra-system). One of the most evident shifts here is a level shift, where the temporal subordinating structure "Soon as" in English, which functions grammatically to introduce a subordinate clause, is translated into the Urdu lexical

item “جونہی,” a single-word adverbial that encapsulates the grammatical function. This shift from a grammatical construction to a lexical equivalent demonstrates a clear grammar-to-lexis transition, typical of level shifts. Additionally, a unit shift is observed, as the English clause contains a slightly longer syntactic structure—“Soon as [subject] [verb]”—whereas the Urdu structure condenses this into a more compact expression through the pre-posed “جونہی,” reducing the unit size from a full subordinate clause to a word-level connector. Structurally, both sentences are subordinate adverbial clauses and thus do not exhibit a structure shift in terms of clause function, although English typically places more emphasis on syntactic completeness than Urdu does in narrative openings. Regarding class shift, there is a subtle movement from the English subordinating conjunction “Soon as” to the Urdu adverbial “جونہی,” indicating a shift in word class while retaining the temporal meaning. However, there is no intra-system shift, as both languages employ the past tense (“entered” in English, “داخل ہوا” in Urdu), and the voice, number, and mood remain unchanged. Overall, the translation efficiently adapts the English expression into Urdu using compact and idiomatic structures, exemplifying how Catford’s shifts—especially level and unit shifts—operate to maintain both semantic accuracy and narrative fluency in the target language.

**Catford Shift Analysis Table**

| Type of Shift             | Applied | Explanation  |
|---------------------------|---------|--|
| <b>Level Shift</b>        | ☑ Yes   | “Soon as” (a grammatical structure) is translated as “جونہی” (a lexical item in Urdu); this is a shift from grammar to lexis.                          |
| <b>Structure Shift</b>    | ✗ No    | Both the English and Urdu versions retain the subordinate clause <b>structure</b> ; the syntactic role is maintained.                                  |
| <b>Class Shift</b>        | ☑ Yes   | “Soon as” (subordinating conjunction) becomes “جونہی” (temporal adverb); this involves a change in grammatical class.                                  |
| <b>Unit Shift</b>         | ☑ Yes   | The English phrase “Soon as Eesher Singh entered...” (clause level) becomes a more condensed construction in Urdu; this is a shift in linguistic rank. |
| <b>Intra-system Shift</b> | ✗ No    | Both versions use the past tense (“entered” / “داخل ہوا”) and share the same number, aspect, and mood; no change in the internal grammatical system.   |

### Example-2

#### Source text

“تیری جان کی قسم، کچھ بھی نہیں۔”

#### Target Text

(2) “I swear there’s nothing wrong.”

#### Interpretation

The translation of the Urdu sentence “تیری جان کی قسم، کچھ بھی نہیں۔” into English as “I swear there’s nothing wrong.” demonstrates several key applications of Catford’s translation shift theory, particularly level shifts, structure shifts, class shifts, and unit shifts. At the outset, a clear level shift occurs in the rendering of “تیری جان کی قسم,” which is a lexicalized oath construction in Urdu, into the grammatical clause “I swear” in English. The Urdu expression literally invokes the addressee’s life to intensify the speaker’s sincerity, while the English version substitutes this with a grammatical performative verb (“swear”), shifting from lexis to grammar. A structure shift is also apparent: the Urdu sentence uses a two-part structure—an

oath followed by a flat declarative (“کچھ بھی نہیں”)—whereas the English merges both into a unified syntactic clause. Furthermore, a **class** shift arises in the representation of “کچھ بھی نہیں,” where the Urdu expression comprises pronoun + negation (literally: “nothing at all”), while the English renders it as “there’s nothing wrong,” introducing the adjective “wrong” not present in the original. This alters the grammatical category by embedding negation in a predicative adjective rather than a pronoun. There is also a unit shift, as the emphatic Urdu phrase is condensed and syntactically reconstructed in the English version, resulting in a shift from two coordinated utterances to a single clause. However, no intra-system shift occurs, as both versions maintain present tense and convey negation. Overall, this translation creatively reconfigures structural and lexical elements to preserve the emotional intensity and pragmatic function of the original, aligning well with Catford’s framework of functional equivalence via strategic shifts.

**Catford Shift Analysis Table**

| Type of Shift      | Applied | Explanation   |
|--------------------|---------|---|
| Level Shift        | ✓ Yes   | “تیری جان کی قسم” (lexical oath) → “I swear” (grammatical performative verb); shift from lexis to grammar.                        |
| Structure Shift    | ✓ Yes   | Urdu uses a split structure (oath + denial), while English forms a single syntactic unit (“I swear there’s nothing wrong”).       |
| Class Shift        | ✓ Yes   | “کچھ بھی نہیں” (pronoun phrase) → “nothing wrong” (negative existential with adjective “wrong”); a shift in grammatical category. |
| Unit Shift         | ✓ Yes   | The two-part Urdu sentence is merged into one clause in English; a reduction in syntactic unit occurs.                            |
| Intra-system Shift | ✗ No    | Both versions retain present tense, negation, and first-person assertion; there is no change in the grammatical system.           |

### Example-3

#### Source text

ایشر سنگھ کی آواز بے جان تھی۔

Target text (3) “There was no life in Eesher

Singh’s voice”. **Interpretation**

The translation of the Urdu sentence “ایشر سنگھ کی آواز بے جان تھی” into English as “There was no life in Eesher Singh’s voice” illustrates several key translation shifts as outlined by J.C. Catford, particularly structure, class, unit, and level shifts. In the Urdu source text, the sentence follows a straightforward subject–predicate structure, where “ایشر سنگھ کی آواز” (Eesher Singh’s voice) is the subject and “بے جان تھی” (was lifeless) serves as the predicate with an adjective. However, the English version reorganizes the syntactic structure by adopting an existential clause that begins with “There was,” followed by the noun phrase “no life in Eesher Singh’s voice.” This change in grammatical configuration represents a structure shift, as it moves from a descriptive subject–predicate form in Urdu to an existential sentence in English that repositions emphasis. A class shift is also evident, since “بے جان” (lifeless) is an adjective, while “no life” in the target text functions as a noun phrase, demonstrating a grammatical class transformation. Moreover, a unit shift occurs, as the compact Urdu phrase “بے جان تھی” is expanded in English into a more elaborated syntactic construction involving a dummy subject (“there”) and a prepositional phrase. This expansion also introduces a level shift, where Urdu conveys meaning lexically through the adjective “بے جان,” while English expresses the same idea through a grammatical existential structure (“there was no...”). Despite these shifts, there



is no intra-system shift, since both texts maintain the past tense ("تھی" and "was") and equivalent mood. The translation succeeds in conveying the same underlying semantic content, while adapting its structure and expression to conform to natural and idiomatic English, thus exemplifying Catford's notion of achieving equivalence through systematic shifts.

**Catford Shift Analysis Table**

| Type of Shift      | Applied | Explanation   |
|--------------------|---------|---|
| Structure Shift    | Yes     | Urdu uses a subject–predicate structure ("آواز بے جان تھی") while English adopts an existential clause ("There was no life in...").                       |
| Class Shift        | Yes     | The Urdu adjective "بے جان" is translated into the noun phrase "no life," indicating a shift from adjective to noun.                                      |
| Unit Shift         | Yes     | The short Urdu clause is expanded into a longer English clause, including a dummy subject and a prepositional phrase.                                     |
| Level Shift        | Yes     | The Urdu expresses lifelessness lexically ("بے جان") while English uses grammatical construction ("There was no..."), showing a grammar–lexis transition. |
| Intra-system Shift | No      | Both versions use past tense ("تھی" / "was") and convey negation, so no change occurs in the grammatical system.  |

#### -4

#### Example

##### Source

بڑا Text

ظالم ہے تو

ایشر سیان

##### Target text

(4) "You're are so cruel, Eesher darling."

##### Interpretation

The translation of "بڑا ظالم ہے تو ایشر سیان" into "You're so cruel, Eesher darling" illustrates a range of translation shifts in accordance with J.C. Catford's framework, specifically class, structure, unit, and level shifts. The Urdu sentence opens with the intensifier "بڑا" (very), followed by "ظالم" (cruel or oppressor), forming a compound adjective phrase. In English, this is rendered as "so cruel," where "so" functions as an intensifier. While semantically similar, this shows a class shift, as the Urdu phrase can act both adjectivally and nominally ("ظالم" is also a noun in some contexts), while in English, "cruel" is strictly adjectival. Structurally, there is a shift in sentence arrangement: Urdu begins with the predicate phrase and places the subject "تو ایشر سیان" (you, Eesher darling) at the end, a structure typical in emotive or poetic Urdu. In English, the subject "You" is placed at the beginning, followed by the verb and complement, conforming to standard English word order. This inversion reflects a structure shift. A unit shift is also evident, as the Urdu sentence merges emotive address and judgment into a single structure, while English separates these more distinctly by introducing punctuation ("You're so cruel, Eesher darling"). Additionally, there is a level shift in the rendering of "ایشر سیان," where "سیان" is a culturally rich, poetic form of address. It is replaced by "darling," which, while affectionate, lacks the regional and cultural embeddedness of the Urdu original. Thus, the translation substitutes a cultural lexical item with a target-language equivalent based on

emotional function, not cultural form. However, there is no intra-system shift: both sentences retain the present tense ("ہے" and "are") and direct address.

**Catford Shift Analysis Table**

| Type of Shift      | Applied | Explanation   |
|--------------------|---------|---|
| Structure Shift    | Yes     | Urdu places the subject at the end ("ہے تو ایسر سیاں"), while English follows SVC word order ("You're so cruel").                                     |
| Class Shift        | Yes     | "ظالم" can be both noun and adjective in Urdu, whereas "cruel" in English is purely adjectival; a shift in grammatical class occurs.                  |
| Unit Shift         | Yes     | Urdu blends the vocative and predicative elements into one expression, while English separates them with punctuation and word order.                  |
| Level Shift        | Yes     | "سیاں" (a culturally loaded term) becomes "darling" (neutral endearment), showing a shift from cultural lexis to emotionally equivalent target lexis. |
| Intra-system Shift | No      | Both texts use the present tense and retain the same mood and person; no grammatical system change is observed.                                       |

#### Example-5

##### Source Text

“ہونے دے آج ظلم۔”

##### Target text

“(5)“Let the cruelty begin.”

##### Interpretation

The translation of the Urdu sentence "ہونے دے آج ظلم۔" into English as "Let the cruelty begin" exemplifies several types of translation shifts based on J.C. Catford's model—primarily structure, class, unit, and level shifts. The source sentence in Urdu adopts an imperative form through "ہونے دے" (let it happen), followed by the noun "ظلم" (cruelty) and the temporal adverb "آج" (today). This structure emphasizes immediacy and permission. The English translation, while preserving the imperative mood, expresses the idea through a grammatical construction involving the verb "Let" followed by an infinitive clause "the cruelty begin." This shift from the Urdu lexical imperative structure to an English modal-infinitive construction represents a level shift, moving from a **lexical** imperative ("ہونے دے") to a grammatical structure ("let...begin"). Additionally, a structure shift is observed in the placement of "آج" (today), which is absent in the English version. The translator omits this temporal marker—either as a stylistic choice or due to its redundancy in the English context—resulting in semantic compression. There is also a class shift in the use of the verbal noun "ہونا" (to happen), embedded within "ہونے دے," translated into the finite verb "begin," shifting from a verbal noun to a full verb form. A unit shift occurs as well: the compact Urdu phrase is translated into a more structured clause in English, changing the rank from phrase to clause. Despite these changes, the imperative mood and tone are preserved, so no intra-system shift takes place regarding modality.

**Catford Shift Analysis Table**

| Type of Shift      | Applied | Explanation  |
|--------------------|---------|--|
| Structure Shift    | Yes     | Urdu places the temporal element "آج" (today) within the clause; English omits it entirely, simplifying the sentence.                          |
| Class Shift        | Yes     | The verbal noun "ہونا" (to happen) within "ہونے دے" is rendered as the main verb "begin" in English—changing from noun to verb.                |
| Unit Shift         | Yes     | Urdu uses a short, phrase-like imperative; English employs a more elaborated clause ("Let the cruelty begin")—phrase to clause transformation. |
| Level Shift        | Yes     | "ہونے دے" (a lexicalized idiomatic imperative) becomes "let...begin" (grammatical imperative with modal verb); lexis to grammar shift.         |
| Intra-system Shift | No      | Both versions use the <b>imperative mood</b> and carry the same directive force; no change occurs in tense, aspect, or polarity.               |

#### Example-6

##### Source Text

“کون ہے وہ چور پتہ؟”

##### Target text

(6) “I asked who’s that whore?”

##### Interpretation

The translation of "کون ہے وہ چور پتہ؟" into “I asked who’s that whore?” reflects several significant shifts according to J.C. Catford’s translation shift theory, especially structure, class, and unit shifts, along with a critical level shift in terms of speech reporting. Firstly, the Urdu source sentence is a direct interrogative containing the phrase "چور پتہ" — a vulgar or slang term often used in highly emotive or offensive contexts, more literally referring to a sexually immoral woman. The English rendering, “that whore,” approximates this connotation, but simplifies the original compound derogatory noun into a more universally recognizable single-word insult, leading to a class shift from a compound noun phrase to a simple noun. Structurally, the Urdu sentence is in direct speech form, framed as a question, while the English version adds “I asked” as a reporting clause, thus converting the utterance into reported speech. This is a clear structure shift, moving from a standalone interrogative to a subordinated declarative. There is also a unit shift, as the direct question is now integrated into a single sentence with dual clause structure, compressing the functional parts of the original. A level shift occurs when the interrogative "کون ہے" is absorbed into the clause “who’s that whore,” preserving the meaning but restructuring the grammar through embedded reporting. Notably, intra-system shift does not occur both texts retain present tense (ہے / is) and interrogative function, though the formal structure differs. Overall, the translation reduces the linguistic weight of the original while amplifying clarity in the target language through strategic restructuring, but it does slightly flatten the stylistic intensity of the source insult by narrowing its semantic register.

**Catford Shift Analysis Table**

| Type of Shift      | Applied | Explanation   |
|--------------------|---------|---|
| Structure Shift    | Yes     | Urdu uses a direct interrogative; English adds a reporting clause ("I asked"), changing the sentence type from interrogative to declarative with embedded speech. |
| Class Shift        | Yes     | "چور پتہ" (compound insult noun) is translated as "whore" (simple noun); a shift from compound structure to simple derogatory noun.                               |
| Unit Shift         | Yes     | Urdu expresses a question as a stand-alone clause; English embeds it into a reporting sentence — sentence → clause transformation.                                |
| Level Shift        | Yes     | "کون ہے" is a direct interrogative in Urdu; in English, it's embedded into reported speech grammar ("who's that whore"), showing grammar-level restructuring.     |
| Intra-system Shift | No      | Both versions remain in present tense and preserve speaker attitude; no grammatical system changes occur.   |

### Example-7

#### Source text

کلونت کور اس کے جواب کی منتظر تھی، "ایشر سیاں تو مطلب کی بات کر"

#### Target text

Get to the point "Furious Kalwant Kaur was waiting for an answer.

#### Interpretation

The translation of the Urdu sentence into English presents multiple translation shifts according to J.C. Catford's model, particularly structure shift, unit shift, class shift, and level shift. Structurally, the order of clauses in the Urdu sentence places the narration first ("کلونت کور اس کے جواب کی منتظر تھی") followed by the direct speech ("ایشر سیاں تو مطلب کی بات کر"). In contrast, the English version inverts this sequence, beginning with the quoted command ("Get to the point") and following it with the narrative clause ("Furious Kalwant Kaur was waiting for an answer"), resulting in a clear structure shift. A unit shift is evident in the translation of "مطلب کی بات کر" which is a compound noun phrase plus verb construction (literally: "speak to the point") into the idiomatic English phrase "Get to the point." The change from a concrete verb phrase to a phrasal imperative reflects a shift from phrase to clause. A class shift occurs as well: "مطلب کی بات" (noun phrase) becomes

"the point" (noun), and the Urdu verb "کر" becomes "get" in English—a verb with a different grammatical behavior and collocational pattern. Furthermore, there is a level shift, as the culturally embedded vocative "ایشر سیاں" (a poetic and intimate form of address) is omitted entirely in the English translation, shifting from lexical content to zero translation, which alters the interpersonal tone. The word "furious" in English is an amplification of the Urdu "منتظر تھی" (was waiting), where emotional intensity is explicitly added, though not overtly present in the source text. Despite these shifts, there is no intra-system shift, as both sentences remain in the past tense, and the imperative tone of the direct speech is preserved across both languages.



**Catford Shift Analysis Table**

| Type of Shift      | Applied | Explanation  |
|--------------------|---------|--|
| Structure Shift    | Yes     | The Urdu sentence presents narration first, then speech; English reverses the order, beginning with direct speech.                                 |
| Class Shift        | Yes     | “مطلب کی بات” (noun phrase) + “کر” (verb) → “Get to the point” (phrasal verb); a change in grammatical class and expression form.                  |
| Unit Shift         | Yes     | A longer Urdu phrase (“مطلب کی بات کر”) is translated as a shorter, idiomatic English clause (“Get to the point”)—phrase to clause transformation. |
| Level Shift        | Yes     | Cultural vocative “ایشر سیال” is omitted; the personal tone is not replicated, showing a shift from lexical item to omission (zero translation).   |
| Intra-system Shift | No      | Both texts remain in the past tense and use the imperative mood in dialogue; no grammatical system change.   |

### Example-8

Source text

ایشر سنگھ نے مونچھوں پر جمتے ہوئے لہو کو پھونک کے ذریعے سے اڑاتے ہوئے کہا

Target text

Blowing on the blood-clot forming on his mustache”; , Eesher Singh said:

### Interpretation

The translation of the Urdu sentence into English reveals several important translation shifts, particularly in terms of structure, unit, class, and level, as outlined in J.C. Catford’s translation shift theory. In the Urdu sentence, the structure follows a complex verbal chain, beginning with the main clause “کہا” (said), preceded by an elaborate participial phrase that includes “مونچھوں پر جمتے ہوئے لہو کو پھونک کے ذریعے سے اڑاتے ہوئے” — a highly descriptive expression emphasizing the method and state of action. In English, this description is simplified and rearranged to appear as an initial participle clause (“Blowing on the blood-clot forming on his mustache”), followed by the reporting clause (“Eesher Singh said”). This reordering of clauses from final position to initial position demonstrates a clear structure shift, common when adapting Urdu’s right-branching syntax to English’s left-branching, subject-initial style.

A significant unit shift also occurs. The Urdu participial structure includes two separate action phrases — “جمتے ہوئے لہو” (blood that was congealing) and “اڑاتے ہوئے” (blowing it away using breath) — which are semantically compressed in English into “blowing on the blood-clot forming.” This transition from a detailed verb chain to a single participial phrase indicates a shift from extended clause unit to a condensed phrase. Additionally, a class shift is present in the way “لہو کو پھونک کے ذریعے سے اڑاتے ہوئے” (literally: blowing away the blood using breath) becomes “blowing on the blood-clot.” The verb “اڑاتے ہوئے” (causing to scatter) is replaced with “blowing on,” which subtly shifts the force of action and lexical class from a more dynamic causative construction to a milder physical action verb.

Furthermore, a level shift is evident in how instrumentality is handled. Urdu explicitly mentions the instrument — “پھونک کے ذریعے سے” (by means of blowing), while English makes this implicit, relying on the verb “blowing” to suggest the method. This shift from explicit lexis to implied grammar reflects Catford’s lexis-to-grammar level shift. Importantly, there is no intra-system shift; both texts maintain the past tense and narrate the event using the same perspective and grammatical voice. The English translation thus reorganizes and simplifies the descriptive

weight of the Urdu source, using grammatical economy while preserving the narrative's grotesque imagery and intent. **Catford Shift Analysis Table**

| Type of Shift      | Applied | Explanation  |
|--------------------|---------|--|
| Structure Shift    | Yes     | Urdu places descriptive action after the main verb; English pre-poses the participial clause ("Blowing on..."), changing clause order.             |
| Unit Shift         | Yes     | Urdu uses a multi-part participial structure; English condenses it into a single participial phrase — clause → phrase.                             |
| Class Shift        | Yes     | “اڑاتے ہوئے” (causing to scatter) is rendered as “blowing on” — a change in verb type and force.   |
| Level Shift        | Yes     | Urdu explicitly states “پھونک کے ذریعے سے” (by means of blowing); English implies this through the verb “blowing” — a shift from lexis to grammar. |
| Intra-system Shift | No      | Both use past tense and maintain narrative mood; no grammatical system change.   |

## Conclusion

From the above discussion we can say that the researcher has found the different type of shifts from short story “Thanda Ghost”. As indicated by the present research, on one hand, the shifts are acquainted with the field of translation contemplates don't happen with a similar rate during the time spent interpretation; some of them come up frequently and other in all respects once in a while. Then again, shifts-as as of now have been thought to be—are not simply spoken to among semantic components, there are cases in which a sort of move is essential between an unremarkable limit of the SL appeared sign and semantic components of the TL.

## References

- Alenkina, T. (2007). Translating Drama: From John Wilson's “The City of the Plague” to Alexander Pushkin's “Pir vo Vremya Chumy”
- Alhussaini, M. (2021). English-Arabic translation of medical terminology in Saudi Arabian hospitals: A functional theory-based investigation (Doctoral dissertation, University of Leeds).
- Baker, M. (2018). In other words: A coursebook on translation. Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. (1991). Translation Studies Revised Edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bell, R. T., & Candlin, C. (1991). Translation and translating: Theory and practice (Vol. 298). London: Longman.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). A linguistic theory of translation (Vol. 31). London: Oxford university press.
- Chesterman, A. (1993). From ‘Is’ to ‘Ought’ Laws, Norms and Strategies in Translation Studies. Target, 5(1), 1-20.
- Delabastita, D. (1991). A False Opposition in Translation Studies: Theoretical versus/historical approaches. Target, 3(2), 137-152.
- Hermans, T. (2011). Translation as institution. In Translation as intercultural communication (pp. 3-20). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Levy, J. (2011). The art of translation. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2008). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Application.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (Eds.). (1974). The theory and practice of translation (Vol. 8). Brill Archive.
- Eugene, A. (1964). Toward a science of translating.
- Rao, P. S. (2019). The role of English as a global language. Research journal of English, 65-79.
- Sapir, E. (1921). An introduction to the study of speech. Language, 1(1), 15.
- Van Leuven-Zwart, K. (1989). Translation and original: Similarities and dissimilarities, I. Target. International Journal of Translation Studies, 1(2), 151-181.
- Vinay, J. P. (1991). Translation in theory and practice. American Translators Association Series, 157-171.