

Amrita Pritam's Translation of Indian Cultural Violence during the Partition: A Holocaust of Abductions in *Pinjar*

Kashyap Deepak*

Amrita Pritam build a historical museum to display the tragic tale of abducted girls in a hypostatized text *Pinjar* or *The Skeleton*. She shed tears on sexual violence faced by the women during the cross-border exodus. Herein she 'deplores dispassionately the Holocaust' that paralysed the Indian girls.¹ Perhaps Pritam was "writing about the cultural and political identities"² of Indian women who were victims of inter-community violence. Moreover, partitive experiences forced Pritam to put pen on "the suffering of those who are abducted and raped."³ In the realistic dark picture of the communal time, she portrayed:

the plight of the women—people's daughters, sisters, and wives—who were forcibly held by strangers under roofs.⁴

Pinjar is based on the lived experience of Pritam who was rehabilitated from Pakistan to India, and opens sometime around the mid-thirties. In her arbitrary divisional drawings:

men were being slaughtered in hundreds, rows of houses were being burnt down; neighbours were slitting each other's throat.⁵

Moreover, the man was ready to shoot deflation upon the different community whom he identified by their religion, ethics, dress, language, caste, name and other identical objects. Pritam termed it 'mass hysteria' and 'it was a crime to be born a girl' at that time.⁶

The epicentre of *Pinjar* revolves around the abduction of a Hindu girl named Pooro by Rashida, a Muslim boy. She was converted into Islam after her forceful marriage which later got incarnated into the heroine's clandestine bond of love for the abductor. This change was not sudden. It occurs after Rashida helped Pooro in restoring her brother's wife Lajo, who was in the illegal custody of another Muslim boy, Allah Ditta.

* Department of English, Mahatma Gandhi Central University Bihar.

However, Pooro decided to stay with Rashida in Pakistan. Thus, in the climatic end, the captor and captive were shaking hands under the obsession of a prophetic hope about the symbiosis of culture not only with interreligious marriages. With the weapon of this 'inter' marriage, Pritam romanticized an unexpected understanding between two blood-thirsty religions. This was the step which the great diplomats, like Nehru and Jinnah, failed to imagine. Even the historians remained unsuccessful to write while the feminists kept busy in tracing the suffering of dislocated women that followed by their restoration. As Gyanendra Pandey observes:

there is a wide chasm between the historians' apprehension of 1947 and what we might call a more popular, survivors' account of it – between history and memory, as it were.⁷

Truthfully, a literary piece excavates those hidden facts and information which the political tracts of historians, the watchful eyes of leaders and the mainstream critics failed to trace. *Pinjar* belongs to the same category.

As a revolutionary novelist, Pritam asked some fundamental questions including why the communities, who regularly bowed their heads at *mandir*, *masjid*, and *gurdwaras*, got involved in an inhuman task of abductions, rapes, and killings. While replying it through novel, the civilizations habitually considered woman as an extension of culture's respect. A forceful coercion becomes enemy's most acrimonious apparatus if he were to degrade one's social honour. Marriage of Pooro is a perfect example of this. Historically saying, to save their false prestige in the past, our ancestors assassinated their daughters. Pritam sympathetically seized this motif in *Pinjar*. Thus, the women of a different religion were objectified only as a delicate creature for sexual pleasure or for settling the old family scores. Abduction became

—a way of transcending the Hindu nationalist production of Hindu-Muslim ethnic difference as always already a site of conflict.⁸

Accordingly, Rashida was caught in the web of flattery of his uncle, who cultivated his old-age vendetta. Under the spell of patrimonial vengeance, Rashida confessed how his uncle forced him to take an oath on the *Koran* that he would 'abduct the Sahukar's daughter before she was wed.'⁹ Kidnapping by Rashida changed Pooro's physical and psychological world forever and her marriage became a mental holocaust.

I

One could summarize the above-motivated hysteria with Emile Durkheim's 'social currents'. It is nothing but some magnetic spur-of-the-moment feeling which first attracted the mob and later allowed it to crush the morality, norms, as well as the humanity. Under its deadly impact, men identify oneself with a particular group, and do what he likes. All the partitioned rapes, abductions, and bloodsheds were its first conclusion as the member of same religion were accepted as human. For example, while searching for Lajo after she fled with the help of Rashida, Allah Ditta let Pooro leave his home. The reason was the tattoo on her wrist which bore a Muslim name, Hamida. If Allah Ditta were aware of Pooro's Hindu identity, then her fate would have been entirely different. Therefore, Pritam

transcends the usual blame game of indicating political leaders and parties, and holds 'fate' responsible for the shattering of everyday life.¹⁰

Thus, mass culture became a weapon to satisfy the pseudo-psychological needs, primarily based on hatred, violence, bloodshed, abduction, rape and mayhem. In the end, the reader feels relief with the romantic possibilities between two communities with the marriage between Pooro and Rashida as well as with the relocation of Lajo.

Nothing was easy for Rashida after his inter-religious marriage with Pooro. He disputed against the sclerotic condition and left for the village Sakkar after learning the lesson that the religiosity would produce nothing except destruction. He condemned mass-culture as the deadliest enemy of individualism, happiness, and freedom. In such a situation, a person's safety is often at stake as Rashida was half in fear while talking to the village *panchayat* for the right of his adopted son. Rashida's adoption created a stir in hornet's nest of Hindu ideology, and the adopted boy deserted him under the quandary phobia of his conversion into 'a Muslim boy'.¹¹ The Hindu threatened Rashida with a warning about the 'matter of religion, and one should not stand in its way'.¹² Thus, the adopted boy restored to a Hindu guardian with the materialistic thought that 'when he grows up he can sweep the temple floor'.¹³ However, the boy was again in Pooro's lap after

the sixth day on the verge of death. This incident aptly proves that culture is an attempt to recognize the causes of differences and similarities among societies.

When one felt unnecessary threats from different religions then culture converted into materialism. It defines how dialectics of social process and cultural systems undergo cumulative changes. By comparing religion with the 'opium,' Karl Marx differentiated spiritual and idealistic from mechanistic and materialistic where the latter had a greater value. An early segment of *Pinjar* effectively promulgates Marx's statement how 'Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature.'¹⁴ However, in the second half where Pooro chose Rashida as her husband, Marx's dead maxims proved to be nothing but an orientalist investigation about India. At a different time, Marx, rightly too, said that masses never mount revolution but join as a cannon fodder. However, Pooro was not a revolution but a furious tempest, a threat to Marxist theory, and she could not be shackled by the traditional approaches. It was possible only because Rashida and Pooro learned to accept their punishment by self as a reply to social currents.

Apart from this, the lifespan of Durkheim's 'social currents' is short lived as it overrides morality and society. It is against the notions of equality, fraternity, and brotherhood. While rejecting the culture, the characters like Tilak, Ram Chand, Pooro and even Rashida resided in the humanitarian terrain. Tilak accepted Lajo, and Ram Chand too was ready to marry Pooro, but she decided to choose Rashida over him. Thus, these characters came together and punctured the concept of social currents. With it, Pritam evidently differentiates the conservative attitude of old (Pooro's parents) and a new generation. When one's consciousness witnessed the truth that culture robbed him of its real function (the case of Rashida), then he disassociated himself because the success of culture depends on what would happen in politics. Thus, its success lies in the obedience to the social hierarchy, and it is nothing outside individual's contribution.

Pooro's story becomes synonymous with the 'story of women in every country' yet Pritam announced in other work *Kala Gulab, (Black Rose)* that there were many other 'stories which are not on paper, but are written in the bodies and minds of women.' These words have a direct bearing with the thematic pattern of *Pinjar*. If one excavates the Partition records, then one would find how culture had abducted unnumbered skeletons of Pooro, Lajo, and Taro. Some skeletons were:

forced into marriage ... some murdered, some stripped and paraded naked in the streets.¹⁵

In the stroke of fear, most of girls either committed suicide or their family mercilessly executed them. This

type of assassination stands not only for reported but also spiral discrimination that celebrated mass suicide through the label of martyrism. In *Pinjar*, the character of Taro criticized this act ruthlessly while calling it "a big fraud", "swindled", and "lying" to the girls.¹⁶ To be critical, religion is continuously limiting women's power as well as freedom according to the theology with the instruction of not to cross man-made *Laxman Rekha*. In this way, the "religion had become an insurmountable obstacle" for the miserable Punjabi girls.¹⁷ Taro marched forward in defence of defenceless with the comment:

there is no justice in the world; nor any God. *He* can do what he likes; there is no God to stop [man]. God fetters were meant only for [women].¹⁸

Thus, aesthetic barbarity was dancing to the rhythm of the theological beat of violence when people martyred their daughters under the obsession of 'honour'.

II

A microanalysis of the nature of violence would be enough to tell how the partitioned state organized violence against women. On the base of practice, the violence had two divisions: visible and invisible. There is adequate archival data on increasing 'visible' (killing, looting, rape, and abductions) and communal problems and political engagement between Nehru and Jinnah. But, there is hardly something on invisible violence. This novel incorporated different shades of invisible violence in the form of patriarchal, domestic, gender and finally violence to inherit the property rights of women. To see such crack one should read *Pinjar*, where Pooro's parents annulled her identity with the interpretation of purity that who would marry her as she lost her 'religion and birthright'.¹⁹ It had the seed of patriarchal violence, wherein the head of family controls the weaker members. While questioning her purity after Rashida's abduction, Pooro's parents indirectly abducted her and it left a scar on her psyche. The customary gulf had played havoc in her parent's consciousness, especially in her mother. Despite being a woman, her mother was too homogeneous that she knowingly followed the inescapable many-faceted tradition.

After spending "fifteen days"²⁰ in Rashida's hermit, Pooro turned "impure" for the culture of her guardians. Invisible violence was active when the society rejected a girl against her sanctity. Urvashi Butalia answers that only men were the "perpetrators of violence towards them".²¹ Taro, another case of invisible violence, was regularly treated as a night sex slave for some "pleasure" by her husband. The same act forced her to declare herself a whore, "like a common prostitute", a slut or "a common

tart".²² Her body is utilized as a product that recycled daily for monotonous regularity of use. It carries the symptom of domestic violence. In this oldest form of violence, the physical body is not harmed as it sailed along the marriage custom, and everything happened behind the walls. The women abductions took place not because they were beautiful or because of the old racial Hindu-Muslim hatred. It is all for their incalculable wealth (Lajo) or some personal vendetta (Pooro). The women, like Lajo, were enslaved not for a man's biological answers but because of the properties that evacuees (Shyamlal, father of Lajo) had left behind. Allah Ditta, the abductor of Lajo, declared himself her relative, the husband, to take control of her mansion. With such action Allah Ditta obtained not only a money-oriented house to rest but also a good wife to sleep at night. When Allah Ditta captured the helpless Lajo, then the violence of Muslim on Hindu women exhibited its presence. Finally, the use of masculinity against the mad woman fulfils the demands of gender violence which spare not even a mad woman. In all the cases, the patriarchal understanding, traditional family, and their conservative values were extremely violent towards their or other's daughters and all these constitutes an indirect form of violence.²³

To contextualize violence, Michel Foucault begins the Preface of *Madness and Civilization* with a quotation from Pascal, which runs thus, "Men are so necessarily mad, that not to be mad would amount to another form of madness."²⁴ It can be proved with the help of Jinnah's phrase, "hostage population theory" that derived from Venkat Dhulipala's *Creating a New Medina*.²⁵ It explains how the different governments struggled to save their minority from the wrath of the majority. But the condition for women remained unchanged even as a 'hostage'. While sitting in Pakistan, Jinnah warned with the theory that if a single Muslim got harrassed, then the retributive violence would entertain the non-Muslim Indians residing in Pakistan. This violent warning and the mad announcement was used as an unsuccessful apparatus to guarantee the imaginary security for the minorities living in the opposite country. As a critique of hostage population theory, *Pinjar* presents the example of an unknown girl who "had been forced to spend the preceding nine nights with different men."²⁶

Pritam painfully wrote how under the shadow of mad forces "a band of a dozen or more *goondas* pushing a young girl before them."²⁷ Following Foucault's concept, the trope of madness when "the *goondas* beat drums and danced about the naked girl"²⁸ converted the idea of newly declared Indian democracy into demon-o-crazy. Women were mere products on whose consuming skeletons depends the success of religion. Thus, the partitioned women played the two-fold role, that of an 'agent' and

of a 'victim', and only the materialistic notions of nation and culture accompanied by religion degraded their life.

Rape, abduction or coercion could be categorized as the extensions of visible violence. Any mean of forceful invasion of a female body is the violation of humanitarian law. Expanding further the concept of forceful invasion, *Pinjar* portrays two types of rape: 'legal' (punishable by law) and 'not-legal' (not punishable).²⁹ In the first category, one could bracket the people like Allah Ditta, Taro's husband and many unknown individuals who legally consumed the body of Lajo, Taro, and madwoman against their choice. Pooro's heart bled at the pitiable condition of mad woman and in rage, she questions, "What wretch could have lusted after the charred body" of a woman? However, she failed to locate whether it was with her 'consent' or would it be treated as a 'rape'.³⁰ Pritam directed a satire against society with the pregnancy of these objects, and special emphasis is laid upon the mad woman. The pregnancy defines the psychological trauma of violation through the metaphor of a mother's womb. She dramatized how "the womb is a victim of partition madness".³¹ But "nobody would ever know how the dreams of so many girls"³² were liquidated.

The second category includes not-legal rape or domestic rape that was set in motion by Rashida, who utilized Pooro after a forceful marriage. Though he did not molest her physicality before the wedding yet, the rape theory was in its full swing when Pooro requested him to let her go. In response, Rashida questioned her "who will quench the fire"³³ of his heart. Rashida exercised masculinity over her weak body and a boy, 'had been planted inside her by force, nourished inside her womb against her will'³⁴.

As a rehabilitated woman, Pritam realistically, "sense[s] the pain of such a girl—the youth, whose body is forced into motherhood."³⁵ In protest, Pooro wanted to throw "the worm out of her womb"³⁶ but later she dropped the idea. Thus, having intercourse with an abductor was a physical and psychological burden. As per the perfidious institution of marriage, it is not-rape but modern gender activists term it as indirect rape. In this type of crime, a married woman gets molested physically for years under the cloud of rituals which do not permit her even to protest against the customs. Thus, constricting dichotomies between legal and not-legal rape, the customs distinguished these objects from prostitutes. Soon, the government, and the people like Rashida come to know about their mistakes and then is introduced the formula of relocation.

III

So much blood flowed after the partition. The governments

of opposite side decided to enact a bill regarding the restoration of abducted women. The policy resulted in the Inter Dominion Treaty Bill, which later was substituted with the Abducted Persons (Recovery and Restoration) Act, 1949. The Bombay High Court declared it as:

"An Act to provide, in pursuance of an agreement with Pakistan, for the recovery and restoration of abducted persons."³⁷

If the government data of both sides are correct, then by the end of the year 1949, total recoveries were "12,000 for India and 6,000 for Pakistan".³⁸ As per the calculation of Central Recovery Organization, till 1954, some, "17,000 women were rescued from Pakistan and sent to India, and 20,000 Muslim women the other way".³⁹ Thus, the primary task of this bill was the recovery of seized women and their rehabilitation to their native places. The novel mentions this Act when Rashida, in Pakistan, explained to Pooro about

"the Government proclamation ordering people to hand over all abducted person so that they could be exchanged for other similarly abducted by Indians".⁴⁰

Rashida's psychic, rational and metal prognostic undergoes a tremendous change after Pooro's abduction. Hence, he gambled his life to protect Lajo and sent her back to India. Consciously aware of Lajo's stay with Allah Ditta, she was accepted by Pooro's brother, who also asked his sister to join them but Pooro rejected his advice. While resisting against the government as well as the religion, Pooro repudiated to return and solved the communal puzzle with her international marriage. It was a direct metaphorical slap on the face of Nehru and Jinnah who were responsible for making thousands of Pooros homeless again with the Bill. In this way, by giving a perpendicular resistance against the Abduction Bill, Pritam broke the misogynistic walls with Pooro's complete independence to choose her husband without paying particular attention to religion.

Some critics like Anis Kidwai, Urvashi Butalia and Ritu Menon among others, continuously criticized Abduction Bill, as first the men defiled women and hereafter, these defiled creatures forcefully migrated to unknown lands against their wishes. And finally, they were questioned on the base of their 'purity'. Creating a space for the metaphor of identity of those dislocated women, who were first abducted and raped, like Lajo and Kammo, then restored with the aid of the Bill, could be an easy target for the society. It could interrogate their purity, religion as well as identity. Hence, Butalia complained how the restoration's vocabulary was "defined for women by the men of the respective countries" in which the oppressed "did not have a choice" except surrender.⁴¹ The governments of either side were unable to pass a

strict law whether India or Pakistan would accept these victims or not. Though the regime failed yet, *Pinjar* effectively offers an answer which is of an international marriage. The reader would be relieved when Rashida asserts, "parents had been exhorted to receive back their abducted daughters"⁴². Thus, whether it was India or Pakistan, these miserable unconcerned women were not more than the master's tool, but Pooro herself became a teacher when she preferred international marriage.

Pooro became a paragon of restraint, but she had no identity before marriage. But, she had a passionate thrust upon the liberal, social and political sphere. When Rashida, an embodiment of masculinity, gave her the respect long denied to her, she started to build a castle in the air. Moreover, she clears the morning fog when Rashida promised that "no harm will come to you for the rest of your life."⁴³ The novel enlightens the fire in darkness with the question, what a woman needed from the society out of security, respect, equality, freedom or authority. No doubt, Ram Chand's simple behaviour would satisfy Pooro, but it was inadequate to convince her of the worried "security". But, such security was given to her by Rashida. Without identity, her futuristic life would be insecure which was simultaneously attached to respect, security, equality and authority. Acutely aware of losing her antecedental identity while selecting Pakistan she chose it. But, in India too, she was not more than a domestic slave. Apparently, India could reduce her to "a skeleton than a living person".⁴⁴ Some twenty-two years of her life ostensibly cover the span from a daughter, wife, and mother and revealingly the barricades of identity could fall when she cross the *Laxman Rekha* of her past. In this life, Pooro "often used to say that *Allah* was her step-father or she the step-daughter of *Isvara* because neither the one nor the other had given a gift for her sorrows."⁴⁵

In an unknown country,

"she was, however, grateful that Rashida had not said a harsh word to her, and her honour was unsullied."⁴⁶

After all, "he was a kind husband".⁴⁷ Her conceded sensational happiness was in increasing mode when Rashida disposed to offer her a new definition of respect, security, and equality. In the final scene, he granted her the 'authority' to choose between him and Ram Chand or between Pakistan and India. With this respect of equality, he won over the Hindu girl as his wife.

Balbir K. Punj termed the concept of international marriage between Rashida and Pooro as 'Stockholm Syndrome'.⁴⁸ In this theory, the old rage and anger of an individualistic mind incarnated into love and positive feelings towards the captor, who took care of her for a long time. In rejecting Punj's claim, Pooro was a human being of blood and flesh and did not have symptoms

of a Stockholm syndrome. After all, she exercised her constitutional "will to choose". To add to it, she too, either as Hamida or Pooro, had an individual identity. Furthermore, why should she follow the politically-inspired Abduction Bill? To put it in different words, she was among the few women who were able to collect the precious diamond of identity during the most turbulent time. It could be taken as iconoclastic reformation that will force the false theological gods to shake hands and shuns their ancestral customs. Thus, *Pinjar* is "an enduring archive on inter-community relations in Punjab"⁴⁹ that bridges the gap between Hindu and Muslims which Nehru and Jinnah were unable to construct. The interpreter of religion like Punj repeatedly and obsessively practised counterfeit arraignment that Pooro belonged to a new agglomeration. The religion of Pooro was neither Hindu nor Muslim but a hybrid form. This categorical Indian religiosity mirrored, after Partition's eerie twilight, "true of the history of German Nazism".⁵⁰ Butalia's above conclusion reflects sympathy for the abducted creatures whose deflation equals to the Holocaust, a horrible one than the real. A molested person is neither living nor dead but 'a skeleton without a shape or a name'⁵¹. In this sense, Pooro was trapped within the mythological enchantment of purity that echoed how girls robbed of their 'future'⁵². Unlike others, the novel's holocaust remnants did not face an emotional torment or social ostracism. But, it successfully heals the fissures that their biological bodies witnessed through psychological impairment.

IV

Pinjar has indirect models of *Ramayana* but Pooro gives a direct resistance against the archetypal myth of Sita. The archetypes are some traditional but mythical stories that define and determine the shape and meaning of a literary work. In the past, to satisfy spontaneous wishes of the culture, Pooro's uncle-sexually assaulted Rashida's aunt for "three nights"⁵³. Thus, she resembled Surpanakha, whose kinsfolk Ravana (Rashida) incarcerated Sita (Pooro) to settle the family revenge and captivated her in Ashok Vatika (hut). Later, Rama (Ram Chand) accompanied with Hanuman (Trilok) marched towards Lanka (Pakistan) to get Sita back. Nevertheless, *Pinjar* has an anti-climatic end when Sita boycotted not only Rama but also Ayodhya (India) and embraced Ravana. This modern Sita passed through the fore of Holocaust, and biased gender consternation was enough to create hatred in her heart against masculinity. Being aware of Sita's mythical novelette, she did not crave one more exile. Therefore, she was satisfied with the semi-equivocal relationship with Ravana.

One could argue if it was a myth rejection or the question that still is unanswered, how is it against the myth. In answering, the mythical Sita had not accustomed her power to choose and followed the culture of *narijati* that was bound with *dharma*. The modern Indian Sita is unfit to the traditional idol-object myth which would prefer inhuman performance, like Sati. In a democracy, it is preferential to choose Ravana over Rama than *agni-pariksha*. Consequently, a powwow harmony of affluence of love between her and Rashida became active. Moreover "out of this conflict of hate and love, love, and hate, were born Hamida's son and Hamida's love for her husband, Rashida".⁵⁴

It is directly a deadly blow to the guardians of religion, who, in rage, named Pooro a Hindu turned Muslim or a hybrid Indian. Moreover, why should she return to the parents who deserted her on the basis of purity.

The celebration, martyrism, historicization and objectification of the dead bodies has symptoms of 'soft' exploitation, which could easily be termed as neo-holocaust. Gandhi, during the Partition, appears to have advocated this theory while advising

'to Indian women that in certain circumstances even suicide was morally preferable to submission'.⁵⁵

Gandhi, at this time, was not thinking about how to save the women rather advising them to commit suicide. Pooro, in *Pinjar*, rightly ridiculed this historicization while crying that "people raise monuments to the dead; they have funeral feasts and make gifts in charity".⁵⁶

Such type of hypocrisy is visible in the 21st-century India in the form of "martyrdom". Critically, Urvashi Butalia mentioned an event in Delhi where connoisseurs paid a remembrance service in the local Gurudwara every year by calling it a 'heroic' death.⁵⁷ They celebrated the historical death of those girls who preferred suicide rather than to lose their *izzat*. But, truthfully, they do so to hide their criminality. The religious pundits are continuously trying to rationalize the death of their daughters. They sacrifice their daughters' life and continue to live shamefully. It is a sign of hypocrisy that they put the weight of 'respect' on the shoulders of girls only. Now, the heinous act of killing their daughters and sister becomes their reputation and the same is announced from the podium. In truth, it is honour killing. Paradoxical but true, the definition of greatness written in men's language, syntax, and vocabulary. In fact, equal to "positive discrimination", in this soft form consumer and consumed fantasized to achieve martyrdom based on *Dulceet decorum est* rather than to lose "ijjat". The hypothesis is that consumed (privileged daughters) is a martyr and consumer (assassinator) celebrates it. But, ironically, the consumer never sacrifices his life. On the

ground of gender, it is prejudice, hypocrisy, stereotyping or neo-discrimination against women, who forced into a sacrifice for pseudo-religion.

V

All the critics, including Indian and non-Indian, termed the Partition as 'madness.' However, till the 1980s, there was hardly any scholarly book of criticism on this shameful act, expect the narrative or autobiographical works by the women who were working for the rehabilitation of women. In fact, Indian critics, male or female in general and nationalists in particular, successfully hide their guilt for a long time. But, in the 21st century, this matter is highly debated by the contemporary writers, especially in the Jaipur Literary Festival.

Ravikant bracketed, in 'Partition: Strategies of Oblivion, Ways of Remembering', how Partition history is studied, in particular by the male writers. It is examined merely as a division of Pakistan from India and not as a mass migration of around fifteen million men and women.⁵⁸ If some historians rejected this stereotype with their attempt to dramatize the narrative of migration, then they proved their bankruptcy of words which forced them not to articulate on the topics such as rapes, abductions and forceful marriages of women. The radical feminist critics like Kidwai, Butalia and Menon could be seen as an answer to the questions posed by Ravikant. They, indeed, wrote exclusively on the horrible experiences of women and such invisible rhetoric portrayed in Pritam's quasi-autobiographical novel. This smallbook is a partition archive based on the experience of dislocated women.

Finally accomplishing it, when the black box of religiosity opened in 1947, it brought into consciousness a long aged sleep of a witch whose anger brought rape, abduction, forcible migration, killing, looting, death, and woe. *Pinjar* recollected these wounds of a heinous past and its catastrophic ramifications on the consciousness of women through the characters of Pooro, Taro, Lajo and others incomputable. However, it is, in truth, a moral edification for that patriarchic hypocrisy, chauvinist attitude and nationalist possessors who thought that by abducting a rival woman they had paid homage to their religion or nation. Meanwhile, one could praise Rashida, who became a witch-hunter when he rejected the communal war under the healing spell of humanity. During the partition, one could criticize, whether it is religion A or religion B, woman equates object that manufactured for consuming in the positive or negative way. With the ending of the novel, Pritam, it seems, gave a message that "we should respect other people's daughters and sisters"⁵⁹ as today's woman is not hungry for martyrdom but a guarantee of her identity and respect.

In a concluding line, the abduction of Pooro managed to convey a countless number of substantial implications and a subtle hint that quiver with irony, sadness and benign resignation to change. In reality, she was merely an 'advertisement' of religiosity that metaphorically and ironically showcased the powerlessness of society in providing any security to them.

Notes

1. Pritam, Amrita. *The Revenue Stamp: An Autobiography*. Trans. Krishna Gorowara. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1977, p. 13
2. Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2019, p. 5. Print
3. *The Revenue Stamp: An Autobiography*, p. 11
4. Pritam, Amrita. "The Skeleton." Pritam, Amrita. *The Skeleton and That Man*. Trans. Khushwant Singh. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1992, 1-50, p. 37.
5. The Skeleton, p. 33.
6. The Skeleton, p. 35.
7. Pandey, Gyanendra. *Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism and History in India*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 6. Print.
8. Daiya, Kavita. *Violent Belongings: Partition, Gender and National Culture in Postcolonial India*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008, p 175. Print.
9. The Skeleton, p. 8.
10. Datta, Nonica. "Transcending Religious Identities: Amrita Pritam and Partition." *Partitioned Lives: Narratives of Home, Displacement, and Resettlement*. Ed. Anjali Gera Roy and Nandi Bhatia. New Delhi: Pearson Longman, 2008, 1-25, p. 14.
11. The Skeleton, p. 23-24.
12. The Skeleton, p. 26.
13. The Skeleton, p. 24.
14. Marx, Karl. "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right." Marx, Karl. *Early Writings*. Ed. T.B. Bottomore. Trans. T.B. Bottomore. London: C.A. Watts and Co. Ltd., 1963, 41-59, p. 44.
15. The Skeleton, p. 34.
16. The Skeleton, p. 20.
17. The Skeleton, p. 39.
18. The Skeleton, p. 19.
19. The Skeleton, p. 10.
20. The Skeleton, p. 8.
21. Butalia, Urvashi. "Community, State and Gender: On Women's Agency during Partition". *Economic and Political Weekly* 28.17 (1993): 12-24, p. 15.
22. The Skeleton, p. 19.
23. Bergoffen, Debra B. *Contesting the Politics of Genocidal Rape: Affirming the Dignity of the Vulnerable Body*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
24. Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Routledge, 2002.
25. Dhulipala, Venkat. *Creating a New Medina: State Power, Islam, and the Quest for Pakistan in late Colonial North India*. New Delhi: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
26. The Skeleton, p. 35.
27. The Skeleton, p. 35.
28. The Skeleton, p. 35.
29. Tomaselli, Sylvana and Roy Porter, *Rape: A Historical and Culture Enquiry*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989, Print.
30. The Skeleton, p. 23.
31. Datta, p. 13.
32. Datta, p. 10.
33. The Skeleton, p. 7.
34. The Skeleton, p. 14.
35. Datta, p. 12.
36. The Skeleton, p. 1.
37. Bombay High Court. *Abducted Persons (Recovery and Restoration) Act*. Bombay: Bombay High Court, 1949. Internet. <http://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/actc/1949.65.pdf>, p. 1.
38. Menon, Ritu and Kamla Bhasin. "Recovery, Rupture, Resistance: Indian State and Abduction of Women during Partition." *Economic and Political Weekly* 28.17 (1993): 2-11, p. 4.
39. Kidwai, Anis. *In Freedom's Shade*. Trans. Ayesha Kidwai. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2011, p. 146.
40. The Skeleton, p. 39.
41. Butalia, p. 16.
42. The Skeleton, p. 39.
43. The Skeleton, p. 7.
44. The Skeleton, p. 21.
45. The Skeleton, p. 40.
46. The Skeleton, p. 7.
47. The Skeleton, p. 23.
48. Punj, Balbir K. "Do Skeletons Have A Soul?" *Outlook* 10 November 2003. <http://www.outlookindia.com/article/do-skeletons-have-a-soul/221974>
49. Datta, p. 17.
50. Butalia, p. 12.
51. The Skeleton, p. 11.
52. The Skeleton, p. 9.
53. The Skeleton, p. 7.
54. The Skeleton, p. 15.
55. Butalia, p. 16.
56. The Skeleton, p. 36.
57. Butalia, p. 14.
58. Ravikant. "Partition: Strategies of Oblivion, Ways of Remembering". *Translating Partition*. Ed. Tarun K. Saint. Ravikant. New Delhi: Katha Publishers, 2001, 159-174, p. 161.
59. The Skeleton, p. 44.