



TRANSLATION; AN INJUSTICE TO POETRY

Memoona Manzoor, Kinnaird College for Women Lahore, Pakistan, memoonarana498@gmail.com

Anam Shehzadi, University of Lahore, Pakistan, anamshehzadi338@gmail.com

Abdul Wali Ahmad Abbasi, University of Lahore, Pakistan, abdulwali.ahmadabbasi@gmail.com

Faisal Irfan, School of Languages, Civilization and Philosophy, University Utara Malaysia, Malaysia, faisal.irfn@gmail.com

Abstract- Translation of the poetry is one of the most difficult and challenging task. Translatability of the poetry has been one of the most debated issues since old times. This is because of high cultural regard of poetry which requires much effort, ingenuity and time of the translator to translate a poetic piece. To translate rhythm, tone, and other cultural elements and to maintain the sense of the poem, at the same time, is a hard task. In the present study Daagh Dehlvi's first eight verses of poem "*Ajab apna hal hota, jo visal-e-yar hota*" are compared and analysed with the translated English version. Both English and Urdu versions are examined using qualitative methodology. Data is analysed on the basis of seven strategies of translating poetry proposed by Lefevere. The aim of this research is to distinguish the poetic and linguistic elements that results in injustice to poetry by restricting the appropriate translation.

Keywords: Translation, poetry

I. INTRODUCTION

In today's modern world there are countless people who live in-between cultures and languages. Humans interact over both cultural and linguistic borders. This paper intends to compare and analyse translation of a poem. Translation always involves interaction of two or more languages. This study is based on analysis of a poem; written in Urdu (source language) and translated into English (target language). As far as these two languages; English and Urdu are concerned, they vary in structure, culture and phonology. Poetry is one of the ancient forms of literature. William Wordsworth (1805) defines poetry as "the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings". It is all about expressing feelings by using language as a tool. According to Francis R. Jones (2012), features of Poetry can be "sound-based, syntactic or structural or pragmatic in nature." Translating a text into another language has always been a challenging task for translators.

It is claimed that poetry is untranslatable because most of the time it loses its aesthetics. Moreover poem conveys emotions and feelings, which translator fails to translate in another poem. Cultures mix together and many different languages can be heard at the same time in the streets of any society across the world. Thus, language represents identity of a culture. Translation of poetry has always been a subject of debate and causes controversies. Francis R. Jones (2012) stated that translation of poetry involves "cognition, discourse, and action by and between human and textual actors in a physical and social setting". According to Yinhua (2011), translation is a form of communication that carries a purpose of maintaining equivalence between target language and source language. Its main purpose is to convey the meaning of one language into another, along with the original sense. When there is no equivalent in target language for a word, meaning is not communicated properly, and then translator step ahead towards modification of meaning. To modify the word or meaning to make the Target Text (TT) approximately equivalent to Source Text (ST) becomes need of that time. This activity, sometimes, changes the whole idea of the original text. For example, there are some cultural specific words which contain hidden cultural connotations within them. Similarly, in Urdu language there are many words which are 'untranslatable' e.g. 'tishnagi', 'naz', 'marasim', 'uns', 'ishq', 'pyar', 'muhabbat', 'nafs' and many more. Such words which do not have accurate equivalent in other language are called 'heart words'. In Urdu there is a word 'Phir' which has its two meanings or connotations in English language 'then' and 'again'. The Urdu sentence 'Wo gira or phir rony laga' would be translated in English as 'He fell and then started crying'; another Urdu sentence with same word 'Phir' is 'Main Phir aon ga' that would be translated as 'I'll come again'.

According to Irfan, Shahzadi, Talib, & Awan (2020) point of view, there must be total shift of sense along with its meaning and must be understood by a native speaker. In the process of translation, meaning of the text is totally in the hands of translator, he/she can transform the meaning which may vary from

source language to target language. A translator must be skilled enough that he/she can translate all elements of the text, involving semantic, pragmatic, syntactic and cultural aspects. In fact, the translators do not translate meanings but the messages. That is why, the text must be considered in its totality. While on the other hand some critics are against the authority of translator. Terence Hawkes asserts that "writing writes, not author".

Translating a poetic piece is difficult because of its expressive value, linguistic structure and rich use of cultural words. In translation of poetry translator should have proper knowledge about the characteristics, individualities, style, foundations and fundamentals of the source poem and culture it represents. During translation of poetry, translator should keep in mind the cultures of both poems. According to Robert Frost "poetry is what is lost in translation". The present study explores the linguistic challenges that translator faced while translating Daagh Dehlvi's Urdu poetry into English.

Urdu poetry is richer in expressions than English. According to Newmark (1988) while translating poetry, the focus of a translator should be on emotional and connotative aspects of literature. Similarly, "Poetry is virtually untranslatable." (Czerniawski, 1994:3) when TL and SL are dissimilar in their social, moral cultural and political elements, the translation of a poem becomes perplexing. The sentence structure of English language is SVO and, in Urdu it is SOV. The translator should have a comprehensible understanding of original text in terms of meaning, writing style and its cultural values. Translator must find a way to maintain the accuracy and originality of the source content. As translating the metaphorical, lexical and symbolic aspects of Dehlvi's Urdu poetry is a hard nut to crack because these expressions are part of social, political, cultural and historical background.

Statement of Problem and Purpose of the Study:

Poetry is basic genre of literature and has been centre of attention for translators and linguists. Translation converts the meaning of source text of into the target text and during the exchange or sharing the meaning and idea, there is always something which has been missed or replaced due to the cultural variation which results in the damage to an original idea. The purpose of the study is to find out and understand the cultural specific linguistic aspects of a language that are responsible for the damage to an original idea, specifically poetry.

Research Objectives:

- To observe the effect of translation on identity and meaning of a poem.
- To identify the missing linguistic and poetic elements in English translation of Daagh Dehlvi's Urdu poetry.
- To explore the Linguistic features that are responsible for destruction of sense and meaning in translated text of Daagh Dehlvi's poem.

Research Questions:

- How translation affects the meaning and identity of poetry?
- What are the poetic and linguistic elements that restrict the appropriate translation of Daagh Dehlvi's Urdu poetry into other language like English?
- Which Linguistic features are responsible for destruction of sense and meaning in translated text of Daagh Dehlvi's poem?

Research Framework:

This study conducts analysis of English translated version of a poem on the basis of seven strategies Proposed by, Andre Lefevere 1957. According to Sen and Shaole (2010), if the source or the target language is English then the Lefevere's classification of methods is useful. Seven strategies for poetry translation by Lefevere are comprehensive enough to cover all the poetic features, semantic, lexical, syntactic and contextual. The list of seven strategies to analyse a poem are given below;

1. **Phonemic Translation:** It refers to imitating the source language sounds in TL (target language).
2. **Literal Translation:** It refers to rendering of word for word translation.

3. **Metrical Translation:** According to it, when the translators reproduce the source language meter into target language text.
4. **Poetry into Prose:** It refers to altering the sense, syntax and communicative value of a source text in a target text.
5. **Rhymed Translation:** It refers to translating or transferring the rhyme of the original poem into the target language text.
6. **Blank verse Translation:** It refers to translators finding proper equivalent words in the target language that have same semantic value. Restrictions are imposed on translator by choice of structure are emphasized.
7. **Interpretation and imitation:** The substance (sense) of source language text is retained but the form (language) is changed.

Significance of the study:

This research is significant as it deals with the effect of translation on identity and meaning of a poem. It informs that some poetic elements like phonemic, metrical and rhymed translation restrict the appropriate translation of Daagh Dehlvi's Urdu poetry into other languages like English. It also compares and analyses the linguistics features like semantic, syntactic and lexical that are responsible for destruction of sense and meaning in translated text of Daagh Dehlvi's poem. The research has been analysed by keeping in mind the seven strategies given by Andre Lefevere (1957). These seven strategies fall under the domains of literature (meter, rhyme, interpretation and imitation) and linguistics (literal, phonemic, metrical etc.).

Delimitation of the Study:

- This research deals with only two languages Urdu (source language) and English (targeted language).
- Only the poetic translation of Dagh Dehlvi' poem has been analysed.
- This research is limited to only one poem of Dagh Dehlvi.
- It is limited to eight verses only.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Roman Jakobson (1960) believes that poetry by definition is untranslatable. Language in any culture reflects its identity. Therefore scholars, poets, and writers use language as tool to represent the cultural heritage of their society. When a literary piece of writing i.e. poetry is translated into another language, translator should not only focus on translation but should also pay attention to meaning and its sense. A translator should not forget the foundations and characteristics of source culture. According to Brodzki (2007) translation plays an important role in expressing culture, to such an extent that it impacts "all cultural transactions from the most benign to the most venal". Roman Jakobson (1960) asserts that poetry is untranslatable. According to Frost (1969), the main characteristic of poetic discourse that the form and content cannot be separated and this distinction discriminates between common and poetic discourse. He believes poetry is what is lost in translation.

Hashmi (2011) believes that the inadequacy of translation is true, when the languages are different in their form, culture and origin such as English and Urdu. According to Javaherian (1992), the main aim of the literary translation is to make the readers of Translated language (TL) acquainted with the culture of the source language (SL). This is because culture and language are mixed and cannot be separated. Yang (2010) claimed about successful translation that the concept of biculturalism is more important than bilingualism as words only have meanings in term of culture in which they function.

The term translation was first introduced in 1340 and derived either from old French *translation* or directly from the Latin *translatio* that itself came from the participle of the verb *transfere* which means 'to carry over'. The word Translation has its several meanings in the field of language: a subject, a process and a product as well. Translation as a process has its purpose to communicate the meaning of source language text by means of target language text. Translators spend most of their time dealing with problems of lexis, fixed expressions and words during translation of a poem. According to Ansari (2003) a translator faces many lexical, structural and cultural barriers in translating poetry and regards translation

of poetry as most difficult task. Besides linguistic features, the main focus of poetry is on literary elements that deliver proper feel and sense, like imagery, metaphors, symbolism and rhyme, rhythm. Translation of poetic texts is extremely sensitive and critical. "Poetry is an imaginative expression of a poet's feelings and experiences and its translation must be faithful transference of poet's ideas" Nair (1991).

Critics bear dissimilar views about responsibility of a translator. A translator must have knowledge about literary criticism. He has to consider the quality of a text before interpretation and translation of particular text. According to Dodds (1994: 151), a literary translator, when translating a text, needs to focus on all aspects and should be concerned about semantic, pragmatic, phonological and stylistic features that cover all levels of language. Procházka (1955) asserts that a translator should meet four important requirements while translating a literary piece of text (1) making sense, (2) conveying the spirit and style of the original, (3) having form of expression that is natural and easy, and (4) creating a similar response. However in this way conflict between form and content arises. "Meaning must be given priority over style" (Tancock 1958:29). Poetry translator's main aim is to interpret a source poem's layers of meaning, and to deliver this interpretation and to 'create a poem in the target language that can be read and enjoyed by audience in target language as an independent literary piece of writing. According to Connally (1991) if both style and content of poetry are transferred, during its translation than the translation of poetry is successful. Cultural studies and translation studies are close related to each other.

Various critics have given various kinds of translation. Eugene Nida (1964) classified translation into two types, known as formal translation and dynamic translation. Catford (1965) gave three types of translation according to criteria: 1: full translation and partial translation 2: Rank bound translation and rank unbound translation 3: Total translation and restricted translation. Similarly, another distinction of types of translation was given by Newmark (1988), according to him translation is divided into proposes two types; semantic and communicative. Translation studies have brought a significant revolutionary in the social and cultural identity.

According to L. Venuti (1998); "ability of translation to participate, according to the necessity, both in ensuring culture's coherence or homogeneity as well as in activating cultural resistance or culture's innovation processes". Giblett (1987) stated that Nabakof associates translation of poetry to the scream of parrot and dead's insult. This research paper focuses on analysis and comparison of English translation of Daagh Dehlvi's poem "Ajab apna hal hota, jo visal-e-yar hota". As a prominent poet of Urdu language, Dehlvi is popular for his romantic and sensuous poems in simple Urdu. According to Daneesh majid (2019), Dehlvi, being submerged in the Persian influenced traditions, brought change in poetry of Urdu language by using simplified language.

"Daagh didn't just believe in the simplicity of language, he also turned away from the literary elements that were integral to the Persian poetic traditions which Urdu ghazal adhered to" (Daneesh majid, 2019). "He left behind a treasure-trove of love poetry but did not experience the blessings of love." (Rekhta, 2018)

III. METHODOLOGY

This research is descriptive in nature. In this study English *translated* version of Daagh Dehlvi's poem "Ajab apna hal hota, jo visal-e-yar hota" is analysed on the basis of particular linguistic and literary features and is compared with the original Urdu version. Keeping in mind the nature of this research qualitative method is used, and textual analysis is done. This study first conducts analysis of English translated version of a poem on the basis of seven strategies Proposed by, Andre Lefevere 1957. These seven strategies are described in above mentioned research framework. In this study researcher has practically applied these strategies to original text of Urdu and English translated version of Daagh Dehlvi's poem. The data for this study is collected from online sources. First eight verses of Dehlvi's poem "ajab apna hal hota, jo visal-e-yar hota" in Urdu are taken from the website of Rekhta Foundation (<https://www.rekhta.org>).

Rekhta foundation is basically a community that promotes Urdu language, culture, and literature. It is said to be the largest online repository of Urdu literature and poetry all around the globe. On the other hand, the English translated version of first eight verses of Dehlvi's poem is taken from the blog of Shafinn Ali. (<https://shafinnali.wordpress.com/category/poets/hindi-poets/daagh-dehlvi/>)

The English version of Dehlvi's poem by Shafinn Ali has to be true to the original essence of the poem. It should follow the fundamental rules of translation, as according to (Eugene Nida, 1964) "making sense; conveying the spirit and manner of the original; having a natural and easy form of expression and; producing a similar response."

IV. DATA ANALYSIS:

In this research English translated version of Daagh Dehlvi's poem "*Ajab apna hal hota, jo visal-e-yar hota*" is analysed and compared with the original Urdu version of the poem. Only first eight verses of this poem are compared and analysed. The data is also analysed on the basis of literary and linguistic elements that restricts the appropriate translation of Daagh Dehlvi's poem "*Ajab apna hal hota, Jo visal-e-yar hota*" into English. At linguistic level; semantic, syntactic and lexical features are analysed by applying seven strategies proposed by Andre Lefevere (1957) for translation of poetry. These seven strategies fall under the domains of literature (meter, rhyme, interpretation and imitation) and linguistics (literal, phonemic, metrical etc.). The data is analysed to investigate that whether the sense of poem is distorted or not, when it is translated into another language with different cultural values, traditions and interpretations. Data analysis aims to discover the cultural elements that cannot be translated and are responsible for the loss of meaning as well as identity. Both original and translated version of poem is given in the table 4.1 below.

Table: 4.1

No	English translated version	Original version
1.	That would be a strange feeling, if my beloved had come to see me,	ajab apnā haal hotā jo visāl-e-yār hotā
2.	At one moment I would rendered my heart and at another my soul for her.	kabhī jaan sadqe hotī kabhī dil nisār hotā
3.	There is no charm in enmity, no pleasure in friendship,	na mazā hai dushmanī meñ na hai lutf dostī meñ
4.	Someone had to be an enemy like enemy; someone had to be a friend like friend.	koī ghair ghair hotā koī yaar yaar hotā
5.	It would be quite amazing in love if both were having in the same fire (passion) of love,	ye maza thā dil-lagī kā ki barābar aag lagī
6.	Nor you were at ease not I was at ease.	na tujhe qarār hotā na mujhe qarār hotā
7.	O my merciless beloved, I would wait a little longer on your words of promise	tire va.ade par sitamgar abhī aur sabr karte
8.	If I had a guarantee of my life any more.	agar apnī zindagī kā hameñ e'tibār hotā

The analysis of poem is done verse by verse and is compared with original Urdu version of the poem. All seven strategies of Lefevere are analysed, out of which four strategies (literal, phonemic, metrical, interpretation and imitation) are analysed in every verse and rest of three (poetry into prose, rhymed and blank verse) are analysed collectively. As these three strategies can be applied to a collective text that is

whole poem at a time so they are analysed collectively, while other four strategies can be applied to each verse individually.

Translation always plays important role in transferring knowledge and some cultural aspects as well. While on the other hand, it fails to convey the proper context and sense due to difference in syntactic structures, use of lexical items, semantic features, phonological aspects and particular characteristic of culture. To know about all these aspects and missing literal and linguistic elements that are responsible for giving proper essence to poem, it is evaluated verse by verse. As poetry has its own identity on the basis of its style and choice of lexical items, so it is difficult to maintain its proper sense and style while translation.

Table 4.2; verse-1

Original text	Translated Text
ajab apnā haal hotā jo visāl-e-yār hotā	That would be a strange feeling, if my beloved had come to see me,

The comparison of first verse of the poem results in various distinctions on the basis of Lefevere's strategies. The Urdu version, 'ajab apna haal hota' is translated into English as 'that would be strange feeling' as shown above in table 4.2. Considering lexical and semantic choices of words in the English Translated Version of the verse, the word 'ajab' is translated as 'strange'. 'Ajab' in Urdu has cultural meaning as it refers to wonder, astonishment and extreme joy. While on the hand the word 'strange' is not conveying the proper sense. It refers to something that is unusual or unknown. Similarly the word 'haal' bears an abstract cultural meaning in Urdu and in this verse it is translated as 'feeling'. When the poet says 'ajab apna haal hota', he is referring to his joy and astonishment on meeting his beloved (yar). The translator referred it as a strange feeling. This shows that during translation of the verse-1 meaning is not properly communicated and sense of the verse is destroyed due to wrong choice of lexical items.

Moreover 'jo visal ye yar hota' is translated as 'if my beloved has come to see me'. Translation of 'visal' as 'come' and 'yar' as beloved is inappropriate. This is because both of these are cultural specific and have abstract meaning. Therefore they are not translated precisely. Use of words like 'ajab', 'visal' shows that Urdu is extremely sensual language and translators face difficulty in translating the cultural specific words. Original Urdu verse refers to many imaginations that cannot be felt from its translation. On the basis of first strategy of Lefevere, no **phonemic translation** is done. Observation revealed that the sounds of Source Text (ST) are not imitated accurately in Target Text (TT). This is because both English and Urdu languages varies at phonemic level. For example; sound of Urdu word 'haal' and its English translation 'feeling' varies at phonemic level.

The translation of verse-1 refers to the absence of **literal translation**. This is because Word for word translation refers to replacing every word with its equivalent in target language. For example 'ajab' 'visal' are not literally translated. Moreover Urdu verse contains nine words while English verse contains fifteen words. No **metrical translation** is done in this case. For example 'hota' is stressed in Urdu while its equivalent is not stressed in English.

According to Lefevere, **interpretation and imitation** refers to interpretation of source text and then rewrite it in their own words in target text. This strategy is properly used by the translator, as it delivers the mood and imagination of poet. This strategy focuses on substance of source language text is retained but the form is changed which means; maintaining the sense and distorting the form (language) of source text. In verse-1, sense of feelings while meeting beloved are same in both original and translated text but the choice of lexical items, phonemes, syntactic features is different.

Table 4.3; verse-2

kabhī jaan sadqē hotī kabhī dil nisār hotā	At one moment I would rendered my heart and at another my soul for her.
--	---

As mentioned above in table 4.2 the Urdu verse 'kabi jaan sadqe hoti' is translated as 'at another my soul for her'. This shows the inaccurate use of lexical items by the translator. The word 'jaan' in Urdu have several cultural meanings like beloved or life. Hence 'soul' for 'Jaan' refers to inaccurate semantic choice of words; soul refers to 'rooh' in Urdu. As 'jaan' is culture specific and cannot be properly translated. Similarly the word 'sadqe is another cultural word with many cultural connotations. Dehlvi says that for his beloved he is even ready to sacrifice his life.

However, translator fails to convey same sense or meaning because of lack of equivalent words for sadqe, 'jaan' and 'nisar' in target text. This lack of equivalent words refers to failure of **literal translation**. Similarly, he says 'kabhi dil nisar hota' which is translated as 'at one moment I would rendered my heart'. Lexical choices of words made by translator are unsuitable. As 'nisar' refers to abstract idea in this verse that is translated as 'rendered' which does not communicate abstract meaning and cultural identity. The translated version does not have the same effect on readers as that of Urdu version.

Phonemic translation is again missing in verse-2 for example the word 'nisar' is translated as 'rendered', starting with phoneme [n] and ending with [r] while rendered starts with phoneme [r] and ends with [d]. In this case no focus is given to **metrical translation**. For example in verse-2, word 'nisar' is stressed while 'rendered' is not stressed in English. In verse-2, translator failed to apply the strategy of **interpretation and imitation**. The sense selflessness is not conveyed in translated text while the form (language) is also not maintained as that of source text.

Table 4.4; verse-3

na mazā hai dushmanī meñ na hai lutf dostī meñ	There is no charm in enmity, no pleasure in friendship
--	--

The translator has used lexical items that are equivalent to the ones present in Urdu version as shown above in table 4.3. For example, 'maza' as 'charm' 'dushmani' as enmity and 'dosti' as 'friendship' are appropriately translated. Moreover semantic choices made by the translator are also accurate in this verse. As poet says 'na mazā hai 'dushmanī meñ which is translated as "there is no charm in enmity". This shows exact translation by the translator, as meaning and sense of the target text is same as that of original text. The translator has attempted to **literally translate** the verse-3. As exact word for word translation is done for many lexical items .i.e. 'dushmani as enmity' 'dosti as 'friendship', 'maza' as 'charm' and 'lutf' as 'pleasure'. Furthermore both English and Urdu verses contain equal number of items; ten in both verses. Similarly, 'na hai lutf dosti mein' is also accurately translated as 'no pleasure in friendship'.

Phonemic translation strategy is not used by the translator as both Urdu and English have different sound patterns. For example; 'charm' is translated as 'maza' starting with [ch] and ends with [m].while on the other hand 'pleasure' begins with [p] and ends with [e] the strategy of **metrical translation** is not used here. As 'maza' is stressed and on the other hand 'charm' is not stressed as such. From the analysis it can be seen that the strategy of **interpretation and imitation** is properly used by the translator, as it delivers the mood and imagination of poet. In verse-3, sense and feeling of being in love is properly delivered.

Table 4.5; verse-4

koī ḡhair ḡhair hotā koī yaar yaar hotā	Someone had to be an enemy like enemy; someone had to be a friend like friend.
---	--

In the verse-4 mentioned above in table 4.4, Dehlvi says 'koī ḡhair ḡhair hotā,'which is translated as, 'someone had to be an enemy like enemy'. Lexical items chosen by the translator are inadequate, as translation of 'ḡhair' into 'enemy' is not exact. Moreover the semantic choices made in TT are also unsuitable. 'ḡhair' in Urdu refers to an unknown person with whom we have no close proximity, while it is translated in TT as 'enemy'. In verse-4 poet intended to communicate that unknown is unknown, while a beloved is a beloved. Nonetheless this is translated into English as 'some has to be enemy like enemy and some has to be a friend like friend'. This shows that the meaning or sense of the verse is destroyed by

the translator. For example 'yaar' has abstract cultural meaning and in verse it denotes to having a beloved. **Phonemic translation** strategy is not applied. No attention is given to the use of same sounds. For example; 'yaar' when translated into English as 'friend' bears different sounds.

ST contains many culture specific lexical items but besides that, method of **literal translation** is followed at an instance when translating 'yaar' into friend but not at other instance when 'gair' is translated as enemy. But in verse-4, the strategy of literal translation is not followed in general. Moreover ST comprises of total eight words while TT contains sixteen words. There is no focus on **metrical translation**. For example 'yaar' is stressed in ST but when translated as 'friend' it is not stressed likewise. This verse is poor example of **interpretation** by the translator, as it does not deliver the mood and imagination of poet. In verse-4, sense and feeling of being in love is not properly delivered. Translator on other hand creates his own poetry and does not follow the SS text properly. As 'koī ghair ghair hotā koī yaar yaar hotā' is translated as 'Someone had to be an enemy like enemy; someone had to be a friend like friend'. Neither the sense, nor the form is retained in verse-4.

Table 4.6; verse -5

ye maza thā dil-lagī kā ki barābar aag lagti	It would be quite amazing in love if both were having in the same fire (passion) of love
--	--

In verse-5, 'dil lagi' is translated as 'in love' and 'aag' as 'fire (passion) of love'. The lexica item, 'dil lagi' is a traditional expression in Urdu and refers to infatuation or a temporary affair. Hence its translation 'in love' does not signify the same meaning as that of original. This shows lack of application of strategy of **Literal translation**. Similarly, translation of 'aag' into 'fire (passion) of love' is appropriate pragmatically but not semantically. Word 'maza' when translated as 'amazing' loses its meaning. This is because of the fact that 'maza' in Urdu refers to pleasure and joy. 'Amazing' on other hand refers to wonder or surprise. Thus translated verse does not yield the equivalent effect. Moreover ST consists of ten words while TT contains eighteen words.

Phonemic translation strategy is not followed by the translator as both Urdu and English have different sound patterns. Sounds vary phonemically. This can be shown from the word 'aag' it starts with phoneme [a] and ends with [g]. While, 'fire' starts with [f] and ends at [e]. Same is the case with all other sounds like 'maza' as 'amazing', 'barabar' as 'same' and all others. In verse-5, 'dil lagi' is stressed but 'in love' is not stressed which shows no sign of **metrical translation**. In verse-5, sense and feeling of being in love with same emotional states is delivered so the sense is retained and the form of ST is distorted in TT, hence the strategy of **interpretation and imitation** is followed in this verse.

Table 4.7; verse-6

na tujhe qarār hotā na mujhe qarār hotā	Nor you were at ease not I was at ease
---	--

Lexical and semantic choice of words is appropriate as 'qarar' is translated as 'ease' in TT. In Urdu language, the word 'qarar' has several cultural connotations. Here translation of 'qarar' as not having ease is appropriate. Dehlvi intends to communicate that having a beloved is not easy and this is aptly translated into English. The sense and meaning of the verse is not distorted as message and sense of original is retained in the translated version. However translated version does not produce the same effect on the reader as the original version due to cultural differences. The strategy of **phonemic translation** is not applied here. No sounds of source text are reproduced in Target text. For example 'qarar' and its translation as 'ease' have different sounds. Translator has tried to translate the verse literally but was unsuccessful. As both languages have different syntactic structures. Additionally Urdu verse has eight words while English verse has total ten words. This marks the lack of **literal translation**. As the translation of 'mujhe' as 'I' whereas 'mujhe' is a word that can have two meaning in Urdu i-e 'me and I' hence it was difficult to translate it accurately but translator, being a bilingual, interpreted and used correct equivalent word 'I'. There is a minute variation in ST and TT at syntactic level but the strategy of Literal translation is used accurately in this verse-6. The strategy of **metrical translation** is not used. In Urdu version 'qarar' is stressed but 'ease' is not stressed in TT. In verse-6, translator succeeds in applying the strategy of **interpretation and imitation**. The sense or feeling of restlessness is appropriately conveyed in TT while the form (language) is not maintained as that of source text due to varied syntactic features of source and target language.

Table 4.8; verse -7

tire vaade par sitamgar abhī aur sabr karte	O my merciless beloved, I would wait a little longer on your words of promise
---	---

The table 4.8 shows that ‘tire vaade par stimgar’ abhī aur sabr karte’ is translated as ‘O merciless beloved, I would wait a little longer on your words of promise’. The lexical and semantic choices made by translator are suitable, it can be seen from translation of ‘stimgar’ as ‘merciless’ and translation of ‘vaade’ as ‘promise’ and ‘Sabr’ as ‘wait’. Thus it reveals that **literal translation** is done accordingly while on the other hand there are some aspects that enables us to deny from this statement of accurate literal translation. There are some additional words in TT such as ‘my’ and ‘beloved’. The word ‘O merciless’ would be enough for ‘sitamgar’. Similarly, ‘aur’ is translated as ‘a little longer’. It increased the number of words and resulted in lack of literal translation of verse-7 in general.

Sounds of ST are different from sounds of TT. Therefore strategy of **phonemic translation** is not applied. For example; ‘vaade’ starts with phoneme [v] and ends with [e] whereas ‘promise’ starts with [p] and ends with [e]. **Metrical translation** is not done by the translator in this case. For example ‘sabar’ and ‘abhi’ are stressed in ST but not in TT. The sense is conveyed properly while choice and use of form is insufficient therefore the strategy of **interpretation and imitation** is applied aptly.

Table 4.9 Verse -8

If I had a guarantee of my life any more	agar apnī zindagī kā hameñ e'tibār hotā
--	---

Verse-8; ‘agar apnī zindagī kā hameñ e'tibār hotā’ is translated as ‘If I had a guarantee of my life any more’. The translator has used appropriate semantic and lexical items. Strategy of **Literal translation** is applied perfectly. comparison of ST and TT reveals that there are many words in source text that are literally translated into target text such as ‘life’ is appropriate translation of ‘zindagi’ and ‘Agar’ is translated as ‘if’ and ‘etibar’ is translated as ‘guarantee’. This shows sense or meaning of original verse is retained in TT.

In this case no **phonemic translation** is done. ‘Zindagi’ begins with phoneme [z] and ends with phoneme [i]. While life begins with phoneme[l] and ends with[f], same is the case with all other lexical items in verse-8. This shows phonemic divergence of sounds. **Metrical translation** is absent as ‘zindagi’ is stressed in ST but ‘life’ is not stressed in TT. In verse-8 strategy of **interpretation and imitation** is followed by the translator. The feeling of waiting for a beloved is transported appropriately. While on the other hand language is used properly but still there are lacking due to varied syntax of English and Urdu language.

Rhymed Translation refers to translating or transferring the rhyme of the original poem into the target language text. Data analysis reveals that the strategy of rhymed translation proposed by Lefevere is not applied anywhere. This is because both languages have different syntactic and phonological features so rhythm cannot be followed properly. Furthermore, the comparison showed that the original version is following a proper rhyming scheme. Every couplet of ST ends with ‘hota’ while in TT every couplet ends with different words such as ‘her, friend, ease and more’. So, on this basis we can regard this translation as non-rhymed translation.

According to Lefevere, **Blank verse Translation** refers to finding proper equivalent words in the target language that have same semantic value. Translator is restricted to the style and structure of ST. The aspect of semantic values is followed by translator in some verses, specifically in verse-3 and verse-8.

There are no accurate equivalent words of ST and TT, for example 'visal' 'ajab'. We can say that the translator did not use the strategy of blank verse. And if we talk about style of the poem, it is evident that translator did not follow it. The analysis of the selected poem shows that the original version has not used blank verse, as every verse ends with 'hota'. On the other hand the translator has used this strategy for translating, in contrast with the style of the original poem which is related is in rhymed form. However, in ST every verse is following proper rhyming scheme while in TT blank verse translation is done. In TT, all verses ends with different lexical items like ease, anymore, promise which is not the case in ST.

The Lefevere's strategy of **Poetry in Prose** denotes the alteration of sense, syntax and communicative value of a ST in TT. The data analysis reveals that translator has used this strategy at various occasions. Through above mentioned analysis of ST and TT, it can be noticed that sense and style is distorted and communicative purpose is fulfilled to some extent in TT by the translator. In general, the sense of ST is almost delivered in TT but some cultural connotations and culture specific words are not translated properly as 'visal-e-yaar' in verse-1. And when we talk about syntax, it is different for English and Urdu due to which rhythm is not maintained and the poetic essence of ST is lost somewhere in TT. Poetry is converted into the form of prose.

V. CONCLUSION:

This research determines that translation is a damaging act to an original in the way that cultural specific linguistic variations have their impact on it. Data analysis reveals that both languages; Urdu and English comprises of different linguistic features and belongs to two different cultures. Language and culture are directly proportional to each other. Only a person having linguistics competence of both languages can translate and when a script is translated it represents the culture of the people to whom that language belongs and thus they are identified on such particular characteristics. So in simple words bilinguals translate particular script and represents identity.

In a nutshell, translation effects the identity and meaning of a poem. In translation some linguistic features are responsible for destruction of sense and meaning of a poem. In this particular Daag Dehlvi's poem English translated version of Urdu poem fails to convey the proper context and phonological aspect. In some of the verses of the text the meaning is not properly conveyed as some words are cultural specific. They have different meaning in different languages and culture. For example, 'yar' as a beloved is inappropriate translation of the word. Hence, it is true to say that in this translated version of a poem, sense and style of a poem is distorted and communicative purpose is fulfilled to some extent.

On one hand, there is inaccurate use of lexical item and no literal translation has been done as the word 'jaan' is translated as a 'soul', 'ghair' as an enemy. Soul means 'rooh' while enemy means dushman. While on the other hand, some words have equal lexical items in a poem like 'maza' as charm and 'dosti' as 'friendship'.

Phonemic translation has been ignored as both the languages have different sounds. Both languages have different syntactic and phonological features so rhythm cannot be followed properly. Different words have different sounds in both the languages as 'maza' in Urdu has the sound of [m] while its English translation 'charm' has [ch] sound. There is no metrical translation has been done. We have seen in Daag Dehlvi's poem that every couplet of Urdu text ends with 'hota' while in English every couplet ends with different words such as 'her, friend, ease and more'. Some words are stressed in Urdu text i.e 'hota' while in English translation it is not stressed. Translated version of a text does not have the similar effect on the minds of a reader. Thus, English version of the text is regarded as non-rhymed translation.

Since both English and Urdu have different culture it is difficult to produce exact translation of Urdu into English and vice versa. Comparative analysis of ST and TT showed that all sever strategies of translation of poetry given by Lefevere are not applied as a whole. Strategy of literal translation is applied in few verses while wherever translator deviates from literal translation, TT makes sense but loses specified linguistic features like rhythm and blank verse. As sounds and their patterns of both languages are different that results in lack of phonemic translation. Translator fails to apply the strategy of Metrical translation due to distinct phonological patterns of English and Urdu. A syllable that is stressed in one language is unstressed in another. Meanwhile the strategy of interpretation and imitation is aptly followed in TT. The accuracy of sense resulted in distortion at linguistic level.

REFERENCES

1. Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: an essay in applied linguistics*.
2. London: Oxford University Press.
3. Frost, W. 1969. *Dryden and the Art of Translation*. New Haven, CON: Yale University Press.
4. Giblett, R. 1987. *Translating the Other: Nobakov and Theories of Translation*. *Babel* 3.
5. Jacobson, R. 1960. Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In T. Seboek (ed.), *Style in*
6. *Language* 350-77. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
7. Irfan, F., Shahzadi, M., Talib, N., & Awan, T. H. (2020). A COMPARATIVE CORPUS
8. BASED ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE MARKERS FOR GENDER DESCRIPTION
9. IN THE ALCHEMIST AND PRIDE AND PREJUDICE, *PalArch's Journal of*
10. *Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(11), 358-376
11. Irfan, F., Naqvi, S. A., Awan, T. H., & Abbasi, A. W. A. (2021). IMPACT OF L2
12. PERFORMER'S ACCENT ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNERS LISTENING
13. COMPREHENSION, *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*,
14. 18(3), 171-186
15. Lefevere, A. (1975). *Translating poetry: seven strategies and a blueprint*. Assen: Van
16. Gorcum.
17. Malmkjær, K., Windle, K., & Jones, F. (2011-03-17). The Translation of Poetry. In *The*
18. *Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*. : Oxford University Press. Retrieved 13 Nov. 2019
19. Nida, E. (2001). *Contexts in translation*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Publishing Company.
20. Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
21. Newmark, P. (2004). Non-literary in the light of literary translation. University of Surrey. *The*
22. *Journal of Specialised Translation*, 1, (1).12-20.
23. Sen, G., & Shaole, G. (2010). *Plural complementarism of translation standard and Chinese*
24. *translation strategies of English metrical poetry*. *Journal of language and literature*.
25. Retrieved December, 2, 2011, from: [www.lit.az/ijar/pdf/ijl/2/ILL2010\(2-3\).pdf](http://www.lit.az/ijar/pdf/ijl/2/ILL2010(2-3).pdf) Venuti,
26. L.(1998) *The Scandals of Translation*, Routledge, New York
27. Yogesh Hole et al 2019 J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. 1362 012121