

Translation as Cultural Politics: Rewriting Gender, Culture, and Identity in the English Translation of Umrao Jan Ada

Dr. Qudsi Rizvi

Faculty, English, Maulana Azad National Urdu University Hyderabad

Abstract

Translation is often perceived as a process of linguistic transfer; however, such a view overlooks its role in shaping cultural meaning and social understanding. This paper examines translation as a site of cultural politics by analyzing the English translation of Mirza Hadi Ruswa's *Umrao Jan Ada*. Situated within the socio-cultural milieu of nineteenth-century Lucknow, the original Urdu text presents a layered representation of tawaif culture, where questions of gender, performance, and social hierarchy are intricately intertwined. When translated into English, these culturally embedded meanings undergo subtle yet significant transformations.

Using the English translation by David Matthews (2001) as the primary text, this study explores how translation mediates between linguistic systems while simultaneously negotiating cultural difference. The paper argues that translation operates as an act of rewriting, wherein cultural concepts, social relations, and narrative voice are reshaped to align with the expectations of a different readership. Through close textual analysis, it demonstrates how key elements such as forms of address, culturally specific terms, and poetic insertions are either simplified, reinterpreted, or partially displaced in translation.

The study further examines how these shifts affect the representation of the tawaif, whose position in the Urdu text reflects a complex interplay of marginality and cultural authority. In translation, this complexity is often moderated, leading to a reconfiguration of gendered identity within more familiar interpretive frameworks. Occasional reference to the English translations of Faiz Ahmed Faiz's poetry highlights similar patterns of cultural and aesthetic transformation.

By foregrounding the relationship between translation, power, and representation, this paper seeks to reposition translation as an active cultural practice rather than a neutral medium. It contributes to ongoing discussions in translation studies by demonstrating how literary translation participates in the production and circulation of postcolonial identities.

Keywords: Translation, Cultural Politics, *Umrao Jan Ada*, Postcolonial Identity, Cultural Representation

1. Introduction

Translation has conventionally been understood as the transfer of meaning from one language to another, with emphasis placed on accuracy and equivalence. However, such a perspective tends to obscure the extent to which translation is embedded in cultural, social, and ideological processes. Rather than functioning as a neutral conduit, translation actively participates in shaping how texts are interpreted and situated within new contexts. It involves the negotiation of meaning across linguistic boundaries while

simultaneously engaging with structures of power that influence representation and reception. In this sense, translation does not merely reproduce meaning; it reorganizes it within a different cultural framework.

Recent developments in translation studies have increasingly foregrounded these concerns, drawing attention to the role of translation in the construction of cultural knowledge. The movement of a text from one language to another inevitably entails a shift in the conditions under which meaning is produced and understood. Cultural references, linguistic nuances, and social codes embedded in the source text often resist direct equivalence, requiring the translator to make interpretive choices. These choices are not made in isolation; they are shaped by the expectations of the target audience, the norms of the receiving language, and broader discursive formations that govern how cultures are represented.

This becomes particularly significant in the context of texts that are deeply rooted in specific historical and cultural milieus. Literary works written in Urdu, especially those emerging from the refined culture of nineteenth-century North India, are characterized by a high degree of linguistic sophistication and cultural density. The language carries not only semantic meaning but also social and aesthetic values, encoded in forms of address, idiomatic expressions, and poetic conventions. When such texts are translated into English, the process involves more than linguistic substitution; it entails the rearticulation of an entire cultural world.

Mirza Hadi Ruswa's *Umrao Jan Ada*, first published in 1899, provides a compelling site for examining these dynamics. The novel presents a detailed and nuanced portrayal of the tawaif culture of Lucknow, a world structured by performance, refinement, and complex social hierarchies. The protagonist's narrative voice is shaped by cultural codes that govern expression, emotion, and social interaction. These codes are deeply embedded in the Urdu language and are not easily transferable into English without modification. This study focuses on the English translation of the novel by David Matthews (2001), which serves as the primary text for analysis. While the translation seeks to preserve aspects of the original narrative, it also reflects the challenges inherent in rendering culturally specific meanings into a different linguistic system. Through shifts in vocabulary, tone, and narrative texture, the translation produces a version of the text that is both connected to and distinct from its source.

The paper argues that translation functions as an act of cultural rewriting that reshapes the representation of identity, particularly in relation to gender and social roles. In the case of *Umrao Jan Ada*, the English translation does not merely reproduce the original narrative but repositions it within a different cultural and interpretive framework. This process affects the representation of the tawaif, alters the texture of narrative voice, and transforms the reader's engagement with culturally embedded meanings. By examining specific instances of linguistic and cultural transformation, this study seeks to demonstrate how translation operates as a site of cultural politics, where meanings are negotiated, adapted, and redefined.

2. Literature Review

The field of translation studies has undergone a significant shift from viewing translation as a problem of linguistic equivalence to understanding it as a culturally and ideologically embedded practice. Early approaches to translation were largely concerned with fidelity to the source text and the preservation of meaning across languages. However, such models have increasingly been critiqued for overlooking the socio-cultural contexts within which translation operates. Contemporary scholarship emphasizes that translation is not merely a technical act but a process that is deeply implicated in questions of power, representation, and cultural negotiation.

One of the foundational interventions in this regard is André Lefevere's concept of translation as "rewriting," which foregrounds the role of ideology and patronage in shaping translated texts (Lefevere, 1992). Lefevere argues that translations are produced within specific cultural systems that determine what is translated, how it is translated, and how it is received. This perspective shifts attention from the notion of equivalence to the conditions under which translation takes place, highlighting its function in the construction and circulation of literary and cultural value. In the context of Urdu–English translation, this framework is particularly useful, as it allows for an examination of how culturally specific texts are reconfigured for global readerships.

Lawrence Venuti further develops this line of inquiry by examining the invisibility of the translator and the dominance of fluency in English translation practices (Venuti, 1995). According to Venuti, translations that read smoothly in the target language often conceal the cultural differences of the source text, thereby domesticating it. This process not only shapes the reader's experience but also reinforces the dominance of the target language culture. Venuti's distinction between domestication and foreignization provides a critical lens for analyzing how translation strategies influence the representation of cultural identity.

Postcolonial theory has contributed significantly to expanding the scope of translation studies by situating translation within broader structures of colonial and cultural power. Edward Said's analysis of representation in *Orientalism* demonstrates how non-Western cultures have historically been mediated through discursive practices that align them with Western expectations (Said, 1978). Although Said does not focus specifically on translation, his insights are highly relevant, as translation often functions as one such mediating practice. The translation of literary texts from Urdu into English can thus be seen as part of a larger process through which cultural meanings are interpreted and reframed.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak extends this critique by emphasizing the ethical dimensions of translation. In her essay "The Politics of Translation," Spivak argues that translation must attend closely to the linguistic and cultural specificity of the source text, particularly when dealing with marginalized languages and literatures (Spivak, 1993). She cautions against translations that prioritize accessibility at the expense of rhetorical and cultural nuance, noting that such practices can lead to a form of epistemic violence. Spivak's intervention is especially relevant in the context of Urdu literary texts, where meaning is often carried through subtle linguistic and cultural cues that resist easy translation.

Homi K. Bhabha's notion of cultural hybridity offers another important perspective by framing translation as a space of negotiation rather than simple transfer (Bhabha, 1994). For Bhabha, translation is not about reproducing an original meaning but about creating an "in-between" space where cultural identities are rearticulated. This approach allows for a more nuanced understanding of translation as a dynamic process that can both challenge and reproduce existing power structures. In literary translation, this hybridity becomes visible in the coexistence of source and target cultural elements within the translated text.

While these theoretical frameworks have significantly advanced the study of translation, there remains a relative lack of sustained attention to specific Urdu texts within this discourse. Much of the existing scholarship on Urdu–English translation has focused on poetry, particularly the works of Faiz Ahmed Faiz, where questions of metaphor, rhythm, and political expression have been central. Studies have shown that the translation of Faiz often involves a negotiation between preserving poetic intensity and ensuring readability in English, leading to shifts in tone and affect.

In comparison, prose texts such as *Umrao Jan Ada* have received less focused attention in terms of translation analysis, particularly with regard to the intersection of language, gender, and cultural representation. The novel's rich linguistic texture and its embedding in the cultural practices of the tawaif

tradition make it a valuable site for examining how translation operates as cultural rewriting. However, existing discussions tend to either treat the text primarily as a literary work or address translation in passing, without sustained comparative analysis.

This paper seeks to address this gap by bringing together insights from translation studies and postcolonial theory in a close reading of the English translation of *Umrao Jan Ada*. Rather than treating translation as a secondary concern, it places translation at the center of analysis, examining how specific linguistic and cultural elements are transformed in the process. In doing so, the study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of translation as a site where cultural meanings are not only transmitted but actively reshaped.

3. Theoretical Framework

The present study approaches translation as a culturally situated and interpretive act rather than a purely linguistic operation. While earlier models of translation privileged equivalence and fidelity, more recent theoretical developments emphasize the ways in which translation is shaped by ideological, cultural, and institutional forces. This section outlines the conceptual framework that informs the analysis of *Umrao Jan Ada*, with particular attention to translation as rewriting, the negotiation of cultural difference, and the relationship between language and representation.

A central premise of this study is drawn from André Lefevere's understanding of translation as a form of rewriting. According to Lefevere, translation is not a neutral reproduction of the source text but a process influenced by cultural norms, ideological expectations, and the target literary system (Lefevere, 1992). This perspective is especially relevant for texts that are embedded in specific cultural traditions, where meaning is not confined to lexical units but extends to social practices and symbolic structures. In the case of *Umrao Jan Ada*, translation involves the reinterpretation of a culturally dense narrative for a readership that may not share the same historical or social context. The resulting text, therefore, reflects not only the original but also the conditions of its reception.

The question of how cultural difference is managed in translation can be further understood through Lawrence Venuti's distinction between domestication and foreignization. Domestication refers to translation strategies that minimize the foreignness of the source text in order to produce a fluent and accessible target text, while foreignization seeks to retain elements of linguistic and cultural difference (Venuti, 1995). These strategies are not merely stylistic choices; they have implications for how cultures are represented and understood. A domesticated translation may facilitate readability but can also obscure the specificity of the source culture, whereas a foreignizing approach may preserve difference but risk alienating the reader. The English translation of *Umrao Jan Ada* reflects a negotiation between these tendencies, revealing the tensions inherent in translating culturally embedded material.

The relationship between translation and representation is further illuminated by postcolonial perspectives. Edward Said's critique of cultural representation highlights how non-Western societies have historically been interpreted through frameworks that render them intelligible within Western discourse (Said, 1978). Translation can function as one such framework, mediating how a text is perceived in a different cultural context. When a work like *Umrao Jan Ada* is translated into English, it enters a global literary space where its meanings are shaped not only by the source text but also by the expectations and interpretive habits of the target audience. This process raises questions about whose perspective is being privileged and how cultural identities are constructed in translation.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's reflections on the politics of translation provide an important ethical dimension to this discussion. Spivak emphasizes the need for translators to engage closely with the linguistic and rhetorical texture of the original, particularly when translating texts from marginalized or less globally dominant languages (Spivak, 1993). She cautions against translations that prioritize ease of comprehension over fidelity to cultural specificity, arguing that such practices can result in the erasure of important nuances. In the context of Urdu–English translation, this concern is particularly relevant, as many culturally significant terms and expressions do not have direct equivalents in English.

At the same time, Homi K. Bhabha's concept of cultural hybridity offers a way of understanding translation as a site of negotiation rather than loss. For Bhabha, cultural meaning is not fixed but produced in the interaction between different cultural systems (Bhabha, 1994). Translation can thus be seen as creating an “in-between” space where meanings are rearticulated and new forms of understanding emerge. This perspective allows for a more nuanced view of translation, one that acknowledges both its transformative effects and its potential to generate new cultural configurations.

Taken together, these theoretical perspectives provide a framework for analyzing translation as a practice that is deeply embedded in cultural politics. Rather than evaluating translation in terms of accuracy alone, this study examines how translation reshapes meaning, reconfigures identity, and participates in broader processes of representation. In the following sections, this framework will be applied to a close reading of *Umrao Jan Ada*, with particular attention to how linguistic choices in translation affect the portrayal of culture, gender, and narrative voice.

4. Text and Context: *Umrao Jan Ada*

Mirza Hadi Ruswa's *Umrao Jan Ada*, first published in 1899, occupies a distinctive place in the development of Urdu prose fiction. Written at a time when the Urdu novel was still in its formative stages, the text combines elements of fiction, memoir, and oral narration to produce a layered and self-reflexive narrative. Presented as the life story of a courtesan narrated to the author himself, the novel blurs the boundaries between autobiography and literary construction, thereby complicating questions of voice, authenticity, and authorship.

The narrative is set in the cultural milieu of nineteenth-century Lucknow, a city that had come to symbolize refinement, artistic patronage, and linguistic sophistication in North India. Even after the political decline of Awadh following British annexation in 1856, Lucknow continued to sustain a vibrant culture of poetry, music, and performance. The *tawaif*, or courtesan, played a central role in this cultural landscape. Far from being merely a figure of social marginality, she was often a trained artist, well-versed in poetry, music, and etiquette, and participated actively in shaping the aesthetic sensibilities of the time.

The world of the *tawaif* as represented in *Umrao Jan Ada* is structured by a complex interplay of gender, class, and cultural capital. While the courtesan occupies a socially ambiguous position—simultaneously marginalized and sought after—she also exercises a degree of agency through her mastery of language and performance. *Umrao Jan*, the protagonist, is not only a performer but also a narrator who reflects critically on her own life and circumstances. Her voice is marked by wit, irony, and self-awareness, qualities that are deeply tied to the linguistic resources of Urdu.

Language, in this context, is not simply a medium of communication but a carrier of cultural meaning. The Urdu used in the novel is characterized by its idiomatic richness, nuanced forms of address, and incorporation of poetic forms such as the *ghazal*. Terms like *ada*, *mehfil*, *tehzeeb*, and *nazakat* are not easily translatable, as they encapsulate cultural practices and values that do not have direct equivalents in

English. Similarly, the system of pronouns and honorifics—such as *aap*, *tum*, *janab*, and *begum*—encodes social relationships and hierarchies that are integral to the narrative.

The presence of poetry within the prose narrative further complicates the linguistic texture of the text. Ghazals and couplets are interwoven into the story, serving not only as aesthetic embellishments but also as vehicles for emotional expression and cultural memory. These poetic insertions draw on a long-standing Indo-Persian literary tradition, where metaphor, rhythm, and intertextuality play a crucial role in meaning-making. The reader's engagement with the text thus depends on an awareness of these literary conventions. When *Umrao Jan Ada* is translated into English, this dense network of cultural and linguistic elements presents significant challenges. The translation must negotiate between preserving the specificity of the original and ensuring readability for an audience that may not be familiar with the cultural context. As a result, certain elements are retained, others are adapted, and some are inevitably lost or transformed. The translated text becomes a rearticulation of the original, shaped by the constraints and possibilities of the target language.

The English translation by David Matthews (2001), which serves as the primary text for this study, attempts to balance these competing demands. It retains selected Urdu terms and provides a relatively faithful rendering of the narrative structure. At the same time, it reflects the pressures of producing a coherent and accessible English text, leading to shifts in tone, simplification of cultural references, and modification of linguistic nuance. These shifts form the basis for the analysis that follows, where translation is examined not merely as a linguistic exercise but as a process that reshapes cultural meaning.

5. Analysis I: Translation and Cultural Rewriting

The translation of *Umrao Jan Ada* into English provides a productive site for examining how culturally embedded meanings are reconfigured in the process of linguistic transfer. Rather than functioning as a transparent medium, the translation reflects a series of interpretive choices that reshape the cultural and social dimensions of the original text. These shifts are particularly evident in the treatment of culturally specific vocabulary, forms of address, and poetic expression, all of which contribute to the construction of meaning in the Urdu text.

One of the most revealing aspects of this transformation lies in the handling of culturally dense terms. The Urdu word *ada*, from which the protagonist derives her name, signifies more than a gesture or mannerism; it refers to a cultivated mode of expression combining grace, stylization, and performative intelligence. In the English translation, while the name “Ada” is retained, the broader semantic field associated with the term is not consistently articulated. The reader encounters it primarily as an identifying label rather than as a culturally embedded aesthetic principle. This narrowing of meaning illustrates how translation can reduce a concept that is deeply rooted in a cultural system to a more limited referential function.

A similar shift occurs in the rendering of *mehfil*. In the Urdu text, the *mehfil* is not simply a social gathering but a structured cultural space governed by etiquette, performance, and hierarchy. It is a site where artistic authority and social relations intersect. In Matthews' translation, the term is sometimes translated as “gathering” or retained without elaboration. While these strategies ensure readability, they do not fully convey the institutional and aesthetic significance of the *mehfil*, resulting in a partial flattening of its cultural meaning.

The term *tehzeeb* presents an equally complex case. In Urdu, *tehzeeb* encompasses refinement, ethical conduct, social decorum, and cultural sophistication. English approximations such as “culture” or “manners” capture only fragments of this meaning. In translation, the absence of a stable equivalent

disperses its semantic weight across different contexts, weakening its conceptual coherence. Such instances exemplify what Lefevere describes as the rewriting of cultural meaning within the constraints of the target system (Lefevere, 1992).

Forms of address constitute another significant site of transformation. Urdu encodes social relations through a nuanced system of pronouns and honorifics, where distinctions such as *aap* and *tum* signal varying degrees of respect, intimacy, and hierarchy. In English, these distinctions are largely neutralized through the use of the single pronoun “you.” Similarly, titles such as *janab* and *begum* are often simplified or omitted. This linguistic flattening alters the relational dynamics between characters, particularly in contexts involving patronage and authority, where subtle gradations of respect are central to meaning.

The challenges of translation become even more pronounced in the rendering of poetic insertions within the narrative. The ghazals embedded in *Umrao Jan Ada* are integral to its emotional and aesthetic structure, drawing on a rich Indo-Persian tradition of metaphor, rhythm, and intertextuality. In Matthews’ translation, these verses are typically rendered in a simplified poetic form that privileges semantic clarity over formal equivalence. For example, a verse expressing emotional vulnerability is translated into English in a direct and linear manner, where the imagery is retained but the rhythmic and phonetic qualities are significantly reduced (Ruswa, 2001).

In the Urdu text, such verses rely on compact expression and layered metaphor, producing an affective intensity that is closely tied to their formal structure. The English rendering, while faithful to meaning, tends to disperse this intensity by unfolding the compressed imagery into a more explanatory form. The reader is thus able to understand the sentiment but encounters it in a different aesthetic register. This shift reflects a broader tendency in literary translation, where poetic density is moderated to ensure accessibility for the target audience.

The difficulty of translating such poetic expression can be further illustrated through the wider ghazal tradition. Consider, for instance, Mirza Ghalib’s well-known couplet:

دل ہی تو ہے نہ سنگ و خشت، درد سے بھر نہ آئے کیوں
روئیں گے ہم ہزار بار، کوئی ہمیں ستائے کیوں

In one established English translation, this appears as:

It is only a heart, not stone or brick—why should it not fill with pain? I shall weep a thousand times—why should anyone torment me so? (Ghalib, 1994)

While the translation conveys the semantic content, it does not fully reproduce the rhythmic balance and metaphorical density of the original. The phrase *sang-o-khisht* carries cultural and literary resonances within the Urdu poetic tradition that extend beyond its literal meaning. The English version renders the contrast intelligible but cannot replicate the compactness and musicality of the Urdu expression. This example helps to situate the translational challenges observed in *Umrao Jan Ada* within a broader literary context.

Returning to Ruswa’s text, the translation of ghazals reflects a similar pattern, which can be clearly observed through Matthews’ own renderings of the verses embedded in the narrative. For instance, the opening couplet of the novel appears in Urdu as a compact and rhythmically balanced expression of memory and sorrow, while Matthews translates it as:

How many tales of pleasure we recall— A preface to the pain of sorrow’s call (Ruswa, 2001, p. 1).

Although the translation conveys the thematic contrast between pleasure and sorrow, the shift from the condensed and culturally resonant Urdu expression to a more explanatory English form alters its aesthetic

impact. The internal rhythm, idiomatic density, and suggestive ambiguity of the original are replaced by a more structured and interpretive rendering.

A similar transformation is visible in the verses recited during the mushaira scene, where Umrao's poetic voice emerges within a performative cultural setting. One such couplet is translated by Matthews as:

Who will hear the sadness of my heart, Ada? In wandering life's journey took us near and far (Ruswa, 2001, p. 20).

Here again, while the emotional content is preserved, the compact suggestiveness of the Urdu verse gives way to a more linear and discursive structure. The translation renders meaning accessible but attenuates the layered interplay of sound, rhythm, and cultural symbolism that characterizes the original.

As in Matthews' rendering of Ruswa's text, the semantic content is conveyed, but the rhythmic balance and metaphorical density of the original remain difficult to reproduce. This demonstrates that translation operates not as a simple transfer of meaning but as a process of cultural and aesthetic reconfiguration. As Venuti (1995) suggests, such domestication enables readability while simultaneously reshaping the expressive qualities of the source text.

6. Analysis II: Gender, Identity, and Representation

The translation of Umrao Jan Ada not only reshapes linguistic and cultural meanings but also significantly mediates the representation of gender and identity. The figure of the tawaif, as constructed in the Urdu text, is articulated through performance, language, and social positioning. In Matthews' translation, while this identity is retained at a narrative level, its tonal and cultural complexity undergoes subtle but important transformations.

A key entry point into this transformation is the dialogic encounter between Umrao Jan and Ruswa in the early part of the narrative. When she addresses him, she says:

“By Allah, Mirza Sahib! You have forgotten me. Who on earth could have guessed where you had disappeared to?” (Ruswa, 2001, p. xvii)

This moment is significant because it reflects a culturally embedded mode of address that combines familiarity, emotional charge, and performative grace. The use of “Mirza Sahib” retains a trace of Urdu honorific culture, yet the English rendering simplifies the layered tonal shifts that would be present in the original—where respect, irony, and intimacy coexist within a single utterance. The translation conveys the content but moderates the performative nuance of Umrao's voice.

This becomes more evident in her self-positioning within the mushaira setting, where poetic expression is closely tied to identity. When her verse is praised, she responds:

“Thank you, gentlemen... I am nothing.” (Ruswa, 2001, p. xxii)

In Urdu, such expressions of modesty are often culturally coded forms of self-presentation rather than literal self-effacement. They function as part of a refined etiquette (tehzeeb) that structures social interaction. In translation, however, the phrase appears more direct and self-denying, potentially leading the reader to interpret it as an expression of humility in a literal sense rather than as a stylized rhetorical gesture.

The mushaira scene further illustrates how Umrao's identity is constructed through poetic performance. Consider the translated lines:

“It's certain that my lover will not come, But still I fix the portal with my eye.” (Ruswa, 2001, p. xxii)

Here, longing and emotional endurance are articulated through metaphor. While the translation preserves

the meaning, the cultural resonance of such imagery—rooted in the conventions of Urdu ghazal—is less immediately available to the English reader. The tawaif’s identity as a poet-performer, whose subjectivity is expressed through inherited aesthetic forms, becomes partially detached from its cultural grounding. Another important moment occurs when Umrao reflects on poetic voice and gendered expression. When questioned about the tone of her verse, she responds:

“My own experience is another matter... The subject I chose is merely poetic.” (Ruswa, 2001, p. xxiii)

This statement reveals a sophisticated awareness of the distinction between lived experience and poetic construction. It challenges any simplistic reading of the tawaif as merely expressing personal emotion, instead positioning her as an artist who consciously engages with literary convention. In translation, while the statement remains clear, the subtle interplay between performance and authenticity—central to her identity—is less textured due to the flattening of linguistic nuance.

These examples demonstrate that translation does not merely carry over gendered identity but actively reshapes it. The Urdu text constructs Umrao Jan as a figure whose agency is embedded in performance, linguistic refinement, and cultural codes. The English translation, while preserving narrative structure, tends to render this identity in more transparent and individualized terms. As a result, the tawaif may appear less as a culturally situated performer and more as a psychologically legible individual.

This shift can be understood through Spivak’s (1993) argument that translation must attend to the rhetorical and cultural specificity of the source text. When such specificity is moderated, the representation of marginalized or culturally embedded identities risks being simplified. At the same time, as Bhabha (1994) suggests, translation also produces a hybrid space in which new forms of meaning emerge. The Umrao Jan encountered in English is not identical to her Urdu counterpart; she is a rearticulated figure, shaped by the linguistic and cultural conditions of translation.

Thus, the translation of Umrao Jan Ada reveals that gender and identity are not stable textual properties but are mediated through language. The tawaif’s voice, poised between performance and subjectivity, undergoes a subtle transformation in translation, demonstrating how cultural meaning is negotiated rather than simply transferred.

7. Analysis III: Aesthetic Loss and Poetic Translation

The translation of Umrao Jan Ada brings into focus a central tension in literary translation: the difficulty of preserving not only meaning but also aesthetic form. While the English version successfully communicates the narrative and thematic concerns of the original, it reveals the limits of translation when confronted with a literary tradition in which sound, rhythm, and cultural symbolism are integral to meaning itself. The ghazals embedded in the text are not ornamental additions but constitute a core expressive mode through which emotion, memory, and identity are articulated.

As observed in the earlier analysis, Matthews’ translation renders these verses in a manner that privileges semantic clarity over formal equivalence. This approach ensures accessibility for readers unfamiliar with Urdu poetic conventions but simultaneously alters the sensory experience of the text. The compactness of the Urdu couplet—its internal rhyme, metrical balance, and phonetic resonance—is difficult to reproduce in English without either distorting meaning or imposing an artificial poetic structure. As a result, the translated verse often appears more expansive and explanatory, where the suggestive power of the original gives way to interpretive clarity.

This shift may be understood not simply as a loss but as a transformation of aesthetic experience. In Urdu, the ghazal operates through a shared cultural vocabulary of metaphor and allusion, where meaning is

layered and often indirect. The reader's engagement depends on familiarity with this tradition. In English translation, where such shared conventions cannot be assumed, the verse is rearticulated in a more explicit and linear form. The aesthetic experience thus moves from one based on resonance and suggestion to one structured by intelligibility.

Matthews himself acknowledges, in the translator's preface, that Urdu poetry is embedded within performative contexts such as the *mushaira*, where meaning is shaped not only by language but by audience, recitation, and cultural expectation (Ruswa, 2001). When removed from this context and presented in written English, the verse undergoes a shift in function. It becomes part of a narrative rather than an event of performance, and its affective force is consequently mediated in different ways.

The example of Ghalib's translated couplet, discussed earlier, reinforces this broader pattern. Even in highly accomplished translations, the movement from Urdu to English involves a recalibration of poetic form. The semantic core of the verse may be preserved, but its rhythmic and cultural dimensions are inevitably altered. In *Umrao Jan Ada*, this recalibration is particularly significant because poetry is central to the construction of character and atmosphere. The aesthetic loss is therefore not confined to isolated lines but affects the texture of the narrative as a whole.

However, it would be reductive to frame this entirely in terms of loss. As Bhabha's notion of cultural hybridity suggests, translation also produces new forms of aesthetic experience (Bhabha, 1994). The English rendering of the *ghazals*, while different from the original, allows the text to circulate within a broader literary space and reach audiences beyond its initial cultural context. The translated verse acquires a different kind of readability and interpretive openness, even as it departs from the formal qualities of the source.

Ultimately, the translation of poetic elements in *Umrao Jan Ada* demonstrates that aesthetic meaning is not fully transferable across languages. What is preserved is not the form itself but a reconfigured version of its effect. This underscores the central argument of this paper: that translation is not a neutral act of transmission but a process of transformation in which cultural and aesthetic meanings are reshaped. The English text, therefore, should be read not as a replica of the Urdu original but as a distinct literary work that bears the marks of its translational journey.

8. Conclusion

This study has examined the English translation of *Umrao Jan Ada* as a site of cultural negotiation, demonstrating that translation operates not merely as a linguistic transfer but as a process of rearticulation shaped by cultural, ideological, and aesthetic considerations. Through a close reading of David Matthews' translation, the analysis has shown how key elements of the Urdu text—culturally specific vocabulary, forms of address, and poetic expression—undergo transformation in the movement from one linguistic system to another.

The discussion of terms such as *ada*, *mehfil*, and *tehzeeb* has highlighted how translation mediates cultural concepts that resist direct equivalence. These terms, deeply embedded in the social and aesthetic fabric of nineteenth-century Lucknow, are not simply lexical units but carriers of cultural meaning. Their partial translation or semantic dispersion in English reflects the constraints under which translation operates, where readability and accessibility often necessitate a degree of simplification. This process, while enabling cross-cultural communication, also reshapes the conceptual framework within which the text is understood.

The analysis of gender and identity has further demonstrated that translation plays a crucial role in reconfiguring subjectivity. The tawaif in Ruswa's narrative emerges as a figure defined by performative agency, linguistic refinement, and cultural sophistication. In translation, however, this complexity is moderated through shifts in tone and the neutralization of culturally specific modes of expression. The resulting figure is more readily intelligible to an English-speaking audience but is also partially detached from the cultural codes that structure her identity in the original text. Translation thus participates in the reinterpretation of gendered identity, not by erasing it but by rearticulating it within a different discursive framework.

The treatment of poetic insertions has revealed the limits of translation in preserving aesthetic form. The ghazals embedded in the narrative, characterized by their rhythmic precision and metaphorical density, are rendered in English in ways that prioritize semantic clarity. While the thematic core of the verses is retained, their formal and affective qualities are inevitably transformed. This shift underscores the broader challenge of translating literary traditions in which meaning is inseparable from form and performance. Taken together, these observations reinforce the central argument of this paper: that translation functions as an act of cultural rewriting. It does not simply reproduce the source text but produces a new version shaped by the linguistic and cultural conditions of the target context. In doing so, translation becomes a site where meanings are negotiated, identities are reconfigured, and cultural forms are adapted for new audiences.

At the same time, this process should not be understood solely in terms of loss. Translation also enables the circulation of texts across linguistic and cultural boundaries, allowing works such as *Umrao Jan Ada* to reach a global readership. The English translation, while distinct from the Urdu original, opens up new interpretive possibilities and invites engagement from readers who might otherwise remain outside its cultural horizon. It is within this tension between transformation and transmission that the significance of translation resides.

By situating *Umrao Jan Ada* within the framework of cultural politics, this study contributes to ongoing discussions in translation studies and postcolonial criticism. It underscores the need to approach translation not as a secondary or derivative practice but as a central mode of cultural production, one that plays a decisive role in shaping how texts, identities, and traditions are understood across languages.

References

1. Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
2. Ghalib, Mirza. (1994). *Selected Poems of Mirza Ghalib*. Translated by Ralph Russell and Khurshidul Islam. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
3. Lefevere, André. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.
4. Ruswa, Mirza Hadi. (1996). *Umrao Jan Ada*. Translated by David Matthews. New Delhi: Rupa Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
5. Said, Edward W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
6. Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. (1993). "The Politics of Translation." In *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York: Routledge, pp. 179–200.
7. Venuti, Lawrence. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.