

“SELF TRANSLATION AND PHENOMENON OF REWRITING: A STUDY OF ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF URDU NOVEL “AAG KA DARYA” BY HYDER”

Wania Gul

Visiting Lecturer and PhD Scholar at Department of English, University of Sargodha, Pakistan

waniagul59@gmail.com

Babar Riaz

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

briaz064@gmail.com

ABSTARCT

This research explores the idea of rewriting in two different cultural perspectives. Sometimes rewriting or self-translation occurs because of addition, omission, substitution and explanatory notes between two languages, two cultures and sometimes it is intentionally caused by the translator to fulfil some purposes. This study explores the socio-cultural ideology between ST and TT. Self-translation basically explains the process of writing in more than one languages by the same author. It can also be explained that the translator and author is the same person in this piece of writing. A writer who can write and translate in different languages and who translates his or her own texts from one language into the other language produces self-translation or bilingual text. The purpose of this research is to shed light on the process of self-translation and rewriting in the ST “Aag Ka Darya” and TT “River of Fire” and to investigate the aspects of self-translation in ST of “Aag Ka Darya” and TT of “River of Fire”. For the sake of data analysis, Lefereve’s rewriting model is used as a theoretical framework. This research explains the translations that look for the different cultural specific items and discusses the possible strategies for translating them. These cultural and religious perspectives further analyzed either on the word level as well as sentence level.

Keywords: Self-translation, cultural perspectives, source text, religious perspective, target text, omission and translation studies.

Introduction

Concept of Translation

Translation, undoubtedly one of the most complex realities in human history, gives people an opportunity to create bridges across cultures by means of their messages, materials, literary and aesthetic aspects. Translation may in this sense be viewed as a real kind of human cultural activity. However, the fact that translation was regarded as a sub-discipline for (applied) linguistic and literary studies by academics has ignored this cultural component of translation throughout the history of translation study. Consequently, translation primarily addressed issues such as translatability, loyalty, correctness and equivalence. Although the aforementioned issues have an immense significance within the area, the newly developing discipline should have included the other elements of translation that had previously been ignored. The 1970s and 1980s saw the relentless attempts to establish and create "translation studies" as an independent field. The Leuven Literature and Translation Colloquium brought together Israeli and Low Country theorists and enabled these academics to discuss their findings with other translation specialists. In the years after the Leuven conference, the process research carried out played an important role in the development of Translation Studies as an independent field. The Leuven seminar set the ground not only for the field to develop, but also reinforced the notion of translation as a critical aspect of contact across cultures in the 1970s. One of the key contributions to the seminar was Israeli academic Itamar Even-Zohar's in a paper entitled “Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem”, which opened fresh discussions within the area of recent evolution. In addition to the ideas presented in the research, the notion of (poly)system theory has become the main emphasis.

Within the context of the systemic and descriptive approaches to the study and practice of trafficking, new approaches have emerged from the opinions expressed by Gideon Toury.

Larson (1997) explains definition of translation in a quite different way and states that translation is a method of moving from source language to the target language. His definition focuses on the meaning that meaning should not be lost while translating the text from source language to the target language. For Larson to the message accurately, there can be change in form and in the structure because of the difference between the two different languages and cultures. Because of the two different norms which exists in the cultures of ST to TT. It is also evident by previous researches that these differences come in the thoughts and ideas as well when translator translates text.

Brislin (1976) states his definition regarding translation and says that it is process of translating the thoughts and idea from the ST to TT. The language is in either the written form or spoken form. Brislin further describes his view regarding the translation that the translator should be well aware of the subject matter of the source language, he should be aware of the deep rooted word or expressions of the source language. While Translation is an activity, which existed before and therefore to practice it is much easier than translation as a theoretical discipline. Translation was practiced without any consistent rule and regulation and there were no theoretical principles, which can be used in the practice of this one. Translation study is an academic discipline which deals with the different languages, different cultures as well as with the different people. As Mirani, (nod) states that "in the process of translation there is need to look at the source text from different angles, what to translate, and what to substitute and where to paraphrase". As indicated by Hatim and Mason (1990), the social setting in translating a book is most likely a more significant variable than its sort. The practice of translation happens in the socio-cultural setting. Thus, it is significant to judge translational action just inside a social setting.

Miremadi (1993) define the translation as a reverse process of translating one culture and to the other and the other into one culture. Miremadi (1993) is of the view translation is simply the process of giving and taking. He further uncovers that this process is further related to deal with non-equivalents in which the translator has to find out suitable equivalents. It becomes necessary for the translator equivalent with the same concept as it was in the source text and then to provide it in the target text with same concept and expression.

Most people think of translation as the process of decoding a source text and re-encoding it in a destination text. The language in which this encoding occurs may be the same language, a different language, or a different medium in a different language. All of these changes are referred to as translations in linguistics. According to Spivak (2021), reading is also a personal act of translation. Barthes (1977a; 1977b) concurs with this observation in his writings "From Work to Text" and "The Death of an Author," in which he contends that the reader is the text's creator. Furthermore, Nancy Huston (2003) contends that since translation entails decoding the writer's ideas and encoding them in a text, the act of translating is extremely similar to the writing process. Writing is the same as translating, according to Saramago (1997), who has a similar opinion: "To write is to translate." That is how it will be forever. Even if we speak our own tongue. Additionally, there have been efforts to see translation as an act of interpretation and representation.

Idea of Self-Translation

Also known as auto-translation, self-translation is the way of changing textual material from one language (SL) into another language (TL) by the author themselves. The process of self-translation is also known as auto-translation. It is obvious that the majority of self-translation is carried out by the author themselves; hence, the self-translator is not typically a translation specialist as a result. Self-translator would surely become the protagonist of his own creative

work, not only in terms of substance, but also in terms of form, Stavans (2018) said at the beginning of his book *On Self-Translations*. The term "self-translation" is defined by Rainier Grutman (2009) as "the act of translating one's own works into another language or the product of such an attempt". According to Wilson (2009), "these authors self-reflexively investigate the degree to which they understand themselves as formed via language." As a result, "the narrative of their lived experience is increasingly understood as an act of (self-)translation," as Wilson puts it. The following is a definition of self-translation in a literary sense that is proposed by Christopher Whyte (2002): in his essay titled "Against Self-Translation" "it implies that the creator of a literary piece created in one language later reproduces it in a second language."

As a result, academics like Popovic (1976) have come to the conclusion that literary self-translation is a translational act that is carried out by multilingual writers themselves. According to Tanqueiro (2008), "the author, when electing to self-translate, performs more the function of translator and rather less that of author." This is mostly due to the fact that he is bound, just like any other translator, by the presence of a pre-established fictitious world in the literary work. Self-translations are considered to be outliers, according to Berman (1992), as are situations in which a writer decides to write in a language that is not his native tongue. The idea of rewriting in translation was first presented by André Lefevere, a renowned academic in the field of Translation Studies, and was further refined by Maria Tymoczko. The process of rewriting may be described as the act of rewriting literary writings from one culture to suit the needs of another culture that is the intended audience. When Lefevere discusses "rewriting," he describes it as "the driving force behind literary progress." He also says that "rewriters alter, change the originals they work with to some degree, often to make them fit in with the prevalent ideological and poetological currents of their period" (Lefevere 1992b).

Self-translation has been an important subject of study in translation studies, particularly in the postcolonial literary world where issues of power, identity, and cultural negotiation are at the heart of the matter. Self-translation lets the author change, reinterpret, and rewrite their own story across language and cultural barriers (Bassnett, 2011; O'Sullivan, 2011). This is different from regular translation. Qurratulain Hyder's "Aag Ka Darya" (1959), which she translated into English as *River of Fire* (1998), is an example of a language act that changes things. Scholars stress that Hyder's translation is a "transcreation" that changes the structure, the story, and the ideas (Abbas, 2023; Ansari & Patel, 2025; Spivak, 2021). This step brings up key issues concerning integrity, authorial purpose, and the changing role of cultural distinctiveness when a book transcends language and knowledge barriers (Venuti, 2017).

Hyder's "Aag Ka Darya" is a novel that tells the story of how the Indian subcontinent's ideas, politics, and religion have changed over the course of two thousand years. But when Hyder translated it into English, she made big alterations to the story and the words. Mirza (2020) says that "River of Fire" softens or leaves out some of the cultural, philosophical, and historical elements in the original Urdu in order to appeal to English speakers. Reshi (2014) also notes that Hyder shortens language, changes how characters evolve, and makes intertextual connections less complex in her English translation. These omissions were not made by mistake; they were made on purpose, which is what Spivak (1993) calls the "politics of translation." This means that the translator's decisions are based on what they think the target audience would believe. Dmitrieva and Glukhova (2022) also say that in these kinds of translations, symbolic language from indigenous cosmologies typically loses its semantic complexity, which makes the cultural representation less complex.

Hyder has creative control over the translated story since he is both the author and the translator. However, this also creates problems with authenticity and agency. Cronin (2013)

says that self-translation is always a rewriting of the self, particularly in postcolonial settings when language is both a source of pain and a way to fight back. Hyder's choice to translate her work into English, an imperial language, puts her in a liminal space where she has to balance the cultural memory in Urdu with the global accessibility of English (Zboray, 2019; Abbas, 2023). Ansari and Patel (2025) also say that the English translation gives a cleaner, more secular view of history, which is different from the original's extremely lyrical and spiritual connotations. In this approach, *River of Fire* does not only show Hyder's original idea; it tells it again in a way that fits with new audiences, publication economies, and cultural markets (Venuti, 2008; Mirza, 2020).

In literary history and translation theory, the phenomena of self-translation (ST) has been overlooked since it was thought to be an eccentric aberration. "Another enormous area without history" is how it was described (Bastin & Bandia, 2006: 22). The problem has only lately become the subject of theoretical research. Self-translation is clearly worthy of careful consideration these days. Since the source and TTs were created by the same individual in this instance, there is a very high degree of equivalency between them. Generally speaking, self-translation means that the writer recreates their work in a different language. It is also common for self-translation to produce linguistic forms that enhance the target language. As a result, the topic is pertinent to translation theory and crucial.

Self-translation is a creative type of translation that, in some aspects, is distinct from the typical act of translation, according to the definition that Petruca provides in her paper that was just released in 2013. She continues by defining a self-translator as an author who is able to make modifications to their work as it is being translated in order to update and enhance the content. She says this is a self-translator. Throughout her lecture, she touches on a broad variety of variables that inspire authors to self-translate their writings by themselves. She also mentions that there are writers who self-translate their own works "simply because they know another language," and that these authors are keen to expand their bilingualism or multilingualism. In addition to this, she claims that there are authors who self-translate their own works.

Grutman (2019) explains the concept of self-translation in his book "Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies". Grutman (2019) illustrates the concept of self-translation in his research by saying that the idea of self-translation refers to the practice of translating one's own writings into another language. Grutman (2019) asserts that self-translation served at the end of the middle ages and in the renaissance to shift information and knowledge from one state to another. He states that in history it was a common practice to convey information from the Latin language to different European languages with the help of translation, these translations were conducted in various languages such as French, Italian, German, Dutch, Spanish and English language.

This study aims at socio-cultural ideology between source text and TT. Self-translation basically explains the process of writing in more than one languages by the same author. It can also be explained that the author and translator is the same person in this piece of writing. A writer who can write and translate in different languages and who translates his or her own texts from one language into the other language produces self-translation or bilingual text. For example, Bacon's treatise and Nabokov's novels. The research intends to investigate the ways English translators mistranslate Urdu source text culture. It further provides guidelines to future researchers in order to determine whether the self-translator proposes "between different sign systems and audiences to produce a text in two languages" (Hokenson and Munson 2007). This is a descriptive study having various different aims and objectives. It will follow to indicate the process of literary self-translation and the texts created in non-native language. It will also explore the strategies and methods applied by the self-translators

in the process of self-translation. The study intends to shed some light on the vast nature of cultural translation and challenges faced by translators and possible ways to address and overcome these challenges.

This text or data which has been selected is a novel. This novel is written by Qurat-ul-Ain Hyder in Urdu language. The name of this novel is “Aag Ka Darya”. She translated it in English language by herself. The English name of this novel is “River of Fire”.

“Aag ka Darya” is a book that has gained a great deal of recognition in the realm of literature; the author considers this work to be her identity. As a result of authoring this work, Qurat-ul-Ain Hyder became much more famous. In other words, it is the historical novel. It tells the account of how India was divided into two states at certain points in time. Beginning with Chandragupta Maurya in the fourth century B.C. and continuing through the post-independence era in India and Pakistan, it offers a fairly extensive chronology that spans two thousand and five hundred years. 1959 was the year that saw the publication of the Urdu book “Aag ka Darya”. During the year 1998, the book River of Fire was successfully translated into English and published. It is possible to divide this book into four distinct stages: the classical, the mediaeval, the colonial, and the contemporary post-national. Every one of these phases has been portrayed by a different character: Gautam, Champa, Kamal, and Cyril. Due to the fact that they are representative of the many phases of the novel, these characters have made their appearances in the book according to the time period and ages.

A systematic and descriptive approach to translation research would certainly open the door to future examination of the cultural component of translation. From a cultural viewpoint, however, one may easily determine that thorough enquiries into translation/s – however accurate they are to be for the assessment of a foreign culture simply does not offer sufficient information for the purpose of understanding a whole culture. In the study of translations, the investigation of other kinds of works (i.e. anthologies, reviews, critics, comments, historiographies and reference works' creations) that form the image of a foreign author inside the target culture should be supported. Andre Lefevere addressed this vacuum which may be found in the study of cultural exchange via translation. Lefevere took this systematic approach one step further via his research with the phrase "rewriting." In the literary system described by Lefevere writing may be discovered in two ways: the first is that the rewritings are apparent; the second is the less visible, to the wit; critiques, historiographies, and any other kind of reference work. From this point of view, rewriting means all elements connected to the formation of a writer's image and/or piece of literature in a target culture. On the other hand, a thorough examination of this concept reveals others who play a key part in building a culture (e.g., ideological elements, dominating forces, and the present aesthetics of a target society). Each rewrite "reflects a particular ideology and poetics and manipulates the literature in a certain culture in a certain manner," whatever their purpose. 2) Rewriting refers in this sense to a social phenomenon which includes the governing powers of a particular society.

The primary goal of Lefevere is to transmit the image of the foreign author to a target culture as well as to regulate mechanisms that lead to potential changes to the foreign image in the literary system. Lefevere focuses on the idea and the role of rewriting in a literary system before he develops the concept of system.

Need and significance of the study

This study is very significant and workable. This study will explore the cultural, religious and linguistic aspects in Hyder's Urdu novel “Aag Ka Darya” and its English Translation “River of Fire”. This research holds critical significance as it delves into the nuanced process of self-translation and the phenomenon of rewriting, exploring how authors reshape their own narratives across linguistic and cultural boundaries. By focusing on Qurat-ul-Ain Hyder's

English version of her seminal Urdu novel “*Aag Ka Darya*”, the study uncovers the shifts in meaning, tone, and ideological framing that occur in self-authored translations. It enriches the discourse on authorship, identity, and fidelity in translation studies. Furthermore, it offers valuable insights into postcolonial literary dynamics where bilingual writers actively reconstruct their works to engage with diverse readerships.

1.3 Problem Statement

The study will explore the phenomenon of self-translation and rewriting in comparison with its original text.

1.4 Aims and Objectives

Objectives of the research are following:

1. To highlight the phenomenon of self-translation and rewriting in the source text “*Aag Ka Darya*” and TT “*River of Fire*”.
2. To investigate the aspects of self-translation in source text “*Aag Ka Darya*” and TT “*River of Fire*”.

1.5 Research Questions

This research will investigate the following research questions:

1. What are various ways through which Urdu novel “*Aag Ka Darya*” has been rewritten as “*River of Fire*” in the process of Self-translation?
2. What are different aspects of the source text that have been rewritten and what are the reasons behind this phenomenon?

Research Methodology

This is qualitative research and the study of this research is descriptive in nature. Lefevere’s theory of Rewriting has been implied by researcher in order to look at the socio cultural perspective as research methodology. It is the comparative analysis of source text and TT. TT will be analyzed in a strategic manner that how some translation strategies help the translator to convey meaning? It focusses on the data analysis and gives its theoretical explanation. The theory of rewriting by Lefevere has been used as a research methodology in this research. Lefevere describes three types of categories that falls within the process of rewriting, one is socio-cultural, the second is ideology and the third one is the change in the poetics. Here the researcher will adopt two strategies that are socio cultural changes and ideological change between source text and TT. The study is confined to Urdu to English translation of “*Aag ka darya*” to “*River of Fire*”. All the selected data has been analyzed by discussing history, similarities and differences between the source and TT.

Data Collection

The main data for this research is taken from English translation of Urdu novel “*Aag Ka Darya*” by Hyder. Researcher analyzed in detailed both the ST and TT in order to demystify the various techniques which are used by translator. Researcher paid special attention to the cultural references and ideological references that how they are translated by the translator in the process of self-translation.

Delimitations of the Study

The study is limited to the analysis of Qurratulain Hyder “*Aag Ka Darya*” and it’s English translation “*River of Fire*” in order to focus on the phenomena of self-translation. The study doesn’t include any of the other works of Quratulain Hyder. The limitations are set by researcher in order to maintain a very focused and manageable framework.

Data Analysis

In this section, the data that has been collected will be analyzed according to the methodology and in alignment with the set theoretical framework, so that the established objectives can be achieved. Below, different examples are provided along with their analysis and interpretation.

Extract no.1

Source Text	Target Text
<p>گوتم نیلمبر نے کہا تم اور میں آوارہ پتوں کی طرح ہیں اور وقت ساکن نہیں رہتا۔ سب ایک خواب ہے جو آنکھ کھلتے ہی ختم ہو جائے گا۔</p>	<p>“In the shoreless ocean of events,” said Gautam, “you and I are floating like stray leaves. Am I responsible for what has happened before me? Time cannot be determined. All is a dream and shall pass”.</p>

Interpretation

Strategy of Omission

In this example, the Hyder used character's full name that is Gautam Nelamber in the ST however she mentioned him only as Gautam in the TT. In this line, the translator used Lefevere's model of rewriting the strategy of omission here during the course of self-translation. That there was Gautam Nelamber in ST and only Gautam in the TT. By applying the strategy of omission the translator excluded a word that is present in the source text and removed it in the TT. This strategy is generally used in translation when the elimination of a word from the TT does not change the original meaning of the phrase that is present in the source text. Further these two lines: “In the shoreless ocean of events” and “Am I responsible for what has happened before me?” are not mentioned in the source text therefore Qurratulain Hyder has applied the strategy of addition by the theory of Lefevere during the self-translation of the TT. The addition is a strategy that is used to create a connection and link between two different ideas, words or sentences. This way some lines are not present in the source text but the translator employed addition while transferring meanings from one language into another. Furthermore, while translating the lines: “اور وقت ساکن نہیں رہتا” the translator substituted the word “ساکن” as “determined”. Hyder applied substitution strategy in these lines hence she the translation is different as compared to the source text. In this translation, the meaning of the source text has been clearly depicted in the TT. Although the words and dictions in the source text and TT are according to the understanding of the target readers.

Extract no. 2

Source Text	Target Text
<p>گوتم نیلمبر نے چلتے چلتے ٹھٹک کر پیچھے دیکھا۔ راستے کی دھول بارش کی وجہ سے کم ہو چکی تھی۔ گو اس کے اپنے پاؤں مٹی سے اٹے پڑے تھے۔ برسات کی وجہ سے گھاس اور درخت زمرد کے رنگ دکھلائی پڑ رہے تھے۔</p>	<p>“It was the beerbahuti of the season that Gautam had seen. The prettiest of rain-insects, clothed in god’s own red velvet, the beerbahuti was called the bride of indra, lord of clouds”. (page no. 01)</p>

Interpretation:

Strategy of Rewriting and Substitution

This example has been chosen from first chapter of text. In this example the translator has introduced the character Gautam Nelamber in the source text while he is Gautam in the TT. In this line translator uses the rewriting model of Lefevere and uses his strategy of omission

here by using the phenomenon of self-translation. That there was Gautam Nelamber in source text and only Gautam in the TT. In this translation the meaning and the message of source text has been clearly depicted in the TT. Although the words and dictions in the source text and TT are different. However, the meaning and the message of source text is that the writer is talking about rain. These introductory lines are about rain. Translator has used the strategy of addition. This strategy of self-translation plays the vital role in the transference of meaning from source text to TT. The translator has adopted the words to convey meaning and message in TT. One can see the reference of classical god. The god of rain, beerbahuti. Translator in the translation of this source text example uses the strategy of substitution and translators rewrites in a different way than that of the source text. We can see a clear change in the socio-cultural in the translation of this example by the implementation of theory of rewriting by Lefevere. The ideological stance of the translation by using the strategy of rewriting by Lefevere. The ideological stance of the translator can be seen by seeing the names from classical age. She wants to depict the scenes from classical ages. She is introducing classical names of gods and characters. The message and meaning of the source text has been conveyed very clearly. In the source text there is direct explanation of rain but in the TT by using the addition the translator is depicting the scene of rain by telling the names of beerbauti and indra. This god is the lord of cloud. He is responsible of rain in the territory. Here the translator use the aspect of Lefevere's religious ideology and the reason of rewriting the text. That how the religious aspect is depicting here in the TT. The structure of words is different but the structures of sentences and discourse is obvious and clear. The meaning is clear in this rewritten text. By using this technique the writer has conveyed the complete idea and message to the readers from source text to TT.

Extract no. 3

Source Text	Target Text
چورابوں پر مداری اپنے کرتب دکھاتے۔ بھنگ کی دکانوں پر آوارہ گردوں، اچکوں اور ٹھگوں کا مجمع رہتا۔ تہواروں کے موقعے پر بنجارے تازی پی کرزور زور سے گاتے پھرتے۔	“Thieves, thugs and harlots had their own guilds and canons. The populace enjoyed life. Jugglers and harlequins performed in the market-place and colorful festivals were celebrated with much merriment. Courtesans played ornate lutes at their windows”.

Interpretation

Strategy of omission is used

This example has been taken from the third chapter of the source text and TT as well. In this example Lefevere theory of rewriting has been discussed and there is omission of some words from source to TT. There is no translation of بھنگ کی دکانوں پر but the whole meaning is clear. The structure of words is different but the structures of sentences and discourse is obvious and clear. The meaning is clear in this rewritten text. By using this technique the writer has conveyed the complete idea and message to the readers from source text to TT.

Extract no. 4

Source Text	Target Text
رتھکار، مٹی کے برتن بنانے والے، کلال اور بید کی ٹوکری بننے والے شہر سے باہر رہتے تھے۔ آبادی سے بالکل الگ تھلگ چنڈالوں کی بستی تھی۔ ان کا پنجم طبقہ چاروں ذاتوں سے کم تر تھا۔ محض لاشیں اٹھانا اور مردے جلانا ان کی قسمت میں لکھا تھا یہی ان کا پیشہ تھا۔ وہ صرف مردوں کی اترن پہن سکتے تھے۔ ان کو حکم تھا کہ ٹوٹے پھوٹے برتنوں میں کھانا کھائیں۔	“Low-born cart-wrights, potters and basket-weavers lived in shanties outside the suburbs. The Chandals were the lowest of the low, inferior even to the Shudras. They were the fifth caste, destined to be pall-bears. They could only wear clothes taken off dead bodies because their karma had not decreed

	otherwise”.
--	-------------

Interpretation

Strategy of Substitution

This example is the socio-cultural depiction of India after partition. The minorities were considered very inferior and were treated very badly. In this example the translator has applied the theory of Lefevere in which there is strategy of substitution has been used. رتھ has been translated as Low-born cart-wrights. There is also the strategy of omission has been used by the translator by self-translating the text. ان کو حکم تھا کہ ٹوٹے پھوٹے برتنوں میں کھانا has not been translated in TT but the meaning and significance of the TT is cleared because it is expressing the meaning very clearly. Although the words and dictions in the TT and TT are different.

Extract no. 5

Source Text	Target Text
رات پڑتے ہی ٹڈیوں اور مچھروں نے گوتم کو ستانا شروع کر دیا۔ مینڈک ٹرانے لگے۔ جس طرح طالب علم اپنے استاد کے الفاظ یک زبان ہو کر دہراتے ہیں اسی طرح ایک مینڈک دوسرے مینڈک کی بولی کی نقل کرتا ہے۔	“At night, he was bothered by mosquitoes. Toads and crickets disturbed his sleep. Noisy frogs used to compared to Brahmins repeating their shlokas in unison”.

Interpretation

Strategy of Omission

This example shows the socio-culture perspective. Lefevere theory of rewriting has been applied. In the above-mentioned example, Qurratulain Hyder self-translated the text from the Urdu language into English, keeping the socio-culture perspective in mind. During the course of self-translation, the writer/translator ignored some words and changed them in order to convey the meaning according to the target culture. As we can observe that these lines from the ST رات پڑتے ہی ٹڈیوں اور مچھروں نے گوتم کو ستانا شروع کر دیا are not translated word to word in the target language as Hyder translated it in the TT as: “At night, he was bothered by mosquitoes”. We can observe that the word ٹڈیوں has not been added in the TT by Hyder in her self-translation while transferring the ST into the TT. Then, مینڈک ٹرانے لگے from the ST is translated as "Toads and crickets disturbed his sleep", that reveals that the translator changed the phrase in the TT during self-translation but the message is conveyed clearly. As "crickets" are not mentioned in the second line of the ST but Hyder mentioned crickets alongside toads in the second line of the TT. Therefore, during the process of self-translation of the novel “Aag Ka Darya”, Hyder adopted some strategies to convey the meaning of the ST to the target reader. She applied Lefevere's theory of rewriting and strategies of omission, addition and substitution to the lines mentioned above.

Extract no. 6

Source Text	Target Text
<p>- وشنو گپتا۔۔۔گوتم نیلمبر کی کٹی میں ایک شام حسب معمول محفل جمی تھی۔ اکلش نے، جو نیا نیا رکشا سے لوٹ کر آیا تھا، ایک نئے نام کا ذکر کیا: " وشنو گپتا۔ نیتی پر اس کے وچار بھی سننے کے قابل ہیں۔ تکشلا میں تو اس نے اپنی ذہانت کی دھوم مچا رکھی تھی۔ میں نے سنا ہے وہ آج کل کسم پور کے دربار میں موجود ہے۔"</p>	<p>"Moreover, your guru chanakya, vishusharma of Taxila, has turned up there. He was bound to, responded the bhikshu, jumping over a puddle. "if one wants to capture power one ought to be in the capital."</p>

Interpretation

Strategy of omission

In this ST example there is discussion about the religious culture. دربار کسم پور refer to our source culture and the reader of the ST are very well aware of the these religious building. Translator during the process of rewriting omits the main religious term that is deep rooted into the culture of subcontinent. When translator translates, it she simply omits as the readers of target does not have any idea about these deep rooted cultural terms of ST. Translator in this translation of this makes use of the strategy of omission and there does not provide the word of دربار کسم پور. Here in this example we can see a change from socio-cultural perspective. This is actually the reason behind this phenomenon to explore the religious domains. The things that are of importance in our source culture has been omitted. Furthermore, there is ideological shift in the thoughts of translator. There we can say that translator omits the main idea in this example while giving the clear idea of understanding.

Extract no. 7

Source Text	Target Text
<p>- تم شیلہ کاروں کی منڈلی میں شامل ہو گئے ہو؟ کیوں کھستریوں کا نام ڈبوتے ہو! گوتم نے اسے چڑاتے ہوئے کہا "تکشلا سے لوٹ کر بہت دن ہاتھ پہ ہاتھ دھرے بیٹھا رہا۔ کوئی جنگ ہی شروع نہیں ہوئی۔ کیا کرتا۔ اکلش نے ہنس کر جواب دیا۔"</p>	<p>"Gautam said, why are you interfering in Shalaks' party? You are ruining your own party. Aklash listened carefully and smiled".</p>

Interpretation

Strategy of omission and substitution

In the above lines, Hyder in her self-translation used Lefevere's theory of rewriting with a political perspective in her mind. In this ST example, Gautam (the main character of the novel) is having a discussion about the socio-political factors of the ST. Qurratulain Hyder in the ST used the word شیلہ کاروں کی منڈلی and in her self-translation, she omitted and substituted the words as "Shalaks' party". Thus we can observe that Hyder during the process of self-translation ignored some words and changed diction by applying Lefevere's theory of rewriting and strategies of omission and substitution. This way the author in her self-translation applied these strategies and successfully transferred the exact meanings from one language into another.

Further in the ST the phrase "اکلش نے ہنس کر جواب دیا۔" is self-translated by Hyder as "Aklash listened carefully and smiled". Hence in the TT, the writer did not mention if Aklash answered however, Aklash's answer has been mentioned clearly in the ST. As a result, the research examines that Qurratulain Hyder ignored and executed some aspects of the ST while translating them into the TT. Hence the political and social aspects are depicted accurately in the TT.

Extract no. 8

Source Text	Target Text
ابو المنصور کمال الدین، جو پہلی دفعہ بہرائچ آیا تھا، سالار مسعود کی زیارت گاہ کی دیوار سے لگ کر درخت کے سائے میں بیٹھ گیا۔۔۔۔۔ اور گونالندہ اور اکرم شیلا اور اجین اور امراتوی کے عظیم الشان بین الاقوامی دارالعلوم اب اجڑ چکے تھے۔	I, Abdul Mansur kamaluddin of nishapur, begin in the name of the merciful god this travelogue of mine which I have called <i>the marvels and strange tales of hindustan</i>

Interpretation:

Strategy of rewriting

In this source text example the translator describes the religious perspective. In the source text the translators adds and specifies the religious culture by self-translation. In this example, the writer doesn't use the word of "safarnama" in the source text while there is depiction of travelogue in the target text. In the last lines of source text there is the names of greatest leaders while the target text there is only called the marvels and strange tales of Hindustan. In the source text the idea is not clear what does the writer wants to say and what is his purpose. On the other hand, in the target text the translator specifies the religious building and makes it clear for her readers. Translators here in this example uses the strategy of rewriting and during the process of rewriting translator adds and brings change in the religious words that are used in the source text. This type of addition describes manipulation of the source text into the target text. The source text does not provide us about the religious culture in detail whereas after the rewriting the target culture does. In the second part of the sentence, the translator again rewrites the lines. Here the translator changes the scenario for her target text readers. She is well aware that to comprehend the lines that are in source text are difficult task for target text reader there she rewrites and uses the strategy of addition. She manipulates the idea from source text to target text.

Conclusion

In the present study, the researcher explored the phenomenon of rewriting from two different cultural perspectives in Qurratulain Hyder's novel "Aagka Darya" with a comparison to its English translation "River of Fire". As the target text was also translated by the same author that wrote the ST of this research data (that is Qurratulain Hyder) therefore, the researcher used the concept of self-translation for the comparative analysis of ST and target text in this research. The theory of rewriting and self-translation was applied as a research methodology by the researcher with the aim to analyse the process of rewriting in the ST "Aag ka Darya" and the target text "River of Fire". Another goal was to investigate the aspects of self-translation in the source and the target text.

The findings of research proved with the comparative analysis of both the source and the target text that the writer/translator employed certain translation strategies that served the translator to convey the appropriate and accurate meanings. The researcher has also observed that she chose the words while the process of rewriting was in accordance with the cultural, religious and linguistic aspects of the reading audience. During the course of finding the answers to the research questions, the researcher observed that the process of rewriting in self-translation takes place due to addition, omission, substitution and explanatory aspects of translation between two different languages and two cultures. The researcher examined that the concept of rewriting and self-translation sometimes intentionally transpires by the translator to achieve some purpose.

References

- Abbas, S. (2023). Transcreation and Postcolonial Knowledge. *know: A Journal on the Formation of Knowledge*, 7(2), 271-291.
- Ansari, A., & Patel, R. N. (2025). Analysing Hyder's transcreation from "Aag Ka Darya" to *River of Fire*. *The Criterion: An International Journal in English*, 16(1), 1-7.
- Bassnett, S. (2011). *Reflections on translation* (Vol. 39). Multilingual Matters.
- Bastin, G. L., & Bandia, P. F. (2006). *Charting the future of translation history*. Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa/University of Ottawa Press.
- Berman, A. (1992). *The experience of the foreign: Culture and translation in romantic Germany*. Suny Press.
- Brislin, R.W. (1976). *Translation : Application and Research*. New York : Gardner Press Inc.
- Cronin, M. (2013). *Translation and globalization*. Routledge.
- Dmitrieva, D. A., & Glukhova, O. V. (2022). Linguistic Means of English Language at the Coverage of the Domestic Violence Problem. *The European Journal of Social & Behavioural Sciences*.
- Grutman, R. (2009). Self-translation, in Baker, M. and Saldanha, G. (eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2 nd edn. London: Routledge, pp. 257-260
- Grutman, R. (2019). Self-translation. In *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 514-518). Routledge.
- Hatim (1990). *Teaching and Researching Translation*, Pearson Education Limited, Harlow.
- Huston, Nancy. 2003. Public Interview. Victoria College, University of Toronto. February 24.
- Larson, M. L. (1997). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. University press of America.
- Lefevere, A (1992b). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. Routledge. London and New York.
- Miremadi, A. (1993). *Theories of translation and interpretation*. Tehran: SAMT.
- Mirza, U. B. (2020). *From "Aag Ka Darya" to River of Fire: Forging Identity Through Self-Translation* (Doctoral dissertation).
- O'Sullivan, C. (2011). *Translating popular film*. Springer.
- Petruca, I. (2013). Self-translation, communication bridge between cultures. In *The Proceedings of the International Conference Literature, Discourse and Multicultural Dialogue. Section: Language and Discourse* (Vol. 1, pp. 759-762).
- Reshi, A. H. (2014). From "Aag Ka Darya" to *River of Fire*: A study in transcreation. *European Academic Research*, 2(6), 8672-8681
- Richard, W., & Brislin, W. (1976). *Translation, Application, and Research*.
- Roland, B., & Stephen, H. (1977). The death of the author. *Image, music, text*, 142-148.
- Roland.B (1997a). "From Work to Text." *Image-Music-Text*. London: Fontan Press. 155-164.
- Saramago, José. 1997. "To Write Is to Translate." *The Translator's Dialogue*: Giovanni Pontiero. Edited by Pilar Orero and Juan C Sager. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Spivak, G. C. (2021). The politics of translation. In *The translation studies reader* (pp. 320-338). Routledge.
- Stavans, I (2018). *On Self-translation: Mediation on Language*. SUNNY Press.
- Tanqueiro,(2008, October). Self-Translation as an extreme Case of the author-Translator-Dialectic. In *Investigating Translation: Selected Papers from the 4th International Congress on Translation, Barcelona, 1998* (pp. 55-63). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Venuti, L. (2017). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.
- Whyte, C. 2002. "Against Self-Translation". *Translation and Literature*, 11 (1), pp.64-71.
- Wilson, R. (2009). The writer's double: translation, writing, and autobiography. *Romance Studies*, 27(3), 186-198.
- Wilson, R. P. (2012). Parallel creations: Between self-translation and the translation of the self. In *Creative Constraints: Translation and Authorship* (pp. 47-65). Monash University Publishing.
- Zboray, R. (2019). Translated memory: Language, trauma, and identity in bilingual narratives. *Translation Studies Review*, 14(2), 118-135.