

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

<https://llrjournal.com/index.php/11>

**Lexical Choices and Cultural Nuances in Urdu Translations of
“The Alchemist”: A Comparative Analysis**



Babar Riaz

PhD Scholar, Department of English, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

Email: briaz064@gmail.com

Dr. Behzad Anwar

Associate Professor, Department of English, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

Email: behzad.anwar@uog.edu.pk

Wania Gul

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

Email: english.waniagul@uos.edu.pk

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17063692>

Abstract

The aim of the present study is to investigate the variation in semantic interpretation in the translation of cultural terms. This research attempts to address the challenges faced by translators while translating cultural and lexical terms and the sensitivity of meanings involved in the process of translation from one language to another. An English literary work, *ALchemist* by Paulo Coelho, and its three Urdu translations by Syed Alauddin, Abass Somro and Umar Alghazali have been selected as the source and target texts, respectively. The study aims to compare the meanings of the Urdu translations of the English text to identify specific obstacles faced by the translators. The research further seeks to adopt suitable strategies to overcome these hindrances for attaining the most accurate meanings of cultural and lexical terms. This study is a modest contribution to understanding that translators must go beyond surface-level meanings, delving into deeper meanings to convey philosophical concepts effectively. Additionally, it provides a platform for further research on the challenges of translating philosophical content

Keywords: Translation, philosophy, meanings, deconstruction, interpretation, context.

Introduction

According to Hornby (2020), the Oxford Learner's Dictionary defines 'translation' as the procedure by which spoken or written words in one language are converted into another. Translation consists solely of the substitution of terms from one language for those of an additional language. In practice, however, translation is a difficult process rife with subtle complexities that can significantly alter the text's meaning. Amidst this procedure, the translator is perpetually involved in dialogue with the source language and target language; it is additionally the translator's responsibility to guarantee coherence, accuracy, and the transmission of the intended message and meaning in the target text (House, 2018). The literal translation of the intended message is of the utmost importance; it must be communicated without any modifications, omissions, or additions to vocabulary. In the target text (TT), the intended significance of the source text ought to be conveyed without any modifications to its content, theme, or context (Baker & Diriker, 2019). Translation as an outcome of a linguistic-textual function acts as the process of converting a text from one language to another language. The translation is impacted by linguistic conditions and elements in addition to textual linguistic functions.

Translation and philosophy have a very different connection. Although they share a history and affect one another, philosophy has a far greater effect on translation than the other way around. In this examination, the meaning interpretation and the method used to interpret lexical terms in Urdu translations of a cultural text are closely examined. Translation is a continuous process that aims to capture the essence of the source material. Incorporating the essence of the Source Text (ST) into the Target Text (TT) is crucial to achieving the initial sense.

While translating cultural concepts, the study focuses on analyzing the differences in meaning interpretation. Translating lexical or cultural terminology and sensitive connotations from one language to another is a difficulty for translators. A lot of

emphasis is placed on the translator's ability to handle meaning and use solutions to overcome challenges while translating cultural terminology. With this insertion, the translator's job is established as an essential component of the translation process. Meaning structures are linked to the profound mental processes that govern meanings (Augustina, 2013).

Because it raises questions about identity, language, thinking, and other philosophical topics, Jacques Derrida's theory is relevant to philosophy. Language, according to Silverman (2004), returns and complicates philosophers' work. According to Koerner (2013), the language is a remarkable network of meaning, and signifier and signified do not logically relate to one another. The difference between sensation and sound points in the direction of meaning.

This study focuses on all meanings that arise in texts rather than just certain meaning kinds (connotative or referential). It is common to debate the meanings of lexical terms in relation to subjective activities. On the one hand, language makes meanings visible, but on the other side, language also shapes meaning creation. Since the word's philosophical meaning emerges from people's imaginations, different people will interpret it in different ways, which makes it easier to compare two translations of the same work. This study investigates the connection between lexical meanings and cultural translation. It contributes to the more thorough understanding of the cultural terminology by illustrating this connection. Few meanings are generalized to produce knowledge outside of the lexicon, and words and their meanings are intricately linked.

Research Questions

What are the differences in lexical choices among various Urdu translations of *The Alchemist*?

How do translators handle word-level challenges in rendering English lexical items into Urdu in different versions of *The Alchemist*?

Delimitations of the Study

The study is limited to the three Urdu translations of "The Alchemist" which are translated by Syed Alauddin, Abass Somro and Umar Alghazali.

Literature Review

The meanings of lexical choices are neither singular, self-identical, or universal. However, the reference to the term's use, its author, its intended context, and its audience may reveal its meaning (Munday, 2016). Translating philosophical texts is challenging; the translator's goal is to convey the universal truth with the least amount of personal participation. But in order to identify the historical and cultural background of coined literature, the ST must be connected to its creative person. for the reason that enduring ideas serve as the foundation for new philosophical concepts. In the translation process, the closer the translator is to the author and his objectives, the closer the ST will be interpreted.

The translation process involves more than just changing words; it also involves using different names for the same term in different languages. Only the translation itself leads to misunderstandings. On the other hand, the pragmatic variety of language in philosophy is essentially the production of a single global language rather than a translation. According to Batchelor (2013), the translation must be discernible as the original in its replica. In this approach, translated philosophy will only become a bad

replica of the original, since interlingual copies are often vulnerable to transliteration. In this way, philosophy descends into transliteration. For philosophical information to exist, interpretation is absolutely essential. The first consideration is the proper translation of cultural concepts, which raises the issue of why cultural texts should be translated. In this approach, translation gives explanations for the logical disparities between languages by actively creating linguistic variances. Determining the rationale for the variety of languages is the first step in revealing the motivations behind translating philosophical texts.

Lexical choice continues to be a significant challenge for researchers that are interested in the study of human and machine translation. It is especially important to keep this in mind while translating literary masterpieces like "The Alchemist," which are rich in metaphor, symbolism, and cultural relevance. Kwong (2021) investigated the atypical lexical methods that are used by translators and interpreters. This investigation is carried out with the help of a two-way corpus. The purpose of this research is to highlight the influence that task-specific components have on their word-level choices. Lyu et al. (2021) show that even minute lexical differences may harm the coherence of a narrative in their additional examination of the problem of lexical consistency in document-level neural machine translation (NMT). This is as a result of the fact that they look into the issue further. Subramanian and Sundararaman (2021) provide light on the influence that lexical semantics, namely ambiguity and polysemy, have on translation accuracy, particularly in languages with limited resources. namely, they focus on the impact that these two factors have.

Through the use of corpus-driven keyword analysis, Frankenberg-García (2022) endeavors to compare the results obtained from human translation with those of machine translation. Within the realm of lexical differences, this study reveals that human translations are more consistent than machine translations. The fact that lexical diversity is often degraded in literary machine translation, as stated by Ploeger et al. (2024), underscores the need of using word-level recovery strategies that are sensitive to context. Using a literary perspective, Berezhniy et al. (2022) explore the employment of topic and lexical alterations in literary translation. The goal of this investigation is to maintain coherence and correctness in the translation process. Kutsa (2022) lays an emphasis on pragmatic adaptation via vocabulary changes such as generalization and compensation, particularly in the translation of fiction from one language to another that is typologically diverse. This is especially true from the perspective of the translation of fiction. These results, when considered as a whole, provide light on the relevance of lexical decision-making, regardless of whether it is carried out by people or machines, in terms of preserving the objective of the story, retaining stylistic nuance, and preserving cultural context across languages.

According to Joosten (2012), while translating lexical choices, the translator should try to ascertain the text's intended meanings and create an equivalent in the target language that only permits those interpretations. The phrase "appropriate translation" refers to a distinct approach to translating lexical words that entails aligning the conflict between clarity and ambiguity with the context (e.g., identity, culture, religion, and history). The translator must determine how much uncertainty must be there in the philosophical translation. According to Ricoeur (2008), the process of interpreting lexical terminology to fit the current situation results in a hazy meaning development. According to Zohar and Itamar (2004), the fact that meanings come before and beyond the language indicates that they are translatable, and the translation will be on

the other side of the words. Translation is more than just translating words from one language to another; it is the process of interpreting the original text's fully philosophical contents in the target language. In the translation process, word interpretation is crucial. According to Arduini and Hodgson (2012), translation is an interpretation of the ST words, as such, the translator should comprehend the ST's conveyed meanings in a way that allows the TT recipients to understand the essence of the ST.

Any translation's natural philosophical clarifying process led to a number of meaning variations. The translation of cultural specific concepts results in significant alterations to the source words and the translators' apparent lack of alignment with the philosophical dispute engaged in their endeavor. It is the sheer reality that words that are assumed to be interpreted in completely different contexts do not convey the same meaning. The words of the source language should provide a more distinct notion than the words of the target language as the whole range of lexical properties is available in the target language in addition to the source language. Its goal is to adequately convey the translator's comprehension of the text.

Generally speaking, it is possible to think of a word as a separate component of meaning. Since translation conveys the tone of the original culture, the word choice should satisfy the recipients' expectations. According to Munday (2016), we often assert that because texts and words have meanings of some type, discussing language that socializes lexical interpretations of the terms is not unreasonable. Even we have an idea that our words and texts will be stolen, and that their meanings might be taken and passed on. When interpreting the ST and TT, words should be comprehensible in a way that communicates the meaning of the philosophically ambiguous term to the signified. After that, the meaning has to be connected to either the target language's signifier or another comparable signifier in the same language.

Using a philosophical explanation of language, Derrida (2004) highlights meaning and leads to interpretation in a responsive manner. The source text's informational components have the power to maintain philosophical implications. The description of the terms from the source text preserves the core of ST; it suggests that the original meanings are only slightly altered. It is believed that meanings may stay the same provided the altered words retain their meanings—not in the sense of translation, but in the sense of mystical meaning. When there are differences between pure terms (synonyms) within a language, it is reasonable to believe that translation will be straightforward. According to Raatikainen (2005), even after understanding this notion, one may still argue that the interpretation is impossible, which is an act of translation in and of itself.

Thus, the analysis of lexical term translations is a study of their translatability in this sense, which conveys the truthfulness and meanings of one language to another without causing any required damage. Every language or culture's philosophy is translated, but it fails when its concepts are not understood, translated, or both. The separation between signifier and signified should be pure, but translational procedures are what separate signifier from signified (Rorty, 2001). If the distinction is not pure, it suggests that the translation is not trustworthy and accurate; in fact, it is not a translation at all. Carnap (1988) contends that we are prone to never have—and even never will—any "transfer" of pure "signified" inside one language or across languages that rely on signifying instruments to remain virgin and essential.

According to Batchelor (2013), there are a number of different kinds of challenges

that arise while translating texts. Certain terminology and the literary style of the text are the causes of various problems. The study is descriptive in nature, and the self-translated two cultural works to compile the data. His main conclusions are that the translator should be knowledgeable about both the cultural they are translating, and that they cannot translate their own invented philosophical concepts.

According to Raatikainen (2005), philosophy should be taken into consideration while discussing the reasons for translating texts, not so much for the answers to its questions—since none of the solutions are very noteworthy as factual—but rather for the questions themselves. The meaning that words convey demonstrates the importance of meaning in language theory and its connections to linguistic ideologies (Kjoll, 2010). The majority have discussed many facets of word meaning; nonetheless, the primary emphasis of the study is on the sensitive nature of philosophy's semantic contents and their basic relationship to words. The researcher is now interested in how words are used, understood, and express independent outward relationships in a given context.

There is a significant discrepancy between what an utterance explicitly asserts and what it means when a certain word is utilized. Expanding the meaning description has shown that meanings are found in the relationships between the signifier, signified, and sound notion. According to the current study, meaning is defined by the distinctions between words and the linguistic system itself. Meaning is defined by the differences between a system of variations.

The study demonstrates the relationship between semantics and linguistic philosophy as well as how it affects translation studies. The researcher attempts to clarify the link between these two disciplines' translation studies and semantics as well as to show the numerous translation ideas. The Indonesian translator provides information and highlights the benefits of these two topics in translation philosophy. It can be stated that the meaning of a difficult expression, especially when translating the script, is entirely determined by the meaning of its components and the way they are placed along, even though the emphasis on various considerations and areas, but the processes, highlights entirely different itemizations.

A dictionary is an essential tool for learning any language. A dictionary helps one evaluate and distinguish between a word's several semantic meanings (Tabossi, 2004). According to Machery, Olivola, and De Blanc (2009), translation studies include transferring the meaning of the source language into the target language. This led to the formation of a second language via the use of semantic structure inside the original language's system. Only the form changes; the meaning is being conveyed and should be captured constantly. It has a significant function and significance in the translation process. Research on translating cultural words, which emphasizes the full portion of philosophical works with the specifics of practical terms, such as vocabulary, forms the basis of this segment's review. Other specific disciplines may also use this process for lexical translation. Furthermore, in the sense of fabricating facts, this study serves as a platform for words that become accessible to the translator, a realm of inspiration and revelation.

Recent academic research has concentrated on the complex linguistic and cultural issues that arose during the process of translating Paulo Coelho's novel *The Alchemist* into Urdu. To explain the phenomenon of translation loss in both symbolic and artistic dimensions, Shaukat and Bin Sadiq (2024) provide an explanation. This phenomenon often undermines the intellectual depth of the original work. On the other hand, they

highlight the fact that translators commonly use adaptive approaches in order to maintain items that are both simple to read and emotionally impacting. Akhtar, Qureshi, and Zahoor (2024) provide a more in-depth analysis of Muhammad Zaki Kirmani's Urdu translation, focusing on 110 culturally distinctive parts of the text. What they find is that modulation is the way that is used the most often, whereas through-translation is the one that is used the least frequently. Through the use of Venuti and Newmark's conceptual frameworks, they provide evidence that these lexical choices were purposefully employed in order to bring about a reconciliation of cultural differences. Ali and Imran (2023) provide more elucidation on this topic by investigating the ways in which Urdu translators use techniques such as equivalence, transposition, and adaptation in order to handle obstacles at the lexical level, particularly when it comes to the translation of metaphorical or spiritual notions. Jahan-e-Tahqeeq (2024) has an anonymous research that exhibits the use of cultural replacement and domestication in order to enhance the understanding of Coelho's mystical themes for Urdu readers, while yet maintaining the intellectual tone of the original work. At an advanced level of language proficiency, Khan et al. (2025) investigate the lexical semantics and compounding of the Urdu language. They illustrate the use of alternatives that are structurally complicated yet semantically exact in order to express abstract or compound notions. For example, words such as "Personal Legend" or "Soul of the World" are examples of such alternatives. In light of the fact that these studies together demonstrate how significant word choice is to the way in which Urdu-speaking individuals perceive *The Alchemist*, this paves the way for more comparative study.

Research Methodology

In order to investigate the ways in which lexical choices made in the Urdu translations of Paulo Coelho's *The Alchemist* impact the meaning, tone, and cultural subtlety of the target language, this research adopts a qualitative comparative technique to assess the lexical choices used in the translations. Baker's taxonomy of word-level equivalence is utilized in this research. Researchers have examined these extracts in great detail and see how they compare in at least three different Urdu translations. There are a number of factors that have been considered when deciding which translations to utilize, including the publishing history of the translations, the background of the translator, and the variations in style. It is possible to record lexical changes and organize them into categories such as literal translation, cultural replacement, borrowing, and semantic shift by using a comparison table that is organized. In the end, the purpose of this study is to provide light on the ways in which diverse linguistic choices made during translation influence the perspective of the reader as well as the cultural reception of *The Alchemist* within the context of Urdu literary culture.

Theoretical Framework

This study employs Mona Baker's word-level theoretical framework from *In Other Words* (1992) to analyze lexical choices in Urdu translations of *The Alchemist*. Baker emphasizes that equivalence at the word level is not about finding identical words but about conveying meaning and function within the cultural and linguistic context. Applying this framework enables a systematic comparison of how Urdu translators

interpret lexical choices and symbolic terms in *The Alchemist*, revealing their approaches to balancing fidelity and cultural adaptation.

Data Analysis

Example No. 1

ST(English)	TT:1(Syed Alauddin) 2018	TT:2(Aqeel Abbass Somro)2013	TT:3(Umar Alghazali)2009
The boy thought back to that conversation with his father, and felt happy; he had already seen many castles and met many women (but none the equal of the one who awaited him several days hence) (MacDougall, 2017)	لڑکے کو باپ سے کی ہوئی گفتگو یاد آئی اور اس نے خوشی محسوس کی۔ اس نے پہلے ہی بہت سے محلات دیکھے اور بہت سی عورتوں سے مل چکا تھا۔ (لیکن کوئی بھی ایسی نہیں تھی جو اس کی منتظر ہو)	لڑکے کو باپ سے کی ہوئی گفتگو ازبر تھی وہ اس پر خوش تھا۔ وہ پہلے ہی بہت سے محلات اور بہت سی عورتوں سے مل چکا تھا۔ (لیکن کوئی بھی ایسی نہیں تھی جو اس کی منتظر ہو)	لڑکا اپنے اور باپ کے دو میان ہونے والی بحث کو یاد کر رہا تھا۔ وہ اپنے فیصلے پر مطمئن تھا۔ اب تک وہ کئی خوبصورت مقامات سے گزرا تھا اور اس کی ملاقات کئی لوگوں سے ہوئی جن سے اس نے بہت کچھ سیکھا تھا۔ وہ بہت سی عورتوں سے بھی ملا۔ مگر ان میں سے کوئی بھی اس جیسی نہیں تھی جس سے اس نے چند دن بعد ملنا تھا۔

Interpretation

The application of Mona Baker's theoretical framework to *The Alchemist*, alongside its three Urdu translations, reveals a nuanced interplay of linguistic choices, translation strategies, and semantic adaptations. Each translation presents a different approach to equivalence lexical, grammatical, textual, and pragmatic reflecting varying priorities in rendering the philosophical and narrative tone of the source text. TT1 and TT2, produced by Syed Alauddin and Aqeel Abbas Somro respectively, follow a relatively literal path, maintaining close word-level and grammatical equivalence. Expressions like "conversation," "castles," and "awaited him" are directly rendered as "محلات," "گفتگو," and "منتظر ہو," preserving the structure and semantic detail of the original. These versions align well with the source's linear progression and emotional trajectory, keeping intact the memory, emotion, past experience, and anticipatory longing.

In contrast, TT3 by Umar Alghazali significantly diverges through expansion and semantic enrichment. Lexical equivalence is softened; for example, "castles" becomes "خوبصورت مقامات" (beautiful places), and "conversation" shifts to "بحث" (discussion), introducing interpretive nuance. Grammatical structure is also restructured as compound sentences are broken into smaller clauses, creating a more digestible narrative flow in Urdu. Most notably, TT3 introduces pragmatic shifts, such as "پر مطمئن تھا" (he was satisfied with his decision) and "بہت کچھ سیکھا تھا" (he learned a lot), which are not present in the source text. These inclusions reflect the translator's strategy of **explicitation**, wherein implicit ideas are made explicit to aid comprehension and philosophical reflection. Furthermore, the simplified and idiomatic rendering of "the one who awaited him" as "جس سے اس نے چند دن بعد ملنا تھا" replaces metaphor with temporal certainty, demonstrating **simplification**.

TT1 and TT2 maintain structural and lexical parallelism with the source, while TT3 diverges in both form and content to capture broader philosophical depth. Altogether, this example vividly illustrates Baker's principles, showing how different translators balance fidelity, fluency, and reader engagement when rendering complex literary-philosophical narratives across languages.

Example-2

ST(English)	TT:1(Syed Alauddin) 2018	TT:2(Aqeel Abass Somro)2013	TT:3(Umar Alghazali)2009
But in his heart <u>he knew</u> that it did matter. And <u>he knew</u> that shepherds, like seamen and like traveling salesmen, always found a town where there was someone who could make them forget the joy of carefree wandering (MacDougall, 2017)	"لیکن دل ہی دل میں وہ سمجھتا تھا کہ اس سے فرق پڑھتا ہے۔ وہ بھی جانتا تھا کہ گڈریے ملاحوں اور گھوم پھر کے سامان بیچنے والوں جیسے ہوتے ہیں جو چلتے پھرتے لطف کو بھلا دیا کرتے ہیں۔"	"لیکن دل ہی دل میں جانتا تھا کہ اس سے بہت فرق پڑھتا ہے۔ وہ اس بات سے واقف تھا کہ گڈریے ملاحوں اور گھوم پھر کے سامان بیچنے والوں جیسے ہوتے ہیں جو چلتے پھرتے لطف کو بھلا دیا کرتے ہیں۔"	لیکن اسکا دل اسکے ساتھ نہیں تھا۔ وہ ابھی تک تاجر کی دکان کی سیڑھیوں میں اٹکا ہوا تھا۔ چرواہوں، پھیری والوں اور ملاحوں کے دل کہیں نہ کہیں ضرور اٹکے ہوتے ہیں کہیں نہ کہیں کوئی ایسا ضرور ہوتا ہے جس کے ساتھ ان کا دل ہوتا ہے جو ان سے ان کی خوشیاں اور سیاحت کا لطف چھین لیتا ہے۔

Interpretation

This is a long analytical paragraph that uses Mona Baker's theoretical framework to look at the provided part of *The Alchemist* and its three Urdu versions. The paragraph talks about the shepherd protagonist's complicated emotional reality, giving us a philosophical look at how people become attached and what it costs to be free to travel. The three translations show different ways of dealing with equivalence (word, grammatical, textual, and pragmatic) and universal translation aspects (such as simplification and explicitation).

In TT1 (Syed Alauddin, 2018) and TT2 (Aqeel Abbas Somro, 2013), we notice a lot of word-level and grammatical equivalency, and both translations stay true to the English original in terms of both vocabulary and sentence structure. Both translations keep phrases like "دل ہی دل میں" for "in his heart" and make sentences that are almost the same for "shepherds, like seafarers and like traveling salespeople." The main philosophical premise is that wanderers ultimately meet someone who makes them forget how much fun it is to travel. This is well captured in "جو چلتے پھرتے لطف کو بھلا دیا کرتے ہیں." TT2 uses "بہت فرق پڑتا ہے" to add a little more intensity, making the emotional weight more clear than in the original. These translations show Baker's ideas of textual and pragmatic equivalency by keeping the emotional impact and logical flow of the original story.

However, TT3 (Umar Alghazali, 2009) is quite different in both structure and

meaning. TT3 does not only copy the original text; it changes the story by adding fresh images and a more reflective tone. TT3 does not just say "he understood that it did matter." Instead, he writes, "لیکن اس کا دل اس کے ساتھ نہیں تھا" and "وہ ابھی تک تاجر کی" turning the internal reflection into a metaphor for being trapped in one's own mind. The mention of shepherds, sailors, and businessmen turns into a meditation on emotional anchors: "ان کے دل کہیں نہ کہیں ضرور اٹکے ہوتے ہیں." This change follows Baker's idea of explicitation, which makes hidden emotional subtext into clear images and more detailed themes. Also, TT3's break from the source's linear, expository style shows how grammar and text may be changed, and it also shows how narrative digression can be used instead of layered metaphor to make things easier to understand.

The differences between TT1/TT2 and TT3 show how various translators deal with the balance between being faithful to the original text and making it easy to read in another culture. TT1 and TT2 provide accurate, semantically tight translations that are great for keeping the author's purpose, while TT3 gives a philosophically redesigned rendition that is full of emotional detail and metaphor. This scenario clearly shows that Baker was right when he said that no one level of equivalence can adequately reflect how complicated translation is, particularly when it comes to philosophical depth. It also confirms the translator's job as both an interpreter and a cultural mediator, constructing meaning via careful choices about words, structure, and how things work.

Example-3

ST(English)	TT:1(Syed Alauddin) 2018	TT:2(Aqeel Abass Somro)2013	TT:3(Umar Alghazali)2009
"Because you have already lost your savings twice. Once to the thief, and once to the general (MacDougall, 2017)	"کیونکہ تم دو بار مالی نقصان اٹھا چکے ہو۔ ایک بار چیف سے دوسری بار جنرل سے۔"	"کیونکہ تم دو بار مالی نقصان اٹھا چکے ہو۔ ایک بار چیف سے دوسری بار جنرل سے۔"	"کیونکہ تم دو دفعہ اپنا سرمایہ کھو چکے ہو۔ ایک دفعہ ایک چور کے ہاتھوں اور دوسری دفعہ سردار کے ہاتھوں۔"

Interpretation

This is a lengthy analysis paragraph that uses Mona Baker's theoretical model to look at the statement "Because you have already lost your funds twice..." from *The Alchemist*, which was translated into Urdu by Syed Alauddin (TT1), Aqeel Abbas Somro (TT2), and Umar Alghazali (TT3). The study looks at word-level, grammatical, textual, and pragmatic equivalency, and it employs Baker's ideas of simplification and explicitation to show how each translator deals with meaning, tone, and cultural clarity.

TT1 and TT2 are the same at the word level. They both utilize the phrase "مالی نقصان اٹھا چکے ہو" to mean "lost your funds," which is a semantically accurate and technically comparable translation. The two times of loss "once to the thief and once to the general" are reflected as "ایک بار چیف سے دوسری بار جنرل سے" which is a near-

literal translation that keeps the meaning clear and short. But the phrases "چیف" and "جنرل" are borrowed from English, thus they may still have foreign meanings in Urdu, depending on how well the reader knows them. These translations keep the same grammatical structure and linear text structure as the original, following it closely in both meaning and form.

TT3 (Umar Alghazali, 2009), on the other hand, takes a more local and interpretative approach. The term "سرمایہ" substitutes "lost your savings." (capital/investment) is more culturally based than "مالی نقصان" (financial loss). TT3 also uses "ایک دفعہ ایک چور کے ہاتھوں اور دوسری دفعہ سردار کے ہاتھوں" which gives better, more realistic translations for "thief" and "universal." Using چور and سردار instead of transliterated چیف and جنرل shows explication and lexical adaptation, which makes things more clear for a wide Urdu-speaking audience. Also, the phrase "کے ہاتھوں" (at the hands of) gives the translation a subtle sense of loss and vulnerability, which makes it even more useful.

TT3 also provides a smoother, more natural translation that uses normal Urdu phrases instead of borrowed English terms, which makes it easier to understand. This fits with what Baker said about how translators typically make things easier to understand by simplifying them. TT1 and TT2 stay true to the original structure and word choice, while TT3 gives a more localized and emotionally powerful translation by changing the tone and meaning of the text for Urdu readers.

In conclusion, this example shows how various ways of translating may change how well readers understand and how well they accept the culture. TT1 and TT2 follow a strict and constant pattern that maintains the meaning and grammatical structure of the sentences. TT3 is different since it focuses on cultural fluency and emotional impact. This shows how Baker's approach lets us look at the trade-offs between integrity, clarity, and resonance in cross-cultural translation, particularly in philosophical and narrative literature like *The Alchemist*.

Example-4

ST(English)	TT:1(Syed Alauddin) 2018	TT:2(Aqeel Abass Somro)2013	TT:3(Umar Alghazali)2009
"They were <u>looking</u> only for gold," his companion answered. "They were <u>seeking</u> the treasure of their Personal Legend, without <u>wanting</u> actually to live out the Personal Legend (MacDougall, 2017)	"وہ صرف سونے کو دیکھ رہے تھے۔" اس کے ساتھی نے جواب دیا۔ "ان کی خواہش قسمت کے خزانے کو پانے کی تھی بغیر یہ جانے کہ وہ قسمت میں نہیں ہے۔"	"وہ صرف سونے کو دیکھ رہے تھے۔" اس کے ساتھی نے جواب دیا۔ "ان کی خواہش قسمت کے خزانے کو پانے کی تھی بغیر یہ جانے کہ وہ قسمت میں نہیں ہے۔"	"وہ لوگ صرف سونے کی تلاش میں تھے۔" کیمیا گر نے جواب دیا۔ "وہ خزانہ تو پانا چاہتے تھے لیکن اس کے لیے مشقت کرنے کو تیار نہیں تھے۔"

Interpretation

Using Mona Baker's theoretical framework on this part of *The Alchemist*: "They were merely seeking for gold," his friend said. "They were looking for the treasure of their Personal Legend, but they did not wish to truly live out the Personal Legend" shows how three Urdu translations (TT1 by Syed Alauddin, TT2 by Aqeel Abbas Somro, and

TT3 by Umar Alghazali) deal with varying degrees of equivalence and translation universals. This example has a lot of philosophical depth, so we need to be aware of more than just the literal meaning; you also need to be aware of the spiritual and metaphorical aspects of the idea of a Personal Legend.

TT1 and TT2 are the same, which means that they used the same or similar translation approach. They translate "They were seeking just for gold" as "وہ صرف سونے کو دیکھ رہے تھے," which is a grammatical and lexical match, although the syntax in Urdu is a little off. "سونے کی تلاش میں تھے" is a more idiomatic way to say it, and TT3 uses it. Also, TT1 and TT2 interpret "the treasure of their Personal Legend" as "قسمت کے خزانے," where "قسمت" (fate) is used in place of "Personal Legend." This change makes a culturally complicated idea easier to understand, but it might lose its meaning. In *The Alchemist*, "Personal Legend" is a key metaphor for destiny realized via self-discovery, not only fate.

TT3 chooses "خزانہ تو پانا چاہتے تھے لیکن اس کے لیے مشقت کرنے کو تیار نہیں تھے." The translator replaces "Personal Legend" with the word "مشقت" (work), which keeps the spiritual and moral meaning of effort, sacrifice, and change. This change shows that there is compensation at work: the metaphor of Personal Legend is gone, but it is replaced with a more practical concept.

TT1 and TT2 keep the structure of the text from the source, keeping the rhythm and order of the conversation. But the part that says "بغیر یہ جانے کہ وہ قسمت میں نہیں ہے" ("without understanding that it was not in destiny") does not follow the original meaning. The difficulty in English is not that the treasure was not in their destiny; it is because they desired the conclusion (the treasure) without going through the process (the Personal Legend). So, TT1 and TT2 are textually equal, but they do not have pragmatic equivalence since the main philosophical tension is lessened.

TT3 does a better job at this. The translation gets the point across better by changing the second clause to "لیکن اس کے لیے مشقت کرنے کو تیار نہیں تھے," which means "but they were not willing to work hard for it." This fits better with Coelho's existential and Sufi-influenced narrative tone. Even if the exact word "Personal Legend" is left out, this interpretation is more practically accurate.

TT1 and TT2 simplify things by substituting the abstract term "Personal Legend" with the culturally general term "قسمت." This could make it easier for those who are not acquainted with Coelho's spiritual language to read, but it makes the philosophy less deep. There is not much explicitation; important metaphors are kept but made more broad.

TT3, on the other hand, leverages explicitation by going into more detail on the trip (مشقت) and the searchers' refusal to act. This plan fits with Baker's approach, notably her claim that philosophical books' hidden meanings frequently need to be made clear in translation so that they have the same effect in a new language and culture.

TT1 and TT2 put more emphasis on formal and textual equivalency, keeping the framework of the original while oversimplifying its philosophical substance by changing words. TT3 has a different structure and style, but it stays true to the story's main point: that fulfillment is not only about desire, but also about being committed to the road. This study backs up Baker's claim that good translation, particularly of philosophical or allegorical material, typically requires a trade-off between form and function. Compensation, simplification, and explicitation are important ways to find this equilibrium.

Conclusion

This comparative analysis of lexical choices in Urdu translations of Paulo Coelho's *The Alchemist* highlights the significant role that word selection plays in shaping the reader's experience and interpretation of the text. The study reveals that translators employ diverse strategies—ranging from literal translations to culturally adapted renderings when conveying key concepts such as “Personal Legend,” “omens,” and the “Soul of the World.” These choices not only affect the philosophical and spiritual tone of the narrative but also reflect the translators' individual approaches to balancing fidelity with cultural relevance. The analysis demonstrates that lexical decisions in literary translation are more than linguistic substitutions; they are acts of cultural mediation that can enhance or diminish the original work's metaphysical resonance. Ultimately, the study emphasizes the need for sensitivity and intentionality in translation, particularly when dealing with lexical choices, where preserving the essence of the source text requires both linguistic accuracy and deep cultural insight.

References

- Agustina, S. (2013). Loss and Gain in Translation Process of a Comic “The Adventures of Tintin: Tintin in America” into Indonesian Version “Petualangan Tintin: Tintin di Amerika”. *English Department UDINUS*.
- Akhtar, S. A., Qureshi, M., & Zahoor, A. (2024). A Study of Cultural Propositions in the Urdu Translation of The Alchemist. *Jahan-e-Tahqeeq*, 7(1), 448-466.
- Ali, Z., & Imran, M. (2023). Translation Challenges and Strategies in Urdu Translations of English Literary Text. *Spry Journal of Literature and Linguistics*, 1(2).
- Aqeel, B., & Sadiq, A. H. B. (2024). Probing Swearing Expressions in the Urdu Translation of Hamlet. *Jahan-e-Tahqeeq*, 7(1), 27-36.
- Arduini, S., & Hodgson, R. (Eds.). (2012). *Similarity and difference in translation: Proceedings of the International Conference on Similarity and Translation*. Guaraldi.
- Batchelor, K. (2013). Translation and Philosophy. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 6, 122-126.
- Baker, M., & Diriker, E. (2019). Conference and simultaneous interpreting. In *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 95-101). Routledge.
- Berezhniy, D. B., Grushevskaya, T. M., Kanon, I. A., Grinenko, K. M., Grushevskaya, E. S., & Paresheva, V. O. Subject Transformations In The Translation Of Literary Texts. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*.
- Carnap, R. (1988). *Meaning and necessity: A study in semantics and modal logic* (Vol. 30). University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (2004). *Eyes of the university: Right to philosophy 2* (Vol. 2). Stanford University Press.
- Frankenberg-Garcia, A. (2022). Can a corpus-driven lexical analysis of human and machine translation unveil discourse features that set them apart?. *Target*, 34(2), 278-308.
- Hornby, A. S. (2020). No Title Oxford advanced learners dictionary.
- House, J. (2018). *Translation: The Basics*. Routledge.
- Imran, M., Imtiaz, M., Gilani, S. F., & Parveen, S. (2024). Rendering Cultural Propositions in the Urdu Translation of Paulo Coelho's Eleven Minutes. *Jahan-e-Tahqeeq*, 7(2), 483-491.

- Joosten, J. (2012). *Towards the Interpretability Logic* (5th ed.). Amsterdam: Longman.
- Karanevych, M., & Kutsa, O. (2018). Use of Lexical Transformations for Pragmatic Adaptation of Fiction Translation. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія»: Серія «Філологія»*, 3, 6-10.
- Kjøll, G. (2010). Content similarity and communicative success. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 2(1), 21-45.
- Koerner, E. F. (2013). *Ferdinand de Saussure: Origin and development of his linguistic thought in western studies of language* (Vol. 7). Springer-Verlag.
- Kwong, O. Y. (2021). Probing a Two-Way Parallel T&I Corpus for the Lexical Choices of Translators and Interpreters. In *New Perspectives on Corpus Translation Studies* (pp. 101-132). Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- Lyu, X., Li, J., Gong, Z., & Zhang, M. (2021, November). Encouraging lexical translation consistency for document-level neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 3265-3277).
- Machery, E., Olivola, C. Y., & De Blanc, M. (2009). Linguistic and metalinguistic intuitions in the philosophy of language. *Analysis*, 69(4), 689-694.
- Munday, J., Pinto, S. R., & Blakesley, J. (2022). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. routledge.
- Ploeger, E., Lai, H., Van Noord, R., & Toral, A. (2024). Towards tailored recovery of lexical diversity in literary machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.17308*.
- Raatikainen, P. (2005). On how to avoid the indeterminacy of translation? *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*. 43, 395-414.
- Ricoeur, P. (2008). The Conflict of Interpretations. In D. Ihde & W. Domingo (Eds.), *Essays in Hermeneutics* (pp. 34-53). Northwestern: Evanston.
- Rorty, R. (2001). Indeterminacy of Translation and of Truth. In D. Follesdal (Eds), New York: Garland Pub. *Indeterminacy of Translation*. (pp. 443-62).
- Saleem, T., & Ahmad, S. (2025). From structure to meaning: a lexical semantic framework for Urdu compounding. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1), 1-13.
- Silverman, H. J. (2004). *Derrida and deconstruction*, Routledge.
- Subramanian, V., & Sundararaman, D. (2021). How do lexical semantics affect translation? An empirical study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.00075*.
- Glucksberg, S., Cacciari, C., & Tabossi, P. (1993). Idioms: Processing, structure, and interpretation. *Idiom meanings and allusional content*, 3-26.
- Even-Zohar, I. (2021). The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In *The translation studies reader* (pp. 191-196). Routledge.