



attention to passages where metrical structure, rhyme, metaphor, and intertextual reference are especially prominent.

Analytical Criteria: The poetic invariant was operationalized across four analytical dimensions:

1. **Lexical-metaphoric network** – recurring metaphors, key images, and conventional tropes;
2. **Formal features** – metrical patterns, rhyme schemes, and internal sound organization;
3. **Cultural and intertextual allusion** – references to Sufi symbolism, classical Persian poetic motifs, and Turkic idiomatic expressions;
4. **Poetic effect** – tone, register, and rhetorical strategies.

Each translation was examined to determine how these dimensions were treated in English – whether the invariant was preserved, adapted, lost, or transformed.

Comparative Approach: For every poet – translation pair, the analysis compared features of the source text (as established in authoritative editions) with those of the English version. Where possible, translation strategies were classified according to their dominant orientation – literal versus free, prose versus verse – and evaluated in terms of how effectively they reconstruct the poetic invariant. Subsequently, cross-poet comparison was undertaken to identify recurrent challenges, divergences in translation practice, and instances of best practice in rendering classical Turkic – Persian poetics into English.

Limitations: Several limitations should be noted. High-quality English translations, particularly of Navoiy, remain scarce; in some cases, source texts are available only in manuscript form or in transliteration. Moreover, achieving metrical equivalence between Turkic/Persian and English verse presents inherent difficulties. Nevertheless, the comparative framework adopted here provides valuable insights into the dynamics of poetic invariance and its reconstruction across linguistic and cultural boundaries.

Results

Alisher Navoiy. Our analysis of select Navoiy translations revealed that:

Lexical-metaphoric networks (e.g., garden/bird, dust-divine-love) are often simplified in English, losing subtle Turkic-Persian interplay.

Formal features: the original uses classical Persian/Chagatai meters which are rarely reproduced; many translations render the poem in free verse, thereby losing part of the rhythmic invariant.

Cultural/allusion layer: many Sufi and Turkic idioms are either omitted or converted into generic Western metaphors, reducing specificity.

Poetic effect: while meaning is often retained, the musicality, emotional register, and multi-layered resonance are diminished.

Jami. In the Jami translations studied, we found somewhat better preservation of metaphorical networks (due to stronger presence of Persian tradition familiar to translators) though formal and intertextual dimensions still often suffer.

Fuzuli. For Fuzuli, the trilingual (Turkish-Persian-Arabic) complexity poses additional challenges: translators tend to prioritise meaning and eschew rhyme/meter, resulting in a more radical transformation of the invariant.

Comparative observations



Across all three poets, the main losses in translation are: the formal-rhythmic dimension and the culturally-specific intertextual network. The lexical-metaphoric layer is most often retained, albeit in a simplified form. Among the three, Navoiy seems most vulnerable to invariant loss, owing to his less familiar Turkic dimension, while Jami fares relatively better in English translation.

Discussion

The findings reveal persistent challenges in reconstructing the poetic invariant in English translations of classical Eastern poetry. In the case of Alisher Navoiy, the hybrid Turkic–Persian linguistic texture and the interplay between courtly and Sufi symbolism generate multiple layers of meaning that are difficult to render in English. Moreover, limited familiarity among translators with Chagatai Turkic exacerbates the loss of linguistic nuance and cultural resonance. By contrast, Jami’s corpus – being exclusively Persian – proves relatively more accessible to translators working within the established Persian poetic tradition, whereas Fuzuli’s multilingual composition (Ottoman Turkish, Persian, Arabic) presents its own set of complexities. The comparative analysis thus underscores a clear pattern: the greater the linguistic and cultural distance between the source and the target traditions, the more difficult it becomes to reconstruct the poetic invariant.

From a translation-poetic perspective, these findings suggest that translators seeking to preserve the invariant must engage not only with lexical accuracy, but also with the formal and cultural dimensions of the source text. This involves:

- striving, where possible, to reproduce or creatively approximate meter and rhyme, or to compensate for their loss in a deliberate and aesthetically motivated manner;
- providing footnotes or glosses to clarify culturally specific allusions, Sufi terminology, or symbolic imagery;
- employing creative adaptation to sustain the original metaphoric network even when formal patterns cannot be fully transferred.

For Navoiy’s poetry in particular, bilingual editions with detailed commentary or hybrid translation forms – for instance, partial rhyme or echoic structures – could help convey something of the original’s rhythmic and formal complexity.

It must also be acknowledged that English poetic language operates under a distinct metrical and rhythmic system, making absolute replication of the source invariant unattainable. Nevertheless, approximation and evocation of the poetic effect remain both feasible and desirable aims.

Finally, the study points to implications for literary reception. When the invariant is insufficiently maintained, English readers encounter a flattened or diluted version of the poem, stripped of its musicality, intertextual depth, and spiritual undertones. Translators, therefore, bear an ethical responsibility to mediate the original text sensitively – seeking balance between accessibility and fidelity, rather than domesticating the poem entirely into the norms of English verse.

Conclusion

This study of Navoiy, Jami and Fuzuli affirms that reconstructing the poetic invariant in English translations remains challenging, especially for less familiar poetic traditions like Navoiy’s. However, strategic translation choices — attention to metaphor networks, conscious handling of form, and cultural annotation — can improve the fidelity of translated poetry. Future work might enlarge the corpus, explore reader reception of different translation strategies, and experiment with new hybrid translation forms (e.g., English-Chagatai bilingual renderings). In conclusion, while perfect replication of the invariant may be unattainable, translation that respects and evokes the original’s poetic architecture offers the best pathway for engaging global readership with Navoiy’s rich heritage.



References :

1. Shermamatova, S. "Problems of Translating Navoi's Lyrics into Foreign Languages." Language and Literature, Vol. 9 No. 1, 2024. (acopen.umsida.ac.id)
2. Shermamatova, S. "Samples of translation of Alisher Navoi's aphorisms into English and problem of their translation." Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching, Vol. 4 (2022). (geniusjournals.org)
3. Kaxarova, M. B. "History of Translation of Works of Alisher Navoi into Foreign Languages." Journal of Science-Innovative Research in Uzbekistan, Vol.1 No.8, 2023. (universalpublishings.com).
4. Maxamadolimovna, T. X. (2025). "LISON UT-TAYR" TARJIMASI: METAFORIK BIRLIKLARNING ADEKVATLIGI MUAMMOSI. Research Focus, 4(Special Issue 1), 234-235.
5. Turaxanova, X. (2025). "LISON UT-TAYR" TARJIMASIDA BADIY SAN'AT VOSITALARINING TALQINI. Nordic_Press, 8(0008).
6. Hosiyat, T. (2023). LINGUO-CULTURAL STUDY OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE EPIC" LISON UT-TAIR". Conferencea, 170–172.
7. Mahamadolimovna, T. H. (2024). Leveraging The Classroom Environment As A Source Of Vocabulary In EFL Classes. American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies, 1(1), 32-35.
8. Hosiyat, T. (2023). LINGUO-CULTURAL STUDY OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE EPIC" LISON UT-TAIR". Conferencea, 170-172.

