

Ideological Perspectives in Two Selected Persian Translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

Amin Amirdabbaghian*

Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Krishnavanie Shunmugam, Mansour Amini

Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

School of Languages, Literacies and Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia

Received on: 29-10-2023

Accepted on: 11-7-2024

Abstract

Ideology plays a vital role in influencing language use in Persian translation work in Iran. Hence, those who engage in Islamic-oriented discourse are treated with more respect and favor in the community, particularly after the revolution in 1979. This study aims to describe the ideological impact of the Islamic Revolution on the pre- and post-Revolution Persian translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945) and for this purpose two translations i.e., Amirshahi (1969) and Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh (2003) were selected. Farahzad's (2012) three-dimensional textual analysis model was used for data categorization while van Dijk's (1998) theory of ideology aided in discussing the ideological perspectives that manifest themselves in the Persian translations. The findings revealed significant differences in ideological perspectives of the pre and post revolutions translators. The study has several practical and theoretical implications for translators, and language learners as well as instructors.

Keywords: Translation, Ideology, Persian, *Animal Farm*

1. Introduction

A broad multidisciplinary definition of ideology formulated by Teun A. van Dijk (2007) is ideologies refer to the fundamental beliefs of a group and its members. Van Dijk (2007) states that ideologies are influenced by language use and discourse, which consequently affects how ideologies are learnt, acquired, or changed. He adds that the discourse used by the members of groups indicates ideological opinions. Regarding ideology in translation, for André Lefevere (1992), translation is a rewriting of an original text regardless of their intention, reflecting a particular ideology as well as the poetics, therefore, manipulating literature to function in a specific way in a society.

The "voice" of the translator (Munday 2007, 58) relates to Lefevere's rewriting where the translator makes decisions in his/her selections in the predominant social, cultural, political and ideological macro-context. Alvarez and Vidal (1996) similarly stress that behind every decision a translator makes, a voluntary act reveals his or her history and the socio-political environment around him. Hatim and Mason (1997) posit that translator's mind contains an antecedent classification of reality in ideological

© 2025 JJMLL Publishers/Yarmouk University. All Rights Reserved,

* Doi: <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.17.3.17>

* Corresponding Author: amirdabbaghian@um.edu.my

terminologies of every systematic linguistic choice. Klimovich (2016) concedes with Lefevere (1992) and Bassnett (2000) that all rewritings, no matter what their purpose is, suggest a specific ideology by referring to how both children and adult literature from foreign and local sources were republished in Soviet Russia in line with the Marx and Lenin ideology.

Several studies on translation products have revealed ideological manipulations throughout the history of many nations. Fawcett (2001) confirms that over the years, members of groups have transferred their own beliefs to the creation of clear impacts on translation. Hassanzade Novin and Salmani (2017), thus aptly describe translation as a cultural-ideological communication that is always subjective.

This study aims to highlight the ideological influence of the socio-political situation in pre- and post-Revolution Iran on two Persian translations of George Orwell's renowned political novel, *Animal Farm* (1945). The novel has been a bestseller in Iran over the past three decades. It is the most widely read foreign literary text amongst Iranians (Shoqi 2017). The National Library and Archives of the Islamic Republic lists thirty-four translations and three adaptations of *Animal Farm* in Iran (Amirdabbaghian 2019).

This study employs two frameworks. For sample categorization, Farahzad's (2012) three-dimensional textual analysis model, which focuses on choices translators make at the lexical, grammatical, and translational strategy levels is used. Her model is most suitable for sample categorization in the present study as the ideological shifts in this study's data are only evident at the word or phrase level. To discuss the findings of the study, van Dijk's theory of ideology is referred to as it explains a wide range of personal and social values, functions, attitudes, and practices which manifest themselves in language and reveal various types of ideologies.

Interest in examining ideology has been expanding in Translation Studies since ideology has played a crucial role in Cultural Studies. The past studies on this subject focus only on the lexical level, however, the present study includes grammatical and translation strategy choices, thus stressing on the ideological manipulations that could happen at different linguistic and textual levels. This study offers a cohesive argument compared to others by discussing the manipulations in accordance with van Dijk's (1998) theory of ideology, background of translators as well as the historical environment and the censorship policy in Iran. The findings of this study may contribute to the already existing scholarship on ideology and translation with a specific contribution from Persian, focusing on two significant political periods in Iran's history, i.e., before and after the 1979 revolution in Iran.

2. Ideology

De Tracy was the first person to introduce the notion of *ideologie* as a scientific study of ideas, during the French Revolution (Karalus 2013). Since then, ideology has been redefined in a number of ways by scholars from different disciplines. The American sociologist, Levi Martin (2015), summarizes the shifting definitions of ideology: It is common for sociological discussions of ideology to begin by acknowledging, if not bemoaning, the plurality of different ways of using the term ideology. Marx and Engels used it to denote the most abstract conceptions in an imaginary world of ideas independent of

material life. Later Marxists referred to it to signify a conspirative ideational wool pulled over the eyes of the masses. For political scientists they are packages of positions, often believed to be mergeable in one preferred state, and some use it to signify the disagreements with beliefs, attitudes and opinions of others.

In the multitude of studies that have come forth on ideology from disciplines like psychology, sociology, and politics, is van Dijk's (1998) substantial contribution inspired from (critical) discourse analysis in dealing with this complex notion. Van Dijk (1998, 177) defines ideology as "belief systems that are only shared by specific (ideological) groups of people and are typically not shared and taken for granted by the whole sociocultural community". He believes that members form groups if they share social representations. Following this idea, individuals, as members of such groups, have a personal identity associated with a social identity that van Dijk calls "self-representation of being a member of a social group" (1998, 142). Translation is one of the conduits through which the members of such groups represent their socio-personal identities. This is evidenced in past studies on ideology in translated works in Iran as also seen in the present study.

2.1 Review of Literature

Numerous seminal studies have explored the intricate relationship between ideology and translation, shedding light on how decisions of translators are shaped by underlying ideological factors. Venuti's (1995/2018) work, introduced the concepts of *foreignization* and *domestication*, revealing how translators' choices reflect ideological preferences and power dynamics. Similarly, Hermans (1999/2020) examined the *norms* in translation, that has contributed significantly to understanding of how socio-cultural, political, and economic factors influence translation practices, thus illuminating the ideological dimensions of the translation process.

Moreover, contemporary studies have delved into the ideological implications of translation in specific contexts, such as literature, media, and politics. Baker's (2006/2019) research explores the role of translation in disseminating and contesting dominant ideologies, particularly in conflict zones and post-colonial settings. Additionally, studies examining translation in political discourse, such as House et al. (2005) have elucidated how translators negotiate ideological tensions and power struggles, navigating between competing interests and perspectives. These studies collectively underscore the critical importance of understanding ideology in translation studies, emphasizing its pervasive influence on language, culture, and society.

Past studies on Persian translations of literary texts and media discourse reveal ideological manipulations and this is noticeably so in post-Revolution translations. Two relatively recent studies by Shahsavari and Mehdizadeh Naderi (2015) and Naghmeh Abbaspour (2020) make this evident. Shahsavari and Mehdizadeh Naderi compared pre- and post- Revolution Persian translations of Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities* while Abbaspour studied eight book covers of children's literature translated into Persian in post-Revolution Iran. Both studies concluded that the post-Revolution translator and book publisher were clearly influenced in terms of the religious and political ideology of the Islamic Republic.

Among the past studies on Persian translations of *Animal Farm*, two studies specifically focused on ideology. Yazdanimogaddam and Fakher (2011) examined the relationship between ideology and idiosyncrasy in the lexical choices of Persian translations of three political novels, including *Animal Farm*. Zareh-Behtash and Chalabi (2016) studied the impact of socio-political factors on lexical equivalents in two pre- and post-Revolution translations of *Animal Farm*. Both studies employed Fairclough's (2010) Critical Discourse Analysis theoretical framework. While the earlier studies focus only on the lexical level, the present study also includes grammatical and translation strategy choices, thereby highlighting that ideological manipulations can occur at different linguistic and textual levels. This study also provides a more integrated discussion compared to the earlier studies by relating the manipulations to van Dijk's (1998) theory of ideology, the translators' background and historical environment, and Iran's censorship policy.

3. The 1979 Islamic Revolution and Censorship in Iran

The 1979 Iranian Islamic Revolution led to censorship practices particularly affecting the publication of both original and translated works in Iran (Girgis 1996).

During the Pahlavi regime, amidst pressing concerns like socio-economic inequality, clerical leaders and militants were outraged at the spread of immorality, libertinism, and the influence of the Western culture (Amir Arjomand 1986) which expressed a disregard of Islam and the traditional beliefs of the Iranian people. Amongst the repercussions of such an indignation was a strict censorship on publications of books and translations specifically related to Western cultures, under the post-Revolution theocratic rule. Although the state censorship policy was strict in the pre-Revolution years with individuals being detained for translations involving direct ideological agitation and propaganda for Communism (Mollanazar 2011), it became far less tolerant with the establishment of the Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance (MCIG) in post-Revolution Iran. Anvari (2018) discusses that the Islamic Revolution brought in a further dimension of censorship over anything deemed immoral or pornographic, in the areas of arts, culture, and exposure to international ideas—that had been fairly uncontroversial in the Shah's time.

The Department General of Book Affairs (Haddadian-Moghaddam 2014) in the MCIG (Khoshsaligheh and Ameri 2016) screens and assesses all products submitted for publication including written and audiovisual translations. Haddadian-Moghaddam (2014) explains that the Iranian state does not acknowledge state censorship. Instead, they use a system called *Momayyezi* (literally “audit”), which is, examining and segregating the “good” and “bad” for publication or production, such as books, films, music, and dramas. The *Momayyezi* is run by anonymous individuals (Rajabzadeh 2002), and it usually scrutinises only at the lexical level (Ramazani 2009; Izadi 2014); the *momayyez* (censor/appraiser/auditor) decides which lexical items are suitable to be used for both the source and translated texts (Haddadian-Moghaddam 2014).

In this research, the post-Revolution translators' lexical choices are carefully selected in adherence to the expectations of the *Momayyezi* which upheld the dominant ideology of the Islamic Republic in the context of arts and culture.

4. George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

Orwell published *Animal Farm* on the heels of World War II in the UK (Amirdabbaghian and Solimany 2013). While *Animal Farm* looks like a story about animals, it is Orwell's political satire on the Revolution in the communist Soviet Union. The novel depicts Marx's ideology of a classless society from the animals' view. The animals being abused by human beings indicate the misuse of the working class by the bourgeoisie while the animals' united effort to overthrow their human master and overtake the farm symbolises Marx's belief that equality could only be achieved by the oppressed overthrowing the oppressor (Wright 2001).

The novel is also reflective of a real-world historical-political situation which is evident in its allusion to the Tehran Conference (1943), a significant meeting between the Big Three Allied Leaders that is, Britain, the US and the USSR intending to find a strategy to stop World War II (Gellately 2013). *Animal Farm* ends with a meeting between the pigs and the neighboring humans. The pigs intend to explain to the humans that their real intention was "to live at peace and normal business relations" (Orwell 1945, 10) but Napoleon, the pig leader, and Mr. Pilkington, a neighboring gentleman farmer, cheat each other in the card game and a fierce fight ensues. The meeting thus ends on a "loud note of discord" alluding to the Cold War between the USSR and the West (Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh 2003, 158).

Senn (2015) states that Orwell's intention was to use the allegory against capitalists and communists, mainly to warn against totalitarianism. According to Elliott Brown (2014), Orwell was against totalitarian mindset and accepted no royalties for translations of *Animal Farm* that was written for readers too poor after the World War II to buy them, such as Ukrainian, Russian, and Persian editions.

As a political allegory that scrutinizes the ideology of false egalitarianism, and the ideals and beliefs of the proletariat versus the capitalists, *Animal Farm* is a potential text for the examination of ideology in its original production as well as in its translations, as undertaken by this study.

5. Background of the Persian Translators

The background of translators plays a crucial role in uncovering the ideological practices embedded within translations. Firstly, translators bring their socio-cultural, political, and personal perspectives to the translation process. Their intellectual capital, including education, upbringing and experiences, shapes their understanding of the source text and influences the choices they make during translation. Furthermore, understanding translators' backgrounds would provide insights into the broader socio-political context in which the translation occurs. Translators may belong to specific communities, hold certain affiliations, or possess insider knowledge about the cultures represented in the source and target texts. This insider perspective enables translators to navigate cultural nuances, decode implicit meanings, and identify ideological biases that may be less apparent to outsiders. By drawing on their intellectual

capital, translators can critically engage with the ideological dimensions of the text, uncovering hidden agendas, challenging dominant discourses, and promoting alternative perspectives in the translation process. Thus, knowing translators' background serves as a valuable lens through which to analyze and interpret the ideological practices at play in translations.

The two translators who will be discussed in this study are Amir Amirshahi and Saleh Hosseini, who translated *Animal Farm* into Persian in pre-Revolution and post-Revolution Iran, respectively.

There are no official records on Amirshahi in Iran. The sole evidence that he was a translator is his name, which appears on the 1969 Persian translation of *Animal Farm* as well as an information entry for published translations on the portal of the National Library and Archives of Iran. The only other piece of information was provided by Amirshahi's daughter, Mahshid Amirshahim in her email to one of the authors of this paper in 2019. In her email, Mahshid, who currently lives in Europe, revealed the following information about her father:

My father was born sometime before 1910 and died in 1970 when he was around 60 years old, which was a few months before his translation of *Animal Farm* was published. He had read Law and was a high-ranked Senior Judge. He was fluent in French and learned English from me as I was sent to the United Kingdom to study. My father became a translator by chance. We were both fans of Orwell's works; my father took on the translation of *Animal Farm* when requested by the British Council as part of his English learning project. I helped edit his Persian translation and then submitted it to the Franklin Foundation. My father wanted to dedicate the translation to the people of Iran, but because of political controversies at that time – with the monarchy being hostile to left-wingers like the Franklin Foundation and the Jibi publishers in Iran – he did away with the idea of dedication. My father did not involve himself in political activities. I would liken him to a Conservative member of Parliament like that of the United Kingdom. He was like a right-winger in public. My mother, Molud Khanlari, however, was a very active left-winger and one of the co-founders of the Tudeh party [literally, the party of the masses] together with some of her close relatives. My mother was very open-minded compared to the women of her time.

Born in 1946, Hosseini, the post-Revolution translator, graduated from George Washington University, USA, with a doctorate in English Literature (Amirdabbaghian and Shunmugam 2019b). He produced the Persian translation of *Animal Farm* (2003) while working as an academician in Languages and Linguistics at Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran (Islami 2003). He presently serves as a retired professor of Linguistics at the university. The MCIG nominated Hosseini as the prominent critic and translator of 1997 and named him as the most prolific translator in 2003 (Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz 2019). Hosseini does not explicitly profess allegiance to any specific political group or ideology, but the analysis of his Persian translation of *Animal Farm* implicitly provides some evidence of the religious ideological values expected to be upheld in post-Revolution Iran.

Masoumeh Nabi Zadeh is the other name mentioned on the book cover alongside Hosseini. She is known to have “contributed towards a few parts of the translation as an editor” (Khorsand and Salmani 2014, 231).

6. Data Analysis and Discussions

A comparative analysis of Amirshahi's and Hosseini's choices at the lexical, grammatical and translation strategy level which manifest ideological perspectives is presented in a total of ten samples in the following sub-sections.

6.1 Lexical Choices

Farazhad (2012, 36) asserts that lexical choices are not naively made; rather they are purposeful selections that “affect representations” of a certain phenomenon in a particular context. She believes that lexical choices denote and imply even when they seem ideologically neutral. She adds that sometimes there is an ideological implication in a lexicon of the source text but may lose its ideological importance in the target text or that the reverse can happen, thereby foregrounding the difference of power relations between the source and target culture (2012).

The four lexical items that reflect a particular ideology owing to semantic intensifications are presented in the following section.

6.1.1 Intensification

In translation, an event or action expressed in the source language may be conveyed in a manner where the lexical choices take on a more forceful impact in the target language. Intensified tones evoked by the translator's lexical choices can influence the source author's ideology.

Sample 1	
ST: “Major's speech had given to the more intelligent animals on the farm a completely new outlook on life. <i>They did not know when the Rebellion predicted by Major</i> would take place, they had no reason for thinking that it would be within their own lifetime, but they saw clearly that it was their duty to prepare for it.” (Orwell 1945, 6)	
TT 1: «آنها نمی دانستند انقلابی که میجر پیش بینی کرده بود...» (Amirshahi 1969, 17)	BT: “They did not know the Revolution predicted by Major ...”
TT 2: «نمی دانستند شورش میجر پیش بینی کرده بود...» (Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh 2003, 18)	BT: “They did not know the Rebellion predicted by Major ...”

In this sample, Amirshahi substitutes Orwell's ‘Rebellion’ with ‘Revolution’, while Hosseini retains the author's choice. Erich Weede and Edward Muller (1998, 44) state that “rebellion and revolution are matters of degree.” They explain this by quoting from Diana Russell's book, *Rebellion, Revolution and Armed Force* (1974): “[T]ake Russell's (1974, 6) concept as a starting point, where rebellion is defined as a form of violent power struggle in which the overthrow of the regime is threatened by means that include violence...a successful revolution may be said to have occurred when substantial social change follows a

rebellion.” This suggests that ‘rebellion’ does not necessarily imply lasting social change while a ‘revolution’ does. A rebellion might fail, but a ‘revolution’ by definition promises a higher degree of success. Amirshahi’s “انقلاب [enqelab] [revolution]” therefore intensifies the degree of success of the act.

Before the Islamic Revolution, the atmosphere was to rebel and change the government. “انقلابی [enqelabi] [Revolutionary]” would have been the prevalent mental attitude of the haters of the monarchy in the pre-Revolution era. Van Dijk (1998, 19) argues that beliefs are not limited to “what exists, or what is (or maybe) true or false” but that beliefs are also the products of “judgments” based on “values and norms.” In this regard, Amirshahi’s lexical choice here, if chosen deliberately, could reflect his judgment of the pre-Revolution social sentiment of Iran, where the majority supported the need for radical changes in the political system.

Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh (2003) translated ‘Rebellion’ as “شورش [shoorash] [Rebellion]”. In Hosseini’s time, the Revolution had already taken place, and Hosseini’s (2003) lexical selection suggests that any action against the government would be considered a rebellion. While the agents of a rebellion would see their aggression and law-breaking as a necessary means for a worthy cause, the persons or institution the rebellion is leveled against would obviously see it as a subversive act. Amirshahi’s choice of ‘revolution’ and Hosseini’s ‘rebellion’ are somewhat akin to ‘freedom-fighter’ versus ‘terrorist’, which van Dijk (1998, 42) provides as an example of the double-sided coin of ideological perspectives.

Sample 2	
ST: <i>“Sooner or later the <u>day</u> is coming, Tyrant Man shall be o’erthrown, And the fruitful fields of England Shall be trod by beasts alone.” (Orwell 1945, 4)</i>	
TT 1: <i>«هان به امید آن چنان روزی!» (Amirshahi 1969, 14)</i>	BT: <i>“<u>Lo!</u> Hope for such a <u>day</u>.”</i>
TT 2: <i>«ز طاغوت انسان ها رها شوید!» (Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh 2003, 15)</i>	BT: <i>“<u>Get rid of</u> the <u>idolatrous</u> humans!”</i>

In Sample 2, the tone of Amirshahi’s (1969) translation is intensified by the interjection, “هان [haan] [Lo!]”. In Persian, “هان [haan] [Lo!]” is an interjectory discourse marker that functions to get one’s attention to listen to advice (Amid 2010). It is a poetic interjection employed by several Iranian poets like Nasir Khusraw (1004-1088), Khaqani (1120-1190), Kamal al-Din Esmail (1172-1237), Hafez Esfahani (18th century) and Reza-Qoli Khan Hedayat (1800-1871) (Amid, 2010). The literary rendering, ‘Lo!’ draws attention to the words which follow it, “هان به امید آن چنان روزی! [haan be omid-e aan chanaan roozi] [Lo! Hope for such a day].” It intensifies the imperative call to ‘hope’ for ‘such a day’, that is, a day of release from slavery to hardship – the kind caused by the rulers in the pre-Revolution era. By contrast, Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh (2003) intensify their translation with a tone of fury, “ز طاغوت انسان ها رها شوید! [ze taaghoot-e ensan ha rahaa shavid] [get rid of the idolatrous humans!].” The entire utterance ends in anger رها شوید [rahaa shavid] [Get rid], with the addition of the adjective طاغوت [taaghoot] [Idolatrous].” These words intensify the utterance compared with the author’s words. While the ST and

Amirshahi's (1969) translation sound hopeful for the arrival of a day of freedom, Hosseini's and Nabi Zadeh's (2003) modulated translation expresses hostility towards those regarded as irreligious. The label "طاغوت" [*taaghoot*] [idolatrous]" became prevalent during the Islamic Revolution and was mostly used to refer to the regime of the former monarchy (Yazdanimogaddam and Fakher 2011).

Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh (2003) seemed to have adopted the post-Revolution ideological perspective, as the second translation, in comparison with the first one, is influenced by the post-Revolution ideology.

Van Dijk (1998, 68) states that ideologies are "intuitively functioning as self-serving principles" in explaining the world generally (such as religious ideologies) and of the social and economic worlds like "conservatism or capitalism". Amirshahi's expression of eager hope for a day of freedom reflects the pre-Revolution need for freedom from monarchical capitalism (via a revolution) while Hosseini's lexical choices which evoke a tone of vehemence to rid the farm of 'idolatrous' humans echo the post-Revolution religious ideology. In van Dijk's words, both translators express the "self-serving principles" or beliefs of the time they live/d in.

Sample 3	
ST: " <u><i>In April</i></u> , <i>Animal Farm</i> was proclaimed a Republic, and <u><i>it became necessary</i></u> to elect a President. There was only one candidate, Napoleon, who was elected unanimously." (Orwell 1945, 46)	
TT 1: « <u>در ماه آوریل</u> در قلعه ی حیوانات اعلام جمهوریت شد و لازم شد رئیس جمهوری انتخاب شود.» (Amirshahi 1969, 131)	BT: " <u><i>In the month of April</i></u> , in the animals' castle, the republic was proclaimed and <u><i>it became necessary</i></u> to elect a president."
TT 2: « <u>بهاران</u> در مزرعه ی حیوانات ندای جمهوریت در دادند و انتخاب رئیس جمهور <u>جزو واجبات گردید</u> » (Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh 2003, 117)	BT: " <u><i>In spring</i></u> , in the animal farm, a call for a republic was announced, and the election of a President was <u><i>among the wajibs (obligatory religious acts)</i></u> ."

In this sample, Amirshahi (1969) renders "April" as "آوریل" [*aavril*] [Persian for April]", and "it became necessary" verbatim as "لازم شد" [*laazem shod*] [it became necessary]." By comparison, Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh (2003) substitute "April" with "بهاران" [*bahaaraan*] [plural form of spring season]". In Persian literature, spring symbolises the rebirth of Nature and is a source of inspiration to literary artists (Khoshnam 2009). The shift from 'April' to "spring" in the post-Revolution translation has cultural and ideological implications related to the Islamic Revolution in Iran. This could also be related to the proclamation of the Islamic Republic which was in spring (April 1, 1979), and a hymn for Iran's national day is named "بهاران خجسته باد" [*bahaaran khojasteh baad*] [happy spring(s)]" (Salehi 2003).

The post-Revolution translators also changed Orwell's "necessary" into "واجبات" [*wajibat*] [obligatory religious acts]". In Islam, *wajib* refers to religious actions that must be performed; neglecting a *wajib* act is punishable. The shift into religious discourse, as discussed in the earlier examples, reflects the strong link forged between religion and politics in the public sphere in post-Revolution Iran (Khoi 2009). Amirshahi, from the pre-Revolution era, where religious thought and speech were less important in public discourse, understandably settles for a neutral word i.e., 'necessary' [*laazem*]. The religious ideology prominent in the post-Revolution translation relates to van Dijk's (1998) concept of social representations

or identities of members of a group which are determined by particular political beliefs and cultural values.

Sample 4	
ST: “The flag was run up and Beasts of England was sung a number of times, then <u>the sheep who had been killed</u> was given <u>a solemn funeral</u> , a hawthorn bush being planted on her grave.” (Orwell 1945, 18)	
TT 1: «از گوسفند شهید تشییع مجالی به عمل آمد.» (Amirshahi 1969, 51)	BT: “For <u>the martyred sheep, a glorious funeral</u> was held.”
TT 2: «برای گوسفند مقتول مراسم تشییع جنازه به جا آوردند.» (Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh 2003, 47)	BT: “For <u>the killed sheep, a funeral</u> was held.”

Here, Orwell (1945) describes the victory of the animals in the Battle of the Cowshed. The fallen ones in this battle are the sheep, which in *Animal Farm* symbolize the mindless people who accept their leaders’ words and resort to protests and slogans to gain public acceptance of the leaders (Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh 2003).

The focus points in this sample are the verb “killed” and the adjective “solemn”, which qualifies the noun “funeral”. Amirshahi (1969) intensifies “killed” by translating it as “شهید [Shahid] [martyred]” which attaches the meaning of “a holy death”; “shahid” refers to a person who is killed/willing to die for his/her religious ideology. Amirshahi’s (1969) ‘martyred’ coupled with ‘glorious’ expresses the noble or holy act of the revolutionaries. Dying for a noble cause and being considered a martyr was a common idea lauded during the 1979 Revolution in Iran (Fischer 2003). John Kifner (1984), describing Iranians as “inordinately proud...of martyrdom...” writes, “[d]uring the revolution, demonstrators would dip their hands in the blood of the dead when the Shah’s soldiers fired into the crowds”. Muslims believe “those who are killed for the sake of God are martyrs and will dwell in the presence of God” (The Quran 3:169).

While Orwell describes the funeral as a “solemn” one, Amirshahi refers to it as being “glorious”. The adjective, “glorious” is more semantically laden than “solemn” although both share the suggestion of being distinguished; the former refers to something markedly worthy of admiration, honor and fame or notable for its achievements in addition to being noble, splendid or spectacular while the latter denotes an occasion that is formal and ceremonious. This implies the translator’s equation of being killed for resisting a corrupt leader (like the “irreligious Shah”) as a holy or glorious death, which echoes the religious ideology of Amirshahi’s time. Van Dijk views such ideologies as beliefs that are based on community-based norms and values.

In stark contrast to Orwell’s and Amirshahi’s choice of adjectives, Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh’s “funeral” is provided no evaluative expression. In Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh’s era (2003), the Revolution had already long achieved its aims, and there was no need for martyrs to fight for freedom from irreligious leaders. As such, they follow the source author’s choice and translate it as “مقتول [maqtool] [killed]”, which is the nearest and neutral Persian equivalent for “killed”.

6.2 Grammatical Choices

Farazhad (2012) observes how grammatical choices which include agents, actions, events, and entities can be systematically framed in a text to express different intents. For example, an agent/doer of an action, if recurrently absent for the most part of the discourse, can foreground an important idea. Similarly, if an action is repeatedly fronted in a language where it is not a norm, it becomes a syntactical choice. Fairclough (2010, 26-27) believes there is a “located” ideology in these grammatical forms and describes this ideology as important procedures through which power relations are “established, maintained, enacted and transformed”.

The following section discusses the passivization and activization of utterances, one of the categories of grammatical choice (Farahzad 2012).

6.2.1 Passivization and Activization

The passive voice highlights the prominence of “the action” over “the agent”. Passive sentences leave “causality and agency” (Fairclough 2010, 130) unclear while active constructions clarify “the doer, the subject, the one causally implicated in action” and represent action processes (Fairclough 1989, 39).

Below are two such samples which reflect ideological positions. Although rendering passive sentences into active ones in Persian could be a stylistic/ grammatical choice and in translation into Persian, it is highly desirable to render the passive into active, here the “voice” has been most likely used to indicate the ideological stance.

Sample 1	
ST: “And so, almost before they knew what was happening, the Rebellion had been successfully carried through: <i>Jones was expelled, and the Manor Farm was theirs.</i> ” (Orwell 1945, 9)	
TT 1: «جونز تبعید و مزرعه ی مانر از آن آنان شد.» (Amirshahi 1969, 23)	BT: “Jones was exiled and the Manor farm was owned by them.”
TT 2: «جونز را بیرون انداخته بودند و مزرعه مال خودشان شده بود.» (Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh 2003, 23)	BT: “They have expelled Jones and the farm was owned by them.”

In the above sample, Orwell (1945) describes a scene where the animals overthrow Mr. Jones in the Battle of the Cowshed and he has to leave the farm. Orwell uses the passive voice to describe Mr. Jones’s expulsion. Amirshahi (1969) renders it in a similar passive form: “تبعید شد [tab’id shod] [was exiled].” By contrast, Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh (2003) express the sentence in an active voice, placing emphasis on the agency that is “they”, the animals and their power to conquer humans.

When the Shah fled Iran on January 16, 1979 (Patrikarakos 2009), it was declared as a time for the people to celebrate not the Shah’s noble “departure”, but his cowardly “escape” from the country (The Iran Project, 2016). Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh (2003) in their translation, construct a discourse that is reflective of broader post-Revolution socio-political happenings in Iran. By giving prominence to the agent, the translators have expressed the power created in the ideological solidarity of the animals in the

fictional *Animal Farm*. This closely relates to their own context where the singleness of purpose of the Iranian people fueled the power for their revolutionary leaders to succeed in expelling the former ruling power and launch a Revolution.

Sample 2	
ST: “As his last act upon earth, Comrade Napoleon had pronounced a solemn decree: <i>the drinking of alcohol was to be punished by death.</i> ” (Orwell, 1945, 64)	
TT 1: «مجازات شرب الكل اعدام است.» (Amirshahi 1969, 121)	BT: “ The penalty for drinking alcohol is execution. ”
TT 2: «کیفر خمر نوشی مرگ است!» (Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh 2003, 103)	BT: “ The retribution for drinking Khamr (wine/alcohol) is death. ”

Here, the sentence constructions in both the target texts are vividly different from the source text. Fronting the nouns denoting punishment “مجازات [mojaazaat] [Penalty]” and “کیفر [kayfar] [Retribution]” in both translations in active structures immediately highlights the severity of drinking alcohol, as opposed to Orwell’s passive structure where punishment by death appears at the final position. The activization of the utterance in both the target texts is because “alcohol” consumption was and is regarded as a sin and forbidden among Iranians before and after the Islamic Revolution. Amirshahi (1969) reflects the common culture of the Iranian Pre-Revolution society where the predominantly Muslim community considered “drinking alcohol” as an anti-value and against Islamic norms (Hosseinian 2004). Hosseini’s and Nabi Zadeh’s (2003) translation of the declarative sentence in the active voice is clearly influenced by their common knowledge of the Islamic penal code of Iran (Chapter 28), established after the Revolution, which punishes drinkers in public. In van Dijk’s (1998, 40) view, cultures have “a moral basis which monitors interaction, communication and discourse” across members of society. He explains that these moral principles have to be “uncontested and presupposed” in all evaluative actions and interactions; hence, these moral issues are the basis for “judgments about and sanctions against moral deviances by individual members of a culture” (1998, 40). One of the uncontested moral principles that underpins a part of the religious ideology in both pre- and post-Revolution Iran is clearly the forbiddance of alcohol consumption.

6.3 Choices of Translation Techniques

In Farazhad’s (2012) view, all translation strategies have ideological implications. This includes all types of shifts at the micro, sentential level to translation methods at the macro text level, such as literal translation, substitution, omission, addition, and foreignization. Translation techniques can carry ideological implications due to the inherent cultural, social, and political significance embedded within the languages. When translating from one language to another, the translators make choices about how to convey meaning, tone, and nuance. These choices can reflect beliefs, values, and biases, as well as broader cultural and societal ideologies of the translators.

Ideological Perspectives in Two Selected Persian Translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

Farazhad regards omission and addition as ideological acts of censorship and manipulation, respectively. To her mind, omission censors the ideology of a specific pattern in the target text while addition serves to overrepresent a character or attribute a certain quality to something, which is not present in the ST. Where cultural substitutions occur, Farazhad admits it is likely to ease comprehensibility for the target audience, but she also stresses that this could affect the ideological representations in the target language. She also highlights that a domesticating strategy tends to overshadow “the values and beliefs of the source culture when translating from a marginalized language into a language of power,” while a foreignizing strategy mediates “foreign values in the guise of the self when translating from a language of power into a non-power language” (Farazhad 2012, 40).

Samples 1 and 4 show cultural substitutions which relate to a religious ideology, while samples 2 and 3, which employ non-cultural substitutions, express a political ideology.

Sample 1	
ST: “It was situated somewhere up in the sky, a little distance beyond the clouds, Moses said. <i>In Sugarcandy Mountain</i> it was <u>Sunday</u> seven days a week, clover was in season all the year round, and lump sugar and linseed cake grew on the hedges.” (Orwell 1945, 8)	
TT 1: «در سرزمین شیر و عسل هر هفت روز هفته یکشنبه است.» (Amirshahi 1969, 20)	BT: “In the land of milk and honey, seven days of the week is <u>Sunday</u> .”
TT 2: «در کوه پر از شهد و شکر هفت روز هفته جمعه است.» (Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh 2003, 21)	BT: “In the mountain, full of nectar and sugar seven days of the week is <u>Friday</u> .”

In this sample, Orwell (1945) illustrates an atmosphere in which the people in the Soviet Union were experiencing when confronting clergymen. Moses, the raven who is the messenger of the pigs in *Animal Farm*, symbolizes organized religious clergymen. Habibi (2003) informs us that the clergy in Russia supported both the Tsar and the USSR at different times and in return, they were also supported by the ruling power. Habibi adds that the clergy spoke of the other world and paradise to prevent people from any rebellion against poverty and oppression; it was an ideological strategy that the clergy adopted to support the Tsar’s position.

The keyword in Sample 1 is “Sunday”, a weekend holiday or a day of rest, the Christian analog for the Jewish Sabbath. While Amirshahi (1969) translates it faithfully into “یکشنبه [yekshanbe] [Sunday]”, Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh (2003) substitute “Sunday” for “جمعه [Juma’a] [Friday]”. Since Iranians are mostly Muslim, and verse 9 of the Surah Al-Jumua in the Holy Qur’an, recommends a Muslim to leave his job and pray on Fridays, Friday is declared as Iran’s weekend holiday or Muslim Sabbath. Special days declared as public holidays or days off for cultural or religious festivities form a part of the “cultural and social traditions incorporated in a society or institution” (Fairclough 1989, 166) which serve as an effective means of ideological representations. Hosseini’s substitution of “Sunday” with “Friday” represents “a culturally shared norm” (van Dijk 1998, 40) which is an important communal religious ritual practiced by Muslims all over the world.

Sample 2	
ST: “Animal <u>Farm</u> ” (Orwell 1945, Title)	
TT 1: «قلعه حیوانات» (Amirshahi 1969, Title)	BT: “Animal <u>Castle</u> ”
TT 2: «مزرعه حیوانات» (Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh 2003, Title)	BT: “Animal <u>Farm</u> ”

In the title of Orwell’s political allegory (1945), the noun “farm” is used as the animals were living on a farm. In the pre-Revolution version, Amirshahi (1969) substitutes ‘farm’ with “قلعه [qale’] [castle]”. In contemporary Iranian culture, a قلعه [qale’] is usually associated with a large and expensive construction with high and thick walls to house the royal family (Amid 2010). The marked shift from “farm” to “castle” may represent that Amirshahi’s (1969) “قلعه [qale’] [castle]” evokes connotations of the luxurious living and martial rule related to the Iranian monarchy.

The title of a book encapsulates the story. Considering the importance of translating titles, Amirshahi’s title reflects a reality his nation was facing; his choice to substitute “farm” for “castle”, is less likely to be a random choice. This relates to van Dijk’s (1998) statement on the choice of words, which reveal one’s perspectives, interests, and ideological, social, and political position.

By contrast, in the post-Revolution version, Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh (2003) translated the novel’s title faithfully as “مزرعه [mazra’e] [farm]”. Hosseini and Zadeh have no reason to translate the title differently in post-Revolution Iran, where ‘farm’ would be a safe, neutral, non-anti-Islamic word referring merely to a plot of land for agricultural purposes or rearing domestic livestock.

Sample 3	
ST: “The three hens who had been the ringleaders in the attempted rebellion over the eggs now came forward and stated that Snowball had appeared to them in a dream and incited them to disobey Napoleon’s orders. <i>They, too, were slaughtered</i> ”. (Orwell 1945, 55)	
TT 1: «مرغ ها بی درنگ اعدام شدند.» (Amirshahi 1969, 108)	BT: “The hens immediately <u>were executed</u> .”
TT 2: «مرغ ها را بدون معطلی از دم تیغ گذرانند.» (Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh 2003, 97)	BT: “They immediately <u>slaughtered</u> the hens.”

Sample 3 was earlier used to highlight a grammatical choice in terms of agency and here it is employed to show substitution of verbs which suggests yet another ideological manipulation. Orwell (1945) expresses the animal nature of the rebels by employing the verb “slaughter” which refers to “the act of killing; specifically: the butchering of livestock for [the] market” (Merriam-Webster 2018). Amirshahi (1969) renders it as “اعدام شدند [e’daam shodand] [were executed]” a term that refers to killing someone especially in compliance with a legal sentence (Amid 2010). The use of “executed” personifies the animal victims (i.e., the hens) and the shift in meaning from Orwell’s choice.

Van Dijk (1998) highlights that social events or arrangements that may be in conflict with key group interests will consequently be deemed negatively, and the negative judgments are applied as the starting point for negative social actions like discrimination. The pre-Revolution translation is influenced by the ideology of its time; executions were viewed as negative social actions in conflict with the state of well-being and interests of the Iranian people. By contrast, Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh (2003) kept the author's intention and rendered it as “از دم تیغ گذرانند” [*az dam-e tigh gozaraandand*] [slaughtered].”

Sample 4	
ST: “As his last act upon earth, Comrade Napoleon had pronounced a solemn decree: <i>the drinking of alcohol was to be punished by death</i> ”. (Orwell 1945, 64)	
TT 1: «مجازات شرب الکل اعدام است.» (Amirshahi 1969, 121)	BT: “The penalty for drinking alcohol is execution.”
TT 2: «کفر خمر نوشی مرگ است!» (Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh 2003, 103)	BT: “The retribution for drinking Khamr (wine/alcohol) is death.”

In the first translation, due to the secular state of pre-Revolution Iran, Amirshahi (1969) could render the culturally sensitive term “alcohol” as a general term “الکل [*alkol*] [alcohol]” in Persian. By contrast, Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh (2003) use the word “خمر [*khamr*] [wine/alcohol]”, which is an Arabic, religious/Qur’anic, literary and aesthetic term for wine/alcohol (Amid 2010). “خمر [*khamr*] [wine/alcohol]” replaces “alcohol” as it is forbidden in Islam and after the Islamic Revolution; drinking alcohol became a crime in Iran (Chapter 28, The Islamic Penal Code of Iran 1991). A euphemistic and Qur’anic expression is used since “خمر [*khamr*] [wine/alcohol]” is morally more acceptable, avoiding negative values connected with drinking. “خمر [*khamr*] [wine/alcohol]” can be found verse 219 of Surah Al-Baqarah and verse 90 of Surah Al-Maida in the Holy Quran.

Van Dijk (1998, 34) defines beliefs as socially shared values and norms, which are constructed by “socially acknowledged truth criteria.” Truth criteria (1998, 34-35) are a set of rules of evidence including “those of everyday common sense...of science...religion or other evaluation basis” in accordance with “the social domain, group or culture” for which “truth or factuality must be established”. In this sample, a religious rule of evidence in which the post-Revolution social truth criteria exist may have influenced Hosseini’s and Nabi Zadeh’s (2003) translation.

7. Discussion and Conclusion

“Language is ideological when it is used to promote one perspective over another” (Hart 2014, 2) and in translation behind every systemic linguistic choice which a translator makes, there is “inevitably a prior classification of reality in ideological terms” (Hatim and Mason 1997, 161) as revealed by the findings of this study. In most of the samples, substitution was used as a translation strategy expressing a particular ideological viewpoint, as with ‘revolution’ and ‘rebellion’, ‘execution’ and ‘death’, “slaughtered” and “executed” and “wine” and “*khamr*”. While these pairs look like close synonyms, they express different nuances and tones that imply certain ideological inclinations. Lexical choices that

semantically evoke religious and conservative connotations convey the predominant “beliefs” and “values” of the pre- and post-Revolution Iranian society. Words and phrases that are ideologically intensified, added, or omitted likewise indicate the translators’ membership and relationship with other groups as well as their personal “beliefs”. This relates to van Dijk’s (1998) “social functions” in his theory of ideology.

The analysis of the two Persian translations “disclose[s] the interaction between discursive structures and historical situations” (Makus 1990, 496) particular to the time in which the translators produced the translations. The pre-Revolution era in which Amirshahi lived, especially the 1960s to the very early 1970s, was a time when Western influence under the Shah’s rule was very visible in Iran in terms of dressing, education, activities of leisure etc., but when the country advanced into the 1970s, the clash between the Western influence and traditional values began to mount.

While Amirshahi lived in an era distinctly different from the one Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh live in presently, the samples analyzed in their translations, overall, imply that they were united in one respect. They believed in the preservation of traditional values. The example of alcohol being forbidden in Islam highlighted by both translators with “penalty” and “retribution” could possibly be the depictions of normative statements, which summarize what group members should or should not do. Again, Amirshahi’s choices of “castle” over “farm”, and “martyred” over “killed” imply the pre-Revolution translator’s implicatures about dying nobly to oust a corrupt monarchy. What is truly different is that Hosseini and Nabi Zadeh living in the new state of the Islamic Republic are expected to abide by a pointedly religious/Islamic register as seen in examples like “idolatrous humans”, “*wajibat*”/obligatory religious acts and the use of “Friday” to substitute “Sunday”.

Thus, what separates the post-Revolution translators from Amirshahi is a cautious adherence to the stringent regulations of the *Momaymez*. Hosseini is a prolific writer and translator who was awarded for his achievements by the MCIG in 1997 and 2003. Whether he subscribes to the Islamic Republic’s conservative religious ideology with conviction cannot be concretely proven. However, it is obvious that he is very well acquainted with the censorship rules of the *Momaymez* to have kept well within the limits of their expectations that he qualified to receive MCIG’s recognition as a prized writer and translator. Hassani (2015, 35) states that “The system rewards its favored poets and writers [...] with financial incentives, positions in cultural institutions, political establishments and academia, through fame and recognition, literary awards...[etc]”. Based on the logic and evidence provided in the present study, it can be concluded that the ideology of the ruling system has a significant influence on Hosseini’s lexical choice in the post-Revolution Persian translation of *Animal Farm*.

Amirshahi’s translation was not subject to a ministry like MCIG, although he too had to be careful not to provoke the anger of the monarchy. However, a literary translation in his time is a safe outlet to express one’s point of view (Mirabedini 1998) vis-à-vis one’s personal or collective ideology via a political allegory like *Animal Farm*. Despite the findings of the present study, it has limitations in terms of the generalizations made about translators’ ideology as proving that a statement was absolutely due to the ideological concerns, or stylistic matters such as preference for lexical choice could be impossible.

Ideological Perspectives in Two Selected Persian Translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

Further validation will require triangulation of data from several data sources and possibly interviewing the translators, which in the case of this study was not feasible. However, the findings still have theoretical and practical implications for the translators, language learners and instructors. Theoretically, the study contributes to the fundamental understanding of ideology in the Iranian context of literary translation. Practically, the findings can be used by translators and language learners by referring to the examples analyzed in this study and producing translations in various meaning situations.

The findings of this study confirm that the translator, as a processor of texts, always filters the text world of the source text through his/her own worldview or ideology, "which leads to differing results" and "[i]t is in this sense that translating is an ideological activity" (Hatim and Mason 1997, 121). The study has also highlighted that the translator's ideologies are often not a personal, but communal one as s/he is a part of a socio-political structure which consciously, or subconsciously exerts a powerful influence on his/her value and belief system.

To date, *Animal Farm* has been translated into at least 70 languages. It would be insightful to extend this study by conducting a comparative analysis of several translations of *Animal Farm* in other nations (especially those translated during periods of political upheavals) to investigate how translators elsewhere have manipulated language to express their ideological viewpoints as seen in this study. This research, along with other comparative studies, can serve as a pedagogical material for Translation Studies students who are looking for examples of different translation techniques and their impact in illustrating totally different scenarios of a source text to the target readers.

المنظورات الأيديولوجية في ترجمتين فارسيتين مختارتين لرواية جورج أورويل (مزرعة الحيوان)

أمين أميردباغيان

كلية اللغات واللسانيات، جامعة مالايا، كوالالمبور، ماليزيا

كريشنافاني شونموغام، منصور أميني

كلية اللغات واللسانيات، جامعة مالايا، كوالالمبور، ماليزيا

كلية اللغات ومحو الأمية والترجمة، جامعة العلوم الماليزية، بينانج، ماليزيا

الملخص

تلعب الأيديولوجيا دوراً محورياً في التأثير في استخدام اللغة في أعمال الترجمة الفارسية في إيران. ولذلك، فإن الذين يخرطون في خطاب ذي توجه إسلامي يُعاملون باحترام وتقدير أكبر في المجتمع، لا سيما بعد الثورة عام ١٩٧٩، وتهدف هذه الدراسة إلى وصف التأثير الأيديولوجي للثورة الإسلامية على ترجمتين فارسيتين لرواية جورج أورويل "مزرعة الحيوان" (١٩٤٥)، إحداهما قبل الثورة، وهي ترجمة أميرشاهي (١٩٦٩)، والأخرى بعد الثورة، وهي ترجمة حسيني ونبي زاده (٢٠٠٣). استخدم نموذج التحليل النصي ثلاثي الأبعاد لفرحزاد (٢٠١٢) لتصنيف البيانات، في حين استعانت الدراسة بنظرية فان دايك (١٩٩٨) حول الأيديولوجيا في مناقشة المنظورات الأيديولوجية التي تتجلى في الترجمات الفارسية، وكشفت النتائج عن اختلافات جوهرية في المنظورات الأيديولوجية بين المترجمين قبل الثورة وبعدها. وتقدم هذه الدراسة عدداً من الآثار العملية والنظرية لكل من المترجمين، ومتعلمي اللغة، والمدرسين.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الترجمة، الأيديولوجيا، الفارسية، مزرعة الحيوان.

References

- Alvarez, Roman, and M. Carmen-Africa Vidal. 1996. *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Amid, Hasan. 2010. فرهنگ فارسی عمید [Amid Persian Dictionary]. Tehran: Amir Kabir.
- Amir Arjomand, Said. 1986. Iran's Islamic Revolution in Comparative Perspective. *World Politics*. 38(3): 383-414. doi:10.2307/2010199
- Amirdabbaghian, Amin and Sanaz Solimany. 2013. The Application of Baker's Taxonomy on Translation of Literary Texts A Case Study of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*. 2 (12): 280-284.
- Amirdabbaghian, A. 2019. Ideological perspectives in the Persian translations of animal farm and nineteen eighty-four. Ph.D. diss., Universiti Malaya.
- Amirdabbaghian, Amin and Shunmugam, Krishnavanie. 2019a. The Translator's Ideology: A Study of Three Persian Translations of George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four. *Lebende Sprachen: Zeitschrift für interlinguale und interkulturelle Kommunikation*. 64 (1): 1-22. doi: 10.1515/les-2019-0001
- Amirdabbaghian, Amin and Shunmugam, Krishnavanie. 2019b. An Inter-semiotic Study of Ideology on the Book Covers of Persian Translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. *Ilha do Desterro: Revista Língua Inglesa, Literaturas em Inglês e Estudos Culturais*. 72(2), 225-244. doi: 10.5007/2175-8026.2019v72n2p225
- Anvari, Haleh. 2018. Translating Life in Iran. *Roads and Kingdoms*. Available online at <https://roadsandkingdoms.com/2018/translating-life-in-iran/> (accessed 20 May 2023).
- Baker, Mona. 2006/2019. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Brown, Roland Elliott. 2014. Orwell: A Writer for Iran. *IranWire*. Available online at <https://iranwire.com/en/features/629> (accessed 24 May 2023).
- Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran (1979, November 15). The Guardian Council of the Constitution: <http://nazarat.shora-rc.ir/> (accessed May 26, 2023)
- Corrective Resolution: Goals, Policies and Rules for Publishing Books (2010, April 13). Office of Book and Reading Development, Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance: <https://ketab.farhang.gov.ir/fa/principles/principles89> (accessed April 8, 2023)
- Eagleton, Terry. 1991. *Ideology. An Introduction*. New York: Verso.
- Fadzeli, Mahmud (2012) روایتی تازه از شکنجه در زندان های شاه (A New Narrative of Torture in the Shah's Prisons). *Oral History Weekly*, 10-13.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2010. *Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Farahzad, Farzaneh. 2012. Translation Criticism: A Three-Dimensional (Model Based on CDA). *Translation Studies*. 9, 27-44.
- Fawcett, Peter. 1998. Ideology and Translation. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. M. Baker. 106-111. London: Routledge.

- Fischer, Michael. M J. 2003. *Iran: From Religious Dispute to Revolution*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Freedon, Michael. 2003. *Ideology: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gellately, Robert. 2013. *Stalin's Curse: Battling for Communism in War and Cold War* (Vol. 1st). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Girgis, Monique. 1996. *Women in pre-revolutionary, revolutionary and post-revolutionary Iran*. Iran Chamber Society: http://www.iranchamber.com/society/articles/women_prepost_revolutionary_iran2.php (accessed January 14, 2023)
- Habibi, Mojtaba. 2003. قلعه حیوانات: تمثیل تاریخی یا تاریخ تمثیلی [Animal Castle: Historical allegory or allegorical History]. *Adabiyat-e Dastani*. 71, 16-18.
- Haddadian-Moghaddam, Esmaeil. 2014. *Literary Translation in Modern Iran: A Sociological Study*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hart, Christopher. 2014. *Discourse, Grammar and Ideology: Functional and Cognitive Perspectives*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Hassani, Alireza. 2015. *Censorship of Poetry in Post-Revolutionary Iran (1979 to 2014), Growing up with Censorship (A Memoir), and The Kindly Interrogator (A Collection of Poetry)*. [Doctoral Thesis] Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Newcastle University.
- Hatim, Basil and Mason, Ian. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Haynes, John. 1989. *Introducing Stylistics*. London: Hyman.
- Hermans, Theo. 1999/2020. *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Hosseini, Ruhollah. 2004. چهارده سال رقابت ایدئولوژیک شیعه در ایران (1343 - 1356) [Fourteen years ideological contest of Shiites in Iran]. Tehran: Islamic Revolution Document Center.
- House, Juliane., Ruano, Rosario Martín., and Baumgarten, Nicole. 2005. *Translation and the construction of identity*. International Association for Translation and Intercultural Studies. Seoul: IATIS Yearbook Vol. 1.
- Islami, Majid. 2003. درباره ترجمه های 1984 [About 1984 Translations]. *Haft*, 12-13.
- Islamic Consultative Assembly. 1991, November 28. *Islamic Penal Code of Iran*, The Guardian Council of the Constitution: <http://www.shora-gc.ir/portal/Home/ShowPage.aspx> (accessed September 19, 2023)
- Izadi, Mostafa. 2013. گزارش یک نشر [A Report of A Press]. *Shargh Daily*, 1. <http://magiran.com/n2805627> (accessed 3 November 2023)
- Karalus, Andrzej. 2013. The Origins of the Concept of Ideology. *Archive of the History of Philosophy and Social Thought*. 58, 131-149.
- Karimi-Hakkak, Ahmad, 2009. Persian Tradition. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. M, Baker & G, Saldanha. 493-501. Abingdon, United Kingdom: Routledge.

- Khoi, Esmail. 2009. میز گردی با شما (A Roundtable with You). (Falahati, M. Interviewer) Voice of America (VOA).
- Khorsand, Majid. and Salmani, Bahloul. 2014. Anthems as Propaganda: A Discoursal Translation Quality Assessment. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*. 5(3), 222-237.
- Khoshnam, Ellaheh. 2009. گل گشت بهاری در کوچه پس کوچه های شعر فارسی [Spring Flowers in the Alleys of Persian Poetry]. Deutsche Welle: <http://p.dw.com/p/HDrD>. (accessed February 27, 2023)
- Khoshsaligheh, Masood. and Ameri, Saeed. 2016. Ideological Considerations in Official Dubbing in Iran. *Altre modernità/ Otras modernidades/ Autres modernités/ Other Modernities* (Special Issue). 232-250. doi:10.13130/2035-7680/6864.
- Kifner, John. 1984. Iran: Obsessed with Martyrdom. *The New York Times Magazine*. 36.
- Klimovich, Natalya V. 2016. Manipulative Strategies in the Translations of Literary Texts Carried Out in the Soviet Union. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences* 3. (9): 543-550.
- Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge
- Makus, Anne. 1990 Stuart Hall's Theory of Ideology: A Frame for Rhetorical Criticism. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*. 54, 459-514.
- Mansourabadi, Fatemeh. and Karimnia, Amin. 2013. The impact of ideology on lexical choices in literary translation: A case study of *A Thousand Splendid Suns*. *Akdeniz Language Studies Conference 2012*. 70. 777-786. Antalya: Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.123.
- Martin, John. Levi. 2015. What is Ideology?. *Sociologia, Problemas E Práticas*. 77, 9-31.
- McWilliams, Wilson. Carey. George Orwell and Ideology. *Front Porch Republic*, Available online at <https://www.frontporchrepublic.com/2011/06/george-orwell-and-ideology/> (accessed 29 July, 2023).
- Merriam-Webster Inc. 2018. *Merriam Webster Dictionary Revised Edition*. Massachusetts: Merriam-Webster Publishing company.
- Milani, Abbas. 2011. *The Shah*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mirabedini, Hassan. 1998. صد سال داستان نویسی ایران [A Hundred Years of Fiction Writing in Iran]. Tehran: Cheshmeh Publication.
- Mollanazar, Hussein. 2011. Text Screening (Censorship) in Iran: A Historical Perspective. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*. 3(2), 159-186.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2007. The Relation of Style and Ideology in Translation: A Case Study of Harriet de Onís. *Actas del III Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Ibérica de Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación. La traducción del futuro: mediación lingüística y cultural en el siglo XXI. Barcelona 22-24 de Marzo de 2007*, Barcelona: PPU. Vol. n. ° 1. 57-68.
- Naghme-Abbaspour, Bitā. .2020. The Impact of Dominant Ideology on Front Covers of Translation of Children's Literature in Iran. *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews*. 8(3), 480-488. doi: 10.18510/hssr.2020.8352.

- Orwell, George. 1945. *Animal Farm*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Orwell, George. 1969. *Animal Farm*. Trans. Amir Amirshahi. Tehran: Franklin Publishing Center.
- Orwell, George. 2003. *Animal Farm*. Trans. Saleh Hosseini and Masoumeh Nabi Zadeh. Tehran: Doostan Publication.
- Patrikarakos, David. 2009. The last days of Iran under the Shah. *The Financial Times: International Edition*: <https://www.ft.com/content/509f5672-f261-11dd-9678-0000779fd2ac>. (accessed October 19, 2023).
- Rajabzadeh, Ahmad. 2002. ۱۴۰۰ سند ممیزی کتاب در سال ۱۳۷۵ [Book Momayyezi: Research on 1400 book momayyezi documents in 1996]. Tehran: Kavir.
- Ramazani, Mohammad Ali. 2009. من یک ممیز بودم [I was a momayyez]. *Etemad Melli Daily*. (Gholami, A. Interviewer). Tehran, Iran. (accessed October 15, 2023).
- Russell, Diana Elizabeth Hamilton. 1974. *Rebellion, Revolution, and Armed Force: A Comparative Study of Fifteen Countries with Special Emphasis on Cuba and South Africa*. New York: Academic Press.
- Salehi, Anush. 2003. *راوی بهاران [Narrator of Spring]*. Tehran: Qatreh.
- Senn, Samantha. 2015. All Propaganda is Dangerous, but Some Are More Dangerous than Others: George Orwell and the Use of Literature as Propaganda. *Journal of Strategic Security* 8. 149-161. doi: 10.5038/1944-0472.8.3S.1483
- Seyyedi, Reza. 2013. The Ideological Perspective towards Literary Translation: A Discourse Analysis of George Orwell's 1984 (the novel) and Its Three English into Persian Translations. Master Dissertation., Islamic Azad University.
- Shoqi, N. 2017. نویسنده‌ی بریتانیایی محبوب ایرانی‌ها [Iranian's Favourite British Writer]. *Underline Art Magazine*. 1: <https://iran.britishcouncil.org/underline/literature/george-orwell> (accessed May 03, 2023).
- Shahsavar, Zahra, and Mehdizadeh Naderi, Mohammad Sadegh. 2015. Investigating the Influence of Ideology on Translation: A Critical Discourse Analysis of "A Tale of Two Cities" and Its Persian Translations. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 3(1), 35-48.
- The Iran Project. 2016. Shah's escape; last step toward Islamic Revolution. *The Iran Project - News related to Iran, specially political, military and regional affairs!*: <http://theiranproject.com/blog/2016/01/16/shahs-escape-last-step-toward-islamic-revolution/>. (accessed January 29, 2023).
- Van Dijk, Teun. Adrianus. 1993. Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society*. 4(2), 249-283.
- Van Dijk, Teun. Adrianus. 1995. Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. In *Language and Peace*. Ed. C. Schäffner and A. L. Wenden. 17-33. Dartmouth: Aldershot.
- Van Dijk, Teun. Adrianus. 1998/2007. *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. New York: Sage.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995/2018. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London & New York: Routledge.

Ideological Perspectives in Two Selected Persian Translations of George
Orwell's *Animal Farm*

- Weede, Erich, and Edward. N Muller. 1998. Rebellion, Violence and Revolution: A Rational Choice Perspective. *Journal of Peace Research*. 35(1), 43-59, Sage Publications Ltd.
- Wright, Will. 2001. *The Wild West: The Mythical Cowboy and Social Theory*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9781446217177.
- Yazdanimogaddam, Masoud, and Fakher, Mostafa. 2011. Examining the Effect of Ideology and Idiosyncrasy on Lexical Choices in Translation Studies within the CDA Framework. *Journal of English Studies*. 1 (3): 27-36.
- رکتر صالح حسینی [Dr. Saleh Hosseini]. n.d. from the website of Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran: <http://portal.scu.ac.ir/HomePage.aspx?TabID=4889&Site=Lite.scu.ac&Lang=fa-IR> (accessed October 11, 2023).