



**An Najah National University
Faculty of Graduate Studies**

**THE TRANSLATION OF THE DISCOURSE OF
THE SOCIAL RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION
IN GEORGE ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM*
BEFORE AND AFTER THE ARAB SPRING**

**By
Randa Mahmoud Samara**

**Supervisor
Dr. Mohammed Hamdan**

**This Thesis is Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Applied Linguistics and Translation, Faculty of Graduate Studies,
An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.**

2022

**THE TRANSLATION OF THE DISCOURSE OF
THE SOCIAL RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION
IN GEORGE ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM*
BEFORE AND AFTER THE ARAB SPRING**

**By
Randa Mahmoud Samara**

This Thesis was Defended Successfully on 29/06/2022 and approved by:

Dr. Mohammed Hamdan

Supervisor

Dr. Rami Qawariq

External Examiner

Dr. Nabil Alawi

Internal Examiner



Three handwritten signatures in blue ink, each on a horizontal line. The first signature is the most stylized, the second is more legible, and the third is also stylized.

Dedication

I dedicate this study to my parents, who have been my source of inspiration and strength throughout this research.

Acknowledgments

Words cannot express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Mohammad Hamdan for his invaluable support, patience, and feedback.

I would also like to give special thanks to my family and my friends for their continuous support and understanding when undertaking my research, particularly my dear friend Shams.

Finally, I would like to thank God, for letting me through all the difficulties. I have experienced your guidance day by day

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that I submitted the thesis entitled:

THE TRANSLATION OF THE DISCOURSE OF THE SOCIAL RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION IN GEORGE ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM* BEFORE AND AFTER THE ARAB SPRING

I declare that the work provided in this thesis, unless otherwise referenced, is the researcher's own work, and has not been submitted elsewhere for any other degree or qualification.

Student's Name:

Randa Mahmoud Samara

Signature:

Randa Samara

Date:

26/06/2022

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	ii
Acknowledgments	iv
Declaration.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Tables	viii
Abstract.....	ix
Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	5
1.3 Purpose of the Study	6
1.4 Research Questions.....	6
1.5 Scope of the study.....	7
1.6 Significance of the Study.....	7
Chapter Two: Literature Review	8
2.1 Marxist Translation.....	8
2.2 Mode of Production and Translation	12
2.3 Relations of Production and Translation	15
2.4 Arab Ideology, Translation and Orwell	18
2.5 Translating Orwell: Economic and Political Concerns.....	22
2.6 A Brief Overview of the Arabic Translations of Animal Farm.....	24
Chapter Three: Methodology	26
3.1 Type of Study.....	26
3.2 Research Data	27
3.3 Data Collection	28
3.4 Data Analysis.....	28
Chapter Four: Data Analysis	32
4.1 Introduction.....	32
4.2 Terror	33
4.3 Slavery and Hard Work	36
4.4 Hunger	39
4.5 Struggle for Peace and Freedom.....	40
4.6 Cult of Personality and Praise.....	43
4.7 Dispute among Rulers.....	45

4.8 Religion as a Relation of Production	46
Chapter Five: Conclusion & Recommendations.....	49
4.1 Conclusion	49
5.2 Recommendations.....	50
List of Abbreviations	51
References.....	52
الملخص	ب

List of Tables

Table (1): Terror	33
Table (2): Slavery and Hard Work	36
Table (3): Hunger.....	39
Table (4): Struggle for Peace and Freedom	41
Table (5): Cult of Personality and Praise.....	43
Table (6): Dispute among Rulers	45
Table (7): Religion as a Relation of Production	47

THE TRANSLATION OF THE DISCOURSE OF THE SOCIAL RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION IN GEORGE ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM* BEFORE AND AFTER THE ARAB SPRING

By
Randa Mahmoud Samara
Supervisor
Dr. Mohammed Hamdan

Abstract

The ideology of the translators could influence their translations. Therefore, it is important to investigate the degree to which ideology manipulates the literary text and its social, cultural, and political dimensions. In the Arab world, the economic and socio-political scene has been constantly changing since the outbreak of the Arab Spring. This change has influenced Arab countries in many ways, including textual production, translation, and the writers' use of language. Arab writers were encouraged to produce discourses that attempt to explain the causes and effects of those revolutions that swept different regions in the Arab world (Mohammed Masbah, 2021).

This study aims to describe the ideological impact of the economic and socio-political revolution in the Arab world on the translation of the discourse of the relations of production in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945) into Arabic.

This research will apply Peter Newmark's translation strategies to highlight and discuss the differences between the source text and target texts. The target texts which have been chosen for the current research are *Mazrait Al-Haywanat*, which was translated by Shamil Abatha before the Arab Spring in 2009, and *Mazrait Al-Haywan*, which was translated by Mahmoud Abdel Ghani after the Arab Spring in 2013.

This research makes an effort to prove that the translators' ideology influenced by their economic and socio-political situation and environment in the target language country may be revealed in the set of strategies used in translating *Animal Farm* in terms of the use of language and the *re*-interpretation of the ideology embodied in the original text.

Keywords: Discourse, Social Relations, Animal Farm, Arab Spring.

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

This research examines the Arabic translations of the discourse of the relations of production in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945) before and after the Arab Spring, which began in 2010 in response to the archaic political systems of oppressive Arab regimes and the low economic standards of living. The constant feeling of rising against the Arab political systems which were fostered by authoritarian regimes prompted an energetic, change-oriented young generation to revolt against stagnant socio-political infrastructures in order to secure a promising future for Arab nations east and west. In this Arab widespread revolution, the spirit of Marxist political theories was significantly put back on the top agendas of the overheating protests. It is true that protestors did not hold pictures of Marx and his companion, Friedrich Engels, yet the soul of the revolution and the various acts of communal protests could be characterized as Marxist in soul and heart. The fact that the Arab crowds constantly showed a highly developed and organized sense of mass power, expressed their political and economic dissatisfaction creatively and displayed an unwavering sense of exuberance and confidence in their defiance against the regime brutality, reawakened the image of Marx as the leader of the revolutions and his powerful denunciation of the unfair distribution of modes of production as the necessary intellectual food giving vitality to the uprising hungry masses.

In documenting the hunger of the masses for freedom, George Orwell in *Animal Farm* also sheds light on the corrupted aspects of the relations of production such as the abuse of political power, social exploitation, social dissension, and psychosocial manipulation. He also warns us against the underlying consequences of pursuing the same path. In this narrative, Orwell clearly states that violence and the misuse of power incur nothing but hatred and more violence on the part of animals which thought they were finally liberated from the yokes of human oppression. By bespeaking the necessity of breaking the lifelong chains of relations of production within which workers are kept in poverty as "such low animals that they would be dangerous if they had leisure; it is safer to keep them too busy to think" (Orwell, 1933, p. 142). Here, Orwell's criticism of the unjust economic and political system of totalitarian regimes that force the proletariat into a constant state of drudgery also carries the revolutionary seeds of the Marxist socialist spirit. Although

Orwell never announced himself as a Marxist, he gave Marx generous credit for his speaking and writing the stringent workings of the capitalist profit system.

Orwell's declaration of Marx and his philosophies as a source of hate that endangers the economic and political status quo of "politicians, priests, judges, moralists and millionaires" manifests itself in different universal contexts. Orwell's writing against oppression in *Animal Farm*, in other words, can easily foreshadow the political humdrums and economic hustles that both preceded and followed the beginning of the Arab Spring in Tunisia in 2010. In fact, the actions of *Animal Farm* find a prototypical home in the Arab world during the uprisings. The impact of Orwell's text on the Arab world during its uprising can be even traced to the industry of translation. The direct influence of Orwell's narrative on the protestors' thinking and orientation cannot necessarily be confirmed; however, the spirit of Orwell's socialist ideologies has come to form the impetus of political and economic causes for change in Arab nations. If we take into consideration the translation of Orwell's novel after the Arab Spring, we can easily trace the impact of the Orwellian voice within the lines that carry defiance, resistance and subversion. This research explores two selected translations of *Animal Farm* from English to Arabic before and after the revolution, with a particular focus on the rendition of the textual relations of production to cite the changes in both texts.

Overall, Orwell's text is well received in the Arab political scene that has been overheating with the public passion for democratic change that is ideologically fueled by class conflict, which is an ancient conflict that has existed in the history of all societies, as argued by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in *The Communist Manifesto*:

Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-masters and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes. In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters,

journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations. (1848, p.33-34)

In capitalist systems across time and place, the society is divided into two classes that exist in perpetual conflict with each other: bourgeoisie and proletariat. The bourgeoisie owns the means of production, the capital, and the profit. They continuously and mercilessly exploit the lower class to work and perpetuate the process of production without necessarily providing the means of an equal and fair life to the proletarians in return for their work. As a result, the proletarians live in great poverty and become constantly poorer and weaker because the profits of their production go to the bourgeoisie who become constantly stronger and richer. In the words of Lenin,

the relations in this industry are bourgeois [...] We see how a minority, owning larger and more profitable establishments, accumulate 'savings', while the majority are ruined [...] It is obvious and inevitable that the latter should be enslaved to the former – inevitable precisely because of the capitalist character of the given production relations (1893-1894, p. 216).

Lenin's powerful statement leaves no doubt that the main problem of class conflict does not only lie in workers' exploitation and oppression but also in the wicked, methodological and scientific arrangement of power relations within the process of production. Capitalist systems, as noted by Lenin, bind workers to a certain economic contract in which they continually submit to the law of the machine that ties and calculates their changes and motions. While this scientific system increases capital profits for owners and leaders in a dramatic way, it only leads to huge layoffs of workers who "get a wage increase at first. But hundreds of workers get the sack. Those who are left have to work four times more intensively, doing a back-breaking job [...] Only young and sturdy workers are taken on" (1912-1913, p. 595). The capitalist exploitation of workers embodies itself in making these workers believe that they no longer do the same amount of work under the same traditional forms and conditions of their previous enslavement. By introducing machines, for example, workers tend to think some work pressures and exploitation are already eliminated whereas they are truly not. Workers, to put it differently, never gain benefits or enjoy the surplus-value of their mechanical work. The enormous economic pleasures of the workers' usurious extortion pour in capitalist pockets while huge parts of workers' wages are methodically lost without protest.

One of the features that distinguishes capitalist systems from any other previous modes of production is that the bourgeoisie is constantly revolutionizing the forces of production (labor, instruments, and raw material) and thereby the relations of production (the social structures that regulate the relationship between humans in the production of goods). This, according to Marx and Engels, will lead to the destruction of capitalism:

modern bourgeois society, with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells (1848, p.41).

In other words, the proletariat will become more conscious and develop the necessary awareness required to initiate a revolution and break the shackles of the “relations of production” to pursue the ultimate endeavor of creating a society in which all people are equal. This desire for breaking the ever-present codes of capital production and the imbalanced relations between workers and capitalists is also centralized in Orwell’s text, which can arguably be seen as an authentic reflection of the Arab Spring in Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, and Syria. The Arab revolutions, on the one hand, were the result of the accumulated difficulties in establishing financial justice, mending the absence of proper education, recognizing the hollowness of the economic system, and neglecting the corruption in the political leadership in these countries, which were unable to address such problems in an adequate and effective way. On the other hand, these revolutions were a result of external factors, foreign interference in Arab domestic affairs, either directly in the form of military oppression and/or indirectly due to the influence of Western cultures, epistemology and media on the lifestyles and thinking of Arab individuals who experience oppression on a daily basis. Here, one has to consider the place of translation as an effective medium for the communication of political ideologies and economic philosophies. If we, for instance, take the translation of Orwell’s *Animal Farm* into account, we can note that Orwell’s original text functions as a political prophecy for revolutions that continue to send messages about the tragedy of working classes across time and place. The translation of Orwell’s novel brought this prophecy in question closer to the minds and hearts of Arab readers who can simply create links between the events of the Arab Spring and the symbolic fictionalized action of *Animal*

Farm, a novel of all time. In pointing out the value of translation as a powerful tool for change, Tahir-Gurcaglar argues in her study *The Translation Bureau Revisited: Translation as Symbol* that “translation is political because, both as activity and product, it displays process of negotiation among different agents. On micro-level, these agents are translators, authors, critics, publishers, editors, and readers” (2003, p. 113).

Animal Farm was a vital and major criticism of the Soviet Union. It points out the deviation of Communism by showing how the leaders seized, manipulated, and abused their power in pursuit of self-establishment when paying the price of social corruption that extends to all aspects of life. The translation of Orwell’s political and socialist philosophy from English to Arabic could emanate from a general necessity to realize the inner workings of authoritarian systems and to build up aggression against the unchangeability of these systems that are described by the young Arab generation as parasitical. The first translation the researcher examines in this research is done by Shamel Abatha, published for the first time by Dar Shorouk in Egypt in 2009. The other translation is carried out by Mahmoud Abdel Ghani and was published by the Arab Cultural Center in Morocco and Lebanon in 2014. The two Arabic translations were first published in different political eras. While Abatha’s translation was published before the Arab Spring, Abdel Ghani’s translation appeared after the Arab Spring. This study investigates the potential political and ideological influences on both translations.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Animal Farm has an impact on our contemporary political and social reality. It outlines the nature of relations of production in the political scene in the Arab world by shedding light on the process by which a minority owns and controls the means of production and creates dictatorial totalitarian regimes which continue to impose a politics of inequality, corruption, horrification, death, and despair on their citizens. The State, along with its means of production, turns into a set of private properties of the bourgeoisie.

Translating this novel requires a vast knowledge of the linguistic devices of the ST and their functions to understand the information conveyed in the ST. This translation also requires that the translator knows how to transfer that information using the appropriate linguistic devices of the target language. Translating this text without caring about the linguistic devices used would cause distortion of the information conveyed in the ST.

Thus, this study probes the authenticity of Abatha's and Abdel Ghani's translations by exploring how accurate their translations are and examining whether both translations are influenced by a certain political logic or social environments during the act of translation. In order to do so, the researcher looks into the changes that happened in the translations of Orwell's novel before and after the Arab Spring by focusing on the type of language that reflects different kinds of relations of production.

A fundamental issue must be addressed here, namely, reading/ translating a text is governed by the spatiotemporal realities. There are other variables that may influence a translation in addition to time and place; the translator's commission or brief, his/her education, the translation approach, among other factors. With or without the Arab Spring, a difference in translation is bound to happen. Yet, the influence of the Arab Spring is specified among other realities in this study.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate how the translators translated the different relations of production in *Animal Farm*. The study will show how the economic and socio-political contexts before and after the Arab Spring influenced the mode of both translations. My emphasis on translating the relations of production stems from the importance of understanding the rich impact of these relations on the outbreak of the revolution and their associations with the buried causes of the Arab Spring. Studying the equivalence between the source text and the translated texts is the main concern of this research. This will be based on both linguistic and ideological aspects of the source text and Abatha's and Abdel Ghani's translations.

1.4 Research Questions

There are three research questions that guide this study:

1. What are the strategies used in translating relations of production from the ST to the TTs?
2. Does the economic and socio-political contexts before and after the Arab Spring influence the translators' view in the translation?
3. How did the translators' economic and socio-political contexts interfere with their choices of such strategies in translating the ST?

1.5 Scope of the study

This study explores the relations of production in Orwell's *Animal Farm* and their Arabic translations in pre- and post-Arab Spring. The Farm in *Animal Farm* is a virtual place that reflects socio-political issues related to the relations of production in Arab countries. The translations under consideration are only two Arabic translations of Orwell's text. TT1 was translated before Arab Spring and TT2 was translated after Arab Spring. This study focuses on the linguistic and ideological differences between the two translated texts by comparing sentences that reflect different types of relations of production.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The reason for choosing *Animal Farm* is the elaborate depiction of the consequences of political conflict that essentially outlines the nature of Orwell's representation of the liminal space within a simple small farm. More importantly, this text pinpoints how economic and socio-political tensions quickly emerged when the reactions of the oppressed animals were aimed at the superficial outcomes of their social and political conflict with the ruling regime rather than the essence of the conflict per se. If the oppressed, by a means of analogy, overthrow tyrannical presidents, they do not necessarily get rid of tyrannical regimes, and therefore fail to establish a democratic alternative to Arab tyranny. The animals' revolution against the owner of the farm, Mr. Jones, is very similar to the revolutions that took place in the Arab Spring against the dictatorial and totalitarian regimes. On the one hand, a faithful translation of *Animal Farm* can be considered a powerful weapon to change the Arab corrupt societies by challenging and motivating readers to question the different experiences of political prejudice and economic injustice across the globe. On the other hand, an unfaithful translation could be misleading and perpetuate political and social problems.

This research contributes to a pivotal understanding of the ideological and textual equivalence of content related to a common understanding of the relations of production that shape social and economic structures in contemporary regimes. It summarizes and describes strategies employed in both translations.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.1 Marxist Translation

Animal Farm occupies a controversial critical position in the field of political literature. Orwell's satirical and allegorical novella unravels the essential reality of the most notorious political systems in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, namely, the Soviet regime which claims to feed on the Marxist philosophy of class formation, public economic wealth and political struggle. Marx's political philosophies did not only find means of expression in theoretical books, pamphlets and newspapers but also in translation. Translation, in particular, becomes a powerful media that offers easy shipping of Marx's ideas around the globe. In fact, translation has a vital role in the construction and proliferation of Marxist theory. Along the same lines, Orwellian criticism of the double-faced communist regimes also leaves significant marks on different international contexts due to translation. This sub-section examines translation as both a practice and a concept-metaphor in Marx's theory.

It is particularly important to mention that there is no approach called Marxist Translation. It is an ideology that constrains the flow of information so that the spirit of the text is Marxist. A Marxist translation is so-called not only because it is a translation Marx's works. A Marxist translation is a translation that investigates ideological struggles between hegemonic and counter hegemonic forces for the ownership of means of production and translational decisions of the target text. Hegemonic forces in source texts justify that the social, political, and economic status quo is natural, inevitable, perpetual and beneficial for everyone. Yet, Marxist translators seek to highlight that this social, political, and economic status quo is not natural but an artificial social construct that benefits only the ruling class. Translators do so by identifying and interrogating the contradictions that exist within capitalism in source texts and by being the voice of the counter hegemonic forces such as the working class or the poor. Marxist translation seeks also to find how textual features in relation to translational criticism aim to influence the reception of the target text to establish a particular translation of a certain text as the only correct translation.

Translation has a vital role in the construction and proliferation of Marxist theory. Nergis Ertürk and Özge Serin state that Karl Marx is a translator working across Russian, German, French, and English; in addition, he has an intimate knowledge of the European classical Languages (2016, p.8-9). This trans-national knowledge allows him to move between languages, cultures and political contexts in a way that facilitates the progress of his ideologies by a means of translation. He uses translation as a methodological approach in his criticism of classical political economy. Ertürk and Serin explain that his critiques of the works of British and French classical political economy are established in his translations of the classical political economy extracts (2016, p.8). In brief, being multilingual enables Marx to find and expose the contradictions of the works of classical political economy, which subsequently guides him toward composing his ideology, namely, Marxism.

Louis Althusser and Étienne Balibar (1970) state that Marx was reading classical political economy while taking into consideration its omission and oversight of some important issues. To be more exact, Marx claims that classical political economy was noted for “its blindness” and its failure to name other essential class-and-labor-related matters due to “its silent vision” (1970, p.17-25). Althusser and Balibar explain that Marx, in his book *Capital* (1867), for instance, observes that classical political economy emphasizes the determination of the value of labor by the value of commodities which controls “the maintenance and reproduction of laborer” (1970, p.21). Marx notes that classical political economy pointed toward the concept of “labor-power”, yet it failed to name what it saw by signifying the impetus or essence of this power. Marx, therefore, coins the missing concept in classical political economy and distinctly names it “labor-power”, a term which also extends to suggest that translation is a condition of possibility for his critique of classical political economy. It is a condition of possibility because translation can be used as a tool either to maximize the position of the bourgeoisie or to relieve and unbound the working classes. In other words, translation is subjected to changeability as it can be used to establish and sustain a system or to resist another. Therefore, Marxist translation can be used as a tool of resistance against capitalism.

Translation in Marxist philosophy, on the other hand, emerges as a practice that estranges the STs of classical political economy by exposing the gap between its concepts and the role they serve. For example, Marx’s translations modify the difference between labor

mentioned in classical political economy and labor power. He marks that labor power refers to the personality of the laborer and labor refers to the work a laborer performs to produce certain goods or to provide services. In this context, Althusser and Balibar make an analogy between drama and classical political economy in which the characters/concepts are nameless, and there is a dislocation between the characters/concepts and their roles. He suggests that Marx's translation exposes the gap between the name of the concepts and the role they play in the ST, allowing him to supplement them in the TT (1970, p.30). In the Marxist translation of literary texts, namelessness is also an important factor because namelessness denies referentiality. In other words, by unmanning characters in novels, plays or short stories, a Marxist translator subverts the traditional class-based associations between a certain character's description and actions and the role it performs in the literary text. This means that characters do not have direct references in terms of names of labour, class or roles because these concepts are detached from characters' places and names in the literary text.

On the other hand, translation develops as a concept-metaphor in Marx's works. Ertürk and Serin illustrate that Marx's critical body of philosophy highlights that translation is the origin of the capitalist constitution of reality. Marx states that in order for a commodity to appear in the world that overheats with production and consumption, it must expose itself in the "commodity-language". For example, in order for the (value soul) to appear in the world of commodities, it must be translated into a coat (value body) (2016, p.13). In this context, Werner Hamacher argues that there is a statement of equivalence between the value soul and the value body; for example, "20 yards of linen = 1 coat" (Cited in Ertürk and Serin, 2016, p.13). He further notes that this transformation of commodity language is not just a language of exchange but also a language "of turning, of reversal, of specular inversion" (ibid). To put it differently, the source text is the value soul which must be translated into the commodity language/the target text (value body) in order to appear in the world of commodities. This translation, however, cannot simply be a representation of the spirit, language and ideology of the source text which the translator remolds into the commodious statements in the target language. A translation, to put it differently, might purposefully encompass insertions of certain ideologies which might conform to or rebel against the dominant ideology of the target culture. This, according to Ertürk and Serin, will result in a translation with a "fetish" character as its true content

is “altered” or “veiled” by the radical transformation of the ST (2016, p.14). In the words of Edwin Gentzler,

inescapable infidelity is presumed as a condition of the process; translators do not work in ideal and abstract situations nor desire to be innocent, but have vested literary and cultural interests of their own, and want their work to be accepted within another culture. Thus they manipulate the source text to inform as well as to conform to the existing cultural constraints (2001, p.131).

This indicates, in the words of Susan Bassnett, that “there can never be sameness in translation, for as a text moves across languages, so it is decoded and re-encoded, dismembered and re-membered, reshaped and remade into a new original to be read anew” (2013, p.165). This implies that the relationship between the ST and the TT is incomplete. Consequently, a Marxist translator seeks to look for this incompleteness to expose it.

Marx finally argues that translation/production is a process of transforming the “visible” relations of production into “invisible” relations between products/texts. The translated text/commodity is an animated object that is “imbued with souls” captured from translator’s/laborer’s human bodies. This animated body veils the producers and the relations of production that animate it, and acts as if it is the source of its movement in the social sphere (cited in Ertürk and Serin, 2016, p.15). The translated text then is a textual commodity that is offered as the original or source product. This eliminates or suppresses the laborer’s or original writer’s body/voice. In *Capital I*, Marx writes that:

the mysterious character of the commodity-form consists therefore simply in the fact that the commodity reflects the social characteristics of men’s own labour as objective characteristics of the products of labour themselves, as the socio-natural properties of these things. Hence, it also reflects the social relation of the producers to the sum total of labour as a social relation between objects, a relation which exists apart from and outside the producers (1992, p.164-165).

To put it differently, the translated texts use objective language that conceals, obscures, and veils the reality of the prevailing mode of production. Thus, translation is considered

a process inherent in the capitalist constitution of reality because it silences and objectifies the original meaning of labour and labour power in the name of capitalist profit and dominant relations of production. However, one may argue that the nature of translation and writing, in general, is a process that is truly cannibalistic, and that the translators must be stuck with the original source text. Many translators and translation scholars prefer to be literal and not to “alter” the original which is the “pure” according to them. But, the researcher believes that word for word translation is problematic because it does not give us the opportunity to reveal and unfold the gaps and the incomplete essences in the body of the source text in terms of hegemonic relations.

2.2 Mode of Production and Translation

Textual analysis in modern Western critical thought is not confined to the theoretical readings and propositions of poststructuralists such as Jacques Derrida, stylistists such as Roman Jakobson, or structuralists such as Algirdas Julien Greimas. Other theories and conceptual frameworks can also be employed to study literary texts from social, economic, and political points of view. These points of view are rooted in an epistemological vision that extends from Karl Marx to the modern functions and use of “Structural Marxism” which, according to Friedrich Engels, posits that the state regulates class conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and functions to serve the latter. With regard to this vision, the Anglo-American school comes with contributions to literary criticism influenced by the foundations of Marxist philosophical thought which realizes that texts do not occur in a vacuum, but are the products of social, economic and political ideological settings. Among the critics of this school is Terry Eagleton, who identifies the constituent elements of Marxist social theory in literature based on “General Mode of production”, “Literary mode of production”, “General Ideology”, and “Authorial Ideology” (1976, p.44). These terminologies, according to Eagleton, refer to the factors that must be taken into consideration while relating the source text to the context where it was produced. Thus, his critical theory is embodied in the analysis of the ideology of a particular mode of production that characterizes and dominates the ideology of the literary text.

Marx defined ideology as the system of illusionary beliefs that is characterized by the dominant class or classes to perfect the illusions that a class has about itself and typically function to mystify, for all classes in that society, their self-understanding, and their

understanding of social reality. The mystification typically functions in such a way that it is protective of the society's economic structures, and with that, of the interests of the ruling class. (Kai Nielsenm, 1989, p. 147)

Marx suggests that ideology is related to power and hegemony as ruling classes manipulate certain modes of production to secure their power from the constant intervention or possible inclusion of other classes. Ideology is, therefore, manipulative and propagates misguided beliefs. In order to perpetuate its self-sufficiency and continuity, the ruling class controls the modes of production in a certain society. Controlling these modes of production grants the ruling class easy access to the maintenance of economic and socio-political stabilities. If we speak of writing and re-writing original texts into other languages, we can also argue that the process of translation transforms into a mode of production per se. Translation as a mode of production can be defined as a specific combination of forces and relations of production so organized that it can sustain the prevailing economic and socio-political system. Forces of production include not only translators, critics, reviewers, and teachers, but also persons and institutions that regulate and distribute the writing and rewriting of literature. Relations of production, which will be tackled under the next sub-heading, refer to the working relations between classes within the productive entity, or, for example, between censorship and translators. It is the combination of these forces and relations that determine and maintain the ideology of the ruling class; in this sense, literature and the translation of literature between languages become a powerful mode of production that stabilizes economic and political relations in capitalist societies. For example, translation is politically employed to create divisions and subdivisions within the society. Translation, for instance, becomes a tool of social entertainment that frustrates the proletariat as workers find themselves entrapped and located in translational ideologies in which poor characters remain poor and powerless; .wealthy characters powerful and richer. To borrow the words of Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere in the preface of *Translation/History/Culture* (1992),

Translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and in its

positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society. Rewritings can introduce new concepts, new genres, new devices, and the history of translation is the history also of literary innovation, of the shaping power of one culture upon another. But rewriting can also repress innovation, distort and contain, and in an age of ever increasing manipulation of all kinds, the study of the manipulative processes of literature as exemplified by translation can help us towards a greater awareness of the world in which we live.

Michael Ryan (2007) states that literature is one of the ways by which ideology is controlled and administered since it allows ideas to circulate widely in a community. To demonstrate this, Ryan contrasts the dominant ideologies of two different modes of production: feudalism and capitalism. Historically speaking, the feudal mode of production meant that the aristocracy and the Catholic Church in the Middle Ages in Western Europe instilled the concepts of loyalty, duty, fealty, and honor in the peasants. In this way, the aristocracy and the Catholic Church were able to retain their wealth by persuading the landless peasants to work and accept their situation (2007, p.116). In later centuries following the Industrial Revolution and the rise of a dominant scientific culture in the West, the bourgeoisie continued to reinforce individual freedom, political equality and economic competition through the use of different types of media such as literature, schools, and media to uphold their sovereignty on the one hand and reshape the social structure, on the other (2007, p.116).

In conclusion, if the writing of the original text is ideological, its rewriting is potentially even more ideological. Rewriting a text metaphorically gives it another life in a different time and space. The most obviously recognizable form of rewriting, according to Andre Lefevere, is translation. He states that “rewritings are inspired by ideological motivations, and produced under ideological constraints, depending on whether rewriters find themselves in agreement with the dominant ideology of their time or not” (1992, p.7). Lefevere then asserts that literature that goes against the prevailing ideology will be called “dissident”, and it will find great difficulty in getting published, or it will be relegated to the status of “low” or “popular” literature (1992, p.17). In this context, Shunyi Chen gives an example of a feudal society which was called Qing in which the landlord controlled both the means of material production and the means of intellectual production

including translation. Chen argues that the Qing government adopted a closed-door policy in which translation was banned. Chen added that

translation was associated with treacherous collusion with foreign countries and translators were equated with traitors. As such, translators often risked execution. This official attitude to translation and foreign language skills in general, led to a serious lack of foreign language talents in modern China, especially translators and interpreters. The few who translated or interpreted a foreign language were referred to as “通事” (tong shi, “linguists”) and invariably received a low salary and were of low social status (2017, p.316).

Therefore, translation is an instrument used by the prevailing mode of production to maintain prevailing power imbalances that typically exist between classes in society. In a feudal mode of production, as we see in Qing society, translation was prohibited and translators were seen as traitors. However, in the Capitalist mode of production, translation is used as a tool to instill the concepts of individual freedom, political equality, and economic competition.

2.3 Relations of Production and Translation

Relations of Production are defined by James Wright as the de facto power relationships that result from the division of the means of production in a society. They are the asymmetries of power between capitalists and workers, feudal lords and landless peasants, masters and slaves, or employers and employees (2015, p.715). According to the classical formulation of Marx, relations of production in a capitalist society divide individuals into two classes: the exploitative, identified with the bourgeoisie, and the exploited, represented by the working class. Marx states in his preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1970) that the consciousness and conduct of the workers are determined by their position in production relations:

In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which

arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness.

Marx adds that the bourgeoisie produces its ideology that misleads the consciousness of the working class. This ideology, according to Paul Gee, maintains the “distribution of social goods such as power, prestige, status, distinction, or wealth” (2010, p.9). One way to manifest, generate, and transfer this ideology is via translation which is considered by many scholars as an instrument for securing power for it is ideologically shaped by the relations of power and by struggles over power.

In *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation*, Andre Lefevere points to the relations of production between “patronage outside the literary system” and “professionals within the literary system”. He argues that patronage uses professionals to produce acceptable texts or criticism and provide them with acceptable interpretations. In fact, according to Lefevere, patrons have the power to censor and exclude the parts that do not conform to their own ideology (1992, p.15-16).

Lefevere introduces patronage as the powers from outside the literary system; persons (e.g. Louis XIV), groups of persons (e.g. religious body or social class), or media (e.g. newspapers and television). He adds that patronage is concerned with the ideology rather than the poetics of literature, and it can “further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature” (1992, p.15). Lefevere explains that patronage operates by institutions set up to regulate and distribute the writing or rewriting of literature such as academies, censorship bureaus, or educational institutions (1992, p.15).

In this context, Lawrence Venuti (2010) maintains that translation practice is guided by hermeneutic thinking. In his approach, translation is “an interpretation of the source text” (2010, p. 74). This refers to the important role of the dominant ideology of the ruling class in affecting understanding, interpreting, reproducing and receiving the source text. This also indicates that there could be different interpretations and translations of the source text according to the consciousness of the translators which could subsequently alter the source text:

Translating never gives back the source text unaltered. It can only inscribe an interpretation, one among many possibilities, through lexical and

syntactic choices that can alter source- textual features like meter and tone, point of view and characterization, narrative and genre, terminology and argument (Venuti 2010, p.74)

Lefevere then states that the patron(s) depend on the professionals within the literary system in transferring their ideology/ies (1992, p.15). Professionals within the literary system, according to Lefevere, are the critics, reviewers, teachers, and translators. He explained that they “repress certain works of literature that are all too blatantly opposed to the dominant” poetics or ideologies of their society. He added that the patron(s) will make the professionals rewrite and manipulate the source text until it is deemed acceptable to the dominant ideology and poetics of certain time and place (1992, p.14).

Lefevere (1992, p.16) refers to the three constituents of patronage as follows:

- The ideological components which are political sphere, grill work of form, convention, and belief which order our actions. They act as a constraint on the choice and development of both form and subject matters.
- The economic component refers to the payments made by patrons to writers and rewriters.
- The element of status: Acceptance of patronage implies integration into a certain support group and its lifestyles.

Lefevere stated that patronage could be differentiated or undifferentiated. It is undifferentiated when the three elements (ideological, economic, and status elements) are all provided by one person. However, it is differentiated when the ideological factor is independent of the economic success and does not bring status with it (1992, p.17).

Lefevere concludes that the most important consideration is the ideological one: “On every level of the translation process, it can be shown that, if linguistic considerations enter into conflict with considerations of an ideological and/or poetological nature, the latter tend to win out” (1992, p.39). It is clear then that the ideology of the patrons determines the translation policy for any translation project (Munday, 2008, p.197).

2.4 Arab Ideology, Translation and Orwell

According to Hasan Ghazala, “translation is generally used to refer to all the process and methods used to convey the meaning of the source language into the target language” (1995, p.12). Thus, understanding the meaning of the source language is vital to have an equivalent in the target language. However, Will Firth raises an important question here: “Do we really know how we translate or what we translate? Are we to accept “naked ideas” as the means of crossing from one language to another?” (cited in Mona Baker, 1991, p.7). Firth’s questioning of principles taken for granted led people to doubt and take enough distance to envision the limitations of some widespread concepts, such as equivalence. Thereafter, contemporary translation studies, which evolved in the second half of the twentieth century, examine the relationship between the production of the source text and its “transmission, relocation, and reinterpretation” (Valdeón, 2020, p. 1) in the target language. With this in mind, Román Alvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal argue that “the translator can artificially create the reception context of a given text. He can be the authority who manipulates the culture, politics, literature, and their acceptance (or lack thereof) in the target culture” (1996, p.2). This manipulation will result in a translation conceived, as Edward Said argues, “as an invented geography, an imaginary space built according to the ideology, cultural values and norms of the” target culture (1991, p.66-68). Accordingly, this subsection discusses the influence ideology has on the translation of Orwell’s *Animal Farm* in the Arabic economic and socio-political contexts before and after the Arab Spring with a particular focus on shifts of production-related terminology.

Georges Corm (2020), Abdullah Laroui (1973), Hassan Hanafi (2009), Mohamed Abed al-Jabiri (1980 and 1990) argue that most Arab readers know, understand, feel, and experience social reality through the lens of either the ideology of the religious “clerics” or the ideology of the “liberals”. On the one hand, clerics translated the progress of the West, which has always embodied “the beacon of reason, freedom, and humanism” (Yasmeen Daifallah, 2012, p. 28) as the result of candid European secular departure from Christian creed “with its belief in myth and its premise in miracles... with its persecution of mavericks from Galileo to Bruno [which] could make a claim to freedom” (ibid). Thus the clerics, believing that Islam is the religion of “tolerance, of faith after rational deliberation, and of freedom from submission to any earthly rule or being,” (ibid) come

to the conclusion that Arabo-Islamic progress lies in returning to “untainted Islam” which is “sublime, authentic, and untainted by the workings of time, and another subject to the whims of Muslims, perverted and maimed throughout past generations and centuries” (cited in Yasmeen Daifallah, 2012, p.28). To put it differently, the religious cleric conceived modernity as a time of religious reformation. On the other hand, the liberal leaders translate Western progress as a “political organization” based on “freedom” and “egalitarianism”. Liberals define the Arab self as historically “free and strong” and argue that the continued predicament of the Arab self is a result of “its long subjection to an Ottoman tyranny that suppressed its genuine potential for freedom and progress” (Yasmeen Daifallah, 2012, p.30). Liberals believe that the singular essence in modernity is “Enlightenment” (ibid,p.31).

According to Maria Perez, the “more dominant” ideology becomes “common, whereas others are pushed aside to the edges of our societies” (2014, p.5). She asserts that the texts that contain the “more dominant” ideology “are more useful to succeed in public spheres while others remain chained to more domestic settings” (ibid). In the Arabic context, as Corm argues, the Salafi ideology is more dominant than the liberal because it “underpins the official state religion of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and has become all-powerful within Arab circles” (2020, p.27). Corm asserts that

thought in the Arab world had become completely stuck within a theologico-political approach to the world, one that is obsessive and radical, refusing all modernity and any kind of individual liberty which could threaten the cohesion of the ‘community of believers’... It also aimed to create a radical otherness between Muslims and non-Muslims by devising the criteria of existence for their Homo islamicus, and even more so for an Islamic woman, in a detailed way that focused on physical appearance, clothing, and food (2020, p. 33)

Corm added that this ideology that has “high visibility in the media and in academia” (2020, p.33) seeks to “petrify a society based on an imagined cultural heritage long left behind by centuries of progress” (2020, p.47); therefore, it “denounces the ‘invasion of the Arab world by Western culture’, which has allegedly taken away its ‘soul’” (2020, p.33). According to Corm, Arab thought is consciously or unconsciously guided by analytical framework based on Islamic studies which tends to highlight the otherness of

the other's thoughts (ibid, p.43). As a result, Arab translators filter parts of the source text that might have influences on the Arab world in terms of culture, politics, and economic ideology.

Consequently, the escalating development of translation from foreign languages into Arabic until the beginning of the twentieth century almost excluded and neglected literature, and it is likely that the reason for this was that classical literature (Greek and Latin) was pagan (Mohamed Enani, 2003, p. 203; my translation).

In the nineteenth century, during the reign of Muhammad Ali, translation flourished, but everything that was translated was exclusive to the natural sciences and humanities, not literature. In the twentieth century, some literary works were translated for the purpose of seeking unfamiliar knowledge or exploring new territories of meaning (ibid). In 1900, the first translation of Shakespeare was issued. However, the translations of Shakespeare's plays were subjected to modifications that almost deviated from their source meaning prior to their stage performance, such as turning *Romeo and Juliet* into a musical comedy (ibid, p. 204).

Translators at that time were more inclined to translate texts that had great didactic lessons or moral purposes or texts that were part of the curriculum in schools affiliated with the Ministry of Education (Dar El Ma'arif) (ibid). Ideological shifts in translation, however, can be traced to Taha Hussein's introduction to Ahmed Amin's book, *Dawn of Islam* (1928), in which he encouraged young writers to imitate modern Western literary genres such as novels and musical theater without labeling them as inferior men of letters. Hussein's support of literary translation from European languages and the use of contemporary language in translation gave birth to new, authentic or modern ways of writing in which Arab translators and writers became more ideologically influenced by certain Western styles, genres, theoretical frameworks and modes of representation. Hussein's introduction, in other words, marks the beginning of transformation.

Egyptian writers and translators were influenced by modern European schools of thought. For example, Ahmed Shawqi wrote his play *Laila and Majnun* as an emulation of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Death of Cleopatra* as an emulation of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* while Tawfiq Al-Hakim wrote plays such as *The Food for Every Mouth* (Al-Ta'am Li-Kull Fam), that follow the European realist doctrine

in contemporary Arabic in a way that reflects everyday life experiences in a realistic manner. In the 20th century, the Arabic literature polysystem “continued to take shape through a selective accepting and rejecting of British literature norms” (Adam Smallwood, 2016/2017, p.7). Arabs became familiar with the western styles which can be considered to confirm translated literature’s position within the centre of the system (ibid). In the words of Itamar Even-Zohar, “to say that translated literature maintains a central position in the literary polysystem means that it participates actively in shaping the center of the polysystem” (1990, p.46).

Despite the tacit acceptance of Western literature and its new genres into the canons of Arabic fiction, translated texts that reflect liberal ideological changes came under scrutiny; some of which were often rejected or obscured. In the seventh Article of The Arab Cultural Covenant, which was signed by all member states of the Arab League, it was clearly stated that selecting texts to be translated must be pursuant to “a national strategy” (cited in Mahmoud Alhirthani, 2018, p.119) that consolidates “self-independence and the development of national language and identity” (ibid).

Since the dawn of the twentieth century until today, the religious rigorist ideology and the political sectarian landscape of Arab systems continue to influence the nature of literary productions and translations, which is an everlasting form of censorship that seeks to obscure and cancel politically dangerous texts under the pretext of “[in]authenticity” (‘aşāla). This term, as suggested by Corm, has come into use in Arabic only recently as an opponent to “modernity” (2020, p.49).

A compelling evidence, in such case, would be the detention of a student at Cairo University by the Egyptian police for carrying Orwell’s 1984 in 2014, an incident which prompted the BBC News Agency to describe the Egyptian government and the dictatorial regime it stands for as the “big brother” (BBC News, 2014). Orwell’s *Animal Farm*, in particular, turned into a revolutionary site of political and social transformation before, during and after the Arab Spring, a fact which implied that its translation has to come under constant supervision due to the many possible ideological resonances and dangers it may carry.

2.5 Translating Orwell: Economic and Political Concerns

After colonization, the Arab world has endured an economic crisis from which the poor suffered the most. The bourgeoisie, at that time, began to grow and there was a remarkable shift into a pseudo-capitalist system. As a result, the Arab Spring (2010-2012) broke out to eliminate “authoritarianism, monopoly of power, absence of social justice, sectarianism, and the absence of modern concept of equal citizenship” (Musa Alzghoul, 2018, p. 73-74). Yet, rebels in different Arab countries could not translate their needs into an action. In other words, the causes of the protests doubled rather than diminished, and “the expectations of democratic transformation faded away” (Alzghoul, 2018, p.75). Even though these expectations seemed too far-fetched, one could easily recognize how the Arab Spring was ideologically informed by newly used platforms of social media and transnational crossing of models and experiences of worldwide rebellions in writing and cinema. In terms of writing, translation among languages, here Orwell’s *Animal Farm*, played a major role in the circulation of radical ideas of equality and rights into the Arabic context. It is true that translation, at that time, did not initiate those revolutionary ideas, yet it played an important role in promoting these thoughts and in raising political awareness among Arab readers. Being hesitant to accept foreign literary works and new colonial literary genres, Arab translators shifted their focus to the social and political terrains of their countries after colonialism. They used translation as a platform to challenge the oppressive regimes and the barriers that were built to limit the awareness of the oppressive political leaders. This subsection discusses how translation during the pre-Arab Spring period was a fundamental class-based cause of successful revolutions against socioeconomic tyrannies. It also demonstrates how translators and interpreters manipulated the source texts to serve their agendas during the Arab Spring uprisings. This shows how translation can always be employed in the double sense of hegemony and resistance: while the proletariat can employ translation to create a necessary social and economic consciousness of production, consumption, fair distribution of wealth, change and revolution, the political bourgeoisie and elite also use it to control the masses and subject them to binding codes that ensure their continued subservience to the ruling class.

In the first case, according to James Scott 1992, every ruled group turns its oppression into a hidden counter-narrative that will be the root of the dissident discourse (cited in Abaher El Sakka, 2014, p.9; my translation). In fact, the more repressive the authority is,

the more the oppressed form a counter-reaction becomes. Consequently, in a particular historical moment, a revolution breaks out in a sudden (ibid). This spontaneous reaction grows independently through several manifestations, most importantly, through translation which is described by Mona Baker as “an integral element of the revolutionary project” (2016, p.6). Arab translators are aware of the educational and cultural deterioration of the public during and after the Arab Spring. They also realize that “for social change to take place, it is not enough for the material, economic conditions to change, but that a shift must also occur on the level of ideas and concepts” (Rebecca Gould and Kayvan Tahmasebian, 2020, p. 17). Subsequently, they work on raising the awareness of people to the political scenes of their countries indirectly by translating others’ experiences and insights into the mechanism of resisting the dominant system. Here, Rebecca Gould and Kayvan Tahmasebian refer to the role of translation by suggesting that “translation is what enables protest movements to connect and share experiences across the globe” (2020, p. 38). Translators indicate their political ideologies through the selection of texts to be translated as Baker (2010) maintains that communicating ideologies through translation does not necessarily involve linguistic inaccuracy for these translations. Translation yields more results, according to Baker (2010, p.347), “by intervening in the space around the text (footnotes, prefaces, addition of visual material) and by the very selection of texts to be translated”. Arab translators select historical experiences that reflected overthrowing cruel totalitarian regimes similar to the Arab regimes. In doing so, Arab translators are able to awaken the silenced people and to redirect them to the political scene that they were forbidden to discuss in public.

The advent of Arab Spring has a particular significant impact on Arab translators and interpreters. Arab translators consciously or unconsciously support certain ideologies or interests by manipulating texts or utterances in European texts they rendered to Arabic through deletion, addition or substitution (Jasim Al-Maryani 2017). Al-Maryani argues that translators and interpreters serve specific agendas of their employing institutions and news agencies such as Al-Jazeera. He asserts that these institutions were socio-politically engaged in the ideological conflicts during the Arab Spring. Thus, the texts and utterances that were translated by these institutions are questionable (2017, p. 12). The translation of literature, in particular, becomes one of the defining aspects of

revolutionary actions that influences political transformations of governmental systems in the Arab world, one of which is the translation of Orwell's *Animal Farm*.

2.6 A Brief Overview of the Arabic Translations of *Animal Farm*

Animal Farm has been translated into Arabic at least sixteen times by different translators in different Arab cities: Cairo, Damascus, Beirut, Amman, Baghdad, Casablanca, and many others. The very first translation was produced by Abbas Hafez and published in 1952 by Dar Al Maaref. The other translations are carried out by Shamil Abatha, Sabri Al Fadl, Asaad Al Hussein, Abdel Hamid Abdel Ghani, Nabil Ragheb, Muhammad Eid Al Arimi, Abdel Karim Nassef, Rana Iskandar, Mahmoud Abdel Ghani, Abdullah Adwan (published by Dar Pharos), Muhammad Husayn Allawi (published by Dar al-Rafidain), Abd al-Razzaq Belhashmi (published by Dar Kalimat), Heba Fathi (published by Dar MK), Malik Salman (published by Dar al-Saqi), in addition to a new edition of Shamil Abatha's translation, entitled "*A World Inhabited by Animals*" (published by Al-Osra Library - Cairo). It is difficult to determine the exact reason behind this practice of frequent or successive translation of Orwell's novel *Animal Farm*. Perhaps this race in translating the novel among Arab translators may be explained by the fact that *Animal Farm* represents the reality of the Arab world, which is mired in multifaceted conflicts, or that Orwell's novel expresses the reality of the complex current social and political paranoia that the Arab world is constantly experiencing.

In 1998, Anthony Pym states that reprinting this work shows the validity of the existing translation, and the repetitive act of retranslation reflects a direct challenge of previous existing translations (2014, p.83). However, in his article "ترجمات عربية متلاحقة لـ"مزرعة" أوروبيل تحدث فضيحة (Six Successive Arabic Translations of Orwell's "Farm" is a Scandal in 2021; my translation), Abdo Wazen argues that the recurrent interest in the retranslation of *Animal Farm* is neither natural nor "healthy" because the translators did not benefit from the previous efforts made by their colleagues in translating the novel. In other words, most of them did not return to the existing translations to discuss, evaluate, and reveal their strengths and weaknesses.

In this study, the translations by Shamil Abatha and Mahmoud Abdel Ghani will be examined. The researcher has looked into other translations of Orwell, and to the best of her knowledge, she chooses to examine these translations not only because they are the

most accurate but also the most ideologically-informed narratives in which readers can recognize or note the impact and influence of political, social and cultural atmospheres that preceded and followed the events of the Arab Spring on the nature and process of rewriting Orwell's text into Arabic. These translations represent two historical and political contexts, namely, before and after the Arab Spring respectively. The first one was translated by Shamel Abatha (1930-2019) who holds a Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Toulouse in France. He translated *Animal Farm* into *Mazrait Al-Haywanat* in 2009 and it was published by *Dar Alshorok*. In his translation, he prioritized Arabic literary eloquence over the adequacy and accuracy of translation. The second translation was carried out by Mahmoud Abdel Ghani (1967) who is a well-known Moroccan translator, researcher, novelist, and poet and who speaks Arabic, French, and English. He is a college professor at the Faculty of Arts and Humanities in Rabat. He translated *Animal Farm* into *Mazrait Al-Haywan* in 2013 and it was published by *Markaz Takafi Arabi*. To the best of the researcher's knowledge *Dar Alshorok* and *Markaz Takafi Arabi* are independent publishing houses which publish many Arab translations regardless regardless of their political affiliation.

Chapter Three

Methodology

This study investigates the various strategies employed by Shamil Abatha and Mahmoud Abdel Ghani in their translations of Orwell's *Animal Farm* by using a Marxist framework of translation. *Animal Farm* is a parody of the Russian Revolution of 1917 and Russian insidious renunciation of communist ideals of equality and adoption of a belligerent totalitarian state ruled by a single dictator. The novel aims to reveal the causes and consequences of certain movements in society by depicting the relations of production that take place before and after such movements. Relations of production refer to the ownership and control of the productive assets of society and the way social classes are linked within an economic sphere of production. In *Animal Farm*, the relations of production are embodied in the constant conflict between the bourgeoisie and the working class/the proletariat. Bourgeois are those who own the means of production and gain capital by exploiting the working class/the proletariat.

This study focuses on the ramifications of the strategies used to translate the relations of production in Orwell's *Animal Farm* before and after the Arab Spring. The renditions of Orwell's narrative into two Arabic translations are likely to embody certain political conditions of the time of the publishers' views; therefore, this study investigates the TTs for using different strategies to reflect different ideological variances and influences. This means that this study will be product-oriented, and will focus on the TTs and the translation process, which involves the translators' employment of certain strategies, methodologies, and choices.

3.1 Type of Study

This is a descriptive translation study that relies heavily on Gideon Toury (1995) who is considered a pioneer of descriptive translation studies. He established his approach based on analyzing and describing the tendencies in the process of translation without involving any strict rules. According to him, translation science should provide the translators with practical guidelines through describing and highlighting the tendencies involved in the process of textual transference while translating.

DTS interprets the target text/s as a result of the constraints and influences of socio-historical conditions surrounding it, or as a cause for introducing changes into the target

culture. Descriptive theorists start with the text and evaluate the TT's norms, history, constraints, and the context in a certain cultural and historical time. DTS describes what translation is or does in certain socio-historical conditions. DTS, therefore, allows the researcher to inspect translation methodologies, thinking processes, and decisions, as well as what resources the translator may have employed.

Toury suggested three stages to do DTS:

1. Find the place of the text within the system of the target culture, looking at its importance, significance, and acceptability.
2. Identify relationships between “coupled pairs” of ST and TT segments, where TT shifts are found and compared to the ST.
3. Attempt to reconstruct and generalize the findings on the translation process for these “shifts” or “changes” between the ST and the TT.

The main concern of this research is to examine and demonstrate how Abatha's and Abdel Ghani's translations of *Animal Farm* are related to the socio-cultural environment in which they exist in order to answer important questions related to the rationale or motives that prompt translators to make certain choices in the act of translation, considering the socio-political and cultural contexts of these textual productions before and after the Arab Spring. The research, thus, shows that both translations of *Animal Farm* are influenced by Marxist materials or tools of Arab political cultures that dominated discourses before and after the events of the Arab Spring. Therefore, this study uses and is located within the descriptive translation approach.

3.2 Research Data

In order to arrive at coherent conclusions in this study, the researcher chooses *Animal Farm* as the source text, and its Arabic translations entitled *Mazrait Al-Haywanat* (TT1) and *Mazrait Al-Haywan* (TT2) as the target texts. The source text, which was written by George Orwell in 1945, was chosen because it bespeaks a severe criticism of class-based social hierarchies, political manipulations, and oppression of workers; all of these denote a Marxist discourse that appears to be at play within the context of Arabic translations. The manipulation of relations and modes of production by a minority of rulers constitutes a crisis of labor, a paradox of belonging, and necessity of resistance. One can argue that socioeconomic and political imbalances define the political landscape of *Mazrait Al-*

Haywanat (TT1), which was translated by Shamil Abatha before the Arab Spring in 2009, and *Mazrait Al-Haywan* (TT2), which was translated by Mahmoud Abdel Ghani after the Arab Spring in 2013. Those translations were chosen because they represent two historical and political contexts, namely, before and after the Arab Spring respectively.

3.3 Data Collection

In the process of collecting the data, the researcher applies the document analysis technique which is defined by Leedy and Ormrod (2005) as the detailed and systematic process to examine the contents of the source text. To collect the data, firstly, the researcher reads the ST and TTs thoroughly to discover the texts that present types of Relations of Production, which include the struggle for peace and freedom, the cult of personality and praise, terror and intimidation, slavery and hard works, killing and torture, dispute among rulers, and famine and misery. Secondly, the researcher selects specific sentences that manifest types of Relations of Production. Thirdly, all of the selected data are classified and distributed in a table. Finally, the translations of the selected sentences are distributed in the table.

Every selected text from ST and TTs was distributed into seven data collection tables. The classification of the tables is based on the seven types of Relations of Production presented in the ST. Therefore, in this process, the data were distributed into several tables based on the topic. Then, the data will be classified according to Newmark's (1988) taxonomy for cultural specific items.

3.4 Data Analysis

Following the classification and discussion of the data, the researcher analyzes these data by comparing the Relations of Production in ST and TTs and then scrutinizes the data according to translation methods proposed by Peter Newmark's model of translation procedures. The researcher uses Newmark's classification because it provides translation strategies for culture specific items. The researcher studies the dominant cultural, social and political norms prevalent at the time of writing/translation, so she needs a classification that embodies the translation of cultural words and expressions, taking into consideration that the word "culture" "encompasses all of the shared rules for appropriate behaviour that are learned by individuals as a consequence of being members of the same group or community, as well as the values and beliefs that underlie overt behaviour"

(Saville Troike 1986, p:47-48). Newmark (1998) suggests seventeen translation procedures: transference, naturalization, cultural equivalent, functional equivalent, descriptive equivalent, synonymy, through-translation, shift or transposition, modulation, recognized translation, compensation, componential analysis, reduction and expansion, paraphrase, couplets, and notes. The five strategies that will be used and referred to in this research are:

Literal translation:

According to Newmark, literal translation is used when the grammatical construction of the source language is rendered, while the lexical words are translated individually (1998, p.46). In literal translation, the translator renders the words rather than the form (1998, p.69). In this context, Newmark explains that literal translation is different from word-for-word translation in the sense that the latter means transferring the source language grammar and word order, while the former looks for the nearest equivalent in terms of the meaning and word order. Moreover, Newmark argues that “literal translation is correct and must not be avoided, if it secures referential and pragmatic equivalence to the original” (1998, p.69). This strategy, according to Newmark, is used when the SL term and TL term refer to the same concept. Yet, it should be avoided when the TT is inexact or illegible. In short, if literal translation leads to referential and pragmatic equivalence, it shouldn't be avoided.

Cultural Equivalent:

Newmark defines cultural equivalent as replacing a cultural word in the SL with a TL one (1988, p.82). According to him, this strategy is not accurate, but it is important in “publicity and propaganda, as well as for brief explanation to readers who are ignorant of the relevant SL culture... they may occasionally be used if the term is of little importance in a popular article or popular fiction” (1988, p.83). Moreover, it is used when the term in a popular article or popular fiction is not important. Its importance, according to Newmark, lay primarily in drama because it creates “an immediate effect (ibid).

Functional Equivalent:

According to Newmark, functional equivalent refers to “the use of culture-free word, sometimes with a new specific term” (1988, p.83). Thus, this strategy neutralizes or

generalizes the SL term and sometimes adds a particular (ibid). Newmark adds that this strategy is the most accurate way of “deculturalising a cultural word” (ibid). It is also used when the SL technical word has no equivalence in the TL (ibid).

Synonymy:

According to Newmark, synonymy equivalent is translating the ST word using a “near TL equivalent” (1998, p.84). It is used

where there is no clear one-to-one equivalent, and the word is not important in the text, in particular for adjectives or adverbs of quality (which in principle are 'outside' the grammar and less important than other components of a sentence... A synonym is only appropriate where literal translation is not possible and because the word is not important enough for componential analysis. Here economy precedes accuracy (ibid).

Newmark adds that the “unnecessary use” of this strategy in translation is a mark of a “poor translation” (ibid).

Expansion:

Newmark states that this strategy is “imprecise” and can be used intuitively in some cases and ad hoc in others (1998, p.90). It refers to exceeding the number of elements of the ST in translation. This strategy creates a result in poorly written texts (ibid).

Transposition:

Transposition or shift, according to Newmark, refers to changing the grammatical category or the part of speech from SL to TL. Yet, the meaning of the TT is not affected by the changes to the ST. Transposition is clear when word classes are not transferred, where a verb, for example, is translated to a noun, but the meaning is still the same. According to Newmark, translators use this strategy intuitively as it is concerned with grammar (ibid).

Deletion:

Deletion, according to Newmark, refers to the omission of certain passages, elements or words of the ST in the TT. This strategy causes the “loss of meaning” which leads to misunderstandings due to misinformation.

The process continues by analyzing the data through a Marxist point of view and making conclusions about the relationship between translation strategies and the motivation behind using them.

Chapter Four

Data Analysis

4.1 Introduction

This chapter compares the relations of production in the source text with its translated versions in the light of Marxist theory. It introduces various types of relations of production from Orwell's *Animal Farm* and examines how these relations are embodied in Orwell's text by analyzing certain sentences that reflect important dominant socialist ideologies in the animals' communal system. The novel came to criticize the relations of production that were prevalent in the socialist system in terms of exploiting the working class or proletariat in order to increase the influence and wealth of the capitalist class. Relations of production refers to the relations between individuals in the literary text; for example, a capitalist's relationship with the capital, a capitalist's relationship with other capitalists, a proletarian relationship with other proletarians, a proletarian relationship with the capitalists, etc. These relations are abundantly depicted in *Animal Farm* and were represented in more than one form, including the language of food, religious discourse, the language of slavery, exploitation, liberation, etc. The selected relations analyzed in this chapter are carefully chosen due to their importance in defining the nature and value of translation between two texts representing two different political, social, and cultural contexts; one before the Arab Spring and the other after it. The researcher analyzes and discusses the Arabic translations that have been done by Shamil Abatha and Mahmoud Abdel Ghani.

As mentioned before, this research answers the questions about the relationship between the ideology embedded within both translations and the choices made in translating Orwell's *Animal Farm*. Therefore, the source text items will be compared with their counterparts in the target texts in order to describe the differences in the strategies before and after the Arab Spring and to explore the close relevance of those strategies to ideological impacts as one of the variables that affect the translation result. The data the researcher collects from the ST, TT1, and TT2 will be presented based on the classification the researcher outlines earlier in chapter three. Then the researcher will analyse these data to shed light on the impact of different contexts, namely the economic and socio-political context before and after the Arab Spring and the translation of ST, and

to examine the extent to which the ideologies of the translators' social and political contexts could influence the process of translation.

4.2 Terror

Karl Marx's theory of class conflict states that society is in a constant state of struggle due to competition for limited resources. In the capitalist system, two basic classes: the bourgeoisie, who are represented in the novel by both Mr. Jones and Napoleon, and the workers who are represented in the novel by the animals, oppose each other. The social order of this capitalist system is implemented through domination and force of the political power which, according to Marx and Engels, "is merely the organized power of one [socio-economic] class for oppressing the other" (2014, p.31). For Marx, the owners of wealth and power will try to maintain this system by all possible means, in particular, by suppressing the poor and the weak by a means of terror, intimidation, killing, and torture.

Orwell's narrative fashions a system of powerful communication between different relations of production on the farm. In this case, animal leaders exploit dogs to apply terror and discipline whenever they are needed. This exploitation becomes a necessary action to stabilize the relations between pigs, which are the animals in power, and the rest of the animals who are constantly busy with producing goods for the overall welfare of the commanding capitalist category. The table below demonstrates this:

Table (1)

Terror

ST	TT1	TT2
<i>Animal Farm</i>	مزرعة الحيوانات	مزرعة الحيوان
"Nine enormous dogs wearing brass-studded collars came bounding into the barn." (Orwell, 1945, p. 46-47)	"دخول تسعة كلاب شرسة إلى مبنى الحظيرة وفي أعناقها أطواق مطعمة بالنحاس..." (شامل أباطة، 2009، 46)	"اقتحمت الحظيرة تسعة كلاب حراسة أعناقها مطوقة فلادات نحاسية." (محمود عبد الغني، 2013، 62)

In *Animal Farm*, Napoleon uses the dogs as guards to protect himself against any possible threat on the part of animals. These dogs function as a metaphor of military force that is constantly used to intimidate the animals. He would have the dogs kill any animals if he suspected any subversive activity that could threaten his rule and the loyalty of all animals to the regime he presides

By internally exploring the target texts, we find that the exploitation of dogs is differently embodied. The word “dogs” was translated using Literal strategy to "كلاب" (*kilāb*) in both TT1 and TT2. This translation strategy doesn't affect the message of the ST despite the different cultural perception of dogs in the source and target texts. Dogs enjoy a special status in the source culture. For English people, dogs symbolize loyalty and companionship. Dog-related idioms are used to signify essential humanitarian behavior and to refer to good people. For example, "clever dog" and "if an old barks, he gives real speech" are used to refer to wise people; “top dog” is used to refer to authority; and "work like a dog" refers to diligence. Yet, there are many negative images of dogs in dog-related idioms such as “go to the dog” which implies degeneration. In this example, we can see that the source culture and the target culture have a similar symbolic employment of the negative meaning of dogs. In the Arabic culture, dogs are mostly seen as impure animals and only permissible for utilitarian purposes such as watchdogs but not simply for companionship (Oxford University Press, 2017). In short, literal translation, in this case, doesn't affect the meaning because the cultural significance of dogs is not completely different.

However, “enormous” was translated differently in both target texts. In TT1, using Cultural Equivalence into "شراسة" (*šarisa*) means “apt or ready to attack” (*Almaany Dictionary*), which is a classical adjective that collocates with dogs or *kilāb*. By looking into TT2, we will find that the translator used a different cultural equivalent in translating “enormous” which is "حراسة" (*hirāsa*) meaning “preservation; safeguarding; watching; protection; supervision; trust” (*Almaany Dictionary*), which is another classical adjective that collocates with كلاب. Although both translators used the same strategy, their choice of cultural equivalent differed to reflect the prevailing political situation at the time. In TT1, which was translated before the Arab Spring in 2009, the translation of “enormous” into "*šarisa*" denotes a high level of social and political censorship of citizens by the Arab regimes which have always employed the police, metaphorically referred to as dogs in Orwell's narrative, to watch the general behavior of people, especially before the eruption of the Arab Spring. This brutality of the security sector was one of the many reasons that directly led to the outbreak of the Arab Spring revolutions. In Tunisia, the revolution erupted when Mohamed Bouazizi set himself on fire after being subjected to a number of insults by the police in December 2010 (Lageman, 2020). In Egypt, the murder of the

Internet activist Khaled Saeed by two policemen in June 2010 set the context for the revolution (BBC News, 2011). In Syria, the violations committed by Bashar al-Assad's security forces in March 2011 led to the outbreak of protests that ignited the civil war in the country (عاشور, 2016). As for TT2, which was translated after the Arab Spring in 2013, the word “enormous” was translated as "*hirāsa*", meaning “guard”. The use of this word to describe the dogs that symbolize the security services after the Arab Spring indicates the transformation of the security services to serve and protect the repressive regimes in the state instead of providing security for the citizens. In other words, the use of security forces became even worse in the sense that the newly risen Arab regimes have resorted to extreme procedures to protect themselves against other possible revolutions, which means that the revolutions achieved nothing but made things even worse by putting high demands or pressures on personal freedom as Mohamed Saleh, a Syrian writer from Homs, stated: “Since the Arab Spring, everything has become worse” because, according to Amr Darrag, who served as a minister in the democratically elected government that led Egypt for barely a year before it was toppled by the military in 2013, “the forces that are against change in our region are numerous and they have a lot of common interests that allowed them to unite against any kind of positive change” (Hubbard & Kirkpatrick, 2021).

As for the word “came”, the first translator renders it using Transposition strategy which refers to changing the class without changing the meaning of the SL, in rendering “came” into a noun "دخول" (*dukūl*). In TT2, the translator applied Synonymy in translating the word into "اقتحم" (*iqtaḥama*) meaning (to break into). Although the word *dukūl* "دخول", in TT1, refers to the act of coming, the word *iqtaḥama*, in TT2, has many negative connotations. On the one hand, it means entering a building or car by force, in order to steal something (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English). On the other hand, it refers to the police entering a place forcefully and violently. In addition, *iqtaḥama* in the Palestinian context is used to refer to the Israeli military attacking Palestinians’ property, injuring and/or killing civilians, and vandalizing civilians’ property. The use of the word *iqtaḥama* supports the view that, after the Arab Spring, the security services turned into “organized crime gangs” (عاشور, 2014).

Finally, the word “collars” was translated as "أطواق" (*aṭwāq*), which means “ribbons” (*Almaany* Dictionary), using Synonymy in TT1. On the other hand, the translator in TT2

used a different Synonymy for the translation of “collars” which is "قلادات" (*qlādāt*), which means “a piece of jewelry or narrow cloth that fits around the neck” (*Almaanyg Dictionary*) that is commonly granted by the State to whomever it wants in order to show appreciation. The use of the words *iqtaḥama* and *qlādāt* in TT2 refers to the use of the security services by repressive regimes to preserve their political and economic interests.

By comparing both renderings of the original segment, we may notice that although both translators use the same strategy in rendering most of the examples, they use different linguistic items to reflect different meanings according to the political context of the translated text, namely, before or after the Arab Spring.

4.3 Slavery and Hard Work

Marx argues that the bourgeoisie alienates, exploits and enslaves the proletariat. He explains that capitalism forced the proletariat to work constantly to earn extremely low wages so that the only thing a proletariat cares about is survival. In other words, survival turns into a kind of intense struggle that is empty of meaning, which both translators’ texts, i.e. before and after the Arab Spring, have rendered differently in their translations as clearly shown in the table below.

Table (2)

Slavery and Hard Work

ST	TT1	TT2
<i>Animal Farm</i>	مزرعة الحيوانات	مزرعة الحيوان
“All that year the animals worked like slaves .” (Orwell, 1945, p.51)	"كانت الحيوانات تعمل كالعبيد طوال العام" (شامل أباطة, 2009, 53)	"بذلت الحيوانات طيلة السنة جهدا كبيرا مثل العبيد." (محمود عبد الغني, 2013, 69).

Animal Farm shows that the animals are not free because a certain class of them, the pigs, controls and enslaves them. The pigs force other animals to work day and night in return for small rations of food. They inflict corporal punishment on other animals and command them by brutal labor. The fear of punishment creates a class of obedient workers who serve the supreme authority in many possible ways. The subjugation of these workers, who are enslaved by a monotonous laborious lifestyle, maintains well-defined status quos in society. In fact, slavery points to a mechanical lifestyle in which Orwell’s animals are entrapped in a stringent system of constant production and consumption that never changes realities on the ground, a meaning which is captured in both Arabic translations.

While the translator in TT1 opts for Literal translation in rendering the word “slaves” into "رقيق" (*raqīq*), in TT2, the translator opts for Synonymy in rendering the word “slaves” into "عبيد" (*‘abīd*).

The word *raqīq* refers to people whose bodies are owned by other free people. Although different societies have their own understanding, customs, and laws for regulating *raqīq*, there are some commonalities that marked the *raqīq* all over the globe, including “physical and sexual abuse”:

They typically served for life and often passed that status on to their children. Perhaps most important, slaves were outsiders, not only in the literal sense of coming from outside the societies in which they were held but also in the sense of being excluded from the basic recognition and rights enjoyed by those who were free. In the United States, for example, the free-born could contract marriages, buy and sell property, testify in court, and make basic decisions about the welfare of their children. Slaves could do none of these things. (Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice, 2006, p.7)

In addition, *raqīq* is a commercial term because the *raqīq* can be bought, sold, gifted, and used as collateral. It is worth noting that although the bodies of the *raqīq* are enslaved, their minds and hearts are free. In other words, they are not forced to believe that what they are told is true, and therefore it is easy for them to secure their own freedom through different ways, including escape, self-purchase, or being freed by the slaveholder. To give a clear example, Bilal ibn Rabah, in Islamic history, was a *raqīq* to his master Umayyah ibn Khalaf, a leader and one of the arch enemies of Islam in Mecca. When Bilal heard about the prophet Muhammad and his teachings, he declared his conversion to Islam which wasn’t an easy step because Muslims at that time were subjected to persecution. Similarly, Bilal was tortured mercilessly by his master till Abu Baker, a wealthy trader and prophet Muhammad’s closest companion heard about him and paid Umayyah ibn Khalaf to set him free.

The term *‘abīd* refers to two types of people: those who are slaves of ideologies "عبيد الفكر" *‘abīd* of the ideologies, and those who are slaves of desires. The *‘abīd* of the ideologies subjugate themselves to the ideologies, beliefs, wills, or attitudes of others. They are

unable to view ideas and events objectively. Moreover, they can't think or evaluate what they are being told to see whether it's true or rational. In addition, they are conditioned to reject any ideology, idea, or attitude contrary to the one they follow. In Arabic, we say "عبيد الأفكار" *'abīd* of the thoughts not "رفيق الافكار" *raqīq* of thoughts. On the other hand, *'abīd* can be used to refer to people who mindlessly and blindly yield to their desires. In other words, the word refers to the people who have an overwhelming inclination towards fulfilling their desires even if this will harm their bodies. As an illustration, in Arabic, we say "عبيد الشهوة" *'abīd* of the lust/desire, "عبيد الشهرة" *'abīd* of fame, "عبيد الدينار" *'abīd* of the dinar, "عبيد الموضة" *'abīd* of the fashion, and "عبيد الاستهلاك" *'abīd* of consumption.

By contrasting both translations, slavery is imposed by force from outside the *raqīq*, so it is possible for others to free them by legal or military means. Moreover, the *raqīq* know that they are subjected to slavery. They also understand their problem so that it is easier for them to work out a solution. However, slavery comes from within the *'abīd*, so only the individual can free himself/herself. The problem is that many people do not see themselves as *'abīd* who are in need of emancipation.

The use of the word *raqīq*, in TT1, reflects the hope that Arab countries live in a transition towards a better and more equitable future. Arabs thought that they will live in tranquility and will have an egalitarian society after getting rid of the repressive regimes that rule them. However, in TT2, the translator chose the word *'abīd* to show that the situation after the Arab Spring got worse. The new governments, after the Arab Spring, turned people into machines running after money and survival and obeying their oppressors without thinking. As a result, the revolutions have created a vicious circle involving narrow-mindedness, lack of political justice, hunger, poverty, and conflicts which turned the Arab society into a society of *'abīd* who don't have the social consciousness to resist political corruption. Arabs become similar to Orwell's farm animals who don't resist the pigs because they are turned into machines who persistently try to survive, and who are programmed to think that the way they live is ordinary and natural and that the days of Mr. Jones are far worse.

4.4 Hunger

Marx argues that capitalism exploits and represses the working class. He introduces the concept of the growing misery of the wage workers in his book *Capital*:

Accumulation of wealth at one pole is, therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole, i.e., on the side of the class that produces its own product in the form of capital. (1976, p. 799)

In the theory of Marx, the proletariat has to engage in industrial production and sell their labour power in order to earn a meager wage to survive. As a result, the proletariat is poor and, in most cases, suffers from famine and misery. In *Animal Farm*, Orwell uses the animals to highlight the growing misery of the working class, which was translated differently in both target texts as can be seen in the table below:

Table (3)

Hunger

ST <i>Animal Farm</i>	TT1 مزرعة الحيوانات	TT2 مزرعة الحيوان
“In January food fell short [...] Starvation seemed to stare them in the face.” (Orwell, 1945, p.62)	" وفي يناير عانت المزرعة من نقص الغذاء [...] أصبح شبح المجاعة يتهددها!" (شامل أباطة, 2009, 64)	" في شهر فبراير عرفت المؤونة نقصاً كبيراً... فبدت وكأنها مهددة بـ النفوق البطيء ." (محمود عبد الغني، 2013، 82).

The animals lived a miserable life full of oppression, hunger, and inequality under the rule of Mr. Jones. The animals decide to revolt under the leadership of the pigs against the tyranny of Mr. Jones who neither provides them with bread nor grants them freedom. They thought that the removal of the human rule means the removal of the only cause of hunger. Yet, after the victory, the pigs took over the farm and start to oppress the other animals whose life got worse. This portrait that reveals the misery of the working class is conveyed differently in both Arabic translations. While the translator in TT1 opts for Expansion in the translation of the word “starvation” into “شبح المجاعة” (*šabaḥ al-majā‘a*) meaning the specter of starvation which is a common collocation in Arabic. In TT2, the translator uses the Functional Equivalence of “starvation” which is “النفوق البطيء” (*an-nufūq al-baṭī‘*) meaning “slow death”.

In TT1, the translator adds "شبح" *šabaḥ* (specter of) to the word “starvation”. Specter, according to Merriam Webster, is “a notion or fear of something bad that might happen in the future” such as “news of the disease raised the specter of a possible plague.” This catastrophe may strike any country at any time as a result of poverty, conflicts, gender inequality, seasonal changes, or natural disasters. Yet, starvation is never inevitable in the sense that it can be eliminated or even prevented.

In TT2, the translator uses "النفوق البطيء" *an-nuḫūq al-baṭī* (slow morality) which means in Arabic the death of large numbers of animals such as sheep. The translator here creates an image of the Arab citizens who are turned into a herd after the Arab Spring. This herd is dying slowly without questioning why this is happening. This expression conveys the idea that people after the Arab Spring are unwilling to resist and are unable to think. They are completely exhausted and fatalistic in the sense that they believe that everything is predetermined and therefore inevitable. Unlike the specter of starvation, slow morality is more culture-specific because it refers to the Arab citizens who are purposefully turned into a herd that is dying slowly because of programmed hunger.

4.5 Struggle for Peace and Freedom

The struggle for peace and freedom, according to Marx, is an inevitable consequence of the exploitation of the working class. In other words, the bourgeoisie exploits the labour power of the proletariat to increase their capital and reap the profits that the proletariat has no share in. Having no share in the profit, the working class will be marked by agony which will lead them to rise up against the bourgeoisie eventually. *Animal Farm* is full of struggles between the previously mentioned classes. This is proved in the speech of Old Major in which he addresses the bad treatment of Mr. Jones and tries to convince the animals to rebel in order to eradicate the misery. This struggle was rendered differently in both target texts, i.e. before and after the Arab Spring, as can be seen in the table below:

Table (4)*Struggle for Peace and Freedom*

ST <i>Animal Farm</i>	TT1 مزرعة الحيوانات	TT2 مزرعة الحيوان
“Fix your eyes on that, comrades, throughout the short remainder of your lives! And above all, pass on this message of mine to those who come after you, so that future generations shall carry on the struggle until it is victorious. “And remember, comrades, your resolution must never falter. No argument must lead you astray.”(Orwell, 1945, p.12)	"ركزوا أنظاركم على هذا الهدف المنشود أيها الرفاق حتى النفس الأخير من حياتكم القصيرة، وعليكم أن تنقلوا رسالتي هذه للأجيال القادمة، حتى نصل بأهدافنا إلى النصر، وواصلو الجهاد بعزيمة لا تلين، وعليكم ألا تتفرقوا في سراديب الخلافات المذهبية!" (شامل أباطة، 2009، 12-13)	" لا ترفعوا أعينكم عن الهدف، أيها الرفاق، طيلة ما بقي من سنين عمركم. لكن قبل كل شيء، بلغوا قناعاتي لمن سيأتون بعدكم، حتى تتابع الأجيال القادمة النضال حتى النصر النهائي. تذكروا هذا أيها الرفاق: لا ينبغي أن يفتر عزمكم. إن أخطاءكم الجسيمة غير مبررة." (محمود عبد الغني، 2013، 19).

In this speech, Old Major enlightens the animals about their tragic circumstances describing their lives as nothing but misery and exploitation. He also instructs the animals to rebel against Man who is their primary enemy. This elaboration of the struggle for freedom experienced by the working class that is oppressed and brutalized by the bourgeoisie was conveyed differently in both Arabic translations.

While, in TT1, the translator opts for the Cultural Equivalence of the word “struggle” which is the Islamic word "جهاد" *jihād*, in TT2, the translator uses Literal translation in translating it to "نضال" *niḍāl*. *Jihād* is an Islamic term that has an extensive meaning. It is defined by Wahbah al-Zuhayli as devoting all the capabilities to fight the infidels (cited in Ramlan, 2016, p.36). Moreover, Yusuf Qardhawi divided jihad into three levels: jihad against the visible enemies (e.x. infidels), jihad against the temptation of Satan, and jihad against worldly lust (ibid). Jihad in the notion of *shari'a* is defined as devoting the fullest ability in the holy war in the way of Allah, either directly by fighting or indirectly by providing financial assistance, opinions, or logistic propagations and other means (to win the battle) in order to elevate the word of Allah (ibid). We may notice that the use of the Islamic term “jihad” before the Arab Spring suggests that the demands of the revolution were directed toward establishing an Islamic system that adheres to the teachings of Islam. *Niḍāl*, on the other hand, which is a universal term that prevailed in the forties, fifties, and sixties, and even before the end of the last decade of the twentieth century, is a struggle against colonialism, capitalism, reactionary belief systems, imperialism,

occupation, patriarchy, and/or Zionism. *Niḍāl* was used in TT2 to signify the secular atmosphere that prevailed in the Arab world after the Arab Spring.

In the ST, the statement “your resolution must never falter. No argument must lead you astray” was translated differently in both TTs. In TT1, the translator uses Cultural Equivalence in translating “argument” to “الخلافات المذهبية” *al-kilāfāt al-maḍhabīyya* which literally means “disputes among madahib”. The Islamic term “*maḍhab*” is defined by Emad Hamdeh as:

A madhhab linguistically means “a way” and therefore it is a method of interpreting scripture that binds a group or school of scholars together. Furthermore, the madhhabs are not theological schools or sects. Nevertheless, in modern times, following a madhhab has sometimes become an identity marker. It has sometimes become a description people give themselves to express a particular method of practicing Islam that is in opposition to “non-traditional” Islamic movements. However, the madhhabs were never intended to be identity markers; rather they are methodologies of understanding and applying scripture. (2020, p.5)

In TT2, “No argument must lead you astray” was translated by the Cultural Equivalence “أخطاءكم الجسيمة غير مبررة” (*'aḳṭā'kum al-jasīma ḡeyr mubarrara*) which literally means your grave mistakes are unjustified. The use of the cultural equivalent *al-kilāfāt al-maḍhabīyya* in TT1 reflects the unknown destination of the Arab World before the Arab Spring. This means that there were many Islamic parties intensely involved in the politics of the Arab World such as The Justice and Development Party (PJD) in Morocco, the Justice and Construction Party in Libya, Al-Nahda in Tunisia, the Muslim Brotherhood in Jordan, Egypt, and Syria, and Hamas in Palestine. Besides, the word *al-kilāfāt*, which means to argue irritably or with irritating persistence, refers to the fundamental problem of the Arab World before the Arab Spring which is the pervasive and intractable dispute among the religious parties in the Arab World. On the other hand, the use of the word *'aḳṭā'kum*, which means the wrong actions that can be avoided and corrected, reflects the ambitious spirit of the TT2.

4.6 Cult of Personality and Praise

Jan Plamper defines personality cult as the “godlike glorification of a modern political leader with mass medial techniques and excessive popular worship for this leader” (cited in Crabtree et al., 2020, p.3). Leaders of cult of personality often manipulate people through a variety of means such as mass media to create “beliefs, values, myths, symbols, and rituals directed at the adulation of the leader” (ibid). People eventually accept the authority of the leader and worship him in many different ways, namely “mass spectacles and rituals, ostentatious architecture, cult imagery in the visual and performing arts, cult objects, and cult language” (ibid). In *Animal Farm*, Orwell satirizes cult of personality by using Napoleon who creates an image of himself as a caring leader and god who protects his people from harm and enemies. This satire is conveyed differently in both target texts as can be seen in the table below:

Table (5)

Cult of Personality and Praise

ST <i>Animal Farm</i>	TT1 مزرعة الحيوانات	TT2 مزرعة الحيوان
“It was absolutely necessary, he said, that the pigs, who were the brains of the farm, should have a quiet place to work in. It was also more suited to the dignity of the Leader (for of late he had taken to speaking of Napoleon under the title of “ Leader ”) to live in a house than in a mere sty.” (Orwell, 1945, p.56)	" ذاكرا لها أن الخنازير تمثل العقل المدبر بالمزرعة، فلا بد إذن من أن يهيا لها مقر هادئ للعمل! وكذلك فإن كرامة الزعامة تقتضي أن يسكن نابليون منزلا لائقا به بدلا من (الزريبة)) وكان لقب نابليون في ذلك الحين هو الزعيم! " (شامل أباطة, 2009, 58)	"أوضح "سكويلز" بأن الأمر بسيط وبأن الضرورة المطلقة، قال، تحتم أن تقيم الخنازير، باعتبارها العقل المدبر في المزرعة، في مكان هادئ للعمل. إنه من اللائق لكرامة القائد (لأنه منذ مدة قصيرة قرر منح لقب القائد لنابليون) أن يعيش في بيت يدل زريبة الخنازير." (محمود عبد الغني، 2013، 75-76).

After overthrowing Mr. Jones and establishing his animal kingdom, Napoleon works tirelessly on creating a cult of personality and making himself the unmoved great master. Furthermore, he forced the animals to glorify his personality and his leadership, so it was compulsory to refer to him in the formal style such as “Our Leader”. The word “leader” was translated differently in both target texts: in TT1, the translator uses the Cultural Equivalence "الزعيم" (*az-za ĩm*); in TT2, the translator translated the word “leader” literally into "القائد" (*al-qā'id*).

Az-za ʿīm is defined by *Almaany* Dictionary as “the leader or person in charge of a group”. Additionally, *az-za ʿīm* indicates steadiness in the sense that it is a reference to the unmoved leader, according to *Al-Ghani* Dictionary. Moncef Marzouki (2021) argues that this word is used to refer to the savior of the oppressed. Marzouki added that people see *az-za ʿīm* as the symbol of the nation and the remarkable man who is able to understand the hardships endured by his people, and who will avenge the repressed classes. In the Arab world, *az-za ʿīm* is a demigod on whom all hopes for prosperity are pinned. He is shown disproportionate words of praise by his people. He is alleged by some like the one and only person whose absence will inevitably lead to destruction and ruin.

In TT2, the word *al-qāʿid* is defined by *Almaany* Dictionary as “a person or thing that leads.” Moreover, leadership was defined by Benscoter and Rothwell in 2012 as “a process of individual influence on a group of individuals aimed at the achievement of individual and or common goals of the group or the organization” (cited in Rudolph Muteswa, 2016, p. 135). Manzoor Ali, Aftab A. Shaikh, and Muhammad Sajid state that “leaders always have credit to influence their followers in positive manner, whether in political or institutional setup. Talking about sustainable economy of any country, leaders have strong vision and strategies to work with their followers to achieve economic goals” (2017, p. 75). This means that, unlike *az-za ʿīm* who is seen as a savior, *al-qāʿid* only leads and he can be a good one or a bad one. In both cases, it’s easy to replace the bad leaders if they don't change their toxic ways. It is worth noting that *al-qāʿid*, which is pronounced as (*qiyāda*) in modern colloquial Arabic, is used to taunt the rulers.

By contrasting the two target versions to the source text, we see two different tendencies reflected via the cultural equivalence and literal translation. One main outcome of the Arab Spring is that it has unfolded the hidden and undermined the so called glory and national value of political rulers. As a result, people no longer believe in *az-za ʿīm*. They realize that they need a leader, who is monitored and held accountable for his actions, not a *za ʿīm* who suppresses them after fleecing their money. Arabs after the Arab Spring seek freedom, democracy, human dignity, and a return to the voice of the people. After the Arab Spring, *az-za ʿīm* gets out of place in the Arab world.

4.7 Dispute among Rulers

According to Marx, capitalist society is in a state of perpetual conflict. This conflict isn't only between different classes of society, but also among the individual members of these classes. The members of the proletariat are in constant conflict among themselves as are the ruling class among themselves. This conflict among the ruling class is because of the competition for limited resources. Each member of the ruling class is in the way of the other and tries to eliminate all who are in his/her way. This kind of conflict is manifested in *Animal Farm* by the conflict between Snowball and Napoleon and was conveyed differently in both target texts as can be seen in the table below:

Table (6)

Dispute among Rulers

ST <i>Animal Farm</i>	TT1 مزرعة الحيوانات	TT2 مزرعة الحيوان
<p>“But it was noticed that these two were never in agreement: whatever suggestion either of them made, the other could be counted on to oppose it. Even when it was resolved — a thing no one could object to in itself — to set aside the small paddock behind the orchard as a home of rest for animals who were past work, there was a stormy debate over the correct retiring age for each class of animal.” (Orwell, 1945, p.30)</p>	<p>"وإن لوحظ أن الاثنین قلما يتفقان: فإذا ما أبدى أحدهما رأياً وحظي بالموافقة فإن الآخر يثير خلافاً على تفاصيله: فمثلاً حينما اتفق على تخصيص مرعى للمسنين من الحيوانات خلف حديقة الفواكه، دب الخلاف بينهما حول السن التي يتاح له أن يستقيد فيها بهذا المرعى!" (شامل أباطة، 2009، 30).</p>	<p>" ومع ذلك يلاحظ أنهما لا يتفقان أبداً: كيفما كان رأي أحدهما، نعرف أن الآخر لا يوافق عليه. وحتى عندما يتخذ القرار - ولا أحد يستطيع أن يحتج على هذا الشيء في حد ذاته - بخصوص تحويل الأرض المسورة المجاورة للحديقة إلى بيت استراحة، يتبع ذلك نقاش عاصف: ما هو السن القانوني للتقاعد، حسب كل فئة من الحيوانات؟" (محمود عبد الغني، 2013، 41).</p>

In *Animal Farm*, the dispute among rulers is represented by the clash between Napoleon and Snowball. Both power-hungry rulers are trying, by all means, to impose their vision on the farm. While Snowball is active and works hard to develop plans for the farm, Napoleon raises in seclusion nine puppies to be his own private army which will later drive his opponent, Snowball, from the farm.

One face of the clash between the previously mentioned rulers in Orwell's farm is the “stormy debate” over any suggestion made by either of them. The word “debate” is translated by using Synonymy to "خلاف" (*kilāf*) in TT1 and by using the same translation strategy into "نقاش" (*niqās*) in TT2. The word *kilāf* has many definitions in Arabic

including a rupture of friendly relations; the state of being unlike; a violent contention or altercation between individuals; active opposition or hostility, especially between two people (*Almaany Dictionary*). Moreover, Ibn Taymiyyah states that *kilāf* in the Qur'an refers to opposition and contradiction, not just asymmetries (20-19/13 الفتاوى: ابن تيمية; translation is mine). In addition, *kilāf* refers to the *fiqh* issues on which Islamic scholars do not agree (الفقهاء معجم لغة) cited in عرب ديكت; translation is mine). On the other hand, the word *niqāš* is defined by *Almaany Dictionary* as "Talk for the purpose of discussing; and Discussion or argument on a subject that people have different opinions about". Furthermore, Ihab Fikry defines *niqāš* as a healthy debate to pursue the truth by more than one party on one or more topics regardless of the convergence of views (2017, p. 62; my translation).

By contrasting the two target versions to the source text, we see two different tendencies reflected via two different synonyms. The *kilāf* in TT1 before the Arab Spring becomes *niqāš* in TT2 after the Arab Spring. This indicates that Abdel Ghani is more optimistic about the new economic and socio-political context. This has something to do with the fact that *kilāf* refers to fundamental struggles which can't be resolved exactly like the struggles between Mr. Jones and the animals in Orwell's farm. However, Abdel Ghani's *niqāš* is deemed more optimistic as it opens the way to democracy and freedom and gives its parties the sense that they are partners in pursuing the truth. Therefore, irrespective of its methodology and outcomes, *niqāš* ends without violent contention or altercations between its parties because it, unlike *kilāf*, is not based on attacking the other in an attempt to win the discussion.

4.8 Religion as a Relation of Production

Karl Marx claims that, in a capitalist society, religion is used to maintain social inequality. He claims that the bourgeoisie uses religion as a tool to both gain control over the means of production and keep the oppressed proletariat pacified by justifying oppression on the one hand and promising rewards in the after-life on the other. In Marx's words, "Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature" (1970, p.1). In *Animal Farm*, Orwell suggests the same idea. He suggests that religion makes people feel better about their oppression by using Moses as a "religious" figure who tells tales of a promised land called Sugarcandy Mountain where the animals can live free from oppression. This is rendered differently in both target texts, i.e. before and after the Arab Spring, as can be seen in the table below.

Table (7)*Religion as a Relation of Production*

ST <i>Animal Farm</i>	TT1 مزرعة الحيوانات	TT2 مزرعة الحيوان
<p>"He (Moses) claimed to know of the existence of a mysterious country called Sugarcandy Mountain, to which all animals went when they died. It was situated somewhere up in the sky, a little distance beyond the clouds, Moses said. In Sugarcandy Mountain it was Sunday seven days a week, clover was in season all the year round, and lump sugar and linseed cake grew on the hedges. The animals hated Moses because he told tales and did no work." (Orwell, 1945, p.19)</p>	<p>"وقد كان (موسى) يدعي وجود بلد غريبة اسمها "جبل السكر نبات" تبعث فيها الحيوانات بعد موتها، وهي فيما وراء الغيوم مباشرة في السماء! وفي هذه الملكة السماوية ترتاح الحيوانات من عناء العمل الدنيوي، ولها ما شاءت من برسيم في كل الفصول، وعلى حدود حقول البرسيم تنمو أسوار من الفطائر اللذيذة "والسكر نبات!" ومع أن الحيوانات كانت تبغض موسى لكسله وخيئه، فإن بعضها كانت تؤمن بنبوته عن مملكة "السكر نبات" وان نفت الخنازير احتمال وجودها،" (شامل أباطة، 2009، 19).</p>	<p>"كان (موسى) يدعي وجود بلد سري، يقال له "جبل الحلوى" تعيش فيه كل الحيوانات بعد الموت. يوجد "جبل الحلوى" حسب موسى، في السماء، وراء الغيوم قليلا. وكان يذهب كل يوم أحد ليقم فيها. ينبت فيها عشب النفل طيلة السنة، وقطع السكر متوفرة على سياجات الحقول. كانت الحيوانات تكره موسى بسبب هذه الترهات، ولأنه لا يكذب مثلهم، ولكن رغم كل شيء بدأ بعضهم يصدق وجود "جبل الحلوى" هذا، والخنازير ان وجدا صعوبات كبيرة في صرفهم عن ذلك." (محمود عبد الغني، 2013، 27).</p>

Moses is introduced by Orwell as the raven who keeps telling stories of a mountain called Sugarcandy Mountain to which the animals will go after their death to reap the reward of their hard work. In the novel, Orwell makes a connection between dictatorship and religion by making Moses the tamed raven of Mr. Jones before the revolution and the ally of Napoleon after the revolution. The pigs allow Moses to stay on the farm without having to work while they also provide him with daily rations of beer by the pigs.

By internally exploring the target texts, we find that Orwell's cynical and harsh view of religion was conveyed differently in both TTs. According to Orwell, Moses was a tool of the ruling class to keep the animals hopeful and productive. Yet, after the revolution, the animals "hated Moses because he told tales and did no work." The word "hated" was translated using Cultural Equivalence to "تبغض" (*tabḡuḍ*), from the root بَغَضَ *baḡaḍa*, which means ("to hate"). It is a cultural equivalent because it "occurs for the sake of Allah by hating those whom Allah hates due to bad qualities which they have, like some of the disbelievers and those who commit religious innovations and the like" (الجمهرة). The use of this word carries the translator's hint that these clerics are not sincere in calling to the

way of Allah. Instead, they sinned against Allah by choosing to support dictators and work for their personal interests. On the other hand, the same word was translated Literally to "نكره" (*takrrah*), from the root ك ر ه (*k-r-h*), which is defined by *Almaany Dictionary* as to “feel distaste for; be disinclined to; dislike.”

In TT1, the translator deletes “he told tales”. This deletion may refer to the idea that people were not against religion itself. In TT2, “tales” was translated using Synonymy to "الترهات" *al-turrahāt* which means, “Something that is said or written that is silly or does not mean anything important” (*Almaany Dictionary*). Despite the slight similarity in meaning between tales and *al-turrahāt*, the latter contains more negative connotations such as "falsehood; rigmarole; flimflam; humbug; rubbish; lie; nonsense; slander" (*Almaany Dictionary*). The use of this synonym indicates the vitriol on religion itself.

In TT1, the phrase “did no work” was translated using Functional Equivalence to "الكسله" *li kasalihi wā kubṭihi*. *Kasalihi* means “The lack of effort and unwillingness to do what needs to be done, despite being able to do it” (الجمهرة). The word *kubṭihi* from the root *kubut* means “The quality of being impulsive, harmful, obloquy, and offensive” (*Almaany Dictionary*). Here we see that the translator uses two adjectives to attack the character of clerics to justify why people hate them. In TT2, the word “work” was translated using Synonymy to *yakuddu* from the root ك د د (*k-d-d*) which is defined by *Almaany Dictionary* as “work hard; drudge; fag; moil; plod; slave; sweat; travail”. The use of the word *yakuddu* elicits the reader's sympathy with the pain of the working class, which suffers and is exploited by the ruling class with the help of clerics.

By contrasting the two target versions to the source text, we see two different tendencies reflected via synonymy, functional equivalence, and deletion. In TT1, the translator omits the criticism of the religion and directed the criticism on the clerics themselves because they work as the dictators' tool in persecuting the working class. In TT2, the translator uses a synonym to severely criticize religion itself and another one to emphasize the suffering of the working.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

4.1 Conclusion

This research demonstrates that the translation of literary texts is not simply a process of transferring meaning from one language into another. The high frequencies of ideologically loaded choices above clearly prove that the dominant ideology and the economic and socio-political system of the target culture can steer the translator's pen on the paper and determine what to translate from SC to TC and how to translate it.

This study has been shaped by three key research questions (section 1.3). The first question deals with the strategies used in translating relations of production from the SL to the TTs. Subsequent analysis in Chapter four shows that from thirteen data, it was found that eleven data in the TT1 contain semantic shifts: cultural equivalence was used five times, transposition was used once, synonymy was used twice, expansion was used once, deletion was used once, and functional equivalence was used once. Fewer semantic shifts were found in TT2: synonymy was used six times, functional equivalence was used once, and cultural equivalence was used once. Moreover, the researcher concludes that TT1 contains more semantic shifts compared to TT2.

The second and third key research questions deal with the impact of economic and socio-political contexts on the translators' views in translation. Subsequent analysis in chapter four shows that the economic and socio-political contexts before and after the Arab Spring did influence the translators' view in the translation. By comparing the two translations of various types of relations of production in *Animal Farm*, done before and after the Arab Spring, readers can recognize that Islamic thought was dominant before the Arab Spring, which explains why Abatha uses many Islamic terms in his translation before the Arab Spring. On the other hand, in TT2 which was done after the Arab Spring, a considerable number of changes have been made to the text which is indicative of the secular ideology that mostly dominates the scene in the said period.

The overall conclusion of the thesis is that the use of different equivalents before and after the Arab Spring makes it evident that the dominant ideology and economic and socio-political context of a specific period of time can affect the language of the people and, therefore, embody the language of writing and rewriting (e.g. translation).

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher recommends the following:

1. More research should be conducted on Marxist translation to stress its role in revealing and unfolding the gaps and the incomplete essences in the body of the source text in terms of hegemonic relations.
2. Translation is inseparable from its economic and socio-political context. Therefore, researchers should take into consideration the context in interpreting both the source text and the target text.

List of Abbreviations

ST : Source Text (Orwell's text)

TT: Target Text

TT1 : Target Text 1 (Abatha's translation)

TT2 : Target Text 2 (Abdel Ghani's translation)

SL : Source Language

TL : Target Language

SC : Source Culture

TC : Target Culture

References

1. Ali M., Shaikh A., Sajid M. (2017). The Political Leadership and Corporate Governance: An Analysis of Leadership Theories and It's Influence. *International Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.14419/ijbas.v6i3.7706>
2. Al-Maryani, J. (2017). Revisiting Translator's and Interpreter's Role after the Arab Spring. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339208762_Revisiting_Translator's_and_Interpreter's_Role_after_the_Arab_Spring
3. Althusser, L., & Balibar, E. (1970). *Reading Capital: The Complete Edition* (Abridged ed.). New York: Verso.
4. Alhirthani, M. (2018). Nation and Translation in the Arab World: A Palestinian Perspective. *AlAqsa University Journal*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327673133_Nation_and_Translation_in_the_Arab_World_A_Palestinian_Perspective
5. Álvarez, R., & Vidal, C. (1996). *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
6. Alzghoul, M. (2018). *Translation and Conflict: Arab-Spring Uprisings and Their Impact on Translation from Arabic into English* [Graduate Dissertations and Theses, Binghamton University]. Research Direct. https://orb.binghamton.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1120&context=dissertation_and_theses
7. Baker, M. (2010). Narratives of Terrorism and Security: 'Accurate' Translations, Suspicious Frames. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 3(3), 347–364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2010.521639>
8. Bassnett, S. (2013). *Translation (The New Critical Idiom)* (1st ed.). London, England: Routledge.
9. BBC News. (2014, November 10). #BBCTrending: Why George Orwell is trending in Egypt. <https://www.bbc.com/news/blogs-trending-29995874>

10. BBC News. (2011, October 26). *Egypt jails police over activist Khaled Said's death*. Retrieved April 12, 2022, from <https://www.bbc.com/news/15467022>
11. Chen, S. (2017, August). Translation and Ideology: A Study of Lin Zexu's Translation Activities. *Meta*. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1041026ar>CopiedAn error has occurred.
12. Corm, G. (2020). *Arab Political Thought: Past and Present*. London: Hurst.
13. Crabtree, C., Kern, H. L., & Siegel, D. A. (2020). Cults of Personality, Preference Falsification, and the Dictator's Dilemma. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 32(3), 409–434. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0951629820927790>
14. Eagleton, T. (1976). *Criticism and Ideology*. London: Lowe and Brydone Printers Limited.
15. Daifallah, Y. (2012). Political Subjectivity in Contemporary Arab Thought: The Political Theory of Abdullah Laroui, Hassan Hanafi, and Mohamed Abed al-Jabiri. [Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley]. Research Direct. file:///C:/Users/lenovo/OneDrive/%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%B3%D8%AA%D9%86%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%AA/eScholarship%20UC%20item%201cc0g870.pdf
16. Ertürk, N., & Serin, Z. (2016, August). Marxism, Communism, and Translation: An Introduction. *Boundary 2*, 43(3), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01903659-3572526>
17. Even-Zohar, I. (1990). Polysystem Studies; Volume 11, Number 1. *Poetics Today: International Journal for Theory and Analysis of Literature and Communication*. https://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/books/Even-Zohar_1990--Polysystem%20studies.pdf accessed 29th July 2022.
18. Fouad, Y. (n.d.-a). *Arabdict*. <https://www.arabdict.com/ar/english-arabic>
19. Ghazala, H., (1995). *Translation as Problems and Solutions* (4th ed.) Syria: Dar Elkalem ElArabi.

20. Gee, J. P. (2010). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* (3rd ed.). London, England: Routledge.
21. Gentzler, E. (2001). *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
22. Gould, R., & Tahmasebian, K. (2020). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Activism*. New York: Routledge.
23. Gürçağlar, Ş. T. (2003). The Translation Bureau Revisited: Translation as Symbol. *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology-ideologies in Translation Studies* (p.113-129). Calzada-Pérez, M.(Red.).
24. Hamdeh, E. (2020). What is a Madhhab? Exploring the Role of Islamic Schools of Law. *Yaqeen Institute for Islamic Research*. file:///C:/Users/lenovo/OneDrive/%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%B3%D8%AA%D9%86%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%AA/What_is_a_Madhhab.pdf
25. Hubbard, B., & Kirkpatrick, D. D. (2021, February 14). A Decade After the Arab Spring, Autocrats Still Rule the Mideast. *The New York Times*. Retrieved May 12, 2022, from <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/14/world/middleeast/arab-spring-mideast-autocrats.html>
26. Lageman, T. (2020, December 22). Remembering Mohamed Bouazizi: The man who sparked the Arab Spring. Arab Spring: 10 Years on | *Al Jazeera*. Retrieved April 12, 2022, from <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2020/12/17/remembering-mohamed-bouazizi-his-death-triggered-the-arab>
27. Lefevere, A. (1992–2003). *Translation/History/Culture (Translation Studies)*. London, England: Routledge.
28. Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London, England: Routledge.
29. Lenin, V.I. (1893 – 1894/1960). *V. I. Lenin's Collected Works* (Vol. 1). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

30. Lenin, V.I. (1912-1913). *V. I. Lenin's Collected Works* (Vol. 18). Moscow: Progress Publishers.
31. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* | LDOCE. (n.d.). LONGMAN. <https://www.ldoceonline.com/>
32. Marx, K. (1870) *Introduction to A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
33. Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1848/2008). *The Communist Manifesto*. London: Pluto Press.
34. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2014). *The Communist Manifesto* (New edition). New York: International Publishers Co
35. Marx, K. (1970). *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
36. Marx, K. (1870). *Introduction to A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
37. Marx, K., Fowkes, B., & Mandel, E. (1992). *Capital* (Vol. 1): *A Critique of Political Economy* (*Penguin Classics*) (Illustrated ed., Vol. 1). London, England: Penguin Classics.
38. *Merriam-Webster*. (n.d.). Dictionary by. The Merriam-Webster.Com Dictionary. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>
39. Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London, England: Routledge.
40. Muteswa, R. (2016). Qualities of a Good Leader and the Benefits of Good Leadership to an Organization: A Conceptual Study. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 8(24), 135.
41. Newmark, P. (1988/1995). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall
42. Nielsen, K. (1989). The Concept of Ideology: Some Marxist and Non-Marxist Conceptualizations. *Rethinking Marxism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08935698908657894>
43. Orwell, G. (1945/2017). *Animal Farm*. Giza: JO Publishing and Distribution.

44. Orwell, G. (1933/2001). *Down and Out in Paris and London*. London: Penguin.
45. Mikhail, A. (2017, July 13). Dogs in Ancient Islamic Culture. OUPblog. *Oxford University Press*. Retrieved April 12, 2022, from <https://blog.oup.com/2017/07/dogs-ancient-islamic-culture/#:%7E:text=Dogs%20in%20Islam%2C%20as%20they,nullify%20a%20pious%20Muslim's%20supplications.>
46. Pérez, M. (2014). *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology- Ideologies in Translation Studies*. London, England: Routledge.
47. Ryan, M. (2007). *Literary Theory: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Wiley.
48. Said, W. (1991). *Orientalism*. London, England: Penguin Books.
49. Saville-Troike, M. (1986). *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
50. Smallwood, A. (2016/2017). The Role of Translated Literature in the Polysystem. [Graduate Dissertations and Theses, The University Of Birmingham]. Research Direct. https://www.academia.edu/31977339/_The_role_of_translated_literature_in_the_polysystem
51. University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice. (2006). Slavery and Justice. <https://slaveryandjustice.brown.edu/sites/default/files/reports/SlaveryAndJustice2006.pdf>
52. Toury, Gideon (1995/2012) *Descriptive Translation Studies – And Beyond* (Rev. edition). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
53. Valdeón, R. (2020). Introduction: The Politics of Translation and the Translation of Politics. *The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 12(2), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.11222.2020.a01>
54. Venuti, L. (2010). Translation, Empiricism, Ethics. *Modern Language Association* (p. 72-81). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41419863>
55. Wright, J. D. (2015). *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier.

56. Ramlan, R., Erwinsyahbana, T., & Hakim, N. (2016). The Concept of Jihad In Islam. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 21(09), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2109073542>

المراجع العربية

1. أباطة، شامل (2009). *مزرعة الحيوانات*. دار الشروق: القاهرة.
2. ابن تيمية (1425-2004). *مجموع فتاوى شيخ الإسلام أحمد بن تيمية (مجموع الفتاوى)* (ط. الأوقاف السعودية). *مجموع فتاوى شيخ الإسلام أحمد بن تيمية (مجموع الفتاوى)* (ط. الأوقاف السعودية).
3. *الجمهرة موسوعة مفردات المحتوى الإسلامي*. (n.d). *الجمهرة*. <https://islamic-content.com/>
4. السقا، أباهر (2014). *الانتفاضات والثورات العربية الحالية وأثرها على القضية الفلسطينية*. المركز الفلسطيني لأبحاث السياسات والدراسات الإستراتيجية (مسارات).
https://www.masarat.ps/files/content_files/Intfdt_bhr_lsq_-_wfq_lmtbw_0.pdf
5. المرزوقي، منصف. (November 3, 2021). *المشروع الديمقراطي العربي بين مطرقة الاستبداد وسندان الشعبوية*. آراء | الجزيرة نت. Retrieved April 20, 2022, from <https://www.aljazeera.net/opinions/2021/11/3/%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D8%B4%D8%B1%D9%88%D8%B9-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AF%D9%8A%D9%85%D9%82%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%B7%D9%8A-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%B1%D8%A8%D9%8A-%D8%A8%D9%8A%D9%86-%D9%85%D8%B7%D8%B1%D9%82%D8%A9>
6. عاشور، عمر (2016, July 30). *إتمام المهمة: إصلاح قطاع الأمن بعد الربيع العربي*. Brookings. <https://www.brookings.edu/ar/articles/%D8%A5%D8%AA%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%85-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%85%D9%87%D9%85%D8%A9-%D8%A5%D8%B5%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%AD-%D9%82%D8%B7%D8%A7%D8%B9-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D9%85%D9%86-%D8%A8%D8%B9%D8%AF-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B1%D8%A8>
7. عبد الغني، محمود (2013). *مزرعة الحيوان*. المركز الثقافي العربي: بيروت.

8. عنان، محمد (2012). *نظرية الترجمة الحديثة* الدكتور محمد عناني. الشركة المصرية العالمية للنشر-لونجمان: مصر.
9. فكري، إيهاب (2012). *فن الكلام وأصول الحوار الناجح*. دار دون للنشر والتوزيع. مصر.
10. قاموس ومعجم المعاني متعدد اللغات والمجالات - قاموس عربي عربي و قاموس عربي انجليزي ثنائي. قاموس المعاني. <https://www.almaany.com/>
11. مصباح، محمد (2021). *ثورة ودولة الربيع العربي: فلسفة الثورات العربية وأسئلة الدولة والمجتمع والأمة، قراءة تركيبية في كتابات الباحث سلمان بونعمان*. مؤمنون بلا حدود للدراسات والأبحاث. <https://www.mominoun.com>
12. وازن، عبده (2021, March 5). 6 ترجمات عربية متلاحقة لـ"مزرعة" أرويل تحدث فضيحة. اندبندنت عربية. <https://www.independentarabia.com>.



جامعة النجاح الوطنية
كلية الدراسات العليا

ترجمة خطاب علاقات الإنتاج الاجتماعية في رواية
مزرعة الحيوانات لجورج أرويل قبل وبعد الربيع العربي

إعداد

رندة محمود امين سماره

إشراف

د. محمد حمدان

قدمت هذه الرسالة استكمالاً لمتطلبات الحصول على درجة الماجستير في اللغويات التطبيقية والترجمة بكلية الدراسات العليا في جامعة النجاح الوطنية في نابلس، فلسطين.

2022

ترجمة خطاب علاقات الإنتاج الاجتماعية في رواية مزرعة الحيوانات لجورج أورويل قبل وبعد الربيع العربي

إعداد

رندة محمود أمين سمارة

إشراف

د. محمد جمدان

الملخص

يمكن للمترجم التدخل فكرياً في الترجمة سعياً لتحقيق مآرب لا يعكسها محتوى النص الأصلي، لذلك من المهم تسليط الضوء على التصرف الأيديولوجي في الترجمة الأدبية مع الأخذ بعين الاعتبار السياقات الاجتماعية والثقافية والسياسية للنص، فمثلاً شهدت الساحة العربية منذ ثورات الربيع العربي تغيرات اقتصادية واجتماعية سياسية مستمرة تجلت هذه التغيرات في عديد من المجالات منها إنتاج النص والترجمة واستخدام الألفاظ، فقد دفعت العديد من الكتاب الى انتاج نصوص تحاول تفسير عوامل وأسباب هذه الثورات التي اجتاحت المنطقة العربية (محمد مصباح، 2021).

فجاءت هذه الدراسة لوصف التأثير الأيديولوجي للثورة الاقتصادية والاجتماعية السياسية في العالم العربي على ترجمة خطاب علاقات الإنتاج في رواية "مزرعة الحيوانات" (1945) لجورج أورويل. تتمثل مادة البحث في تحليل مقتطفات من رواية "مزرعة الحيوان" -كنص أصلي- مع المضاهاة من ترجمتين عربيتين تنتمي كل منهما الى حقبة تاريخية مختلفة: "مزرعة الحيوانات" التي ترجمها شامل أباطة قبل الربيع العربي عام 2009، و"مزرعة الحيوان" التي ترجمها محمود عبد الغني بعد الربيع العربي عام 2013.

ولتحقيق هذا الهدف استخدمت الباحثة استراتيجيات الترجمة التي يقترحها بيتر نيومارك (Peter Newmark) لتسليط الضوء على الاختلافات بين النص الأصلي والنصوص الهدف ومناقشتها.

وقد أظهرت الدراسة أن أيديولوجية المترجمين المتأثرة بوضعهم الاقتصادي والاجتماعي السياسي وبيئتهم في بلد اللغة الهدف يمكن الكشف عنها من مجموعة الاستراتيجيات المستخدمة في ترجمة مزرعة الحيوانات من حيث اختيار الألفاظ و إعادة تفسير الأيديولوجيا المجسدة في النص الأصلي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الخطاب، العلاقات الاجتماعية، مزرعة الحيوانات، الربيع العربي.