

Investigating Manipulation of Orwell's *Animal Farm* in Two Arabic Translations: Further Insights

Submitted by
Basma Mohamed Ali Abdel Gafour
an M.A student

Abstract

The Manipulation School in translation has brought radical changes in the investigation process of translated texts, particularly the "literary" ones. Not only does it regard translation as a linguistic process serving a communicative purpose; but rather a systematic manipulative activity relying internally on an array of factors (source text and context; target linguistic/social norms, translator's knowledge of text language and world; his/her ideology as well as experience) simultaneously it is interconnected with other co-existing systems i.e., cultural, literary and political at a given time and place. Due to its creative nature, aesthetic conventions, loose norms as well as its continual link with socio-cultural environment thereof, literary works are said to be the most prone type to manipulation. Henceforth, they form the focused subject of study for theorists belonging to this school where notions such as ideology, power, dominance and manipulation have been intrinsically indicative. This paper aims at examining manipulation as a concept in theory and practice exploiting Dukate's model of translational manipulation (2007), in addition to Lefevere's view (1985/2014,1992) of translation as rewriting of dominant ideology and poetics. The probed data is a corpus of extracts quoted from two Arabic translations of Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945), each belonging to a different historical frame work (1951-197). The findings have showed that the three types of manipulation (handling, improvement and distortion) are exhibited, however, with one dominant type in each target text.

Keywords: Manipulation school, Polysystem, Translation as rewriting, Ideology and poetics, Literary work, Dukate's model

تقصي المعالجة اللغوية لرواية "مزرعة الحيوان" عبر ترجمتين: رؤى إضافية بسمه محمد علي عبد الغفور

مستخلص

استطاعت مدرسة "التحوير اللغوي" في الترجمة إن تحدثت تغيير جذري في فحص النصوص المترجمة بشكل عام و الأدبية منها بشكل خاص. لا تعتبر هذه المدرسة عملية الترجمة نشاط لغوي يهدف الى التواصل فقط؛ بل ينظر اليها على انها نشاط سميتة الاساسية التحوير و يعتمد - من ناحية النص و اللغة- على عدة عوامل مثل ماهية النص الاصلى و سياقه , الاعراف اللغوية و الاجتماعية للغة المترجم إليها, حصيلة المترجم المعرفية الخاصة باللغة و الثقافة المنقول إليها, الى جانب خبرته و خلفيته الايدولوجية. بعيداً عن اللغة و نصوصها فان الترجمة هي نظام متداخل مع الانظمة الاخرى القائمة مثل النظام الثقافى و الأدبى و السياسى فى مجتمع بعينه فى مرحلة تاريخية محددة. ويعتبر النص الادبى أكثر أنواع النصوص المعرضة للتحوير أثناء الترجمة نظراً لعدة أسباب: طبيعته الابداعية, جمالياته, أعراف الكتابة الأدبية التى تتسم بعد التقيد بالاضافة الى ارتباطه بالوضع الاجتماعى و الثقافى. و بالتالى فان النص الأدبى هو محور دراسة و اهتمام مدرسة "التحوير اللغوي" بحيث تشكل مفاهيم مثل "الايدولوجية", "القوة", "الهيمنة", "التحوير" دلالات اساسية.

يهدف هذا البحث الى فحص مفهوم " التحوير " كنظرية و تطبيق فى الترجمة عن طريق استخدام نموذج " ديوكيت" لانواع التحوير اللغوي (٢٠٠٧) بالاضافة الى رؤية " ليفيرى" للترجمة (١٩٨٥\٢٠١٤, ١٩٩٢) باعتبارها " عملية إعادة كتابة للايدولوجيات و الشعاريات السائدة. إن مادة البحث تتمثل فى تحليل مقتطفات من رواية "مزرعة الحيوان" - كنص أصلى- مع المضاهاة من ترجمتين عربيتين تنتمى كل منهما الى حقبة تاريخية مختلفة: ١٩٥١ و ١٩٨٧. وقد أظهرت نتائج التحليل ان جميع الامثلة المستخدمة فى الترجمتين قد عبرت عن الثلاث أنواع من التحوير اللغوي (التحوير كمعالجة- التحوير كتحسين- التحوير كإفساد) مع وجود نوع واحد ممثل بشكل أكبر فى كل واحدة منهما.

الكلمات المفتاحية: مدرسة "التحوير اللغوي", نظرية الأنظمة المتعددة, الترجمة كإعادة كتابة, الايدولوجية و الشعاريات, النص الأدبى, نموذج "ديوكيت"

Investigating Manipulation of Orwell's *Animal Farm* in Two Arabic Translations: Further Insights

Submitted by
Basma Mohamed Ali Abdel Gafour
an M.A student

1. Introduction

Undoubtedly translation acts as an indispensable part in intercultural communication. One essential constituent of the ' culture ' system of any society is literature. The literary system has always been the mirror reflecting and commonly shaping a society's identity, political, social and ideological values and perceptions. Hence, translated literature has always acted as an intellectual bridge for communication. Accordingly, without the process of translation, that intercultural communication would be impossible.

Bassnett and Lefevere (1992a, p.vii) view translation as a process "rewriting of an original text, reflecti[ng] a certain ideology and a poetics" therefore that rewriting, or transposition of a text/context into a different one could leave room for manipulation.

1.1 Context of the Study

Borrowed from Russian Formalists school, the cultural perspective in translation studies view literature as a " sub system " which is inevitably in " interplay " with other subsystems like science, technology, etc. (Steiner in lefevere 1992a, p.11). Notably, from the cultural approach, the literary work should be studied when functioning in the literary canon, which is in - what Tynjanov (1927, p.27) – terms "interrelationship with other orders".

Centered his "Polysystem" on the same view, Even-Zohar (1971, 1978, 1990) conceived translation as a sub system with the literary polysystem and in a constant interplay sustained; in the selection of which texts to be translated, what norms and functions to be adopted by translated texts as well as which of them should be " canonized " (i.e., at the seat of power) as opposing " the non-canonized ". Relied on this,

Toury (1980, 1995) elaborated that translation is a norm-governed activity with cultural significance.

Lefevere (1985/2014,1992a) expanded "Polysystem"; adding that translation is "the most obviously recognizable type of rewriting...potentially the most influential" (1992a, p.9). Proven by numerous examples in the cultural history, rewriting literary works have been produced - or precisely- 'manipulated' under the constrains of dominant ideology and

poetics i.e., literary devices, genres, motifs, prototypical characters and situations, symbols as well as what literature should be like). Needless to say, ideology might be individual, collective or institutional (i.e., enforced by the Patrons).

1.2 Scope of the Study

This paper is a study of the so-called " Manipulation " phenomenon, examined contrastively in two Arabic translations of George Orwell's (1945) *Animal Farm*. The first Arabic text is entitled *اسطورة الحيوانات الثائرة* (1951) translated by Abbas Hafez, published by Dar al-Marref Publishing Group. The second Arabic version is *مزرعة الحيوانات*; translated by Abdel-Hamid Alkateb and published via Dar Akhabar ELYom in 1978.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

In the light of Manipulation School's assumption that "all translation implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose." (Hermans,1985/2014, p. 11) This research seeks to answer the following questions:

1-How is the image of ST as a literary work projected in the given historic-sociocultural context? Given the socio-cultural context, how far do the translator's ideology and the dominant poetics (Lefevere,1992a, pp.39- 41) reflect on the translation of *Animal Farm* as a literary work?

2-Relying on the concept of manipulation as rewriting of a text compromising a set of linguistic, cultural, aesthetic as well as ideological factors (Dukāte,2007, p.79; lefevere1992a), how far is "Manipulation" realized text -internally as handling or as improvement or as distortion based on Dukate's typology (2007, pp.96-104)?

3- Considering Dukāte's internal manipulation, how far can these semantically and pragmatically manipulative instances be perceived, reasoned, and categorized: ideologically-induced, or culturally - induced or ignorance - induced?

1.4 Significance of the Study

This research is an attempt to give insight into Manipulation as a concept, approach as well as strategy at work in translation. This study might serve as a merging point between Manipulation as a notion and a

school of thought and between how it is applied and meant to function in a certain literary work at a given in the social, cultural and historical time.

1.5 About Source Text

- ***The Historical & Cultural setting of the ST***

Animal Farm is a parody of the events leading up to the Bolshevik Revolution October 1917, and it particularly parodies the political situation in Stalin's USSR. *Animal Farm* is a representative of Orwell's mental fixation; as a revolutionary socialist who was standing against totalitarianism. The rudiments of this thought is said to be formed during Orwell's police service in Burma, which was a British colony Orwell was deeply affected by the miserable conditions of the Burmese society whom was deemed to be poor defeated workers for the interest of the British Empire monopolies. This is clearly exemplified in the words of Orwell's main character *Flory* in *Burmese days* (1934) "How can you make out that we are in this country for any purpose except to steal? "(as cited in Wengraf, 2003)

His anti-capitalism stance was rather consolidated after he spent a short time experiencing social conditions in economically depressed northern England, that actuality yielded in the non-fiction *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1937). It is believed that his participation in the Spanish Civil War (1936 – 1937) was Orwell's pivotal point as he experienced himself what as " horrible atmospher produced by fear, suspicion, hatred, censored newspapers, crammed jails, enormous food queues and prowling gangs of armed men." (Orwell, 2010, p.155)

In his own words, Orwell summed up his ideology:
The Spanish war and other events 1936-37 turned the scale and thereafter I knew where I stood. Every line of serious work I have written since 1936 has been written directly or indirectly against totalitarianism and for democratic socialism as I understand it.

(Orwell, 1946, *Why I write*)

1.6 About Target Texts

- ***The Historical and Cultural setting of the TT1***

1951- Egypt was a feudal monarch under the British colonization; on the verge of a revolution (which actually took place within a year later.e.1952-revolution). Egypt then was going towards the end of what had been called the "liberal age" (1928-1952) where" European-style constitutionalism and political pluralism were incorporated into the country's landscape"(Botman,2008, p.285). The end of the nineteenth

century witnessed the emergence of the anti-colonial nationalistic course, which rose gradually until the mid of the twentieth century when " the population considered competing ideologies for Egypt's political and economic development including western-style liberalism, monarchy, Islamic fundamentalism, Marxism, feminism, and secular nationalism." (ibid.)

- ***The Historical and Cultural setting of the TT2***

The end of 1970s was a critical era in Egypt's history for Egypt was witnessing turmoil both externally as well as internally; after President *Sadat* signed *Camp David Accords* - in September 1978 - with Prime Minister *Menachem Begin*.

Albeit the fact that the frameworks of these accord led- directly to the 1979-Egypt Israel Peace treaty, they sparked a fierce controversy locally and internationally. Domestically, most Egyptians –particularly the Nassrists- felt resentment and condemnation primarily due to the sign of *Camp David Accords* which had been regarded as " betrayal "of the 1952 revolutionary goal led by Nassir whose "leadership was based on confrontation with the Zionist entity" (Roussillion,2008, p.343).

Furthermore, the "opening up" economic policy, return of the exploitative bourgeoisie had been other causes which inflamed the situation internally as they were regarded "counter 1952-revolution". (ibid.) Internationally, most of Arab countries expressed their ostracism and anger as they considered engaging with Israel in peace negotiations a kind of treason; against the concept of "Arab Nationalism", which was consistently propagandized during Abdel Nassir's reign (i.e., whose leadership symbolized Arab Nationalism). Obviously, *Sadat* was in perpetual confrontation with the Nassirist ideology (Stein ,1999; Roussillon ,1998/2008).

On the other hand, all pros of *Sadat's* policy as well as state-owned institutions were directed then to manage a counter- propaganda with the aim of enhancing *Sadat's* image, defaming his predecessors and promoting his image as the "first defender of the country's political, religious gains".

2-Review of Literature

2.1 Translation as a product, discipline and process

Translation is a term that can be defined from different prospects with different aims. Prior displaying definitions for translation, it is essential to overview de facto status of this term. Translation can be used to denote a product, discipline, and process. Bearing in mind that under

each lying a number of types and sub-types; i.e., Pure vs. applied (as a discipline), as a product (e.g., literary, religious, legal, etc / translation, version, adaptation / in terms of the strategy processed: literal vs. free, and so on). Respectively, *Oxford Advanced learners* defines the 'product' translation as "a text or work that has been changed from one language to another."

Translation as a discipline

- ***Before 20th century***

As known, translation started as merely a practice, it was initiated as early as humans began to record history "Antiquity" (e.g., Cicero 106-43 BC; Horace 65-8 BC). Thenceforth, the interest in such practice continued to grow and develop, shaped by different scholars for different purposes: the religious need of conveying the "spirit" and "truth" of holy books and sacred texts (e.g. St. Jerome 399 AD; Martin Luther 1522-34); the thrust for creating humane and transcultural communications across societies e.g., Roger Bacon 13th, Geoffrey Chaucer 14th C, Fredrick Schleiermacher 1813.

(Munday,2001; Lebert, 2016; Aissi, 1987)

- ***The early 20th century and onwards***

With the beginning of the 19th C, modern civilizations, along with modern languages have been established and language teaching has found its way to be institutionalized in schools and universities. The primary method in teaching foreign languages was executed via the of translation lexical and syntactic rules of 12, namely 'Grammar-translation' method. Thus, that approach of teaching language made translation as an essential tool in the process.

Another evolving stage appeared with the rise and spread of literary workshops in the 1960s, in Iowa and Princeton Universities where the study of literary works necessitated the examining their linguistic as well as cultural contexts, which is included under the scope of so-called Comparative literature and Contrastive Analysis.

(Munday, 2001, pp.8-9; Gentzler,1990, pp.7-18)

The second half of the 20th C has witnessed a rapid activity and thrives in the fields connected to the study of the semantic, communicative as well as the socio-cultural aspects of language. All

underpinned and prompted Linguist's attempts to question the notion of translation, looking for exploring it as a process and finding common foundations for all translators when dealing with its dilemmas (Vinay & Darbelent ,1958; Catford ,1965; Nida,1964). This enrichment inspired the Dutch-U. S translator *James Holmes* to write down what Genzler (1993, p. 92) calls as " the founding statement for the field." Holmes (1988) described the then – situation where translation problems exist and no paradigm or model managed to produce sufficient results. He stresses that such a situation creates the need to establish new "channels" of "communication" and the development of what he terms "new disciplinary utopia", focusing on "the complex of problems clustered round the phenomenon of translating and translations.", and "reaching all scholars working in the field ..." (pp. 67-70) Following, Homes suggested to name this ' new disciplinary': Translation studies.

Translation as a process

Given the different approaches attempted to theorize and model translation as a process, thus that process has been differently defined. From the linguistic perspective, Catford (1965, p.1) considers translation as " an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in another. Clearly, then any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language – a general linguistic theory." (As cited in Jixing, 2013, p. 108).

On the other hand, Eugene Nida (1964, p.12) accounts for a rather dynamic definition: "the closest natural equivalent of the source- language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style" (ibid.) André lefevere and Susan Bassnett are two prominent representatives of the cultural approach i.e., cultural turn, they view translation as " rewriting of an original text ... that reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and this rewriting is a manipulation, undertaken in the service of power..." (1992a: vii)

Since adequately- accessing a source text - particularly the ' literary' –necessitating the access of its linguistic as well as cultural gate and for the purpose of the present study, translation process is defined as *a lingual– cultural interface between two text worlds, which, during delivering a certain message, and it may or may not perform the same communicative function and may or may not cast the same effect on the target text world.*

2.2 Towards systematic approaches for the process of translation

2.2.1 *The Onset*

Having mentioned earlier, the practice of translation has been initiated as very early as the first century. That practice has been cornered on recognized milestones. The first was traced back to 46 BCE /1960 CE, when *Cicero* defended his translation of the Speeches of the Attic Orators Aeschires and Demosthenses: And I did not translate them as in interpreter but as an orator keeping the same ideas and forms, or as one might say, the ' figures ' of thought, but in language which conforms to our usage. And in so doing, I did not hold it necessary to render word for word, but I preserved the style and force ' of the language'. (Cited in Munday 2001, p.19).

Whilst Cicero's usage and naming of ' word for word ' might be the first, St. Jerome (395CE/1997:25) mentioned explicitly "word-for –word" and "sense-for-sense" as two different methods of translations, defending his Latin translation of the Greek Septuagint Old Testament:" ...I render not word-for word, but sense-for-sense." (ibid.,20) We might spot these early endeavors as the spark of the then-continued debate, namely literal vs. free translation, which forms the platform of the three main approaches:

Linguistic, Functional and Cultural.

2.2.2 Contemporary approaches

Linguistic approach

It wasn't before the second half of the 20th century when the process of translation has become the primary subject of a systematic study. Albeit the early-started debate of 'literal' vs. ' free' (the question of how far the translator should remain faithful to the original text thence forth, translation had continued to serve as a secondary-status practice fulfilling other purposes. Incorporating comparative studies and other linguistic models such as generative and functional grammar, linguists produced the first models discussing and theorizing the process of translation. These models are mostly oriented towards the idea of

equivalence: the replacement of ST units with their equivalent TTs, occurring on different levels of text: lexical, syntactic, semantic and stylistic (e.g Catford 1965; Nida 1964; Nida & Taber 1969)

- **Functional Approach**

While equivalence has been at the heart of all theories representing the linguistic perspective, functionalists have moved to a rather dynamic, communicative view of translation process. Grounded on typifying language function specified by Bühler (1934, p.65) and modified by Jakobson (1960/2000, p. 114) as well as on Halliday's systematic functional grammar model, some scholars shift their focus to examine what and how the text aimed to function and influence its audience, in its socio-cultural context.

Accordingly, this outlook of texts dictates what the process of translation should go through; starting from selection of texts, linguistic and pragmatic strategies employed ending by judging the adequacy of its products. Reiss (1971,1976,2000), Holz Manttari (1984), Hans J. Vermeer (1984,1989,2000), Christiane Nord (1988,1991) are examples of prominent contributors belonging to the functional school in translation. Like linguistic approach, the functional has faced criticism and counter-arguments, it is evidently credited for shifting the view of the translation process to be rather communicative, socio-culture oriented. Besides, it has paved the way for the upcoming approach, namely "cultural" (Munday, 2001 pp.73-8; Schäffner in Baker & Saldanha, 2011, pp. 115-112).

- **Cultural Approach**

The late 1990s has witnessed the rise of *Discourse Analysis*, which is an interdisciplinary approach that examines language used as a tool reflecting its users' shared ideas, values and ideology. Meanwhile, this approach focuses on how texts are interrelated and how language functions pragmatically and socio-culturally.

Unquestionably, the discourse analysis view opened up new horizons in approaching texts in relation to their users: their beliefs, ideologies, status, as well as approaching the text world. This perspective has influenced the view of translation as a process of communication, operated on both levels: textual and con-textual; " attempting to relay across cultural and linguistic boundaries..." (Hatim & Mason ,2005 p.1).

The consideration of the socio -cultural aspect turned -later- to be the fore interest for other many linguists. First to mention, *Even-Zohar* (1978, 1990, 2000) whose model sees "translated literature as a system operating

in the larger social, literary and historical systems of target culture." (Munday, 2001, p. 108).

In his own words, Munday (2001, p.109) outlining Zohar's *Polysystem theory*: Polysystem theory was developed in the 1970s by the Israeli scholar Itamar even Zohar borrowing ideas from the Russian Formalists of the 1920s, who had worked on literary historiography. A literary work is here not studied in isolation but as a part of a literary system, which itself is defined as " a system of functions of the literary order which are in continual interrelationship with other orders" (Tynjanov 1927/71:72). Literature is thus part of the social, cultural, literary and historical framework and the key concept is that of the system, in which there is ongoing dynamic of "mutation" and "struggle" for primary position in the literary canon.

Worth mentioning that the corresponding work of *Gideon Toury* (1978) in the Polysystem theory formed the main ground for developing the basis of the descriptive branch of translation studies. Since he comparatively examined existent translated texts into Hebrew, in their socio-cultural setting summing up with common translation 'norms' and 'laws' (Toury 1980,1995). To name but few prominent representatives of this approach are Theo Hermans, Jose Lambert & Hendrick van Gorp, Susan Bassnett & André lefevere, Gentzler.

2.2.3 Manipulation School

Manipulation school is considered the 'offspring' of the cultural approach in translation studies. It arose towards the late 1970s. It relies on the Polysystem theory and fed into the descriptive studies.

Hermans (1985/2014, pp.10-11) describes this school as "an approach of literary translation which is descriptive, target-oriented, functional and systematic; and an interest in the norms and constraints that govern the production and reception of translations..." Hermans highlights the group's main proclamation "all translation implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose" (ibid., p.11)

2.2.4 Manipulation & Translation at work

Prior to questioning how manipulation and translation might come into play, it is imperative to highlight how manipulation is conceptualized

and approached from different angles. Literally, Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary defines to *manipulate*:

1. to control or influence sb/sth, often in a dishonest way so that do not realize it
2. to control or use something in a skillful way.

Fair clough (1994, p.2630) defines translation as " strategies that people use to get others to do what they want them to do" which are partly linguistic, involving manipulative uses of language. He demonstrates the deviousness of this usage as a way to "hide one's strategie and objectives" (ibid.) Drawn from the above definitions, it is believed that we are speaking of "*habitual/ professional manipulation*" whose impact could be neutral, positive or negative (c.f. Dukate 2007 / 2009).

From the cultural perspective in translation studies, a number of scholars have attempted to approach the manipulative nature of translation. Even- Zohar (1971,1978, 1990) views translated literature as a system of complex network and activities, could only be governed and assessed through its position and what it meant to function in the literary hierarchy ("high" vs. " low", " Canonized " vs." Non-canonized"). Hermans (1985/1999); Bassnett and lefevere (1990); lefevere (1992) and Katan (1999) name manipulation as a parcel of translation process; which " undertaken in the service opower and in its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and society." (Bassnett &lefevere 1992a: xii). Later on, Hermans (2003) discusses " thick translation ", which goes beyond adhering to a certain literary convention, but aiming to produce a target text with full comprehensibility and acceptance for the target audience.

Toury (1995, p. 24) views translations "as facts of the culture which hosts them". Thereby, cultural considerations is the principal determinant of the position and function of translations as well as the determinant of the strategies resorted to "during its generation" These cultural considerations are communally originated by" persons- in - culture"; to the extent "it is easy for fictitious translations to pass as genuine ones". (ibid.,27). Moreover,

Toury proposes " norms "and " laws" which account for a translator's options and possibilities governing the entire process of translation (selecting, processing and describing actual texts) - most importantly – in a given socio historical context. Theorists concerned with post-colonial

studies, such as Venuti (1995,1998) implicitly considers manipulation through his study of translations of dominated literature into in service of colonized power and struggling political agendas, in which he explains as "domestication".

Meanwhile, he names "foreignisation" as translation strategy meant to be used for resisting this intellectual colonization and expose the foreign elements in the text. Unlike other scholars, Dukāte (2007 /2009) dedicates a comprehensive account on manipulation as a specific phenomenon in translation and interpreting, where she discusses manipulation as a concept, school of thought as well as a practice.

Drawn up on the above preview, the manipulative nature of translation has been differently explored: it can be explained in terms of producing a target text, positioned and meant to function in a certain historic-cultural literary tradition and constrained by its socio-cultural norms. On the other hand, manipulation could be traced in the light of investigating construction social identities and exposing power relations.

Nevertheless, there has been no a clear-cut, unified understanding of translational manipulation as well as there is no agreement among scholars regarding how it is / should be manifested.

- **Manipulation & Ideology**

Ideology has been the question to be posed, particularly when scrutinizing literary texts for a number of reasons. In the first place, translation is a human action meant to perform a certain function (also see Holz Manttari 1984). If one shall adopt Simpson's definition of ideology as "the tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups" (cited in Hatim & Mason, 2005, p.120), then these assumptions and beliefs are strongly to be underpinning such a significant human action like translation. Secondly, speaking about the literary system as approached by this research, we are to regard it a sub system in an interplay with other systems: political, cultural, social and the rewriting of its texts " can introduce new concepts, new genres, new devices, ... but can also repress innovation, distort and contain..." (Bassnett & lefevere 1990: vii).

Hence, we are discussing a work that is loaded with manifestations of ideology, namely manipulation. Lefevere (1992a) defines rewriting as manipulation produced to reflect ascertain ideology and "poetics" (i.e.,

literary devices, genres, prototypical characters and situations and symbols, in addition to what the role of literature is, or should be [p.26]). He further explains that acceptability of literary works is measured against dominant poetics and ideology at a given time. Outside the literary system, there is "Patronage" i.e., "powers (persons, institutions) that can further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature", who usually enforces the dominant poetics and is rather interested in the ideology of literature. (ibid.,pp.15-23). Lefevere exemplifies the role played by the ideological/poetical dimension in the process of rewriting in a number of cases across different historical moments e.g., translations in Germany between 1933-1945, Edward Fitzgarald's translation of Khayyam's *Rubayyat*, etc.

Zauberga (2001/2004) considers manipulation in reference to ideology. She holds Bassnett & Lefevere's view that rewriting is never innocent and exemplifies her stance in analyzing a number of foreign translations where manipulation is manifested in the form of deletion, substitution, addition and attenuation (in Dukāte 2007, pp.54-57)

Last to mention, Dukāte (2007 /2009) who lists ideology as one of the reasons that result in lexical shifts as omissions, additions, substitutions, replacements. She further classifies "ideologically- induced shifts" inside a text as a "Manipulation as conscious distortion" (pp.77-103).

2.2.5 Manipulation & Translation Quality Assessment

Assessing the quality of translation has been a thorny issue; subjected to continuous research and investigations for numerous reasons. Translation assessment is axed on two main poles: the tool (the process of translation itself) and the handler (the translator, or might be the reviewer, critic). In respect to the latter, Hatim & Basil (2005 pp.164-176), and Nord (1991p.160) are among scholars who are concerned with the assessment of translator's performance. Each pole is interrelated with a number of factors, regarded from different perspectives and approaches. Speaking of translation, a practice as old as human history, we shall trace those rudiments of assessments in the counter arguments criticizing early Cicero (first century B.C); St. Jerome's (late fourth century), whose main defenses lie in "sense - for - sense" not for " word-word- word (Munday,2001 p.19).

Centuries later, the controversy was sparked by the publication of Luther's Bible (1522-34) who again justified his version by conveying the same holly meanings in a vernacular German, close to people (ibid., pp.22-23; Lebert 2016). Throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, the debate had been reshaped in the terms of "faithfulness, spirit and truth."

Those debates and counter arguments are what House (2015: 8-10) identifies as the "mentalist views" in which lay persons make their judgments based on their intuitions, experiences and knowledge of the world, inevitably resulting in subjective, undifferentiated evaluations. Along with the theorization of language teaching, and the shift to create a systematic analysis of languages in translated texts, a considerable equivalence- oriented approaches have come to existence, notably, Catford (1965); Nida (1964); Newmark(1981), among others.

Whilst these studies have made a considerable contribution to developing a rather objective systemic language - in – text criterion; they are mostly centered on the idea of linguistic equivalence, or replacement without fully incorporating the pragmatic and socio- cultural context.

Following the linguistically-oriented approaches, the functional and discursal perspectives that lay heavy emphasis on the communicative function of texts and its interconnectedness with other texts, their users and their expectations. Prominent scholars belonging to this approach include Vermer (1989/2000); Holz Mäntäri (1984); Nord (1988/91); Hatim &Mason (1997/2005); Baker (1992); House (1977/1997/2015). No doubt these scholars have opened new horizons in exploring texts, thus assessing their acceptability and workability in their context and the counter ones.

Like the functionalists and discourse-oriented frameworks, the historical, socio- political cultural studies in translation are descriptive in their nature and evaluating translation inside the system of the receiving culture (House 2015). However, they differ in visualizing these texts - particularly literary- in a larger context, consisting of a network of complex relations underpinned by notions of mutation and struggle; ideological and political pressures; dominance and power. Unquestionably, manipulation would serve the ideal manifestation for all these underlying concepts, in cross-cultural communications (Munday,2001, pp.109-161); Venuti (1995,1998); Toury (1995), and Wang Hui's in (Baker& Saldanha,2011)

Conclusively, the researcher may be reasoned by the above implications and suppositions to consider a descriptive, historical-socio-cultural the most adequate when apprehending literary works across different cultures as well as literary traditions. Before finalizing this discussion, I may need to stress the individuality of my as well as any researcher's / scholar's choice and account of a quality assessment approach, since " it is well-nigh impossible for any particular model of translation quality assessment to take into account all of these factors..." (House 2015, p. 3)

3-Methodology

3.1. Data

Source Text:

Animal Farm: is an allegorical novella [Satiric Beast Fable] written by George Orwell in the period between November 1943 and February 1944 until it was finally published in England, on 17 August 1945 by Secker and Warburg publishing house. The events deal specifically with the Stalinist era of the Soviet Union between 1924 and 1943.

Target Text 1 : " اسطورة الحيوانات الثائرة "

" اسطورة الحيوانات الثائرة " is the first Arabic translation of Orwell's Animal Farm to appear in the Egyptian society. It was published in March 1951, by *Dar al-Maaref* publishing house

Target Text 2 : مزرعة الحيوانات

" مزرعة الحيوانات " is another translated version of *Orwell's Animal Farm*. A translation presented by *Abdel-Hamid Al katteb* and published via *Kattab El youm*; an affiliate publishing house of Dar Akhabar ELYoum (Egyptian state-owned institution) . This version was published in November 1978.

3.2 Model and Tools of Analysis

As mentioned earlier, manipulation is an evasive notion and there is a lack of a unified conceptualization as well as perception of its meaning and application in translation. Since various factors come into play: what is translated; who is translating; why ST is translated or rewritten; the existing socio- cultural context and its poetics; the other participants in the process: the commissioner, the publisher, the original author and so forth.

Nonetheless, for the purpose of this study, Dukāte 's definition (2007, p, 79) may serve as the most relevant: The translator's/ interpreter's handling of a text which results in the adaptation of the text for the Target Audience, considering the cultural, ideological, linguistic and literary difference between cultures in contact, which takes place within a particular cultural setting and is carried out by a human agent, with the consequences of a possible influence of individual - or psychology-related factors upon the end product. In terms of this definition, and following Dukāte (2007/2009) number of considerations could be highlighted:

Manipulation is perceived not only as a handling necessarily involving any kind of changes, but the sort of major changes "adaptations" that lead to a target text appealing to its reader on the cultural, ideological, linguistic, literary layers. Subsequently, not only do these adaptations fall within one label: "distortion", but also it could be labeled as "handling", "improvement" (Dukāte, 2007, pp. 69-71).

Besides, the mention of "handling" a text and the resulting "adaptation" implies the meaning that manipulation could be interpreted as a partial strategy or a general strategy encompassing a number of employed strategies. Meanwhile, by referring to the translator's handling of a text and the end product, manipulation can be regarded as the activities performed during the translation process as well as the result of it (Dukāte, 2007, pp. 72-4).

Furthermore, the inclusion of individual or psychology-related influence indicates two typologies of manipulation *conscious* and *unconscious*. In addition, another distinction is made between *text internal* and *text external* – manipulation.

This study draws on Dukāte's typology (2007 /2009) of manipulation as follows (p.84- 105)

I-Text-External Manipulation: the kind of manipulation which proceeds outside the text, which is interpreted with reference to external struggle for power and dominance in the various layers of the literary system. That struggle is considered in terms of selection of texts, external constraints governing the process of translation, and extends to involve its label: **handling, improvement, or distortion**

II-Text-internal Manipulation: the kind of manipulation which proceeds inside the text, or better -described in Dukate's terms " an all-

embracing term, denotes all kinds of manipulation contained in the text" (p.97). In relation to text-external factors, these manipulative instances are labeled **handling**, **improvement**, or **distortion**. Notwithstanding the above classifications, it is essential to stress the fuzziness and overlapping edges between these types, that they can never be judged as "absolute " and "can be developed further " (Dukāte 2007:110) Through applying an objective descriptive approach; this research explores the concept of manipulation in translation. It seeks to investigate the reflection of socio-cultural setting along with its *poetics* in the source text, along with the two Arabic versions translation of Orwell's *Animal Farm*. Text internally, manipulation would be traced in the lexical level (i.e., omissions/deletion - substitutions/replacements, rewording, attenuations), in accordance with their semantic and pragmatic implications.

4 –Analysis

4.0 *Animal Farm*

Animal Farm is an Orwellian masterpiece, published in 1945. It is a parody of Communist Russian allegorizing from the Bolshevik revolution in October 1917- which was fuelled by Lenin and Marx 's Communist Manifesto - until the Teheran Conference at the end of 1943. It aims at exposing Joseph Stalin's totalitarianism, standing for democratic socialism as perceived by Orwell; the novel was rejected by four publishers : Gollancz, Dial Press, Faber & Faber, Johnathan Cape; even though the latter initially accepted it; however, the publishing house changed its opinion after consulting the British Ministry of Information then, which warned from publishing such a highly anti-Soviet fable (Orwell's *The Freedom of the Press* 1945; *Orwell's Letters to Leonard Moore* in Davison 2010; R. Awad's introduction to *Animal Farm*) until it finally got published by the "anti-Soviet" Secker and Warburg. It was the setting which echoed the socio-political polarization as a consequence of a paramount historical event " Second World War" (1939-1945), when the world was divided chiefly as pro-Stalin represented by the Allies bloc (Russia, America, Britain and China) versus the Axis (Germany, Italy, Japan), the " Soviet-enemy". Even though soon after its publication, this Orwellian piece was negatively received by many British and American intellectuals, for instance, the critic

George Soule wrote an article published in *The New Republic* magazine, 1946: "Instead, the book puzzled and saddened me. It seemed on the whole dull...And many of the things are not said instantly recognized as the essence of truth, but are of the sort which start endless

and boring controversy", whereas Kingsley Martin¹⁹⁴⁵ (in Meyers,1975, p.197) disapproved with the Orwell's powerful message stating," he may try to solve his dilemma by deciding on some particular Power -figure as the embodiment of Evil...". Moreover, the novel faced challenge, resistance and even ban in countries like Russia, America until the political atmosphere had radically changed and the "Cold War" had grew fierce between America and Britain on one side, and the Soviet Union on the other. By the end of the Cold War in the late twentieth century, this piece of art turned has become popularized and canonized (Jaccard in Haron, 2018) for example, it was chosen as one of the 100 best-English novels for the period 1923-2005 by *Time magazine* and listed number 31 on "Modern Library List of Best 20th Century Novels" (Time magazine.com; Modern Library.com).

Technically speaking, this situation could be described in terms of what Even-Zohar (1971,1978, 1990) demonstrates about the constant struggle and mutation among texts for the system's "center" vs." periphery " or " canonized" vs. "non - canonized" at a certain literary and historical moment; in lefevere's (1992a) dynamic illustration it is when a literary work prescribed "unacceptable" is elevated to the state of " classics", stipulated by the change of dominant poetics and ideology.

In terms of understanding the ST author's pragmatic intention or universe of discourse (lefevere,1992a, p.87), one should refer to the allusion between the characterizations, events and plot and their real equivalents in the history of USSR. Allegorized characters and events (R. Awad's introduction to *Animal Farm*, pp.11-13) as follows:

- **Old Major** = a mixture of Marx and Lenin
- **Parts of Old Major's speech** = Communist Manifesto
- **Animal Farm**= USSR
- **Rebellion**= Bolshevik Revolution October 1917
- **Mr. Jones** = the Last Tsar of Russia, Nicholas II
- **Beasts of England**= Orwellian Version of L'internationale
- **Napoleon** = Joseph Stalin
- **Snowball** = Trotsky
- **The pigs**= the Communist Commissars
- **Boxer** = the exploited and self-sacrificed proletariat
- **The onomatopoeic Squealer** = the Bolshevik machinery of propaganda

- **The dogs**= the extraordinary commission for Combating Counter-Revolution, Sabotage and Speculation "OGPU"
- **Animals on Animal Farm**= workers and peasants
- **Human beings**= the Western Capitalists
- **Moses**= the Russian Orthodox Church
- **Mollie** = the White Russians
- **Pilkington of Fox wood Farm** = Churchill of Capitalist England
- **Frederick of Pinch field**= Hitler Nazi of Germany
- **Minimus**= Soviet Poet Mayakovsky, who composed the adulatory "Hym to J.V. Stalin"
- **Napoleon's permission for Moses to return to Animal Farm**= the tactics of Godless Stalin to be reconciled to religion
- **The Battle of the Cowshed**= the military intervention of Western troops from Britain, France, Poland and America to quell the revolution.
- **Hens Revolution**= the Sailors' Rebellion at the Kronstadt naval base in 1921
- **Napoleon's dealings with Whymper and Willingdon markets** = the Treaty of Rapallo
- **The first demolition of the windmill** = the catastrophic results of Stalin's forced collectivization (1929-33) and the failure of the first five-year plan
- **The execution of accused animals** = Great Purge Trials (1936-38)
- **The act of forgery** = Hitler-Stalin non-aggression pact of August 1939
- **The second destruction of the windmill** = Germany's invasion of Russia without a warning

Plot Summary

One night, all the animals at Mr. Jones' **Manor Farm** assemble in the barn to hear **Old Major**, the Prize oldest boar on the farm, describing a dream he had about a world where all animals live free from the tyranny of their human masters. Old Major dies soon after the meeting, but the animals – inspired by his philosophy of Animalism- plot a rebellion against **Mr. Jones** "the owner of Manor Farm". When he forgets to feed the animals, they rebel against him then they are chased off the farm. The Three Pigs Napoleon, Snowball and Squealer, the only literate animals, assume the leadership of the Farm.

Manor Farm is renamed **Animal Farm**, and the **Seven Commandments of Animalism** are painted on the barn wall. Mr. Jones and his men attempt to retake the farm by force; however, they are beaten

off in what comes to be called " The Battle of Cowshed". Later on, the rivalry starts between Napoleon and Snowball ending by Napoleon send the dogs to chase Snowball until he gets expelled from the farm. This incident is considered the first breach of animalism Commandments. Throughout his full mastery of Farm, Napoleon – by the help of his mouthpiece and apologist Squealer- keeps violating the Seven Commandments. He breaches them in a number of ways: trading with humans, moving into the farmhouse and sleeping on human beds, sending **Boxer** (the devoted, laborious horse) to the knacker. With each breach Napoleon resorts to manipulate one of the Commandments. By the end, the pigs turn to imitate a human life: walking on two legs, drinking alcohol and pursue their rule as full dictators.

The novel ends with the final scene when the hard-working, depressed animals are watching the pigs playing and cheating at cards with human being as they feel hard to distinguish between their fellow animals and their human enemies. (Cliff notes, Awad's introduction to Animal Farm)

4.1 Sample Analysis

4.1.1 Excerpt One

Source text

Chapter One, (p.45)

Contextual scene

[The author is introducing the first central character in the novel: **Old Major**] *Old Major (so he was always called, though the name under which he had been exhibited was Willingdon Beauty) was so highly regarded on the farm that everyone was quite ready to lose an hour's sleep in order to hear what he had to say.*

Target-text 1

و كان للحلوف الاكبر مكانة مرموقة بين معاشر البهائم فى المزرعة فلم يتردد منهم أحد فى الحرمان من النوم الهنئ ساعة أو بعض ساعة لسماع قصته.

Target-text 2

و كان الماجور العجوز يحظى بتقدير رفيع عند جميع الحيوانات, و كان كل حيوان يشعر بالسعادة إذا انفر د بلقاء معه ليسمع بعض ارائه الحكيمة.

Source-text analysis

By pointing to ST underlined clause, we understand that Orwell wants to emphasize the fore headed meaning that Old Major is highly

regarded and respected, evident in the readiness of each animal to sacrifice sleeping to listen to the narration of his dream as referred to in the first excerpt. With reference to the socio-historical context and related pragmatic choice, Old Major is an allegoric figure for the revolution inspiring figures Marxis and Lenin.

Target-text1 analysis

Text- internally, by examining the translator's *substitution* of ST Unit every *one was quite ready* by *فلم يتردد منهم أحد* indicates the translator has successfully recognized the communicative semantic meaning of that respect and appreciation, in which he opts for a negative clause, rather signifying the definiteness of that meaning. Further, the translator continues and consolidates that meaning by using the *addition* of the adjective *الهنيئ* to the noun *النوم* and also the addition of *بعض ساعة* that is considered a kind of repetition asserting the respect and devotion.

Target-text 2 analysis

In Target text 2, the translator opts for a total substitution by another semantic image *و كان كل حيوان يشعر بالسعادة اذا انفرد بلقاء معه ليسمع بعض ارائه* linguistically, it seems that the translator is rendering the same communicative meaning of that high valuation and respect. By contrasting ST to TT1, it is noticeable that the translator used the addition of '*النوم الهنيئ*' as well as the collocation '*الحرمان*'; manifesting *explicitation* which is intended for better comprehensibility of the text [**manipulation as improvement**] or may be a translator's attempt towards domestication.

On the other hand, by the rendered meaning in TT2, it is obvious that the translator makes a semantic transformation by substituting the ST units with totally unequal Arabic equivalents: *و كان كل حيوان يشعر بالسعادة اذا* "و كان كل حيوان يشعر بالسعادة اذا" By closely examining TT2, the lexical substitution linguistically leads to the creation of a new semantic meaning and image. Yet it could be possibly inferred as indicating a different pragmatic reference compared to the ST unit. This assumption could be further consolidated by referring to translator's own article *مزرعة الحيوانات* "مزرعة الحيوانات" following the translated text (i.e. external guidance): "ألم تقرأ: "ألم تقرأ: "كل هذا في " مزرعة الحيوانات "؟ ألم تتخيل أحيانا أنك لا تقرأ قصة طريفة، خفيفة، عن (p.151) الحيوانات... بل تقرأ قصة تعرف كثيرا من أبطالها، كثيرا من و قعائها؟! This rendering could be categorized under **manipulation as distortion** owing to the fact it is ideologically-induced.

4.1.2 Excerpt two

SLT

Chapter One (p.46)

The contextual scene

[The author is confirming that all animals are gathered in the barn, awaiting for Old Major's speech, except one animal] *All the animals were now present except Moses, the tame raven who slept on a perch behind the back door.*

TLT1

و كذلك حضر الجمع , لم يتخلف غير " موسى " الغراب الأسحم الأليف الذى أعتاد ان ينام جاثما خلف الباب الخلفى.

TLT2

جاءت جميع حيوانات المزرعة.

- **SIT Analysis** In ST, the author mentions that all animals were present except Moses, which pre-justifies Orwell's description of Moses in chapter 2 as "Mr. Jones's especial pet, was a spy and a tale-bearer ..." (p.53). Pragmatically, it might be claimed that the writer uses Moses as a symbol for the Russian Orthodox Church that was a subservient tool in the hands of Russia Nicholas II before the Bolshevik Revolution (Ramses Awad's introduction, p.12)
- **TLT1 Analysis**

By internally exploring **TT1** unit, we find that the translator opts for the *addition* of the word الاسحم (i.e., black-coloured): a classical adjective collocates with الغراب The second addition is جاثما meaning "unmovable, stuck to the floor", which is an Arabic idiomatic expression indicating the condition when the person is in deep sleep. According to Dukāte's typology of manipulation (2007/2009), the two additions might be interpreted with reference to Toury's *Law of Growing Standardization*: as the translator selects a rather habitual "repertoire"; favouring to make the linguistic and cultural function more realizable for the target reader. (Toury, 1995, pp. 266-7).
- **TLT2 Analysis**

By looking into **TT2**, we will find that the translator omitted the whole segment introducing Moses as one of the major characters. A deletion can be attributed to the fact that Moses was the first name of *Moussa Sabry*, who was holding the post the Chairman of Dar Akhabar ELYom then (stated on the print page). Thus, we can say that the

translator opts for avoiding offence – or better understood in Lefevere's words (1992a, p.15) "patronage. can further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature."

By contrasting both renderings to the original segment, we may notice that in TT1 it seems that the translator's addition of جائم misinterprets or fails to recognize the pragmatic reference associated with who slept on a porch behind the front door; hence acting as a spy while pretending to be asleep. Due to such error on the translator's part, this rendering presumably might be labeled as "manipulation as handling"; for linguistic and/or factual mistakes are categorized under manipulative cases of handling (Dukāte,2077, p.101)

As for TT2, this deletion- resulting in a semantic as well as pragmatic gap for the target reader - exercised under the influence of patronage - marked "manipulation as distortion".

4.1.3 Excerpt three

SLT

Chapter One: Contextual scene (p.45)

[The opening lines of Old Major's rebellious speech for the gathered animals] ... *I have had a long life; I have had much time for thought as lay alone in my stall and I think. I may say that I understand the nature of life on this earth as well as any animal now living. It is about that I wish to speak to you.*

TLT1

فقد عيشت طويلا و تراخت بي الايام, و كنت كثيرا ما اطلق للفكر العنان, و أنا راقد في الفراش و أتدبر أمور الدنيا, و شئون الحياة, حتى ليصبح لمثلي اليوم أن يقول و هو مطمئن انه العليم بها الخبير بتصاريفها, فلا بيزة في علمها حيوان, و لا تفوقة دابة على الارض في فهم ما حوت من غرائب و أسرار.

TLT2

... لقد كانت حياتي طويلة, و كان في شيخوختي وقت للتفكير و التأمل و أنا راقد وحدي في الحظيرة بينما أنتم تعملون و تكدهون, و استطيع أن أقول انتي أفهم طبيعية الحياة على هذه الارض فهما عميقا.

SLT Analysis

In the ST, Orwell is trying to portray Old Major's wisdom & experience, drawn from the fact of being the oldest pig in the farm and resulting in being assigned a position of respect and appreciation among all animals.

TT1 Analysis

In **TT1**, the translator manipulates the same meaning in the form of prolonged paraphrases / *rewording* of phrases like *I have had long a long life* into the idiomatic expression " *تراخت بي الايام* " as well as the rendering of the sentence *I have had much time for thought* into *وأتدبر أمور الدنيا, و* *شئون الحياة* *و كنت كثيرا ما اطلق للفكر العنان -* *I think I may say that I understand the nature of life on this earth as well as any animal now living* into *العليم بها لا تفوقه دابة على فهم ما حوت من غرائب و اسرار ولا* *الخبير بتصاريفها, فلا بيزة في علمها حيوان.* We might explain these rewordings in the light of the translator's spur for the naturalness of expression. (Nida, 1964)

TT2 Analysis

In **TT2** rendering, the translator rewords *I have had a long life, I have had much time for thought* into the clause *وكان في شيخوختي وقت للتفكير* *و التأمل* *بينما أنتم* *تعملون و تكبحون* attaching it to the original meaning of "Laying alone". That intrusion-namely manipulation - which of no origin in the source text, might allude a contradictory semantic meaning i.e., Old Major's laziness or being deceptive as all animals work hard whereas he is resting in the stall, an instance could be categorized under "manipulation as distortion". By contrasting the two target versions to the source text, we see two different tendencies reflected via the rewordings and additions. For the **TT1**, we are to frame the rephrasing included in the usage of culturally-rooted classical Arabic idiomatic and collocational expressions which represents translator's strategy to minimize the strangeness of the foreign text (Venuti 1995); or an endeavor towards better readability and comprehensibility for the Target reader "explicitation ". Therefore, this example might be counted as "manipulation as improvement". In **TT2**, we are to deal with a distortive representation of the source meaning perceived with reference to its pragmatic dimension, that is in relation to the historic-cultural context. This handling could be labeled as "manipulation as distortion".

5-Conclusion

This study has attempted to investigate the phenomenon of translational manipulation in two Arabic translations of Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945). Compared to the source text, each translation was produced under a different socio-cultural context at two distinct points of time in the history of Egypt i.e., 1951 vs. 1978. In the light of a number of scholars'

theoretical frameworks belonging to Manipulation school (Holmes1988; Even-Zohar1978,1990,1997; Toury 1980,1995, Lefevere 1992; Bassnett and Lefevere2003; Venuti1995,1998; Hermans1985,1999; Dukāte 2007,2009) this research aims at uncovering in each target text how manipulation is conceptualized, manifested, interpreted and accordingly assessed.

The context, objective and the findings of present paper fall within the purview of cultural perspective in translation studies, which is concerned with re-position translation as a system that is, on one hand, diachronically interrelated with elements such as original text, translator; linguistic norms/strategies; other texts and on the other hand, synchronically with other systems i.e., literary; cultural; political etc. in a given community. Contrary to traditional paradigms, no longer is equivalence the ultimate goal and the prescriptive measure for a successful translation i.e., matching with the source on different levels, rather a relative descriptive quality of exchange between two texts. The expected outcome of the process has become an 'acceptable' translation than an 'equivalent' one; hence the departure point has turned into the target text not the source.

Within the wide application of the cultural approach, developed Manipulation school which nature is identified by Hermans:" descriptive", "empirical" and " target-oriented" with "an interest in translation as it actually occurs, now and in the past, a part of cultural history." (1999, p.7) 'Power', 'Ideology', 'Manipulation' are key issues upon which theorists of this school center their work: Even-Zohar, Toury, Hermans, Bassnett, Lefevere, Pym, Venuti, Spivak, Tymoczko to name a few.

Notwithstanding the debatable essence of manipulation phenomenon in translation; there are two prevailing perceptions: the first consider 'manipulation' (in the meaning of refitting a foreign text with all its linguistic, cultural, aesthetic and even ideological constraints, into the target community) as an indispensable requirement as well as consequence of translation process; both the source and target poles are manipulated. (Levý1963/1969; Popvič 1970; Hermans 1985/2014,1999; Katan1999). The second side holds the view that manipulation basically denote the linguistic alterations meant to impose or resist power, manifest or suppress certain ideologies, whereas the contact usually occurs between a major/highly prestigious culture and minor/low prestigious culture (Even-Zohar 1978,1990,1997; Toury 1980,1995; Bassnett and Lefevere1990; Lefevere1985,1992a) some scholars even went further and described 'Manipulation' as a tool of colonization and/or decolonization such as Niranjana (1992); Spivak (1992);Robinson (1997a); Venuti 1995, 1998) and Tymoczko (1999a) .

Nevertheless, translational manipulation will remain a controversial, elusive phenomenon accordingly, the conception of its manifestation will always vary depending on who is evaluating the text, what his/her understanding of manipulation and what expectations s/he has about the text as well as cultures of contact at time of translation.

References

Primary sources

Orwell, G. (1945). Animal Farm. In Animal Farm Edited With An Introduction By Prof.R. Awad (pp.45-122). Cairo: The Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop.

عباس حافظ . (١٩٥١) . اسطورة الحيوانات الثائرة . مصر : دار المعارف للطباعة و النشر

عبد الحميد الكاتب . (١٩٧٨) . مزرعة الحيوان . مصر : كتاب اليوم- مؤسسة دار أخبار اليوم

Secondary sources

Assi, L. (1987). An analytical Study of the Process of Translation (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Salford, England

Baker, M. (1992). In other Words: A course book on translation. London and NewYork: Routledge

Saldanha, G. (Ed.). (2011). Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, Part I: General.London and New York: Routledge

Bassnett, S. & lefevre, A. (1990). General Editor's Preface. In Lefevre, A. Trnlsation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame (pp.vii-viii). London and Newyork: Routledge

Botman, S. (1998/2008). The Liberal age,1923-1952.In Daly, M.W. (Ed.), The Cambridge History of Egypt: Volume 2 Modern Egypt, from 1517 to the end of the twentieth century (pp.285-308). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press

Catford, J.C (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Davison, P. (2010). George Orwell: A life in letters. New York and London: Liveright Publishing

Dukate, A. (2007). Manipulation as a Specific Phenomenon in Translation and Intrepreting. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Latvia, Latvia

- Even- Zohar, I. (1978). Polysystem Theory. In Munday, J. *Introducing Translation Studies* (pp.109 -111). London and New York: Routledge.
- Even- Zohar, I. (1971,1978,1990). Poly system Terms. In Hermans, T. *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and Systematic Approaches Explained* (pp.106-111)
- Fairclough, N. (1994). Manipulation definition. In Dukate, A. *Manipulation as a Specific Phenomenon in Translation and Intrepreting*. (p.74). (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Latvia, Latvia
- Gentzler, E. (1993). *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London and Newyork: Routledge
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997 /2015). *Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge
- Hermans, T. (ed.), (1985/2014). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London and NewYork: Routledge Revivals
- Hermans, T. *Cross Cultural Translation studies as Thick Translation*.
<https://www.citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/view doc>
- Holmes, J. (1998). The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. In Holmes, J., *Translated!*
- Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies* (pp.66-80). Amsterdam: Rodopi. <https://www.tauc.c.il/tarbut/tirgum/holmes75-html>
- Hornby, AS. (Ed.). (18th ed). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford and NewYork: Oxford University Press.
- House, J. (2015). *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*. London and NewYork: Routledge
- Jaccard, E. (2018). *His Fable, Right or Left: Orwell, Animal Farm, and the Politics of Critical*
- Reception*. In Horan, T. (Ed.), *Critical Insights: Animal Farm*. (pp.3-17). USA: Salem Press

- Jeremy, M. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London and New York: Routledge
- Jixing, L. (2013). Translation Definitions in Different Paradigms: *Canadian Social Science*, 4,107-115. doi: 10.3968/j.css.1923669701309044.2703
- Katan, D. (1999). *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translations, Interpreters and Mediators*. Manchester U.K: St. Jerome Publishing
- Lefevere, A. (1985). Why waste our time on rewriters? In Hermans, T. (Ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. (2nd ed, pp.215-243). London and New York: Routledge Survivals
- Lebert, M. (2016). *A Short History of Translation Through the Ages*. <https://www.marielebertwordpress.com/2016/11/02/translation>
- Martin, K. (1945). *New Statesman and Nation*. In Meyers, J.(Ed.), *The Critical Heritage: George Orwell*. (2nd ed,pp.197-204). London and New York: Routledge
- Nida, E. (1964). Translation definition. In Jixing, l., *Translation Definitions in Different Paradigms* (108-109). *Canadian Social Science Journal* 4
- Orwell, G. (1945). *The Freedom of Press: Preface to Animal Farm*.
- Roussillion, A. (1998/2008). *Republican Egypt interpreted: revolution and beyond*. In Daly, M. W, *The Cambridge History of Egypt: Volume 2 Modern Egypt, from 1517 to the end of the twentieth century* (pp.334-393). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Ideology*. In Hatim, B. & Mason, I., *Translator as Communicator* (pp.119-135) London: Routledge.
- Stein, K.W. (1999). *Heroic Diplomacy: Sadat, Kissinger, Carter, Begin, and the Quest for Arab Israeli Peace*. New York and London: Routledge
- Steiner, G. (1984). *The System : Patronage*. In Lefevere, A., *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (pp.11- 25). London and New York: Routledge
- Toury, G. (1980). *In Search of a theory of translation: Disposito, VII*, (19-

Tynjanov, Y. (1927). Poly System theory. In Munday, J., *Introducing Translation Studies* (pp.109 -113). London And New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York : Routledge.

Wengraf, L. (2003). The Orwell we never Knew. *International Socialism Review ISR*. Online publication. Retrieved from <https://www.isreview.org/issues/32/orwell.shtml>

Zauberga, I. (2001). *Manipulation School and Ideology*. In Dukāte, A., *Manipulation as a Specific Phenomenon in Translation and Interpreting* (pp.54- 55). (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Latvia.

Manipulation as Specific Phenomenon in Translation and Interpreting (pp.55- 57). (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Latvia, Latvia

Online Sources

<https://www.cliffnotes.com/literature/a/animal-farm/book-summary>

<https://www.britannica.com/biography/George-Orwell>

Arabic Sources

المعجم الوجيز . (٢٠٠٢) . مجمع اللغة العربية . مصر : الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الاميرية