



Akademik Eğitim ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (AJESS Journal)

**Translating Ideopolitical Slogans and the Dilemma of Equivalence
Animal Farm translated into Arabic by Mahmud Abdelghani from the point
of view of literary Criticism and Translation Studies**

**İdeopolitik Sloganların Çevirisi ve Eşdeğerlik İkilemi: Mahmud
Abdelghani'nin Arapça *Hayvan Çiftliği* Çevirisinin Edebiyat Eleştirisi ve
Çeviribilim Açısından İncelenmesi**

Dr. Nassima Guernane

guernanenassima@gmail.com

Skikda University

<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3343-7307>

Dr. Said Cheridi

said.cheridi@univ-skikda.dz

Skikda University

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-1165-5155>

Received: 20/02/2026

Accepted: 18/05/2026

Published: 11/08/2026

Abstract

This paper is about the translation of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and how political allegory and social ideology could constitute a dilemma for translators, considering the language as a principal instrument of domination. Among its most striking linguistic features are the ideological slogans repeated by the animals to simplify thought, strengthen obedience, and legitimize power. Translating these slogans is therefore not a merely lexical operation; it is a critical act that requires sensitivity to literary form, ideological function, and reader response. This article examines the translation of ideological slogans in *Animal Farm* from the perspective of literary criticism and translation studies, with special attention to the dilemma of equivalence. It argues that the translator must negotiate between formal

Öz

Bu çalışma, George Orwell'in *Hayvan Çiftliği* adlı eserinin çevirisini ele almakta ve dilin temel bir egemenlik aracı olduğu düşüncesinden hareketle siyasi alegori ile toplumsal ideolojinin çevirmenler açısından nasıl bir ikilem oluşturabileceğini incelemektedir. Eserin en dikkat çekici dilsel özellikleri arasında hayvanlar tarafından tekrarlanan ideolojik sloganlar yer almaktadır. Bu sloganlar düşüncüyü basitleştirmek, itaati güçlendirmek ve iktidarı meşrulaştırmak amacıyla kullanılmaktadır. Dolayısıyla bu ifadelerin çevrilmesi yalnızca sözcüksel bir aktarım işlemi değildir; edebî biçime, ideolojik işleve ve hedef okuyucunun tepkisine duyarlılık gerektiren eleştirel bir eylemdir.

Bu makale, *Hayvan Çiftliği*'ndeki ideolojik sloganların Mahmud Abdelghani tarafından yapılan Arapça çevirisini edebiyat eleştirisi ve çeviribilim

Cited For: Guernane, N., & Cheridi, S. (2026). Translating Ideopolitical Slogans and the Dilemma of Equivalence: Mahmud Abdelghani's Arabic Translation of *Animal Farm* from the Perspectives of Literary Criticism and Translation Studies. *Akademik Eğitim ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (AJESS Journal)*, 3, Article e25.

equivalence, which preserves the structure and verbal shape of the original and dynamic equivalence, which seeks to reproduce the slogan's communicative force in the target language. By combining literary analysis with translation theory, the article shows that the most effective translation strategy is often a balanced one: faithful to the slogan's ideological role, but flexible enough to preserve its impact in the target culture.

perspektiflerinden incelemekte ve özellikle eşdeğerlik ikilemine odaklanmaktadır. Çalışma, çevirmenin kaynak metnin yapısını ve sözel biçimini korumayı amaçlayan biçimsel eşdeğerlik ile sloganın iletişimsel gücünü hedef dilde yeniden üretmeye çalışan devingen eşdeğerlik arasında bir denge kurması gerektiğini savunmaktadır.

Edebî çözümlemeyi çeviri kuramıyla birleştiren çalışma, en etkili çeviri stratejisinin çoğu zaman dengeli bir yaklaşım olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Buna göre çeviri, sloganın kaynak metindeki ideolojik rolüne sadık kalmalı, ancak hedef kültürdeki etkisini koruyabilecek ölçüde esnek olmalıdır. Bu yaklaşım, sloganların yalnızca görünür anlamlarının değil, aynı zamanda iktidar ilişkileri, propaganda, toplumsal denetim ve ideolojik yönlendirme bağlamındaki işlevlerinin de hedef dile aktarılmasını gerektirmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: ideopolitik sloganlar, eşdeğerlik, edebî çeviri, çeviribilim, siyasi alegori, *Hayvan Çiftliği*.

Introduction

Translating ideological slogans in *Animal Farm* is one of the clearest examples of the close relationship between literary criticism and translation studies. The novel does not merely contain political language; it is built around the manipulation of language itself. Slogans in the text are repeated formulas that shape collective consciousness, enforce obedience, and conceal contradiction. Because of this, they demand a translation that can preserve both meaning and function.

The central problem is equivalence. A translator who works on *Animal Farm* must decide whether to preserve the original form of the slogan or recreate its effect in the target language. Formal equivalence privileges the wording and structure of the source text, while dynamic equivalence privileges the response of the target reader. In slogans, this dilemma becomes especially acute because the slogan is expected to sound short, memorable, and authoritative. Hence, we've to ask the following question: How literary criticism and translation studies could solve the problem of equivalence in translating ideopolitical slogans? And to which extent formal and dynamic equivalence constitute a dilemma when dealing with slogans marked by ideology?

To answer these questions, a theoretical study has to be carried out followed by a list of samples taken from the translated text, used to confirm that the translation of slogans in *Animal Farm* cannot be separated from literary interpretation. Literary criticism reveals why the slogans matter in the structure of the novel, while translation studies offers the tools to examine how those slogans can be rendered effectively in another language. Together, these fields show that equivalence is not a simple one-to-one relation but a strategic choice shaped by ideology, form, and function.

Translating ideological language of *Animal Farm*

The slogans in *Animal Farm* are especially challenging because they are tied to collective memory and political conditioning where translators judge “the form and the function of the source text to be basically adequate per se as regards the predetermined skopos in the target culture” (Venuti, 2012, p. 193). Their role is not simply to communicate an idea but to encode a belief or a “system of beliefs” (Venuti, 2012, p. 392). A phrase that is too literal may fail to sound like propaganda; a phrase that is too free may lose its connection to the source text. As well as other ideological literary texts *Animal Farm* is often read as a satire of revolution, propaganda, and political betrayal. Its slogans are a central part of that satire because they show how ideology can be condensed into short, repeatable verbal patterns and to be translated “the most crucial element of the translator's work is finding a voice for the text being translated” (Brian & Brigid, 2013, p. 3). So, in order to deal with these formulas which are not considered as neutral statements but devices of social control, the translator must proceed to simplify the complex ideological reality, reality of literature language which is considered as “a record of the present, a foundation for the past and a vision for the future” (Aziz & Abd El-Rahim, 2024).

The importance of slogans in the novel lies in their repetitive and performative nature. They are not intended to inform; they are intended to condition. Their rhythm and brevity help make them easy to remember and easy to repeat, which is precisely why they are effective as ideological tools that have “deeply influenced literary works” (Aziz & Abd El-Rahim, 2024). In literary terms, they function as part of Orwell's stylistic economy, and in political terms, they represent the reduction of thought to obedience.

From a critical perspective “language is an indispensable element in the realization of the verbal act and a necessary precondition for communication” (Venuti, 2012, p. 281), therefore, the translator must understand that these phrases are embedded in Orwell's larger allegorical design. A slogan in *Animal Farm* may appear simple, but it carries narrative, symbolic, and ideological weight. Translating it without this awareness risks flattening the novel's meaning and weakening its satirical power.

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative, comparative textual-analysis design situated at the intersection of literary criticism, translation studies, and critical discourse analysis. It examines how ideopolitical slogans in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

are rendered in Mahmud Abdelghani's Arabic translation and evaluates the extent to which the target-text formulations reproduce the slogans' semantic content, formal organization, rhetorical force, ideological function, and satirical effect.

A qualitative design is appropriate because the study is concerned not with measuring lexical correspondence statistically but with interpreting how translation choices reconstruct relations among language, ideology, power, and literary form. The analysis therefore treats each slogan as both a linguistic unit and a functional component of the novel's allegorical structure.

Research Questions

The study addresses the following questions:

- How are selected ideopolitical slogans in *Animal Farm* rendered in Mahmud Abdelghani's Arabic translation?
- To what extent do the Arabic renderings preserve the semantic, formal, rhetorical, and ideological properties of the source-text slogans?
- When does formal equivalence provide an adequate translation solution, and when is dynamic or functional equivalence required?
- How do lexical, syntactic, rhythmic, and rhetorical shifts influence the slogans' ideological and satirical effects?
- Can a hybrid strategy reconcile fidelity to the source-text form with communicative effectiveness in Arabic?

Textual Corpus

The primary corpus consists of the English text of *Animal Farm* and Mahmud Abdelghani's 2014 Arabic translation. The unit of analysis is the slogan pair: one ideologically significant expression in the English source text and its corresponding formulation in the Arabic target text.

The analytical sample comprises ten recurrent or structurally significant slogans and commandments examined in the article. These examples represent several functional categories, including binary classification, collective identity formation, moral prohibition, behavioural regulation, leadership glorification, labour discipline, political exhortation, and the manipulation of equality. The sample is purposive rather than statistically representative because it targets expressions that play a demonstrable role in the novel's representation of propaganda and ideological control.

A passage was included when it satisfied the following criteria: it was concise and repeatable; it expressed or reinforced a political belief, command, identity, or hierarchy; it contributed to collective conditioning or behavioural regulation; it recurred in the narrative or occupied a structurally important position; and it presented a meaningful translation problem involving form, effect, ideology, or cultural reception. Ordinary dialogue and descriptive passages without a comparable slogan-like or regulatory function were excluded.

Theoretical Framework

The analysis is principally informed by Nida's distinction between formal and dynamic equivalence as presented in translation-studies scholarship. Formal equivalence refers to the preservation of source-text wording, grammatical organization, brevity, parallelism, and surface structure. Dynamic equivalence concerns the reproduction of communicative force, naturalness, reader response, and functional impact in the target language.

These orientations are treated as analytical poles rather than mutually exclusive categories. A translation may preserve some formal properties while adapting others to maintain rhetorical or ideological effectiveness. The study therefore allows for a hybrid category when a target-text slogan combines formal correspondence with controlled functional adaptation.

Literary criticism is used to establish each slogan's relationship to characterization, plot development, irony, allegory, and satire. Critical discourse analysis supports the examination of slogans as instruments through which political authority simplifies social reality, constructs in-groups and out-groups, normalizes obedience, and conceals contradiction. Together, these perspectives prevent equivalence from being reduced to isolated lexical matching.

Analytical Framework

Each source–target pair is examined across six interrelated dimensions:

Dimension	Analytical focus
Semantic correspondence	Preservation, reduction, expansion, or alteration of propositional meaning
Lexical choice	Ideological connotations, evaluative force, register, and culture-specific associations
Syntactic structure	Imperative or declarative form, negation, modality, parallelism, and clause organization
Rhetorical form	Brevity, repetition, rhythm, symmetry, memorability, and chant-like quality
Ideological function	Construction of authority, obedience, exclusion, hierarchy, or collective identity
Literary effect	Preservation of irony, contradiction, characterization, allegory, and satire

This framework distinguishes linguistic accuracy from functional adequacy. A translation may reproduce referential meaning while weakening rhythm, authority, irony, or memorability. Conversely, a more idiomatic target formulation may strengthen rhetorical impact while introducing semantic or ideological shifts.

Analytical Procedure

The analysis proceeds in several connected stages. First, each selected slogan is located within its immediate narrative context to determine who produces it, who repeats it, what political purpose it serves, and whether its meaning

changes during the novel. This contextual reading establishes the slogan's literary and ideological function before its translation is evaluated.

Second, the English expression is aligned with its Arabic counterpart. Lexical choices, grammatical structures, patterns of negation, repetition, parallelism, modality, and rhetorical compression are identified. The analysis then records whether relevant source-text features are preserved, modified, expanded, reduced, or omitted.

Third, each translation is assessed in relation to formal and dynamic equivalence. A rendering is classified as predominantly formal when it closely retains source-text wording and structure; predominantly dynamic when it reorganizes the expression to recreate its communicative effect in Arabic; or hybrid when it combines structural correspondence with functionally motivated adaptation.

Fourth, the target-text formulation is evaluated within Arabic rhetorical and linguistic conventions. The analysis considers whether it sounds concise, natural, repeatable, authoritative, and memorable to an Arabic-speaking reader. Naturalness is not treated as an independent measure of quality: it is evaluated in relation to the slogan's literary function and Orwell's intentionally simplified political language.

Fifth, alternative Arabic formulations are considered only when the published translation produces an identifiable loss or shift. Alternatives are evaluated against the same six dimensions and are not presented as automatically superior. Their purpose is to demonstrate how different translation choices redistribute fidelity among meaning, form, ideological function, and reader effect.

Interpretation of Translation Shifts

Translation shifts are interpreted according to their textual consequences rather than labelled as errors solely because they depart from literal wording. Lexical substitution may be justified when it preserves ideological force or Arabic idiomaticity. Syntactic restructuring may be appropriate when English word order would produce an unnatural or weak slogan in Arabic. Expansion, however, may reduce compression and memorability, while excessive domestication may replace Orwell's political ambiguity with an interpretation not explicitly present in the source text.

Particular attention is paid to paradox and deliberate illogicality. When linguistic contradiction forms part of the novel's satire, correcting or rationalizing it in translation may weaken the political criticism. In such cases, apparent unnaturalness may be functionally necessary because the source text itself manipulates logical and grammatical expectations.

Analytical Rigor

A structured comparison matrix is used to apply the same analytical dimensions to every slogan pair. Interpretations are grounded in textual evidence, narrative context, and established translation theory. The analysis also distinguishes among description, evaluation, and proposed revision: description identifies the observable shift; evaluation explains its effect; and revision proposes a possible alternative without presenting subjective preference as definitive proof.

Theoretical triangulation strengthens interpretive credibility by combining equivalence theory, literary criticism, and critical discourse analysis. This allows findings to be evaluated at the linguistic, literary, and ideological levels rather than through a single criterion. The study nevertheless recognizes that literary-translation assessment necessarily involves interpretive judgment.

Ethical and Copyright Considerations

The study analyzes legally published literary texts and does not involve human participants or personal data. Only brief textual examples required for scholarly criticism and comparative analysis are used. All primary and secondary sources must be fully attributed, and the bibliographic details of the English and Arabic editions should be clearly identified in the reference list.

Limitations

The study is limited to one Arabic translation and a purposively selected set of ideopolitical slogans. Its findings cannot be generalized to all Arabic translations of *Animal Farm* or to literary translation as a whole. The analysis does not include reception data from Arabic readers and therefore evaluates potential reader effect through textual and rhetorical evidence rather than empirical testing.

The study also focuses on slogan-level comparison. Although narrative context is incorporated, broader questions involving paratext, censorship, publication history, dialectal variation, and reception in different Arab cultural settings remain beyond its principal scope. Future research could compare multiple Arabic translations, employ reader-response methods, or examine how publishers' introductions, covers, and annotations influence the ideological interpretation of the novel.

Literary Review

Literary criticism considers the novel as a text which is "not less rhythmic than poetry" (Venuti, 2012, p. 248). It helps, by the way, to identify what kind of text *Animal Farm* is and how its language works. It reminds us, also, that slogans in the novel are not isolated linguistic units but part of a system of meaning. They are tied to character, plot, irony, and political symbolism. In other words, the translator must read them as literary artifacts before translating them as verbal expressions.

This critical reading and critical linguistics try "to investigate the relationship among language, power and ideology. It regards discourse as the result of the producer's choice in both formal structure and ideology" (CHEN, 2021). For this reason, *Animal Farm* slogans' criticism is too important being often deceptively plain and their simplicity is considered as a literary strategy. Orwell uses short, repetitive language to show how revolutionary ideals can be reduced to propaganda. The translator must therefore preserve not just the semantic content but also the literary effect of plainness, rhythm, and collective force.

Translation studies benefits from literary criticism because criticism reveals why exact wording may not be enough and conveys “the social meaning and ideological function of discourse” (CHEN, 2021). A slogan that is formally accurate but stylistically weak can fail as a literary equivalent. The task is not only to transfer meaning but to retain the slogan’s place in the novel’s ideological architecture. That requires interpretive judgment, not mechanical substitution.

Equivalence as a translation problem

Equivalence is one of the most discussed concepts in translation theory because it addresses the relation between source and target texts, within the frame that consider “the human agents involved in the process” (Munday, 2012, p. 274). In Nida’s model, formal equivalence “which is related to the form and aesthetics of the text” (Munday, 2012, p. 74) emphasizes the message in both form and content, while dynamic equivalence or functional equivalence “based on what Nida calls the principle of equivalent effect” (Munday, 2012, p. 67) emphasizes on the response of the receptor. These two orientations are especially useful for thinking about slogans because slogans must be both semantically clear and rhetorically effective.

Formal equivalence “focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content” (Munday, 2012, p. 66), attempting to preserve the original textual form as closely as possible. It aims at correspondence in wording, grammatical structure, and lexical choice. This approach is attractive when the translator wants to maintain the concision and rigidity of an ideological slogan. It can also help to preserve the textual identity of Orwell’s style.

Dynamic equivalence, by contrast, seeks to recreate the same effect on the target reader that the original had on its readers, so that “the message has to be tailored to the receptor’s linguistic needs and cultural expectation and aims at complete naturalness of expression” (Munday, 2012, p. 67). This means that the translator may alter structure or wording if doing so helps recover the slogan’s persuasive power. In politically charged texts, this is often necessary because the target language may require different phrasing to achieve the same ideological impact.

The dilemma is that neither approach is sufficient on its own. Too much formal equivalence can produce awkwardness or reduce naturalness. Too much dynamic equivalence can erase the distinctive shape of the source text. Translating *Animal Farm* therefore requires a careful balance between fidelity to form and fidelity to function.

Formal equivalence and slogans

Formal equivalence is valuable in translating slogans because it preserves the compactness that gives slogans their force because “accuracy is the only possible goal of translation; that the translator has no right to a personal opinion or interpretation” (Robinson, 2012, p. 19). A slogan is usually short, direct, and repetitive; if translation expands it too much, its verbal energy may disappear. Formal equivalence helps translators who are “voracious and omnivorous readers” (Robinson, 2012, p. 25) to maintain the sharpness and memorability of the original phrase.

In *Animal Farm*, this matters because slogans often work as rhythmic commands rather than explanatory statements. Their power lies in their simplicity, and formal equivalence can “consciously, analytically, alertly” (Robinson, 2012, p. 71) preserve that simplicity when the target language allows it. It also helps keep the reader close to Orwell’s textual texture, which is important for literary authenticity.

However, formal equivalence can become problematic when the source-language structure is not natural in the target language, then, according to Schleiermacher, the translator must “move the reader towards the writer” (Munday, 2012, p. 46). A literal version may sound mechanical or artificial. In that case, the slogan which “must tell the truth” (Sezgin, 1975) may remain accurate and but lose its ideological persuasion. The translator must then decide whether preserving the form is worth the loss of effect.

Dynamic equivalence and slogans

Dynamic equivalence is often more suitable for slogans because slogans depend on effect, not just information, so that “every particular slogan must be deduced from the totality of specific features of a definite political situation” (Sezgin, 1975). Therefore, the purpose of a slogan in *Animal Farm* is to influence the animals, and in translation, the slogan must continue to function as a persuasive formula for the target reader, being “as open and flexible as possible with regard to the issue of translation within a well-defined period” (Hermans, 2014, p. 151). This makes dynamic equivalence a highly practical strategy.

The strength of dynamic equivalence is that it allows the translator to recreate the slogan’s communicative role in “certain a specific sociocultural circumstances” (Hermans, 2014, p. 36). If the original phrase sounds forceful, chant-like, or manipulative, the translation should sound similarly forceful, chant-like, or manipulative in the target language. This may require lexical adaptation, syntactic change, or even cultural adjustment, “demonstrating the potential of translation to advance cultural exchange” (Brian & Brigid, 2013, p. 9).

The danger, however, is over-adaptation. If the translator changes too much, the slogan may lose the ideological sharpness that belongs to Orwell’s original. Dynamic equivalence should therefore be used not as free paraphrase nor with the strategy of over-adaptation in which “artistic techniques that induce defamiliarisation and serve to delay easy understanding” (Brian & Brigid, 2013, p. 213), but as a controlled recreation. It should preserve the slogan’s political and rhetorical identity while making it effective in the target language.

Ideology, manipulation, and translation choice

Translation is never ideologically neutral, especially when the source text itself is with an ideology that “may affect the various formal structures of text and talk” (Sharhan, Naseer, & Majid Rasim, 2021). In translating *Animal Farm*, and as “translation is seen today as one of the tools of cultural diplomacy and intercultural understanding” (Brian & Brigid, 2013, p. 8), the translator participates in the circulation of political meaning. Even the choice between literal and adaptive translation can influence how readers understand the novel’s satire.

This is why literary criticism is so important. It helps the translator detect the ideological signals inside slogan expression that could be “analyzed on many levels of discourse” (Sharhan, Naseer, & Majid Rasim, 2021) and after that he decides which elements must be preserved. Some slogans in the novel are intentionally hollow, deceptive, or repetitive and their emptiness is part of their meaning. If translation fills that emptiness with too much explanation, it can destroy the satirical effect.

At the same time, translation studies reminds us that every language has its own conventions of repetition, emphasis, and political rhetoric. A slogan that works in English may need restructuring in another language to achieve comparable force or power, because “the study of reception must also take into account the effects of such external factors” (Brian & Brigid, 2013, p. 7). The translator’s task is, now, to remain faithful to Orwell’s critical intention while respecting the expressive resources of the target language.

An overview on some selected slogans

Some slogans are built on binary opposition, rhythm, and simplicity, such as the following slogan: *Four legs good, two legs bad* (Orwell, Updated on december 2014)(ST) translated by وسافان سينتان (TT) (Mahmud, 2014) in a formally equivalent Arabic version that preserves the compact structure and the oppositional logic, thing which is important because the phrase works as a *chant* rather than an argument. A dynamic translation would be justified only if the Arabic version needed adjustment to sound natural and memorizable; otherwise, both formal and dynamic equivalence are preferable here because the slogan’s ideological force lies in its blunt symmetry. The following suggestion could strengthen the translation and give it more equivalence: ونذل من يمشي على أربع، ونجد من يمشي على إثنان so that both the meaning and the form could be preserved. The same dilemma for the slogan: *All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others* (ST) rendered in this way (TT) جميع الحيوانات متساوية، لكن بعض الحيوانات أكثر مساواة من غيرها. Being the most famous slogan in the novel because it exposes the collapse of revolutionary language into contradiction formal equivalence works well because the paradox depends on the grammatical shape of the phrase, especially the impossible logic of *more equal*. Yet dynamic equivalence may help to preserve the satirical shock in Arabic if the phrase sounds too abstract or stilted; the translator must keep the contradiction visible, because the slogan’s political meaning is in its abuse of logic. We’d like in this case to make the translation express the ideology of the slogan, by working on the form as well as the communicative dimension to say: ستكون مساواة بين جميع الحيوانات لكن البعض منها سيستمع بعدالة أكبر giving by the way to the sentence more strength and force.

This slogan: *No animal shall drink alcohol* (ST) translated by لا يجوز لأي حيوان أن يشرب الخمر (TT) is ideologically loaded because it reflects moral regulation and later manipulation of the commandments. Here a formally equivalent version keeps the prohibitive tone and legal simplicity, which suits the authoritarian atmosphere of the novel. However, the target culture requires a more idiomatic or morally marked term and a dynamic equivalence may be useful so that the translator would avoid softening the absolute force of the prohibition. Exactly the same as: *No animal shall sleep in a bed*(ST). لا يجوز لأي حيوان أن ينام في سرير (TT) because this latter shows how language is used to regulate behavior through compressed commands. Formal equivalence is effective because the English structure is already simple and direct. The Arabic version should remain short and absolute, since the slogan’s significance lies in its prescriptive rigidity, not in stylistic elegance.

We move to another example in which the slogan bears an actual ideological significance, where Orwell used the sentence: *Whatever goes upon two legs is an enemy*(ST). كل ما يمضي على ساقين هو عدو (TT) thing which is interesting because it reduces complex political distinction to a bodily marker, and where a formal equivalent dehumanizes logic of the original while dynamic equivalence could help make the line sound more natural in Arabic. Here the primitive binary logic has to be preserved to make it a political chant rather than a reflective statement. Here is a possible alternative that could change the sound of the sentence: من يمضي على رجلين فهو بالنسبة لنا عدو

We stay in the same frame with the slogan : *No animal shall kill any other animal*. (ST) Rendered by Mahmud Abdelghani in this way لا يجوز لأي حيوان أن يقتل حيواناً آخر (TT) considered one of the commandments whose stability is later violated through revision. The translation should remain legally absolute and formulaic, because it mimics the tone of a moral law. Formal equivalence is adequate here, since the phrase is already concise and natural in Arabic; dynamic equivalence would be unnecessary unless the target syntax required slight adjustment. Also this simple and direct slogan: *Napoleon is always right*(ST). نابليون على حق دائماً (TT) which indicates a pure ideological submission. Its power lies in brevity and totality, so a formal rendering is very effective. The Arabic phrase must sound like unquestionable dogma; any attempt to embellish it would weaken the authoritarian bluntness. In this case, equivalence is best achieved through directness, because the slogan is meant to suppress thought.

The case of *I will work harder*. (ST) سأعمل بجد أكثر (TT) associated with Boxer, shows how ideology is internalized as self-discipline where the formal equivalent is close enough to preserve Boxer’s sincerity and tragic simplicity. Dynamic equivalence could be considered if the Arabic version needed a more idiomatic expression of endurance or labor, but the plain future tense is important because it reveals the character’s obedience and vulnerability. (an alternative سأجتهد أكثر) while *Tactics, comrades, tactics*(ST)! الحيلة، يا رفاق، الحيلة (TT) has both rhetorical force and collective address. The term of address is important, because it turns the slogan into a political exhortation that needs formal equivalence to preserve the repeated structure, but dynamic equivalence may be necessary for *tactics* if the Arabic lexeme chosen must sound natural and politically persuasive. The translator should retain the urgency and repetition, because that is what gives the phrase its manipulative force the case of this suggestion: يا رفاق: الحيلة وما أدراك ما الحيلة

At the end we encounter a highly polarized slogan that creates a closed ideological universe where formal equivalence could work well because the parallelism of the sentence is essential to the meaning, and where Arabic should retain the balance between the two clauses, since the slogan functions by contrast and totalization. It is the following: *All*

men are enemies. All animals are comrades (ST) translated in this way جميع البشر أعداء. جميع الحيوانات رفقاء (TT) and could be formally translated as : البشر أعداء والحيوانات أصدقاء

A view on the translator's choices

Mahmoud Abdelghani's translation of *Animal Farm* should be read within a broader context of Arabic retranslations of the novel, many of which have been discussed in relation to ideology, paratext, and political framing. Studies of Arabic versions of *Animal Farm* note that translators and publishers often foreground its political satire and sometimes narrow its interpretive possibilities by framing it as a single ideological text. That context matters here because slogan translation is not isolated from the surrounding translation culture.

The translation of slogans often reveals whether the translator is working formally, dynamically, or through a hybrid strategy. A formal strategy is often visible when the Arabic version retains short clauses, direct negation, and balanced opposition. A dynamic strategy appears when the translator adjusts the wording to match Arabic rhetorical habits or target-culture norms. In the case of politically sensitive texts, the choice is also shaped by ideological pressure, taboo vocabulary, and the translator's own interpretation of Orwell's political purpose.

Conclusion

The translation of ideological slogans in *Animal Farm* demonstrates that literary criticism and translation studies are deeply connected. Literary criticism reveals the slogans' symbolic and ideological significance, while translation studies provides the framework for deciding how that significance can be transferred into another language.

The dilemma of equivalence lies at the center of this process. Formal equivalence preserves the shape and compactness of the slogan, while dynamic equivalence preserves its persuasive effect and communicative function. For a text like *Animal Farm*, neither strategy alone is enough. The most successful translation is usually one that respects both the form of the original slogan and the response it is meant to produce.

Ultimately, translating ideological slogans is an act of critical mediation. It requires attention to language, politics, style, and reader response. In *Animal Farm*, slogans are not simple phrases; they are instruments of ideological power. Their translation must therefore preserve their literary role and their political force, allowing the target reader to experience the same satirical insight that Orwell built into the original text. Would you like this reformatted into a more academic paper layout with title page, headings, and paragraph spacing suitable for direct submission?

So, the best way to translate slogans in *Animal Farm* is usually to combine formal and dynamic equivalence. Formal equivalence can preserve brevity, parallelism, and the visual shape of the slogan. Dynamic equivalence can preserve the slogan's ability to persuade, command, or deceive. Together, they offer a more complete solution than either one alone.

This balance is especially important because the slogans in *Animal Farm* serve both literary and political functions. They are part of Orwell's style, but they are also part of the novel's critique of language and power. A good translation must therefore be stylistically convincing and ideologically faithful at the same time.

In practice, this means that the translator should begin with a critical reading of the slogan's role in the text, then ask what aspect must be preserved most carefully: rhythm, brevity, memorability, irony, or ideological force. The answer may differ from one slogan to another. Translation is thus a contextual decision rather than a fixed formula.

Declarations

Ethics Approval: This study is based exclusively on literary and translation analysis of published texts. It did not involve human participants, animals, personal data, interviews, surveys, or experimental procedures. Therefore, ethics committee approval was not required.

Funding: The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, or publication of this article.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no financial, professional, institutional, or personal conflicts of interest that could have influenced the research or its conclusions.

Data Availability Statement: No original datasets were generated or analyzed during this study. The primary materials consist of George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and its Arabic translation by Mahmud Abdelghani. All textual examples and scholarly sources used in the analysis are identified and cited in the manuscript, subject to applicable copyright restrictions.

Author Contributions: Nassima Guernane contributed to the conceptualization, literary analysis, theoretical framework, investigation, and preparation of the original manuscript. Said Cheridi contributed to the translation analysis, methodology, interpretation, manuscript revision, and critical evaluation. Both authors reviewed and approved the final version and accept responsibility for the integrity and accuracy of the work.

Acknowledgments:

The authors have no acknowledgments to declare.

Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence: Generative artificial intelligence tools were used for language refinement, translation assistance, and editorial organization. They were not used as primary sources or as substitutes for literary and translation analysis. The authors reviewed and verified the complete manuscript and assume full responsibility for its accuracy, originality, citations, interpretations, and conclusions.

Ethical Approval

This study is based exclusively on the analysis of published texts, documentary and archival sources, and secondary literature. It does not involve human participants or animal subjects, and therefore ethics committee approval was not required. All sources are cited in accordance with academic integrity and copyright principles.

Informed Consent

Not applicable.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the editors and the anonymous reviewers of the AJESS Journal for their constructive comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies

The authors declare that no generative artificial intelligence (AI) or AI-assisted technologies were used in the design of the study, data collection, analyses, or interpretation of the scientific content of this manuscript. Any language-editing support was reviewed and verified by the authors, who take full responsibility for the content of the published article.

References:

- Aziz, A., & Abd El-Rahim, K. (2024). Literature and contemporary ideological issues. *El Wahat Journal* , 17 (2), 546-561.
- Brian, N., & Brigid, M. (2013). *perspectives on literature and translation*. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis group.
- CHEN, M. (2021). Critical discourse analysis- Slogans in the protest for George Floyd. *Sino-US English teaching* , 18 (4), 90-94.
- Hermans, T. (2014). *the manipulation of literature, studies in literary translation*. New York: Routledge revivals, Taylor and Francis
- Mahmoud, A. (2014). *Mazraât Elhayawan* (éd. 2nd). Beyrout: Arabic Cultural Center.
- Mahmud, A. E. (2014). *Mazraât Elhayawan*. Beyrut : Arabic culture center.
- Munday, J. (2012). *Introducing translation studies theories and applications* (éd. 3). New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis group.
- Orwell, G. (Updated on december 2014). *Animal Farm*. Web edition .
- Robinson, D. (2012). *Becoming translator, an introduction to the theory and practice of translation* (éd. 3rd). Taylor and Francis.
- Sharhan, K. S., Naseer, S. H., & Majid Rasim, Y. (2021). Dominant ideology in Orwell's novel "animal Farm": a critical discourse analysis of selected extracts. *International Journal of development in social science and humanities* , 12, 27-42.
- Sezgin, B. (1975). The art of slogans(the constative part). *Art and Language* , 82-95.
- Venuti, L. (2012). *The translation studies reader*. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis group.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Giriş

George Orwell'in Hayvan Çiftliği adlı eseri, siyasi dilin manipülasyonu üzerine kurulu bir anlatıdır; eserdeki ideolojik sloganlar düşüncüyü basitleştirmek, itaati güçlendirmek ve iktidarı meşrulaştırmak işlevi görür. Bu nedenle sloganların çevirisi yalnızca sözcüksel bir aktarım işlemi değil, edebî biçime, ideolojik işleve ve hedef okuyucunun tepkisine duyarlılık gerektiren eleştirel bir eylemdir. Çalışmanın amacı, Mahmud Abdelghani'nin Arapça çevirisindeki ideolojik slogan aktarımlarını edebiyat eleştirisi ve çeviribilim perspektiflerinden incelemek ve özellikle eşdeğerlik ikilemini tartışmaktır. Araştırma, çevirmenin kaynak metnin yapısını ve sözel biçimini koruyan biçimsel eşdeğerlik ile sloganın iletişimsel gücünü hedef dilde yeniden üreten devingen eşdeğerlik arasında sürekli bir tercih yapmak zorunda kaldığını ileri sürmektedir.

Yöntem

Çalışmada nitel, betimsel ve karşılaştırmalı bir metin çözümlemesi deseni benimsenmiştir. Metin bütüncesini Hayvan Çiftliği'nin İngilizce özgün metninde yer alan ideolojik sloganlar ile bunların Arapça çevirisindeki karşılıkları oluşturmaktadır. Sloganlar; biçimsel yapı, ritim, karşıtlık örüntüsü, ideolojik yük ve hedef kültürdeki alımlanma potansiyeli ölçütlerine göre seçilmiştir. Kuramsal çerçeve, biçimsel ve devingen eşdeğerlik ayrımı ile ideoloji ve çeviri ilişkisine odaklanan çeviribilim yaklaşımlarına dayanmaktadır. Analitik süreçte her slogan için kaynak metin ve hedef metin yan yana konularak çeviri kaymaları belirlenmiş, kaymaların anlam, biçim ve iletişimsel etki üzerindeki sonuçları yorumlanmış ve gerektiğinde alternatif çeviri önerileri geliştirilmiştir. Telif hakkı ilkeleri gereği yalnızca çözümleme için zorunlu olan kısa alıntılara yer verilmiştir.

Bulgular

Çözümleme, sloganların türüne göre farklı eşdeğerlik stratejilerinin işlevsel olduğunu göstermiştir. İkili karşıtlık, ritim ve sadelik üzerine kurulu sloganlarda biçimsel eşdeğerlik, sloganın bir tez değil bir tempo/tekerleme olarak işlenmesini sağladığı için tercih edilebilir bulunmuştur. Eserin en bilinen ve mantığın kendisini bozarak işleyen sloganında biçimsel eşdeğerlik, çelişkinin dilbilgisel biçime bağlı olması nedeniyle gereklidir; ancak hedef dilde ifade soyut veya

yapay durduğunda hicvin şoke edici etkisini koruyabilmek için devingen eşdeğerliğe başvurulması gerekmektedir. Yasak bildiren emir kipli sloganlarda ise biçimsel eşdeğerlik otoriter atmosferi ve hukukî yalınlığı korumakta, buna karşılık hedef kültürde daha deyimsel veya ahlaki olarak işaretlenmiş bir terim gerektiğinde devingen eşdeğerlik yasağın mutlak gücünün yumuşamasını önlemektedir. Bulgular, çevirmenin tercihlerinin yalnızca dilsel değil ideolojik sonuçlar da doğurduğunu ortaya koymaktadır.

Sonuç

Çalışma, ideolojik slogan çevirisinin edebiyat eleştirisi ile çeviribilimin kesiştiği bir alan olduğunu göstermektedir: edebiyat eleştirisi sloganların simgesel ve ideolojik önemini açığa çıkarırken, çeviribilim bu önemin başka bir dile nasıl aktarılabilceğine ilişkin çerçeveyi sunmaktadır. En etkili çeviri stratejisi, sloganın ideolojik işlevine sadık kalan fakat hedef kültürde etkisini koruyacak kadar esnek olan dengeli bir yaklaşımdır. Çevirmenin kaynak metnin biçimsel özelliklerini korumakla iletişimsel gücünü yeniden üretmek arasında yaptığı tercih, hedef okurun metnin siyasal eleştirisini ne ölçüde algılayacağını doğrudan belirlemektedir. Gelecek araştırmalarda aynı eserin farklı Arapça çevirilerinin karşılaştırılması, okur alımlama verileriyle desteklenen çalışmalar yürütülmesi ve benzer siyasal alegorilerin çevirilerinin incelenmesi önerilmektedir.