



Sheikhbahaee University



ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

Footnotes in the Kurdish Translation of *Animal Farm*: A Paratextual Perspective

Milad Miraki^{1*} ; Zakarya Bezdoode² 

¹ Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

^{1 & 2} Department of English and Linguistics, Faculty of Language and Literature, University of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran

*Corresponding author: milad.miraki@fgn.ui.ac.ir

 [10.22034/efl.2025.541847.1357](https://doi.org/10.22034/efl.2025.541847.1357)

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 17 August 2025

Revised: 13 November 2025

Accepted: 18 November 2025

Keywords:

Paratext; Footnotes;
Animal Farm; Literary
Translation; Kurdish
Translation; Kurdish
Translation Studies

ABSTRACT

In recent years, there has been a growing recognition of paratextual elements in the translated texts. However, the study of paratext hitherto has focused mainly on well-known languages. In response to this gap, the present study investigates the use of footnotes as paratextual elements in the Kurdish translation of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. Employing a descriptive-qualitative method, the research analyzes the translator's footnotes based on Buendía's (2013) distinction between informative and performative notes, and Venuti's (1995) dichotomy of foreignization and domestication. The collected footnotes were examined across three dimensions: category, content, and function. The analysis illustrates that the annotated items primarily fall into two categories, cultural and political. Culturally loaded terms related to the novel's setting and politically charged expressions tied to its thematic concerns are explained through footnotes. Most entries adopt a dictionary-like style providing brief informative explanations, while a smaller number reflect the translator's evaluative stance. The overall pattern indicates a dominant foreignizing strategy aimed at preserving the cultural specificity of the source text. Nevertheless, the translator's inconsistent use of footnotes and excessive reliance on borrowing suggest limited strategic control.

How to cite this article: Miraki, M., & Bezdoode, Z. (2025). Footnotes in the Kurdish translation of *Animal Farm*: A paratextual perspective. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Translation Studies*, 10(2), 45–58.
<https://doi.org/10.22034/efl.2025.541847.1357>

2645-3592/ © 2025 The Authors. Published by Sheikhbahaee University Press.

This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).



1. Introduction

Simply put, paratext refers to any “liminal devices and conventions, both within the book (peritext) and outside it (epitext)” (Genette, 1997, p. 18). Thus, paratexts are ancillary elements either surrounding or mingling with the text. The definition put forward by Genette has in common the view that the book format of any text is essentially accompanied by elements intervening between the reader and the writer. Although Genette (1997) took a cursory look at translation in his formulation of paratext, a view which later on evoked scathing criticism on the part of translation scholars,¹ the concept soon caught the attention of scholars in the field of translation.

Within the context of Translation Studies (henceforth TS), the term is applied to a number of works and inspires a profusion of analysis in various contexts.² One of the earliest attempts to employ this concept in TS comes from Kovala (1996) who gathered footnotes to analyze ideological mediation. Kovala (1996) categorized footnotes into four major branches, namely: modest, commercial, informative, and illustrative (p. 127). Kovala (1996) put emphasis on the importance of these notes as accessible tools to fill the gaps between the reader and the text (p.125). Likewise, paratextual analysis in the historical study of translation was emphasized by Tahir Gürçağlar (2002). She stressed the need for the study of paratext in historical translation research (p. 45). Following the same line of inquiry, a plethora of studies have taken one specific kind of paratext in their analysis: preface (Dimitriu, 2009; Hosseinzadeh, 2015; Bikmanienè, 2018; Fayed, 2020), notes (Buendía, 2013; Sanchez Ortiz, 2015; Bolouri, 2018) footnotes (Haroon, 2019; Yi, 2019; Ukušová, 2021).

Translators resort to strategies in order to cover the linguistic and cultural lacuna between the source and target texts. Newmark (1988) suggested a variety of notes, additions and glosses in his landmark book *A Textbook of Translation*. Being recognized as a kind of addition/explanation strategy, notes serve the function of adding cultural, technical and linguistic information. Translators exploit notes in order to make the translated text more comprehensible for the readers. The important point here is the place of these notes since they vary significantly within the text. Genette asserts that paratexts can be conceptualized: “Spatially (in terms of where they are located), temporally (in terms of when they appear or disappear), substantially (their modes of existence), pragmatically (the sender and addressee) and functionally (in terms of what they aim to do)” (Gürçağlar, 2011, p. 13). Depending on the place it occupies, Newark (1988, p. 92) divides notes into four major categories: in the text, at the bottom of a page, at the end of a chapter, or at the end of the book. Nida (1964, p. 239) asserts that these notes “may be placed on the page where the object or event is spoken of, or the substance of such notes may be summarized in the form of tables or glossaries, placed at the back of the book.” By the same token, Aghayee (2020) maintains that notes are positioned in certain places: “1) below each page 2) at the end of each chapter, and 3) at the end of the book” (p. 69). She prefers endnote for detailed information in order to abide by the rules and regulations of compiling a book. Likewise, Buendía (2013, pp. 150-151) illuminates the place of notes as “they are usually found printed at the bottom of the page or in its margins, although they can also be included at the end of each chapter or book. In terms of the function of these notes, Buendía (2013) makes a clear-cut distinction between two kinds of notes, namely explanatory notes and discursive commentary. While the former is an attempt on the part of the translator to “provide additional information that is considered necessary in order to achieve a perfect understanding of the source text and to reproduce all the effects of the original text in the target text” (Buendía, 2013, p.157), the main characteristic of the latter, as stated by her (2013) “is that the translator does not only says something, but also comments on something and expresses an opinion about it, that is to say, ‘do something.’” (p.157)

One of the most visible forms of note is the explanation provided by the translator below the text, which is known as a footnote to steer the direction of the readers. According to Haroon (2019, p. 130) “translators may employ footnotes to assist readers in their understanding of the translation.” Along with interpolation and omission, footnote is one of the three ways presented by Landers (2001) to “cope with lacunae in the TL reader’s knowledge of the SL culture” (p. 93). In the context of literary translation, the usage of footnotes made the translator more

¹ Genette (1997) includes translations in his discussion of ‘epitext’. Gürçağlar (2002, pp. 7-45) criticized this conception of translation since it accounts for translation as derivative and subordinate in relation to the source text.

² More particularly, paratext functions as a catalyst in sociologically-oriented approaches to translation as it has brought new dimensions to this area of knowledge.

visible. The hatred towards footnotes was to the extent that some regarded it as a ‘shame’ (Aury, 1963, p.11) and ‘insult’ (Pym, 1992, p.89). Footnotes, according to Landers (2001, p.93) might destroy the mimetic effect of the narrative. Nevertheless, since the focus shifted gradually from the text to the translator as a central figure in charge of translation, the study of footnotes as the ‘footprints’ of the translator has experienced a significant upswing (Paloposki, 2010).

Despite the substantial growth of research, very little is known about the nature and usage of this strategy in ‘less-translated languages’ (Branchadell & West, 2005) such as Kurdish. To keep up with these changes and to integrate non-Western traditions and thinking to broaden TS (Tymoczko, 2014), the current study seeks to investigate the footnotes in the Kurdish translation of *Animal Farm*. The case study at stake is a translation carried out by Adib Nader (2008) as a revealing example of a novel and brimming with footnotes. With this view, the study extracts the footnotes accompanying the Kurdish translation of *Animal Farm*. In so doing, three facets of these footnotes, i.e. categories, contents and functions of footnotes are highlighted. Moreover, Buendía’s (2013) classification of notes as *informative* and *performative* is employed to complement discussions concerning the content and function of these notes. Throughout our discussion, this study borrows ideas from Venuti (1995) and his *foreignization/domestication* dichotomy to critically evaluate the footnotes. The study has the potential to provide prospective avenues for research about Kurdish as a language which suffers from a dearth of practical and theoretical underpinnings in TS.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Footnotes in Religious Texts

Thus far, a number of studies have employed the footnote as their point of departure. Footnotes has been approached from a variety of angles such as religious, literary, philosophical etc.

There is a long tradition of using footnotes in the translation of the Bible, the Old Testament and the New Testament. The theoretical discussions revolving around the use of footnotes in the translation of the Bible have been a matter of heated controversy among the experts since there exist many difficulties pertaining to the text that should be surmounted. Indeed, many scholars in Biblical studies have discussed footnotes for a better understanding of the Bible. The earliest attempts to scrutinize footnote in religious books can be found in Nida’s (1964) classic book, *Toward a Science of Translating*. He deems footnote as an adjustment to serve two purposes: “to correct linguistic and cultural discrepancies and 2) to add information which may be generally useful in understanding the historical and cultural background of the document in question” (Nida, 1964, pp. 238-239). This study ultimately argues that footnotes are not supplementary but essential instruments for achieving dynamic equivalence. By providing cultural and historical clarification, they ensure communicative effectiveness and textual accuracy. Osborn (1982) also proposed footnotes for the translation of the Old Testament. He suggests four basic types of footnotes under textual category and two others under translational category (pp. 415-416). Osborn’s typology emphasizes that footnotes serve as interpretive spaces where translators resolve theological ambiguities and textual variants, highlighting the translator’s mediating role between sacred text and audience. Blight (2005) presented a framework for the analysis of footnotes for the meaningful translation of the New Testament. His framework encompasses the categorization of footnotes based on background information (comprising historical background, unfamiliar symbolic actions, and unknown objects), linguistic information (including figures of speech or symbols) and interpretational information (e.g. confusing statements). He concludes that footnotes function as structured aids that prevent misinterpretation and support a more meaningful engagement with Scripture, thus reinforcing the didactic and explanatory mission of Bible translation. In the same vein, Larsen (2010) enlists 10 types of footnotes employed in the Danish translation of the Bible. This list comprises: 1. Measurement and money 2. Meaning unknown or unclear 3. Where the word chosen may not adequately cover the semantic range 4. When wordplay needs explanation 5. When there are several options in theologically loaded or disputed passages 6. When different denominations have significant differences in terms of interpretation 7. When a biblical word is used that non-churchgoers may not be familiar with 8. When some cultural background gives a fuller understanding of the translation 9. When there is a significant textual problem 10. When the New Testament quotes the Old Testament or when the Old Testament has significant reference to a New Testament theme. Larsen’s analysis underlines the reader-oriented purpose of Biblical footnotes and their role in fostering inclusivity among different denominations, demonstrating that footnoting is part of the translator’s hermeneutic responsibility. More recently, Yi (2018)

analyzed the footnotes of five contemporary translations of the Gospel of Mark based on skopos theory. The researcher evinced how the footnote as part and parcel of the religious text is not a trivial tool and it can be studied in its own right. Yi concludes that footnotes, when viewed through skopos theory, perform communicative and pragmatic functions aligned with the translator's purpose, thereby proving that they are integral, not peripheral, to the production and reception of religious texts.

2.2. Footnotes in Literary Texts

Owing to the fact that a literary text is replete with culture-specific and culture-bound items, the translator is in need of inserting explanations in cases where the reader might not be familiar with the unknown words. Hence, the interference on the part of the translator aids the reader and facilitates the flow of reading. That being said, footnote as a strategy to bridge the gap between the source and target text is commonly used by the translator in literary translation. Paloposki (2010) conducted research in which she gathered footnotes in the Finnish translation between 1870 up to 1929. The footnote, according to Paloposki, acts as the second voice of the translators in order to manifest their visibility within the translated text (2010, p. 104). The central argument is that footnotes act as the translator's "second voice," a paratextual manifestation of visibility and agency. Her findings reveal that notes reflect translators' interpretive stance and historical self-positioning within literary systems. Predicated on the premise that the footnote is inevitable in literary translation, Sanchez Ortiz (2015) studied four Spanish translations of Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. The study comes to the conclusion that the footnotes differed substantially in terms of frequency and characteristics. She concludes that variation in the frequency and tone of footnotes across translations mirrors shifts in translation norms and aesthetic ideologies, showing that paratextual choices embody the translators' interpretive freedom. Bolouri (2018) provided a comprehensive overview of footnotes in contemporary Iranian literary translations. Motivated by the notion of paratextual agency, he examined the use of footnotes in bridging the cultural, societal and linguistic voids. The study suggests that footnote is a link, aiding the readers to gain insight into the delicacies of the source text. Bolouri's research demonstrates that footnotes in Iranian literary translation function as bridges across cultural and linguistic divides while simultaneously foregrounding the translator's cultural and ideological agency. Taking into account the categories, contents and functions of footnotes, Haroon (2019) offered an in-depth analysis of the Malay translation of *A Thousand Splendid Suns*. With respect to the categories, culture-bound items were the most frequent category. The analysis reveals the dictionary-style explanation for the content of the study and the purely informative function is accentuated as for the function of the footnotes. Haroon's findings indicate that most footnotes are purely informative, suggesting a dominant tendency toward domestication. His study implies that translators in this context prioritize reader comprehension over authorial style or ambiguity. To examine the (in) effectiveness of footnotes, Ukušová (2021) conducted research on two Slovak translations of *Anne of Green Gables* in both qualitative and quantitative terms. By way of conclusion, the study illustrates that the number, length, subject and function of footnotes vary greatly in two translations. Her comparative study concludes that differences in number, scope, and content of footnotes are indicative of translators' ideological orientations and their perceptions of target readership, reaffirming that footnotes are context-bound cultural markers.

In the same vein, Vid (2023) analyzed the use of footnotes and endnotes in four English translations of the well-known novel, *The Master and Margarita*. Basing the analysis on five hundred footnotes and endnotes, the study also puts emphasis on the length and quality of different retranslations of the novel. Vid's results reveal that the quality and density of footnotes evolve across retranslations, reflecting changing interpretive communities and editorial expectations, and positioning footnotes as dynamic indicators of translational practice over time.

2.3. Footnotes in Other Mediums (Fansubbing, Manga)

Recent years have witnessed a growing academic interest in the analysis of footnotes in other translation mediums such as fansubbing, anime, manga. For example, Fabretti (2016) explored the notes in a particular kind of fan translation known as manga scanlation. More particularly, the study endeavored to elucidate the structure of manga scanlation communities. The study confirmed the duality of these footnotes in relation to scanlation, as they either solve translation problems or act as a vehicle through which scanlators communicate with their readers, thus elevating the visibility of translators. Fabretti concludes that footnotes in manga scanlation have a dual function: they both solve translation problems and serve as channels of communication between translators and readers. This duality enhances translator visibility and creates a participatory translation culture. Noushmand and Miraki (2024)

conducted research in audiovisual translation with an eye on the notes added to the Persian fansubbing of Hollywood movies. Drawing upon Paloposki (2010) and the concept of paratextual agency, the study draws a conclusion that the content of these footnotes falls within seven categories: “narrative-related notes, locations, famous figures, organizations, medical information, allusions, and transliteration” (Noushmand & Miraki, 2024, p. 195). Their study ultimately finds that fansubbing footnotes perform both informative and performative functions. They not only clarify cultural references but also express translator identity, confirming the continued expansion of paratextual practices into digital and audiovisual translation.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative descriptive approach to analyze the content, function, and typology of footnotes in Adib Nader’s Kurdish translation of *Animal Farm*. The methodology involves a systematic process of data extraction, classification, and interpretation, guided by existing models of paratextual analysis. The corpus of the study comprises all 189 footnotes appearing in Nader’s translation. Repeated words were counted only once unless they referred to different entities. For example, *cannibalism*, *tobacco*, and *crowd-derby* appear more than once but were considered a single instance each. Conversely, homonymous words sharing spelling but differing in meaning (e.g., *van*) were treated as distinct entries. Widely regarded as one of the most eminent masterpieces of the 20th century, George Orwell’s *Animal Farm* is a satirical allegory, enveloped in the form of a fable. The novel recounts the goings-on of a farm owned by Mr. Jones. The animals living on the farm revolt against the owner of the farm in order to establish their utopia. However, the project did not work as intended and deteriorated irreversibly and a dictator named Napoleon takes over leadership of the farm. Under this dictatorship, the farm turns into an unbearable state full of vicissitudes for the animals. The novel mirrors the years on the verge of the Stalin dictatorship before and after the Second World War. Each animal in the novel alludes to a real-life figure during the reign of Stalin hence the importance of allegorical reading of the novel. Even though George Orwell had difficulty to have this novel published, as soon as the novel was published, it earned him a reputation and catapulted him from obscurity to literary fame. The novel has been translated into Kurdish several times. To the best of researchers’ knowledge, the novel has been translated into Central Kurdish (also called Sorani)³ by Karim Daneshyar (1986), Ahmad Dashti (2002), Mansour Morovati (2006), Adib Nader (2008), Abdul Khaleq Tavakoli (2014), Isaa Osman (2020) and more recently, Ali Haghigi (2020). Except for Ahmad Dashti⁴ (2002) Abdul Khaleq Tavakoli (2014), Azad Mustafa and Mohammad Shakeli (?) translations which were translated indirectly via Persian, other translations are carried out directly from English. To fulfill the aim of the present study, we have selected Adib Nader’s translation of *Animal Farm* for several reasons. Firstly, the novel was translated directly into Kurdish; as a result, one is capable of tracing the possible lacuna the translator deems necessary to be bridged by means of footnote. Secondly, compared to other translations of the same novel, this translation is accompanied by an excessive number of footnotes, amounting to 189. Consequently, this reliable number indicates that the novel is a revealing example to pursue the unfulfilled potential of footnote in the context of Kurdish translation. The Kurdish title of the novel is *Mezray Ajelan* which is a word-for-word translation of the English title *Animal Farm*. Nader employs an inconsistent and incoherent system of footnoting throughout the translation. Occasionally, he transliterates the unknown words within the text and only the English footnotes appear at the bottom of the page while sometimes there is the other way around; that is, the Kurdish equivalents of obscure words are employed in the text and the original English words are footnoted. This somehow hybrid approach makes the process of collecting, classifying, and annotating the footnotes a challenging activity. The Kurdish translation of the novel contains a total of 189 footnotes. There are some points worthy of consideration concerning the data collection. Words which have been repeated more than once, unless they refer to a distinct entity, have been excluded. For example, Cannibalism, Tobacco, and Crowd-Derby have been repeated twice, and they were counted once. Words having the same spelling and pronunciation but different in meaning, also known as homonyms, are counted as two different words. As a result, words like *van* which refers to two different meanings are categorized under different categories. In order to extract the footnotes, the following steps are taken. Initially, the meaning of each word is clarified. In order to do

³ Compared to Sorani, Central Kurdish is assumed to be more fitting by linguists to accommodate a host of closely related varieties of Kurdish.

⁴ Even though Ahmad Dashti does not make it straightforward that the translation is based on the Persian version, the point that the title of the translation is a literal translation of the Persian title *Qal’aye Heivānāt* and there are stark similarities between the Persian version and its Kurdish counterpart corroborates our claim.

so, we have consulted the English-Kurdish professional translators (No.4) via informal consultation. In addition, to verify the translator's claims regarding the provided information, two dictionaries were consulted: the *English-Kurdish/Kurdish-English Sorani Dictionary* (bilingual) compiled by Goddard (2007), and Jawshani's (2015) two-volume *Kurdistanica* (trilingual). In the next step, we delved into the content and function of each information provided in the footnote. Further, the content and function are discussed based on Buendía (2013)'s two types of function: informative and performative notes. Furthermore, the domestication-foreignization dichotomy is incorporated into our discussions.

4. Results

By analyzing the extracted footnotes, we identified **189 distinct words**, corresponding to an average of **1.7 words per page**. These words fall into **27 categories**, ranging from tools and diseases to slogans. The framework used to define and assign these categories was based on the **frequency and repetition** of the words. Repetitive items such as *tobacco* (2 occurrences), *cannibalism* (2 occurrences), and *Crown Derby* (2 occurrences) were excluded. Additionally, words with **multiple meanings** were included in the analysis.

Table 1

Frequency of Words Footnoted in the Kurdish Translation of Animal Farm

Category	Words (sorted from the most frequent to the least frequent)	Frequency
Tool	Horse-rake, Threshing machine, Horse-brass, Dog cart, Cartage, Circular-Saw, Chaff-cutter, Mangel Slicer, electric milking machine, Incubators, Sail, Dynamos, Cables, Chaff cutter, Turnip-slicer, Harrow, Roller, Reaper, Binder, Governess-cart, Van, Rolling-pin, Wagon, Sledge hammer, elevator	25
Objects	Windsor chair, Horsehair, Lithograph, S, flagstaff, 5, Artillery, Shaft, Basic Slag, Crank, Cog-wheel, Check, Brass-studded collar, Paraffin oil, Block, Tile, Crown-Derby (2 times), Spur, Title-deed, Cheque, Blasting powder, Mug, Ace of Spade	23
Abstract Items and Miscellaneous	Climate, Comradeship, Midsummer, Ration, Spelling, Commandments, Benefit, Point of Honor, Volunteer, Ceremony, meeting, Advantage, Manipulation, Windfalls, Easygoing, Maneuver, Sentimentality, Policy, Mechanical details, Perpendicularity, Justice, Vital, Original	23
Farm Sections, Buildings	Scullery, Perch, Stall, Hedge, Store shed, Farm house, Headquarter, Loft, Cow Shed, Stable, Field Drain, Silage, Van, apartment, school room, brew-house, Kennel, Inebriates	18
Proper Nouns	Major, Willington Beauty, Snowball and Napoleon, Squealer, Mollie, Manor, Foxwood, Pilkington, Pinch, Field, Mr. Frederick, Julius Caesar, Minimus, Mr. Whyper, Pinkeye, John Bull	16
Acting	Quarried, record, business, Diagram, Infanticide, Formulate, graphically, Nocturnal, Brewing, Distilling, tit-bit, Toast, Routine	13
Reference to People and Events	Comrade, Master, Friend, Battle of the Cowshed, Midsummer Day, Publican, Candidate, Banquet	8
Organizations	Animal Committee, Egg Production Committee, Clean Tails League, Wild Comrades Reeducation Committee, Whiter Wool Movement, Defensive Operation, Agency	7
Clothes	Ribbon, Hobnailed boots, Gaiter, Coat, Bowler, Rat catcher Breech, Legging	7
Plants and Trees	Tobacco (2 times), Mangel-Wurzel, Hawthorne Bush, Night Shade Berry, Laurel, Birch	6
Units of Measurement	Hand, Bushel, Stone, Acreage	4

Units of volume and capacity,	Pint bottle, ounce, Pound, Gill	4
City	Berkshire, Sugar Candy, Red Lion, Brussels	4
Jobs	Knacker, Farmer, Broker, Veterinary	4
Animal	Turkey, Boar, Stallion, Minorca	4
Newspaper	News of the World, Farmer and Stock Breeder, Daily Mirror	3
Books	One Thousand Useful Things to Do About The House	3
Music and related terms	Tune, Clementine and Lacucurache	2
School	Animalism, Cannibalism (2 times)	2
Sound of Animal	Quack, grunting	2
Food	Ham, Roots	2
Currency	Pound, Bank-notes	2
Commands words for Animals	Gee, Whoa	2
Months	January, March	2
Disease	Coccidiosis	1
Slogan	Death to Humanity	1
Total		189

The analysis of the data reveals that the words footnoted fall into two major categories: **cultural** and **political**. With regard to cultural terms, it can be observed that the translator explicates culture-specific items unique to English that lack direct equivalents in Kurdish. The most frequently footnoted items include **tools** (e.g., *horse-rake, threshing, horse brass*), **objects** (e.g., *chair, mug*), and **abstract concepts** (e.g., *justice, sentimentality, benefit*). Culture-loaded expressions, particularly **units of measurement** (e.g., *hand, bushel, stone*) and **units of capacity** (e.g., *ounce, pint, gill*), are extensively elaborated upon in the footnotes. This **foreignizing strategy** highlights the cultural distinctions between the source and target texts, encouraging readers to engage with the source culture. Through such elaboration, the translator renders implicit information explicit. The linguistic and conceptual gap between English and Kurdish results in differing ways of representing the world. For instance, units of measurement and capacity (e.g., *hand, bushel, stone, acreage, pint bottle, ounce, pound, gill*) are deeply embedded in English culture and thus require additional explanation to become intelligible to Kurdish readers. Consequently, a substantial portion of the footnotes is devoted to clarifying these cultural concepts and phenomena. In doing so, the translator successfully overcomes many challenges associated with translating cultural items by providing informative notes beneath the text. Conversely, **commonplace words** are often incorporated directly into the translation, reflecting a **domesticating strategy**. Beyond cultural items, the second most prominent category of footnotes pertains to **political terms**. This is unsurprising given that *Animal Farm* is inherently political, critiquing totalitarianism and ideological manipulation. Frequent references to politically oriented categories, such as **newspapers** (e.g., *Daily Mirror*), **organizations** (e.g., *Animal Committee*), and **slogans** (e.g., *Death to Humanity*), further substantiate this claim. In sum, the categories of footnoted words in the Kurdish translation primarily serve to provide essential background knowledge and bridge the cultural and ideological gaps between the source and target texts. The following examples illustrate these patterns in greater detail.

Example 1:

Source Text:

With the ring of light from his lantern dancing from side to side, he lurched across the yard, kicked off his boots at the back door, drew himself a last glass of beer from the barrel in the **scullery**, and made his way up to bed, where Mrs. Jones was already snoring. (p.1)

Target Text:

لهگه‌ل هه‌لقه‌ی ئه‌و رووناکییه‌ی که له فه‌نهر مکه‌یه‌وه له‌ملاوه بو ئه‌و لا سه‌مای ده‌کرد سه‌ر تاسه‌ری حه‌وشه‌و بانه‌که ساتمه‌ی ده‌دا، له‌لای ده‌رگاکه‌ی پشته‌وه شه‌قی له‌ پووته‌کانی خزی هه‌لدا، دوا په‌ر داخه‌ بیره‌ی له‌ بۆشکه‌ی نێو سه‌که‌له‌رییه‌که‌ ده‌ر کێشا به‌ر هه‌و پێخه‌فه‌که‌ رێی گرت به‌ر که‌ مسس (جۆنز) (ل. ۱۰. ۵) ده‌مێک بوو له‌وێ پر خه‌ی ده‌هات.

In this example, the translator clarifies the English word ‘scullery’ for the Kurdish readers. He does so by transliterating the word ‘scullery’ and then provides Kurdish information below the text in the form of a footnote. Transliteration of unknown words cloaks the whole translation. In the case of culture-loaded words of the text, transliteration as a foreignizing strategy helps the translation to retain the cultural and linguistic specificities of the source text. Wherever the translator transliterates unknown words for the readers, a Kurdish explanation shortly accompanies it in a dictionary-style explanation. The advantage of including footnotes is to compensate for the information that the general readers might not be familiar with. That said, the translator moves beyond the mere transferring of the text and guides the readers to pierce into unknown facets of the novel. In this case, the unknown and obscure word ‘scullery’ which is peculiar to English language is accompanied by the Kurdish explanation (lit. a room next to the kitchen) in order to make it explicit for the reader. In this case the cultural specificity of the cultural word has retained. As can be seen, the widely used form of footnoting is to insert the transliterated form of the words and then provide explanation in dictionary-style information.

Example 2:**Source Text:**

The hens and ducks, for instance, saved five **bushels** of corn at the harvest by gathering up the stray grains. (p.12)

Target Text:

م‌ریشه‌که‌کان و م‌راوییه‌کان، بو نمونه له‌ دروینه‌که‌ر دهنه‌که‌دا به‌ کۆکر دهنه‌وه‌ی دهنه‌که‌ په‌ر ته‌وازه‌کان پینج بووشیل دانه‌وێلیمان پاراست. (ل. ۴۳)

Again, the translator follows the same strategy. The very word ‘bushel’ as a unit of measurement has been transliterated, and then the Kurdish explanation added below the text. This foreignization strategy is judiciously applied by the translator since this unit of measurement is non-existent in Kurdish; as a result, the cultural specificity of this unknown word is retained. The Kurdish footnote is “پێوه‌ریکه‌ بو گه‌نم به‌کار ده‌بریت و به‌ر ابه‌ره به‌ هه‌شت گالۆن.” (lit. a measure used for wheat and it is equivalent to eight galloons). This dictionary-style information imparts a considerable amount of knowledge to the Kurdish readers. Consequently, when conveying important culture-specific items to the readers, footnotes primarily function as dictionaries. In addition, based on Venuti (1995)’s dichotomy of foreignization vs. domestication, these words are transliterated to highlight the cultural and linguistic differences. In the next example, the translator has employed the other way around; that is, he inserts the Kurdish equivalent of the text and then provides the footnote.

Example 3**Source Text:**

Finally there came a night when the gale was so violent that the farm buildings rocked on their foundations and several **tiles** were blown off the roof of the barn. (p. 27)

Target Text:

سه‌ر منجام شه‌ویک هات که‌ زریان هه‌نده توندوتیژ بوو بینا‌کانی مه‌زراکه‌ی له‌سه‌ر بناغه‌کانیدا راهه‌ژاند و چه‌ندین کاشی‌ش له‌به‌ر بانی ته‌ویله‌که‌وه تووره‌هه‌لدا بوو. (ل. ۹۲)

In this case, the English equivalent of an unknown word is integrated into the text, and then the footnote is followed. The incorporation of this way of footnoting helps the reader to stay focused on the narrative and the translated text since it does not interrupt the flow of reading, and it does not distract the attention of the readers. This strategy is in line with Venuti’s domestication in which the text is conformed to the target text. Even though this footnote can in turn interrupt the flow of reading, the degree of distraction is minimum. Traces of the source

⁵ ل in these examples stands for the Kurdish word *lāpara* which means ‘page’.

Kurdish speaker is familiar with these words and the information provided has no new apparent function whatsoever. Consequently, the translator does not judiciously expound such words. Recently, Kurdish especially central Kurdish (also known as Sorani) has borrowed a considerable number of words through the process of borrowings due to “Kurdish and English languages intense contact”⁶ (Sedeeq, 2018, p. 607). However, as in the above-mentioned examples the translator does not judiciously make use of footnote as a strategy to compensate for a loss of information. As a result, he inserts a considerable number of footnotes with no apparent functions in a way that sometimes a page contains more than five footnotes, most of which are not necessary. This over-reliance and over-emphasis on footnoting apparent information in the form of transliteration sometimes is too exaggerated and the text bear resemblance to gloss rather than translation. The translator could make a balance between the page and the number of footnotes in each page; otherwise the informative contents of footnotes exceed the aesthetic effects of the text. This is actually in line with Larsen’s (2001) warning about interrupting the ‘mimetic effect’ of the narrative. Newmark (1988) also makes the same point that there must be limitations concerning the length and number of footnotes so that it does not create inconvenience for the readers. Take the example of the following paragraph in which the translator almost turns the translated text into a gloss, brimming with a variety of transliterated words which create uneasiness for the readers to read the narrative.

Example 7

Source text:

She was between the **shafts** of a smart **dogcart** painted red and black, which was standing outside a public-house. A fat red-faced man in check breeches and gaiters, who looked like a **publican**, was stroking her nose and feeding her with sugar. Her **coat** was newly clipped and she wore a scarlet ribbon round her forelock. (p.18)

Target text:

میانێ شەفتهکانیدا دۆگ کارتیکێ تەریۆشی بە سوورو رەش بۆیەکرادا بوو، کە لەبەردەم مەیکانەکیدا راوەستابوو. پیاویکی قەلموی رووخسار-نأل کە پانتۆنێکی کورتی خانەخانای گەیتەرێکی پۆشیبوو، هەر بە پابلیکەن دەچوو، نەوازشی لمۆزی دەکردو قەندی دەرخوارد دەدا. (ل. ٦٤). تازە مووی کۆتەگەمی بڕابوو هەو شریتیکی سووری پۆشیبوو دهوری کاکۆلی

Example 8

Source Text

He claimed to know of the existence of a mysterious country called Sugarcandy Mountain, to which all animals went when they died. (p. 7)

Target Text:

پرايگهياند کە زانیاری دەربارەي نینگیلیزی ولاتیکی نهننی نامیز ههیه پنی دەلین (کیوی نەبات) کە سەرپای گیانلەبەران کاتیک کە مردن بۆ ئەوی دەچن. (ل. ٢٨)

Sugarcandy Mountain stands for heaven in *Animal Farm*. It is a symbol for the afterlife of animals. Moses preaches this on many occasions for the animals in order to keep them obedient. The concept plays an indispensable role in the narrative and is frequently repeated throughout the novel. The translator does not provide any clues for the readers in relation to the symbolic importance of Sugarcandy Mountain. What is more, the translator takes no heed of the name which is written in capital. On many occasions, he has translated a proper noun in which it alludes to specific place, name, or person within the narrative. In these cases, the transliterated form is preferred within the text in order for the reader to gain insight into the narrative; the footnote can supply the the needed information.

Up to now, the study have discussed footnotes, which serve to bridge the lacuna between the source and the target text. In the context of Buendía’s (2013) classification of the function of notes added to translation, most of the footnotes fall within the domain of explanatory notes to supplement the text. According to Buendía (2013) the main function of the explanatory notes rests on the provision of “additional information that is considered necessary

⁶ Two emerging patterns can be seen in Central Kurdish in relation to borrowing. Religious books translated from Arabic into Kurdish are inundated with Arabic borrowings. On the other hand, non-religious books like literary books are accompanied by many English borrowings. Therefore, borrowing into Central Kurdish oscillates between Arabic and English words. (personal observation)

in order to achieve a perfect understanding of the source text and to reproduce all effects of the original text in the target languages". (p. 157). Despite the fact that the translator has opted for explanatory notes to supplement the translation and add necessary information to the readers (it was observed that there are some instances of unwanted footnotes), there are instances of other footnotes, the function of which is not to add information but to comment or express an opinion on the text. It should be mentioned that there are only 2 examples of this type known as discursive notes (performative notes).

Example 9:

Source Text:

It was very neatly written, and except that 'friend' was written 'freind' and one of the 'S's' was the wrong way round, the spelling was correct all the way through. (p. 9)

Target Text:

زۆر وردەکارانه نووسرا بوونەوه، بێجگه لهوه نهیه که (هاوڕێ) به هاوڕێ نووسرا بوومو بهکێک له (س)هکانیش پشت و ڕوو ئاوژوو (هه‌لگه‌ر ابوونهوه، هه‌جاکان سه‌رله‌یه‌ر راست و درووست بوون. سنۆبۆل یۆ هووده‌ی هه‌مووانی تر به‌ ده‌نگی گرو قه‌به خویندیوه. (ل. 38)

Here, the translator aims to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the text. In the footnote, the translator justifies the usage of the very word هاوڕێ in his translation by providing the information هه‌له نووسراوه کهش a friend (lit. The misspelling is a friend). The next commentary is to elaborate on the letter 'S' as به ئاوژوویی نووسرا (lit. written in inverted form). This commentary corroborates Buendía (2013)'s claims concerning performative commentary as "the translator is purposefully guiding the interpretation of the text and accords it with a socially acceptable meaning" (p. 159). The translator here assumes that the reader might not have any hint of the usage of this letter. The more evident kind of performative commentary is encapsulated in the following example in which the translator expressly leaves his comment and judgment.

Example 10:

Target Text:

Mollie refused to learn any but the six letters which spelt her own name. (p. 13)

Source Text:

مۆلی ره‌تی ده‌کرده‌وه که هه‌ج شتیک فێر بێت ته‌نها ئه‌و پێنج بێتانه‌ی که ناوی خۆیان پێکده‌هێنا. (ل. 48)

Since the readers do not have access to the original text when they are reading the translated text, they should be provided with objective and reliable information. Equally important here is that information should be devoid of any ambiguous statements and should enlighten the reader not to confuse them. The example provided here is an interesting example of incorrect information provided by the translator. Although this type of opinion can be classified as performative because it seeks to guide the reader's interpretation, the interpretation has been rendered inaccurately and this judgment is not consistent with the original text and stems from the wrong interpretation of the English text in which six letters have been interpreted as five letters. The translator asserts that "بێگومان پێته‌کانی" (lit. Undoubtedly, the number of letters of Mollie is six rather than five) How this penetrated Orwell's mind?" Footnote is a place through which the translator temporarily leaves his invisible position in the translated text and becomes more visible through this tool. The translator's discursive presence in the footnote, as either extra or intradiegetic narrator should contribute to the narrative and the interpretation provided by the translator should be engaging, leading to further fusion of the reader in the narrative for the sake of enjoyment. The translator as the principal storyteller which can be clearly traced in the footnote added to the text should follow the principle of 'normalizing' effect. Otherwise, these notes, as in the above-mentioned example will "become true digressions that not only do not favour the normal discursive flow of the original author, but also break it by taking into consideration subject matters that hold no relationship whatsoever with the topic of the story." (Buendía, 2013, p.160)

5. Discussion and Conclusion

Paratext, according to Batchler (2018), is a site of translator intervention, a space in which the translator temporarily relinquishes a marginal position within the text and comes to the fore. Footnotes, as paratextual elements, exemplify

such spaces where the translator's visibility reaches its apex; their analysis can yield valuable insights into the translator's role and intervention.

The analysis of footnotes in the Kurdish translation of *Animal Farm* reveals that the words footnoted fall into two major categories: **cultural** and **political**. Regarding culture-loaded words, the translator appears to assume that readers are unfamiliar with these culture-specific items and therefore intervenes to bridge the gap between the text and the reader's knowledge. Consequently, most footnotes function as **supplementary explanatory notes**. In addition to informative notes, some footnotes are **performative**, conveying the translator's judgments or interpretations.

The information provided in the footnotes generally takes the form of **dictionary-style definitions**. However, in cases where the narrative and the reader are more distant, the translator occasionally provides **encyclopedic information**. This reflects a **hybrid footnoting strategy**: specific items are often transliterated to emphasize their foreignness, reflecting both linguistic and cultural distance. This highlights the **dominance of foreignization** in the translated text. Conversely, domestication occurs when the translator provides Kurdish equivalents for culture-specific items directly in the text, facilitating comprehension and normalizing the narrative. Domestication is most frequently applied to items already familiar to Kurdish readers, who can understand the text without extensive footnotes. Overall, the footnotes oscillate between **domestication and foreignization**, reflecting strategic and ideological choices.

Two additional observations merit attention. Although "the proper use of footnotes is one of the best means of supplying needed information and resolving major differences between translations" (Blight, 2005, p. 11), **haphazard footnoting** can produce a disorganized text lacking aesthetic value. In the Kurdish translation of *Animal Farm*, the translator occasionally inserted redundant or obvious information without a consistent organizational principle. Excessive or digressive footnotes may distract readers and potentially "destroy the mimetic effect" of the narrative (Landers, 2001). Accordingly, footnotes should standardize and enrich the narrative rather than interrupt it. Furthermore, some key terms and concepts were either overlooked or insufficiently contextualized, limiting the footnotes' effectiveness.

Despite these shortcomings, the translator partially succeeded in bridging the gap between the English source text and its Kurdish translation. The examples analyzed illustrate both the strengths and weaknesses of the footnoting practice: informative notes are sometimes effective, while redundant or digressive notes diminish the aesthetic and interpretive quality of the translation. Some entries also raise questions regarding accuracy and authenticity.

Viewed through a **paratextual lens**, footnotes function as more than marginal explanatory devices; they are deliberate sites of translator intervention that mediate among the source text, the target audience, and the socio-political environment. In Adib Nader's Kurdish translation of *Animal Farm*, footnotes reflect both cultural and political considerations: they provide access to foreign concepts and Western political allegory while asserting Kurdish linguistic and cultural agency. The oscillation between foreignization and domestication is not merely stylistic but ideologically informed, revealing the translator's negotiation of authority and readership expectations. From a socio-political perspective, the footnotes can be read as subtle acts of **cultural resistance and identity assertion**, allowing politically sensitive content to be conveyed within a constrained context.

Paratextually, these footnotes illustrate how translation operates as a space where literary, cultural, and political interests intersect. The translator becomes a visible agent, mediating and shaping the reader's understanding, bridging textual gaps, and navigating the larger ideological landscape of Kurdish life. Thus, footnotes function simultaneously as **linguistic tools, cultural bridges, and political instruments**, demonstrating the entwined relationship between translation, visibility, and socio-political positioning.

References

- Aghayee, M. (2020). The nature and forms of presenting footnotes. *Translator*, 69, 69–77.
- Aury, D. (1963). Préface. In G. Mounin (Ed.), *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction* (pp. 7–12). Paris: Gallimard.

- Batchelor, K. (2018). *Translation and paratexts*. London: Routledge.
- Bikmanienė, M. (2018). Translator's preface as a genre: A comparative analysis of Lithuanian and English prefaces. *Darnioji daugiakalbystė*, 3(12), 184–201.
- Blight, R. C. (2005). Footnotes for meaningful translations of the New Testament. *Translation & Interpreting*, 1(1), 7–46.
- Bolouri, M. (2018). Translators' agency in footnotes and notes of contemporary Iranian literary translators. *Language Related Research*, 8(6), 191–214.
- Branchadell, A., & West, L. M. (Eds.). (2005). *Less translated languages* (Vol. 58). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Buendía, C. T. (2013). Listening to the voice of the translator: A description of translator's notes as paratextual elements. *Translation & Interpreting: The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 5(2), 149–162.
- Dimitriu, R. (2009). Translators' prefaces as documentary sources for translation studies. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 17(3), 193–206.
- Fabbretti, M. (2016). The use of translation notes in manga scanlation. *TranscUlturAl: A Journal of Translation and Cultural Studies*, 8(2), 86–104.
- Fayed, S. (2020). Translator's prefaces to literary works as means to visibility of invisibility? A CDA approach to analyze translators' prefaces as part of the paratext. *Cairo Studies in English*, 2020(1), 258–279.
- Genette, G. (1997). *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation* (J. E. Lewin, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goddard, M. (2007). *English–Kurdish/Kurdish–English Sorani dictionary*. London: Simon Wallenberg Press.
- Haroon, H. (2019). The use of footnotes in Malay translation of *A Thousand Splendid Suns*. *Translation & Interpreting Research*, 11(1), 130–146.
- Heilbron, J. (2000). Translation as a cultural world system. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 8(1), 9–26.
- Hosseinzadeh, M. (2015). Translatorial prefaces: A narrative analysis model. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies*, 2(3), 311–319.
- Jawshani, A. (2015). *Kurdistanica dictionary: English–Kurdish–Persian*. Baneh: Mang Publisher.
- Kovala, U. (1996). Translations, paratextual mediation, and ideological closure. *Target*, 8(1), 119–319.
- Landers, C. E. (2001). *Literary translation: A practical guide*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Larsen, I. (2010). Acceptability of a Bible translation and the use of footnotes. An *Unpublished paper delivered at the SIL Bible Translation Conference*.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall International.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden: Brill Archive.
- Noushmand, N., & Miraki, M. (2024). Translators' agency in Persian fansubbed movies: A paratextual analysis. *Critical Literary Studies*, 6(2), 195–215.

- Orwell, G. (1987). *Animal Farm*. London: Planet Publisher.
- Osborn, N. D. (1982). Basic types of footnotes for Old Testament translations (based mainly on RSV and GNB). *The Bible Translator*, 33(4), 414–418.
- Paloposki, O. (2010). The translator's footprints. In T. Kinnunen & K. Koskinen (Eds.), *Translators' agency* (pp. 86–107). Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Pym, A. (1992). *Translation and text transfer*. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Sanchez Ortiz, M. T. (2015). The use of footnotes in literary translation. *FORUM: International Journal of Interpretation and Translation*, 13(1), 111–129.
- Sedeeq, D. (2018). The impact of the English loanwords in the Central Kurdish dialect on media discourse. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 45(4), 607–626.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş. (2002). What texts don't tell: The use of paratexts in translation research. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *Crosscultural transgressions* (pp. 44–60). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş. (2011). Paratext. In Y. Gambier & L. Van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 113–116). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tymoczko, M. (2014). Reconceptualizing translation theory: Integrating non-Western thought about translation. In *translating others* (Vol. 1, pp. 13–32). London: Routledge.
- Ukušová, J. (2021). Translator's footnotes as an (in) effective translation strategy. *Bridge: Trends and Traditions in Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 2(Special issue), 51–70.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London: Routledge.
- Vid, N. K. (2023). Notes in English retranslations of Mikhail Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*: Function, meaning, and significance. *Babel*, 69(6), 797–821.
- Yi, A. T. (2018). When notes start to speak: An investigation of footnotes and interlinear notes in contemporary Chinese Bible versions. *The Bible Translator*, 69(1), 56–78.