



## World Literature and Translation in Persian Literature Textbooks

Nazanin SHADMAN

University of Maragheh  
Faculty of Humanities  
Department of English  
n.shadman@maragheh.ac.ir

Mir Mohammad KHADEMNABI

University of Maragheh  
Faculty of Humanities  
Department of English  
m.khademnabi@maragheh.ac.ir (corresponding author)

**Abstract.** Persian literature textbooks, designed, compiled, and distributed by a state bureau run by the Ministry of Education, Organization for Educational Research and Planning, also have sections on the theory and practice of translating world literature. The current study deals with those passages, how they are represented and how they are consequently interpreted in the light of Venuti's conceptualization of domesticating and foreignizing translation. It is aimed to understand the status, significance, and visibility of translators in the corpus under study. The results of content analysis for the five high school literature textbooks (grades 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12) indicate a strong sense of domestication and appropriation by the compilers of the textbooks. The following strategies are recognized to have the largest share in the textbooks: no mention of the name of the translator, Iranization, and appropriation. The strategies are followed by samples for each theme. The paper concludes that the polyphonic world promised to be achieved by studying foreign and world literature is not, therefore, attained in such a context, as the emphasis is ultimately on the target ideologies and worldviews. The study also sheds doubt on the assumption that domestication is confined to the so-called imperialistic cultures like the Anglo-American.

**Keywords:** translation, world literature, textbooks, ideology, representation of foreign literatures

## 1. Introduction

Widely in circulation, school textbooks play an important role in representing discourses, thoughts, and ideas. In addition, they are capable of producing, instilling, and reinforcing those discourses and ideologies. In a country like Iran, millions of students are exposed each year to materials presented in these books. As a textual practice, therefore, they are involved in the creation of identities or discourses. The significance of these widely distributed books lies in the fact that they reflect the ideological view of the compilers and authors. “Since education is usually part of the public sphere and is regulated by the state”, contend Apple and Apple, “it is also a site of conflict” (2018: 7); the conflict may be interpreted in our case as the one between critical literacy and uncritical acceptance, between ideology and science, between Self and Other, or between the domestic and the foreign. The point is even more significant in countries like Iran, where textbooks are exclusively produced, edited, and distributed by a central bureau run by the state. Accordingly, all of them are scrutinized by this bureau so that their content would not deviate from the official ideology of the state, particularly when it comes to textbooks in humanities such as philosophy, literature, religious teachings, geography, and history.

In what follows, we will first review the research into ideology, broadly defined, informing the practice of compiling school textbooks at a global level, and then proceed to review the materials related to the Iranian context. Thereafter, the method implemented and questions to be answered will be elaborated, followed by the analysis of our data, that is, the world literature pieces included in the schoolbooks. Finally, conclusions will be drawn and suggestions provided.

## 2. Previous studies

### 2.1. Studies related to the ideology of textbooks in the world

Texts of humanities are, quite naturally, carriers of ideology, more than the texts of the so-called exact sciences. Interpretation is essential to the former. The whole difference between the two areas may be summarized thus: “The truth about the Newtonian Bible is different from the truth about the Newtonian apple. The truth of the Bible requires the faith of the reader; the truth of the acceleration of gravity does not” (Bleich 1975: 745). The “truth” thus interpreted has consequences for human sciences: they will turn into a locus of power relations, which are, more often than not, unequal. Social discourses influence the making of textbooks, which has been the subject of many studies in historical research. For instance, Bernard (2003) deals with how ideology of a liberal state, Japan, has created

bias in the historical representations of World War II in Japanese high-school history textbooks; interestingly, Japan is a rare case of liberal governments with a centralized power for producing school textbooks.

In the context of the United States, where textbooks are not the exclusive monopoly of the state, Anyon (1979) refers to omissions, stereotypes, and distortions that have long remained in social studies textbooks across the country, which accounts for the powerlessness of native Americans, African Americans, and women. Focusing on economic and labour history from the Civil War to World War I, she observes that there used to be a misrepresentation of the economic aspect of the country in the content of the textbooks. Others, such as Zajda and Zajda (2012), analyse history textbooks in Russia and refer to ideological shift in interpretation and emphasis of national historical narratives which are incorporated in nation-building ideas and the positive representation of today's Russia. In Brazil, Francis (1995) analyses twelve EFL textbooks for value orientation, ideology, and hegemonic purposes, wherein ideology has been identified in statements pertaining to gender and race. Similarly, in a neighbouring country, Moss (2010) observed an eighth-grade history class in northern Colombia and analysed the teacher–student–text interaction where indications to historical determinism have been found in the transitivity and grammatical metaphors.

In the Chinese context, applying CDA methodological approach and examining selective representation of English, shallow linguistic explanations, and grammatical prescriptivism issues, Xiong and Qian (2012) explore how ideologies of English are discursively constructed as legitimate knowledge in Chinese high school EFL textbooks. In the same context, focusing on the comparison of the depiction of minority ethnic groups in two consecutive editions of China's most widely used secondary-level history textbooks in two decades in the context of political and ideological shifts, Yan and Vickers (2019) study the issue of incorporating ethnic minorities into the Chinese history textbooks, an issue that has been the subject of a vast number of studies (Chu 2015, 2017, 2018; Gao 2016).

## **2.2. Studies of ideology in Iranian school textbooks**

As regards the Iranian context, there is a lack of seminal work on the intersection of ideology and textbook material selection. The few studies that are relevant to this field are the ones with focus on gender issues. For example, using critical discourse analysis (CDA) as the theoretical framework of their study, Ghajarieh and Salami (2016) investigate the representations of gendered social actors within equal educational opportunities for both genders in seven Iranian EFL books at secondary, high school, and pre-college levels. In the same line of research, results of Dahmardeh and Kim's study (2019), following the analysis of five new locally

developed ELT textbooks, suggest an imbalance in gender representations and a stereotypical image of females in Iranian English textbooks. By the same token, Karami (2020) analyses both the textual content and the visual representations of high school Persian literature textbooks. The results of the study indicate the underrepresentation of women and a pro-male bias in the analysed textbooks, which accounts for significant ideological issues that Iranian students encounter.

Apart from the latter, there are quite a few studies with a focus on the analysis of Persian literature textbooks. Zekavat (2013), for instance, emphasizes the significance of the inclusion and teaching of works of world literature at the secondary school level, as it makes students familiar with a dialogic and polyphonic world where variety is welcome. Shamshiri and Zekavat (2014) argue that world literature included in the textbooks advances a chauvinistic reading, which reinforces Iranian identity to the exclusion of others. Applying content analysis to the extracts of WL in textbooks, they conclude that these textbooks tend to erase the Other and replace it with the Self. They also argue that the share of world literature in these books is so “slim” that one cannot see the creation of a dialogic, polyphonic world for students reading them.

### 3. World literature and translations

Inclusion of texts, both original and translation, in textbooks is, to some extent, like anthologizing texts: both include “collecting, selecting, and displaying” and “evaluat[ing] ‘collectibles’ for a certain public, thus configuring and/or manipulating the reception of a foreign culture by native readers” (Seruya 2013: 2). The inclusion of translations may thus help shape the reception of the foreign elements in the target culture and be indicative of the general state ideology regarding the issue of the “foreign”. The anthologizer / textbook compiler becomes a “secondary author”, who is empowered to direct the interpretation in a context which denies, by its nature, access to the original text. In pedagogical contexts, translations go through multiple processes, which double the meaning of texts selected for inclusion. When selected for inclusion in textbooks, a translated text is further processed by the editors; it is prefaced, a summary is added, the author’s biography is provided, and, more importantly, a certain reading of the translated text is imposed on it either directly or indirectly. What we see in the textbook has thus gone through the translators’ and then the editors’ filters, reaching the final destination – the users of textbooks. The question is how world literature is represented in such context and what the significance of translation and the translator in this representation is.

To answer the questions formulated above, translation should be considered from the perspective of rewriting. The present study investigates the representation

of world literature in six locally developed Persian literature (*Adabiyat-e Farsi*) textbooks which have been in use in all Iranian schools for the final 6 grades, namely, grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12. Chapter 8 of each one of these books is devoted to WL. The content of these chapters in the textbooks (Akbari Sheldareh et al. 2013, Ghasempour Moghadam–Akbari Sheldareh et al. 2019, Ghasempour Moghadam et al. 2018, Ghasempour Moghadam–Ebadati–Akbari Sheldareh et al. 2019, Ghasempour Moghadam–Ebadati–Vafaei et al. 2019, Ghasempour Moghadam–Ebadati–Sangari et al. 2019) is summarized in *Table 1*. All six books follow the same pattern in thematic categorization. For instance, they all have sections titled “Epic Literature” (*Adabiyāt-e hamāsi*), “Lyrical Poetry”, “Contemporary Literature” (*Adabiyāt-e mo‘āser*) as well as “World Literature” (*Adabiyāt-e jahān*). In the previous versions of the books in circulation, the chapters were not organized, as they are in the new versions.

These textbooks are the ones that have been used since 2013 in the national curriculum. The researchers investigated the organization of the genre of the translated works used in the textbooks, the status of the authors within the Persian readers, the source language from which the work has been translated, and any indications of the translators’ names.

The translator’s invisibility, as Venuti defines it, originates from his work in Anglo-American culture, in which a translation is judged on the basis of the “transparency” of the discourse so that it should sound like an “original”, not like a translation. The translator is thus rendered “invisible” in these cultures. The strategy associated with fluent discourse is what Venuti names *domestication*, which co-opts every foreign element and incorporates it into the dominant cultural formations and linguistic repertoire. The alternative strategy is what he dubs *foreignization*, in which the translator resorts to the marginalized elements in the domestic culture, including the stylistic, linguistic, or cultural elements imported from the foreign culture and text. The resulting translation makes the translator visible. These two strategies, by no means mutually exclusive, are, however, not restricted to the “dominant” cultures like Anglo-American ones. Any culture may have vested interest in translating fluently and domesticating translation (Venuti 2008).

As Venuti notices, translation, especially when it comes to the translation among “minor” and “major” cultures, is of great importance in world literature, which, as he mentions, is “hierarchical” in nature; following Casanova’s line, Venuti asserts that “a minority status often drives a literature to increase its resources by translating texts from its major counterparts”. A minority culture thus imports “forms and practices that its writers had not previously used”, through which “prestige” accompanying the major cultures is transferred to the minor cultures involved. “A majority status”, he maintains, “leads a literature to translate less because its broad range of forms and practices can sustain independent development” (Venuti 2013: 180–181). The corollary is that –

provided that we assign Persian a minor status – the Persian culture needs to translate from major cultures to enrich its literary trove. The implication of his statement is that minority status cultures assign more importance to translators and make them, as a consequence, “visible” – *contra* the major traditions. The strategies of “domesticating” and “foreignizing” translations he proposes follow the same argument: whereas a culture like the Anglo-American might have a tendency to domesticate a text translated from, say, Persian, the latter might opt for a foreignizing strategy that reveals the foreignness of the text through the choice of the text and the discourse developed to translate it. Such a reading of Venuti’s theory, while holding water to some extent, is an oversimplification. All cultures, regardless of their status in the hierarchy of literatures, are capable of adopting both strategies. In addition, the strategies should not be regarded as a clear-cut dichotomy; they should rather be considered a continuum in translating discourses. Since translation is integral to world literature, it is impossible to deal with the latter without referring to how it was made available in a culture which does not have direct, unmediated access to it.

Considering the above definition regarding the translator’s invisibility, overall, three main categories were recognized to be the subsets of what is meant by “translator’s invisibility in Persian Literature Text Books” in the present paper.

## 4. Persian literature textbooks

Before these new versions came into use in 2013-2014, textbooks in use had been of a different nature. Organized according to roughly similar genres, the older textbooks had a dedicated section to WL. These books, however, feature this section in Chapter 4 rather than in the final one. In the old system of education in Iran, which divided school years to 5, 3, and 3 + 1 years for elementary, middle, and high schools, respectively, we observe another pattern. Students were granted a *dīplom*, or high school diploma, after finishing the third grade of high school, but if they aspired to go to university, they had to have another year of education, known as *pīsh-daneshgāhī*, or “pre-university”. The textbooks of grades 1 to 3 followed the same pattern, whereas the literature textbook for the pre-university was totally different. In the latter, we do not see a section devoted to WL but a section titled “Translation”.

While the texts chosen to be included in the old versions of textbooks feature names which are more familiar or “canonical”, the newer versions opt for lesser known authors and texts. Furthermore, the early editions included other texts from authors such as William O’Henry, which were removed from later editions. In addition, there are some other extracts from foreign or translated literature, such as from Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, scattered through the textbooks;

Stowe's text, for example, is included in the 2<sup>nd</sup>-grade textbook under the topic of "Resistance Literature". So is a poem by Mahmud Darwish, a Palestinian poet. These are indicative of the fact that it is not feasible to have clear-cut categories of all genres in literature. This blurred boundary among genres makes it difficult to decide where WL should be inserted.

## 5. Methodology

To determine the status of translators within the WL section of Iranian literature textbooks, we analysed the content of literature textbooks in grades 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12. Furthermore, all the charts, diagrams, and images were analysed to better understand how the literary texts are presented to the Iranian students. All the texts were systematically read, and the analysis resulted in some themes which can be taken as the embodiment of how translators are underplayed in the mentioned textbooks.

## 6. Findings

Overall, three main themes were extracted from the analysed texts. These themes account for the most dominant topics in view of translators that are underestimated in literature textbooks in Iran.

### 6.1. No mention of the name of the translator

Textbook 10 introduces the chapter on WL as follows: "Whatever we have covered so far in the book belongs to the intellectual, spiritual, and geographical space of our home, Iran. We are going to deal with texts, poets, and authors who portray [the space] beyond Iran's cultural geography and show us the issues of other lands or human matters raised in the world" (p. 132).<sup>1</sup>

Additionally, the introduction claims that the students will get familiarized with the "prominent people's thoughts, nations' thinking" and "prominent works" of WL. The "geographical space" mentioned in this extract refers to Persian literature proper, thus drawing a distinguishing line between Persian and foreign literatures.

One of the main recognized themes was the tendency to not refer to the names of the translators throughout the books. The books follow an identical pattern in which an introductory note is given at the beginning of each chapter; then the main text is introduced, wherein the name of the writer and, very rarely,

<sup>1</sup> Translated by the authors.

the name of the translator is given, followed by some exercises at the end of each lesson. In fact, our analysis revealed that among all 21 lessons dedicated to WL in the textbooks of grades 7 to 12 of first and secondary high school levels, only in four can we see the name of the translator (*Table 1*). It should be added that a complete bibliography is given at the end of each coursebook, where full details, including the name of the author, the name of the translator, the place and year of publication, are presented. Nevertheless, the present study focuses on each lesson where the name of the writer is mentioned without mentioning the name of the translator, given that the immediate space after the literary passage is where the readers look for the provenance of the work.

More interestingly, not all translators are effaced from the end of extracts. Seemingly, the editors opt for effacing translators when they are less known or celebrated. If the translator happens to be a well-known man of letters, the textbook indicates his name after the extract. One such case is Daudet's translator – Abdulhusayn Zarinkub (1923–1999) –, who is not, curiously, erased from the text. This visibility seems to stem from the cultural capital accrued by the translator: the students may not know Alphonse Daudet, but there is a high probability that they know who Zarinkub is. The translator's status in Persian culture is indeed different from that of in Anglo-American culture, but one must notice the degree of such attitudes.

## 6.2. Iranization

The objective of including WL in the curriculum of Persian language and literature in Iranian high schools is, as the textbook states, making students familiar with the thoughts of people in other parts of the world. The texts and authors selected for this purpose and the strategies employed in introducing them are, nonetheless, indicative of the fact that the editors have failed to do so. Venuti argues for a strategy in translating foreign literatures into English – he calls it “foreignizing” as opposed to “domesticating”. These strategies are rather ethical attitudes towards foreign cultures. The extracts included in the textbooks tend to depict a literary world that is not that different from the domestic one. This is even reinforced on lower levels by the choice of native *Shekastah* (cursive) fonts for the texts, giving the text an appearance of being domestically produced. Embedding the extracts in these fonts and pictures, which integrates them into the rest of the textbook, is telling enough.

An image from the textbook for grade 9 ornaments a piece by Victor Hugo. The native *Shekastah* font and the picture of a veiled female character is symptomatic of the editors' approach to WL. This also refers to the inherent contradiction in the censorship of the representation of the foreign. What do the textbooks try to achieve when introducing a foreign element which is overtly Iranicized?

Another instance of such domestic animation accompanying a translation is in the textbook for grade 11, in which a piece by Gibran Khalil Gibran (146) is embedded in the picture of a baker with a piece of bread in his hand. What makes it domestically originated is that the bread he is holding is *Sangak*, a type of Iranian bread baked over pieces of hot pebbles or rocks – hence the designation *Sangak*, *sang* meaning “stone” in Persian. The Iranicized image seems to be incongruous with the general setting of the piece – an image that further embeds the foreign material in the domestic context.

### 6.3. Appropriation

The editors constantly change their interpretative approach. In Qabbani’s poem, for instance, one may see the editor’s extratextual or historical approach more readily than one may see in, say, Bach’s. The editors try to reinforce, and even impose, the reading they prefer on the students by raising questions at the end of each unit.

There are three types of question after each piece: those dealing with language called “Linguistic Domain”, those dealing with literary devices, or “Literary Domain”, and those addressing the issue of interpretation called “Intellectual Domain”. In the exercises following Qabbani’s poem, a question is asked regarding the interpretation of the poem:

Question 2: In the following lines “O land from which/wheats are grown/ and prophets rise”, A) Which land is addressed? and B) What does the poet mean by the second and third lines?

The student is, to use a strong term, forced to interpret the piece the way editors want them to. Also, the interpretations of WL are given an air of comparative literature, and the extracts are connected to domestically written literature. Although it is not surprising to interpret foreign literature in terms of domestic literature, the emphasis on this move betrays a sort of “ethnocentrism” that disregards differences. All efforts in translation are to show that difference which is removed by flattening the text.

Furthermore, and apart from the problem of appropriation, another issue is the selection of authors in such texts. Choosing appropriate texts, authors, languages, and cultures for textbooks is a task full of difficulties. Which authors best represent WL is a question that has influenced many factors, including the needs and market for each individual author in the literary and translation history of a country. A review of foreign, mostly Western, authors canonized in the Persian context reveals a great number of authors each holding sway during various periods in the Persian literature, never fading into insignificance though. The list

is populated with writers from the West, such as Charles Dickens, Thomas Hardy, Charlotte Bronte, Emile Zola, or Jules Verne. Surprisingly, most of these authors are not represented in the textbooks, whereas the book market is very keen on these particular authors. This is not to say that the representation is wrong but that is lopsided. Even in the case of William Shakespeare, who is well-known by Iranians, only his sonnets have made their way into the books, while his plays, immensely popular in Iran, are not represented therein.

**Table 1.** *World literature in Persian literature textbooks*

Grade	Title of the lesson	Author	Original language and country/region	Genre	Translator's name	Mention of translator's name in the lesson
7	Lesson 16: The robot and the moth	Vytautė Žilinskaiitė	Lithuanian	prose	Nahid Azadmanesh	Yes
	Lesson 17: We can make it	Jack Canfield and Mark Victor Hansen	English	Prose	Parvin Ghaemi	No
	Recital: The old sage	Abdulrahman Dieji and Mohamad Ghasa	Turkmen	prose	Fathollah Didehban	Yes
8	Lesson 16: Bird of freedom	Mahmud Darwish	Palestine, Arabic	poetry	No	No
	Children of stone	Nizzar Qabbani	Arabic	poetry	Abdolreza Rezaqeinia	Yes
	Lesson 17: The way to happiness	John Lubbock	English	prose	Abolghasem Payandeh	No
	Recital: Over the window	Editor	-	prose	Sara Tehranian	No
9	Lesson 16: Wish	Victor Hugo		poetry		No
	Lesson 17: The little prince	Antoine de Saint-Exupéry	France, French	prose	Mohammad Ghazi	No
	Recital: Two painters	Robert Fisher	English	prose	Seyed Jalil Shahari Langeroudi	No
10	Lesson 17: The dawn	Nizzar Qabbani	Syria, Arabic	poetry	Mohamad Shekarchi, Nahid Nasihat, and Seyed Hadi Khosroshahi	No
	The poet's tomb	François Coppée	France, French	prose	-	No
	Lesson 18: The greatness of sight	Andre Gide	France, French	prose	Mahasti Bahreini	No
	Recital: Three questions	Leo Tolstoy	Russia, Russian	prose	-	No

Grade	Title of the lesson	Author	Original language and country/region	Genre	Translator's name	Mention of translator's name in the lesson
11	Lesson 17: Silence of the sea	Rabindranath Tagore	Indian, English	poetry	A. Pashaei	No
	The embodiment of love	Kahlil Gibran	Lebanese-American, English	prose	-	No
	Talismans	Johann Wolfgang von Goethe	Germany, German	poetry	Koorosh Safavi	No
	Recital: <i>Jonathan Livingston Seagull</i>	Richard Bach	US, English	prose	Soodabeh Partovi	Yes
	Your smile	Pablo Neruda	Chile, Spanish	poetry	Ahmad Poori	No
12	Traveller	Friedrich Schiller	Germany, German	poetry	-	No
	Eternal love	William Shakespeare	England, English	poetry	Omid Habibzadeh	No
	Recital: from Contes du lundi	Alphonse Daudet	France, French	prose	Abdolhossein Zarrinkoob	Yes

## 7. Conclusions

The point of departure in our study, in comparison with those focusing on the issues of gender or Persian literature's position amongst the postcolonial literatures, was that WL is not represented well in the schoolbooks of Persian literature taught in all Iranian schools. Our analysis suggested that translation was underestimated in this context, giving rise to contradictions in the treatment of WL.

While many scholars, particularly those working from within a postcolonial paradigm, assert that the cultures assigned a minority status in world culture are not capable of producing foreignizing translations – as if producing such a translation were a merit *per se* –, our study indicates how the Iranian culture is wont to produce strongly domesticated texts to be consumed in a medium involving a large number of readership. Like Shamshiri and Zekavat, who believe that Iranian culture has a chauvinistic tendency to erase the foreign, we maintain that all these domestication methods – adopted once by the translators and, more significantly, by the textbook compilers – are of a different nature; they seek to defend themselves against the foreign incursions onto the domestically produced content. In view of the Iranization at work in introducing the students to WL, what sounds quite contrary to our conclusions is that the textbooks create a multicultural or “polyphonic” world in the chapters devoted to the topic. Insofar

as the passages, the way they are presented to students, and the visual content accompanying them disregard, or erase, the foreignness which is the fulcrum of the purported dialogic and polyphonic world, the books cannot claim to have made a difference.

The issue of interpretation is at the heart of reading and enjoying literature, which a student – inexperienced in the practice – is deprived of in the textbooks. The so-called original literary texts are also given a single meaning by the teachers at school, and the cross-national university entrance exam called *konkūr* puts multiple-choice questions to students, limiting the literary interpretation to the minimum. WL pieces are not an exception to this rule; students are demanded to agree with the teacher’s interpretation of a passage and even memorize that certain reading for later reproduction at the final exams and at the *konkūr*. Reduction of meaning to a single phrase or stating the theme of a passage or text is carried out by the introduction of questions that are, in some cases, ideologically motivated, directing the student towards that certain reading. We believe the textbooks could have benefited from giving some leeway to the students to experience and explore literature on their own.

Azadibougar names two factors which impede the recognition of the foreign literary tradition in the Persian context: “a growing nationalist and cultural provincialism that is disseminated through departments of Persian language and literature” and “a Eurocentrism that is popularized through departments of English, French and German” (Azadibougar 2018: 232). Our research findings imply that “cultural provincialism”, which is a reformulation of domesticating translations, may be the case with the translation passages included in the literature textbooks. That is to say, a sort of nationalism is discerned here which, as we stated above, does not come to be recognized as chauvinistic but rather as having a xenophobic nature in view of the fact that the state-sponsored books need to be blocking the image not favourable for the state ideology. Whether Azadibougar’s first assertion holds water against the review and analysis of publications, either privately or state-owned, may be the topic of a separate study. As regards Eurocentrism rooted in the departments of European languages, our findings tend to refute such an interpretation to some extent. The corpus of texts represented in the textbooks is variegated, picking up samples from Arabic, Chilean, and Lithuanian literatures, among others – a fact that exonerates the textbooks from the Eurocentric charge. Quite opposite to that, we assume that the European, not least English, literature(s) are underrepresented in the textbooks under discussion for the inclusion of the samples do not do justice to the canonical status of English authors in Iran, particularly since the second Pahlavi era, when English began to be recognized as the most frequently used foreign language in Iran.

The notion of translation developed in some textbooks harks back to the conceptualization of the era of simplistic, pre-translation studies. Reducing

the whole translation process – a complicated practice by nature – to using dictionaries is what the non-professionals in the translation market of Iran do. Interestingly, mentioning translation, although in passing and *passim*, fails to fulfil the task the unit on the translation theory is assigned: while a student is not offered any clue to regard the texts purported to be WL as such, they are ill-positioned to digest translation practices.

Given the importance of ideology in textbooks, and returning to our earlier points regarding textbooks, it appears necessary to do more research into this cultural and textual practice. The research may pivot around the issues of gender, power relations, interpretation, and truths, among others, both in humanities and sciences.

## References

- Akbari Sheldareh, Fereidoon–Hossein Ghasempour Moghadam–Masoumeh Najafi–Mohammad Reza Sangari–Seyed Behnam Alavi Moghadam–Alireza Changizi–Zahra Soltani Motlagh. 2013. *Persian language textbook for students of grade 7*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Tehran: Iranian Textbooks Publishing Company.
- Alphonse, Francis–Lilia Maria Eloisa. 1995. *English as a foreign language: Textbook analysis, ideology and hegemonic practices in a Brazilian context*. The Ohio State University.
- Anyon, Jean. 1979. Ideology and United States history textbooks. *Harvard Educational Review* 49(3): 361–387.
- Apple, Michael–Michael W. Apple. 2018. *Ideology and curriculum*. Routledge.
- Azadibougar, Omid. 2018. Peripherality and world literature. *Journal of World Literature* 3(3): 229–238.
- Bernard, Christopher. 2003. *Language, ideology and Japanese history textbooks*. London: Routledge, Curzon.
- Bleich, David. 1975. The subjective character of critical interpretation. *College English* 36(7): 739–755.
- Chu, Yiting. 2015. The power of knowledge: A critical analysis of the depiction of ethnic minorities in China's elementary textbooks. *Race Ethnicity and Education* 18(4): 469–487.
- Dahmardeh, Mahdi–Sung-Do Kim. 2019. Gender representation in Iranian English language coursebooks: Is sexism still alive? *English Today* 36(1): 12–22.
- Gao, Fang. 2016. Paradox of multiculturalism: Invisibility of 'Koreanness' in Chinese language curriculum. *Asian Ethnicity* 17(3): 476–479.
- Ghajarieh, Amir–Ali Salami. 2016. Gendered representations of male and female social actors in Iranian educational materials. *Gender Issues* 33(3): 258–270.

- Ghasempour Moghadam, Hossein–Fereidoon Akbari Sheldareh–Alireza Changizi–Mohammad Reza Sangari–Abbasali Vafaei. 2018. *Persian language textbook for students of grade 9*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Tehran: Iranian Textbooks Publishing Company.
- Ghasempour Moghadam, Hossein–Fereidoon Akbari Sheldareh–Masoumeh Najafi–Mohammad Reza Sangari–Shahnaz Ebadati. 2019. *Persian language textbook for students of grade 8*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Tehran: Iranian Textbooks Publishing Company.
- Ghasempour Moghadam, Hossein–Shahnaz Ebadati–Abbasali Vafaei–Mohammad Reza Sangari–Fereidoon Akbari Sheldareh. 2019. *Persian language textbook for students of grade 11*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Teheran: Iranian Textbooks Publishing Company.
- Ghasempour Moghadam, Hossein–Shahnaz Ebadati–Fereidoon Akbari Sheldareh–Mohammad Reza Sangari–Maryam Amel Rezaei. 2019. *Persian language textbook for students of grade 10*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Tehran: Iranian Textbooks Publishing Company.
- Ghasempour Moghadam, Hossein–Shahnaz Ebadati–Mohammad Reza Sangari–Ahmad Tamimdari. 2019. *Persian language textbook for students of grade 12*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Tehran: Iranian Textbooks Publishing Company.
- Karami, Ronak. 2020. Gender bias in Persian literature textbooks. *Journal of International Women's Studies* 21(1): 374–386.
- Moss, Gillian. 2010. Textbook language, ideology and citizenship. *Function of Language* 17(1): 71–93.
- Seruya, Teresa. 2013. Anthologies and translation. *Handbook of translation studies* 4. 1–6.
- Shamshiri, Babak–Massih Zekavat. 2014. World literatures in Iranian Persian literature textbooks. *Asian Journal of Education and E-Learning* 2(1): 24–30.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2008. *The translator's invisibility*. London–New York: Routledge.
2013. World literature and translation studies. In: D'Haen Theo (ed.), *The Routledge companion to world literature*. Routledge: Taylor-Francis Publishing. 202–215.
- Xiong, Tao–Yamin Qian. 2012. Ideologies of English in a Chinese high school EFL textbook: A critical discourse analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 32(1): 75–92.
- Zajda, Joseph–Rea Zajda. 2012. Globalization, ideology and the politics of history school textbooks: Russia. *Education and Society* 30(3): 67–78.
- Zekavat, Massih. 2013. World literatures in secondary school curricula in Iran. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 15(6): 1–10.