

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46991/AFA/2021.17.2.116>

**ORWELLIAN IDENTITY IN STYLE**  
**(pragma-stylistic approach to the translations of G. Orwell's**  
***Animal Farm*)**

**Gayane Gasparyan\***

**Hasmik Karapetyan\*\***

*Yerevan Brusov State University*

The article focuses on transformations which occur in Russian and Armenian translations of G. Orwell's allegorical novella *Animal Farm* with special reference to pragma-stylistic analysis of both the source and the target texts. The aim of the analysis is to reveal the so-called Orwellian identity in style and to determine the means of its manifestation in both translations. Viewed from the perspective of pragmatic analysis of the original and the target texts, the Russian translation can be characterized by unnecessary additions to the plain text and tends to be pompous in some cases while the Armenian translation is closer to the style of the source text and tends to remain faithful to its intent. At large, both the Armenian and Russian versions of the fable have retained the chief pragmatic orientation and have almost the same impact on the target reader as the original one: persuasive message, rhetorical narration, manipulative nature.

**Keywords:** *Orwellian, pragma-stylistic analysis, transformation, persuasive message, rhetoric narration, manipulative nature.*

### Introduction

The term *Orwellian* is widely used in different contexts and is differently defined depending on the situation it comes to determine. In general, it is described as an adjective relating to the work of the British novelist George Orwell, especially the totalitarian state depicted in *Nineteen Eighty-four* (English terms dictionary, 2015). It is also defined as an adjective relating to a political system in which the government controls or interferes in nearly every aspect of personal life (Usage of the words and phrases in modern English,

---

\* gasparyan.gayane@yandex.com

\*\* has.kar.tar.29@gmail.com

Received: 06.07.2021

Revised: 27.08.2021

Accepted: 22.09.2021



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

© The Author(s) 2021

2013). A rather full and extended definition of the term is suggested by Wikipedia (Orwellian, 2021) according to which *Orwellian* is an adjective describing a situation, idea, or societal condition that George Orwell identified as being destructive to the welfare of a free and open society. It denotes an attitude and a brutal policy of draconian control by propaganda, surveillance, disinformation, denial of truth (*doublethink*), and manipulation of the past, including the *unperson* – a person whose past existence is expunged from the public record and memory, practiced by modern repressive governments.

Very often the term *Orwellian* is used in situations describing G. Orwell's language or style of writing, though the term *Orwellian language* has lately acquired a different connotation. It is mostly used to specify the language chosen to hide or to invert the truth. In any case, while speaking about G. Orwell's identity in language, the term *Orwellian style* is more than relevant to determine his uniqueness in dystopian literature for its straightforwardness and the unusual manner of allegorical significance.

The allegorical sense of Orwell's books does not hinder the language, on the contrary, his books are simple in manner and in the choice of linguistic means. In his famous essay *Why I write?* G. Orwell suggests a number of rules he has followed throughout his writer's career:

- *Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print.*

G. Orwell appreciates individuality and unique approach to every type of a literary problem, that is why he considers imitation dangerous and *lamentable* for the language because the phrase or any kind of linguistic unit loses its real meaning and value.

- *Never use a long word where a short one will do.*

G. Orwell values simplicity in literature. If you could convey your message to the reader in a straightforward manner without using confusing structures and manipulative figures of speech, that is something deserving appreciation.

- *If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out.*

This rule derives from the former one. Proofreading is the very phase determining whether there are extra words in the literary piece, they serve a particular purpose or not, if not they can be removed.

- *Never use the passive where you can use the active.*

G. Orwell believes that, for the most part, the passive voice as a grammatical category adds unnecessary confusion to the writing, though it has become a characteristics of the English language.

- *Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent.*

For most of his career as an author, G. Orwell has written for the common, ordinary people. He believes that an author should do his/her best to appeal to the reader and make the work as easy to understand as possible.

- *Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous* (Orwell, 1946).

As a conclusion he declares that these rules are by no means fixed, even admitting that he does not always obey these rules. He writes that for certain he has again and again committed the very faults he has been protesting against (ibid.).

G. Orwell is fascinated by the relationship between morality and language. The so-called Orwellian style of simplicity in manner and choice of language means is rather vividly depicted in the allegorical novel *Animal Farm*, where the author uses animals on an English farm to describe communist regime in the Soviet Union. Some animals are directly associated with the leaders of the Communist Party: the pigs Napoleon and Snowball, for instance, are images of Joseph Stalin and Leon Trotsky, respectively. G. Orwell uses the fable form for a variety of aesthetic/literary and political reasons. In order to better understand this, it is useful to know at least the basics of Soviet history under the rule of the Communist Party, starting with the October Revolution of 1917. Napoleon expels Snowball from the farm and, after the windmill collapses, uses Snowball in his purges just as Stalin used Trotsky. Similarly, Napoleon becomes a dictator, while no one ever hears from Snowball again. G. Orwell was inspired to write *Animal Farm* by his experiences in a Trotskyist group during the Spanish Civil War, and Snowball has a more responsive portrayal than Napoleon. Though *Animal Farm* was written as an attack on a specific government, namely the Soviet Union, its general themes of harassment, oppression, suffering and injustice encircle even a wider range; it is relevant for any time and epoch. Modern readers also can see G. Orwell's book as a

powerful tool for fighting against and knowing the nature of any political, military or rhetorical power that tends to control human beings unjustly right the way Stalin did once consolidating his power with brutal intensity, killing or imprisoning his perceived political enemies and running the purge of about twenty million Soviet citizens.

It is also important to focus on the transformations, which occur in Russian and Armenian translations of G. Orwell's *Animal Farm* with special reference to pragma-stylistic analysis of both the source and the target texts, and this is specifically done in this article. The aim of the analysis is to reveal the so-called Orwellian identity in style in the mentioned allegorical novella and to determine the means of its manifestation in both translations.

### **Why pragma-stylistic approach to translation transformations?**

According to E. Nida, "translation consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style" (Nida, 1984, p. 40).

To K. Reiss's firm belief, translations should respect the function of the source text type, for translation of informative texts should completely transfer the information content of the source text, whereas in the case of expressive texts the focus of translation should be the artistic aspects of the source text. Operative text translation should achieve the same psychological effect on target readers' behavior as the source text has on its readers (Reiss, 2014, p. 24-47).

Emotive text translation requires proper initial stylistic analysis. I. Arnold suggests the following approach: "Stylistic analysis can be carried out by focusing either on the driving forces of the writer's creative process, that is, from the author, or on the reader's perception of the text itself. The first approach coincides with literary stylistics, whereas the second one – with the style of decoding" (Arnold, 2002, p. 13). The difference between the tasks of the author's stylistics and the stylistics of perception lies in the fact that the former is more interested in the author than in his/her work, considering the work as a kind of consequence, the reasons for which must be sought. The stylistics of perception and, therefore, the stylistics of decoding, consider the literary work as a source of impressions for the reader. The vocabulary, the linguo-stylistic means which carry the emotive charge of the text, have the utmost impact on the reader and function within the particular genre chosen by the author as the most suitable form for transferring his/her ideas.

Writer's style is identified with two more categories as well: the categories of implicitness and explicitness. The translation process which consists of various phases of transfer, is largely dependent on these categories. Implicitness and explicitness as textual specificities are the result of the author's *choice*, his/her preference, subsequently, his/her individual style. Generally speaking, it is the author who decides to provide his/her message in a more or less implicit manner. However, no matter how original the author's style is, the very topic and the matter under consideration require anyhow the type of writing, its textual categories and its accessibility for perception, thus identifying the particular audience to whom the writing is addressed.

The interpretation and translation of the original text starts with revealing and understanding the cause-and-effect relationships between the events, the importance of the problems raised, the author's attitude, etc. presented with a specific bunch of lexical units, syntactic structures and stylistic tricks. The categories of implicitness and explicitness sometimes can lead to ambiguity or misinterpretation so inadmissible for a proper translation. But the analytical aspect is more specific to this part.

What type of analysis of the source text is needed to achieve an accurate and basically exact transformation of the author's cognition and the manner of its representation in the target text? To answer the question, one should keep in mind that the socio-cultural context around the source text is materialized in it by means of language media used by the author and determines his approach towards the situation described – the utterance itself and the target recipient consequently. Hence, the discourse analysis of the socio-cultural situation together with language media used by the author and the certain impact on the recipient based on its pragmatic value are of great importance for any type of translation. Moreover, the discourse and pragmatic analyses of the source text bring forth another type of analysis considerably valuable for an emotive text translation – stylistic analysis of the language media, which comes to combine the previous two (discourse and pragmatics) to specify the aesthetic value and the definite effect the text generates in a certain situation for a certain recipient.

### **A pragma-stylistic approach to target text analysis of G. Orwell's "*Animal Farm*"**

To characterize Orwellian manner in the allegorical fable *Animal Farm* from the pragma-stylistic perspective one can definitely indicate that it combines caustic reporting with a tone of generous anger that determines G. Orwell's

subsequent writing. The language used in it as well as its form and structure are very important for storytelling. G. Orwell uses *persuasive language*, *circular narrative* and *allegory*, which are particularly significant. The novella is written in ten chapters, but thematically it can be divided into three parts: the dream, the rebellion and the Napoleon regime. The notion of the narration being circular can be explained relying on the fact that Napoleon's regime represents the same dictatorship as Mr. Jones's.

Since the requirements for the article format are rather limited, one example will be illustrated hereinafter to specify the main tips of Orwellian style, to compare its Armenian and Russian translations by A. Emin and I. Polotsk respectively, and to analyze the consistency, value and interchangeability with the source text in the target cultures.

*Now, comrades, what is the nature of this life of ours? Let us face it: our lives are miserable, laborious, and short. We are born, we are given just so much food as will keep the breath in our bodies, and those of us who are capable of it are forced to work to the last atom of our strength; and the very instant that our usefulness has come to an end we are slaughtered with hideous cruelty. No animal in England knows the meaning of happiness or leisure after he is a year old. No animal in England is free. The life of an animal is misery and slavery: that is the plain truth.* (Chapter 1, p. 3).

Compared with the speeches of other animals living on the farm, this pig's speech and manners are more elaborate and sophisticated, and this derives from its intricate intentions. In this very extract the beginning is set with a *rhetorical question*. This device is meant to make other animals question their position on the farm. Old Major, the pig, represents the image of a good politician, he questions the feelings of the audience, *shakes* their views upon the existing setting and then provides the answer immediately. This rhetorical device is used to encourage and make the animals rebel. Old Major asks the question and gives the answer he wishes, persuading them that he is right. Almost every animal on the farm is illiterate, and the leader pigs take advantage of this and use words and expressions the illiterate animals do not understand: *miserable*, *laborious*, *slavery*, *hideous cruelty*, *atom of our strength*, *keep the breath in our bodies*. The style of the speech is rhetorical. Instead of saying *our life*, *this life of ours* is used. The pig emphasizes that they are a community using the

pronouns *we, us, our, ours* to generalize the issue, to make everybody feel part of the existing regime. In the same extract G. Orwell uses *anaphora* repeating in two sentences the negative clause *No animal in England*. This stylistic device is widely used in oratory, it makes speech more persuasive and powerful. Repetition stamps the idea into the head of each representative of the audience. Besides, negation makes the device even stronger and to the point.

The Armenian translation of the same extract sounds as follows:

Ուրեմն, ընկերներ, ի՞նչ է իրենից ներկայացնում մեր կյանքը: Եկեք ծուռ նստենք, բայց շիտակ խոսենք. մեր կյանքը ողորմելի է, տքնաջան և կարճատև: Մենք ծնվում ենք, մեզ մի բուռ լափ են տալիս՝ ինչ է, թե շունչներս չփչենք, նրանց, ուլքեր ընդունակ են, անխնա բանեցնում են, քամելով ուժերի վերջին կաթիլը, և այն նույն պահին, երբ մեր պիտանի- ությունը սպառվում է, մեզ հրեշավոր անզոությունը մորթում են: Մեկ տարին բոլորած և ոչ մի կենդանի Անգլիայում չգիտե, թե ինչ է երջանկությունը կամ հանգիստը: Անգլիայում և ոչ մի կենդանի ազատ չէ: Կենդանու կյանքն անցնում է թշվառության և ստրկու- թյան մեջ՝ ահա գուտ եղելությունը:

The rhetorical question will be analyzed first: the Armenian structure in this very interrogation sounds plain, but it was meant to sound powerful in the original. It would be better to keep the component *nature – բնույթ* in the target text to sound closer to the mood and spirit of the propaganda setting. The following variant may be suggested: *ո՞րն է բնույթը մեր այս կյանքի*. A direct translation from the source text is provided, it both sounds better in accordance with Armenian grammar and stylistics and conveys the style of the original writing.

The verb *to face* in the source text, which is an indicator of the simplicity of Orwellian writing style is transferred into the target text with the phraseological unit *ծուռ նստել, շիտակ խոսել* which is too specific to the Armenian linguo-cultural reality. That is why it is inconsistent with English reality of the original and Orwellian simple style. It would be better to keep the simplicity of the linguistic unit: *Let us face it – Եկեք հասկանանք/Եկեք*

*տեսնենք*. Besides, the expression *իրենից ներկայացնել* has penetrated into Armenian as a result of the Russian influence (in Russian: *являть собой, являться*).

The modifiers given to the word *life* are well transferred into Armenian: *miserable* – *նորստեղի*, *laborious* – *սքնաշան*, *short* – *կարճատև*. The word *food* of the original is translated into Armenian as *լափ* by means of *specification*. It is fair to mention that the word *լափ* is the watery food for dogs, and in its figurative usage the word may mean food of low quality. But not every animal is given a watery smash, let alone the herbivorous ones which can be given smashed potatoes with whey, but not always. If Orwell wanted to mention the quality of the food, he would use a more specific word, but in this particular case it is unnecessary. The most important thing in the sentence is the quantity of the food given, but not the quality.

In the Armenian variant the original figurative expression *to keep the breath in one's body* is adequately transferred through the phraseological unit *շունչը փչել* in the antonymic structure *ինչ է, թե շունչներս չփչենք*. The same structure is used in the Russian translation. The figurative expression *to the last atom of one's strength* is appropriately translated into Armenian with the participial phrase *քամելով ուժերի վերջին կաթիլը*, which conveys the exact meaning of the original expression, and the word *քամել* – *squeeze* intensifies the hyperbolic setting.

For the expression *hideous cruelty* A. Emin came up with the expression *հրեշավոր անզորություն* which, as well as its Russian variant, is a proper choice.

The stylistic device of anaphora is lost in the target text, while the repetition is preserved with the phrase *Անգլիայում և ոչ մի կենդանի*. The loss of the stylistic device is a violation of the source style, the preservation of which would make Old Major's speech sound more logical and well-founded in the translation.

The Russian translation of the same extract sounds as follows:

*Итак, друзья, в чем смысл нашего с вами бытия? Давайте посмотрим правде в лицо: краткие дни нашей жизни проходят в унижении и тяжком труде. С той минуты, как мы появляемся на свет, нам дают есть ровно столько, чтобы в нас не угасла жизнь, и те, кто*

*обладает достаточной силой, вынуждены работать до последнего вздоха; и, как обычно, когда мы становимся никому не нужны, нас с чудовищной жестокостью отправляют на бойню. Ни одно животное в Англии после того, как ему минет год, не знает, что такое счастье или хотя бы заслуженный отдых. Ни одно животное в Англии не знает, что такое свобода. Жизнь наша – нищета и рабство. Такова истина.*

The Russian translation tends to be high in style. It uses structures such as *нашего с вами*, which makes the speech more poetic and emphasizes the idea of community. The translator uses a word wider in the meaning, *бытие* (*в чем смысл нашего с вами бытия?*), which is praiseworthy, because it strengthens the question and forces every animal to think over their well-being not only at present, not only in the past, but in the future as well. The verb *to face* in the source text, is used for starting the explanation and giving the answer to the rhetorical question. In the target text the phraseological unit *посмотреть правде в лицо* definitely contains the equivalent component *face* (*лицо*, which is a noun), but it changes the meaning and the intent of the unit. Old Major has not started talking about unfair things yet, he is just breaking down the situation into questions. The Russian version cuts the pace and immediately submits that something is wrong. The verb *face* is used to mean to recognize and deal with straightforwardly, and the pragmatic value of the verb *to face* is completely presented in the source text. The speech tends to represent a *clear* picture of the existing situation, whereas the Russian phrase *посмотреть правде в лицо*, meaning to soberly assess the situation and recognize the actual state of affairs, gives the impression that the animals are aware of their delusion, though, in fact, they are not. It would be better to use a more neutral expression instead, such as *обратить внимание*.

In the second line of the source extract one can view several attributives to the word *life*, namely *miserable*, *laborious*, *short*. Orwell provides direct modifiers in a simple sentence. The Russian translation is more poetic and pathetic, the translator uses an addition to make the speech more elaborate instead of writing *наша жизнь несчастна, утомительна и коротка* (which is a direct translation from English). I. Polotsk prefers to add *дни нашей жизни* (*days of our life*) to replenish the gap which exists in Russian related to the plural form of the word *жизнь* – *life* with the component *days* (*дни нашей*

*жизни* – *days of our life*) gives the effect of considering life as a whole and feeling oneself as part of the community. The Russian variant (*унижение*) which is a unit of another part of speech (a noun) deviates in its meaning from the source text. The word *misery* indicating a state of suffering and want is translated into Russian as *унижение* which implies interference from a superior side. The modifier *miserable* is better to be replaced by *мизерный* or *ничтожный*. For the English word *laborious* there is *тяжкий труд*, which can be viewed as a good choice of the word for it contains the component of labor as well.

The figurative expression *to keep the breath in one's body*, is replaced by an antonymic expression *в нас не угасла жизнь*. This is a figurative combination of compatible words (we are used to saying *жизнь угасает* – *life fades away* in Russian) and well suits the context in the present extract both stylistically and semantically.

Old Major's speech, though delivered to a simple audience, tends to be as figurative and colorful as possible. Orwell uses the expression *to the last atom of one's strength* hyperbolically intensifying the meaning behind the unit. It is translated into the Russian set expression *до последнего вдоха* which means *to death*. But the English unit is more about losing one's strength which is not so intensive as the Russian one that implies the end of somebody or something. The use of the Russian expression *до последних сил* could be considered a better choice, closer to the original in the meaning and indicating the notion of *strength – сила*.

The Russian translation *чудовищная жестокость* of the metaphorical expression *hideous cruelty* adequately conveys the idea of the fears of animals towards humans who usually try to hide their terrible deeds.

Inconsistency is observed in the translation of the word *leisure* which is presented in Russian through *заслуженный отдых* (*a well-earned rest*) as the latter is wider in sense. The addition of *заслуженный* is not appropriate as the English word *leisure* is not associated with the idea of deserved or well-earned.

The stylistic device of *anaphora*, which is characteristic of oratory is preserved in the target text with the same negation structure: *Ни одно животное... Ни одно животное...* Moreover, the translator uses complex sentences with subordinate clauses in the target text, repeating even the verb *to know – знать*, which rather intensifies the repetition, and makes the Russian speech sound persuasive.

In contrast to the Russian variant the Armenian translation provides a more proper equivalent (*hwiqhuun*) for the word *leisure*.

The source text is not abundant with synonyms, and cognates such as *misery* and *miserable* can be observed here. But both the Armenian and the Russian texts violate Orwellian simplicity: in Russian *унижение* is used, which is given proper consideration above, and *нищета* at the end of the extract, in Armenian – *նղորմելի* and *թշվառություն* accordingly.

In the last sentence of the source extract the collocation *the plain truth* is translated into Russian as *такова истина*, which is suitable and sounds simpler like the Armenian collocation *զուր Էղելություն*: The word *Էղելություն* is not only an event that has already happened but also expresses one action, one setting and also the existing situation. Old Major speaks about a situation which has had a long duration and is still true.

### Conclusion

The language that George Orwell used in his allegorical fable *Animal Farm* is simple, clear and perceivable. Descriptions and dialogues are led to a minimum. G. Orwell avoids sentimentality, and even the heart-breaking and emotionally stressed parts of the text are straightforward in style. The author focuses on telling the story, providing a clear view upon the matter under consideration, thus making the lesson to be taught to the society even more comprehensible. Through the image of the pigs in the fable, George Orwell shows the power of political manipulation.

The pragma-stylistic analysis of source and target texts has been used, i.e. a lot of language means, speech units and devices as well as various expressive means used by George Orwell in the fable have been considered from both pragmatic and stylistic perspectives. The Russian translation can be characterized by unnecessary additions to the plain text, tending to be even pompous in some cases. The Armenian translation is closer to the style of the source text and faithful to its intent. At large, both the Armenian and the Russian versions of the novella have retained the chief pragmatic orientation of the original and provide almost the same impact on the target reader: persuasive message, rhetorical narration, manipulative nature.

## References

- Arnold, I. V. (2002). *Stilistika sovremennogo angliyskogo yazika [Stylistics of modern English]*. Moscow, Flinta: Nauka.
- English terms dictionary. (2015). Retrieved from <https://etymology.en-academic.com/2829/Orwellian>
- Nida, E. (1984). *On translation*. Beijing: Translation Publishing Corp.
- Orwell, G. (1946). *Why I write*. Retrieved from <https://ab3orwell.weebly.com/-writing-style.html>
- Orwellian. (2021). In *Wikipedia. The free encyclopedia*. Retrieved August 9, 2021 from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Orwellian>
- Reiss, K. (2014). *Translation criticism: The potentials and limitations. Categories and criteria for translation quality assessment*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Usage of the words and phrases in modern English. (2013). Retrieved from <https://etymology.en-academic.com/2829/Orwellian>

## Sources of Data

- Orwell, G., (2015). *Animal Farm*. London: Penguin.
- Orwell, G., (2013). *Anasnaferma [Animal Farm]*. (A. Emin, Trans). Yerevan:Antares.
- Orwell, G., (1988). *Skotnyj dvor [Animal Farm]*. (I.Polotsk, Trans.). Riga: Journal Rodnik, №№ 3-6.

### ՕՐՈՒԵԼՅԱՆ ՈՃԱԿԱՆ ԻՆՔՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ

(Զ. Օրուելի «Անասնաֆերմա» վիպակի թարգմանությունների  
 ոճագործարանական քննություն)

Գայանե Գասպարյան  
 Հասմիկ Կարապետյան

Հոդվածում ուսումնասիրության առարկա են դարձել Զ. Օրուելի «Անասնաֆերմա» այլաբանական վիպակի հայերեն և ռուսերեն թարգմանություններում տեղ գտած փոխակերպումները, որոնց ոճագործարանական վերլուծությամբ հեղինակներին հաջողվում է վեր հանել և սահմանել այսպես կոչված, օրուելյան ոճական ինքնությունը և որոշել դրա դրսևորման միջոցները հայերեն ու ռուսերեն թարգմանվածքներում: Բնօրինակ և թիբախ տեքստերի գործարանական վերլուծության տեսանկյունից, հայերեն և ռուսերեն տարբերակները պահպանել են

հիմնական գործարանական արժեքը և գրեթե նույն ազդեցությունն են ունենում թիրախ ընթերցողի վրա՝ պերսուազիվ ուղերձ, ճարտասանական շարադրանք, մտաշահարկային բնույթ:

***Բանալի բառեր.** օրուելյան, ոճագործարանական վերլուծություն, փոխակերպում, պերսուազիվ ուղերձ, ճարտասանական շարադրանք, մտաշահարկային բնույթ:*