
| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Critical Discourse Analysis of Animal Farm Characters: A Comparative Study of Two Arabic Translations

Elrashid Abdel Gadir

King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Corresponding Author: Elrashid Abdel Gadir, **E-mail:** eabdulqadir@ksu.edu.sa

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0802-0247>

| ABSTRACT

This research paper is a descriptive and comparative study. It is descriptive as it presents the ideology of the three main characters in George Orwell's novel "Animal Farm": Old Major, Snowball, and Napoleon, as depicted through their statements. The study is comparative as it compares two translations of the novel into Arabic. The first translation, titled "The Rebellious Animals," was translated by Abbas Hafiz (1952). It is the first Arabic translation of "Animal Farm". The second translation, by Mahmoud Abdul-Ghani (2014), is widely regarded as one of the best. The novel Animal Farm by George Orwell is a political satire that symbolizes the Russian Revolution. The ideologies of the three leading figures, Old Major, Snowball, and Napoleon, represent revolutionary thought and the stages of its transformation. Old Major, the founder of revolutionary philosophy, was a dreamer and the first theoretician, inspired by the doctrine of Animalism. He symbolizes the combination of the characters of Karl Marx, the founder of communism, and Vladimir Lenin, the leader of the Russian Revolution. Snowball, the ideal revolutionary reformer, is a brilliant planner and a true believer in Major's principles, dedicated to educating the animals and improving their living conditions. He symbolizes Leon Trotsky, a revolutionary thinker who was exiled for his ideological beliefs. Napoleon, the pragmatic dictator, represents the opportunist who uses coercion and intimidation to advance his interests, justifying his rise to power by manipulating the laws and altering the Seven Commandments. He symbolizes Joseph Stalin. Discourse includes both structural and conceptual patterns. Most of these patterns vary across languages. Moreover, the characters' positive and negative sides were discussed. The findings indicated that the translators' ideological beliefs affect their lexical choices in translation, which in turn influences their success in recognizing and transmitting the ST's implicit ideologies into the TT. Two Arabic translations are compared in terms of the three characters' ideologies as represented by excerpts of their statements.

| KEYWORDS

Animal Farm, ideology, self-presentation, critical discourse analysis, Arabic translation

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 01 June 2026

PUBLISHED: 31 July 2026

DOI: 10.32996/ijllt.2026.9.8.2

Introduction

One important fact about language is that it becomes one of the most effective tools that functions to change attitudes. Language can be employed to communicate facts and/or to falsify them, or, as Hirschberg and Hirschberg (1998) put it, "political language can be used to inspire as well as to deceive" (p. 499). As such, language can be used to present oneself (in-group) positively and others (out-group) negatively. This function of language is linguistically manifested in different strategies that are intentionally used as manipulation-seekers rather than illumination-carriers. The present paper, therefore, endeavors to investigate a fundamental issue that plays an essential role in shaping and/or reshaping the attitudes of individuals in any society: the use of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation to achieve manipulation through a specific ideological use of language. In other words, how writers/speakers always make use of language to manipulate their addressees

and to produce a distinct cognitive environment that directs their addressees' thinking towards the acceptance of an argument in a particular way, *Animal Farm* is used as a sample in this study.

George Orwell (born on 25 June 1903 – died on 21 January 1950) has proved to be one of the twentieth century's most influential and thought-provoking writers. His small number of writings has had significant literary and political criticism. Although he was a socialist, he did not fit into any neat ideology. Orwell is well known for his novels "1984" and "Animal Farm," both of which warn about the dangers of totalitarianism. Completed just after the Second World War, they touched a chord because of contemporary fears over the growing influence of state control.

Animal Farm's impact, the novella has been the subject of many research papers. One example is David Dwan's (2012), "Orwell's Paradox: Equality in *Animal Farm*", in which the author focuses on how Orwell deals with the theoretical concept of equality. He argues that the satirical portrayal of Stalin and his regime is not the main provocation within the fable, but rather the way Orwell questions "the coherence and viability of equality as an atheoretical principle" (p. 655). Therefore, Dwan believes that "Animal Farm can be interpreted as criticism of all political ideologies since equality is fundamental for all forms of government" (p. 656).

Dwan also attempts to define Orwell's view on equality by analyzing the author's experiences in Spain and the ways Orwell has his characters abuse the concept of equality in his novella. Dwan concludes the article by stating that *Animal Farm* shows that equality is not the solution to everything, since the concept itself is so complex, but, as Orwell acknowledged, the world would be worse off without it (p. 679).

A less extensive study was carried out by Pearce (1998) in his brief paper "Orwell, Tolstoy and *Animal Farm*," where the author proclaims that George Orwell may not have despised Leo Tolstoy as much as it is commonly believed, despite Orwell calling Tolstoy "an imperious and egotistical bully" (p. 64). Instead, Pearce believes that Tolstoy may have inspired Orwell's manipulation of the seven commandments of Animalism in *Animal Farm*. The author argues that the rewriting of the commandments lacks a historical parallel, unlike the closely mirrored corruption of Marx's ideology (p. 66). Considering that Tolstoy discovered something reminiscent of the modification of the commandments, and that Orwell supposedly learned about it whilst writing *Animal Farm*, Pearce hypothesizes that Tolstoy may very well be the source of inspiration (p. 67).

A final example of a study on *Animal Farm* is Kirschner's (2004) "The Dual Purpose of *Animal Farm*," in which Kirschner explores both the political and artistic purposes of Orwell's masterpiece. The article covers many topics, ranging from the development of Orwell's views on capitalism, fascism, and socialism to the impact of the choice of genre. Kirschner's most intriguing claim is that the resistant and skeptical donkey, Benjamin, is supposedly a characterization of Orwell himself. Kirschner predicates this on the fact that it is Benjamin who reveals the true fate of the horse Boxer to the other animals:

"By usurping authorial function, Benjamin suddenly becomes the author not by prudently keeping silent, but by placing sympathy before safety. He becomes 'Orwell' when, through him, the 'author' suddenly seems to drop his mask and show where his heart lies" (p. 765).

Objective:

This paper aims to describe how critical analysis expresses the three characters' ideology based on excerpts of their statements.

The Research Question:

This paper seeks to answer the following question: Are there any differences between the two Arabic translations of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*?

Literature Review

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has been approached theoretically and analytically by many linguists and philosophers. These studies have recognized that CDA is a form of textual analysis that draws on features of texts at the lexical, semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic levels.

According to Widdowson (2007), CDA is a socio-political approach to analyzing texts and talks to reveal the hidden ideologies embedded in them. Blommaert and Bulcaen (2001) also argue that CDA is an analytical approach to language research that highlights how power relations are manifested in texts and talk across different political and social contexts. In addition to its interest in the critical analysis of language, Edelman (2001) states that CDA is concerned with the relationships among discourse and power, language and ideology, and language and social relations.

CDA's notion of criticality stems from its focus on revealing hidden power relations in discourse, examining how language is used and/or abused in social life, including concepts such as power, dominance, ideology, and change in societies (Bora and Hausendorf, 2006). This view is supported by Weiss and Wodak's (2007) argument that CDA is critical because it targets a fundamental analysis of social relations. Further, Widdowson (2007) postulates that CDA is critical in the sense that it aims to decode the ideological assumptions underlying the linguistic expressions that are superficially expressed in discourse and to discover relations of injustice and inequality in discourse, particularly those that privilege the powerful at the expense of everyone else.

It is obvious, then, that CDA pays close attention to social problems and political issues because it perceives discourse as a "form of social practice" (Van Dijk, 1997, p. 258). The linguistic and discursive representations employed in each type of analysis are different. Each type has its own principles and is dealt with from different perspectives. However, all of them are linguistically analyzed in light of the CDA theoretical and analytical framework to demonstrate the way particular discourse structures are employed to produce and reproduce relations of power, dominance, and hegemony.

Van Dijk (1993) states that CDA focuses on the structures of text and talk. This approach clarifies how the different relations are linguistically represented in discourse. This, in turn, reveals the hidden ideologies beyond the surface-level semantic expressions of discourse. Significantly, the ability to discern these hidden meanings in discourse contributes to understanding its intended message. Such an understanding of the hidden motivations behind any discursive act enables participants in discourse to combat the manipulative use of language and to struggle against all forms of dictatorship and inequality (Van Dijk, 2011).

CDA, therefore, is a linguistic approach concerned with the explanation, description, and interpretation of issues related to language, ideology, and power, focusing on the various ways language conveys ideological messages and encodes relations of power (Fairclough, 1992). As such, this field of study offers a way to understand the linguistic and discursive mechanisms employed to communicate themes such as domination, manipulation, and inequality. CDA provides a form of linguistic illumination against the manipulative use of language and stimulates resistance to all forms of injustice and inequality.

Positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation are two CDA's ploys used to communicate ideology in discourse. For Riggins (1997), these two strategies focus on highlighting the positive qualities of selfness (the in-group) and the negative attributes of otherness (the out-group). These strategies, van Dijk (2004) argues, show a disparity between the superior and the inferior, between the good and the bad, and between them and us. They are among the most effective ways of analyzing forms of manipulation in discourse. Positive presentation constitutes a glorification of the in-group and introduces a tactical repudiation of the negative presentation sequences. Within these two processes, van Dijk (1993) maintains that discursive practices are communicated persuasively and/or manipulatively, and that ideologies are encoded to emphasize the best of the in-group and attribute the worst to the out-group. As such, these strategies are perceived as discursive markers that exhibit disparity between US and THEM in discourse (ibid).

Van Dijk (2009) emphasizes the complementary relationship between positive and negative presentation strategies and that they highlight not only the ideologies of social groups but also those of individuals. Within this framework, ideology plays a significant role in determining how in-group and out-group members are delineated and what each group aims to achieve. These strategies also serve to shed light on the social representation of the relationship between them and us; that is, the in-group versus the out-group. For Van Dijk (2004), ideologies serve to produce, reproduce, and maintain social dominance on the one hand, and to organize resistance and opposition on the other. Van Dijk's approach to CDA, therefore, is entirely based on the assumption that social representation of groups is ideologically biased.

The representation of an individual, a group, or a political party, whether positive or negative, influences the public in ways that ensure complete compliance with a specific argument, thereby serving the speakers' interests (Van Dijk, 1997). This, in turn, plays an essential role in shaping recipients' responses and attitudes. The aim of using specific discursive strategies to present the in-group positively and the out-group negatively is that powerful discourse participants tend to intensify their own good qualities and downplay their own bad qualities. The opposite holds true for their opponents: they highlight their flaws and diminish their strengths. In this regard, Van Dijk postulates that those who have power (i.e., rhetorical power) over their recipients can dominate communicative situations, influence behavior, and direct attitudes.

Significantly, the use of positive or negative presentation strategies ultimately aims to maintain obtainable attitudes or to change them (Van Dijk, 1993). Van Dijk states that speakers/writers may use persuasive devices to present themselves positively and to portray their opponents negatively.

Methodology

Given the purpose of the study, the materials should support the ideological and power concepts; therefore, the researcher used George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and its Arabic translation to answer the research question and achieve the objectives of this study. This analysis examines how the characters embody the central concepts of equality, power, corruption, and betrayal in *Animal Farm*. This does not cover the characters' psychological aspects, nor does it attempt to identify any developments or changes in them. The analysis includes Old Major, Napoleon, and Snowball. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), as outlined by Fairclough (2001, 2013), was applied to the text analysis to identify conceptual discourse patterns in the ST and TT, to uncover hidden ideology. CDA, as a useful instrument, is also used to understand how a translator, as a TT reproducer, should clarify the implicit ideologies and social power underlying discourses and to analyze the structural and conceptual discourse patterns in both the ST and the TT as two distinct discourses. The relationship between the characters and the social context, and how the discourse changes or sustains certain social relationships within the social structure, was highlighted. Upon data collection, the next step was to interpret the differences between the writer's and the translators' conceptual discourse patterns. The two Arabic Translations are compared to identify their agreements and differences in ideological expression.

Analysis and Discussion

1. Old Major

Source Text: "Man is the only real enemy we have."

Hafiz Translation: P. 14 إنَّ الشر كله يا رفاق يتلخص في كلمة واحدة ... وهي ... الإنسان إنَّه عدونا الأوحد، وخصمنا الألد

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 17 كل شيء قائم في كلمة واحدة: الإنسان. لأن الإنسان هو وحده عدونا الحقيقي.

This statement establishes Old Major's central ideological belief: humans are exploiters who live off the labor of animals without contributing any productive work themselves. Moreover, the statement characterizes capitalism, the exploiting power, as the main source of suffering. In essence, it promotes class awareness among the animals so they can work together to gain their freedom. Hafiz opted for the connotative meaning of the source text by adding more adjectives *عدونا الأوحد* and *خصمنا الألد*, which are quite effective in emphasizing the meaning of the great enmity the animals perceive in Man. Abdul-Ghani restricted his translation to the literal meaning, without this addition, using *الإنسان هو وحده عدونا الحقيقي* in line with the denotative meaning of the source text.

Source Text: "Remove Man from the scene, and the root cause of hunger and overwork is abolished forever."

Hafiz Translation: P. 14 فأزيلوه من أرضكم، يسلم لكم خيرها، وينتهي جوعكم فيها وسعيكم إلى الأبد

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 17 لنعمل على إزالته، وهكذا نستأصل جذر الشر، لأننا كلما عملنا بك وبلا انقطاع عشنا في فقر مدقع.

Old Major believes oppression originates from the institution of ownership and exploitation rather than from nature itself. This reflects the socialist criticism of economic exploitation and advocates the endeavor that laborers should take control of production. This endeavor amounts to a revolutionary change, the final solution to the animals' suffering at the hands of Man. Hafiz used cause-and-effect through the imperative sentence *فأزيلوه* to render "remove" and the verb *ينتهي* to render "is abolished," which are quite effective in emphasizing the intended meaning for the Arabic reader. Abdul-Ghani used *لنعمل على إزالته* ("let's work to remove him"), which is milder than the stronger imperative that Hafiz used. Abdul-Ghani mentioned the result afterwards *فقر مدقع*. He added the adjective *فقر مدقع* "abject poverty," which does not exist in the source text.

Source Text: No animal must ever tyrannize over his own kind.

Hafiz Translation: P. 20 لا يجوز لحيوان أن يطغى على أبناء جلدته ويستبد بإخوته ويعصف بزمرته

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 21 والأهم من ذلك كله، هو ألا يستبد حيوان بحيوان آخر.

Old Major predicts an equal and democratic society free from hegemony, domination, and oppression. Consequently, he promotes the ideals of equality and anti-tyranny, rejecting hierarchical power structures and advocating a socialist ideal. However, this principle of equality is ironically later dishonored by Napoleon, who led a reign of terror and despotism. Hafiz used *لا يجوز* to convey the legal force of "No animal must" in English. He also used the verbs *يعصف*, *يطغى*, *يستبد*, all of which emphasize and reinforce the meanings of tyranny and oppression. Abdul-Ghani restricted his translation to the verb used in the negative form, *ألا يستبد*, to convey the meaning of tyranny without accounting for the legal force of "must" in the source text.

Source Text: No animal shall kill any other animal.

Hafiz Translation: P.20 ولا يجوز لحيوان أن يقتل حيوانا سواه

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 21 أبدا لن يقل حيوان حيوانا آخر.

To achieve a utopian society, Old Major resorted to legal force to lend his advocacy greater credibility, using the legal "shall". Once again, Hafiz managed to convey the speaker's discursual patterns by using an equivalent legal-force verb and translating "No animal shall kill" as "لا يجوز لحيوان أن يقتل حيوانا سواه". Abdul-Ghani opted for the future negative لن يقل which is less strong than the legal force of لا يجوز

Source Text: "All animals are equal."

Hafiz Translation: P. 20 إنّ معاشر الحيوانات في نظر القانون سواء ...

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 21 كل الحيوانات متساوون

In Animal Farm, the animals overthrew their human farmer and established an egalitarian utopian society where everyone is equal and devised the commandment: "All animals are equal." When they gained power and control, they corrupted this principle and eventually changed the rule to the famous paradox: "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others." They did this to serve their own interests and further enhance their tyrannical and despotic rule. Thus, this statement is considered an embodiment of political hypocrisy. Moreover, it highlights how systemic corruption can invalidate revolutionary ideals, rendering them useless and allowing those in charge to exploit them to justify tyranny, privilege, and inequality while pretending fairness. Old Major's ideology advocates equality, collective ownership, liberation from oppression, and unity among the working class to advance their collective welfare. He is often interpreted as a symbolic figure representing Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin because the ideas and principles he advocated inspired the subsequent animal revolution.

Although Old Major's original vision is idealistic and focused on egalitarianism, George Orwell later shows how revolutionary ideology can be distorted by those in power, i.e., the dominating pigs. The contrast between Old Major's statements and Napoleon's later actions, which led to a reign of terror and intimidation, is one of the novel's central political themes.

Regarding the translation of the statement "All animals are equal," Hafiz rendered it in Arabic as "إنّ معاشر الحيوانات في نظر ...", using the emphatic إنّ to reinforce the statement. He placed the word "law" alongside "نظر" and "سواء" to reinforce the egalitarian principle. Abdul-Hani opted for the denotative meaning of the statement كل الحيوانات متساوون without emphasis.

2. Snowball

Source Text: War is war. The only good human being is a dead one.

Hafiz Translation: P. 64 إنّ الحرب هي الحرب. وما قتلت يا صاح غير إنسان، والإنسان لك عدو مبین.

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 52 الحرب حرب. لا يهمنّا الإنسان إلا عندما يصبح جثة.

Snowball made this statement during the animals' debates about the rebellion and relations with humans. It reveals radical revolutionary thinking and reflects resentment toward oppressive human systems. Thus, it encourages the animals' endeavor to bring about complete political change. Even though the statement seems extreme, it shows Snowball's dedication to the revolution and his militancy in proactively defending it. Moreover, it values courage and the animals' collective defense. Snowball becomes a symbol of revolutionary heroism before being politically purged by his opponent, Napoleon. Hafiz used the emphatic device to emphasize and reinforce the meaning of the statement, إنّ الحرب هي الحرب, unlike Abdul-Ghani, who opted for the literal translation الحرب حرب. Moreover, Hafiz used the exception ما قتلت يا صاح غير إنسان and added عدو مبین which is quoted from the Holy Qur'an "وَتَادَنْهُمْ رَبُّهُمَا أَلَمْ أَنْهَكُمَا عَنْ تِلْكَ الشَّجَرَةِ وَأَقُلْ لَّكُمَا إِنَّ الشَّيْطَانَ لَكُمَا عَدُوٌّ مُبِينٌ" "And their Lord called to them, "Did I not forbid you from that tree and tell you that Satan is to you a clear enemy" Surat Al-A'f (The Heights), Verse 22.

Source Text: Four legs good, two legs bad.

Hafiz Translation: P. 50 ذوات الأربع أحياناً، وذوات الاثنين أشرار.

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 43 نعم لذوات السيقان الأربع، لا لذوات الساقين.

Snowball helps simplify Animalism into this slogan. Thus, he encourages unity among animals, uses propaganda to spread ideology to less-educated animals, and inspires a collective identity against human oppression. In this regard, he furthers his

belief in mass political mobilization. The Hafiz translation used the adjectives أخيار for animals and أشرار for humans, with a similar effect on the target-text reader, whereas Abdul-Ghani opted for نعم for animals and لا for humans, which lack the depth of the intended connotative meaning.

Source Text: Snowball argues that the windmill will: "light the stalls and warm them in winter... run machinery... and give the animals more leisure."

Hafiz Translation: P. 78 إنَّ الطاحون سيزودهم بالكهرباء التي ستزود كل مريض بالأنوار والمياه الساخنة والباردة والمدافئ التي تزيل القر وتذهب بزمهرير الشتاء، وتدير الآلات وترفع بذلك الأعمال الشاقة عن ظهورهم، وتهبى لهم عيشا لنا رغدا

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 61-62 مزايا طاحونة الهواء ستوفر الكهرباء التي ستشغل ليس فقط قطاعات القش والشمندر، بل أيضا، آلات الدراسة والحراث والمشط والحصاد. إضافة إلى أنها ستمكن الإصطبل من الإنارة والتدفئة والماء الدافئ والبارد.

Snowball stresses the importance of modernization and technological progress. He endeavors to improve workers' lives, which reveals his belief in planning and innovation. The windmill Snowball vehemently advocates symbolizes progress, social development, and welfare. Although more democratic than Napoleon, Snowball still employs political persuasion strategically. His ideology embodies revolutionary ideals and collective effort to advance progress through education and literacy. Moreover, he advocates technological modernization and organized socialism, as well as participatory and democratic leadership

Critics often associate Snowball with Leon Trotsky because both were intellectual revolutionaries later expelled by Stalin-like figures. George Orwell presents Snowball as more honestly dedicated to the original principles of Animalism than Napoleon. However, Snowball still uses propaganda and ideological slogans, signifying that even idealistic revolutionary leaders may rely on political persuasion and simplified rhetoric to preserve unity among their followers and gain their support.

Hafiz translation reflects this rosy picture by means of metaphors: وترفع بذلك الأعمال الشاقة عن and تزيل القر وتذهب بزمهرير الشتاء and تهبى لهم عيشا لنا رغدا and ظهورهم He also used synonyms for the cold winter such as القر and بزمهرير which is quoted from the Holy Qur'an "مُتَكِينِينَ فِيهَا عَلَى الْأَرَابِكِ لَا يَرَوْنَ فِيهَا شَمْسًا وَلَا زَمْهَرِيرًا" [They will be] reclining therein on adorned couches. They will not see therein any [burning] sun or [freezing] cold." Surat Al-Insan (Man), Verse 13. Abdul-Ghani restricted his translation to the literal meaning and did not add any metaphors with connotative meanings الكهرباء التي ستشغل ليس فقط قطاعات القش والشمندر، إضافة إلى أنها ستمكن الإصطبل من الإنارة والتدفئة والماء الدافئ والبارد

3. Napoleon

Source Text: Never mind the milk, comrades! That will be attended to. The harvest is more important.

Hafiz Translation: P. 39 دعوا اللبن وأمره إلى حين، فسنعتى به. وتعالوا إلى الحصاد فهو أهم منه شأننا

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 35 لا تحملوا هم الحليب، أيها الرفاق. سنهتم به. الحصاد هو المهم.

Napoleon says this shortly before the milk mysteriously disappears from the pigs, highlighting that the exploitation of privilege has started. Moreover, Napoleon used distraction to avoid accountability. Napoleon used the passive voice, "That will be attended to," which makes the fate of the milk mysterious and keeps the animals puzzled and guessing. To complete this distraction, Napoleon directed the animals toward the harvest, which, according to him, is more important. Thus, trying to convey the idea that leaders deserve special treatment because they are in a position of authority.

Hafiz used the comparative degree to highlight the importance of the harvest and deflect attention from the milk in line with the source text شأننا أهم منه شأننا، whereas Abdul-Ghani restricted his translation to the adjective, describing the milk as important الحصاد هو المهم

Source Text: If Comrade Napoleon says it, it must be right. Napoleon is always right.

Hafiz Translation: P. 83 إذا قال نابليون شيئا فصدقوه، لأن القول ما قاله. نابليون على حق.

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 65 إذا كان الرفيق "نابليون" هو من قال ذلك، فإنه على حق، نابليون لا يخطئ

The slogan that the Boxer, the horse, devised, stating that Napoleon is always right, has become central to the farm culture. Thus, it firmly establishes the leader's dependability and suppresses any kind of criticism or debate. In effect, this slogan promotes Napoleon's authoritarian ideology, making it more important than facts and reflecting his political system. By devising this slogan, Boxer encourages blind obedience, creates a cult of personality, and replaces independent thinking with loyalty to the leader. The shift from collective leadership to dictatorship is now quite evident.

Hafiz, in his translation, quotes the famous Arabic proverb إذا قالت حذام فصدقوها فإنّ القول ما قالت حذام as an intertextual reference, thereby strengthening the meaning and reminding the reader of it. This famous Arabic proverb, "If Hadham says something, believe her; what Hadham says must be right," refers to absolute belief and complete confidence in the validity of opinion and the power of intuition. The saying is attributed to the poet Luajim bin Sa'ab, from the Bakr bin Wael tribe, and to his wife, Hadham bint Al-Rayyan (a woman famous for her exceptional intelligence and keen insight). The story goes back to the fact that Hadham saw a flock of sandgrouse birds, so she concluded that there were evil people lurking to raid them after they had disturbed the birds. She said in poetry about that: Oh, our people, depart, and leave this place... If the sandgrouse had been left at night, it would have slept. When her husband heard her warning, he was convinced of the truth of her insight and ordered his people to leave and seek refuge in the mountains, thereby allowing her tribe to survive the raid. Since then, that story has become a proverb, as stated in the most famous heritage books such as "Majma' al-Amthal" (the Collection of Proverbs). Thus, Hafiz made his translation more interesting. Abdul-Ghani conveyed the meaning as it is, without adding this intertextual reference إذا كان الرفيق "نابليون" هو من قال ذلك، فإنه على حق، نابليون لا يخطئ.

Source Text: No one believes more firmly than Comrade Napoleon that all animals are equal

Hafiz Translation: P. 82 وما أحسب أحدا قد بلغ إيمانه بالمساواة مبلغ إيمان نابليون

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 64 فلا أحد أكثر إيمانا بقضية المساواة بين الحيوانات من الرفيق نابليون.

Squealer spread this ironic propaganda statement among the animals to conceal the rampant inequality and to manipulate political ideals for his own self-interest. Thus, he demonstrates hypocrisy within dictatorship, which means that the pigs pretend that they apply equality while enjoying privileges denied to their fellow animals. The Arabic used قد بلغ إيمانه مبلغ إيمان achieve a similar effect, in which Napoleon is situated far above the animals in his ironic firm belief in the concept of equality.

Hafiz used the absolute object or cognate object in Arabic, which is an object that is derived from the same letters as the verb (or carries the same meaning), to emphasize it, to indicate its type or number, وما أحسب أحدا قد بلغ إيمانه بالمساواة مبلغ إيمان نابليون. Thus, the meaning is effectively emphasized. Abdul-Ghani opted for the comparative degree to convey the denotative meaning. فلا أحد أكثر إيمانا بقضية المساواة بين الحيوانات من الرفيق نابليون.

Source Text: Surely, comrades, you do not want Jones back?

Hafiz Translation: P. ولست أشك يا معشر الحيوانات أنكم لا تريدون أن تعود إلى جونز المزرعة.

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 65 هل أنتم متأكدون، أيها الرفاق، أنكم لا ترغبون في عودة جونز؟

Squealer (acting on Napoleon's behalf) uses this argument to appeal to the animals' revolutionary fear and loyalty, reinforcing unity against former oppression and employing persuasive rhetoric to defend the revolution against the former enemy, Mr. Jones. This ploy is used as a fear tactic whenever the animals question the privileges the pigs enjoy that they do not. It also helps stamp out any kind of opposition or rebellion against the status quo. Hafiz used the emphatic device to a similar effect for translating "Surely": ولست أشك يا معشر الحيوانات أنكم whereas Abdul-Ghani used the interrogative, which does not give the intended connotative meaning هل أنتم متأكدون، أيها الرفاق، أنكم لا ترغبون في عودة جونز؟

Source Text: Napoleon announced that from now on, the Sunday morning meetings would come to an end. They were unnecessary, he said, and wasted time. In future, all questions relating to the workings of the farm would be settled by a special committee of pigs, presided over by himself.

Hafiz Translation: P. 80 وراح نابليون يعلن أن اجتماعات الأحد ستلغى إذ لا ضرورة تدعو إليها، بل هي مضيعة للوقت، وأن مختلف المسائل المتعلقة بشؤون المزرعة ستعرض في المستقبل على لجنة خاصة من الخنازير لنظرها، وأنه سيتولى بنفسه رياستها.

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 63 صعد نابليون متبوعا بكلابه إلى المنصة وأعلن أنه منذ اليوم لن تعقد الاجتماعات صباح يوم الأحد. وقال إنها 63. غير مجدية في شيء، فهي مجرد مضيعة للوقت، وإنه منذ اليوم، كل سؤال يتعلق بتسيير المزرعة سيتم الحسم فيه من طرف لجنة من الخنازير ستكون تحت رئاسته.

Napoleon's announcement to end Sunday meetings clearly reveals his authoritarian rule and dictatorship, telling the animals, "Let's have no more of these useless meetings." Moreover, the animals' role in a democratic society is entirely abolished, as their affairs are discussed by a special committee of pigs, presided over, of course, by Napoleon, the supreme leader. The Arabic translation used مضيعة للوقت to depict the meetings' uselessness, according to Napoleon, who aims to reinforce his dictatorship and authoritarian, tyrannical rule.

Hafiz used the emphatic device بل هي مضيعة للوقت to emphasize the uselessness of the meetings. Moreover, he used the emphatic device أنّ and the active voice to emphasize and strengthen the meaning of Napoleon's presiding over the committee وأنه سيتولى بنفسه رياستها.

Abdul-Ghani also used the emphatic device إنّ to highlight the meaning of the uselessness of the meetings إنها غير مجدية في. However, the translation of Napoleon's presiding over the committee is somewhat weaker in emphasis than the active voice that Hafiz used: سيقم الحسم فيه من طرف لجنة من الخنازير ستكون تحت رئاسته. Hafiz translated "questions" as المسائل, which gives the reader the intended meaning, whereas Abdul-Ghani opted for the literal denotative meaning كل سؤال.

Source Text: Snowball was Jones's agent from the very beginning.

Hafiz Translation: P. 80 لقد كان سنوبل عميلا يعمل لمصلحة جونز منذ البداية

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 87 منذ اليوم الأول كان سنوبول عميلا لجونز

To further reinforce his grip on power, Napoleon discredits his main rival, Snowball, by falsely accusing him of treachery and of being Jones' agent from the beginning. In effect, Napoleon used propaganda and misinformation to create an enemy of Snowball. Consequently, he preserved control and perpetuated his dictatorship to serve his political interests. The totalitarian strategies are used to scapegoat opponents and depict them as traitors and enemy agents. The word عميل in the Arabic translation has a similar effect, as it is used for traitors who serve the enemy's interests against their own folk.

Hafiz used the emphatic device لقد to emphasize and strengthen the meaning of Snowball being an agent to Jones لقد كان. Abdul-Ghani did not use any emphatic device in this regard منذ اليوم الأول كان سنوبول. سنوبل عميلا يعمل لمصلحة جونز منذ البداية عميلا لجونز.

Source Text: All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others.

Hafiz Translation: جميع الحيوانات سواسية، ولكن بعضها أكثر مساواة من الأخرى

Abdu-Ghani Translation: P. 138 جميع الحيوانات متساوية، لكن بعضها أكثر مساواة من غيرها

The pigs (led by Napoleon) devised this commandment to emphasize their dominance and superiority over the other animals.

Napoleon corrupted the original revolutionary principles, and his oppression of the other animals became the norm. This paradox embodies the manipulation of totalitarian propaganda to maintain dictatorship and elite privilege. Finally, Napoleon's ideology turns into authoritarian rule, totalitarian control, manipulation of political propaganda and truth, personality cult, and sheer abuse of revolutionary ideals. He symbolizes Joseph Stalin and illustrates how revolutions can produce new forms of oppression rather than equality, in contrast with what Old Major stands for.

With regard to the phrase "more equal", Hafiz and Abdul-Ghani agreed on translating it into Arabic as "أكثر مساواة".

Conclusion

This paper presented a critical discourse analysis to explore the manipulative strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation in Orwell's *Animal Farm*. The analysis showed that the positive presentation of the in-group (the pigs, particularly Snowball) has been linguistically manifested through certain CDA strategies, including falsification of history. The analysis further demonstrated that the negative presentation of the out-group has linguistically

been represented by CDA devices, including criticism. The main target, beyond the use of both positive and negative presentation devices, is analytically evidenced as manipulation. The analysis also discussed the Arabic translation, how it conveyed the author's ideology, and how the translator himself manipulated certain phrases. It is noted that most of the translations discussed focused on the exact side of the character in English. Finally, this paper recommends further studies that compare the discourse of manipulation and the discourse of illumination in other texts, either within literature or in ordinary settings, such as classroom and courtroom discourse. This could reveal different findings for both types of discourse.

As far as the comparison of the two translations into Arabic is concerned, Hafiz used connotative meanings and the shades of meaning, unlike Abdul-Ghani, who mainly restricted his translation to the denotative and literal meaning. Hafiz, for instance, used emphatic devices and the active voice to emphasize and strengthen the meaning in line with the source text. He also used quotations from the Holy Qur'an, the absolute or cognate object, besides intertextual references. All these factors make his translation more interesting and more engaging to the target Arabic reader. Abdul-Ghani's translation conveyed the full literal meaning; however, it is void of the figurative language and the shades of meaning found in Hafiz's translation.

Bio:

Author Elrashid Mohamed Abdel Gadir was born in Gezira, Sudan, in 1961. He obtained a Bachelor's Degree in English Language & Literature from the College of Arts, Omdurman Islamic University, Khartoum, Sudan, in 1985. He was granted an MA in translation and interpreting from Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, Scotland, United Kingdom, in 1991. He was awarded a PhD in Translation from Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh, Scotland, United Kingdom, in 1998. He has been teaching translation and interpretation courses at King Saud University, College of Language Science, Department of English, since 2001. Dr. Elrashid current research interests include translating books from Arabic into English and from English into Arabic, as well as translation and interpretation.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References:

- [1] Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual review of Anthropology*, 29(1), 447-466. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.29.1.447>
- [2] Bora, A., & Hausendorf, H. (2006). Participatory science governance revisited: normative expectations versus empirical evidence. *Science and Public Policy*, 33(7), 478-488. <https://doi.org/10.3152/147154306781778740>
- [3] Dwan, D. (2012). ORWELL'S PARADOX: EQUALITY IN ANIMAL FARM. *ELH*, 79(3), 655-683. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23256770>
- [4] Edelman, M., & Edelman, M. J. E. (2001). *The politics of misinformation*. Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 3(2), 193-217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926592003002004>
- [6] Orwell, G. (1944). *Animal Farm*, web edition published by eBooks@Adelaide.
- [7] <https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/o/orwell/george/o79a/index.html>
- [8] Hirschberg, S., & Hirschberg, T. (1998). *Reflections on Language*. Oxford University Press.
- [9] Kirschner, P. (2004). The dual purpose of *Animal Farm*. *The Review of English Studies*, 55(222), 759-786. <https://doi.org/10.1093/res/55.222.759>
- [10] Pearce, R. (1998). Orwell, Tolstoy, and *Animal Farm*. *The Review of English Studies*, 49(193), 64-69. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/518004>
- [11] Riggins, S. H. E. (1997). *The language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in discourse*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- [12] Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & society*, 4(2), 249- 283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>

- [13] Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction* (Vol. 2). Sage.
- [14] Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). *Communicating Ideologies*. Peter Lang GmbH.
- [15] Van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Discourse and Ideology. *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, 379, 407.
- [16] Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (eds.). (2007). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- [17] Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis* (vol. 133). Oxford University Press.

Arabic References:

- حافظ، عباس بك أسطورة الحيوانات النائرة لمؤلفها جورج أورويل، دار المعارف بمصر، 1952
- عبد الغني، محمود مزرعة الحيوانات مترجم تأليف جورج أورويل، المركز الثقافي العربي الدار البيضاء المغرب، الطبعة الثانية 2014