

## Social Deictic Shifts in *Animal Farm*: Evidence of More Intense Class Struggle and More Marked Social Stratification in Translation

Othman Ahmad Abualadas \*

Department of English Language and Literature, The University of Jordan-Aqaba, Jordan

Department of English Language and Literature, Kuwait University, Kuwait

Received on: 6-12-2022

Accepted on: 7-3-2023

### Abstract

This article examines the shifts in social deixis in an Arabic translation of George Orwell's novel *Animal Farm*. The results show that the translation moves toward a more frequent use of social deixis and more lexicalization of social/interpersonal relations between characters, bringing some major characters closer to readers in the emotional/psychological space while distancing some other minor characters. The translation moves toward a more emotive language/style, more accentuated/marked focalization, more subjective perspective and more involved reader. There is a tendency toward more explicit social differentiations that improve the text's clarity and communicability. This explicitation pattern can reflect the translator's (intentional or unintentional) attempts to reverbitalize the original text after his concretization of the social realia of the original story. The explicitation may also be looked at as textual traces of the translator's (intentional or unintentional) endeavors to speak for the original author, narrator or characters and adopt their speaking voice(s) in the story.

**Keywords:** Deictic Shifts, Explicitation, Fiction Translation, Point of View, Social Deixis.

### 1. Introduction

In *Animal Farm* (1945), an old boar called "Old Major" inspires the other animals to rebel against their human master to get their freedom. He teaches the animals that "Whatever goes upon two legs, is an enemy" (Orwell 1945, 16, emphasis added). When the rebellion occurs, "Snowball", a strong pig who leads the fight against humans, encourages the other animals and cries "No sentimentality, comrade!" (Orwell 1945, 28, emphasis added). The word "enemy" in Old Major's utterance not only makes reference to humans, but also encodes how Old Major *socially* views humans or how he summarizes their social role/identity in the story. Similarly, the word "comrade" in Snowball's utterance is not only a term of address that he uses to refer to the animals, but also a linguistic expression that marks his social relationship with the other animals. While the word "enemy" in the first utterance can convey such speaker-addressee/referent relationships as antipathy, emotional distance and lack of intimacy or solidarity, the word "comrade" in the second utterance can claim a degree of emotional closeness,

---

© 2024 JJMLL Publishers/Yarmouk University. All Rights Reserved,

\* Doi: <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.16.3.8>

\* Corresponding Author: [othmanadass48@yahoo.com](mailto:othmanadass48@yahoo.com)

intimacy and in-group solidarity (see Huang 2014, 213-216). Both “enemy” and “comrade” can be characterized as *social deixis*, “those aspects of language structure that encode the social identities of participants ... or the social relationship between them” (Levinson 1983, 89). Social deixis, which normally operates at the *interpersonal* level (see Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, 29-30), can function across multiple narrator-character, character-character and author/narrator-reader relationships (cf. Macrae 2020), contributing explicitly or implicitly to the characterization of *voice/point of view/perspective* in narrative fiction (cf. Genette 1972; Uspensky 1973; see Simpson 2005, 27-30).

This paper is an empirical study of the shifts in social deixis in an Arabic translation of George Orwell’s *Animal Farm* (1945). The study presupposes that the original novel paints a picture of *social stratification* and *class struggle* in a way that exalts the reader’s feeling of oppression and inequality (cf. Bloom 2006, 19-22; Patai 2009, 3-6). This picture should remain intact after translation if preserving the *feel* of text is given priority in fiction translation (cf. Bosseaux 2007). But as “translation is never innocent”, as it often involves a *rewriting*, and sometimes *manipulation*, of the original text (Morini 2013, 18), the feel of the original social picture may change after translation. Even if the translator seems to have no clear ideology to impose on his/her translation, his/her choices may be constrained by the *socio-cultural norms* of translation (Toury 2012, 86). The study will therefore explore how translation, as a *socially situated act* (Mason 2014, 36) or *intercultural mediation activity* (Saldanha 2008, 32; House 2016, 124), brings about modifications in the original deictic settings in a way that could influence the social structure of the original story. It analyzes how the *re-narration* (cf. Baker 2018, 179) and *second verbal materialization* (cf. Levý 2011, 28) of the original story can adjust or restructure the *deictic perspective* (cf. Richardson 1998, 127) and social characteristics of the original work.

Much of previous research into the *narratological* features of the translated narrative fiction (e.g., narratorial point of view and narratorial subjectivity/involvement) has focused on *temporal* and *spatial* deixis, but largely neglected social deixis (see Mason and Şerban 2003; Bosseaux 2007; Goethals and De Wilde 2009; Abualadas 2019a, 2019b). The analysis of translational shifts in social deixis in the present study should therefore add to the *linguistic* toolkit used to describe *voice/perspective* in fiction translation, as well as to the *stylistic* tools (Boase-Beier 2018) used to analyze *character* and *characterization* (cf. Leech and Short 2007, 296-298) in the translated narrative. This analysis expands the (Hallidayan) interpersonal component of *functional-pragmatic* models of literary translation (e.g., Morini, 2013), and ultimately contributes to *contextually* and *socio-linguistically* oriented approaches to translation (see House 2016, 5-8) and norms/universals-based approaches to translation (e.g., Blum-Kulka 1986/2004; Toury 2012).

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Social Deixis: Pragmatic Preliminaries

The term “deixis” (cf. Bühler 1934) comes originally from a Greek word meaning *pointing/showing/indicating*, and the words used for this purpose are called *deictics*. *Deictics* are generally defined as pointing expressions which relate our language to its situational context; they work

## Social Deictic Shifts in *Animal Farm*: Evidence of More Intense Class Struggle and More Marked Social Stratification in Translation

as bridges between language and the world. They gain their meaning (referent) from the *canonical* situation of the utterance: face-to-face communication (Lyons 2005, 304-306; see Black 2006, 4). Deictics include *personal* deictics (which point to person) such as “he” and “she”, temporal deictics (which point to time) such as “now” and “then”, and spatial deictics (which point to place) such as “here” and “there”. Social deictics (cf. Fillmore 1975) are those expressions that point to a social status of a person or a social relationship (e.g., respect or social deference) between two people in a communicative event, such as honorifics or titles of address or kin-terms (e.g., Sir, Miss, Mrs., Mr., Dr. or my uncle). Levinson (1983, 89) defines social deictics as those linguistic features that indicate the social identities of speech participants, or those that encode the social relationship between speech participants, or between them and things referred to. They are, as Levinson (2006, 119) describes them, “the marking of social relationships in linguistic expressions”.

Drawing on Comrie (1976), Levinson (1983 90-91; 2006, 120-121) distinguishes between two main types of social deictics: *absolute* and *relational*. Absolute deictics are certain pronouns or titles of address which are attached to a certain social role and which make no comparison of the social rank of the speaker and the referent; they just make reference to the absolute role of an addressee (e.g., Mr. President, Your Honor, Your Majesty, etc.). When we use absolute deictics, we actually refer to a particular office/position rather than a particular person. Relational deictics, on the other hand, encode a particular social relationship between the speaker and an addressee or a referent (e.g., my aunt, my wife, our teacher, student, boss, etc.). Social deictics may then encode *power* relations and reflect the social structure of a community. Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990, 131-132) for instance distinguish between *symmetrical* and *asymmetrical* power relations expressed through social deictics. For example, if one of two speech participants uses a title and surname to address the other, while the other uses only a first name, we can speak of asymmetrical power relationship, but if both use either a first name or a title and surname to address each other, the power relation here can be described as symmetrical. Whereas symmetrical power relations may suggest a level of tacit agreement on the part of both speech participants on level of formality, politeness, distance or intimacy, asymmetrical power relations may reflect a degree of respect, adulation, flattery, condescension or patronage (Wieczorek 2013, 93). According to Huang (2014, 213-216), socially deictic information, which can include social status, kin relationship, gender, age, job/profession, and ethnicity, can be used to achieve several socially deictic effects. The social deictics in English forms like “Madam Juliana”, “Lady Huxley”, “Mr. Johnson” and “Professor William” can, in certain contexts, be a marker of the addressee’s higher social status and of the social *distance* (or lack of familiarity) between the speaker and the addressee. The use of the English “sir” can in some contexts convey respect to strangers and signal a lower level of intimacy between the speaker and the addressee, while a form like “pal” can claim in-group solidarity and higher intimacy.

### 2.2 Social Deictics in Literary Contexts

Stockwell (2002/2005, 44-46) discusses the usage of social deictics in literary contexts. He (2005, 46) calls them *relational deixis*, which he defines as those forms that “encode the social viewpoint and

relative situations of authors, narrators, characters, and readers,” including, among other things, conventions of naming and addressing, expressions of viewpoint, and evaluative forms. Stockwell gives an example that the narrator of the English novel *Tom Jones* is very *polite* in his direct address to his audience in the introductory comments, while over the course of the novel and with the other characters he adopts different *tones of voice/perspectives* (cf. Uspensky 1973; see Toolan 2016, 37-39). For Stockwell (2005, 44) social deictics help establish the social viewpoints of the story participants; in terms of how the narrator and speaking characters are socially related to each other and how they view the other participants in the story (see Simpson 2005, 10-11). Stockwell (2005, 44) gives another example that the primary narrator of Percy Shelley’s poem *Ozymandias* calls the other character (the poem’s second narrator) “the traveler”, summarizing him by his role, by what he sees him, rather than by his full name or any other detailed description. The traveler on the other hand refers to a third character (*Ozymandias*) using his own evaluative terms, encoding his personal attitudes and relationships and building the social hierarchy of the story.

Drawing on a number of earlier accounts of social deixis (e.g., Lakoff 1974, Fillmore 1975; Lyons 1977; Levinson 1983; Short 1996), Macrae (2020) tries to describe the functioning of social deictics in literature. In addition to signaling status, familiarity or politeness, and conveying or building in- and out-group relationships or identities, she (2020, 61) argues that social deictics contribute to the construction of *focalization* (cf. Genette 1972); they contribute to the linguistic forms that convey whose point of view the narrator’s voice is focalizing through. Using Short’s (1996) description of discourse structure, Macrae (2020, 53) maintains that social deictics function across multiple speaker-addressee relationships. In fictional texts for instance, these relationships include those between characters themselves and those between narrator and narrate (i.e., who narrates the story and who listens or reads it), and may overreach those between author and reader (e.g., through implication). For her (2020, 53), social deictics can contribute to “the reader’s dynamic processing of the text, and the deictic manipulation of the reader’s positioning and perspective through that processing”.

### 2.3 Social Deictics: Translational Preliminaries

Bill Richardson (1998) was one of the first researchers to emphasize the importance of *adjusting* deictic relations in translation as the purpose, context and audience of a translation may often differ from those of the original. He (1998, 125-126) emphasizes the importance of rearranging the source text’s deictic features and adjusting its *deictic perspective* in accordance with the target reader’s world view. The deictic perspective, as he defines, is “the structuring of a relationship between writer and reader, a dynamic relationship between the multiple selves of each participant in the discourse” (1998, 131). In translation, the process of transformation involves lifting a message away from the deictic perspective of the source language and orienting it in accordance with the deictic necessities of a target text (Richardson 1998, 126). The translator may need to consider how markers of social deixis in a fictional text such as a novel differ from those used in a non-fictional text such as an essay or magazine article, and how all of these would differ from one culture to another. Assuming that social deictics function at the Hallidayan

*interpersonal* level (i.e., relating to relationships between persons), Morini (2013, 24) argues that social deixis can help literary translators understand the interpersonal relations inscribed or depicted in a literary text. Social deictics, as he (2013, 24) explains, signal “the way that narrators interact with narratees, poetic personae speak to addressees, characters deal with characters”. Any (intentional or unintentional) manipulation in their form in translation may alter the social relationships and interpersonal norms presented in or presupposed by the original work.

Some translation studies, such as Fawcett (2014, 94-96) and Baker (2018, 195-200), alert translators to the potential *cross-linguistic* differences among languages in the *form* and *use* of deictic terms. For example, compared to English, Arabic forms are more marked for gender. The Arabic equivalent of the English second-person form of address “Your Majesty” has both a masculine version “جلالتك” and a feminine version “جلالتكِ”. This *explicitation* (cf. Blum-Kulka 1986/2004) of gender in the Arabic translation, which results from a linguistic constraint (e.g., a grammatical difference between the source and target language), leads to what Klaudy (2009, 106) calls *grammatical explicitation*, or *obligatory shift*, to use Toury’s (1995/2012, 80) term. Another example is that social deixis in English is mostly realized through using a first name or a family name, a combination of first and family names, a kinship term, a job title, or an honorific expression, while Asian languages like Korean and Japanese use special affixes attached to nouns and verbs (Green 1996/2008, 153; Huang 2014, 214-215).

*Non-obligatory/optional shifts* (Toury 2012, 80) in the translation of deixis involve those changes that do not result from a language constraint, but those related to a translator’s preference or strategic choice. A number of *descriptive* studies exploring these shifts in translated fiction (mostly in Indo-European language pairs) have revealed certain translational patterns. Mason and Şerban (2003) have manually examined *spatial* and *temporal* deictics in samples taken from a collection of English translations of novels and short stories from twentieth century Romanian literature. They found a trend to shift proximal items (e.g., “this” and “these days”) into distals (e.g., “that” and “those days”), with the effect of both *distancing* target readers and reducing their *emotional involvement* with the text (cf. Toolan 2016) in comparison with the source readers. In two French translations of Virginia Woolf’s *The Waves*, Bosseaux (2007) has analyzed the shift in several types of deixis (personal, temporal and spatial) and found a tendency to *delete* rather than *add* deictic items via translation. Bosseaux argues that this tendency not only results in a text that is less *deictically-anchored* than its original, but also affects the general *feel* of the text. She also argues that deictic items express the narrator’s *position* in relation to the other participants of the narrative, so losing them via translation may result in a less emphasized/marked *narratorial viewpoint* (see Simpson 2005, 79-81).

In a Spanish translation of a Dutch novel, *Het volgende verhaal* (*The Following Story*), Goethals and De Wilde (2009) however have not found any pattern of deictic shift. The variation in deictic shifts was somehow unsystematic and infrequent. Goethals and De Wilde (2009, 791) argue that such shifts should be looked at as traces of “the interpreter’s effort of adopting the vantage point of the narrating voice(s) in the text”. More recently, Abualadas (2019a; 2019b) in a number of English-Arabic translated novels have

found certain frequent and systematic deictic shifts. In four Arabic translations of the English novels *Jane Eyre* and *A Farewell to Arms*, he (2019a) finds a tendency to *add* rather than *remove* spatial and temporal deictics and to use more proximal than distal forms via translation. He argues that these shifts result in a target text with more focalization points, more *approximated* readers and more *marked* narrative perspectives compared to the original (2019a, 424). In two Arabic translations of *Jane Eyre*, Abualadas (2019b) also finds a trend to add rather than delete personal deixis, with a more deictically-anchored narrative and more involved narrator and speaking characters. Abualadas (2019b, 236) suggests that this trend of shift can increase the narrator and speaking characters' *subjectivity* and maximize the reader's emotional involvement with the translated narrative.

Finally, the previous review has included the most relevant available *empirical* and *descriptive* studies exploring deictic shifts in literary translation in both English-Arabic and Indo-European pairs. These are the systematic studies that have explored the *optional* deictic shifts using both quantitative and qualitative analysis, which is important for describing the *recurrent patterns* of translational behaviors (Toury 2012). What can be observed from this review is that optional translational shifts in social deixis have actually received very little attention. More studies are indeed needed to explore what social deixis can contribute to the analysis of translated fiction from a *narratological perspective*, and ultimately to the analysis of translational language as a distinctive (*third*) code, "translation as translation in contradistinction to original non-translated texts" (House 2016, 56).

### 3. Data and Methodology

The original text is George Orwell's satirical novel *Animal Farm* (1945). George Orwell is an English novelist and journalist who supported *democratic socialism* and opposed totalitarianism, imperialism and fascism. His novel *Animal Farm* is an anti-Soviet satire. It mocks the results of the Russian (Bolshevik) Revolution in 1917; a revolution that only led to a worse life and less democracy and freedom. The novel tells the story of a group of animals who revolt against their human master, Mr. Jones Manor. They manage to overthrow him and start to control their own society. Life on the farm is good only for a short time. The pigs gradually elevate themselves and eventually become more powerful than the other animals. Two young pigs, called Snowball and Napoleon, start fighting over power. Napoleon manages to defeat Snowball, and shortly the situation deteriorates and the other animals' life becomes more difficult than the days before the rebellion. The pigs start to dress, eat and behave like humans, and then the other animals realize that there is no difference between the pigs and the humans they got rid of in the first place.

The present study has selected *Animal farm* as it provides a picture of social class conflict in which social stratification and class segregations are firmly established (cf. (Bloom 2006, 19-22; Patai 2009, 3-6). There are initially two major classes in the farm society: *animal* and *human*. The animals, representing the majority of population, are the working (lower) class who has a poor and hard life, while the humans (Mr. Jones and his men), representing the government officials, are the ruling (upper) class who oppresses the working class. Mr. Jones, the master of the farm, treats animals as slaves, so the animals decide to

unite in the face of his oppression. The animals are initially unified against Mr. Jones, the enemy whom they call a parasite. The pig “Old Major” explained this early when he says “Man is the only creature that consumes without producing. He does not give milk, he does not lay eggs,... Yet he is lord of all animals” (Orwell 1945, 15). After the rebellion takes place, further social stratification is established. The pigs claim that “all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others” (Orwell 1945, 63). Due to their intelligence and knowledge, the pigs elevate themselves to the leadership positions and consequently take control over all aspects of the farm. The pigs then continue to claim to be superior to the other animals.

The target text to be analyzed is the most *recent* Arabic translation of *Animal Farm*, “مزرعة الحيوان” by Maḥmūd Abdel-Ghani (2013/2014). Abdel-Ghani is an Arabic native speaker born and raised in Morocco. He is currently a professor of Modern Literature at Mohammed V University in Rabat/Morocco. He is a well-known novelist, poet, critic and literary translator. As he states in the introduction to his book “مزرعة الحيوان” (2014, 9-11), his Arabic translation is a *faithful* (line-by-line) rendition of Orwell’s novel. The study will first analyze the use of social deixis in the original narrative adopting a number of influential accounts of social deixis, namely Fillmore (1975), Levinson (1983), Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990) and Huang (2014), as well as some accounts that are more oriented to literary texts such as Stockwell (2005) and Macrae (2020). Adopting a *descriptive* and *shift-oriented* approach (Toury 2012), the study will compare the source and target text to identify any potential variation in the use of social deixis. Since the target text can be “a means of retracing of the pathways of the translator’s decision-making procedures” (Hatim and Mason 2013, 4), the conditioning (contextual/socio-cultural) factors of the shift and its underlying processes will be traced through *textual* data analysis.

Drawing on some accounts that employ a *literary* and *socio-cultural* analysis, such as Simpson (2005), Levý (2011), Toury (2012), Morini (2013), Toolan (2016) and Boase-Beier (2018), the study will try to analyze the potential implication(s) of the trends of shift in social deixis for the *pragmatic/functional* and *narratological* characteristics of the original story. The trends of shift and their implications which this analysis will reveal will also be compared to those found in previous systematic studies that analyzed deictic shifts in literary translations in both English-Arabic and Indo-European pairs (e.g., Mason and Şerban 2003; Bosseaux 2007; Abualadas 2019a; 2019b). It is worth to emphasize that the present study explores only *optional* shifts, those resulting from the translator’s choices rather than from certain *linguistic* constraints. It is the analysis of the optional shift that helps characterize translational processes or strategies (see Klaudy 2009, 106), and which is widely argued to lead the search for translation *universals/norms*, universal tendencies of the translation process (see House 2016, 55).

#### 4. Analysis

The present study has analyzed the use of social deictics in the original novel and traced any potential change in their Arabic translation. Because the study concerns social and emotional or

psychological sides, which are *dynamic* and *context-dependent* in nature, the analysis process is carried out manually. This analysis has revealed that there are 65 cases of shift that can influence the original social and emotional structure in a particular way. Table (1) below shows the types of these shifts.

**Table 1:** Translational shifts in social deixis

Type of shift	Occurrences
switching from a socially unmarked to socially marked form	35
inserting extra social deixis	16
deleting social deixis	14
Total	65

The first type of shift involves a change in the form from *unmarked* to *marked* for social distinction. Observe the examples below. Note that back-translation is provided to allow non-Arabic readers to trace the shift. Underlining is used to indicate the selected English target text, while italic type is used to indicate emphasis.

**1. Source Text (ST):** All the pigeons, to the number of thirty-five, flew to and fro over the *men's* heads ... (Orwell 1945, 27)

**Target Text (TT):** طار الحمام الذي كان عدده خمسا وثلاثين فوق كتيبة العدو (Abdel-Ghani 2014, 49)

**[Back-Translation (BT)]:** The pigeons, which numbered thirty-five, flew over the *enemy* troop]

**2. ST:** At the sight, several men dropped their sticks and tried to run. Panic overtook *them* ... (Orwell 1945, 28)

**TT:** وعندما رأى الرجال ذلك تركوا هرواتهم وحاولو الفرار. إنه الخوف وقد تملك من العدو. (Abdel-Ghani 2014, 51)

**[BT:** When the men saw that, they dropped their sticks and tried to escape. It is panic that overtook *the enemy*]

**3. ST:** Nevertheless, the sight of Napoleon, on all fours, delivering orders to Whymper, who stood on two legs, roused their pride ... (Orwell 1945, 37)

**TT:** ومع ذلك، فإن كون الحيوان يعطي الأوامر للإنسان أيقظ داخلهم نوعاً من الكبرياء، ... (Abdel-Ghani 2014, 74)

**[BT:** Nevertheless, that *the animal* is delivering orders to *the human* roused a kind of pride in their inside]

In Example (1), the rebellion occurs and the farm animals start to chase Mr. Jones and his men off their farm. The pigeons flew over the men's heads to drive them out. As the translation shows, the word "men" is rendered into "the enemy". The expression "the enemy" is a new social deixis which marks the type of social relationship between the animals and Mr. Jones and his men and which more explicitly points to the animals' social *evaluation* of Jones and his men in the event. In (2), during the battle the horse "Boxer" with his hooves almost killed the stable boy, and Jones and his men start panicking after seeing the incident. The Arabic translation also changes the personal pronoun "them" into the *evaluative* term "the enemy", which similarly can encode the animals' view of, or personal attitudes toward, Mr. Jones and his men in the story. In (3), After Napoleon decides that the farm has to trade with other farms, he hires a human solicitor, Mr. Whymper, to act as a mediator. Napoleon talks to Mr. Whymper and the other animals are proud of the idea that a pig is giving orders to a human being. The proper name "Napoleon" is translated into "the animal" and the name "Whymper" into "the human being", which both in this context serve as a social deixis pointing to the species distinction between animals and humans. The use of such social deixis in the translation in this example can reflect the animals' conception of themselves as being subordinate to their human masters and the presupposed *asymmetrical* power

Social Deictic Shifts in *Animal Farm*: Evidence of More Intense Class Struggle and More Marked Social Stratification in Translation

relationship between them. The choices opted for in these three examples can be argued to convey more socially deictic information than the original options do.

While unmarked-marked alternations in the first three examples mark relations between animals and humans, some cases of shifts mark relations between the farm animals themselves. Observe the following examples.

**4. ST:** When he did appear, he was attended not only by his retinue of dogs but by a black cockerel who marched in front of him and acted as a kind of trumpeter, letting out a loud “cock-a-doodle-doo” before *Napoleon* spoke. (Orwell 1945, 47)

**TT:**.. قبل أن يتكلم الرئيس يطلق هو صيحة حادة.. (Abdel-Ghani 2014, 98)

[**BT:** ... before *the boss* speaks, he lets out a loud cry]

**5. ST:** They were executed immediately, and fresh precautions for *Napoleon*'s safety were taken. (Orwell 1945, 48)

**TT:**.. فتم إعدامهم في الحال، وإن إجراءات جديدة قد اتخذت لحماية القائد.. (Abdel-Ghani 2014, 99)

[**BT:** They were executed immediately, and fresh precautions were taken to protect *the leader*]

In Example (4), after the pig “Napoleon” takes control of the farm, he starts to eat and dress differently and reduces his public appearances. In (5), as Napoleon becomes more powerful, more executions are carried out and tougher security measures are taken to protect his life. The proper name “Napoleon” in both examples is replaced by the *relational* social deictics “the boss” and “the leader” (see Levinson 2006, 120-121). Such deictics encode, in the given context, the higher social rank of the pig “Napoleon” with respect to the other animals and the *asymmetrical* power relation between him and the animals (see Mühlhäusler and Harré 1990, 131-132). Such shifts may reflect to target readers a level of respect/adulation/flattery on the part of the other animals to Napoleon that is not explicitly expressed by the original choice of vocabulary.

The second type of shift as Table (1) shows is the addition of new social deictics that do not exist in the original. This has most often involved the insertion of the honorific “Mr.” before some *minor* human characters, most often “Frederick” and “Pillington”. See the following example.

**6. ST:** It was noticed that whenever he seemed on the point of coming to an agreement with *Frederick*, Snowball was declared to be in hiding at Foxwood, while, when he inclined towards *Pillington*, Snowball was said to be at Pinchfield. (Orwell 1945, 41)

**TT:** وكانت الحيوانات تلاحظ أنه كلما مال نابوليون نحو السيد فريدرك، يشاع أن سنوبول يختبئ في مزرعة فوكسوود وبينما (Abdel-Ghani 2014, 85)

[**BT:** and the animals noticed that whenever Napoleon is inclined toward *Mr. Frederick*, it is declared that Snowball is hiding at Foxwood Farm, while, when he wants to deal with *Mr. Pillington*, Snowball is said to be hiding at Pinchfield Farm]

The translation here inserts the honorific “Mr.” before “Frederick” and “Pillington”, two neighboring farmers whom Napoleon exploits in his deals as well as in his lies to manipulate the animals' thoughts about the treacherous pig “Snowball”. Compared to the original, the use of the honorific “Mr.” conveys on the part of the narrator a greater level of *formality/politeness* when addressing the two referents in the story (see Wiczorek 2013, 93). Whether it was intentional or unintentional, this addition would imply a sort of *distance* or *lack of familiarity* between the referents and the target reader compared to the source reader.

The last type of shift is the omission of social deictics without any compensation. This has involved the deletion of some honorifics that are used with some major characters in the story, most often “Jones Manor”. Observe the following examples.

**7. ST:** Mr. Jones's gun had been found lying in the mud, and it was known that there was a supply of cartridges in the farmhouse. (Orwell 1945, 29)

**TT:** تم العثور على بندقية جونز وسط الوحل. (Abdel-Ghani 2014, 54)

[**BT:** Jones's gun had been found in the middle of the mud]

**8. ST:** It was fully realized that though the human beings had been defeated in the Battle of the Cowshed they might make another and more determined attempt to recapture the farm and reinstate Mr. Jones. (Orwell 1945, 31-32)

**TT:** من أجل تنصيب جونز على رأس المزرعة (Abdel-Ghani 2014, 60)

[**BT:** in order to inaugurate Jones as the head of the farm]

The narrator in these two examples is describing Mr. Jones and his men's return to the farm and their failure in beating the animals and recapturing the farm. The narrator in both examples uses the honorific “Mr.” before “Jones”, which not only marks Jones's social identify but also implies a level of distance or formality in the narrator-referent relationship (see Huang 2014, 213-216). The translation in both examples however drops the honorific “Mr.”, leading to a target utterance that reduces social differentiation and increases familiarity and intimacy between the narrator and the referent. Since the use of the honorific “Mr.” can also convey politeness or respect on the part of the narrator, dropping it from the target text (whether intentionally or unintentionally) would suggest in the given context a lesser level of politeness/formality between the narrator and the referent in the translated narrative.

## 5. Discussion

The first two types of shift, (i) switching a form unmarked for social distinction into a form marked for social distinction and (ii) inserting extra social deictics, involve adding new social deictics via translation. For instance, translating the word “men” into “enemy” (see Example 1) and inserting the honorific “Mr.” before the name “Pillington” (see Example 6) both result in new social deixis being added to the target text. According to the numerical data in Table (1), the occurrences of the first two types of shift are 51 (about 78% of the total shift), while the occurrences of the last type of shift (the deletion of social deictics) are only 14 (about 22% of the total shift). This suggests that there is a tendency in the shifts to *add* rather than *remove* social deixis. This generally confirms the results of Abualadas (2019a; 2019b), which reveal a general tendency to produce a more deictically-marked or emphasized target text, while contradicts the results of Bosseaux (2007), which show a tendency to *delete* rather than *add* deictic information and hence to produce a less deictically-marked target text.

This tendency to encode more socially deictic knowledge via translation expresses a move to lexicalize/grammaticalize more social relations/functions/positions via translation (Morini 2013, 24), and hence to emphasize the interpersonal aspects of this intercultural literary communication (House 2016, 124). Translating “Napoleon” into the *relational* deictic term “the leader” (see Example 5) and the pronoun “them” into the evaluative form “the enemy” (see Example 2) not only marks more social identify contrast in the target text, but also signals the animals' sympathy for Napoleon and their

antipathy for humans. This move to use more *relational* or *evaluative* deictic items in translation encodes more *social viewpoints* and *relative situations* of the narrator or speaking characters (Stockwell 2005, 46). Similar to the *spatio-temporal* deictic shifts (Abualadas 2019a), social deictic shifts can also be argued to lead to a more marked (or less ambiguous) *voice* or *perspective* (Uspensky 1973; see Toolan 2016, 37-39) in the translated narrative.

Since this increased socially deictic knowledge can be indicative of greater *empathy* and more emphasized *social viewpoints/perspective* on the part of narrator or speaking characters, the addition trend is suggestive of a greater narratorial *subjectivity* (Uspensky 1973, 81, see Fowler 1996/2009, 120-121). This increased narratorial subjectivity in the translated text can actually be conducive to a greater level of emotional involvement/engagement on the part of the reader in the text (Toolan 2016, 38). The translation of “the men” as “the enemy” reveals the animals’ subjective social viewpoint/evaluation of humans in the story, and also intensifies their feelings and emotions and invites the reader to take part in these feelings and emotions. If we suppose that a fictional text *stylistically* and *functionally* allows for a reader’s “affective response”, the transformation of material into personal feelings and real emotional experiences for the reader (Harding 2014, 68-69), the shift in the present study can help achieve such a *stylistic* feature (Boase-Beier 2018) or *function* of such a *text type* (cf. Reiss 2004). This move toward maximizing the narratorial subjectivity and reader’s emotional involvement may however contradict the findings of some previous studies, such as Mason and Şerban (2003), which point to a deictic shift that increases narratorial objectivity and reduces the reader’s emotional involvement.

The socially deictic expressions added through translation can actually be argued to be derived from the original context of situation through a process of *interpretation* on the part of the translator (cf. Blum-Kulka 2004, 298-299). Recognizing the *implicit* social (species) difference between “Napoleon” and “Mr. Whymper” in the original utterance “the sight of Napoleon, on all fours, delivering orders to Whymper, who stood on two legs, roused their pride” (see Example 3) is important to understand what the animals are proud of in the utterance. The translator has opted for the social deictics “the animal” and “the human” instead of “Napoleon” and “Mr. Whymper”, which more explicitly spells out this important social differentiation and helps readers more easily calculate the intended message. The trend toward using more social deixis via translation can then suggest a move toward a greater *simplification* or *disambiguation* in the target text (Toury 2012, 305-306), which is conducive to a target text that is more *explicit* and more *fluent* (cf. Venuti 2008) than its original.

The preference for clearer and more explicit social differentiations in the translated text may provide evidence of a general *explicitation* pattern (translations, due to translators’ interpretive efforts, often come out more explicit than their originals) (cf. Blum-Kulka 2004). This explicitation pattern is claimed to be one *universal* feature of translated texts (see Pápai 2004, 144-145). The preference for more explicit social differentiations may also confirm certain common socio-cultural *norms* of translation (cf. Toury 2012, 63), such as the translator’s preference for clarity due to his conception of his role as an *intercultural* and *literary mediator* (Saldanha 2008, 32). I personally believe that this tendency toward more explicit social differentiations is generally related to a general translation/interpretation strategy

“whereby translators spell out *optional* interpersonal, ideational or textual meanings in the target text” (Saldanha 2008, 32, emphasis added). This strategy could however be conscious or subconscious. Proving whether this strategy is conscious, or not, in product-oriented studies relying only on textual analysis (like the present study), may not actually be very feasible.

This move toward more explicit social information may be inevitable in fiction translation, especially if we assume that the apprehension/interpretation of the original is an inevitable stage in the *recreation* or *reconstruction* of a fictional text (Levý 2011, 31-35). Opting for the social deictic “the enemy” to refer to “Jones’s men” and “our boss” to refer to “Napoleon”, which actually conforms to the narrator or speaking character’s emotions and attitudes, can reflect the translator’s apprehension and *concretization* of the intrinsic artistic and social realities of the story and his second *reverbalization* of these realities in the target text (Levý 2011, 28-31). If we assume that these social deictics added through translation go with/emphasize the social and emotional realities behind the original, they can be considered as textual traces of the literary translator’s (conscious or unconscious) attempts to adopt the original voices, suggesting that literary translators *speak for* the source author, and hence have no separate stylistic perspective (Jones 2009, 154; see Abualadas 2020, 61).

The second type of shift in Table (1), inserting extra social deixis, can also suggest a systematic translational behavior. As the analysis has shown, the 16 shifts have mostly involved the insertion of the honorific “Mr.” before minor human characters (most frequently “Frederick” and “Pillington”). This may for example suggest a tendency to display more politeness and formality with characters who are not of central importance to the plot or whose role in the story is limited or brief. This may in turn express a push toward a decreased level of familiarity or intimacy, and hence more *distance* (see Fowler 2009, 170-171), between readers and minor characters in the translation compared to the original. This decreased level of familiarity or intimacy with minor characters seems to conform to the emotional and psychological spaces presupposed/given in the story, and therefore may reflect the translator’s (subconscious or conscious) interpretative efforts in the translated narrative. The last type of shift in Table (1), which has most often involved dropping the honorific “Mr.” when addressing major human characters (most frequently “Jones Manor”), expresses a shift in the opposite direction. It expresses a push toward an increased level of familiarity or intimacy, and hence more psychological or emotional *approximation* (see Huang 2014, 213-216) between target readers and some major characters of the story.

## 6. Conclusion

The present study has examined the optional shifts in *social deixis* (Fillmore 1975; Levinson 1983) in an Arabic translation of George Orwell’s *Animal Farm* (1945). The findings indicate that the target text moves toward a more frequent use of social deixis, and hence more grammaticalization of *social relations* between characters (Morini 2013) and more emphasis on the *interpersonal* aspects of the narrative (House 2016). This suggests a target text with a more accentuated *focalization* (Genette 1972), more emphasized *voice/perspective* (Uspensky 1973; Simpson 2005), greater *narratorial subjectivity* and *empathy* (Fowler 2009) and higher *reader involvement* (Harding 2014; Toolan 2016) compared to the

original. The above movements are generally suggestive of a more emphasized *emotive language* or *style* (Boase-Beier 2018), which is typical of an *expressive* (fictional) *text type* (Reiss 2004); and hence they can indicate a general *standardizing* orientation on the part of the translator (Toury 2012).

The movement toward a greater lexicalization of socially deictic information may reflect the translator's (deliberate or non-deliberate) attempts to *interpret/disambiguate* the original (Pápai 2004), pushing for a more *explicit* (Blum-Kulka 2004) and *fluent* (Venuti 2008) target text than its original. This movement toward more explicit and clearer social distinctions in the translated narrative, which reflects a general preference for clarity, may stem from the translator's realization of his job as a *mediator* between remote cultures (Saldanha 2008). The explicitation of the implicit socially deictic information follows the translator's *concretization* of the social realia of the source text and his attempts to *reconstruct* (Levý 2011) or *renarrate* (Baker 2018) the original story. This explicitation can be seen as an instance of a translator *speaking for* the original author, narrator or characters and adopting their perspective in the story (Jones 2009). One last trend of shift is, while on the one hand the translation moves toward a lower *intimacy* and greater *psychological distance* (Fowler 2009) between some *minor* characters and the target readers, it pushes on the other hand toward a greater level of intimacy and *approximation* between some other *major* characters and the target readers. I personally believe that this psychological distancing and approximation, resulting from either dropping or adding social deixis, is also evidence of the translator's (subconscious or conscious) mental representation of the characters' social roles and the story's psychological and emotional structure. Since lesser degrees of familiarity or intimacy may *conventionally* induce a more frequent use of formal/polite social deixis such as "Mr." (and vice versa), a general *normalization* or *standardization* pattern (Toury 2012) seems also to be at play during the translation process. Finally, the claims made in the present study call for more investigation and application to larger and more varied populations of literary translations both in English-Arabic and other language pairs. It is hoped that the present study provides more nuance and analytical potential to the theory of social deixis in literary translation.

عندما تجعل الترجمة حلم (حيوانات المزرعة) بمجتمع خالٍ من التمييز الطبقي الاجتماعي أكثر استحالة:  
دراسة خاصة لأدوات الإشارة الاجتماعية في الترجمة

عثمان أحمد أبو العدس

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها، الجامعة الأردنية - العقبة، الأردن

الملخص

تدرس هذه المقالة التغييرات في استعمال أدوات الإشارة الاجتماعية في الترجمة العربية لرواية (مزرعة الحيوان) لجورج أورويل (1945). وتُظهر النتائج أن الترجمة تتجه نحو المزيد من أدوات الإشارة الاجتماعية والتجسيد اللغوي للعلاقات الاجتماعية والشخصية بين شخصيات القصة، مما يدفع نحو تقريب بعض الشخصيات الرئيسية إلى القراء عاطفياً ونفسياً، وفي المقابل تُبعد بعض الشخصيات الثانوية الأخرى. وتميل الترجمة أيضاً نحو استخدام لغة وأسلوب أدبي أكثر إثارة لعاطفة القارئ، مع الاتجاه نحو أسلوب ومنظور سردي أكثر وضوحاً وأكثر شخصية وأقل موضوعية، وقارئاً أكثر انخراطاً مع الأحداث. وتُظهر الترجمة اتجاهاً عاماً نحو تمثيل اجتماعي أكثر وضوحاً يعمل على تحسين وضوح النص. وتعزو الدراسة ميل الترجمة إلى توضيح الأبعاد الاجتماعية للقصة إلى محاولات المترجم (المقصودة أو غير المقصودة) لإعادة صياغة النص الأصلي، بناءً على فهم المترجم لواقع القصة الاجتماعي. كما ويمكن اعتبار هذا الميل لتوضيح الأبعاد الاجتماعية آثراً نصية لجهود المترجم في التحدث باسم المؤلف الأصلي أو الراوي أو الشخصيات وتبني أصواتهم داخل القصة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تغييرات أدوات الإشارة، توضيحات الترجمة، ترجمة النص الروائي، المنظور السردية، أدوات الإشارة الاجتماعية.

## References

- Abdel-Ghani, Mahmoud. 2014. *Animal Farm* (Arabic translation). Cairo: Dar El Shorouk.
- Abualadas, Othman. 2020. Shifts in Speech Acts in Fiction Translation: Evidence of a More Marked Narratorial Voice. *Dirasat, Human and Social Sciences* 47 (1): 61-73.
- Abualadas, Othman. 2019a. Deictic shifts in Fiction Translation: Evidence of a More Marked Perspective in the Translated Narrative. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 9 (2): 424-433.
- Abualadas, Othman. 2019b. Person Deixis and Point of View in English-Arabic Fiction Translation: A Trend towards Repositioning the Narrator, Characters and Readers. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies* 19 (2): 263-280.
- Baker, Mona. 2018. Narrative analysis and translation. In K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of translation studies and linguistics* (pp. 179-193). London and New York: Routledge.
- Black, Elizabeth. 2006. *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Bloom, Harold. 2006. *Bloom's Guides: Animal Farm*. New York: Infobase Publishing.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 2004. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *the translation studies reader* (pp. 298-313). London and New York: Routledge.
- Boase-Beier, Jean. 2018. Stylistic and translation. In K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of translation studies and linguistics* (pp. 194-207). London and New York: Routledge.
- Bosseaux, Charlotte. 2007. *How Does It Feel? Point of View in Translation: The case of Virginia Woolf into French*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Fowler, Roger. 2009. *Linguistic Criticism* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goethals, Patrick & July De Wilde. 2009. Deictic Center Shifts in Literary Translation: The Spanish Translation of Nooteboom's *Het Volgende Verhaal*. *Meta* 54 (4): 770-794.
- Halliday, Michael, & Christian Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). London: Edward Arnold.
- Hatim, Basil, & Ian Mason. 2013. *Discourse and the Translator*. London and New York: Routledge.
- House, Juliane. 2016. *Translation as Communication across Languages and Cultures*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Huang, Yan. 2014. *Pragmatics* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klaudy, Kinga. 2009. Explication. In M. Baker, & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed) (pp. 80-84). London: Routledge.
- Leech, Geoffrey & Mick Short. 2007. *Style in fiction* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Levinson, Stephanie. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Stephanie. 2006. Deixis. In L. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 97-121). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Levý, Jirí. 2011. *The Art of Translation*. (P. Corness, Trans.) Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lyons, Jone. 2005. *Linguistic Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mason, Ian, and Adriana Şerban. 2003. Deixis as an Interactive Feature in Literary Translations from Romanian into English. *Target* 15 (2): 269-294.
- Mason, Ian. 2014. Discourse and translation: A social perspective. In J. House (Ed.), *Translation: A multidisciplinary perspective* (pp. 54-81). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Morini, Massimiliano. 2013. *The Pragmatic Translator: An Integral Theory of Translation*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter, and Rom Harré. 1990. *Pronouns and People: The Linguistic Construction of Social and Personal Identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Orwell, George. 1945/1976. *Animal Farm*. London: Martm Secker & Warburg Limited.
- Pápai, Vilma. 2004. Explication: A universal of translated text? In A. Mauranen & P. Kujamäki (Eds.), *Translation universals: Do they exist?* (pp. 143-164). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Patai, Daphne. 2009. Political fiction and patriarchal fantasy. In R. Fowler (Ed.), *Bloom's modern critical interpretations: George Orwell's Animal Farm* (pp. 3-21) New York: Infobase Publishing.
- Reiss, Katharina. 2004. Type, kind and individuality of text: Decision making in translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation studies reader* (pp. 160-171). London and New York: Routledge.
- Richardson, Bill. 1998. Deictic features and the translator. In L. Hickey (Ed.), *the pragmatics of translation* (pp. 124-142). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Saldanha, Gabriela. 2008. Explication Revisited: Bringing the Reader into the Picture. *Trans-kom 1* (10): 20-35.
- Short, Mike. 1996. *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. London: Longman.
- Simpson, Paul. 2005. *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Stockwell, Peter. 2005/2002. *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Toolan, Michael. 2016. *Making Sense of Narrative Text Situation, Repetition, and Picturing in the Reading of Short Stories*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Toury, Gideon. 2012. *Descriptive translation studies-and beyond* (revised edition). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Uspensky, Boris. 1973. *A Poetics of Composition*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2008. *The Translator's Invisibility: History of Translation* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). London: Routledge.
- Wieczorek, Anna. 2013. *Clusivity: A New Approach to Association and Dissociation in Political Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars.