Shifts in Speech Acts in Fiction Translation: Evidence of a More Marked Narratorial Voice

Othman Abualadas *

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the shift in speech acts in two Arabic translations of *Animal Farm*. The findings reveal a trend to *explicitate* illocutions in a way that maximizes the narrator's omniscience. This trend improves textual relations and increases the simplicity and conciseness of the original language, but reduces the projection of reader's thoughts into the narrative. One of the translations tends to shift *indirect* speech acts to *direct* in a way that changes politeness conventions in the text. The other translation shows a preference for a narrative report of speech acts that leads to a better characterization of the narrator's voice. This shift towards the narrator's discourse produces a more monotonous speech and less-stylistically varied text, and elicits *less contact* between the reader and the speaking character. This shift may help reveal more of dual perspective of narrator and characters, casting more irony and maximizing the original writer's negative criticism.

Keywords:speech acts, illocutionary force, translational shifts, explicitation, fiction translation.

Introduction

This paper uses Austin and Searle's speech act theory to develop a framework to study translational shifts in fiction translation. This framework more particularly aims at exploring how the translational shift in locutions and illocutions can affect the stylistic and narratological characteristics of the original narrative. This framework examines speech acts not only as *vehicle for meaning* but also as a *stylistic device* used by the original author. The existing literature on the translation of speech acts in literary texts is predominantly *equivalence-oriented*: centered on how to achieve an equivalent illocutionary act in the translated text. Speech act has largely been ignored in the study of literary style in translation. So, this study will shed the light on the usefulness of speech act analysis to the study of style in translation, and ultimately contribute answers to the important question "*how* and *why* style differs in translations" (Munday 2008: 2, my emphasis). To achieve maximum benefit, style will be looked at in this study from multiple viewpoints. These include (i) the style of the original narrative as an expression of its author's options (ii) the style of the original narrative in its potential effects on the original audience (iii) the style of the translated narrative as an expression of the translator's options (iv) the style of the translated narrative in its potential effects on the target audience (Boase-Beier, 2010: 5-6). The corpus of the study comprises.The corpus the study selects comprises George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945) and its two Arabic translations. The study hopes to arrive at empirical findings that can be tested in different literary works and language pairs.

2. Literature Review

The notion of speech act was first conceived by the philosopher John Austin (1962). The basic assumption of Austin's theory of speech act is that when people communicate, they actually *do things* with their words; they actually perform certain acts like asking questions, describing, giving instructions, giving orders, or making complaints. Another important assumption is that the meaning of an utterance is often derived from the speaker's intention in making the utterance, so the speaker in "I will call a lawyer" may be predicting, promising or possibly threatening.

*The University of Jordan-Aqaba. Received on 16/3/2019 and Accepted for Publication on 12/6/2019.

Austin (1975: 109) identified three basic types of speech acts. The first one is a "locutionary act", which is the act of uttering a meaningful expression or sentence, the literal meaning/propositional content of the sentence (such as "It is very cold in here" referring to the temperature of a place). The second is an "illocutionary act", the speaker's meaning, which may be different from the literal meaning (such as when we use "It is very cold in here" as a request to close the window). The last type is a "perlocutionary act", which is what is brought about or achieved by the speaker's utterance (such as when the person we talk to closes the window).

John Searle (1999: 12-16) classifies Austin's illocutionary acts into five groups. These are *expressives*, *assertives*, *commissives*, *directives* and *declaratives*. In expressive speech acts, the speaker expresses thoughts or feelings about a certain thing or issue, such as when regretting, thanking, appreciating, congratulating or apologizing. In assertives, we state what we believe to be the case or not, such as in assertions, conclusions, definitions, statements, and descriptions. In commissives, we commit ourselves to something in the future such as promises, vows, swears and threats. In directives, the speaker makes the hearer do something like requests, instructions, suggestions and commands. In declaratives, the speaker makes alteration in the world via their words, such as in the declaration "The court sentences you five years imprisonment", which puts you in prison. Utterances may sometimes have verbs that explicitly state the illocutionary act performed. These are the so-called "performative verbs" or the "Illocutionary Force Indicating Device" (IFID) (Yule, 2008: 49). For example, the verb "promise" in the utterance "I promise that I shall be there" explicitly names the act being performed.

On the basis of structure, Searle (1999: 30) also distinguishes between two more categories of speech acts: "direct" and "indirect" speech act. The difference between them can be determined in terms of whether or not there is a direct natural connection between the content of the locutionary act and the illocutionary act being performed (Bousfield, 2014: 124-125). For example, when a speaker wants a hearer not to stand in front of the TV, he can do this act directly by saying "Move out of the way!", or indirectly by saying "Do you have to stand in front of the TV?" In other words, an indirect speech act occurs whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function, like when a declarative like "It is very cold here" is used in a situation as an indirect request to close the window, even though it is not in the interrogative mood (Yule, 2008: 54-55).

Austin and Searle's theory of speech act has been criticized on several grounds. The theory does not for example take into account the socio-cultural dimension. There are many variations across languages and cultures as to what counts as a complaint, threat etc., and how a particular speech act is performed (Kroeger, 2018: 191-192). In addition, the theory initially relied much on idealization as it often dealt with invented utterances taken outside the actual context and sometimes with ritualized formulas that have fixed interpretations, and therefore may not be able account for the ordinary communicative behaviour (Sadock, 2006: 59). Speech act categories sometimes overlap, as one expression can perform in certain circumstances more than one act or can fall under more than one category; for instance an expression of regret can also indicate an apology (Mey, 2004: 124-125).

Although the notion of speech act was developed mainly in relation to brief spoken utterances, it is widely regarded as relevant to the interpretation of large written texts and also as an important element in many literary and linguistic analytical models (Black, 2006: 17;Warner, 2014: 365-366). Sandy Petrey (1990) provides a detailed account on the contribution and relevance of speech acts to the analysis of literary works. One important assumption here is that since a literary work, say a novel, may rely on a communication between characters, this communication is "susceptible to, and analyzable by, *some* of the same models and methods which are applicable to naturally occurring, real-life or day-to-day interactive language use" (Bousfield, 2014: 119).

If we consider translation an act of communication and that in any kind of communication utterances may bring with them certain intentions or perform specific illocutionary acts, preserving the intentional or performative values of the original text is also important (Morini, 2008: 36-37). Hatim (2009: 205) argues that *equivalence*, which is a major premise in linguistic-oriented approaches to translation studies, can be looked at in the light of speech act theory as an attempt at the successful (re)performance of speech acts. This involves a (re)performance of the locutionary and illocutionary acts of the source text in such a way that the translation can have similar perlocutionary effects on its

readers.

Some problems can appear in the translation of both literary and non-literary texts due to cross-cultural diversity and culture-specificity of illocutionary functions (Hervey, 1998: 11). Members of the same language-community often share a consensual awareness of the illocutionary acts in their language. The familiarity with these illocutionary speech acts often comes from "a knowledge of the community ground rules which constrain and facilitate communicative interaction" (Bell, 1993: 178-179). When a translator lacks such a communicative competence in the culture he translates from or into, such illocutionary functions may unintentionally be lost. In a study of the English translations of the Arabic Naguib Mahfouz's novel The Trilogy, Hassan (2011: 30-35) finds that translators, who were not Arabic native speakers, failed to preserve the illocutionary force of the utterances that contain certain religious formulas and allusive terms rooted in the Arabic-language culture.

Hatim and Mason (2013: 76-78) argue that a text normally has sequences of interrelated speech acts (e.g., a question followed by an answer, an invitation followed by an acceptance or a refusal, a greeting by a greeting and so on), and that the interpretation of an individual act can sometimes depend on its position within such sequences. If an utterance like "Of course" occurs sequentially before a statement like "You always like to travel alone", it would be interpreted as a confirmation or agreement, whereas it would be interpreted as an acceptance if preceded by "Could you give me your pen?"This interrelatedness between speech acts normally leads to the notion of "illocutionary structure" of the text, which is essential to determining the text's progression and coherence. Therefore, the translator should always aim at achieving equivalence at the level of the illocutionary structure rather than individual speech acts.

Hickey (1998: 226-229) emphasizes the need to obtain *perlocutionary equivalence* in literary translation; the translators should aim at producing a literary text that can evoke in its readers effects analogous to those evoked in the original. These effects may involve for example aesthetic appreciation, feelings of pleasure, respect or love, mental thoughts or images. To produce a literary translation that offers the reader the opportunity of experiencing effects offered by the source text, the translator needs to reproduce the features of the source text that evoke these effects. But due to potential gaps or differences in cultural presuppositionbetween the source and target reader, Hickey (1998: 221) argues that the translator may need to use "exegesis", explanation of the source-text terms and realities. This in other words involves explicitation; a translation strategy which involves making what is implicit in the source language explicit in the target language (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995: 342), to keep the target text both more appropriate and accessible to its readers. An example is when "The Beatles" and "Fish and chips" are translated into Arabic as 'al-firqaatu al-mūsīqiatu al-'injilīziatu dha bītilz' (The English music band "The Beatles") and 'al-'aklatu al-'injilīziatu al-ma'rūfatu fish ānd tships' (The popular English food "fish and chips").

3. Corpus and Methodological Issues

The source text is the allegorical novel Animal Farm (1945) by George Orwell, a British journalist and novelist who supported democratic socialism. The story of Animal Farm portrays the events of the Russian Revolution of 1917, and many of its characters parallel those of the Russian Revolution. As Orwell explains in Why I Write (1946), the story is written basically to ridicule the achievements of the Russian Revolution and Communism. It reflects how a revolution is betrayed, a model of socialism fails and people's life becomes more miserable.

The story starts when all animals in the farm of Mr. Jones Manor decide to revolt against him and his men. Tired of mistreatment and enslavement, an old boar, called Old Major, arouses all animals into rebelling. A few days later Major dies and three young boars, called Snowball, Napoleon, and Squealer, assume command. While Mr. Jones is drunk, the animals manage to drive him and all other human workers off the farm. The animals then adopt the "Seven Commandments of Animalism" in which all animals are assumed to be equal. But the pigs start to move themselves to leadership positions while the other animals work very hard in the fields. Napoleon and Snowball then start to fight for the leadership. Napoleon beats Snowball. He then promises the other animals of a better life, but as life goes on all gets worse. The end is that Napoleon and the other boars seem to assume the same role as that of the Mr. Jones and his men.

Orwell uses a third person omniscient point of view. The events are told from the point of view of the animals

participating in the story. The narrator is an anonymous outsider who uses "she" or "he" to refer to the animals and has a privileged access to their thoughts and emotions. The narrator is an *external*, detached, one who has no direct personal feelings in the story, but reports to the reader what he/she sees and knows in an objective and unbiased way (see Simpson, 2004: 27). The writing style of the novel often shows a tendency to use short, simple, straightforward, unambiguous sentences, with rarely complicated structures, which is most effective for the purpose of the fable: to deliver a certain political message with a unique literary style (Menchhofer, 1990: 7-8).

One of the most influential accounts of Orwell's style in *Animal Farm* is *TheLanguage of George Orwell* by Roger Fowler (1995). Fowler (1995: 159-180) points out a number of distinctive features of Orwell' language. These include: impersonal narrative voice (absence of first person pronouns, avoidance of expressions signaling personal judgment or evaluation), simple active syntax, absence of adjectives, avoidance of complex noun phrases, no dialogism, a distanced reader, a plain, concrete and domestic vocabulary register, no jargon or foreign expressions.

Animal Farm is an animal satire through which Orwell criticizes the Russian revolution in an ironical way (see Armstrong, 1985: 64-65; Frye, 2006: 52-53). Irony indirectly expresses Orwell's negative attitudes towards the events and leaders of the revolution. Irony also makes the readers connect mentally and participate intellectually in the story: it arouses negative feelings like criticism, hatred, disgust, sadness, frustration and fear.

The study selects two widely available Arabic translations of the novel, one by Shamil Abada (2009)and a more recent onebyMaḥmoud Abdulghani (2014). The two translators are native speakers of Arabic and have considerable experience in English-Arabic literary translation. Since the study of speech cats requires the study of context, the process of analysis will be done manually, by looking first at what is (potentially) done by the original writer in or by the source text and then comparing it with what is (potentially) done in the translated text as a response to the source text (Hickey, 1998: 4). This type of analysis may sometimes involve a comparison between the source and target texts in terms of dynamic issues such as beliefs, attitudes speech norms and politeness conventions. Through this contextualised analysis, the study will try to trace any potential translational shifts in speech acts and analyse their potential effects on the stylistic aspects of the source text.

4. Analysis

After comparing the target texts with the original text and tracing the change in the speech act performed in the original. The study finds three main patterns of shift. These are shown in Table 1 below. The study will first illustrate how these shifts occur in the translation context and then show how they can affect the communicative and stylistic features of the original story.

Table 1. Shifts in speech acts in the two translations

Type of shift	Abdulghani	Abada	Total
Explicitation of a performative verb (e.g., "complain", "request" or "regret").	59	82	141
Change in mood structure (e.g., from interrogative to declarative or declarative to imperative).	46	11	57
Change in speech mode (e.g., from direct to indirect or vice versa)	13	67	80
Total	118	160	278

The first category of shift is the explicitation of a performative verb that is not explicitly stated in the original. This in other words involves spelling out the illocutionary force of an original utterance. The following examples show how this type of shift occurs. The Arabic target text is transliterated using The Library of Congress Transliteration System. Note that an English gloss of the Arabic text is given to allow non-Arabic readers to compare and trace the change. Italic type is used for emphasis. The underlined text indicates the part of the English text translated into Arabic. It is also worth noting that the examples in this section are devoted mainly to the discussion of the types of shift, and therefore the translators' options may not often be contrasted. A comparison between the translators' overall choices

and strategies will be given in the subsequent section.

1. ST: "What is that gun firing for?" said Boxer.
"To celebrate our victory!" cried Squealer. (Ch.8)

TT: sā'la buksar: "mā hādhihi al-ṭalaqatu al-nāriyah?"
"li-al-iḥtifāli bi-al-naṣri al-ladhī 'aḥraznāh." 'ajābahu snūbūl. (Abdulghani: 110)

[**Gloss:** Boxer *asked*: "What is this gun firing for?"
"To celebrate the victory we achieved." Squealer *answered* him]

2. ST: "No sentimentality, comrade!" *cried* Snowball from whose wounds the blood was still dripping. "War is war. The only good human being is a dead one." (Ch.4)

TT: wa-ṭayaba snūbūl khāṭirahu qā'ilan: lā 'alayka min al-'awāṭifi 'ayuhā al-rafīq! fa-'inna al-ḥarba hiya al-ḥarb, wa-lan tajida min al-bashari 'insānan ṣāliḥan 'illā al-mawtā minhum. (Abada: 39)

[**Gloss:** Snowball *consoled* him, saying: "Forget about emotions, comrade!War is war, and there is no good human being but the dead ones!"]

3. ST: Remember, comrades, there must be no alteration in our plans: they shall be carried out to the day. "Forward, comrades! Long live the windmill! Long live Animal Farm!" (Ch.6)

TT:thumma khatama nidā'ahu bi-hitāf: faltaḥyā al-ṭāḥūnah! waltaḥyā mazra'atu al-ḥaywān!(Abada: 62)

[**Gloss:** Then he concluded his speech *with an acclamation:* "Long live the windmill! Long live Animal Farm!]

4. ST: Throughout the whole period of his seeming friendship with Pilkington, Napoleon had really been in secret agreement with Frederick. (Ch.8)

TT: kamā 'a'lana 'annahu ṭawāla fatrati ṣadāqatihi bi-mistir bilkinktun kāna 'alā wifāqin sirriyin ma'a mistir fridrik … (Abada: 83)

[**Gloss:** and he announced that throughout the whole period of his friendship with Pilkington, he had been completely in secret agreement with Mr. Frederick]

In Example (1), after Frederick and his men destroy the windmill in Animal Farm, Squealer tries to assure the animals that despite this heavy loss, they are the winners of the battle as they managed to drive all Frederick's men away. Boxer wonders about the reason for this gun firing after this loss, and Squealer replies that it is to celebrate their victory. As the translation shows, the verb "said" in Boxers' utterance is turned into "asked" and the verb "cried" into "answered". This shift actually indicates an attempt on the part of the translator to use performative verbs that more explicitly describe the illocutionary force of the original utterances. The explicitation of the verbs "asked" and "answered" has also created a sequence of interrelated speech acts (adjacency pair) that does not explicitly exist in the original, which improves not only the interpretation of the target utterances but also the target text's progression and coherence.

In Example (2), after Jones and his men attack Animal Farm, Boxer thinks that he has mistakenly killed a stable boy during the battle and expresses his sorrow for taking an innocent life, and Snowball asks him not to feel guilty about killing a human. The narrator uses the verb "cried" to report Snowball's utterance "No sentimentality, comrade!", but the translation adds the verb "consoled", which explicitates the illocutionary act of the original utterance. In (3), in a very passionate speech, Napoleon tries to urge all animals to work hard to rebuild the windmill. The translation similarly adds "he concluded his speech with an acclamation" before Napoleon's utterance "Forward, comrades! Long live the windmill! Long live Animal Farm!", which is an attempt to state more explicitly the illocutionary value of the original utterance. Example (4) shows another case of shift where the translation reports illocutionary acts that are not performed on the part of characters. The narrator here says that when Napoleon decided to sell a pile of unused timber to Mr. Frederick, he was secretly negotiating with another farmer, Mr. Pilkington, to get a better price. Although the narrator does not use any reporting verb, the given translation adds the reporting verb "announced", which expresses an assertive speech act performed on the part of Napoleon.

The second group of shifts in Table (1) is the change in the mood structure of the locutionary act while maintaining the same speech mode (direct or indirect) as that of the original. The shift here involves a change in the syntactic mood used to carry out the illocutionary act, for example from interrogative to declarative or declarative to imperative. Declarative sentences typically express statements, interrogative sentences give questions, imperative sentences give commands, while exclamatory sentences express exclamations. So any (intentional or unintentional) alteration in such mood structures in translation may bring a change in the way the illocutionary act is realized.

5. ST: Others asked such questions as "Why should we care what happens after we are dead?" or "If this Rebellion is to happen anyway, what difference does it make whether we work for it or not?" (Ch.2)

TT: "'idhā kānant al-thawratu sa-tataḥaqaqu fī al-nihāyati, fa-'in na'mal min 'ajli taḥqīqahā 'aw lā na'mal sayān." (Abdulghani: 26)

[**Gloss:** "Since this Rebellion will happen anyway, whether we work for it or not is the same."]

6. ST: "I thought so," he said. "Do you not see what they are doing? In another moment they are going to pack blasting powder into that hole." (Ch.8)

TT: 'inanī kuntu 'atawaqa'u minhumā dhālika, 'inahumā yaḥfirāna ḥufratan taḥta al-ṭāḥūnati wa-sa-yamlā'nahā bi-mawādin nāsifih.(Abada: 87)

[**Gloss:** I was expecting that from them. They are drilling a hole near the windmill and are going to fill it with blasting materials]

In Example (5), the narrator reports that at the beginning some animals wondered about the need for the rebellion and were indifferent to it. The interrogative structure of the animal's utterance "If this Rebellion is to happen anyway, what difference does it make whether we work for it or not?" conveys a directive speech act: a question. But it also conveys an indirect speech act: although it is an interrogative sentence, it has the illocutionary force of an exclamation or a statement (they do not like the rebellion). The given translation changes the mood from interrogative into declarative, which seems to force the original utterance to have a direct assertive speech act. In Example (6), based on the context of situation, Benjamin here seems to state (or warn) that Frederick and his men are going to blow up the windmill. Although Benjamin's utterance "Do you not see what they are doing?" is interrogative, it tends to have an assertive force (a statement or warning). In the given translation the interrogative sentence is omitted and the structure

is turned completely into declarative. Since assertives are typically expressed by declarative sentences (see Searle, 1999: 12-13), the shift here signals a shift from indirect into direct speech act in the translated text.

The third group of shifts is the change in the mode of report, particularly from 'direct speech mode' (DS) to 'indirect speech mode' (IS), so that the reported speech becomes fully integrated into the discourse of the narrative (Leech and Short, 2007: 255-226).

7. ST: "Now, comrades," cried Snowball, throwing down the paint−brush, "to the hayfield! Let us make it a point of honour to get in the harvest more quickly than Jones and his men could do." (Ch.2)

TT: "wa-'alān 'ayuhā al-rifāq, hayā 'ilā al-ḥashā'ishi" ṣarakha snūbūl. "'innahu lasharfun lanā 'an najniya al-ḥaṣada bi-sur'atin 'akbara mimmā kāna yaf'alu jūnz wa-mu'āwinūh" (Abdulghani: 35)

[**Gloss:** "Now, comrades, to the hay" cried Snowball. It is an honour to reap the harvest more quickly than Jones and his men could do."]

TT: thuma ṣāḥa fīhāsnūbūl ba'da 'ann 'alqā bi-al-furshāti ṭāliban minhā al-tawajuha 'ilā al-'amali mudhakaran lahā 'anna 'amāmahā 'amalun ḍakhmun yaqa'u 'alā 'ātiqi al-ḥaywānāti 'an tū'adīhi khayran min jūnz wa-'iṣābatihi min al-ādmīīn! (Abada: 25)

[**Gloss:** then Snowball shouted on them after he threw down the paintbrush, *asking* them to go to work, and *reminding* them that there is a lot of work they have to do better than Jones and his gang of humans could do.

8. ST: "Ribbons," he said, "should be considered as clothes, which are the mark of a human being. All animals should go naked." (Ch.2)

TT: "al-sharā'ṭ"qāla mū'kidan "hiya shabihatan bi-almalābisi ,wa-hādhihi al-'ākhīrati tushīru 'ilā jinsi al-'insān. 'alā al-ḥaywānāti 'an yadhhabū 'urāh." (Abdulghani: 31)

[**Gloss:** "Ribbons," he said, confirming "these are like clothes, and these mark the human species. Animals should go naked."

TT: wa-'alana 'annahu ya'tabiru hādhihi al-'ashriṭati min qabīli al-'azyā'i al-basharīti allatī tatanāfā wa-almadhhabi al-ḥaywānī wa-mabād'i al-'irī!(Abada: 22)

[**Gloss:** and he*announced* that that he considers these ribbons as human clothes that do not conform to the approach of animalism and the principles of nakedness]

9. ST: "Muriel," she said, "read me the Fourth Commandment. Does it not say something about never sleeping in a bed?" (Ch.6)

TT: "mūrīl, iqrā'ī lī al-waṣyata al-rabi'ati. 'ālā tū'kidu 'alā 'adimi al-nawmi 'alā al-sarīr?" (Abdulghani: 76)

[**Gloss:** "Muriel, read me the Fourth Commandment. Does it not confirm not to sleep in the bed?"

TT: wa-ṭalaba minhāqirā'ata al-waṣyata al-rabi'ati 'allatī taḥ̣uru al-nawma 'alā al-'asarrah. (Abada: 59)

[**Gloss:** she *asked* her to read the Fourth Commandment that prevents sleeping in the beds.]

In Example (7), after the rebellion, Snowball leads the other animals to the hayfields and asks them to work harder than humans. Although Abdulghani's translation makes some changes in the formal structure of the original text (such as the shift from the imperative into declarative mood in the second clause), it still reports in the direct speech mode as it is in the original. Abada's translation however shifts the whole mode of report from direct into indirect. It features a narrator interpreting what has been said, with no "flavour of the actual words used" (Simpson, 2004: 32). In addition to performing certain grammatical operations (e.g., shifting from first and second person to third person pronouns), this shift has entailed an interpretation of the illocutionary act of the original utterances and explicitation of some performative verbs (like "ask" and "remind") that are not explicitly stated in the original to keep the original's communicative values.

In Examples (8) and (9) Abdulghani's translation in a similar vein tries to report verbatim the *actual words used* and leave it to the reader to infer the intended meaning, Abada's translation tries to capture what has been said. In (8), Mollie, a stupid horse who prefers ribbons over rebellion, asks if she will be able to continue to wear ribbons after rebellion, and Snowball tells her not to wear them because they are a sign of slavery. Abada's translation here renders Snowball's utterance in an indirect speech mood, where the narrator seems to commit himself/herself to make sense of what is said. The translation inserts here the performative verb "announced" that explicitates the assertive speech act of the original utterance. In (9), the animals find out that the pigs moved to the farmhouse and even started to sleep in beds. One of the horses, Clover, wonders about that and asks Muriel to read her the commandment that bans sleeping in beds again. The first clause of Clover's utterance is a directive speech act (a request), while the second clause is a directive (a question) or possibly an assertive statement that the Fourth Commandment bans sleeping in beds. Abada's translation gives an indirect reported speech which both presents the narrator's personal understanding and their statement of the illocutionary force of the character's utterances.

5. Discussion: Translational Trends

The numerical data in Table (1) show a greater tendency in the two translations to explicitate a performative verb (e.g., "reminded", "asked" or "consoled") that expresses more clearly the kind of illocutionary act performed in the original utterance. Out of a total of 278, 141 shifts (about 51% of the total number) involve an explicitation of a performative verb, while 80 shifts (about 29%) involve shift in speech mode and 57 (about 20%) involve shift in mood structure. This explicitation pattern suggests a translated narrative that opts for a narrator clarifying or revealing more of the characters' communicative intentions than the original does. If we assume that a narrative normally consists of sequences of interrelated speech acts (e.g., a question followed by an answer, see Example 1), the explicitation of performative verbs via translation should enhance this interrelatedness and increase sequential properties in the translated narrative (see Hatim and Mason, 2013: 76-78). This explicitation trend may then be linked to the translation 'universal' of explicitation, which postulates that a translation is normally more explicit and cohesive than its original (Blum-Kulka, 2000: 299-300). It in other words points to the general stylistic peculiarities of the translation language, which many empirical studies often find to be flatter, simpler, less ambiguous and less structured, than non-translation language (Pym, 2014: 76).

This feature of explicitation may be induced by the nature of translation process itself which necessitates a process of interpretation and explicitation (Blum-Kulka, 2000: 299-300), or may be related to a perception on the part of translators themselves of the task of translation as to mediate between cultures and supply readers with cognitive assistance when reading texts translated from foreign cultures (Saldanha, 2011: 46). But,given the complexity of the many contextual and socio-cultural factors affecting the translation task (e.g., translators' attitudes, experiences, time and space limitations, publishers' policies etc.), it may be difficult to relate the explicitation pattern in this study to a particular motivation on the part of the translator.

If we assume that the explicitation of illocutionary acts normally leads to a more explicit text, this explicitation trend can also be argued to eradicate the reader's interpretative options and minimize the inferencing processes in the translated

narrative. Communicating illocutionary acts, especially indirect ones, rely on, among other things, "the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer" (Searle, 1999: 31-32). Translating Napoleon's utterance "Long live Animal Farm!" into "He concluded his speech with an acclamation: 'Long live Animal Farm!'" (see Example 3), reflects a dynamic interpretive role on the part of translator, which at the same time leaves the target reader with little room for interpretation in comparison with the original reader. While "pragmatic indeterminacy" induces a more interactive relationship with a text, the explicitation of pragmatic functions in translation may weaken this relationship (Morini, 2008: 42), and probably reduces the reader's "engagement" or "involvement" in the narrative situation (Toolan, 2016: 37).

The explicitation pattern may affect the style of the original story in different ways. Orwell's style in *Animal Farm* is often described as the use of *concise*, *simple* and *unambiguous* language (Fowler, 2009: 63). As explicitations of illocutionary forces can make language appear less ambiguous and more direct and improve message explicitness in the translated text, these explicitations go in the same direction as that of the original style. Also, the explicitations seem to emphasize the narrative point of view and the psychological perspective adopted in the original story. Orwell uses a third-person omniscient narrator who knows everything and has a privileged access to the characters' feelings and thoughts. The explicitations of illocutionary acts would reveal more of the characters' internal intentions and attitudes, and hence would maximize the narrator's omniscience in the translated text.

Although the two translations show an overall pattern of explicitation, they differ in some other behaviours. The comparison of the data in Table (1) reveals that in comparison with Abada's, Abdulghani's translation shows a greater tendency to shift the mood structure of the locutionary content (e.g., from interrogative to declarative) while preserving the same mode of report (direct/indirect) as that of the original. The examination of the shifts in Abdulghani's translation reveals a tendency to shift from *imperative* and *interrogative* sentences with indirect illocutions to *declarative* sentences with more direct and explicit *assertive* illocutions, such as when translating the animals' exclamatory remark on the rebellion"What difference does it make whether we work for it or not?" into the assertive sentence "Whether we work for it or not is the same." This actually makes the locution propositionally match the illocution.

This orientation in Abdulghani's translation actually points to a tendency to shift from *indirect* to *direct* speech act. This kind of shift may have its effects on the *politeness* patterns in the original. Indirect speech acts are usually used for politeness reasons (Black, 2006: 19; Sadock, 2006: 71). The question "What difference does it make whether we work for it or not?" can be taken as an indirect, and hence polite, way of saying "It does not make any difference whether we work for it or not" and the question "Do you not see what they are doing?" also as a polite way of saying "You see what they are doing" (see Example 5 and 6). So, if we assume that "the real answer to why we are not more explicit, direct and fulsome in our utterances lies in the linked concepts of face and im/politeness" (Bousfield, 2014: 128), the shift into more direct speech acts would also point to a change in politeness strategies used by the speaking characters.

Whereas Abdulghani's translation tends to change the mood of locution while keeping the speech mode of the original, Abada's translation tends to change the speech mode from *direct* into *indirect*. Instead of saying "'Ribbons,' he said, 'should be considered as clothes, which are the mark of a human being'", Abada's translation says "he announced that he considers these ribbons as human clothes". His translation features a narrator producing, in comparison with Abdulghani's translation, a less faithful report of the original speaker's speech. The narrator here becomes an interpreter of what the original speaker means. Leech and Short (2007: 259) refer to this as a narrative report of speech acts (NRSA), which is often "useful for summarising relatively unimportant stretches of conversation". One effect of NRSA in the translated text is that the target reader will now see the speech act entirely from the perspective of the narrator, losing the "flavour of the actual words" used by the speaking characters in the original text (Simpson, 2004: 32). In comparison with the original text, this means a translated text that maximizes the narrator presence and involvement, but at the same time conceals the characters' attitudes and diminishes their speech identity or style.

The movement towards a greater NRSA in Abada's translation can have more potential effects on original style. For

instance, it creates less direct contact or more distance between the reader and the characters than the original text does. The narrative voice becomes now more interposed between the target reader and the character's speech. Furthermore, such distancing pattern in the translated narrative may provide a vehicle for more irony, which is an important stylistic feature of this animal satire (Frye, 2006: 52-53). NRSA allows for a dual perspective or voice of narrator and character within the narrative, which is often a potent source of irony (Black, 2006: 68). As Leech and Short (2007: 262) puts it: "the use of a form which creates distance between us and the character's words can only be interpreted as placing them in an ironic light". Abada's translation of Clover's utterance "'Muriel, read me the Fourth Commandment. Does it not confirm not to sleep in the bed?'" as "She asked her to read the Fourth Commandment that prevents sleeping in the beds" may cast an ironical light on the utterance. The increased NRSA in translation may then enable to cast more of Orwell's negative attitudes towards the revolution and help convey his political messages to the target reader in a more sarcastic way.

Fiction authors normally use a direct mode of report for what they believe to be the more important utterances and NRSA for the less significant ones (Black, 2006: 68). In addition to being an ironizing devise, NRSA is often used as a technique to compress a sequence of extended language exchanges (Simpson, 2004: 32). So, this tendency of Abada's translation to use greater NRSA than that of the original may point to a greater summarising effort and more concern for brevity in the translated narrative than that of the original. Finally, the shift into a greater NRSA can express a "standardization" process in the translated narrative: a movement towards a text with more habitual, normal or usual options than those of the original text (Toury, 2012: 304). In fiction, it is normal or conventional to use a verb tense that reconciles with the tense of the narrative (present or past) (Toolan, 1990: 178). It is also argued that the normal narrative tense in conventional fiction is the simple past (Black, 2006: 6). NRSA always involves an explicitation of a perfomative verb, always in the past tense (e.g., "asked", or "complained"). Since *Animal Farm* is a past-tense narrative, the greater NRSA in Abada's translation may reflect an effort to maintain the tense of the narrative and make the speech act more integrated in the narrative description.

6. Conclusion

This study has examined the shifts in speech acts in two Arabic translations of George Orwell's Animal Farm. The findings reveal a trend in the two translations to explicitate the illocutionary force of the original and broaden the narrator's omniscient knowledge of the characters' intentions. This explicitation trend increases the text's sequential properties and coherence, and emphasizes the simplicity and conciseness of the language of the original, nonetheless, minimizes the inferring process and the reader's dynamic relationship with the text.

Abdulghani's translation changes the grammatical mood of locutions in a way that reduces mismatch between form and force and shifts indirect speech acts to direct in a way that reduces the conventional indirectness used for politeness. Abada's translation, on the other hand, shows a preference for a less direct discourse which reports the speech act in a less immediate and faithful way, and which contributes to a more characterization of the narrator's voice than that of the speaking character. His translation leans towards using more narrative report of speech acts and switching into the narrator's discourse, which creates a monotonous speech that distances the target reader from the perspective of the original speaking character. This greater narrative report of speech acts, which allows for more juxtaposition of the narrator and characters' voices, is likely to trigger more irony and maximize the original author's negative criticism. The shift into indirect speech mode suggests a translator's preference for more standardized, as well as economical, language options during the decision-making process.

Findings of the study have shown that fiction translation may not always evoke an equivalent perlocutionary effect (Hickey, 1998), or perform an equivalent illocutionary function as that of the original (Hervey, 1998). Given the complexity of the interactive and dynamic features of the narrative text, achieving a narrative that "reproduces" or "re-performs" the same illocutionary acts as those of the original may require a special awareness and effort on the translator's part (Hatim, 2009: 205). Given the multifold effects of translational shifts in speech acts on the narratological structure, achieving

a narrative that is stylistically equivalent to the original seems also to be a challenge. However, even if the "intentional/performative values" of or in the original text are difficult to identify with any certainty (Morini, 2008: 37-38), the translator may at least need to identify those that shape the style of the original and give them priority in translation.

Finally, the study has proved the validity of speech act theory for exploring the stylistic characteristics of fiction translation. The findings of this study will hopefully help characterize the pragmatic features of English-Arabic fiction translations and raise the translators' awareness of the source text's implicit messages and stylistic features. Future research may explore these shifts in speech acts in a bigger corpus of English-Arabic fiction translations to derive a more solid conclusion on what fiction translations do in response to their originals.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, J. (1985). Animal Farms by George Orwell. London: Macmillan.

Austin, J. (1975). How to Do Things with Words, 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bell, R. (1993 [1991]). Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice. London: Longman.

Black, E. (2006). Pragmatic Stylistics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Blum-Kulka, S. (2000). Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation. In: Venuti, L. (ed.) The Translation Studies Reader. London and New York: Routledge. 298-313.

Boase-Beier, J. (2010 [2006]). Stylistic Approaches to Translation. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Bousfield, D. (2014). Stylistics, Speech Acts and Im/politeness Theory. In: Burke, M (ed.), The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics. London and New York: Routledge. 118-135.

Fowler, R. (1995). The Language of George Orwell. London: Macmillan.

Fowler, R. (2009). Animal Farm. In: Fowler, R. (ed.), Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Animal Farm. New York: Infobase Publishing. 59-78.

Frye, N. (2006). The Success and Failure of Animal Farm's Various Satires. In: Bloom, H. (ed.), Bloom's Guides: Animal Farm. New York: Infobase Publishing. 52-55.

Hassan, B. (2011). Literary Translation: Aspects of Pragmatic Meaning. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars.

Hatim, B. (2009). Pragmatics. In: Baker, M. and G. Saldanha (eds.), Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, 2nd edition. London: Routledge. 204-208.

Hatim, B. and I. Mason, (2013). Discourse and the Translator. London and New York: Routledge.

Hervey, S. (1998). Speech Acts and Illocutionary Function in Translation. In Hickey L. (ed.) The Pragmatics of Translation. Multilingual Matters: Clevedon. 10-24.

Kroeger, P. (2018). Analyzing Meaning: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Leech, G. and M. Short. (2007). Style in Fction, 2nd edition. UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Menchhofer, R. (1990). Animal Farm. USA: Milliken Publishing Company.

Mey, J. (2004). Pragmatics: An Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Morini, M. (2008). Outlining a New Linguistic Theory of Translation. Target Vol. 20. No. 1. 29-51.

Munday, J. (2008). Style and Ideology in Translation. New York and London: Routledge.

Petrey, S. (1990). Speech Acts and Literary Theory. London: Routledge.

Pym, A. (2014). Exploring Translation Theories, 2nd edition. London and New York: Routledge.

Sadock, J. (2006). Speech Acts. In: Horn L. and G. Ward (eds.), The Handbook of Pragmatics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 53-73.

Saldanha, G. (2011). Translator's Style. The Translator Vol. 17. No. 1. 25-50.

Searle, J. (1999 [1979]). Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simpson, P. (2004). Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students. London and New York: Routledge.

Toolan, M. (1990). The Stylistics of Fiction: A Literary Linguistic Approach. London: Routledge.

Toolan, M. (2016). Making Sense of Narrative Text Situation, Repetition, and Picturing in the Reading of Short Stories. London and New York: Routledge.

Toury, G. (2012). Descriptive Translation Studies-and beyond, Revised Edition. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Vinay, J-P. and J. Darbelnet. (1995). Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation, trans. and ed. by Sager J. and M. Hamel. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Warner, C. (2014). Literary Pragmatics and Stylistics. In: Burke, M (ed.), The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics. London and New York: Routledge. 362-377.

Yule, G. (2008). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arabic References

Abada, S. (2009). riwāyatu mazraʻati al-ḥaywān, (tarjamah). Morocco and Lebanon: al-markaz al-thaqāfī al-ʻarabī.

Abdulghani, M. (2014). mazraʻatu al-ḥaywān, (tarjamah). Cairo: dār al-shūrūq.

Appendix

The Library of Congress Transliteration System for Arabic Consonants and Vowels

Arabic symbol	Transliteration	Arabic symbol	Transliteration
ء	’	ف	f
أ	a	ق	q
ب	b	ك	k
ت	t	ل	l
ث	th	م	m
ج	j	ن	n
ح	ḥ	ه	h
خ	kh	و	w
د	d	ي	y
ذ	dh	ا	ā
ر	r	◌َ	a
ز	z	ي	ī
س	s	◌ِ	i
ش	sh	و	ū
ص	ṣ	◌ُ	u
ض	ḍ	◌ً	an
ط	ṭ	◌ٍ	in
ظ	ẓ	◌ٌ	un
ع	‘	◌ً	an
غ	gh		

التغيرات التي تطرأ على أفعال الكلام في ترجمة النص الروائي: نحو منظور سردي أكثر عمقاً وتجسيداً من الأصل

عثمان أبو العدس*

ملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى بحث التغيير لأفعال الكلام في ترجمتين عربيتين لرواية (مزرعة الحيوانات) لجورج أورويل، تشير نتائج الدراسة إلى أن النص المترجم عند مقارنته بالأصل يميل إلى توضيح أكثر لمقاصد الكلام مما يزيد من إدراك الراوي الضمني لأحداث وشخوص القصة، بينما قد يحسن هذا التغيير من ترابط النص وبساطته ودقته، فإنه قد يقلل من جهة أخرى من مشاركة القارئ وتفاعله مع النص، بينما تتجه إحدى التراجم المدروسة إلى مداولة مقاصد الكلام بين الشخصيات بشكل مباشر أكثر ممّا قد يؤثر في معايير لباقة الكلام في الأصل، وتتجه الترجمة الأخرى إلى إعطاء دور أكبر للراوي في سرد تلك المقاصد ممّا يعزز منظور الراوي في النص المترجم أكثر من الأصل، وهذه التغييرات من شأنها توحيد الأسلوب السردي، وتخفيف تنوع الأسلوب اللغوي في الأصل، وإقصاء مشاركة القارئ مع الشخصيات الأصلية، ولكن من جهة أخرى ربما تعمل هذه التغييرات على كشف المزيد من رأي ونظرة الرواي نحو شخوص القصة بطريقة تبعث المزيد من سخرية ونقد المؤلف للأحداث المروية.

الكلمات الدالة:أفعال الكلام، مقصد المتكلم، تغييرات الترجمة، توضيحات الترجمة، ترجمة النص الروائي.

*الجامعة الأردنية، فرع العقبة. تاريخ استلام البحث 2019/3/16، وتاريخ قبوله 2019/6/12.