

تحليل سيميائي لثلاث ترجمات عربية لرواية جورج أوريل 1984

A Linguistic Analysis of Rats Semiotics in Orwell's 1984 and its Three Arabic Translations: An SF-MDA

الباحثة: أبة محمد علام

المخلص:

يُعتبر هذه الدراسة محاولة لربط آلية صنع المعنى من خلال عملية الترجمة من النص الأصلي إلى النص المستهدف بمنهج تحليل الخطاب المتعدد الوسائط النظامي. تظهر أهمية هذا المنهج من خلال إستراتيجية عملية إستخراج المعاني المضمنة عبر السياق الذي المذكورة به تلك المعاني ، وعلاوة على ذلك فإن هذا المنهج يُعتبر طريقة لتوضيح النص من خلال التعرف على الإختيارات المعجمية التي تساهم بشكل كبير في عملية صنع المعنى. إعتقاداً على الأطر النظرية لكلا من هاليداي (2004) و كريس وفان لوين (2006)، فإن هذه الدراسة تُعتبر مقارنة لإعادة صياغة المعنى لعلامة "الفئران" السيميائية بين رواية أوريل 1984 و ثلاث ترجمات عربية للرواية ، حيث يتم توضيح وتفسير الإختيارات المعجمية لعلامة الفئران السيميائية في النص الأصلي من خلال العمليات الإنتقالية بإستخدام منهج تحليل الخطاب المتعدد الوسائط النظامي. وعلاوة على ذلك يتم مقارنة ترجمة العلامة السيميائية في الثلاث ترجمات العربية للتعرف على كيفية إعادة صياغة وتصوير الصور الساخرة لسيميائية الفئران في الثلاث ترجمات. البيانات المستخدمة في هذه الدراسة تتضمن رواية أوريل 1984 و كذلك ثلاث ترجمات عربية لنفس الرواية لكلا من أنور الشامي و أحمد خالد توفيق والحارث النبهان. تستنتج الدراسة أن عمليات الترجمة من اللغة الإنجليزية إلى اللغة العربية الفصحى تولد بعض التركيبات النحوية المختلفة فيما يتعلق بعلامة الفئران السيميائية من النص الأصلي إلى النص المستهدف ، وكذلك توضح الدراسة إنه تم تحليل العلامة السيميائية لغويا باستخدام منهج تحليل الخطاب المتعدد الوسائط النظامي بهدف إظهار وجهات نظر أوريل الساخرة من خلال ثلاث ترجمات عربية بشكل مختلف.

A Linguistic Analysis of Rats Semiotics in Orwell's 1984 and its Three Arabic Translations: An SF-MDA

Aya Mohamed Allam,

Suez Canal University

ayaallam166@gmail.com

Abstract

The current study is an attempt to interlink meaning making, through the process of translation from the source text (ST) to the target text (TT), to Systemic Functional Multimodal Discourse Analysis (SF-MDA) (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2006). Given the relevance to SF-MDA through the process of extracting embedded meaning within context, it serves as an approach to textual demonstration via the identification of lexicogrammatical choices which contribute to meaning construction. Based on Halliday's (2004) and Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) theoretical frameworks, the current study is a comparison between creating the meaning of ironical image through the semiotics analysis of the sign "**rats**" in Orwell's *1984* in three Arabic translations. The lexicogrammatical choices of the ST are interpreted through transitivity processes using SF-MDA approach. Further, the three translations of "rats" semiotics are compared and examined to investigate how the ironical imagery of "rats" semiotic connotation is re-narrated in the Arabic translations. Data of the current study

consist of Orwell's *1984* as the ST beside three translations from English to Arabic rendered by Enbhan, Tawfik and Eshamy.

Keywords: Source Text, Target Text, Systemic Functional, Multimodal Discourse Analysis, Translation

1. Introduction

Translation is a linguistic activity that allows people from diverse cultures to understand each other. Further, it enables them to understand the literary works of other cultures. Thereupon, translation is realized to be both as an interlingual and an intercultural activity. Also, it presents many challenges to translators since other languages are highly influenced by their original syntactic and cultural criteria. Culture of a specific language community encapsulates the entire tendencies of its members towards the world, current events, other people, and cultures in addition to the way through which such tendencies are to be considered and mediated (Daraghmeh, 2016). In this respect, translation is considered as a mediation process between many cultures and languages (Faiq, 2004).

Great writers are really aware of the existence of evil on earth. In a trial of salvation, writers' creative faculties are usually motivated within the scope of human dilemmas and sufferings. In addition, every writer is, directly or indirectly,

to prescribe a remedy so as to improve human conditions especially after a remarkable deviation owing to some materialistic tendencies through their literary works. Recently, employing linguistic theories within literature studies has become more common since they help to solve translation problems. Moreover, SF-MDA is regarded as one of the most common theories in viewing grammatical system as a resource of meaning construction. SFL was first introduced to translation studies by Halliday (2004) through his article about machine translation. Further, he argues that SFL provides essential tools for translation studies and that SFL can be explored as an approach to translation. When SFL is applied to translation studies, some considerable attention is directed to the ideational, interpersonal and textual meta-functions of language. The ideational metafunction is accomplished through transitivity system which covers processes of actions, relations, and events.

According to Leonardi (2007), understanding the transitivity structure and its elements contributes to grasping the original meaning lying between lines. Therefore, the transitivity elements which contain processes identified by verbs, participants, and circumstances contribute to constructing the ideational meaning which is coded in the ST of the translation process.

On the other side, the study of literature links language to man's psyche enabling him to understand the mutual influences of both on one another i.e., how language affects the ways through which people express their ideologies and how literature portrays the way through which people speak and write. Transitivity system is one of the tools that play an essential role in framing this relationship. Accordingly, this research tries to explore the ironic imagery expressed within transitivity structure and how such ironical imageries are transmitted into three Arabic translations by Enabhan (2014), Tawfik (2004) and Eshamy (2006).

To this end, the linguistic choices which are represented by transitivity system under the ideational metafunction are scrutinized in the ST concerning the recurrent imagery of rats in the ST through a selected passage extracted from Orwell's *1984* and its three translations. There are two questions to be answered in this study:

1. How do rats ironically dominate humans according to the relational process in Orwell's *1984*?
2. How do the three translators manage to portray the semiotics of rats through addition or omission in the TTs through phraseological levels?

2. Literature Review

The application of SF-MDA to translation studies is shown in many works such as Catford (1965) and House (1997). However, few studies using it are conducted on

literary translations. O'Halloran (2008) conducts a linguistic analysis on SF-MDA which is associated with the theory and practice of meaning analysis arising from the usage of multiple semiotic resources in discourses. The so-meant approach investigates the meaning which arises through linguistic use and visual imagery within some printed texts. Data are collected in the form of a printed advertisement so as to attain its ideational meaning. The analysis concludes that semantic metaphorical constructions (i.e., semiotic metaphors) obtain their occurrence across linguistic and visual components.

Ikemefuna (2015) conducts a systemic–functional linguistic analysis on Seti's poem "*A Cry of the Blind*". In accordance with Halliday (2014), the study demonstrates the three meta-functions within the poem: experiential, interpersonal, and textual. The study reveals that the poet is restricted to three processes, namely, material, relational and mental. These processes are distributed as 36.4%, 36.4% and 27.3%, respectively. The study concludes that such meta-functional use expresses and transposes the poet's personal life experience; Nevertheless, the analysis is limited to the original text, and no comparison is made with reference to translated texts.

3. Theoretical Framework

This section discusses a theoretical framework about semiotics and its development with reference to translation.

In addition, it sheds light upon SF-MDA approach which is eclectic. According to Halliday (1978, 1985a), Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is realized to be a social, descriptive linguistic theory. However, Kress and van Leeuwen's (1996) observe that MDA is system for the composition of information value.

3.1 Semiotics

Words never take place on their own. Not only do people take in the verbal message but they also make judgments about the speaker according to some background information and diverse extra-linguistic codes during listening to the speaker. These coded categories are likely to be either written or oral.

- **What is Semiotics?**

Semiotics is considered as the science which is associated with studying signs. In addition, it sheds light upon the ways people represent their world to themselves and to others. Furthermore, humans have the ability to communicate either verbally or non-verbally. In other words, to deliver a message, they are able to use signs, symbols, sounds or paralinguistic means. Therefore, semiotics is related to producing and interpreting meaning. According to Nöth, (1990), meaning is composed by nominating acts and objects which operate as signs in

relation to other signs. The complex relationships, which are allocated between a sign and another, constitute the signal system.

- **Semiotics and Translation**

Jakobson (1959) puts some differentiations across three ways of demonstrating a verbal sign:

- Intralingual translation in which a verbal sign can be translated into other signs of the same language involving rewording or paraphrasing.
- Interlingual translation in which a sign is inserted and interpreted into another language.
- Intersemiotic translation in which translation between sign systems is accomplished.

Translation implies two equivalent messages in two diverse codes (Jakobson, 1959). Therefore, the translator decodes the embedded meanings of the ST and then he recodes such meanings to transmit them as an equivalent message in the TT. Further, the literary text is considered to be combined of verbal signs and a culturally loaded linguistic system. Thus, it requires an accurate examination before carrying out the process of translation (Popovic, 1975). Furthermore, Popovic (1975) observes that the semiotic domain in translation is associated with the

distinctions found within translation process. These distinctions are a consequence of a diverse spatial realization of the translated text (Popovic, 1975).

- **Text**

Halliday (1978) defines the text as a sociological event or a semiotic encounter in which the meanings which formulate a social system are liable to exchangeability. According to Halliday (1978), a text can be acknowledged as a semantic unit which represents a choice. In other words, a text is defined as actualized meaning potential which is represented as optional ranges that are related to a certain situation category (Halliday, 1978). Furthermore, Halliday adds that meaning is constructed in messages which are explored within clauses inside the texts which are understood in accordance with a social-semantic context.

Hodge and Kress (1988) mention the following contextual functions:

1. The semiosis context is arranged according to textual series with assigned meanings to participants' categories.
2. The participants' behavior is restricted according to logonomic systems which operate through messages about signifying power and solidarity.
3. Participants transmit a great profusion of messages in a lot of codes about the exchangeable status and their own roles.

4. The set of messages implies a generalized version of social relations.

3.2 SF-MDA

According to Djonov (2005) and O'Halloran (2007) Systemic Functional Multimodal Discourse Analysis (SF-MDA) is considered to be an approach which is associated with discursive analysis regarding social semiotics. Chandler (2007) and Cranny-Francis et al. (1991) point out that social semiotics is concerned with the study of semiotics which is socially orientated towards a certain approach.

Halliday defines semiotics as the study of sign systems. In other words, it sheds light upon the study of meaning in its most comprehensive sense (Halliday & Hasan, 1989). Halliday is a considerable linguist; furthermore, the semiotic system with which he is most associated is language; however, he views language as an interaction with both semiotic systems and communication i.e., multimodal. Halliday (1978) observes that meanings mutuality is an influential process in which language is realized to be as one symbolic resource. Thereby, Halliday's definition refers to the definition of either social systems or cultural concepts, as a meaningful system. Eco (1976) says that the word 'social' indicates a particular scope of the relationships

between language and social structure which regards the social layers as one domain of the social system (Halliday & Hasan, 1989).

O'Halloran (2005) puts forth some essential definitions which are associated with SF-MDA as shown below:

1. Semiotic resource (semiotic system) shapes meaningful resources composed in diverse domains such as languages, visual images, mathematical symbolism, and architecture which are arranged into sign systems.
2. Mode (modality) is considered as the channel of communication; it is probably visual, aural, olfactory, or tactile.
3. Medium which formulates the material resources that are used in semiotic events, including both the tools and the materials used in musical instruments, as an example. (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001)
4. Multi-semiotic approach which combines diverse semiotic resources such as language, image, and music in a communicative act; multi-semiotic texts may or may not combine different modes such as visual and aural in a communicative act.

3.2.1 Convergence of Multimodal Texts and Meta-functions

Both SF and MDA converge in describing a mode which is a “socially and culturally shaped resource for meaning making” (Bezemer & Kress, 2008, p. 171). That is to say, texts are always composed for a certain determined purpose (Aiello, 2006). Accordingly, there are differentiations in the ways through which modes are formulated and surveyed. That is to say, visual modes are generally more reliant on spatial layouts whereas linguistic modes are typically more linear (Serafini, 2010). Therefore, it is essential to understand how multimodal texts are composed and the meanings related to them within a determined cultural context. Halliday (1995) and Kress and van Leeuwen (1996) argue that language and visuals simultaneously operate for three purposes:

- ideational/representation,
- interpersonal/interactive, and
- textual/compositional” (Shanahan, 2013).

These purposes cover what they call meta-functions, or ways of understanding and discussing the relationships between modes and what can be nominated with them (Jewitt, 2005) i.e., the categories of meaning-making functions available in communication. Halliday (1985) represents the three meta-functions according to his system of functional grammar (SFG).

That is to say, the ideational meta-function identifies the content and what is explored in one's experiences of the surroundings; However, the interpersonal metafunction denotes the ways in which relationships across texts and individuals are composed. Further, the textual meta-function identifies the ways in which a text is created to conform to its coherence. Kress and van Leeuwen (1996) adapt Halliday's work for visual communication in the sense that they concentrate upon how images are produced and interpreted. In addition, they use the terms representational, interactive, and compositional to describe the three meta-functions respectively.

According to Halliday (1985) and Kress and van Leeuwen (1996), the three meta-functions conform to each other. The representational metafunction is associated with how modes convey a notion (Bourdieu, 1991); However, the interactive function is interpreted according to both exemplifying and communicating (Kress & van Leeuwen, 1996). Regarding this meta-function, both images and texts are described through the analysis of the demand and offer, framing and social distance, perspective and subjective and objective images, and horizontal and vertical angles (Lewis, 2001) as well as words (e.g., "you", "sir", Bourdieu, 1991). The interactive metafunction is defined in accordance with modality and how true or close to "real life" the image/text is (Lewis, 2001).

Concerning, the compositional meta-function, it is associated with textual composition through the multimodal resources and how this influences the reader's view.

Unsworth (2006) divides the ideational metafunction into three parts. The first part is associated with is concurrence, meaning “one mode elaborates the meaning of the other by further specifying or describing it while no new element is introduced by the written text or image” (Unsworth, 2008, p. 61). This can be obtained in terms of exemplification, exposition and equivalence.

The second is complementarity in which a mode is extended or enhanced by another meaning. This can be accomplished through augmentation (i.e., additional meanings) or divergence (i.e., opposed meanings). However, the third is interconnection in which meaning is composed through projection (reporting speech or thoughts) or conjunctive connection (relationships of time, place, and cause). The ideational metafunction, combined with the other meta-functions, creates and formulates the attitude or the tone of the composition of modes.

3.2.2 Points of Contact between SFG and MDA

Whereas SFG introduces a transitivity system composed of six processes to explore ideational content in accordance with verbal language, Visual Grammar (VG) covers two main dynamics: narrative and conceptual processes. Generally, narrative processes describe participants ‘doing’ something or performing an action while conceptual processes describe the participants’ general state of affairs. According to Kress and van

Leeuwen (1996), both SFG and VG introduce some similarities according to their semiotic categories.

Material processes of Halliday's transitivity system introduce linguistic functions which share correspondence with narrative processes because both serve to represent 'outer experiences' in the material world. Further, both existential and relational processes realize meanings similarly to conceptual processes because all of them are inclined about expressing 'being and having' status. In other words, the way in which participants are realized as things or actions/events refers to existential process and the way in which participants are explored in terms of their attributes refers to relational process.

__Doing and Happening: Material and Narrative Processes

➤ **Material Processes**

In SFG, material processes allocate and define actions in the material world according to physical actions like happenings (such as 'running' and 'throwing') and transformations unfolding through time and space ('cooking') (Halliday, 2004). Two types of material processes are monitored depending on the process nature: creative and transformative. The first category of the material process; creative, refers to those clauses in which a participant comes into existence (Kress; van Leeuwen, 1996): for example : 'I cooked dinner', that is, there is no dinner before I cook it; However, transformative process refers to those clauses that identify some changeability in an

existing participant: ‘He made the bed’, that is, the bed seems tidy now as he has acted upon it.

In material clauses, there is at least one participant who performs the action (actor). In transitive clauses there is also the goal; the participant at whom the action is oriented, as shown in the following table:

Table 1 Material Process Demonstration

Actor	Material Process	Goal
My sister	made	the bed

“My sister” (actor) is doing a physical action (made) which is directed to another participant represented as an inanimate object (the bed). The process type is transformative because the actor is changing or modifying the external aspects of the goal.

- **Narrative Processes**

Similarly, narrative processes in VG describe a physical action which identifies an event, a movement, or a change in state (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 1996). It denotes carrying out a specific scope of physical activity associated with a game as an example.

Table 2 Material Process Demonstration Narratively

Actors	Material Process	Goal
The boys	are playing	tennis

__Being, having and existing: Relational, Existential and Conceptual Processes

➤ **Relational Processes**

In SFG, relational processes characterize and identify things (either concrete or abstract ones) through setting a relationship of identity or class membership across two entities (Halliday, 2004). Two kinds of relational processes are observed, in Halliday's words, 'two modes of being': attributive and identifying.

➤ **Relational Attributive Processes**

Relational attributive processes set up a relation of class membership across two participants through signaling to the reader that an entity (a participant called carrier) has some class attributed to it (Halliday, 2004) as seen the following table:

Table 3 Relational Attributive Processes

Carrier	Attributive Process	Attribute
The boys	are	well-mannered

➤ Relational Identifying Processes

Relational identifying processes nominate a participant's identity by establishing a relationship of signification between two entities in which one of them is used to identify (identifier) the other (identified) (Halliday, 2004), as shown in the following table:

Table 4 Relational Identifying Processes

Identified	Identifying Process	Identifier
Sally	is	a famous girl

• Types of Relational Processes

Attributive and identifying modes of being have a variety according to the category of relationship established across participants. There are three main categories of relations expressed by the English system: intensive, possessive and circumstantial:

- Intensive is the type of relation in which a participant is identified by another ('x is y') (Halliday, 2004).

- Possessive is the type of relation in which participants set a part-whole relationship in the clause ('x has y') as illustrated by 'She has nice eyes in the following table:

Table 5 Possessive Attributive Processes

Carrier	Possessive Attributive	Attribute s
She	has	nice eyes

Circumstantial is a relational category in which participants establish a relationship in terms of a circumstance (time, place, manner etc.) as seen in the following table:

Table 6 Circumstantial Attributive Process

Carrier	Circumstantial Attributive	Attributes
The festival	is	on Wednesday

- **Existential Processes**

Existential processes inform the reader about the existence of an entity (e.g., ‘There is a man at the door’) or a happening (e.g., ‘There was a storm yesterday’) (Halliday, 2004). These processes present only one participant (the existent) which is usually accompanied by a circumstance of time and place as seen in the following table:

Table 7 Existential Process

Existential	Process	Circumstance
There	is	an accident in the street

4. Methodology

The current study adopts a qualitative-descriptive approach to analyze ironical imagery of the semiotic sign of rats in Orwell's *1984* within a certain selected passage through SF-MDA and how this sign is translated into three Arabic translation versions. Qualitatively, the study interprets the image of irony in the ST and the three translations through phraseological levels. Thus, the transitivity system is investigated to reveal how this image is created in the ST and recreated in the TT within the extracted passage through phraseological levels. The study also follows a comparative approach in data analysis regarding the three Arabic translations to state similarities and differences in the neo-versioned translations.

5. Analysis and Discussion

This section investigates how transitivity system processes contribute to creating of the recurrent ironical image of the sign of "rats" in the ST and how such ironical image of the sign is translated into three Arabic translations within a selected passage. The following passage presents

the types of transitivity process, participants and circumstances in the semiotics of rats in Orwell's *1984*:

‘The rat,’ said O’Brien, still addressing his invisible audience, ‘although a rodent, is carnivorous. The rats are certain to attack it. Within quite a small time, they will strip it to the bones. They also attack sick or dying people. They show astonishing intelligence in knowing when a human being is helpless.’ (p. 360)

Regarding the former extract, it is explicit that Orwell syntactically exploits NP 'rats' in the location of subject; However, there are some varieties of material and relational processes as shown in the following table:

Table 8 Transitivity Processes in Rats' Semiotics

The Structure Process					
Material	Actor	Material	Goal	Circum.	
	They	will strip	it	to	the bones
	They	attack	sick or dying people		
They	Show	astonishing intelligence	in	knowing...	
Relational	Carrier	Attribute	Attributive		
	The rat	is	carnivorous		
	The rats	are	certain to attack it		
A human	is	helpless			

In terms of the former table, it is noticeable that the NP "rats" has a syntactic variety in accordance with material and relational processes; However, the relational process includes three linguistic structures to express Winston's fears of rats (musophobia). Furthermore, material processes include three linguistic structures.

It is clear that Orwell uses the sign of rats in a certain way so as to convey how fearful they are especially when

Winston and Julia are caught in the Ministry of Love to be tortured. This passage is run by O'Brien addressing Winston. O'Brien uses some NPs which identify paradox namely "rodent" and "carnivorous" to present a fearful visual imagery of the rats despite their little size. Furthermore, Orwell uses some VPs to portray the rats' savagery through portraying some kinesthetic and visual imagery such as: "attack", "strip", and "show".

There upon, Orwell manages to convey his ironical tendency through the use of some mono-transitive verbs which need direct objects. The NP "body", operating as the direct object, is replaced by the presence of the pronoun "it" in the infinitive phrase "to attack it" and the future simple tense "will strip it". Further, the rats' extra-ordinary powers are formulated in the use of the additional particle "also" which is followed by the mono-transitive verb "attack". The use of plurality versus singularity refers to the ironic power of rats against humans. The previous passage ironically portrays rats as violent monsters who prey on weak humans. Moreover, rats are ironically considered to be a mini incarnation for the society who is ruled by the Party who also preys on the Oceania citizens by controlling them through spreading fear and constant surveillance.

In accordance with the contrastive analysis of the three Arabic translations, Enabhan, Eshamy, and Tawfik present their translations to the previous passage as shown below:

- قال أوبراين لا يزال مخاطبا جمهوره غير المرئي "الجرذ حيوان .. فمن المؤكد أن الجرذان سوف تهاجمه .لاحم مع أنه من القوارض... , و هي تلتهمه حتى العظام خلال وقت قصير. إنها تهاجم أيضا الأشخاص المرضى أو المحتضرين. و هي تظهر ذكاء مدهشا في قدرتها على معرفة متى يكون الإنسان عاجزا عن الدفاع عن نفسه. (النبهاني, ص, 297)
- قال أوبراين و كأنه لا يزال يخاطب جمهورا لا يرى " إن الجرذان , ورغم أنها من القوارض , هي من آكلات اللحوم أيضا. بل أنها أيضا تهاجم المرضى و من يحتضرون على فراش الموت. و هي في ذلك تظهر ذكاء مذهلا في معرفة متى يكون الإنسان عاجزا و لا يستطيع حتى الدفاع عن نفسه." (الشامي , ص, 336)
- قال أوبراين " الفئران في هذه البقعة من المدينة آكلة لحوم. إن لديها حاسة خارقة لتتبين متى تكون ضحيتها عاجزة. (توفيق, ص , 103 جـ 2)

5.1 Enabhan's Translation

In accordance with the previous passage, Enabhan prefers to use the gerund through the present participle of the mono-transitive verb 'addressing'. Enabhan translates the first sentence as shown below:

- The rat, although a rodent, is carnivorous.
- الجرذ حيوان لاحم مع انه من القوارض

Within the TT, Enabhan prefers to begin with the nominal sentence; furthermore, he prefers to retard the

contrast clause in a final position. To clarify, six lexemes are to be included in the ST; however, Enabhan renders eight lexemes as shown below:

Table 9 Enabhan's Parallel Translation of the ST

ST	The rat	is	carnivorous	although	a rodent
TT	الجرذ	حيوان لاحم	مع انه	من القوارض

In accordance with the former contrast, it is explicit that Enabhan prefers to use the strategy of addition and omission in his translation. Firstly, some lexemes are retained across both ST and TT namely the NP "the rat" and the adjective "carnivorous". Furthermore, some lexemes are added namely "حيوان" and the 3rd person singular masculine "-ho" which identifies its anaphoric reference to "the rat". In addition, he translates the NP "a rodent" into three lexemes as "من القوارض" as a PP.

In terms of the following sentence, it is rendered as follows by Enbhan:

- The rats are certain to attack it."
- فمن المؤكد أن الجرذان سوف تهاجمه

Regarding the ST, the copulative verb to be is preceded by the NP "the rats" which forms the subject; however, it is

followed by the predicative adjective "certain" which is thought to be its subjective complement. Furthermore, the adjectival phrase is followed by the infinitive clause which is shaped form "a preposition + a verb + a pronoun". Such structure is grammatically rendered as a mono-transitive verb + a direct object. However, in the TT, Enabhan begins his translation with a PP which is structured of the preposition "من" plus the NP "المؤكد". Furthermore, the PP is followed by the complementizer clause which is syntactically parallelized with the ST as below:

Table 10 Lexemes and syntactic Function of the ST and TT

Lexemes	الجرذان	سوف	تهاجم	هـ
Phrases	NP	aux	VP	NP
Function	Subject	Mono-transitive		Direct Object

Such structure, indicating S+V+O, is common especially after the complementizer clause. Therefore, two lexemes are additionally existent within the TT namely "فـ" and "سوف". In addition, the S+ Copulative "be" + Subject Complement + an infinitive clause + (mono-transitive verb + direct object) are rendered into PP + complementizer clause "S+V+O".

In terms of the following sentence, Enbhan renders it as below:

- "Within quite a small time they will strip it to the bones."
- و هي تلتهمه حتى العظام خلال وقت قصير.

In accordance with the ST, Orwell prefers to begin with a PP, a preposition + adverb + determiner + adjective + noun. Consequently, he resumes his structure with the 3rd person plural which indicates the subject of the sentence. It is followed by the VP which identifies a mono-transitive verb+ DO which is rendered in the pronoun "t". Further, he finished his sentence with the prepositional phrase.

On the other side, in the TT, Enabhan begins with the independent pronoun "هي" which represents the anaphoric reference to "the rats". The independent pronoun "هي" is considered to be an equivalent for the 3rd person plural "they" in the ST. He, then, follows the independent pronoun "هي" with the mono-transitive verb "تلتهم" which is followed by the dependent pronoun "هـ" which identifies the direct object of the verb. He prefers to follow the direct object with the PP "حتى العظام"; However, he inverts the position of the PP "within quite a small time" to be put into a final position of the sentence as "خلال وقت قصير".

In terms of the following sentence, Enbhan renders it as follows:

- They also attack sick or dying people.

- انها تهاجم ايضا الأشخاص المرضى أو المحتضرين.

According to the two former extracts, lexemes are rendered as below:

ST:	They	also	attack	sick	or	dying people
TT:	انها	ايضا	تهاجم	المرضى	أو	المحتضرين

In accordance with the former extracts, Orwell follows the syntactic structure of “a subject + a mono-transitive verb + a direct object”. Subsequently, there's almost full equivalence across the ST and TT except for the emphatic particle "إن". On the other hand, Enabhan prefers to begin with the emphatic annuller particle "إن" which is attached to the dependent 3rd person singular feminine "ها" which is regarded as an anaphoric reference to “the rats”. However, this dependent pronoun syntactically refers to the nominative case. Therefore, it can be said that the presence of the complementizer "إن" contributes to equalizing both structures of the ST and TT in which the complementizer "إن" is followed by the structure of “S + V + O”. Furthermore, Orwell's parallelized coordinated structure of “sick or dying people” is translated into the linguistic block "الأشخاص المرضى والمحتضرين". In the sense that, the AdjP “sick or dying people” which is composed of “an adjective “sick” + a coordinator “or” + an adjective “dying” + noun “people” is translated into the NP which is composed of “a determiner "ال"+ noun "الأشخاص”+ an

adjective "المرضى" + coordinator "او" + an adjective "المحتضرين".

In terms of the last sentence, it is rendered by Enbhan as follows:

- They show astonishing intelligence in knowing when a human being is helpless.
- و هي تظهر ذكاء مدهشا في قدرتها على معرفة متى يكون الانسان عاجزا عن الدفاع عن نفسه.

The TT is featured by a semi-full retention of the ST's lexemes; however, Enabhan presents two additional phrases, which do not have equivalents in the ST, to his translation. The first phrase is the PP "فى قدرتها" which does not have any equivalent in the ST. Thus, in case of omitting such PP from the TT, the meaning is not to be affected. According to the second additional phrase, Enbhan adds the PP "عن الدفاع عن نفسه" after the adjective "عاجزا". Although such phrase has no literal equivalent in the ST, its addition may be useful to assert the idea of human beings' fragility and the savagery of rats.

1. Tawfik's Translation

According to Tawfik, he renders the passages as shown below:

- قال أوبراين " الفئران في هذه البقعة من المدينة آكلة لحوم. إن لديها حاسة خارقة لتتبين متى تكون ضحيتها عاجزة.

According to Tawfik's translation, the TT lacks a lot of lexemes. Moreover, there is a loss of some sentences within the TT. Tawfik's translation seems to grasp some essential points of the ST regardless of the entire linguistic aspects of the ST as shown below:

ST:	The rat	in	quarter	of	town	carnivorous
TT:	الفئران	في	هذه	البقعة	من	المدينة	أكلة لحوم

Tawfik renders some scattered lexemes, ignoring many lines. His translation is syntactically composed of "NP "الفئران" + PP "في هذه البقعة" + PP "من المدينة" + AdjP "أكلة لحوم". The first NP "الفئران" represents the subject of the sentence; nevertheless, the last AdjP "أكلة لحوم" represents the predicate which is considered to be the SC of the subject. According to Musabhién (2009), MSA is characterized by delayed predicate; Thus, Tawfik places the two PPs "في هذه البقعة" and "من المدينة" to separate the subject from its predicate. However, there some omitted structures and sentences within Tawfik's translation in accordance with the former passage.

In terms of the last sentence, Tawfik renders it as follows:

- They show astonishing intelligence in knowing when a human being is helpless.

- ان لديها حاسة خارقة لتتبين متى تكون ضحيتها عاجزة

Tawfik begins his translation with the complementizer "إن". He, then, follows the complementizer with the PP "لديها". This PP is composed of the preposition "لدى" which is attached to the 3rd person singular feminine "ها" which is anaphoric reference to "الفئران". Such PP expresses the rats' possession of attacking abilities. Thus, Tawfik renders "they show" in the ST into the PP "لديها". Moreover, the AdjP "astonishing intelligence" in the ST is translated into the NP "حاسة خارقة". However, the ST's lexeme "intelligence" is changed from its abstract essence to be rendered as a sensory image of the rats. Furthermore, both phrases "astonishing intelligence" and "حاسة خارقة" are syntactically diverse, in the sense that, "حاسة خارقة" represents the nominative case of the complementizer "إن" in the TT, whereas the AdjP "astonishing intelligence" is realized to be the direct object of the mono-transitive verb "show" in the ST. In addition, Tawfik renders the PP "in knowing" into the dependent particle "لـ" which expresses causality and the imperfect aspect of the mono-transitive verb "تتبين".

Moreover, Like Enbhan, Tawfik translates the adverbial clause "when a human being is helpless" into "متى تكون ضحيتها عاجزة"; however, Tawfik renders the lexemes "human being" in a satirical tone to become the NP "ضحيتها" in the TT. This phrase is considered to be the nominative case of the defective verb "تكون". Such NP "ضحيتها" is an exaggerated word that represents humans as victims of the

"rats"; in other words, the NP "ضحية" identifies rats as predators although they are not. Satirically, Tawfik portrays human beings as very weak creatures. Furthermore, the predicate of the defective verb "ضحيتها" is followed by the AdjP "عاجزة" as an equivalent for the adjective "helpless" in the ST, to represent the brittle nature of humans in contrast to the rats.

In accordance with Eshamy, he renders his translation in a similar way to Enabhan. Furthermore, He translates the introduction of O'Brien's direct quote into a simile which expresses O'Brien's showy manner as if he is talking to audience that he cannot see. Such introduction is rendered by Eshamy as below:

- "____", said O'Brien, still addressing his invisible audience
- قال أوبراين و كأنه لا يزال يخاطب جمهورا لا يرى

Eshamy presents his simile using the word "كأنه". Moreover, he renders the adverb "still" as the VP "يزال" which is preceded by the particle "لا" which indicates O'Brien's continuation of speech. Eshamy also renders the Adv.P "addressing" as a VP to become "يخاطب". In addition, the adjective "invisible" in the ST is translated into adjectival clause "لا يرى"; in other words, the adjective "invisible" which is syntactically considered to be a pre-modifier for the NP "audience" is translated into the

adjective clause "لا يرى" which is composed of the negative particle "لا", which is considered as an equivalent for the negative prefix "in_" , and the imperfect aspect of the passive verb "يرى" as a supplemented clause.

2. Eshamy's Translation

In terms of the first sentence, Orwell renders it as displayed hereby:

- The rat, although a rodent, is carnivorous
- إن الجرذان , ورغم انها من القوارض , هي من آكلات اللحوم أيضا .

It is explicit that Eshamy prefers to add some lexemes which are not existent within the ST. Furthermore, he prefers to begin his translation with the plural of the singular lexeme "the rat" within the ST. That is to say, the subject "rat" in the ST is translated into the plural noun "الجرذان". Moreover, the contrasted clause of the ST "although a rodent" which is composed of the conjunction "although" + determiner "a" + noun "rodent", is rendered into the contrast conjunction "رغم" and a nominal clause which is headed by the complementizer "إن" followed by the dependent pronoun of the 3rd person singular feminine "ها". Consequently, the predicate of the complementizer "إن" is the PP "من القوارض". This PP is composed of the preposition "من" + the definite noun "القوارض" and is marginalized by two commas. Furthermore, the complementizer clause is followed by the predicate of the plural noun "جرذان" which is represented as the PP "من آكلات الحوم". In addition, Eshamy unnecessarily

adds the addition conjunction "أيضا" at the end of the sentence.

In terms of the following sentence, Eshamy renders it as below:

- They also attack sick or dying people.
- بل أنها أيضا تهاجم المرضى و من يحتضرون على فراش الموت.

Eshamy syntactically adds some lexemes in the TT. Beginning with the palinode particle "بل", Eshamy expands the imagery of the rats' brutality because they do not prey on babies only, but they also attack older people. Moreover, the 3rd person plural "they" in the ST is rendered into the complementizer phrase "إنها" which is composed of the complementizer "إن" and the dependent pronoun "ها" which is an anaphoric reference to "the rats". Furthermore, the addition conjunction "also" in the ST is translated into "أيضا" in the TT. Thus, the presence of "بل" and "أيضا" refers to the savagery emphatic imagery of such fearful creatures. Subsequently, Eshamy translates the mono-transitive verb "attack" in the ST into the mono-transitive verb "تهاجم" which is followed by its direct object "المرضى" which is realized to be the equivalent for the adjective "sick" in the ST. Then, the coordinated phrase of the ST "or dying people" is translated into the Arabic relative clause "و من يحتضرون على فراش الموت". Thus, Eshamy extends the AdjP "dying people" into a nominal clause which is composed of

"a conjunction "من" + imperfect verb "يحتضرون" + PP "على"
فراش الموت

In terms of the last sentence, Eshamy renders it as follows:

- They show astonishing intelligence in knowing when a human being is helpless.
- و هي في ذلك تظهر ذكاء مذهلا في معرفة متى يكون الانسان عاجزا و لا يستطيع حتى الدفاع عن نفسه.

Regarding the former extracts, it is clear that Eshamy nearly accomplishes a full syntactic parallelism across the ST and TT except for in two positions in which he prefers to add some lexemes to assert the ideas which are conveyed by the sentence. In the first position, Eshamy adds the PP " في ذلك" which expresses the rats' intelligence in detecting helpless people such as babies, sick, and dying people to attack them. Furthermore, he adds the final clause "لا يستطيع الدفاع عن نفسه" which is realized to be an extensive assertion for the SC "helpless" to emphasize the ideas of human's fragility and rats' brutality.

Eshamy begins his translation by rendering the independent 3rd person plural pronoun "they" into the independent 3rd person singular feminine "هي". Then, Eshamy translates the mono-transitive verb "show" into the mono-transitive verb "تظهر" in the TT. Furthermore, the AdjP "astonishing intelligence", which operates as the direct

object of the verb “show” in the ST, is translated as the NP “ذكاء مذهلا” in the TT. In addition, the PP “in knowing” which is composed of the preposition “in” + the gerund “knowing”, is translated into the PP “في معرفة” in the TT. Subsequently, Eshamy renders the relative clause “when a human being is helpless” into a parallel syntactic structure, to be rendered as “متى يكون الإنسان عاجزا”. Nonetheless, Eshamy presents the additional clause “لا يستطيع الدفاع عن نفسه” which gives the same of the adjectival phrase “helpless” which is translated as “عاجزا” in the TT.

5. Conclusion

The study investigates how Tawfik, Eshamy, and Enabhan recreate the ironical meaning of the sign of rats into their translations. This is done by analyzing a selected passage including the sign of rats using SF-MDA to investigate the embedded ironic meanings of the sign in the ST. Moreover, the study explores the lexicogrammatical choices employed by the three translators to reproduce the ironical image of rats. Further, the three translations are compared from the perspective of syntactic manipulations to examine how the three translators render the sign of rats into their Arabic translation.

The findings of the study show that the translators manage to convey the ironical image of rats as depicted by Orwell in the ST. Throughout the whole passage, the total number of the phraseological units is nearly the same;

however, some additions and omissions are apparent in certain positions. More specifically, Tawfik tends to elide a lot of linguistic units to be compensated by two sentences. On the contrary, Eshamy and Enabhan tend to preserve almost all the linguistic units of the ST with some modifications.

References

Aiello, G. (2006). Theoretical advances in critical visual analysis: perception, ideology, mythologies, and social semiotics. *Journal of Visual Literacy*, 26(2), 89–102.

Bezemer, J., & Kress, G. (2008). Writing in Multimodal Texts: A Social Semiotic Account of Designs for Learning. *Written Communication*, 25(2), 166–195.

Bourdieu, P., & Thompson, J. B. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.

Catford, J.C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics: The basics* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Cranny-Francis, A., Matthiessen, C., Threadgold, T., & van Leeuwen, T. (1991). Editorial. *Social Semiotics*, 1(1), 1-3.

Daraghmeh, S. H. M. (2016). *Cultural Consistency in the Literary Translation of the Novel Awlaadu Haaratena* (Doctoral dissertation).

Djonov, E. (2005). *Analyzing the Organization of Information in Websites: From Hypermedia Design to Systemic Functional Hypermedia Discourse Analysis*.

Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of New South Wales, Sydney.

Eco, U. (1976) *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington, In: Indiana University Press/ London: Macmillan.

Enabhan, M. Hareth. (2004). *George Orwell's 1984*, Tanweer publishing House, Cairo, Egypt.

Esahmy, Anwar. (2013). *George Orwell's 1984*. Arab Cultural Center, Casa Blanca, Morocco.

Faiq, S. (2004). *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1975). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. A., & Christian, M. I. M. Matthiessen. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 3rd.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1985) *Language, context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Hodge, R. & Kress, G. (1988) *Social Semiotics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

House, J. (1997). *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Narr.

Ikemefuna, Luke., (2015). A Systemic Functional Analysis of Aleti Seti's "A Cry of the Blind". University of Ilorin, P.M.B. pp.15-35.

Jakobson, R. (1959) "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation", in R. A. Brower (ed.). *On Translation*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 232-239.

Jewitt, C. (2005). Multimodality, "Reading", and "Writing" for the 21st Century. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 26(3), 315–331.

Kress, G. and Van Leeuwen, T. (2006) *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Leonardi, V. (2007). *Gender and Ideology in Translation. Do Women and Men Translate Differently?* Bern and Oxford: Peter Lan

Lewis, D. (2001). *Reading contemporary picture books: Picturing text*. Psychology Press.

Musabhien, M. (2009). *Case, Agreement and Movement in Arabic: A Minimalist Approach* (Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University).

Nöth, W. (1990) *Handbook of Semiotics*. Bloomington & Indiana Polis: Indiana University Press.

O'Halloran, K. L. (2005). *Mathematical Discourse: Language, Symbolism and Visual Images*. London: Continuum.

O'Halloran, K. L. (2008). Systemic Functional-multimodal Discourse Analysis (SF-MDA): Constructing Ideational Meaning Using Language and Visual Imagery. *SAGE Publications Visual Communication*, 7(4), pp. 443-475.

Popovic, A. (1975) *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. Edmonton, Alta: University of Alberta Press.

Serafini, F. (2014). Exploring wordless picture books. *The Reading Teacher*, 68(1), 24- 26.

Tawfik, A. Khalid. (2008). *George Orwell's 1984*. Modern Arab Institution, Cairo, Egypt, Selah Etelmeeth Press.

Unsworth, L. (2008). Multiliteracies and metalanguage: Describing image/text relations as a resource for negotiating multimodal texts. In Coiro, J., Knobel, M., Lankshear, C., & Leu, D. J. (Eds.).