
From Fiction to Function: Translating Newspeak's Ideological Intent in Dystopia Literature

Aderboub Nassima¹

University of Algiers 2, nassima.aderboub@univ-alger2.dz

Reçu le: 29/08/2025

Accepté le: 23/09/2025

Publié le ..././....

Abstract:

Newspeak in George Orwell's *1984* is a constructed language created to limit expression and suppress independent thought. Unlike ordinary translation tasks, where equivalence can often be established, Newspeak resists transfer because its very design distorts meaning and enforces ideological control. Debate persists over whether translation should preserve its strangeness to reflect Orwell's warning or adapt it for easier comprehension. In Arabic, the challenge is heightened by linguistic and cultural differences that complicate the rendering of neologisms and ideological distortions. The translator must therefore decide whether to retain the alienating features that embody Newspeak's oppressive design or to clarify meaning for the sake of accessibility. This tension highlights the broader question of whether translating Newspeak is primarily a linguistic exercise or an ethical act of preserving its critical force.

Keywords: Newspeak; Orwell; Arabic translation; interpretive translation; ideology; dystopian literature; linguistic manipulation.

1. Introduction:

Every society reveals its power structures through language, and few works illustrate this as sharply as George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In the novel, Newspeak emerges as a language stripped of nuance and deliberately constructed to curtail imagination and suppress critical thought. Unlike ordinary linguistic systems that evolve organically to expand human expression, it was engineered to reduce complexity and confine what can be conceived. This makes it not only a fictional invention but also a symbol of how regimes can reshape reality through control of words.

For translators, the challenge of handling Newspeak lies in this very paradox. Its vocabulary was designed to deform meaning rather than convey it, which places the translator in a difficult position when rendering it into another language. In Arabic, the task is further complicated by structural differences, cultural expectations, and ideological resonances that

¹ Corresponding Author : Aderboub Nassima

affect how Orwell's neologisms are received. The translator must therefore decide between two paths: to preserve the unsettling strangeness that embodies Orwell's warning, or to adapt it into familiar forms that aid comprehension while risking a loss of force.

This study approaches the problem by combining theoretical reflection with practical analysis. It first explores the ideological and linguistic function of Newspeak within Orwell's narrative. It then considers how interpretive approaches to translation can inform strategies for carrying its critical power into Arabic. Finally, through case-based analysis of key terms, it evaluates how far Arabic renderings capture the satirical violence and ideological distortion that make Newspeak an enduring critique of totalitarian language.

2. The Ideological Nature of Newspeak

2.1. Definition and Creation of Newspeak in Orwell's 1984

Can controlling words control minds? George Orwell believed so, and in his novel 1984, he brings this idea to life through Newspeak, a language carefully engineered to suppress independent thought and eliminate dissent. Set in the totalitarian state of Oceania, the novel reveals that psychological domination is achieved not only through constant surveillance but also through the calculated manipulation of language. Orwell makes this intent clear when he writes, "the purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression... but to make all other modes of thought impossible" (Orwell, 1949/2021, page. 343). This statement highlights his view that language is not merely a tool for communication but a mechanism capable of shaping and limiting human thought itself.

This concept is echoed in the analysis by Subaihi & Hanita (2020, p. 289), who argue that the regime deliberately narrows language to influence cognition and suppress the possibility of resistance. Their insight reinforces the idea that controlling what people can say also controls what they are able to think. Building on this, Youvan (2024, p. 3) emphasizes that Newspeak functions as the central tool of ideological enforcement. By embedding power structures within language, the regime ensures that even the seeds of rebellion are linguistically and mentally impossible to form.

These perspectives illustrate Orwell's powerful warning: language is never neutral. When manipulated, it becomes a tool of domination that governs not just speech but the very capacity to think freely. Newspeak, in this light, is not just fictional vocabulary, it is a metaphor for how oppressive regimes can shape reality itself by distorting the language people use to understand it.

2.2. Political Purpose Behind the Structure and Vocabulary of Newspeak

2.2.1. Restriction of Thought

Imagine a world where rebellion never needs to be punished because it cannot even be imagined. This is the quiet danger of Newspeak in 1984. Orwell presents a system where language is stripped down until independent thought has no soil in which to grow.

It has been noted that brute repression can often be resisted, but the deliberate reduction of vocabulary penetrates much further, undermining the inner life of the individual (Rogenmoser, 2018, p. 7). Such a limitation is not merely a restriction on speech; it reshapes the terrain of consciousness itself. When words vanish, the ideas they carry are weakened, and the ability to formulate opposition dissolves before it can even be imagined. In this sense, linguistic constraints prove more powerful than physical coercion, for they anticipate rebellion at its very source, the realm of thought.

This insight becomes sharper when considering how systematically language is diminished in *1984*. The project of Newspeak is not to improve communication but to carve away the very possibilities of expression until nothing remains outside the Party's frame of reference. Shadi (2018, p. 183) makes clear that by compressing expression to such an extreme, Newspeak erases alternative perspectives from human awareness altogether. His observation shows that linguistic contraction is never neutral; it is an ideological act that collapses the boundaries of thought itself. When words are pruned, the concepts they represent fade into silence, leaving individuals incapable of imagining what lies beyond the permitted lexicon. Thus, what appears as a narrowing of vocabulary is, in reality, the construction of a cognitive cage. Silence, in this light, is not absence but design, an engineered void that eliminates dissent before it can even be born.

2.2.2. Manipulation and Control

If restriction limits what people can say, manipulation goes further by reshaping how they interpret what remains. Once vocabulary is redesigned, patterns of thought are redirected, guiding perception along lines already sanctioned by power. As the lexicon contracts, the cognitive space for reflection shrinks with it, leaving fewer avenues for independent reasoning (Hossain et al., 2024, p. 3). This suggests that the most insidious form of control is not the open prohibition of expression but the quiet reorganization of mental categories. When alternative formulations no longer exist in the language, they cease to exist in the imagination, and the possibility of resistance dissolves before it ever reaches articulation.

This process, however, is not passive; it works through the systematic dismantling of linguistic resources. By "systematically destroying" words, the very tools required for criticism and resistance are eroded (Meyers, 1975, p. 21). Manipulation thus operates from within language itself, embedding ideology in the structures people use every day. Over time, the absence of certain terms produces a subtle but profound reconfiguration of reality, one in which categories of dissent are neither spoken nor even conceived. The result is a form of control that does not silence openly but shapes thought at its source, ensuring compliance by predetermining the boundaries of what can be imagined.

2.2.3. Framing Reality

The most profound function of Newspeak lies in its ability to reshape the way reality itself is understood. Orwell explains in the Appendix that once words are removed from language, the concepts they represent also begin to disappear from thought (Orwell, 1949/2021, p. 343). Through this process, ideals such as freedom, justice, or rebellion are not only silenced but gradually erased from the collective imagination. Language here is not just a tool of expression; it is the framework through which people grasp what is possible, and by narrowing it, the Party narrows reality itself.

Historical parallels make this vision even more striking. Rogenmoser (2018, p. 8) compares the Party's strategy to colonial practices of language suppression, where the imposition of a dominant tongue fractured cultural identity and reshaped memory. In both cases, controlling language meant controlling how communities understood themselves and their past. Extending this idea further, research shows that authoritarian regimes rely on similar mechanisms, using linguistic control to enforce a single version of truth (Libman et al., 2024, p. 14). Thus, once rival vocabularies are erased, alternative realities are silenced along with them, leaving only the narrative sanctioned by power.

This echoes the way framing is used in diplomatic language, where the way an issue is presented shapes how it is understood and what kind of response it invites (Chaalal, 2022, p. 442). But in Newspeak, this framing is absolute, no alternative view remains to be framed or responded to.

What disappears is not just a set of words but the capacity of a community to imagine and articulate its own perspective, a process that transforms language from a medium of shared meaning into an instrument of ideological monopoly.

Restriction pares thought down to its barest limits, manipulation bends what remains into sanctioned patterns, and the framing of reality ensures that no other vision can endure. What emerges from this triad is not simply a diminished language, but an altered human condition. By removing words, Newspeak hollows out the very terrain of thought, leaving individuals incapable of recognizing what has been lost. By redirecting meaning, it trains minds to accept imposed categories as natural, reducing critical awareness to a shadow of itself. And by narrowing reality, it ensures that the structures of power appear inevitable, the only possible truth against which no alternative can even be imagined.

This layering of control reveals that language is not a passive medium but an active force, one that can cultivate silence as deliberately as speech. In the world of 1984, the absence of words is not emptiness but design: an engineered void where rebellion cannot germinate because its vocabulary has already been erased. Resistance does not die in confrontation with authority; it vanishes earlier, in the collapse of linguistic resources that once made opposition conceivable. The reader is left to see how power operates most effectively not through the

brutality of force, but through the quiet restructuring of consciousness, a transformation so deep it disguises itself as normality.

Newspeak, then, is more than an artificial language; it is the template of totalitarian control. Its structure demonstrates how suppression can wear the mask of simplicity, how control can operate invisibly through everyday words, and how ideology can settle into language so completely that it ceases to feel imposed. This is Orwell's sharpest warning: once words are surrendered, thought itself follows, and with it the capacity to imagine freedom.

2.3. The Paradox of Simplicity

The striking feature of Newspeak is not merely the reduction of vocabulary but the illusion of simplicity that governs its structure. By presenting itself as an accessible and orderly linguistic system, Newspeak creates the appearance of transparency and clarity. Yet this very simplicity is deceptive, for it conceals an intricate ideological mechanism that channels expression along predetermined lines (Orwell, 1949/2021, p. 344). The act of simplifying does not neutralize language; rather, it transforms simplicity into a tool of control. As has been observed in critical analysis, what seems to strip away complexity for the sake of efficiency in fact generates a linguistic construct that eliminates subtlety and depth while masking coercion under the pretense of clarity (Doboş, 2022, p. 117). In this way, the paradox emerges: the simpler the language appears, the more effectively it functions as a sophisticated instrument of domination, normalizing conformity while erasing the possibility of alternative ways of thinking.

3. Translation Theories in Dialogue with Newspeak

Translation is never a simple matter of transferring words across languages; it is always entangled with questions of how meaning is interpreted and reshaped. This becomes especially visible when the text itself resists equivalence, when language is designed not to communicate freely but to restrict, distort, or conceal. In such cases, the translator faces a dilemma: should the task be to reproduce the form of the words, or to recover the intentions that lie beneath them? This tension is at the heart of translating Newspeak. As a language invented to compress and manipulate thought, its terms cannot be carried over mechanically without losing the very force they were meant to exert. The problem then is not only how to find words in another language, but how to carry across the distortion, the strangeness, and the ideological weight that define Newspeak itself.

3.1. The Interpretive Theory of Translation

Translation has long been approached as a process that goes beyond the surface level of words, raising the question of how meaning can be carried from one linguistic system into another without distortion. One influential answer to this problem is offered by what has become known as the Interpretive Theory of Translation, associated with work at the

University of Paris in the mid-twentieth century (Seleskovitch, 1978; Lederer, 1994). This framework shifts attention from words themselves to the underlying sense they convey, suggesting that translation is not simply a matter of substituting signs but of reconstructing meaning across languages.

Within this approach, the act of translation is understood as unfolding in distinct stages, beginning with comprehension of the original message, followed by deverbalization where the linguistic shell is set aside, and culminating in reformulation in the target language (Zhu, 2020, p. 129). Seen in this light, translation becomes a dynamic cognitive process rather than a mechanical operation, requiring the translator to continuously balance fidelity to sense with the linguistic and cultural demands of the target audience.

This interpretive dimension is further underlined by perspectives that stress translation's non-linear and interactive character. Instead of a straightforward transfer, it is described as an interpretive activity in which meaning is extracted, reshaped, and re-embedded in new linguistic structures (Zhao, 2015, p. 1140). Such a view emphasizes that interpretation is inherent to translation itself, for the translator must actively decide how best to transmit the intended message without reducing it to mere equivalence.

Building on this, further arguments highlight that the task of the translator is not to reproduce form at all costs, but to ensure that the effect and intention of the original reach the reader. Literalism, in this sense, risks obscuring meaning, while fidelity to sense preserves the communicative force of the text (Hong & Rossi, 2021, p. 103). This reminder situates the translator as an interpreter, a figure who mediates between texts and contexts, rather than a neutral conduit of words.

When these perspectives are applied to Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, their significance becomes sharper. The constructed vocabulary of Newspeak resists literal rendering, since its ideological weight depends on distortion, simplification, and strangeness. A purely lexical transfer risks draining the terms of their political charge, while an interpretive approach makes it possible to reformulate them in ways that preserve their function as instruments of critique. In this sense, translating Newspeak illustrates how the Theory of Sense and related frameworks open space for thinking of translation not as replication, but as an interpretive act that determines how a text's meaning survive across languages.

3.2. Umberto Eco: Translation as Negotiation

Umberto Eco conceives of translation as a process of negotiation, "by virtue of which, in order to get something, each party renounces something else" (Eco, 2013, p. 129). This formulation underscores that translation is never a matter of simple transfer but an act of compromise, where gains and losses are inseparable. Meaning does not travel unchanged; it is reshaped as the translator decides what must be preserved and what can be sacrificed. From this perspective, the role of the translator becomes one of balancing competing demands. On one

side lies fidelity to the source, with its linguistic form and cultural weight. On the other lies the target audience, whose language and interpretive framework inevitably transform the text. Negotiation is the space where these forces meet, a process that requires continual adjustment rather than fixed solutions.

Such an understanding is especially relevant to Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four. Newspeak was designed to deform thought by collapsing meaning, and any attempt to translate it confronts the impossibility of full equivalence. What Eco describes as renunciation becomes unavoidable: the translator may preserve the unsettling strangeness of the terms, but at the cost of accessibility, or pursue clarity, but with the risk of softening their ideological violence. In this way, Eco's model of negotiation exposes the heart of the dilemma, showing that translation is never neutral, but an act of choice shaped by what is gained and what is lost.

3.3. George Steiner: Hermeneutic Motion

George Steiner's hermeneutic model frames translation as a fourfold movement: trust, aggression, incorporation, and compensation. Trust begins with the assumption that the text carries meaning worth recovering. Aggression follows as the translator dismantles and interrogates the text to grasp its core sense. Incorporation then embeds this recovered meaning into the target language and culture, and finally, compensation addresses inevitable losses through creative adaptation (Steiner, 1975/2007, pp. 296–298). This cycle highlights that translation is not mechanical substitution but a transformative dialogue between languages, where meaning must be deconstructed and rebuilt. By foregrounding loss and recovery, Steiner shows that translation involves creativity as much as fidelity, demanding from the translator both critical distance and imaginative reconstruction.

Steiner further describes translation as “the most intense form of reading” (Steiner, 1975/2007, p. 293), a practice that forces the translator to go beyond surface understanding, engaging critically and interpretively at every step. This insight resonates strongly with the case of Newspeak. Orwell's invented vocabulary is deliberately constructed to obscure and restrict thought, presenting the translator with terms that resist straightforward rendering. To engage with Newspeak, therefore, is to embody Steiner's idea of intense reading: each neologism demands to be broken apart, interrogated for its ideological weight, and then carefully reconstructed in the target language.

In this sense, the hermeneutic motion mirrors the translator's struggle with Newspeak. Trust is tested because the text itself is built on distortion, aggression is required to dismantle its deceptive simplicity, incorporation must account for cultural and linguistic differences, and compensation becomes indispensable when direct equivalents cannot capture the satirical force of Orwell's critique. By situating translation as both critical reading and creative reconstruction, Steiner's framework underscores why Newspeak so forcefully resists translation: its language is not merely to be carried across but to be wrestled with, interpreted, and reshaped without losing its oppressive charge.

3.4. Lawrence Venuti: Translator's Visibility and Ideology

Lawrence Venuti shifts the debate by exposing translation as a political act. He critiques the long-standing tradition of translator invisibility, where texts are made to read fluently in the target language, thereby hiding the translator's role and reinforcing dominant cultural values (Venuti, 1995, pp. 1-5). As an alternative, he advocates foreignization, which maintains the strangeness of the source text and forces readers to confront cultural difference (Venuti, 1995, pp. 19-20). This approach underscores that translation is never a neutral act but an intervention that either assimilates or resists difference.

Viewed through the lens of Newspeak, A domesticated translation might read easily and naturally, but in doing so it risks softening the sharp satire and weakening the political critique carried in Orwell's invented words. On the other hand, a more foreignizing approach keeps their strangeness intact, forcing the reader to confront the same unease and disruption that Orwell built into the language. In this way, Venuti shows that translating Newspeak is not just about choosing words, but about making a political choice: whether to smooth over its unsettling power or to preserve it for the reader in all its disturbing force.

4. Translation, Ideology, and Mediation

Translation is never a neutral transfer of meaning; it is always shaped by the social, cultural, and political contexts in which it takes place. It has been observed that "translation today is deeply influenced by cultural and literary theory" (Pérez-González, 2023, p. 372), a reminder that linguistic activity is embedded within broader intellectual and ideological frameworks. This influence means that translating is not a detached linguistic act but part of larger cultural negotiations about how knowledge and values are transmitted across communities.

The position of the translator within this process is equally significant. As has been described, the translator is a "socially and historically constituted subject" (Zaid & Bennoudi, 2023, p. 246), which implies that their work inevitably reflects their cultural positioning and historical moment. Translation, in this sense, does not simply mirror an original but reshapes it through the lens of the translator's own interpretive stance. This makes the translator not only a linguistic agent but also a participant in the circulation of ideas, one whose choices determine what is highlighted, silenced, or transformed in the act of transfer.

This active role becomes even clearer when considering the ethical and political implications of translation. It has been argued that translators can "reinforce, resist, or question" dominant discourses (Monzó-Nebot, 2020, p. 14). Such a view highlights that every translation carries a dimension of power: the choice to preserve, adapt, or omit elements of a text directly affects how it will be read and understood. Translation thus becomes an act of responsibility, shaping the reception of a text and its ideological impact across linguistic boundaries.

Within this perspective, the translator is best understood as a cultural mediator rather than a neutral conduit. Mediation implies intervention, where meaning is not only transferred but reinterpreted in light of the target culture's linguistic and ideological resources. This makes translation an act of positioning, one that can open space for resistance and dialogue or, alternatively, reproduce existing hierarchies by softening or erasing critical voices. In this way, translation reveals itself as a practice where language, ideology, and ethics converge, requiring constant negotiation between fidelity to the source and responsibility toward the target

5. Challenges of Translating Newspeak to Arabic

Translating Orwell's Newspeak presents obstacles that far exceed the usual challenges of transferring meaning between natural languages. Unlike ordinary linguistic systems that grow and evolve with usage, Newspeak was deliberately engineered to diminish vocabulary, flatten nuance, and curtail thought. These features turn the translator's task into a struggle not only with linguistic forms but also with cultural distance and ethical responsibility. The following subsections examine how these challenges unfold within the linguistic, cultural, and ethical dimensions of translation, with particular emphasis on Arabic.

5.1. Linguistic Dimensions

Constructed languages are deliberately designed rather than naturally evolved, which makes them less flexible and more restricted in their expressive capacity (Sanders, 2016, p. 192). This rigidity becomes especially apparent in Newspeak, whose reduced lexicon was created to impoverish expression and reinforce political control (Lidfors Andersson, 2020, p. 3). The translator, therefore, confronts a language that does not expand toward clarity but collapses inward, designed to close off interpretive possibilities.

The challenge is compounded by structural gaps. Invented languages often lack temporal structures such as past and present, complicating their transfer into natural languages that rely heavily on tense and aspect (Shadi, 2018, p. 184). This absence disrupts coherence across systems, creating uncertainty for translators attempting to maintain consistency. Moreover, because Newspeak has no native speakers, there is no living standard of reference, leaving translators to navigate an ambiguous terrain where equivalence must be constructed rather than replicated (Hietaranta, 2022, p. 140).

These linguistic limits intersect directly with Newspeak's ideological function. Political language, as noted in translation studies, is highly technical and often symbolic, resisting straightforward equivalence (Sárosi-Márdirosz, 2014, pp. 163–168). Rendering Newspeak into Arabic, therefore, risks flattening its ideological force if approached literally. The task becomes one of preserving sharpness and distortion, ensuring that Orwell's neologisms continue to expose manipulation rather than being absorbed into ordinary speech.

5.2. Cultural Dimensions

Linguistic difficulty is further intensified by cultural distance. English and Arabic differ substantially in grammar, syntax, semantics, and idiomatic expression (Elhadary, 2023, p. 104). These structural divergences demand that translators rely on interpretive judgment rather than literal substitution, a process made more complex by Newspeak's deliberate reduction of vocabulary and grammar (Akan, Karim, & Chowdhury, 2019, pp. 61–63).

Cultural context deepens this challenge. Arabic has historically been a language of both authority and resistance, carrying traditions of eloquence, rhetoric, and religious authority. By contrast, Newspeak is a language created solely for domination, one that erases alternatives rather than expressing them. This sharp contrast complicates its translation into Arabic, as the target language often resonates with emancipatory connotations that clash with Newspeak's oppressive design. The translator must therefore decide whether to emphasize the alien harshness of Orwell's invention or integrate it into the cultural rhythms of Arabic, each choice shaping how readers perceive Orwell's critique.

5.3. Ethical Dimensions

The ethical challenges of translating Newspeak arise from the impossibility of neutrality. Translation choices inevitably position the translator within structures of power, since reformulations can either reinforce authoritarian discourse or resist it by exposing its distortions (Monzó-Nebot, 2020, p. 15). This makes the act of translation not only a technical task but one that carries political and ethical weight, shaping how Orwell's critique is received across cultures.

The historical dimension of this problem shows that translation has long been recognized as a site of influence. Far from being a neutral craft, it has often been subjected to mechanisms of censorship, credentialing, and institutional regulation (Tymoczko, 2006, p. 452). When viewed in relation to Orwell's novel, this insight highlights the translator's responsibility to avoid reproducing the very strategies of silencing that Newspeak itself embodies. In this sense, translation becomes a moral act, demanding decisions that determine whether Orwell's warning is preserved with its critical sharpness or softened into harmless familiarity.

6. Case-Based Reflection on Key Terms

The translation of Newspeak cannot be separated from the specific terms that carry its ideological weight. Each neologism in Orwell's novel was carefully designed to distort language, flatten meaning, and reshape thought. Examining how these terms have been rendered into Arabic reveals not only linguistic and cultural challenges but also the interpretive choices and ethical responsibilities of the translator. The following case studies highlight how meaning shifts across languages and what is gained or lost in the process.

6.1. Doublethink

The Arabic translation "التفكير المزدوج" conveys the idea of holding two contradictory beliefs at once with precision and clarity. It makes the concept easily accessible to Arabic readers, but in doing so it loses the strangeness that Orwell embedded in the original term. In English, Doublethink is disturbing precisely because it collapses contradiction into a compact compound, embodying the absurd logic of the Party. In Arabic, the phrase feels conventional and even neutral, turning Orwell's satirical invention into a standard expression. The unsettling jolt that should expose ideological distortion instead risks being smoothed away.

6.2. Thoughtcrime

Rendered as "جريمة الفكر," the Arabic translation powerfully conveys the criminalization of thought. Its clarity captures the absurdity of punishing inner mental activity. Yet the phrasing inevitably resembles a standard legal term. In English, Thoughtcrime is not simply descriptive; it fuses "thinking" and "breaking the law" into a single unnatural unit, erasing the boundary between private reflection and criminality. Arabic separates the elements, making the concept understandable but softening the linguistic shock. What in Orwell's text reads as an assault on categories risks becoming formal and familiar in Arabic.

6.3. Minluv

The Arabic "وزاحب" attempts to mirror Orwell's clipped abbreviation for the Ministry of Love. While inventive, it feels strange rather than bureaucratically banal. In English, Minluv mimics the sterile language of administration, concealing violence beneath a neutral label. Its satire comes from the contrast between the word "Love" and the institution's role in torture. The Arabic version, however, produces a neologism that feels awkward and confusing. Instead of exposing cruelty hidden in ordinary bureaucracy, it draws attention to its own strangeness, which weakens Orwell's critique.

6.4. Doubleplusgood

In Arabic, Doubleplusgood becomes "جيد جداً جداً." The phrase succeeds in intensification but does so by natural repetition. Orwell's original collapses language into a childish formula, embodying Newspeak's assault on nuance. The Arabic form, by restoring rhythm and familiarity, undermines that poverty of expression. Rather than confronting readers with a linguistic tool designed to reduce thought, it offers them a comfortable way of saying "very good." The critical force of Orwell's satire is softened, as a phrase meant to illustrate linguistic impoverishment becomes a natural expression of emphasis.

6.5. Unperson

Translations such as "شخص غير موجود" or "لاشخص" communicate the erasure of existence effectively. The first is precise, while the second is closer in form to Orwell's coinage. Yet both fall short of replicating the chilling bluntness of Unperson. In English, a single word

annihilates identity, reducing a life to nothing with bureaucratic efficiency. Arabic tends toward description, which risks softening the effect by turning annihilation into absence. Even the compact "لاشخص" feels awkward rather than coldly administrative. The violence of erasure thus reaches Arabic readers as an idea, but not with the same linguistic immediacy.

6.6. Duckspeak

A literal translation like "كلام البط" produces "duck talk," which risks being humorous in Arabic, evoking silly images of quacking. The satirical edge is lost, since Arabic lacks the cultural link between ducks and meaningless noise. A compressed neologism like "بطق" could mimic Orwell's blend but may confuse readers. The problem lies in cultural mismatch: what in English lampoons empty political slogans risks sounding either comical or obscure in Arabic. The ideological function of exposing language as empty sound is weakened when the metaphor does not resonate across cultures.

6.7. Ownlife

When translated as "حياة خاصة" or "حياة منفردة," Ownlife becomes familiar in Arabic, evoking privacy or solitude. Yet in Arabic cultural contexts, these carry positive meanings associated with dignity and personal space. Orwell's neologism, however, marks individualism as subversive and dangerous. The translation therefore risks inverting the term's ideological weight, softening its condemnation into affirmation. A forced neologism could reproduce strangeness but would likely alienate readers. As it stands, the Arabic choices convey meaning but dilute Orwell's critique of individualism as deviance.

6.8. Goodthink

"تفكير جيد" translates Goodthink literally, but the result shifts its ideological tone. For Arabic readers, the phrase suggests healthy or constructive thinking, something desirable. Orwell's invention, however, is sinister. By twisting the word "good," the Party redefines morality as obedience. The Arabic phrasing restores naturalness, making the concept reassuring rather than oppressive. A more artificial form could retain the distortion but might lose readability. The outcome is that readers grasp the notion of approved thought yet miss the manipulation of moral categories that makes Orwell's term so disturbing.

7. Conclusion

Newspeak exposes the profound connection between language and power. Orwell's invention is not just a fictional vocabulary but a warning about how words can be reshaped to control thought, restrict imagination, and normalize obedience. When this language crosses into translation, its challenges multiply. Every attempt to carry Orwell's invented words into another language shows how meaning can shift, how satire can be softened, and how

ideological critique can be preserved or lost. These tensions remind us that translation is not a neutral act but a process of interpretation that shapes how ideas live on across cultures.

The examples of Newspeak in Arabic highlight how language resists easy transfer. Words that once shocked with their strangeness become familiar, phrases meant to impoverish thought gain fluency, and satire risks turning into awkwardness. Yet these struggles are not signs of failure. They show that translation is a series of decisions in which meaning must be reshaped, and where each choice either preserves or weakens the force of Orwell's critique. In the case of Newspeak, those decisions determine whether his warning still unsettles or gradually fades into normality.

The larger lesson is clear. Words are not passive containers of meaning but active forces that shape how people think, feel, and imagine their world. When language is manipulated, reality itself is redefined. And when language crosses borders, translators act not just as linguistic experts but as cultural and ideological mediators. To translate Newspeak is more than a linguistic task; it is an ethical and political act. It requires resisting simplification, preserving strangeness, and keeping alive the critical power of language. To protect language is to defend the freedom to think, and that may be the translator's greatest responsibility.

8. Bibliography List:

- Al-Subaihi, Mohammed & Ismail, Hasan (2020), *Orwell's 1984 and the concept of powerlessness*, International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences, India, 5(1).
- Chaalal, Imen (2022), *Persuasion in Arabic and English Diplomatic Discourse*, Cahiers de Traduction, Algiers, 27(special issue).
- Eco, Umberto (2013), *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, United Kingdom.
- Elhadary, Thanaa (2023), *Linguistic and cultural differences between English and Arabic languages and their impact on the translation process*, International Journal of Language and Translation Research, Iran, 3(2).
- Faruquzzaman Akan, Md., Karim, Md. Rabiul & Chowdhury, A. K. (2019), *An analysis of Arabic-English translation: Problems and prospects*, Advances in Language and Literary Studies, Australia, 10(1).
- Hietaranta, Panu (2022), *Constructed languages and translation: Comparing conlang translation with natural language translation*, RiCOGNIZIONI, Italy, 9(18).
- Hong, Wei & Rossi, Chiara (2021), *The cognitive turn in metaphor translation studies: A critical overview*, Journal of Translation Studies, France, 5(2).
- Hossain, Md. S., Kabir, Md., Yeasmin, F., Ahsan, G. & Sepai, S. (2024), *Harnessing words, shaping minds: A comparative analysis of Newspeak in 1984 and language manipulation in Animal Farm*, International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, India, 8(11).

-
- Lederer, Marianne (1994), *La traduction aujourd'hui: Le modèle interprétatif*, Hachette, France.
 - Libman, Alexander, Romanov, Dmitry & Zakharov, Alexey (2024), *Why dictators use Newspeak?*, SSRN Electronic Journal, <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5034536> (accessed on 01/07/2025).
 - Lidfors Andersson, Julia (2020), *The Viability of Orwell's Newspeak: Through the Theory of Saussurean Semiotics*, Faculty of Humanities, Kristianstad University, Sweden.
 - Meyers, Jeffrey (1975), *George Orwell: The Critical Heritage*, Routledge, United Kingdom.
 - Monzó-Nebot, Esther (2020), *Translation, power, ethics: Challenging injustice in cross-cultural understanding and cooperation*, Linguapax Review, Spain, 8.
 - Orwell, George (2021), *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Penguin Classics, United Kingdom. (Original work published 1949)
 - Pérez-González, Luis (2023), *Context in translation and interpreting studies*, The Cambridge Handbook of Language in Context, United Kingdom.
 - Rogenmoser, Benedikt (2018), *Newspeak warrants new thought: Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four and linguistic determinism in Nazi language*, The Review: A Journal of Undergraduate Student Research, United States, 19(1).
 - Sanders, Nathan (2016), *Constructed languages in the classroom*, Language, United States, 92(3), <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2016.0055> (accessed on 03/07/2025).
 - Sárosi-Márdirosz, Klára (2014), *Problems related to the translation of political texts*, Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica, Romania, 6(2).
 - Seleskovitch, Danica (1978), *Language and cognition*, in Gerver, D. & Sinaiko, H. W. (Eds.), *Language Interpretation and Communication*, Springer, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-9077-4_29 (accessed on 29/06/2025).
 - Shadi, Mohammad (2018), *The principles of Newspeak or how language defines reality in Orwell's 1984*, The Journal of International Social Research, Turkey, 11(59).
 - Steiner, George (2007), *After Babel*, Oxford University Press, United Kingdom.
 - Tymoczko, Maria (2006), *Translation: Ethics, ideology, action*, The Massachusetts Review, United States, 47(3).
 - Venuti, Lawrence (1995), *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, Routledge, United Kingdom.
 - Youvan, David (2024), *The semiotics of Newspeak: Language, power, and thought control in Orwell's 1984*, <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.32611.57128> (accessed on 14/04/2025).
 - Zaid, Amel & Bennoudi, Nacira (2023), *Ideology and translation*, International Journal of Language and Literary Studies, Algeria, 5(1).
 - Zhao, Yan (2015), *The application study of the interpretive theory in the college English course: The case study of Qingdao University of Science and Technology*, Journal of Language Teaching and Research, China, 6(5).
 - Zhu, Yan (2020), *Application of the interpretive theory of translation to business interpretation*, Journal of Educational Issues, United States, 6(1).