The Pragmatics of Persuasion in Fictional Communication

Ayman Khafaga[1&3], Raneem Bosli[2] & Maha Al-Anazi[1]

[1] College of Science & Humanities, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

[2] Arts and Humanities Faculty, Jazan University, Saudi Arabia

[3] Faculty of Arts & Humanities, Suez Canal University, Egypt

Correspondence: Ayman Khafaga, College of Science& Humanities, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: a.khafaga@psau.edu.sa

Abstract

By drawing on a pragmatic approach manifested in five pragmatic concepts: directive speech acts, rhetorical questions, back-channel support, gap-bridging, and interruption, this paper attempts to explore the pragmatic weight of the five pragmatic concepts as conduits of persuasion and/or manipulation at the intradiegetic level of fictional communication represented by Orwell's *Animal Farm*. The main objective of the paper, therefore, is to provide a linguistic analysis of the pragmatic strategies effecting persuasiveness in Orwell's novel. One overarching research question is addressed here: to what extent are the five pragmatic concepts employed as strategies of persuasion and/or manipulation in the selected data? The paper reveals three main findings: first, the five pragmatic strategies under investigation contribute effectively to the production of three types of persuasion at the character-to-character level of discourse: pure, manipulative, and coercive persuasion. Second, the five strategies at hand are manifested in various linguistic forms, including imperatives, interrogatives, lexicalization, and slogans. Third, despite the fact that the pragmatic approach is much more pertinent to the conversational genre, it is linguistically evidenced in this paper that the same approach proves analytically relevant to the study of narrative texts, which further accentuates the crucial role of fictional discourse as a source of data in the advancement of linguistic models and analytical frameworks.

Keywords: fictional communication, intradiegetic level of discourse, manipulation, persuasion, pragmatics

1. Introduction

In the last few decades, miscellaneous studies have used literary texts as sources of data to decode certain stylistic, linguistic, rhetorical and ideological properties pertaining to such texts to the extent that contributes to the general understanding of fictional discourse (Paternoster, 2012; Jucker & Locher, 2017; Giltrow, 2017; Khafaga, 2021; Harrison, 2020; Jucker, 2021), among others. This type of linguistic analysis can be conducted by adopting different linguistic approaches, including the lexical, semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic levels of analysis. That is, it can cover the different units of discourse: the word, the sentence and the utterance. This paper, therefore, attempts to explore the extent to which particular pragmatic strategies, including directive speech acts, rhetorical questions, back-channel support, gap-bridging, and interruption, affect the behaviors of characters in Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1944). In other words, how these pragmatic strategies are employed to persuade and/or manipulate addressees to adopt a specific type of behavior and/or belief that serves the addressers' benefit. Crucially, the analysis is conducted at the intradiegetic level of discourse, which refers to the character-to-character level of communication, as opposed to the extradiegetic level of discourse, which constitutes the author-to-reader level of communication (Messerli, 2017).

According to Hirschberg (1999), the term rhetoric means speaking or writing effectively and constitutes the skillful use of language purposefully, that is, to utilize the linguistic expression with all its forms to persuade, argue for and/or against, inform, as well as to create some sort of motivation on the part of readers or listeners towards particular objectives. This rhetorical use of language not only appeals to emotions by activating an emotive style of language but also serves to realize shared values and/or logic among participants in the communication process, either in real-world interactions or in fictional discourse, as is the case in the current study (Simpsom, 1997; Stark, 1996; Seraku, 2022). Fictionality here does not mean that the linguistic analysis is confined to the world of fiction that does not exist in reality; however, investigating fictional texts pragmatically aims to create a cognitive link between the situations used for the linguistic analysis in these texts and what occurs in everyday naturally occurring conversations. Writers and speakers have always employed persuasive strategies to target specific pragmatic purposes on the part of their recipients (Bednarek, 2017; Risdianto, Malihah & Guritno, 2019; Adam, 2021; Khafaga, 2023a).

As one type of rhetoric, persuasion is employed by writers and speakers to achieve positive attitudinal behavior on the part of their addressees (Sandall, 1977; Iswara & Bisena, 2020; Bromberek-Dyzman, Jankowiak & Chełminiak, 2021). Persuasion can linguistically be manifested in different linguistic devices. Among these tools are those that are pragmatically-based. A persuasive discourse can be

produced purely (truth-based), manipulatively (deception-based) and/or coercively (violence-based). Each type comprises a specific technique of discursivity and targets particular pragmatic purposes, which sometimes come in conformity with the speaker only and at other times fulfill the needs of both speakers and hearers. The current study scrutinizes to focus on exploring the pragmatic strategies used in Orwell's *Animal Farm* to achieve the different types of persuasion in such a narrative genre.

The current study, therefore, attempts to explore the different pragmatic devices used to produce persuasive discourse in the selected novel. In so doing, this paper attempts to approach the concepts of rhetoric (Charteris-Black, 2005) and persuasion (Lakoff, 1982; Jowett & O'Donnell, 1992), by drawing analytically upon a pragmatic approach represented by five pragmatic concepts, including directive speech acts, rhetorical questions, back-channel support, gap-bridging, and interruption, which are linguistically relevant to the study of persuasion in the selected novel.

1.1 Research Questions

One overarching research question is addressed here:

1. To what extent are the five pragmatic concepts employed as strategies of persuasion and/or manipulation in the selected data?

This overarching question abounds in other ancillary research questions that are further sought to be answered in this paper. These are as follows:

a. How are the five strategies under investigation manifested linguistically in the discourse of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*?

b. What are the different types of persuasion each strategy communicates in the discourse of the novel?

c. To what extent do the five strategies contribute to the production of pure, manipulative and coercive persuasion in the novel?

d. To what extent is the pragmatic approach relevant to the linguistic analysis of the narrative genre?

The answer to the abovementioned research questions serves to emphasize two things: first, the incorporation of the different levels of analysis in linguistic studies; in the case of this paper, these are the rhetorical (persuasion), the linguistic (pragmatics), and the literary (Orwell's *Animal Farm*); and, second, the relevance of applying a pragmatic approach to the linguistic investigation of the narrative genres.

The remainder of this article is structured as follows: Section 2 presents a theoretical background as well as theoretical preliminaries for the whole study, by offering discussion concerning the notions of rhetoric, persuasion and its types and arguments. Section 3 provides the theoretical and analytical framework of the study, by shedding light on the five pragmatic concepts selected for the analysis, including directive speech acts, rhetorical questions, gap-bridging, back-channel support, and interruption. Section 4 is the methodology of the paper, which briefly displays the description of the selected data and the way it is collected, as well as the analytical procedures adopted in the analysis process. Section 5 offers an analysis of the selected data. Section 6 discusses the findings of the article. Section 7 is the conclusion of the study, which is entailed by some recommendations for further studies in the field.

2. Literature Review

Regardless of the fact that persuasion and rhetoric may be thought to be interrelated, there is a slight difference between the two terms, which may determine the meaning, method, and goal of each one. Charteris-Black (2005) perceives rhetoric as a type of art whose core concern is to persuade others. He argues that both persuasion and rhetoric appear to be inseparable, but the essential difference between the two terms lies in the idea that rhetoric constitutes the act of communication on the part of hearers, whereas persuasion is entirely based on the intention of the speaker or writer and the successful outcomes of the communication process. He maintains that rhetorical discourse is described as successful only when it is persuasive. Such persuasiveness is measured by the degree to which the anticipated purposes beyond rhetorical discourse are realized. Rhetoric then may fail to achieve its purposes if it is not persuasive; that is to say, rhetoric is preconditioned by its persuasiveness degree.

Heinrichs (2017) argues that the modes of persuasion constitute three rhetorical appeals, which encompass the extent to which the speaker appeals to the hearers. These rhetorically-based linguistic devices include ethos, pathos, and logos. Ethos refers to the way of presentation, the personal credibility of the speaker, his or her good character, his or her being qualified to speak, and his or her ability to have access to discourse. In this type, the speaker delivering the message has to be credible enough to guarantee the communication of his or her message to the audience. Pathos, being the second rhetorical mode, comprises the appeal to audience emotions by using clear language as well as emotive language that in turn serves to stimulate their potential towards the acceptance of the speakers' argument without objection. As for logos, it represents the quality of argument on the part of speakers and the reasoning and evidence to construct his/her speech by using facts and statistics; logos also constitutes the tight relationship between claims and the evidence that one is using.

Many linguists and sociolinguists have discussed the concept of persuasion and the way it is communicated and manifested linguistically in discourse, including Brembeck and Howell (1952), Whately (1963), Bryant (1972), Lakoff (1982), Jowett and O'Donnell (1992), Pardo (2001), Pinto (2004), Johnson-Cartee and Copeland (2004), Charteris-Black (2005), and Lu (2021), among others. Whateley (1963, p. 39), for example, defines persuasion as a science that consists of "finding the appropriate arguments to prove what one wants to claim". Bryant (1972) also clarifies that persuasion refers to the process wherein specific ideas are attuned to people, on the one hand, and people are adjusted to particular ideas, on the other. For Lakoff (1982), persuasion is the intentional employment of different communicative tools to influence the behavior and attitudes of others. Lakoff's argument is also accentuated by Jowett and O'Donnell (1992), who

consider persuasion an interactive process that includes two parties: a message sender and a message receiver, where the former attempts to affect the latter. Furthermore, Pardo (2001) approaches persuasion as an act of convincing others of what a person wants. This act of persuading or convincing serves to influence what Simons (2001, p. 7) calls "the autonomous judgments and actions of others." All these definitions revolve around one main idea: persuasion is a communicative process whereby speakers try to adjust, change, and influence others' attitudes to suit their own desires.

Persuasion, according to Pardo (2001), is entirely concerned with argumentation and closely linked to it. However, he states that both persuasion and argumentation are not the same; he relates the two concepts to the idea of intentionality to persuade, which is inherited in persuasion but is missed in argumentation. Consequently, the difference between persuasion, argumentation and rhetoric lies in the realization of intention. Persuasion, unlike argumentation and rhetoric, is clearly intentional. Within the framework of politics, the importance of persuasion lies in its ability to influence others' behavior and to shape their responses in a way that copes with the persuader's views. To create such an influence on the part of the recipients, the persuader, according to Charteris-Black (2005), tries to confirm specific existing beliefs, or to change them totally. The main goal of any persuasive discourse, therefore, remains to realize complete compliance and submission on the part of recipients. This has been emphasized by Sornig's (1989, p. 96) contention that the persuader's main goal is "to make his victim give up his own viewpoint and embrace that of the rhetorician," and to "get the recipient to identify himself with the views proffered."

For Pardo (2001, p. 97), there are different ways of influencing people: (a) by the use of force (coercion), (b) by manipulation, and (c) by persuasion. To Pardo (2001), the type of persuasion is determined by the form of argument and the way it is employed in any act of communication. Accordingly, persuasion may take different forms: first, pure persuasion, which targets the benefits of both persuaders and recipients and is entirely based on the use of facts and logic in the process of interaction between interlocutors; second, manipulative persuasion, which is based on lies and brainwashing; and, third, coercive persuasion, which depends on coercion (i.e., rhetorical coercion) as well as the use of violence (both verbally and/or physically). The persuasion of the first two types depends on the rhetorical dimension of power, whereas the third type makes use of both the physical and rhetorical dimensions of power (Pardo, 2001).

In consonance with Pardo (2001), Pinto (2004, p. 654) perceives manipulation as one distinct type of persuasion. He maintains that this type of persuasion hides its real face behind the curtain of power, particularly rhetorical power. This means that the persuader attempts to hide the effect he wishes to produce in a way that does not allow the persuadees to understand the real target beyond the persuader's message. Harre' (1985) points out that in cases of manipulation, the hearer seems unconsciously ignorant of the influences practiced upon him. Manipulative persuasion is usually based on lies, brainwashing, and falsification and targets complete submission on the part of the persuadees. Sometimes, persuasion depends on the idea of coercion by stimulating fear, launching threats, and using violence. This type is called coercive persuasion and is based on both the rhetorical and physical dimensions of power (Pardo, 2001).

It is worth mentioning that persuasion is necessarily linked to the notion of power, and therefore it always entails some degree of it. The point at which persuasion becomes manipulation or coercion depends on the degree of power (Pardo, 2001). This relationship between persuasion and power allows for the activation of ideology within discourse; both power and ideology are main components within the persuasiveness process (van Dijk, 1997). Significantly, the power used to control others' minds and behavior so that they will act as the persuader wants needs certain ways to persuade (Billig, 2003). That is, instead of giving orders, persuaders can use other devices to persuade their recipients. In this case, "compliance is based not on an implicit threat, but rather on arguments or other forms of persuasion" (van Dijk, 1997, p. 18). Within the framework of persuasion, those who are powerful (rhetorically or physically) tend to persuade, manipulate and/or coerce their recipients by influencing their minds and limiting their freedom of action (Galbraith, 1983). Powerful participants usually control the course of discourse and have the ability to limit the discourse rights of others by using strategies of persuasion, manipulation, or coercion. The act of influencing others' attitudes, therefore, is not only based on the physical dimension of power manifested in the use of force and violence (Partington, 2003), but also rhetorically-based; that is, in the form of persuasion and/or manipulation (van Dijk, 1996).

Drawing on data from fictional communication and literary texts, many studies have approached various pragmatic aspects from different perspectives, by approaching fiction as a specific kind of cultural performance with complex linguistic and multimodal features that have stylistic value (Busse, 2017), investigating the theoretical underpinnings of estrangement and its status as a literary illocutionary device crucial to the pragmatic underpinning of genres including fantasy, science fiction, and historical fiction (Adams, 2017), exploring the characteristics of orality such as features of topic management in the language of fiction (Jucker, 2021), discussing the style of narration as rhetoric in children literature (Wales, 2022), and probing the extent to which micro and macro pragmatics can be communicated by stage directions parentheticals in drama dialogue (Khafaga, 2022). For example, Sell (2014) offers a general assessment of the way literature is communicatively perceived as dialogue that carries the same features that exist in everyday occurring conversations. Sell's study opens the door for detailed discussions and criticism concerning the macro-pragmatic relationship held between writers of fictional texts and readers, which in turn accentuates the reciprocal connection between the processes of production and reception of literary texts as well as the effective role of pragmatics in revealing the underpinnings of such a relationship.

Furthermore, Messerli (2017) discusses the different structures of participation in fictional discourse. His study focuses on telecinematic discourse and highlights the conceptualization of recipients or readers as either ratified participants or unratified overhearers. Messerli's study also sheds light on the participant roles within fictional discourse, particularly those related to writers, producers, characters, and especially recipients or readers, which also receive the majority of attention in pragmatic research. Further, Culpeper and

Fernandez-Quintanilla (2017) investigate the effective role of pragmatics in the study of characterization. Their study sheds light on the extent to which characters' behaviors can be inferred via dialogue by clarifying the way representations of characters are constructed in the readers' minds when they interact with the linguistic, paralinguistic and visual communicative phenomena in a given literary text.

From the standpoint of pragmatic stylistics, Yang (2023) examines how power dynamics appear in dialogue between characters in Arthur Miller's *A View from the Bridge*. Yang's study analyzes and interprets the development of power relations in the Carbone family using turn-taking patterns in light of the fact that conversation analysis approaches have demonstrated their viability and efficacy in the analysis of dramatic dialogue. This study concludes by emphasizing the role of turn-taking as an effective pragmatic strategy that mirrors the way power is manipulatively practiced and consumed in literary communication.

Having reviewed the above theoretical preliminaries and related literature, it is time to reflect on the theoretical framework adopted in this study. This study uses a pragmatic approach to investigate the persuasive discourse in Orwell's *Animal Farm*. The pragmatic approach is concerned with the study of linguistic communication in context (Blum-Kulka, 1997), or as Mey (1993, p. 5) puts it, pragmatics is the science that studies language in relation to its users. Yule (1996a) also argues that pragmatics is mainly concerned with the intended meaning of the speaker. He clarifies that meaning within the scope of pragmatics may be visible, that is, explicitly conveyed, or invisible, which is inferred from the semantic expressions. Pragmatics, for him, seeks to arrive at the invisible meaning, even if it is not actually written or uttered in discourse. Crucially, applying pragmatics, with all its different aspects, to the study of fictional discourse has been approached by many studies (e.g., Paternoster, 2012; Murphy, 2015; Hoffmann, 2017; Risdianto, Malihah, & Guritno, 2019, among others). These studies highlighted the extent to which the pragmatic level of analysis applied to fictional texts is significantly contributive to the interpretation of these texts. Based on this assumption, the pragmatic level of analysis adopted in this study covers analytically five strategies: (i) directive speech acts, (ii) rhetorical questions, (iii) back-channel support, (iv) gap-bridging, and (v) interruption. Each of these strategies will be briefly reviewed in the following lines.

In terms of directives, they are one linguistic manifestation of speech act theory (e.g., Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969, 1979; Grice, 1975; Yule, 1996a, 1996b), among others. Directives exhibit a high degree of imposition, which in turn makes them highly representative through the use of imperatives (Short, 1996). By employing directives, speakers tend to get a response on the part of their hearers (Leech & Short, 1981). Accordingly, directives usually seek a response, and this response may be delivered verbally or physically in discourse (Fowler, 1991; Ryckebusch & Marcos, 2004). Because they carry a high degree of imposition, directives are usually utilized to achieve manipulation in discourse (Short, 1996), and sometimes, within specific contexts, they are used as persuasion strategies (Khafaga, 2023b).

Rhetorical questions are the questions that do not seek an answer, but rather instigate a further response on the part of discourse recipients (Thomas, 1995; Hirschberg, 1999). This type of questioning serves as a discursive motivator that stimulates both the potential and participation of addressees. They are also active tools of persuasion employed in discourse, particularly within the field of politics. Sometimes, rhetorical questions play the role of declarative speech acts; that is to say, they are utilized to give information, not to ask for it. In this regard, Sotillo (2004) argues that rhetorical questions function to generate a framework for new information sought by language users. They are used to influence others' attitudes and behaviors towards the addresser's argument; they are asked not to be answered but to create effect. In literature, the same holds true for this type of questions; they are effective devices of persuasive discourse. Writers of fictional discourse mainly use them to communicate particular ideas that strengthen their ideological position beyond their works.

As for the strategy of back-channel support, Pridham (2001) suggests that when participants tend to show that they are supporting each other's arguments and share mutual understanding in conversation, then they exercise an argumentative agreement or back-channel support strategy. Pridham maintains that this strategy is one of the techniques initiated by one discourse participant towards another with the intention to emphasize agreement on what has been said and to activate the initiation and continuation of further speaking. Yule (1996a, p. 75) postulates that the strategy of argumentative agreement or back-channel support describes the situation wherein speakers need further support on the part of their conversational partners, which indicates that they are listening. He clarifies that there are many ways of showing that recipients are listening to what is communicated by the speaker. Among these ways are 'head nods', 'smiles', and other facial expressions and gestures, but 'back-channels' is the most common vocal indication of doing so. Yule (1996a) maintains that back-channel strategies indicate that there is no objection on the part of listeners concerning what the speaker is saying. Sometimes recipients say nothing verbally, but they support the speaker's utterances nonverbally; that is, by nodding their heads or making any sort of gesture. This is called "nonverbal back-channel" (Delin, 2000, p. 93).

Concerning the strategy of gap-bridging, it is a pragmatic ploy used in discourse to achieve solidarity and coherence between discourse participants. This strategy is always active in discursive situations wherein one discourse participant is more powerful than his recipient(s), and when the powerful tries to narrow the gap so as to facilitate his arguments with others and achieve his intended goals. In many cases, this strategy is realized by many linguistic tools, including the use of specific terms of address, such as adjectives that carry positive connotations. Bridging the gap can also be conducted through the use of certain pronouns, such as the use of the inclusive 'we' (Fairclough, 2014).

As for the strategy of interruption, it is a discursive device that enables a more powerful participant to put constraints on the contributions of a less powerful one (Fairclough, 2014). It occurs when one participant interrupts another in order to control his or her contributions. Interruption is closely related to the notion of power because only powerful participants are able to constrain the contributions of the powerless. These constraints are preconditioned by finding appropriate access to discourse (Truan, 2016). Furthermore, Fairclough (2014)

argues that interruption may occur directly (e.g., by cutting the participant's speech) or indirectly (by selecting the discourse type). Fairclough (2014) emphasizes that interruption violates the discursive norms of turn-taking, which are closely related to the notion of power. Turn-taking sometimes occurs in conversations between equals and sometimes between unequals. The form of turn-taking between equal participants is managed on a turn-by-turn basis; that is, all conversation participants have equal rights to speak and/or to invite other participants in the same communication process to speak (Fairclough, 2014).

3. Methodology

3.1 Data Collection and Description

The data of this study encompasses one novel constituting the literary narrative genre: George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1944). The novel consists of ten chapters. The analysis is conducted at the character-character level of discourse, by focusing on the conversational turns between the characters in the novel throughout the whole text. Also, a frequent reference to the ideological message of Orwell is incorporated throughout the analysis of the selected data. The reasons why Orwell's novel is selected to undergo the current linguistic analysis are: First, the novel contains a large number of conversational turns that carry linguistic devices employed dexterously to convey particular persuasive purposes. Second, the selected novel is a type of the narrative texts exhibiting certain pragmatic functions at the character-to-character level of discourse. Third, regardless of the fact that the discourse in *Animal Farm* is fictional, the incidents and the conversational turns of the characters mirror different situations that can be applicable to situations in reality. Fourth, the novel emphasizes the relevance of the pragmatic approach to the analysis of narrative fiction, as is demonstrated in the analysis part below.

Thematically, the novel attempts to "expose the lie which Stalinist Russia had become" (Welch, 1980, p. 31). For Orwell, Russia "was supposed to be a socialist Union of States, but it had become a dictatorship" (Woodcock, 1984). Stradling (1984) also states that Orwell's purpose goes beyond the particular example of the Russian Revolution. In *Animal Farm*, Orwell criticizes something inherent in all revolutions, a theme that is also stressed by Brown (1984, p. 49), who argues that the novel deals with "revolution in general." The novel, therefore, "is intended as a satire on dictatorship in general". Welch (1980, p. 48) argues that the theme of Orwell's *Animal Farm* is closely related to its purpose. He maintains that the main idea the novel presents is that "political ideals collapse to give way to tyranny" (Welch, p. 48). The idea that dominates Orwell's mind in *Animal Farm* is that "political idealism can turn sour," as was the case in Russia after the 1917 Rebellion (Welch, p. 48). For Sedley (1984, p. 161), the main theme *Animal Farm* tackles is that "through revolution, a human (that is a capitalist) oppressor will simply be replaced by an animal (that is a proletarian) oppressor."

3.2 Procedures

The methodological procedures adopted in this study consist of three stages: the first stage presents a general reading of the selected novel in order to highlight the situations in which the characters in the discourse of the novel use certain persuasive and rhetorical tools in order to affect a change in the response of addressees. This stage ends with marking numerous conversational turns that attempt a persuasive discourse. For analytical purposes, only samples of these turns are selectively extracted for the analysis. The second stage constitutes the linguistic analysis of the selected extracts by marking the type of persuasion each conversational turn carries as well as the pragmatic meaning attempted beyond their surface semantic one. In this stage, many pragmatic devices contributing to the persuasive process in the discourse of the novel have been revealed. As for the third stage, it shows the linguistically-based connection between the pragmatic level of analysis, the narrative genre, and persuasion so as to demonstrate the relevance of applying the pragmatic approach to the analysis of narrative texts. Importantly, all the italicized emphases made in the selected extracts are not in the original text; they were conducted by the author for analytical reasons.

As alluded before, to achieve its objectives, this paper analytically draws on a pragmatic approach represented by five pragmatic concepts, including directive speech acts, rhetorical questions, back-channel support, gap-bridging, and interruption, which are linguistically relevant to the study of persuasion in the selected novel. Table 1 offers the total number of indicative occurrences for each of the five pragmatic strategies used in this paper.

Table 1. Pragmatic strategies and their total frequency of indicative occurrences in *Animal Farm*

Pragmatic strategy	Total number of indicative occurrences
Directive speech acts (imperatives)	6
Rhetorical questions	11
Gap-bridging	29
Back channel support	8
Interruption	7
Total	61

4. Analysis and Findings

4.1 Directive Speech Acts

The directive speech acts are employed in the discourse of the selected novel to influence the persuasive response on the part of addressees. Old Major uses this strategy to inform the other animals directly to end Man's oppression. Consider the following extracts:

Extract (1)

>   *Remove* man from the scene, and the root cause of hunger and over work is abolished forever. (*Animal Farm*, p.9, henceforth *AF*)

Extract (2)

Get rid of Man, and the produce of our labor would be our own…and above all, *pass on* this message of mine to those who come after you, so that future generation shall carry on the struggle until it is victorious. (*AF*., p. 10)

Extract (3)

And remember also that in fighting against Man, we must not come to resemble him. Even when you have conquered him, *do not adopt his* vices. (*AF*., p. 12)

The above extracts show Old Major's attempts to persuade the animals to revolt against Man and to end his oppressive regime. He believes that being direct is the best way to achieve his goals, so he uses the directives in *remove Man*, *get rid of Man*, *pass on this message* and *don't adopt his vices*. He tries to motivate them to struggle against Man represented by Mr. Jones. Addressing the animals via direct orders leaves them no freedom to disobey. Major addresses them directly to be sure that they will grasp the meaning of his message without any hesitation. The three utterances in the above extracts express the enmity of Man and emphasize the need to expel him from the farm. This expulsion of Man is the main goal of Old Major's long speech. Here, it is noticed that directives manifested in the use of imperatives, either in the affirmative or negative form, serves as a strategy of persuasion, which goes in conformity with Khafaga's (2023b) argument that imperatives, within specific situations, go beyond their semantic functionality of directivity towards further pragmatic purposes. Interestingly, the same use of the directive mood can also be perceived as a politeness strategy, that is, a face-threatening act via the bald on-record strategy. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), face-threatening acts are acts that challenge the face wants of an interlocutor. For Thomas (1995), these face-threatening acts can be discursively practiced by means of a number of strategies, among which is the bald on-record strategy, which is entirely based on the use of imperatives, as is the case for the imperatives used by Old Major in the above extract, either in the affirmative or negative forms. According to Yule (1996a), using the bald on-record strategy allows the speaker to address his recipients clearly and directly because it is usually associated with speech events where the speaker assumes that he or she has power over the other and can control the other's behavior with words.

The style adopted here by the character of Old Major is considered a form of rhetorical logic (Fisher, 1987a, 1987b), through which reasons for the necessity of the expulsion of man from the farm are communicated. Such a rhetorical logic manifests itself in Old Major's clarification of the reasons and results beyond the necessity to expel Man from the farm. This adopts four ordered stages on the part of Old Major: first, by providing the reasons of expulsion, which is apparent from the statement that Man is *the root cause of hunger and overwork*; second, by showing the required action, which is channeled to the animals by the directive mood in *get rid* of *Man*; third, by demonstrating the expected results when Man is removed from the farm in *the produce of our labor would be our own*; and, finally, by advising the rest of the animals not to *adopt his* (Man) *vices*. This rhetorical logic is not only based on offering cause and effect but also on delineating the anticipated brilliant future of animals that follows afterwards. Crucially, what Old Major uses is a rhetorical type of discourse that aims at stimulating the potential of the animals towards action. He uses logic, facts, and past experiences in an attempt to influence the animals' behaviors persuasively. Here, Old Major's persuasive discourse is a pure type of persuasion since it targets the benefits of both the speaker and the listeners. Table 2 demonstrates the linguistic manifestations of directive speech acts and their frequency.

Table 2. Directive speech acts, their linguistic manifestations and frequency in *Animal Farm*

Pragmatic strategy	Linguistic manifestation	Operator	Total frequency	Indicative occurrences	Examples of indicative word in context
Directives speech acts	imperatives	remove	1	1	*Remove* man from the scene, and the root cause of hunger and over work is abolished forever
		Get rid of	1	1	*Get rid of* Man, and the produce of our labor would be our own
		pass	1	1	*pass on* this message of mine to those who come after you
		Don't	1	1	*Don't* take your own brother to his death!
		Do not	2	2	*Do not adopt his* vices
Total number of indicative occurrences				6	

Table 2 clarifies that directive speech acts are linguistically manifested in the imperative mode, represented by the imperative operators 'remove', 'get rid of', 'pass', 'don't take' and 'do not adopt'. Despite the very low frequency of the imperative operators, they are highly indicative in the production of persuasion in *Animal Farm*.

4.2 Rhetorical Questions

Rhetorical questions are one of the pragmatic strategies which are used to produce the different types of persuasion: pure, manipulative, and coercive. They are polite ways of presenting requests, dominating others' minds and directing their thinking to obey and submit to the speaker's argument. Notice the following:

You cows that I see before me, *how many thousands of gallons of milk have you given during this last year?* And *what had happened to that milk…..*Every drop of it has gone down the throats of our enemies. And you hens, *how many eggs have you laid*

this year, and how many of those eggs ever hatched into chickens? The rest have all gone to market to bring in money for Jones and his men. And you clover, *Where are those four foals you bore?* Each was sold at a year old. (*AF*., p. 9)

Old Major's rhetorical questions: *how many thousands of gallons of milk have you given last year?*, *what had happened to that milk?*, *how many eggs have you laid this year?* and *Where are those four foals you bore?* Serve to instigate the animals to accomplish the rebellion against Man. He tries to direct their minds to the real facts of their lives under Mr. Jones's regime. Major's questions then carry an indirect message for the animals: they should revolt against Man in order to lead a happy life. Major does not expect any answer, but he tries to communicate the idea of rebellion to the animals, to arouse their thoughts, and to drive them to act in a way that serves to achieve his intended purpose. Here, rhetorical questions are used to achieve pure persuasion.

Another important rhetorical question that is delivered in the discourse of inequality is the question: *would you like to see Jones come back*?, which is asked by Squealer whenever the pigs try to coerce the other animals into accepting something that runs counter to the principles of animalism. This question is employed as a threat that forces the animals to obey whatever the pigs demand, even if it violates the seven commandments of animalism. The aforementioned question is used three times in the discourse of inequality. In all situations, the question is not asked to open a channel of communication between Squealer and the other animals, as questions are always used for, but it is employed to force the animals to accept the pigs' argument. It is also noticed that the pigs use this question to end an argument they start to justify a violation they commit. Here are the situations in which the question is employed.

> It is for your sake that we drink that milk and eat those apples. Do you know what would happen if we pigs failed in our duty? *Jones would come back! Yes, Jones would come back! ....Surely there is no one among you who wants to see Jones come back?* (*AF.,* pp.   32-33)

Squealer tries to justify the pigs' seizure of the milk and apples. He entails his justification with the rhetorical question, *surely there is no one among you who wants to see Jones come back?*, which attempts to motivate the animals to accept the current situation without any objection. Squealer's rhetorical question is employed to gain the animals' obedience since it makes a link between Mr. Jones's return and the pigs' seizure of the milk and apples. The animals find themselves torn between two difficult options: either to accept the pigs' violation or to be governed by Jones again. The two resolutions are more difficult than each other, but as they tasted Jones's oppressive rule, they virtually came to accept Squealer's argument that the pigs need both milk and apples in order to be able to organize and run the farm. Notice the following: "Now if there was one thing that the animals were completely certain of, it was that *they did not want Jones back*" (*AF.,* 33). By using the rhetorical question, *would you like to see Jones come back?* Squealer offers the animals no alternative resolution except submission to the pigs' demands.

Further, Squealer's argument comes to justify the abolishment of the Sunday morning meetings. His utterance *surely comrades, you do not want Jones back?* serves to force the animals to submit to Napoleon's decision to abolish the Sunday morning meetings. Again, Jones's return is linked to the animals' acceptance or refusal of Napoleon's decision. Shocked and terrified by the mere idea of Jones's return, the animals submit to the decision without any objection: "Certainly the animals did not want Jones back; if the holding of debates on Sunday morning was liable to bring him back, then the debates must stop" (*AF.,* p.   50). The animals' compliance then is due to their fear of Jones's return and not due to the assumption that they are persuaded by Squealer's argument. They are coerced to submit: "You would not rob us of our repose, would you, comrades? You would not have us too tired to carry out our duties? *Surely none of you wishes to see Jones back?*" (*AF.,* p.   60).

The same question is asked again by Squealer to end his argument, in which he tries to justify the pigs' violation of one of the commandments, which forbids sleeping in beds for animals. Squealer's utterance, *surely none of you wishes to see Jones back?* is to demand the animals' obedience and to compel them to accept such a violation without any protest. Once again, the animals find no way except to submit: "The animals reassured him on this point immediately, and no more was said about the pigs sleeping in the farmhouse beds" (*AF.,* p.   60).

It is obvious that in all previous situations, Squealer neither seeks an answer to his question nor tries to open a conversation with the animals. He attempts to coerce them to act the way he wants. His questions carry an implicit threat of the possibility of Jones's return, which leaves the animals no freedom to choose, so they blindly decide to submit to the pigs' violation. The mere mention of Jones brings about their submission. It is important to mention that the animals' stupidity and ignorance play a role in their manipulation. They do not try to ask the pigs how Jones could return to the farm. They only absorb what they are told without any discussion, which facilitates the pigs' task of manipulating them. Using such rhetorical questions, therefore, aims to achieve both manipulative and coercive persuasion. Table 3 displays the linguistic manifestations of rhetorical questions employed in the novel as well as their frequency.

Table 3. Rhetorical questions, their linguistic manifestations and frequency in *Animal Farm*

Pragmatic strategy	Linguistic manifestation	Operator	Total frequency	Indicative occurrence	Examples of indicative word in context
Rhetorical questions	interrogatives	how many	3	3	*how many thousands of gallons of milk have you given during this last year?*
		what	1	1	*what had happened to that milk?*
		where	1	1	*Where are those four foals you bore?*
		would	1	1	*would you like to see Jones Come back?*
		do	1	1	Do you know what would happen if we pigs failed in our duty?
	declarative questions (via rising intonation)	surely + declarative sentence	4	3	*Surely none of you wishes to see Jones back?*
Total number of indicative occurrences				11	

As indicated in Table 3, rhetorical questions in *Animal Farm* are linguistically manifested in two linguistic modes: interrogation, through the interrogative operators of 'how many', 'what', 'where', 'would', and 'do'; and declarative questions communicated by the rising tone of intonation. As seen in the table, rhetorical questions, irrespective of their linguistic manifestations, are low in frequency, but they are highly indicative of achieving persuasion.

4.3 Gap-bridging

Gap-bridging is another pragmatic ploy used in both the discourse of equality and the discourse of inequality to narrow the gap between the speaker and his recipients. Old Major uses this strategy to emphasize the animals' unity and equality. Three words are employed to realize this goal: *equal*, *brother*, and *comrades*. Major overuses the three words in the discourse of equality to create a feeling of equality and brotherhood in the animals' minds so as to make them believe that there is no distinction or advantage merited by one animal over another. It is a feeling of solidarity that contributes to the accomplishment of the rebellion and the removal of Man. Notice the following:

> All animals are *comrades.* (*AF*., p. 11)

> All animals are *equal.* (*AF*., p. 12)

> We are all *brothers.* (*AF*., p. 12)

Major's *comrades*, *equal*, and *brothers* serve to break the borders between the animals. He tries to narrow the gap between him and the other animals to make it easier for him to persuade them of what he wants. Major's words aim to remove any hindrance that may impede the animals' understanding or make them reluctantly receive his words.

The same strategy is also employed by Squealer in the discourse of inequality to achieve manipulative persuasion. Squealer starts the majority of his arguments with the word 'comrades' to emphasize the principle of equality between the pigs and the other animals. The abundance of using the word 'comrades' in the discourse of inequality reflects the pigs' hypocrisy. They use the word to manipulate the animals into accepting what the pigs demand. In most situations in which Squealer and Napoleon start their speech with the word 'comrades', they follow it with a number of violations that emphasize the pigs' superiority over other animals. Thus, gap-bridging is employed to achieve manipulative persuasion (discourse of inequality) as well as pure persuasion (discourse of equality). Table 4 shows the linguistic manifestations of gap-bridging and their frequency in the novel.

Table 4. Gap-bridging, its linguistic manifestations and frequency in *Animal Farm*

Pragmatic strategy	Linguistic manifestation	Operator	Total frequency	Indicative occurrence	Examples of indicative word in context
Gap-bridging	lexicalization	comrades	55	23	All animals are *comrades*.
		equal	6	5	All animals are *equal*.
		brothers	1	1	We are all *brothers*.
Total of indicative occurrences				29	

Table 4 demonstrates that the strategy of gap-bridging is linguistically represented by three lexemes: comrades, equal and brother. The three words are employed to create an atmosphere of solidarity between interlocutors, which in turn serves to achieve persuasion.

4.4 Back-channel Support

Squealer uses the back-channel support strategy to win support for Napoleon. This strategy is employed to achieve manipulative persuasion. Consider the following extract:

> Our leader, comrade Napoleon, announced Squealer,…has stated categorically...that Snowball was Jones's agent from the very beginning…Ah, that is different! said Boxer. If comrade Napoleon says it, it must be right. *That is the true spirit, comrade! cried Squealer. (AF., p. 71)*

Squealer is talking to Boxer regarding Snowball's part in the battle of the Cowshed. Boxer believes that Snowball "fought bravely" (*AF*., p. 70), while Squealer tries to minimize Snowball's part proclaiming that he fights on Jones's side. Boxer seems suspicious of Squealer's

argument, but Squealer tells Boxer that Snowball was *Jones's agent from the very beginning*. Believing in Napoleon's character, Boxer says *if comrade Napoleon says it, it must be right*. At this moment comes Squealer's back-channel support for Boxer's words; his utterance, *that is the true spirit, comrade!* Serves to prove Napoleon's credibility and tends to manipulate the other animals into adopting Boxer's same spirit. Here, Squealer attempts to be clearly supportive to Boxer's utterance which influences the rest of the animals to absorb what he is proclaiming against Snowball without any objection.

Further, the strategy of 'back-channel support' is also motivated throughout the incidents of the novel by Boxer's adopted maxim "Napoleon is always right" (*AF*., p. 67), in addition to his private motto of "I will work harder" (*AF*., p. 67). Squealer, the propagandist mouth of the farm, makes use of such a belief to achieve two things: first, to persuade Boxer of Snowball's treachery, which is totally fabricated; and, second, to offer constant and ultimate support to Napoleon as a competent and honest leader among all animals. Such a process of back-channeling support also functions to stimulate the potential of the rest of the animals so as to adopt the same attitude. Table 5 provides the linguistic manifestations of the strategy of back-channel support and their frequency in the novel.

Table 5. Back-channel support, its linguistic manifestations and frequency in *Animal Farm*

Pragmatic strategy	Linguistic manifestation	Operator	Total frequency	Indicative occurrence	Examples of indicative word in context
Back-channel support	lexicalization	right	18	7	Napoleon is always *right*.
		true	8	1	That is the *true* spirit, comrade! Cried Squealer.
Total of indicative occurrences				8	

Table 5 shows that lexicalization is used to communicate back-channel support between interlocutors in the novel. Such a process of back-channeling support is realized by the two words 'right' and 'true', and it is employed to manipulate.

4.5 Interruption

Limiting the discourse rights of other animals through interruption is a ploy used in *Animal Farm* by the sheep in the discourse of inequality to produce both coercive and manipulative persuasion. This strategy manifests itself in the sheep's bleating, which is produced in critical moments in which the pigs commit any violation of the seven commandments and try to distract the animals from this violation. The sheep's bleating is delivered then to suppress the other animals who try to challenge the pigs' dictatorship and oppression. The sheep used to bleat the maxim "four legs good, two legs bad" (*AF*., p. 31), which Snowball, after much thought, announces that the seven commandments are reduced to this single maxim, which in turn "contained the essential principle of Animalism" (*AF*., p. 31). The only aim beyond the sheep's bleating of "four legs good, two legs bad" is to disperse the animals from completing their speech.

> At the meetings Snowball often won over the majority by his brilliant speeches, but Napoleon was better at canvassing support for himself in between times. He was especially successful with the sheep. *Of late the sheep had taken to bleating 'four legs good, two legs bad' both in and out of season, and they often interrupted the meeting with this. It was noticed that they were especially liable to break into 'four legs good, two legs bad' at the crucial moments in Snowball's speeches.* (*AF.*, p. 43)

The sheep's bleating intends to leave Snowball no opportunity to complete his argument. It ends any possible contact that may take place between Snowball and the other animals before its birth. It becomes clearly apparent that the sheep's bleating is skillfully planned by Napoleon, who *was better at canvassing support for himself in between times*.

The sheep's bleating is also used to silence the other animals' protests and suppress any possible objections against the pigs. This is clearly shown after any violation of the commandments. When Napoleon declares that "the Sunday morning meetings would come to an end" (*AF*., pp. 48-49), young porkers "uttered shrill squeals of disapproval" (*AF*., p.49). At this moment, the sheep start to interrupt with bleating to give the other animals no chance to object or just to speak: "Then the sheep broke out into a tremendous bleating of "four legs good, two legs bad! Which went on for nearly a quarter of an hour and put an end to any chance of discussion" (*AF., p.* 49). Again, when Napoleon decides to abolish 'Beasts of England', some animals try to protest against this decision. In order to end their objection before it begins, the sheep start their usual interruption to suppress the other animals. Filled with fear, the animals do not utter a single word in order to avoid the pigs' revenge.

> Frightened though they were, some of the animals might possibly have protested, but *at this moment the sheep set up their usual bleating of 'four legs good, two legs bad' which went on for several minutes and put an end to the discussion.* (*AF.*, p. 77)

Once more, when Napoleon announces that "once a week there should be held something called a spontaneous demonstration, the object of which was to celebrate the struggles and triumphs of Animal Farm" (*AF*., pp. 97-98), some animals try to object, but the sheep use their bleating interruptions to silence them.

> The sheep were the greatest devotees of the Spontaneous Demonstration, and if anyone complained (as a few animals sometimes did, when no pigs or dogs were near) that they wasted time and meant a lot of standing about in the cold, *the sheep were sure to silence him with a tremendous bleating of 'four legs good, two legs bad'!* (*AF.*, p. 98)

Even when the maxim *four legs good, two legs bad* is violated near the end of the story, when the pigs start to walk on two legs like humans, the animals are shocked, and when they try to object, the sheep silence them, providing the pigs with all the support needed to

suppress any protest. Their bleating is modified from *four legs good, two legs bad* to *four legs good, two legs better*, which is delivered to reinforce the pigs' new situation:

> Then there came a moment when the first shock had worn off and when, in spite of everything-in spite of their terror of the dogs….they might have uttered some word of protest. *But just at that moment, as though at a signal, all the sheep burst out into a tremendous bleating of 'Four legs good, two legs better!' ... It went on for five minutes without stopping. And by the time the sheep had quieted down, the chance to utter any protest had passed,* for the pigs had marched back into the farmhouse. (*AF.*, pp. 113-114)

Thus, the sheep's interruption, which dominates the discourse of inequality, aims to limit the discourse rights of other animals, to leave them no freedom to complete their arguments, and to suppress any objection or protest. These interruptions also tend to coerce the animals and manipulate them into submission and acceptance of the pigs' selfish purposes and arrogant decisions. Table 6 demonstrates the linguistic manifestations of the strategy of 'interruption' and their frequency in the novel.

Table 6. Interruption, its linguistic manifestations and frequency in *Animal Farm*

Pragmatic strategy	Linguistic manifestation	Operator	Total frequency	Indicative occurrence	Examples of indicative word in context
Interruption	slogans	four legs good, two legs bad	10	4	four legs good, two legs *bad*
		four legs good, two legs better	3	3	four legs good, two legs *better*
Total of indicative occurrences				7	

Table 6 indicates that the strategy of 'interruption' has been discursively conveyed in the novel by the use of two slogans. The two slogans are very indicative in enforcing animals to keep silent and, thus, achieving both manipulative and coercive persuasion on their part.

Based on the above analysis of the pragmatic strategies of persuasion in Orwell's *Animal Farm*, there are three types of persuasion identified in the discourse of the selected novel: pure persuasion, manipulative persuasion and coercive persuasion. The three types depend on the rhetorical dimension of power. The criteria upon which the three types are classified and judged are represented in the rhetorical input required for the process of persuasion, such as techniques, strategies, and arguments, and in the pragmatic output resulting from such a process, which is represented in the salient goals of persuaders. Table 7 shows the five pragmatic strategies employed in the discourse of *Animal Farm*, their linguistic manifestations, the type of persuasion realized by each strategy, as well as both the rhetorical input used and the pragmatic output sought beyond each of the five pragmatic strategies under investigation.

Table 7. Pragmatic strategies of persuasion in Orwell's *Animal Farm*

Pragmatic strategy	Linguistic manifestation	Type of persuasion	Rhetorical input	Pragmatic output
Directive speech acts	imperatives	pure	logic and facts	free-will behavior
Rhetorical questions	interrogatives	pure	logic and facts	free-will behavior
	declarative questioning	manipulative	lies and brainwashing	controlled-will behavior
		coercive	verbal violence	controlled-will behavior
Gap-bridging	lexicalization	pure	logic and facts	free-will behavior
		manipulative	lies and brainwashing	controlled-will behavior
Back-channel support	lexicalization	manipulative	lies and brainwashing	controlled-will behavior
Interruption	slogans	manipulative	lies and brainwashing	controlled-will behavior
		coercive	verbal violence	controlled-will behavior

5. Discussion

The pragmatic analysis of the selected data shows that directive speech acts, rhetorical questions, gap-bridging, back-channeling and interruption are employed as persuasion strategies at the character-to-character level of communication in Orwell's *Animal Farm*. This, in turn, offers a type of pragmatic assessment to a literary text that aims to provide useful insights into understanding the way pragmatics operates in fictional texts, which correlates with many previous studies, such as Jucker and Locher (2017), Messerli (2017), and Khafaga (2023c), whose contributions highlight the importance of using the pragmatic approach to understand and reveal hidden meanings in literary texts. This also accentuates the communicative richness of literary communication as well as the fact that fictional language is similar to everyday occurring conversation in the sense that it abounds in the same conversational features that shape the process of communication between interlocutors.

Throughout the analysis of the selected data, it has been shown that the five strategies under investigation are manifested in various linguistic forms. First, the strategy of directive speech acts is realized through the use of imperatives, both in the affirmative and negative forms of the imperative verb. Second, the strategy of rhetorical questions is represented by interrogatives, either via the syntactic structure of interrogation by *wh* (e.g., how many, what, where, etc.) or auxiliaries (e.g., do, would, etc.) operators, or by phonological interrogation via the rising intonation in a declarative sentence. Third, gap-bridging and back-channeling are linguistically manifested through a dexterous process of lexicalization that mirrors the ideological power of the word in the process of persuasion, which tunes with Fowler's (1991) and Khafaga's (2023a) argument that vocabulary are usually ideology carriers that mirror the intended meaning of language users, particularly

when they are selected in appropriately specific contexts that serve the purposes of persuaders in the communication process. Fourth, the use of slogans constitutes the linguistic representation of the strategy of interruption. Making use of slogans as a strategy of persuasion goes in conformity with Pinto's (2004) contention that slogans are a form of control and the most common modern persuasive techniques used in political discourse. Significantly, the different linguistic realizations by which the five strategies are represented in the novel indicate that persuasion can be practiced and maintained at the various levels of language functions: declaratively, interrogatively, and imperatively.

Further, the analysis demonstrates three types of persuasion: pure persuasion, manipulative persuasion, and coercive persuasion. Each type has its own characteristics. Pure persuasion depends on the use of facts, logic and past experiences in argumentation. Its main concern is to illuminate the recipients into adopting an attitude that serves their benefits. Persuaders who use this type of persuasion make use of the rhetorical dimension of power, that is, the power of the word. Pure persuasion aims to produce a recipient who has the freedom to choose and to decide for himself or herself even if his or her choice meets the persuader's needs.

Manipulative persuasion exists when misleading or irrelevant information is presented in ways that decrease the public's understanding of the addressed issues (Menz, 1989). Persuaders of this type make use of arguments that depend on lies, falsification of facts and history, and brainwashing. Manipulative persuasion is also based on the rhetorical dimension of power. Its primary concern is to manipulate the recipients into complete compliance with the persuader's views, even if these views contradict the recipient's own interests. This type produces a controlled-will recipient who is rhetorically manipulated to adopt the persuader's attitudes.

Coercive persuasion is the only type of persuasion that is based on both the physical and rhetorical dimensions of power. This type employs violence, whether directly or indirectly, to coerce the recipient into submission to the persuader's needs. Coercive persuasion produces a controlled-will recipient who is forced to comply with the persuader's views. The element of power is evident in the three types of persuasion. Such rhetorical weight of power accentuates both Fairclough's (2014) and Yang's (2023) assumptions that power dynamics shape and reshape dialogue between interlocutors. Significantly, both coercive and manipulative persuasion have two characteristics in common: first, both of them aim to change the persuadees' perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes; and, second, both of them are nonreciprocal. The concept of non-reciprocity here means that they leave no choice for the recipient to object, discuss, or choose during the communication process.

Furthermore, both manipulative persuasion and coercive persuasion are addresser-oriented benefit types of persuasion; that is, they are destructive types of discourse because their ultimate goal is to achieve the persuader's needs even if it goes against the persuadees' interests. These types also kill the ability to choice on the part of the recipient and decrease his participation in the decision-making process. Conversely, pure persuasion is addresser or addressees-oriented benefit type of persuasion because it aims to achieve the goals and desires of both the persuader and the persuadees. It is, therefore, a constructive type of discourse since it develops the recipient's ability to be an active member of society who has the ability to participate in the political process.

This study identifies two types of discourse in *Animal Farm*: the discourse of equality and the discourse of inequality. Each type of discourse is characterized by particular linguistic strategies. Both manipulative persuasion and coercive persuasion are highly representative in the discourse of inequality, in which the pigs attempt to manipulate the rest of the animals in the farm into complete submission to their arguments and actions. This has linguistically been represented by the use of rhetorical questions, gap-bridging, back-channel support and interruption (for manipulative persuasion) and by the use of rhetorical questions and interruption (for coercive persuasion). Pure persuasion, on the other hand, is the dominant characteristic of the discourse of equality, wherein Old Major tries to persuade the animals to get rid of Man, the main cause of their misery. This is linguistically represented by the employment of directive speech acts, rhetorical questions, and gap-bridging. This indicates that Orwell succeeded in employing the proper linguistic devices that cope with the appropriate type of discourse.

To recap, this study exposes some persuasive and manipulative tactics that depend on the use and misuse of language in an attempt to immunize people against the tyrannical use of language and to stimulate them to struggle against dictatorship, combat the oppressive use of language, and resist all forms of inequality. The study, therefore, emphasizes the crucial role of language in the reproduction of dominance and inequality, which correlates with van Dijk's (1993, 1996) argument that the manipulative use of language serves to produce and reproduce the different forms of domination in discourse.

6. Conclusion

This paper has investigated five pragmatic strategies of persuasion in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* to probe the extent to which these strategies are effective in the production of persuasion in the selected novel. These include directive speech acts, rhetorical questions, back-channel support, gap-bridging, and interruption. The five strategies depend on the rhetorical dimension of power to convey particular meanings that lie beyond the surface propositional meanings of the utterances used at the character-to-character level of discourse.

Regarding the first research question, which addresses the way the five strategies under investigation are linguistically manifested in the discourse of the selected novel, the analysis has demonstrated that the five strategies are represented by various linguistic forms, including the use of imperatives (directive speech acts), the use of interrogatives and declarative questions (rhetorical questions), the employment of lexicalization via using specific lexemes (gap-bridging and back-channel support), and the utilization of slogans (interruption). Such a diversity of linguistic representation mirrors the flexibility of the pragmatic approach in allowing the integration of different linguistic forms to arrive at the intended meaning of interlocutors.

Concerning the second research question, which aims to identify the different types of persuasion each strategy communicates in the discourse of the novel, the analysis has revealed that the five strategies serve to achieve three different types of persuasion: first, pure persuasion, which depends on the employment of facts and logic in the argumentation process; manipulative persuasion, which is based on lies and brainwashing; and coercive persuasion, which is entirely grounded in verbal violence. which makes use of logic, facts, and white arguments that rhetorically target the desires and needs of all discourse participants in the persuasion process, that is, speakers and recipients; second, manipulative persuasion, which is based on lies and brainwashing and totally depends on the rhetorical dimension of power; and, third, coercive persuasion, which refers to the use of both the rhetorical and physical dimensions of power. Crucially, in both manipulative and coercive types of persuasion, the ultimate goal of the argument is the realization of the needs of the powerful participant in the communication process, without any consideration of the recipients' benefits.

As for the extent to which the five strategies contribute to the production of pure, manipulative and coercive persuasion, which is sought by the third research question, the analysis has shown that the five strategies, together with their different linguistic manifestations in the novel, are very indicative in the production of the three types of persuasion. It is analytically clarified that these strategies, however low in their indicative frequencies, are very effective in communicating persuasion among interlocutors. This, in turn, accentuates the fact that the significance of any linguistic form, be it a word, phrase, and/or sentence, is not only measured by the degree of its occurrence textually but also by the ideological weight these occurrences (sometimes very few) maintain contextually.

In terms of the fourth research question, the analysis has further revealed that applying the pragmatic approach to the analysis of the narrative genre, as is the case for the current study, is linguistically relevant to explore the different meanings that lie beyond the surface semantic propositions of linguistic expressions. Crucially, this can successfully be conducted at the character-to-character level of discourse; that is, through the conversational turns that occur between characters within the whole narrative discourse, which constitutes one of the communication levels in novels.

Finally, for future research, other levels of analysis, such as the lexical, the semantic, and the syntactic, can be employed in the analysis of narrative genres with the research objective of comparing between the different linguistic levels of analysis in terms of the extent to which they are linguistically relevant to the study of these texts. This linguistic comparison could reveal further findings that give precedence to one particular level of analysis over the other levels in relation to the different literary and/or non-literary texts. Also recommended is an extensive study of the pragmatics of persuasion in naturally occurring conversations. This might contribute to differentiating between the strategies of persuasion used in real communication and those employed in fictional communication.

Acknowledgement

References

Adam, N. (2021). Your duplicitous point of view': Delayed revelations of hypothetical focalisation in Ian McEwan's Atonement and Sweet Tooth. *Language and Literature*, *30*(2), 174-199. https://doi.org/10.1177/09639470211009734

Adams, M. (2017). The pragmatics of estrangement in fantasy and science fiction. In: Locher, M., & Jucker, A. (Eds.), *Pragmatics of fiction* (pp. 330-363). Germany: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431094-011

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford Oxford University Press.

Bednarek, M. (2017). The role of dialogue in fiction. In: Locher, M. & Jucker, A. (Eds.), *Pragmatics of Fiction* (pp. 129-158). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431094-005

Billig, M. (2003). Critical discourse analysis and the rhetoric of critique. In: Weiss, G. & Wodak, R. (eds), *Critical discourse analysis*: *Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 35-46). Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230288423_2

Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). Discourse pragmatics. In van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction. Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, *2,* (pp. 38-63). Sage Publications.

Brembeck, L. W., & Howell, S. W. (1952). *Persuasion: A means of social control*. Prentice-Hall, INC.

Bromberek-Dyzman, K., Jankowiak, K., & Chełminiak, P. (2021). Modality matters: Testing bilingual irony comprehension in the textual, auditory, and audio-visual modality. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *180*, 219-231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.05.007

Brown, A. (1984). Examining Orwell: Political and literary values in education. In: Norris, K. (Ed.), *Inside the myth. Orwell: Views from the left* (pp. 39-61). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085

Bryant, D. C. (1972). Rhetoric: Function and its scope. In: Ehninger, D. (Ed.), *Contemporary rhetoric* (pp. 15-37). Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Busse, B. (2017). Pragmatics of style in fiction. In: Locher, M., & Jucker, A. (Eds.), *Pragmatics of fiction* (pp. 197-233). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431094-007

Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric. The persuasive power of metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan.

https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230501706

Culpeper, J., & Fernandez-Quintanilla, C. (2017). Fictional characterization. In: Locher, M., & Jucker, A. (Eds.), *Pragmatics of fiction*. Germany: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 93-128. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431094-004

Delin, J. (2000). *The language of everyday life: An introduction.* London: Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446218631

Edelman, M. (2001). *The politics of misinformation.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511612640

Fairclough, N. (2014). *Language and power*, (3rd ed). London & New York: Longman.

Fisher, W. R. (1987a). Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value and action. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Fisher, W. R. (1987b). Technical logic, rhetorical logic and narrative rationality. *Argumentation, 1*, 3-21. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00127116

Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.

Galbraith, J. (1983). *The voice of the poor: Essays in economic and political persuasion.* Harvard University Press.

Giltrow, J. (2017). The pragmatics of the genres of fiction. In: Locher, M., & Jucker, A. (Eds.), *Pragmatics of fiction* pp. 55-92). De Gruyter Mouton.   https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431094-003

Grice, H. (1975). Logic and conversation. In: Cole, P., & Morgan, L. (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics, 3,* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Harrison, C. (2020). The truth is we're watching each other': Voiceover narration as 'split self' presentation in *The Handmaid's Tale TV series*. *Language and Literature*, *29*(1), 22-38. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947020905756

Heinrichs, J. (2017). *Thank you for Arguing: What Aristotle, Lincoln, and Homer Simpson can teach us about the art of persuasion* (3rd ed.). New York: Three Rivers Press.

Herre', R. (1985). Persuasion and manipulation. In van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.), *Discourse and communication* (pp. 126-142). Berlin: de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110852141.126

Hirschberg, S. (1999). Analyzing the rhetoric of Nixon's "Checker's Speech". In: Hirschberg, S., & Hirschberg, S. (Eds.), *Reflections on language* (pp. 512-519). New York & Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Hoffmann, C. (2017). Narrative perspectives on voice in fiction (pp. 159-196). In: Locher, M., & Jucker, A. (Eds.), *Pragmatics of fiction*. De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431094-006

Iswara, A., & Bisena, K. A. (2020). Manipulation and persuasion through language features in fake news. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, *6*(1), 26-32. https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.6.1.1338.26-32.

Johnson-Cartee, K., & Copeland, G. A. (2004). *Strategic political communication. rethinking social influence, persuasion, and propaganda*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Jowett, G., & O'Donnell, V. (1992). *Propaganda and persuasion* (2nd ed.). London & Newbury Park: Sage.

Jucker, A. H. (2021). Features of orality in the language of fiction: A corpus-based investigation. *Language and Literature*, *30*(4), 341-360. https://doi.org/10.1177/09639470211047751

Jucker, A. H., & Locher, M. A. (2017). Introducing pragmatics of fiction: Approaches, trends and developments. In Locher, M., & Jucker, A. (Eds.), *Pragmatics of fiction* (pp. 1-24). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431094-001

Khafaga, A. (2021). Exploring ideologies of function words in George Orwell's Animal Farm. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *29*(3), 2089-2111. https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.29.3.30

Khafaga, A. (2022). Caught on page! Micro and macro pragmatics of stage directions parentheticals in Tom Stoppard's Professional Foul. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *193*, 27-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.03.005

Khafaga, A. (2023a). Strategic lexicalization in courtroom discourse: A corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis. *Cogent Arts & Humanities, 10,* 2217585. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2217585

Khafaga, A. (2023b). Imperatives as persuasion strategies in political discourse. *Linguistics Vanguard*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.1515/lingvan-2021-0136

Khafaga, A. (2023c). Beyond relational work: a psycho-pragmatic analysis of impoliteness in Shakespeare's *King Lear*. *Humanities & Social Sciences Communications, 10*, 539. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02039-5

Lakoff, R. T. (1982). Persuasive discourse and ordinary conversation, with examples from advertising. In: Tannen, D. (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 25-42). Georgetown University Press.

Leech, G. N., & Short, M. H. (1981). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. London and New York: Longman. https://doi.org/10.2307/1772012

Lu, S. (2021). Elastic language in persuasion and comforting: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *187*, 115-117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.11.004

Menz, F. (1989). Manipulation strategies in newspapers: A program for critical linguistics. In: Wodak, R. (Ed.), *Language, power and ideology: studies in political discourse* (pp. 227-249). Amsterdam: Benjamins.   https://doi.org/10.1075/ct.7.16men

Messerli, T. (2017). Participation structure in fictional discourse: Authors, scriptwriters, audiences and characters. In Locher, M., & Jucker, A. (eds.), *Pragmatics of fiction* pp. (25-54). Germany: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431094-002

Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1080/10350339309384418

Murphy, S. (2015). I will proclaim myself what I am: Corpus stylistics and the language of Shakespeare's soliloquies. *Language and Literature*, *24*(4), 338-354. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947015598183

Orwell, G. (1979[1944]). *Animal Farm*. Penguin Books Ltd.

Pardo, M. L. (2001). Linguistic persuasion as an essential factor in current democracies: Critical analysis of the globalization discourse in Argentina at the turn and at the end of the century. *Discourse & Society*, *12* (1), 91-118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926501012001006

Partington, A. (2003). *The linguistics of political argument: The spin-doctor and the wolf-park at the White House*. London &New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203218259

Paternoster, A. (2012). Inappropriate inspectors: Impoliteness and overpoliteness in Ian Rankin's and Andrea Camilleri's crime series. *Language and Literature*, *21*(3), 311-324. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947012444221

Pinto, D. (2004). Indoctrinating the youth of post-war Spain: A discourse analysis of a Fascist Civics textbook.   *Discourse &Society*, *15*(5), 649-667. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926504045036

Pridham, F. (2001). *The language of conversation*. London & New York: Routledge.

Risdianto, F., Malihah, N., & Guritno, A. (2019). The analysis of presupposition in George Orwell's novella *Animal Farm*. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, *1*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v1i1.1-12

Ryckebusch, C., & Marcos, H. (2004). Speech acts, social context and parent-toddler play between the ages of 1;5 and 2;3. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *36*, 883-897. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.019

Sandall, R. (1977). *Linguistic style and persuasion.* London: Academic Press Inc.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173438

Searle, J. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609213

Sedley, S. (1984). An immodest proposal: Animal Farm. In: Christopher, N. (Ed.), *Inside the myth. Orwell: Views from the left* (pp. 155-162). London: Lawrence and Wishart. https://doi.org/10.1075/ct.7.09sor

Sell, R. D. (2014). Introduction. In Sell, R. D. (Ed.), *Literature as dialogue: Invitations offered and negotiated* (pp. 1–20). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/ds.22.003int

Seraku, T. (2022). Interactional and rhetorical functions of placeholders: A relevance-theoretic approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *187*, 118-129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.10.023

Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose.* London & New York: Longman.

Simons, W. H. (2001). Persuasion in Society. London: Sage Publications.

Simpsom, P. (1997). *Language through literature: An introduction*. London & New York: Routledge.

Sornig, K. (1989). Some remarks on linguistic strategies of persuasion. In: Wodak, R. (Ed.), *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 95-113.   https://doi.org/10.1075/ct.7.09sor

Sotillo, S. M. (2004). Political discourse in cyberspace and outcomes in real times. In: Martin, P., JoAnne, N. A., & van Dijk, T. A. (Eds.), *Communicating ideologies: Multidisciplinary perspectives on language, discourse, and social practice* (pp. 465-502). New York & Oxford: Peter Lang.

Stark, F. M. (1996). *Communicative interaction, power and the state: A method*. University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781487573911

Stradling, R. (1984). Orwell and the Spanish civil war: A historical critique. In: Christopher, N. (Ed.), *Inside the myth. Orwell: Views from the left* (pp. 103-125). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics.* London & New York: Longman.

Truan, N. (2016). On the pragmatics of interjections in parliamentary interruptions. *Revue de Sémantique et Pragmatique, 40*, 125-144. https://doi.org/10.4000/rsp.323

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4(2)*, 249-283.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006

van Dijk, T. A. (1996). Discourse, power and access. In: Caldas-Coulthard, C., & Coulthard, M. (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 84-104). London & New York: Sage.

van Dijk, T. A. (ed) (1997). Discourse as interaction in society. In: *Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, vol. 2 (pp. 1-37). London & New York: Sage.

Wales, K. (2022). Charles Dickens, children's author: Narrative as rhetoric in A Child's History of England. *Language and Literature*, *31*(1), 85-98. https://doi.org/10.1177/09639470211072170

Welch, R. (1980). *Animal Farm*. Longman.

Whately, R. (1963). *Elements of rhetoric.* Cardandale: Southern Illinios Press.

Woodcock, G. (1984). *The crystal spirit. A study of George Orwell*. New York: Schocken Books.

Yang, F. (2023). Dynamic power relations between characters in *A View from the Bridge*: A pragmastylistic approach. *Language and Literature*, *32*(1), 86-96. https://doi.org/10.1177/09639470231158696

Yule, G. (1996a). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yule, G. (1996b). *The study of language* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.