A dystopian *dialogue* – Semantic and pragmatic perspectives on George Orwell's *1984* and Boualem Sansal's *2084*

Ana-Maria PÂCLEANU[1]

Dystopias are no longer defined as the opposite of utopias and are mostly described by referring to the type of system they depict - "perfectly planned and beneficial", "perfectly planned and unjust" or "perfectly unplanned" (Gordin, Tilley, and Prakash 2010, 2). Furthermore, dystopias are said to reflect societies' worries and warn about some flaws of religious, political systems or science in terms of relationships between the past, the present and the future. George Orwell's "1984" and Boualem Sansal's "2084". The End of the World are dystopian novels that fall into two different categories (based on the type of authority exercising control) – the former is political dystopia and the latter is a religious one. 2084 has often been described as a tribute to Orwell and his 'Big Brother', but the cult of personality is depicted by pointing at elements related to religion. It stands out as an even more explicit illustration of totalitarian regimes and their practices especially when connected to religion. However, both novels revolve around the concepts of ideology, cult of personality and power enforcement. Thus, despite their typology, the dialogue between these two dystopias becomes obvious as regards genre and intertextuality, but also the semantic and pragmatic features they share. Therefore, with a view to tracing the meanings conveyed through language, the present paper tackles the aforementioned dystopian novels from the perspective of these two complementary branches of linguistics, in an attempt at identifying the similarities (especially those referring to ideologies and power).

Keywords: *dystopia, intertextuality, power, religion, pragmatic and semantic features.*

1. Introduction

When it comes to literary texts that are inspired or stem from previously existent literary works, dystopian novels could be a very eloquent example of how intertextuality works.

---

[1] Dunărea de Jos University of Galați, Romania, ana-maria.pacleanu@ugal.ro

The paper "A Dystopian *Dialogue* – Semantic and Pragmatic Perspectives on George Orwell's *1984* and Boualem Sansal's *2084"* enquires into how the same genre and subject matter can cause a novel published 66 years after Orwell's masterpiece be extensively similar to its *Big Brother* in terms of linguistic features, i.e. how similar meanings are conveyed through language after 66 years.

It is obvious from the very title and literary critics' comments that *2084* is a tribute to Orwell's *1984*, but since assumptions cannot be made solely by considering title or characters resemblance, comparing the language of two pieces of fictional literature is a practical means to acquire clear insights into how a political dystopia became the source of inspiration for a religious dystopia. It is, to a certain extent, a more empirical means to show that a not very scientific principle like "what you see is what you get" might refer to the fact that the actual samples of texts provide the best pieces of evidence that could enhance conclusion drawing about the resemblance between the two. Thus, the premise of the research is that intertextuality triggers similarities that can and shall be highlighted at a linguistic level.

However, given the complexity of the language Orwell used in his fiction, this principle does not apply when it comes to the way meanings are encoded in the two novels.

Therefore, the aim of this study is to identify some recurrent semantic and pragmatic patterns of structure and meaning that reveal the similarities between the two dystopias – *1984* and *2084*.

2. Theoretical framework

The present approach is an interdisciplinary one, because the texts under scrutiny in this research are literary texts, hence the similarities between them are analysed by referring to literary criticism elements as well as to two of the major branches of linguistics.

However, since both texts belong to the genre of dystopian literature, as a first step, concepts from literary criticism have been useful in determining the features the two texts share by belonging to the same genre. Also, details on the triangle power-literature-language have been provided by pointing at relevant elements especially from George Orwell's works and the social and cultural contexts of the times his works were published in.

In addition, since a literary text should be seen as discourse, as communication rather than a mere product meant to be 'used as it is', it is important to consider "samples" of texts in which we can identify, although in a fictional context, features that are mimetic of reality. This has enabled us to

identify features that exist in day-to-day language (what we could call real language) but could be deviant or used in a deviant manner in fictional discourse. In coping with this potential difficulty, theorists like Adams have taken into consideration the special "linguistic conditions of fictional discourse" while proving how pragmatics and fiction complement each other" (1985, 1).

As a second step, linguistic criticism is the approach that has allowed an analysis of the linguistic structure of the two novels with a view to identify these similarities in terms of pragmatic and semantic features. The efficiency and relevance of this approach (pioneered by Roger Fowler) will be proved here especially as related to the way power is referred to or conveyed in language. Therefore, the sample of texts inserted in this section are excerpts from the two novels that have been scrutinized/ analysed in order to identify the aforementioned similarities.

The importance of intertextuality has not been overlooked as it is a key concept in this comparative analysis of meanings conveyed through language in the two dystopias. More precisely, it is what has been called (in this study) "recognition of patterns" – a method usually used in machine learning algorithms and that is most of the time followed by an analysis of the identified /recognized patterns.

3. Elements of literary criticism

In the article "Intertextuality" published in the volume *Discoursive Pragmatics*, 2011, 158, Slembrough recalls the importance of intertextuality as it had been put forth by De Beaugrand and Dressler in the 1980s – i.e. a previously encountered text enhances the reception and use of a recently produced text. Moreover, there has also been special attention paid to the role of intertextuality as a crucial factor in the evolution of some classes of texts or text types with typical patterns or characteristics, thus intertextuality has become "a cognitive condition in the production and reception of actual texts" (2011, 157).

Intertextuality has been defined in more or less different ways by various scholars, but the most basic definition has its origin in Bakhtin's idea that when we speak, the language we use automatically echoes earlier uses of language (cited by Black 2011, 49). Thus, similarly, in a literary text, the writer might quote another literary work or echo it by different means (as it will be shown how 1984 is echoed in 2084, directly in the warning and indirectly throughout the whole novel).

The most important feature the two novels share is their belonging to the dystopian genre. Recently, dystopias have no longer been defined as "utopias

gone wrong" or the opposite of utopias. They have been mostly described by referring to the type of system they depict - "perfectly planned and beneficial", "perfectly planned and unjust" or "perfectly unplanned" (Gordin, Tilley, and Prakash 2010, 2).

Furthermore, dystopias are said to have the same purpose as utopias, "to make their audiences critically evaluate and perhaps improve their own societies" (Isomaa, Korpua, Teittinen xxi). In other words, they reflect societies' worries and warn about some flaws of religious, political systems or science in terms of relationships between the past, the present and the future and this is achieved through some pragmatic elements like speech acts and their force proving that "literature has some predominant practical functions, such as a warning, criticism, defense or piece of advice with respect to a certain attitude or action of the author or the reader(s)" (van Dijk 1981, 250).

The connection between reality and dystopian literature has been studied by theorist like Harsanyi and Kennedy (1994, 149-179) (cited in Isomaa, Korpua, Teittinen 2020, 77) who rightly argued that "regimes can use dystopian values of nationalism for their own purposes" but at the same time, along with / besides (because they usually 'coexist') this authority that dominates and enforces its ideas and power, there is also a "resistance movement" (or more than one) whose role is "to change the society to correspond with liberal values that are considered to make the world automatically a better place" (Isomaa, Korpua, Teittinen 2020, 97).

Therefore, when speaking about the two dystopias, it is necessary to provide some details about the cultural and historical contexts that have triggered the two writers to write the political and the religious dystopias under discussion.

4. Everything 'ends' in '84

George Orwell's *1984* and Boualem Sansal's *2084. The End of the World* are dystopian novels that fall into two different categories (based on the type of authority exercising control) – the former is political dystopia and the latter is a religious one.

The purpose (and thus the social, political and cultural context) of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, published in 1949, was explained by Orwell in Press Release, in 15 June 1949, by replying to some reviews (Reprinted in B. Crick ed. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* at Oxford: Clarendon Press 1984, 152-3):

> [A]llowing for the book being after all a parody, something like NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR could happen. This is the direction in which the world is going at the present time, and the trend lies deep in the political, social and economic foundations of the contemporary world situation. Specifically, the danger lies in the structure imposed on Socialist and on Liberal capitalist communities by the necessity to prepare for total war with the USSR and the new weapons, of which of course the atomic bomb is the most powerful and the most publicized. But danger lies also in the acceptance of a totalitarian outlook by intellectuals of all colours.

In addition, a letter to Francis A. Henson, an American trade union leader, makes the purpose of the novel even more explicit:

> My recent novel is NOT intended as an attack on Socialism or on the British Labour Party (of which I am a supporter) but as a show-up of the perversions to which a centralised economy is liable and which have been partly realised in Communism and Fascism.

2084. The End of the World, written by Boualem Sansal (an Algerian writer), was published in 2015. The state of affairs in a country like Algeria at that time was most probably the one that inspired him. A president who ruled for 20 years (until 2019 when he was pushed out of power by popular protests) after turning a newly independent nation into military autocracy, brought the country "into shambles" (https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/10/14/algeria-bouteflika-death-fln-hirak-oil-military-pouvoir/).

Since the novel is quite recent, there are no literary studies about it, but it has often been described (in reviews) as a tribute to *Orwell* and his 'Big Brother'. The *cult of personality* is in this case depicted by pointing at elements related to religion. Given the fact that the writer bases "the religion of Abistan on a parody of Muslim doctrine" but "adventures are told in *some* detail" and "much of the novel is based on explanations of the force of the religion and its power over the inhabitants with little description of characters or events" (Adele King, World Literature Today), the novel stands out as a very explicit illustration of totalitarian regimes and their practices especially when connected to religion. Consequently, it must be agreed with Yassin-Kassab, who describes it as intriguing because it *sounds* like "a statement rather than a question (Yassin-Kassab, The National), in other words, like a textbook on totalitarianism and its practices (very similar to Goldstein's Book, forbidden but illicitly read by the protagonist in *1984*).

In most reviews, it has been acknowledged that the Algerian writer showed his ability to lay out "a fantastically detailed dystopia in complex and often elegant

prose, with "characters that are somewhat two-dimensional" and a plot that "can seem almost accidental". According to critics, it is a complex novel that should read as "a mix of satire, fable and polemic" that, just like 1984, "celebrates resistance" (Claire Hazelton in The Guardian).

5. Elements of linguistic criticism

Given the features these texts share, they are obviously prone to be similar in both form and meaning and an investigation into the features they share can be done by means of linguistic criticism, with particular focus on the semantic and pragmatic level.

It must be mentioned that *2084. The End of the World* is not the original text, but a translation from French into English. However, this has not hindered the comparative analysis of *1984* and *2084* inasmuch as the translations read as smoothly as the original both at a first sight and during a more thorough reading.

As Kohn rightly argues, translators should find, in the target language, the semantic-stylistic units that can re-create the functional sequence of the original (1983, 52), a fact that implies rendering both the content and the form. Considering the fact that the translation reads smoothly and sounds natural and strikingly similar to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, at this stage, it can be agreed that the translator achieved this. Thus, the comparative analysis (meant to identify the semantics and pragmatic features that the two dystopias have in common) is possible despite the more recent text being a translation from French. The value of the translation has also been acknowledged by critics in reviews like Kate Webb's in the Times Literary Supplement: "Alison Anderson's deft and intelligent translation of *2084* helps to overcome such binary thinking by conveying Sansal's abhorrence of a system that controls people's minds, while explaining that the religion was not originally evil but has been corrupted…" (https://www.complete-review.com/reviews/algerie/sansalb2.htm).

Nevertheless, assessing the accuracy of the translation or the translator's ability to deal with deviance – a recurrent feature of literary texts – will be the objective of further studies.

Alongside with the pragmatic account of literature at a macro-level, as it has been suggested by van Dijk (the idea that in literary communication, we do not only have texts, but that the production and interpretation of such texts are social actions), in the present study certain types of meanings are given particular attention. For instance, descriptive/ conceptual versus social and expressive meaning especially (but not exclusively) in direct and indirect speech acts (and their locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary levels). Another element that should

not be overlooked when looking at this typology of texts is deixis, an important indicator of the relationships between characters especially as regards obedience and submission to authorities (religious or political).

As mentioned earlier, fictional language can be analysed in terms of its semantics and pragmatics but here these could be employed on a two level analysis. Both levels refer to the world, processes and actions in the fictional discourse. Language can, therefore, be examined in terms of narrator-to-reader interaction and character-to-character interaction, hence the importance of language as a communicative code shared by the participants in these two types of 'situations' (at these two levels).

Given Sansal's intention or purpose of choosing to write a dystopia, to imagine a world similar to that in Orwell's 1984 and to deliberately create a fictional text in order to warn the audience about a near or far future or something that has happened (but has been voluntarily or involuntarily ignored by people) focus has been laid here on the fictional discourse as a communicative code in the narrator-to-character and character-to-character interaction.

To support the analysis, R. Fowler's ideas (drawn from Halliday's *Introduction to Functional Grammar* and *Language as Social Semiotic)* are of great avail when attempting to prove that vocabulary and syntax are not the only levels of linguistic structure involved in encoding meanings, hence the importance of the levels discussed in this research.

Fowler's ideas derive from the importance Halliday's gives to the *ideational function of language* (one of the three language functions along with the *textual* and *interpersonal* functions). Through this function, "the speaker or writer embodies in language his experience of the phenomena of the real world" (cited in Fowler 1996, 31). Therefore, a statement about the originality of literature in encoding meanings (like Petrey's) totally supports the legitimate nature/ validity of language in fictional discourse (where meanings are encoded just like or more expressively than real language) – "to read a work of imaginative literature is to encounter words that do things through processes like those allowing all other performative language to produce what it names" (Petrey 1990, 13).

Consequently, literary texts should be analysed in the manner we deal with and analyse 'real' discourse.

The 'dialogue' between a novel written in the twentieth century and a 2015 novel consists not only in a similar subject matter but also in very similar "compositional" features (very similar meanings conveyed through, at times, very similar language) or elements that hint (especially to connoisseurs of literature) at ideologies and power. In identifying these meanings conveyed through language, it

was necessary to always keep in mind intertextuality, as well as its advantages and disadvantages in the present contrastive analysis.

On the one hand, as regards the disadvantages of having such similar literary texts, one can easily notice a possible violation of some of Grice's conversational maxims like the maxim of manner in the cooperative principle that refers to information that should be organized and rendered by avoiding ambiguity and obscurity in order to be assimilated.

For example, if intertextuality (used as a textual strategy) is misunderstood or missed by the readers who do not have a "background" related to history, literary criticism or if they simply read it as a story, this will result in *a violation of the maxim of manner*. Thus, instead of enriching the text by recalling some important ideas or concepts and making the reader a part of the communication process by "promoting a feeling of inclusion" (of knowing/ having the knowledge), as Black puts it, (2011, 50), the effect is the opposite. This means that connections with other texts or quotes from other texts could be an overwhelming amount of information that would hinder the process of assimilation on the part of the listener or reader.

This is similar to the dichotomy habitualization vs defamiliarization, in which the reader is (with or without being aware) estranged from the text. The consequence is that the effect of the text is not the one that intertextuality might have been used for. Echoing or quoting other texts would result in an abundance of details that would not add particular or catchy features to the text, but on the contrary, would make it difficult to read.

On the other hand, the advantages of intertextuality lie in the very variety of pragmatic features these share. For instance, 2084 constantly echoes 1984 mainly through its perlocutionary aim. According to some theorists, fictional texts do not have a perlocutionary aim (though they might try to persuade within the writer-to-reader interaction frame that something is or is not right) as it can be noticed especially in the Warning in the first pages of 2084), but throughout the fictional discourse, the characters do have perlocutionary aims.

When acknowledging what could be called 'the advantages of intertextuality', its connection with the *genre* cannot be departed from inasmuch as the concept of habit/ convention (i.e. the expectations that readers set based on their prior knowledge of the generic forms or characteristics of a literary work) makes a semantico-pragmatic analysis of fictional literature an endeavour whose utility cannot and should not be contested.

Therefore, it can be agreed with Wood (2021, xii) on the fact that "the interpretation of literature is more complex than the reception of illocutionary acts" and it often involves "a complex web of intertextual relations that may or

may not be apprehended by the interpreter". Thus, it is clear that the audience's (readers') knowledge could enhance the "recognition of patterns" that are recurrent in the two dystopias.

However, even when the readers are not familiar with the conventions of this genre and do not have prior knowledge about what the 2015 novel recalls of the 1949 one, examining how meanings about power and ideology are similarly encoded in the two dystopian novels can clearly facilitate this recognition through means as the ones employed in the analysis below.

6. Pragmatic and semantic features of the '84opias'

As it has been presented, the aim of this study is to be achieved by not considering the problems that scholars like Adams (in his *Pragmatics and Fiction* 1985, 2) have identified when attempting to answer the question 'How can we refer to fictional identities if we keep in mind Searle's axiom of existence <<whatever we refer to must exist>> or, in other words, what is the correspondence between language and the world when we speak about fictional entities?'. Investigating into this problem of fiction and reference is not the purpose of this paper.

Thus, at this point it is worth bringing into discussion the previously mentioned metaphor - "recognition of patterns". This metaphor has been used because the very comparative analysis in this study works similarly to some automation principles – i.e. algorithms are implemented in order to emulate the human ability to describe and classify objects (Marques de Sa 2001, 1). In this case, the knowledge of linguistics that makes up the theoretical frame of this research, is to be used as 'algorithms'.

In *1984,* a *dialogue* between the protagonist and O'Brien (the person who tortures and tries to brainwash him) could not be analysed by ignoring speech acts and their aims or force. Furthermore, in an excerpt from *2084* (referring to religion and how 'Yolah the almighty' and his messenger Abi impose their ideas while being 'merciful'), the social meaning acquired by words when the *narrator* directly or indirectly praises them cannot be overlooked. Also, a warning addressed to the reader could be considered in terms of how directives are used to engage the reader to a limited extent.

a.   The narrator-to-reader interaction

1984	2084
"The Ministry of Truth—Minitrue, in Newspeak [Newspeak was the official language of Oceania. For an account of its structure and etymology **see Appendix**.]. …From where Winston stood it was just possible to read, picked out on its white face in elegant lettering, the three slogans of the Party: WAR IS PEACE FREEDOM IS SLAVERY IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH" (2008: 6).	WARNING "**The reader is advised to refrain from believing** that this is a true story, or that it is based on any known reality. **No**, in truth, everything has been invented, the characters, the events, and all the rest, and the proof of this is that the story is set in a distant world, in a distant future that looks **nothing** like our own. This is a work of pure invention: the world of Bigaye that I describe in these pages does **not** exist and has no reason to exist in the future, just as the world of Big Brother imagined by George Orwell, and so marvelously depicted in his novel 1984, did not exist in his time, does not exist in our own, and truly has no reason to exist in the future. **Sleep soundly**, good people, everything is sheer falsehood, and the rest is **under control**. (2015, 5).

Table 1. Excerpts displaying instances of narrator-to-reader interaction

A whole novel can be, in fact, considered a narrator-to-reader interaction because everything is, in fact, addressed to the readers (although mostly indirectly), just like a story teller assumes that the one hearing his story is listening, a cooperative principle of communication where the hearer is always quiet. As Black puts it, "in dialogue, which is analogous to real-life conversation, one should be able to apply the maxims as usual. In the discourse of the narrator, the matter is more complex, though the real-life analogy exists too: we tell each other stories, often for a range of interpersonal reasons" (2006, 32).

Nonetheless, in these two novels there are some special instances of narrator-reader interaction. For example, in Orwell's novel, an instance when the narrator addresses the reader directly is when using the verb "see" in a formal way, that recalls the way researchers provide the references in a scientific paper, possibly aiming at accuracy and a sense of verisimilitude.

In *2084*, the effect of this literary technique is completely different. The warning at the beginning does not have a corresponding part in *1984*, but it is the first and most evident proof of intertextuality when referring to Orwell's dystopia. It starts with an indirect speech act that sounds like a theoretical part about fiction

(here called "invention") and it ends with a directive (that could be found ironical) meant to reassure the reader that the world described in the story does not exist. Furthermore, the indirect speech act where "the reader is advised to refrain from believing" consists, in fact, in a directive disguised in an assertive. Avoiding the directive might be a matter of politeness.

Other interesting elements in this warning are the amount of particles used to create negatives ("No", "nothing", "not", "no") and the last group of words "under control", a collocation that is recurrent in both dystopias, with semantic implications that are not as positive as this warning apparently displays (leaving aside the irony). If in the warning it had a supposedly reassuring function, the same collocation acquires a negative meaning (in *1984*) especially when preceded by modifiers like "perfectly" or "satisfactorily in contexts like "but that was merely a piece of furtive knowledge which he happened to possess because his memory was not satisfactorily under control" (Orwell 2008, 43) or "it was possible that his features had not been perfectly under control. It was terribly dangerous to let your thoughts wander when you were in any public place or within range of a telescreen" (2008, 79).

Moreover, the noun "control" appears quite frequently coordinated with other words belonging to the semantic fields of violence, war etc. – "control and repression" (Sansal 2015, 81) or followed by phrases that refer to the control of memory, mind, reality or believers. All these sets of phrases and collocations containing the word "control" hint at power enforcement and imply lack of freedom of speech / thought.

Another detail that is worth mentioning at this narrator-to-reader level is that the insertion of many pages of quotation from 'the book', supposedly Goldstein's (the Enemy) critique of the ruling oligarchy as well as an Appendix on 'The Principles of Newspeak', again extraneous to the main narrative structure of the novel, is a characteristic of Orwellian departure from conventional narration. This complicates the process of reading and makes it difficult to understand who addresses who, violating Grice's maxim of manner by creating ambiguity in the reception of the message by the reader. The most important attempt to break up the quoted text and integrate chunks of it in the narrative is when the protagonist reads sections of it first to himself and then to another character who does not even listen to him.

The Warning in Sansal's dystopia is a less evident departure from conventional narration as it does not seem to complicate the process of reading due to its insertion at the very beginning. However, it is still not a recurrent way of beginning a novel and could be seen as a violation of Grice's maxim of manner.

b. Character-to-character interaction

Although the first set of samples is not an actual character-to-character interaction, it will be further pointed out how some linguistic elements suggest an interaction of this type although not within a speech act per se.

1984	*2084*
"Then the face of Big Brother faded away again, and instead the three slogans of the Party stood out in bold capitals: *WAR IS PEACE* *FREEDOM IS SLAVERY* *IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH* But the face of Big Brother seemed to persist for several seconds on the screen, as though the impact that it had made on everyone's eyeballs was too vivid to wear off immediately. The little sandy-haired woman had flung herself forward over the back of the chair in front of her. With a tremulous murmur that sounded like 'My Saviour!' she extended her arms towards the screen. Then she buried her face in her hands. It was apparent that she was uttering a **prayer**. At this moment the entire group of people broke into a **deep, slow, rhythmical chant of 'B-B!...B-B!'—over and over again, very slowly,** with a long pause between the first 'B' and the second—a **heavy, murmurous sound**, somehow curiously savage, in the background of which one seemed to hear the stamp of naked feet and the throbbing of tomtoms. For perhaps as much as thirty seconds they kept it up. It was a refrain that was often heard in moments of overwhelming emotion. Partly it was a sort of **hymn to the wisdom and majesty of Big Brother,** but still more it was **an act of self-hypnosis**, a deliberate **drowning of consciousness** by means of **rhythmic noise**." (2008, 20-21)	When waiting for the Bidi, the Blessed Day, the great departure, "they gathered together at extraordinary jamborees, … they listened to the oldest , who'd reached the limits of exhaustion but not of hope, tell of their long and blessed ordeal, known as the Expectation. Every sentence was met with an encouraging response from a powerful megaphone: '**Yolah is just**', '**Yolah is patient**', '**Yolah is great**', '**Abi supports you**', '**Abi is with you**' etc., echoed by ten thousand throats with emotion. Then there was **prayer**, elbow to elbow, everyone chanting their heads off, singing the **odes** written by Abi, until they began over again unto exhaustion. […] '**Our** faith is the **soul** of the world, and Abi is its beating **heart**.', '**Submission is faith and faith is truth**.>' '**The Apparatus and the people are ONE**, as Yölah and Abi are One.' '**To Yölah we belong, to Abi we obey.**' etc.: were the ninety-nine key phrases one learned from earliest childhood, and one recited for the rest of one's life." (2015, 13-14).

Table 2. Instances of character-to-character interaction

In these excerpts, the interaction between characters takes place in the form of prayer, adoration, and praise (see the term "prayer" mentioned in both the political and the religious dystopia). In Orwell's novel, the adoration of the ruler is described by the narrator through collocations or words with conceptual meaning like "rhythmical chant", "rhythmic noise", "refrain", "hymn" or phrases like "act of self-hypnosis" or "drowning of consciousness" (in which the reflected meaning could be considered), or expressed directly by reproducing the chant 'B-B…B-B!" (the sound obviously refers to the name of the ruler). A very clear instance of praise is 'My Saviour!' uttered by one of the characters, not a complete speech act like those in *The End of the World* – full utterances that paradoxically do not belong to the believers, but to those that dictated them what to say. It is, therefore, a type of dialogue between the "megaphone people" and the believers who then repeat / echo the praising words or the phrases recited for indoctrination.

Person deixis as used in these excerpts shows involvement – "My" (in *1984*) and "our" (*2084*). The dominated express(es) their adoration towards the authority.

Moreover, the repetition of the personal pronoun "we" (in *2084*) in a deviant way, i.e. after the indirect object, is the clearest illustration (even at the syntactic level) of the priority given to the authority/ power/ dominator, continuing the "Submission is faith and faith is truth" principle.

c. Characters' and narrators' speeches on languages and re-writing

1984	*2084*
" 'The Eleventh Edition is the definitive edition,' he said. 'We're getting the language into its final shape—the shape it's going to have when nobody speaks anything else. When we've finished with it, people like you will have to learn it all over again. You think, I dare say, that our chief job is inventing new words. But not a bit of it! **We're destroying** words— scores of them, hundreds of them, every day. We're **cutting the language down** to the bone. The Eleventh Edition won't contain a single word that will become obsolete before the year 2050…It's a beautiful thing, **the destruction of words**…" (2008, 65)	"It was during the period of successive cataclysms that God was given a new name, Yolah. Times had changed, according to the primordial Promise; another world had been born, on an earth that was cleansed, devoted to truth, beneath the gazes of God and Abi; everything must be **renamed**, everything must be **rewritten**, so that the new life would not be sullied by bygone History, which was now null and void, effaced as if it had never existed. The Just Brotherhood granted Abi the humble but eminently explicit title of Delegate and it conceived a sober, moving salutation for him: 'Abi the Delegate, may salvation be upon him', while kissing the back of one's left hand. […] History was **rewritten** and sealed by the hand of Abi; the present is eternal, today is

1984	*2084*
	always here, time in its entirety can fit in Yolah's hand, he knows things, **he decides upon their meaning** and instructs whomever he chooses" (2015, 13).

Table 3. Common linguistic features of speeches on the destruction of languages

The excerpts in the table above have been chosen because they both refer to the destruction of words, change of names, of meanings and rewritten history, but in a slightly different manner. The verbs used by Orwell are referring to destruction – "we're destroying", "cutting down", clearly described in the character's speech as very different from "inventing new words". Moreover, the cataphoric use of the pronoun "it" (along with the noun phrase "beautiful thing") that refers to the noun "destruction" shows that the tone in the character's utterance shows fulfilment and excitement.

Sansal tones the meanings down by using verbs that seem to be previously described by the sentence "he decides upon their meanings" – derivatives like "rewritten", "renamed", that can be seen as more abstract than the vocabulary used in *1984* and are part of structures in passive voice that, despite accompanying modals of obligation, are not as incisive as the ones in the other dystopia.

7. Conclusions

In an attempt to prove that intertextuality triggers similarities in both form and meaning, the present study has put fictional discourse under the lens by analysing the fictional language in a novel about a world similar to that of Orwell's *Big Brother*.

Given the fact that fictional discourse can be seen as a communicative code in the narrator-to-reader and character-to-character interactions, this investigation into the features shared by the two dystopias has been done by using linguistic criticism elements, with focus on the semantic and pragmatic level inasmuch as language 'makes sense' and should be considered in relation to its users.

One of the most important steps in this comparative analysis has been the 'recognition of patterns' that has enabled us to identify identical or similar terms and structures that show how meanings are encoded by two writers, in different times, to achieve effects that this genre generally achieves – i.e. to keep the habit/ convention and to trigger expectations based on the prior knowledge of the characteristics of dystopias.

Some recurrent semantic and pragmatic patterns of structure and meaning identified in the analysed samples refer to the manner the narrators addressed the readers in pieces of text extraneous to the main narrative structure (mainly indirect speech acts) and that are far from being informative or reassuring. In addition, the occurrence of structures referring to "control" are frequently coordinated with other words belonging to semantic fields that make them acquire negative connotations.

At the character-to-character interaction level, the praising words or the phrases recited for indoctrination, though used with slightly different intensity, are the clearest evidence of intertextuality. Moreover, the deictic elements show involvement as well as a clear impact of the cult of personality. For instance, in excerpts on the destruction of history, languages and culture, characters' beliefs or convictions are emphasized through verbs referring to complete removal or re-doing/ re-making and deixis is used in the characters' utterances in order to make these elements acquire features of stylistic devices.

In conclusion, the ways meanings are encoded in the two dystopias are very similar and the analysis of samples on the same *topics* provide, in a more practical manner, clearer insights into how the 'dialogue' between a novel written in the twentieth century and a 2015 novel consists in very similar "compositional" features or elements that hint at ideologies and power.

References

Adams, Jon-K. 1985. *Pragmatics and Fiction*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Black, Elizabeth. 2006. *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Demerjian MacKay, Louisa (ed.). 2016. *The Age of Dystopia. One Genre, Our Fears and Our Future*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Fowler, Roger 1995. *The Language of George Orwell*. London: Macmillan.

Fowler, Roger 1996. *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.

Gordin, Michael D., Tilley Hellen, and Prakash Gyan. 2010. *Utopia/ Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility*. Princeton and New York: Princeton University Press.

https://fictionwritersreview.com/review/2084-the-end-of-the-world-by-boualem-sansal/

https://foreignpolicy.com/tag/algeria/

https://www.complete-review.com/reviews/algerie/sansalb2.htm

https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/prophesying-doom

https://www.theguardian.com/books/2017/feb/10/2084-boualem-sansal-review-
      timely-tribute-george-orwell

https://www.worldliteraturetoday.org/2016/january/2084-la-fin-du-monde-
      boualem-sansal

Huang, Y*an* (ed.). 2017. *The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford
      University Press.

Isomaa, Saija, Jyirki Korpua, and Jouni Teittinen. 2020. *New Perspectives on
      Dystopian Fiction in Literature and Other Media*. Newcastle upon Tyne:
      Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Kohn, Ioan. 1983. *Virtuțile compensatorii ale limbii române în traducere*. Timișoara:
      Facla.

Marks, Peter, Jennifer A. Wagner-Lawlor, and Fatima Vieira. 2022. *The Palgrave
      Handbook of Utopian and Dystopian Literatures*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Marques de Sa, J.P. 2001. *Pattern Recognition: Concepts, Methods, and
      Applications*. New York: Springer.

Neagu, Mariana and Claudia Pisoschi. 2018. *Fundamentals of Semantics and
      Pragmatics* (2nd edition). Craiova: Editura Universitaria.

Orwell, George. 2008. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Penguin Books.

Petrey, Sandy. 1990. *Speech Acts and Literary Theory*. London: Routledge.

Reznikov, Andrei. 2001. *George Orwell's Theory of Language*. Lincoln: Writers Club
      Press.

Sansal, Boualem. 2017. *2084. The End of the World*. New York: Europa Editions.

Stock, Adam. 2019. *Modern Dystopian Fiction and Political Thought*. New York:
      Routledge.

van Dijk, Teun. 1981. *Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse*. Mouton Publishers.

Wood, Tahir. 2021. *Philosophy of the Act and the Pragmatics of Fiction*. Newcastle
      upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Zienkowski, Ian, Jan-Ola Ostman, and Jef Verschueren. 2011. *Discursive Pragmatics*.
      Vol. 8. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.