
Decoding Narrative Structures: Orwell's *Animal Farm* Through the Framework of Structuralism

Ayush A. Prajapati

Research Scholar, Department of English, Veer Narmad South Gujarat University, Surat.

Article Received: 05/03/2026**Article Accepted:**28/04/2026**Published Online:**30/04/2026**DOI:**10.47311/IJOES.2026.8.04.734

Abstract

The present research aims at analysing *Animal Farm* through the theory of Structuralism. It explores Orwell's symbolical use of animals and repeated patterns in the form of an allegory to present ideas on corruption, revolution and political manipulation. This becomes possible only because of the underlying structure that govern language, literature and society. The study explores that the relationships between characters, symbols and events create significant meanings within the text which reflects the realities of the political society. Through this approach, the research tries to understand how Orwell criticises political oppression and shows that the struggle for power is a common reality in every society. This reflects the structuralist idea that people in power shape society's meaning and order through language, ideas, and ideology.

Keywords: Structuralism, Political Manipulation, Power, Corruption, Allegory, Symbolism, Narrative Structure, Animal Farm, George Orwell.

Introduction

The primary focus of this paper is the exploration of the internal and political motives that Orwell had while composing *Animal Farm*. His other works such as *1984* present a bleak vision of a dystopian future, but in *Animal Farm* Orwell uses allegory and satire to comment on real-world political events. The novel is not just a simple parable, but it has a deeper underlying meaning. It was possible to execute only because of the underlying structures that govern literature, language, and society. The novel's carefully crafted narrative structure, with its repetitive cycles of revolution and betrayal, reinforces

the idea that societal patterns and ideological constructs dictate historical outcomes.

The writer uses animals as a mouthpiece for various political leaders, illustrating how their decisions and motives shape the lives of others. Each animal represents a specific social or political class, which is divided based on their roles and perceived status within the animal kingdom. The swine, associated with filth and cunning, symbolizes the corrupt elite, reinforcing the idea that meaning in literature is derived from relational contrasts rather than individual elements.

This deliberate characterization reinforces Orwell's critique of political hypocrisy and the cyclical nature of oppression, where revolutionary ideals are ultimately compromised by those who seek control. The division of animals based on their roles and perceptions in the natural order mirrors the rigid class structures present in human society. This structuralist approach highlights how Orwell's narrative is shaped by recurring patterns of dominance and subjugation, illustrating the universality of power dynamics.

Animals have predefined roles within the animal kingdom, and when these roles are disrupted, disorder ensues, leaving all animals vulnerable to the dominance of a single entity. Orwell uses this structured hierarchy to reflect the political landscape, where certain nations or ruling classes exert control over others, often dictating their fate through strategic actions. Through this allegory, the writer critiques global power structures, highlighting how dominant forces manipulate societal roles to maintain authority, mirroring how imperial and totalitarian regimes have historically governed and oppressed weaker nations.

Structuralism focuses on identifying the underlying principles that govern any activity or entity on Earth. Its first significant application was in the study of language, where it analysed the structures that shape meaning. When applied to narrative, structuralism helps decode the deeper frameworks that organize a story. In the case of *Animal Farm*, these underlying principles revolve around power and corruption, where fundamental structures are not only within the novel but also in the society it critiques. By examining the relationships between characters, symbols, and events, structuralism reveals how Orwell constructs a systematic critique of authority and ideological manipulation.

Roland Barthes focused on the symbolism of language and analysed how the meaning is constructed through signs and symbols. On the other hand, Tzvetan Todorov applied structuralism to literature and examined how the arrangement of words, narrative structures, and character choices reveal more profound principles of a text. The works of these scholars highlight that a writer will choose certain events, characters, and themes, which are not arbitrary, but it conveys the underlying ideology of the work.

Similarly, *Animal Farm* follows the structuralist pattern that would help to explore how Orwell's choice of animals as political allegories and the cyclical nature of the plot reflects the broader structures of power and corruption in society. The study of these patterns in Orwell's *Animal Farm* focuses on the systematic ways literature reflects and reinforces societal truths. Thus, concerning structuralism as a method, this paper will decode Orwell's critique of political manipulation and narrative structures in *Animal Farm*.

Application of Structuralism to *Animal Farm*

Language and literature are two inseparable parts of the meaning-making process. The language can be used to break down individual meanings and connotations that are influenced by the time and society of the writer. Whereas literature can be analysed to break down fundamental recurring patterns, archetypes and narrative frameworks in the storytelling process. When both are combined, one can argue that the summation of language and literature reveals how the meaning is constructed in a text through structures rather than individual elements.

Structuralism aims to discover the underlying patterns that shape literature. It is done not only by explaining a single work and its similarities to other texts but also by linking literary structures to broader social, cultural, and historical frameworks (Smithson 151). Lois Tyson further connects this argument in his book *Critical Theory Today* and explains that our understanding of the text is not shaped by what we objectively find in the pre-existing structures of the world. In contrast, human interpretations are strongly influenced subjectively by the mental and cultural constructs that we use to organize knowledge. As Tyson said,

Structuralists believe they are generated by the human mind, which is thought of as a structuring mechanism. This is an important and radical idea because it means that the order we see in the world is the order we impose on it. Our understanding of the world does not result from our perception of structures that exist in the world (211).

This idea is significant because it challenges the notion that meaning is inherent. The argument suggests that the meaning is produced through relationships, patterns, and contrasts within a given system - whether in language, literature, or society. In the reading of *Animal Farm*, it is quite evident that the animals create their own system of rules. They believe that they are building a fair and equal society which will promote classless living and anti-totalitarian regime.

However, through the perspective of Lois Tyson's argument, it can be argued that

the system of rules and living which is created by animals on their own is not natural and inherent to the pre-existing world. In reality, their system is purely shaped by language, propaganda, and social hierarchy. The pigs, especially Squealer, manipulate perceptions by reshaping truth through rhetoric and powerful use of language. The example demonstrates that order and meaning in 'animalism' are not inherent but socially constructed and imposed. This reflects the structuralist idea that societal structures, including power and ideology, are not objective realities but human constructs shaped by dominant narratives.

One of the most substantial examples from Orwell's *Animal Farm* of Squealer manipulating other animals through his language is mentioned below,

Do not imagine, comrades, that leadership is a pleasure! On the contrary, it is a deep and heavy responsibility. No one believes more firmly that Comrade Napoleon that all animals are equal. He would be only too happy to let you make your decisions for yourselves (59).

Squealer reshapes reality to justify Napoleon's control by presenting leadership as a burden rather than a privilege. This represents the structuralist view that meaning and order in society are not naturally present but are imposed through language and ideological framing by those who are in power.

Lévi-Strauss's Structure of Mythology

Using animals as characters defines more profound significance behind Orwell's intentions as a writer and a critic. Parables resonate with readers across ages and generations. It would be fair to comment that parables immortalise moral values of the human beings. Similar is the purpose of the myth criticism. Mythology is nothing but the fixed reoccurring pattern from a text to text, narrative to narrative and a story to story. These patterns are used repeatedly in meaning making process.

The animals initially believe in the utopian ideals of Animalism, much like societies believe in revolutionary promises. As Orwell writes, "All men are enemies. All animals are comrades" (22). However, Napoleon's rise to power and eventual dictatorship show that societies tend to follow structured cycles of oppression, reinforcing Lévi-Strauss's idea that myths expose the systems by which cultures organize and understand power. As mentioned here, "To Lévi-Strauss, even though we have no knowledge of any entire mythology, such myths as we do uncover reveal the existence within any culture of a system of abstractions by which that culture structures its life" (Wilfred et. al 336).

Lévi-Strauss's structuralist approach to mythology helps us analyse *Animal Farm* not just as a political satire but as a mythic retelling of power and corruption, structured through deeply rooted binary oppositions. Orwell creates a fable that highlights the

universal human struggles which shows that power, language, and ideology exist in all societies and repeat throughout history. He believed that myths are not just random stories but are built on binary oppositions which are contrasting ideas that help societies make sense of the world. These oppositions, such as good vs. evil, freedom vs. oppression, and chaos vs. order, shape how myths function and how meaning is constructed (428 - 444).

Like traditional myths, *Animal Farm* uses repetitive cycles of revolution, corruption, power and betrayal to highlight an unavoidable pattern in human societies. The idea that revolutions often fail to bring real change reflects the mythic cycle of creation, destruction, and renewal. The use of Napoleon is linked with the trickster figures in the myths. Like a mythological trickster, Napoleon twists the reality to serve his personal interests. Therefore, certain similarities can be drawn out between myths and Orwell's allegory that both serve as tools for explaining power structures.

Even though he is politically and morally corrupt leader, Napoleon is served as a hero and saviour of animals. This is also an example of the structuralist argument that a narrative follows a strict algorithm of structures. To support this argument, Tyson adds in her book that "A hero killing a monster is an example of a mytheme, as is a hero violating a moral law" (216). This pattern is evident in *Animal Farm*, where Napoleon's propaganda justifies the execution of animals accused of treachery. His actions follow a recurring cycle of fear, punishment and influence of power. This very argument supports the idea that myths and political narratives rely on repeated themes to maintain control.

"They were all slain on the spot. And so, the tale of confessions and executions went on, until there was a pile of corpses lying before Napoleon's feet and the air was heavy with the smell of blood, which had been unknown there since the expulsion of Jones" (Orwell 87). The key theme of Lévi-Strauss's argument is the repetition of the thematic events across all the universal myths. Example from the novel not only mirrors the Napoleon's tactics but also historical events linked to it, such as the Russian Revolution.

The way Russian Revolution relied on public execution for maintaining terror as mentioned by Svetlana Malysheva in the article, "Control over death and the dead is the first and crucial condition of social control over the living" (1). This supports the structuralist view that power structures maintain control by turning violence into a ritual. This is very much like historical events that have used death to strengthen social hierarchies. Napoleon's executions follow a recurring pattern of oppression, demonstrating that power functions through established cycles rather than isolated incidents.

The phrase "since the expulsion of Jones" (7) suggests that history is repeating

itself once again, the farm is ruled by fear and brutality, just under a new leader. This event mirrors how revolutions in history often lead to new forms of tyranny. Napoleon, like many historical rulers, uses purges and executions as a tool to maintain control to reflect the structuralist idea that power structures dictate the course of events.

Just as myths use binary oppositions to structure their universal narratives, Orwell's *Animal Farm* also constructs a system of binaries to convey its deeper meaning. While Orwell's primary aim was to criticize Joseph Stalin and his totalitarian regime, the novel extends beyond the Russian Revolution to explore the broader themes of power, corruption, and authoritarianism. Through its allegorical framework, *Animal Farm* highlights how the cycle of oppression and the manipulation of truth are not limited to a single historical event but are recurring patterns seen across different political systems throughout history.

One of the most evident binaries of *Animal Farm* is equality vs. hierarchy. The founding principle of Animalism states that all animals are equal, but the pigs gradually establish a new ruling class, proving that hierarchies unavoidably re-emerge despite revolutionary ideals. This is supported by the ultimate paradox that's presented by Orwell that, "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others" (136). Thus, equality remains an illusion not simply because the pigs become corrupt, but because societies and political systems are inherently structured to favour hierarchical power dynamics. Orwell suggests that even the most idealistic revolutions give rise to new elites who manipulate ideology to maintain control.

Another significant opposition is truth vs. propaganda. Napoleon and Squealer manipulate language to rewrite history, altering the Seven Commandments and forming facts to control the animals' perceptions. In the novel, the commandment of "No animal shall drink alcohol" (Orwell 28) was later changed to "No animal shall drink alcohol to excess" (Orwell 111). Orwell shows that those in power can reshape history and truth through language and ideology.

This highlights the structuralist idea that narratives, like societies, follow predictable patterns where power is always redistributed rather than truly stabilized. However, the reshaping of history is only possible because the societies run on a predefined structures and pillars and language can only reshape history because it is backed by a strict structure. This demonstrates Lévi-Strauss's idea that myths and narratives construct reality rather than merely reflecting it.

Thus, the structural equation of mythemes helps in decoding of the structures of culture of politics in *Animal Farm*. The intricate characters and actions in the story are seen

trying to break the obsequious hegemony of nature. The whole novel is trying to make a point of the failure of imitation of human life in animal kingdom. Basically, commenting on the quality of compassion and humanism which are highlighted in all the myths around the entire world.

Barthes' Symbolism and the Manipulation of Meaning

Structuralism focuses to uncover the underlying principles that govern how things function and evolve in literature and society. It also examines the fundamental role of writing in society and analysing how texts operate within cultural and historical contexts. By exploring these structures, structuralism aims to identify the reasons behind the composition of certain types of texts and the patterns that shape their meaning and significance.

Barthes focus on the exploration of meaning in the language through signs and symbols. His applied symbolism on language and analysed how symbols are used to make narrative appear in a targeted light as per the liking of the author. Barthes's most famous example of wrestling match is explained by Peter Barry in his book *Beginning Theory* as below.

Boxers do not cry out in pain when hit, the rules cannot be disregarded at any point during the bout, and the boxers fight himself, not in the elaborate guise of a make-believe villain or hero. By contrast, wrestlers grunt snarl with aggression, stage elaborate displays of agony or triumph, and fight as exaggerated, larger than life villains or super-heroes (49).

The idea of turning a fight into a staged moral conflict between heroes and villains rather than a simple athletic contest creates a symbolic representation that shapes the perception of the viewer. This creates a symbolic binary of good versus evil where the true intentions behind the purpose are hidden and the audience is manipulated to observe the reality through moral lens.

Similarly, in *Animal Farm*, Orwell employs language as a tool of control, using Squealer's propaganda to construct a distorted version of reality. Just as wrestling portrays wrestlers as either heroes or villains to engage the audience, Squealer rewrites history, portraying Napoleon as a noble leader and blaming Snowball as the enemy. For example, Squealer tries to manipulate other animals with the symbol or good versus evil. "Do you know the enemy who has come in the night and overthrown our windmill? SNOWBALL! ...Snowball has done this thing!" (Orwell 74)

This mirrors the example of Barthes that the way wrestling matches create the perception of good and bad, Orwell's narrative reflects similar incident where the public

perception is shaped to benefit those in power. Through a structuralist lens, Orwell reveals that language is not neutral but a tool for maintaining power and control. The novel's use of propaganda aligns with Barthes's argument that symbols and narratives are crafted to manipulate audiences into accepting a particular ideological interpretation of reality.

The way wrestling matches are portrayed, the real talent and the capabilities of the wrestlers are ignored because of the symbol of good. Orwell picks up the same example to discuss the corrupted power practices of Napoleon where his evil-like motifs are hidden under the symbol of good leader. However, as Napoleon is perceived as a heroic character, animals tend to ignore the most fundamental necessity such as food.

For example, it is evident in novel that the animals suffered equally under Napoleon's rule as they had suffered under Jones's rule. "For days at a time the animals had nothing to eat but chaff and mangels. Starvation seemed to stare them in the face" (Orwell 77). Napoleon's dictatorship is not continued by force alone, but also by a carefully controlled system of signs, language, and historical revisionism. The summation of the whole instance justifies the structuralist claim that power is maintained through meaning-making structures rather than just use of physical strength.

Barthes focused on language as a tool for constructing arguments centred on concepts of good and evil. When the same structuralist concept is applied to *Animal Farm*, it highlights the way power bends truth by forcing individuals to conform to a reality that contradicts their fundamental nature. Orwell's novel presents a critique of political systems, illustrating how universal politics are often shaped by corrupt and oppressive forces. Orwell's novel serves as an allegory, where animals symbolize individuals who are persuaded into acting against their natural instincts which mirrors the way people are manipulated into accepting ideologies that ultimately work against their own well-being.

Barthes' Symbolism and Power Structures in *Animal Farm*

Barthes has profoundly discussed about the functions of power structures and symbols. Naushad Shaikh, a literary researcher, mentions Barthes's theory in his book *Mythologies* and explains about the work as given below,

portrayal of wine in French society as a robust and healthy habit would be a bourgeois ideal perception contradicted by certain realities. He found semiotics, the study of signs, useful in these interrogations. Barthes explained that these bourgeois cultural myths were second order signs, or significations. A picture of a full, dark bottle is a signifier relating to a signified: a fermented, alcoholic beverage - wine. However, the bourgeois take this signified and apply their own emphasis to it, making 'wine' a new signifier, this time relating to a new signified:

the idea of healthy, robust, relaxing wine (53).

From Shaikh's example it is evident that Barthes studied how everyday cultural items such as wine were used by society to push certain ideas or values. He used semiotics to explain that a full, dark bottle of wine is a sign that represents fermented, alcoholic wine, which is a literal message of the sign. However, the bourgeois society adds a second layer of meaning to it for their own convenience. They portray wine as a symbol of health, relaxation, and national pride, ignoring that it can also lead to drunkenness or health problems.

When this example is applied to *Animal Farm*, it can be said that literal signs are often shaped through mythical signs by those in power to maintain power. For example, at very basic level, windmill is just a windmill which will help with the farm work. When Snowball first proposes the idea of windmill, he presents it as a tool that will reduce labour and improve quality of life of the animals. This is the literal meaning of the windmill that it is just a machine meant to provide efficiency.

However, As Napoleon takes control over animals, he reshapes the meaning of the windmill through his politics. The windmill becomes more than just a machine. It turns into a symbol of progress, success, and the pigs' assumed intelligence. Napoleon uses the windmill to justify his rule, and windmill merely works as a distraction rather than improving animals' life. Napoleon constantly talks about the windmill to keep the animals focused on work rather than questioning his rule. As it is written in novel, "The windmill, however, had not after all been used for generating electrical power. It was used for milling corn, and brought in a handsome profit" (Orwell 130).

When the incident it connected to structuralism, it is analysed that the signifier of windmill starts as a simple object, but its signified meaning is manipulated by Napoleon and the pigs. The sign of windmill is turned into a myth that makes animals believe that they are working for a collective dream. But they were just being exploited by the tactics of Napoleon. It is quite substantial that Napoleon controls meaning in the same way ruling classes in bourgeois society shape myths to maintain power, as Barthes argues in *Mythologies*. The windmill becomes the structuralist myth, and its actual purpose is blurred by Napoleon to impose his authority by misleading animals.

The structuralist framework of *Animal Farm* can be understood through the arguments of Barthes which he presented in his book *S/Z* in 2017. Terry Eagleton explains Barthes's concept of 'writerly' text in his book *Literary Theory: An Introduction* as mentioned below.

The most intriguing texts for criticism are not those which can be *read*, but those

which are 'writable' (*scriptible*) texts which encourage the critic to carve them up, transpose them into different discourses, produce his or her semi-arbitrary play of meaning athwart the work itself. The reader or critic shifts from the role of consumer to that of producer (119).

Thus, it can be said that the 'writerly' text aligns with the structuralist argument that texts are not fixed in meaning but open to interpretation through underlying structures and signs. By structuralist standards, Orwell's *Animal Farm* can be put under the framework of "writable" text that challenges the reader to actively engage with it. The text demands readers to deconstruct its layers and uncover multiple interpretations rather than passively consuming a single, fixed meaning. For instance, while *Animal Farm* is commonly read as an allegory of the Russian Revolution, its themes of power, corruption, and propaganda apply to various political systems and historical periods. Structuralist analysis allows critics to transpose its meaning onto different discourses, such as postcolonialism, modern authoritarianism, or even corporate hierarchies.

However, every variety of meaning and interpretation will strictly resemble the very inherent structure of the literary text and society. Even though *Animal Farm's* interpretations go beyond historical context, the readers of the text will not be able to interpret the text beyond structural framework of the reality. This can be understood from the example of mentioned as, "The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say which was which." (Orwell 142-143). The transformation of the pigs into humans suggests that no revolution truly escapes the cycle of power and hierarchy. This is the fundamental argument that no matter how one interprets *Animal Farm*, its structure ensures that readers always return to the central truth about societal oppression.

This instance emphasizes the idea that all interpretations of the novel will still align with its inherent structure, which mirrors real-world power dynamics and societal structures. Even if one applies the novel's themes to different time periods or political systems, the core binary opposition of oppressor versus oppressed remains unharmed. Readers may understand the novel as a critique of Stalinism and totalitarianism, but they will always do so within the framework of Orwell's structured world, where power as usual leads to corruption. This justifies the core of the structuralist argument that meaning is not limitless but is shaped by the deep structures of text and society.

Moreover, structuralists also believe that the meaning of a text comes from differences and relationships between structures within a system. The pillars of this structure are based on linguistic models. This argument supports the fact that language is

more important for any structure to hold its position. Mallarmé states, “The pure work implies the disappearance of the poet speaking, who yields the initiative to words, through the clash of their ordered inequalities” (208). As a French symbolist, Mallarmé insists that any work should have a deep underlying symbol attached to it. His argument stands with the idea that the author must arrange a text in a way that it generates meaning itself through the system of signs.

Similarly, in *Animal Farm*, Napoleon controls his language in the public domain which influences the reality within the structure. Napoleon and Squealer’s propaganda manipulates other animals such as Boxer to blindly trust that “if Comrade Napoleon says it, it must be right” (Orwell 60). Thus, through the help of the structuralist system, Squealer shifts the whole situation into the myth that “Napoleon is always right” (Orwell 60). In this sense, it should be noted that *Animal Farm* is not just Orwell’s personal attack on the ‘Russian Revolution’ but rather a system of myths, symbols, and language structures that create meaning beyond Orwell’s own voice.

To add more, it can be argued that Barthes supports Mallarmé’s statement, claiming that even an author, in his literary work, cannot change or manipulate a predefined structure of society and language. Barthes suggests that “the text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture.” (146). Therefore, in structuralism, a text is understood through its rules and structures and not by the author’s biography. In *Animal Farm*, Orwell’s contribution is less significant in meaning-making because meaning is not controlled by the author or a single perspective, but rather by the structure of language itself.

Overall, it can be argued that analysis of *Animal Farm* through Barthes’s theory highlights that Orwell’s novel has a pattern that exist universally in all societies in which power leads to corruption, and history repeats itself. Barthes’s theory also helps to conclude that Orwell’s contribution to the text is less significant than the text itself as the meaning is generated through pre-existing structures within the text. It is evident that novel’s message goes beyond Russian Revolution which is applied to many political systems throughout history.

Todorov’s Narrative Structures

Narrative is one of the pillars of the structuralist patterns that is universal in all literary works. Narrative structures are set models which mainly portray repetitive cycles, and this decides the progression of any literary work. Structuralist theorists such as Tzvetan Todorov provides frameworks for analysing the narrative structure, character roles, and storytelling techniques in *Animal Farm*. Their theories help to discover how Orwell

constructs a systematic narrative that reinforces themes of power, manipulation, and historical repetition.

Tzvetan Todorov has given various stages to narrative progression. As Richardson has mentioned,

There are five stages of narrative development that are shown in units of text meaning. The five stages are as follows: (1) a state of equilibrium, a condition that should occur; (2) Stage of disruption to the order; (3) Stage of realization (recognition) of disruption; (4) Phase of efforts to repair damage that occurs; and (5) the new equilibrium stage, a state of restoring the balanced condition. (qtd. in Yoseph 92)

When these stages are applied to *Animal Farm*, the equilibrium stage reflects the existence of Jones in his manor farm. According to Todorov this stage refers to the existing order of the order in society as well as in *Animal Farm*. The very opening line of the novel exemplifies the equilibrium of existing power as it states that “Mr Jones, of the Manor Farm, had locked the hen-houses for the night, but was too drunk to remember to shut the pop-holes.” (Orwell 7). Thus, Orwell’s thoughtful beginning is a critique to the oppressive pre-existing power order in *Animal Farm*.

Likewise, the same structure also mirrors the original historical existence of Czar Nicholas II and his absolute monarchy which depicts the oppressive power in Russia around 2017. However, structuralist arguments favour the universality of the patterns of event. Therefore, the existing order in narratives go beyond *Animal Farm* and is applicable to all almost all the narratives.

When we move further to Todorov’s theory, we find the “stage of disruption to the order;” (qtd. in Yoseph 92). This stage exemplifies an event that destabilizes the power system. This stage aligns with an example from *Animal Farm* which goes as, “Remove Man from the scene, and the root cause of hunger and overwork is abolished for ever” (Orwell 11). Old Major delivers a speech that inspires other animals to rebel against Mr. Jones and to lead revolution. Thus, any revolution in the history begins with the ideological awakening among people who suffer from pre-existing order just as events like the French Revolution, Russian Revolution, or anti-colonial struggles in the world. All these events began with the political awareness in the mind of the people. To overthrow Jones is a resemblance of oppressed rebelling against oppressor to destabilize the power.

As we move next, what we find is the “stage of realization (recognition) of disruption;” (qtd. in Yoseph 92). This is an idea of how people fail to understand the early signs of corruption until it is too late. In *Animal Farm*, animals also tend to ignore the

reoccurrence of corruption by Napoleon. He orders the selling of eggs and states, “The hens...should welcome this sacrifice as their own special contribution towards the building of the windmill” (Orwell 67). Thus, it is apparent that revolutionary promises had begun to betray the expectations of animals and animals ignored the occurrence of corruption. All the historical revolutions and narratives reflect the same delayed recognition of corruption.

From the Russian Revolution to the French Revolution, delayed recognition of corruption has undoubtedly been a repetitive pattern in political movements and literary narratives. Todorov and Weinstein believe that “The two moments of equilibrium, similar and different, are separated by a period of imbalance, which is composed of a process of degeneration and a process of improvement” (75). Thus, Orwell’s *Animal Farm* stands as an example that resembles Todorov’s narrative model. his model is about the period of imbalance that includes both perceived progress and degeneration. The animals’ failure to react until their suffering intensifies reinforces how power structures rely on slow, incremental changes to maintain control, a theme that repeats throughout history.

As we move further, we come across the next “phase of efforts to repair damage that occurs” (qtd. in Yoseph 92). This phase of theory mainly refers to the idea of how an oppressor tries to control power through violence and propaganda. This mass execution is also apparent in *Animal Farm* as narrated that “the tale of confessions and executions went on, until there was a pile of corpses lying before Napoleon’s feet” (Orwell 87). Napoleon’s use of propaganda via Squealer and his violence ensures that power remains in the hands of the elite. This phase reflects how authoritarian leaders, such as Hitler or Stalin, used fear to suppress opposition and consolidate their regimes.

In one of his other works, Todorov argues that “apparently independent actions, carried out by different characters and in various circumstances, reveal their kinship, serving to illustrate or exemplify a common ideology” (43) This simply means that actions done by different people in different situations, that appear separate or unrelated, are actually connected because they all serve the same underlying belief or ideology. Napoleon’s purges, propaganda, and manipulation of history are examples in *Animal Farm* that these events may look like separate events, but they all work together to strengthen his dictatorship and maintain control over the animals. Similarly, this can be compared with historical facts also where dictators like Hitler and Stalin used violence, censorship, and propaganda which may all seem separate actions. However, all events serve the same purpose and that is to secure absolute power.

The last stage of the theory is “the new equilibrium stage, a state of restoring the balanced condition” (qtd. in Yoseph 92). Oppression ultimately comes back, and the cycle

of revolution and rebellion keeps repeating itself is the central idea of structuralist theories of Todorov in narrative patterns. *Animal Farm* ends with a new force of oppression, but this time, it is enforced by Napoleon the pig, rather than human beings. The farm returns to a hierarchical position which is a message that the structural cycle of revolution has ended.

In *Animal Farm*, the concluding lines appear as, “twelve voices were shouting in anger, and they were all alike” (Orwell 142). The pigs have replaced the humans as the ruling class, and this reinforces Todorov’s theory that narratives transition to a new equilibrium that may not be an improvement over the original state. Just as Mr. Jones controlled the farm at the beginning, Napoleon now rules with the same level of exploitation and hierarchy. His return to Mr. Jones’s position shows that the revolution has merely reshaped, rather than eliminated, oppression.

Thus, through Todorov’s arguments, it is evident that all literary narratives have a similar structural foundation. To support this argument, Wolfreys states that “Narratological theory thus takes the form of a structured algorithm: starting from a few basic elements, complex narrative structures are gradually generated by means of combinations, transformations and hierarchical levels” (268). The revolution, in *Animal Farm*, does not eliminate oppression but restructures it and this proves that power functions within a predefined system of hierarchical control. Mr. Jones is replaced with Napoleon which is not a random incident. It follows a predictable transformation of power, showing how narratives mirror real-world hierarchical shifts. In this case, the revolution does not eliminate oppression but restructures it. Hence, it can be proved that power functions within a predefined hierarchical control system.

Along with narratives, genres also function within established frameworks that shape their evolution. Todorov claims, “Genres are the meeting place between general poetics and event -based literary history; as such, they constitute a privileged object that may well deserve to be the principal figure in literary studies” (qtd. in Prasad 19–20). When this idea is generalised, it highlights itself as a fact that genres connect the universal rules of storytelling with any particular historical events.

All in all, it is fair to say that genre acts as a bridge between both, universal storytelling patterns and historically truthful events. As Orwell uses of fable, satire, and allegory in his *Animal Farm*, it clarifies his aim to explore structural literary in the real-world political events. The satirical tone of novel and structured character roles, with Napoleon as Stalin and Snowball as Trotsky align with Todorov’s argument that narrative meaning is shaped by structured genre conventions.

conclusion

To conclude, it can be argued that language and literature are two inseparable parts of the meaning-making process. One of the significant bases of structuralism is its linguistic construct. That is the reason why it is meaningful to apply structuralist theory to literary genres and narrative frameworks. *Animal Farm*, a work full of allegorical wit, satirical attacks, and parabolical events, is a reasonable match for applying structuralism.

Lévi-Strauss's structuralist analysis reveals *Animal Farm* as an example of a mythical story of oppression and power which is purely dependent on the structural recurring patterns and binary oppositions. Through Lévi-Strauss's arguments, the paper also explores that due to the structural existence of language and literature, Orwell's allegorical work not only represents the Russian Revolution but all the historical revolutions where power and corruption were used to gain political control. Lévi-Strauss's lens also helps to explore that Squealer's use of manipulative language stands as a myth, and it is Squealer's myth that shapes the actual reality rather than just reflecting it. The novel's central paradox of equality among animals exemplifies the return of the hierarchy despite revolutionary ideals.

Through the help of Barthes's theory, one can find how language and symbols manipulate meaning to serve ideological purposes. Squealer's tactic to portray Napoleon as a hero and Snowball as an evil aligns with Barthes's theory of binary opposition. It can be argued that within the structure, binary stands as the most significant pillar to convey the meaning. Squealer's strategists are examples of historical power dynamics where binaries of good vs. evil, and oppressor vs. oppressed are universally apparent.

Roland Barthes's theory of semiotics in *Mythologies* explains the part of cultural myths that manipulate meanings in society. According to Barthes, wine shifts the perspective of bourgeois society into a symbol of health. Similarly, the windmill which aimed to ease labours, transforms reality into a political distraction. Moreover, Mallarmé's argument supports the fact that in *Animal Farm*, meaning is not controlled by Orwell, but it emerges from the pre-existing structures.

The application of Todorov's theory on *Animal Farm* uncovers the novel's devotion to a universal structural pattern that governs historical and political narratives. It is studied that Orwell's novel develops on Todorov's five-stage progression on narrative. It demonstrates that both fictional and historical narratives tend to follow repetitive structural patterns. The rebellion against Mr. Jones is an example of how political realization directs to revolution only for new rulers to replicate old forms of oppression.

Thus, *Animal Farm* not only mirrors the Russian Revolution but also reflects the French Revolution where revolutionary ideals led to authoritarian rule under Napoleon

Bonaparte; the Chinese Communist Revolution where Mao Zedong consolidated power through propaganda and purges; the Cuban Revolution where Fidel Castro's promises of reform gave way to a long-term dictatorship; and the Iranian Revolution where the overthrow of the Shah resulted in strict ideological control under Ayatollah Khomeini. When everything is put together, structuralist application on *Animal Farm* highlights universal revolutionary movements often replacing one form of oppression with another.

Works Cited

- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. 4th ed., Manchester University Press, 2017.
- Barthes, Roland. *Image-Music-Text*. Translated by Stephen Heath, Fontana Press, London, 1977.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. 2nd ed., Blackwell Publishing, 1996.
- Guerin, Wilfred L. et al. editors. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. 4th ed., Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. "The Structural Study of Myth." *Structural Anthropology*, translated by Claire Jacobson and Brooke Schoepf, Basic Books, 1963, pp. 428-444
- Mallarmé, Stéphane. *Divagations*. Translated by Barbara Johnson, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Malysheva, Svetlana. "The Russian Revolution and the Instrumentalization of Death." *Slavic Review*, vol. 76, special issue 3, Cambridge University Press, 23 Oct. 2017, www.cambridge.org/core/journals/slavic-review/article/russian-revolution-and-the-instrumentalization-of-death/821D27575B09F2B866B363C1A2B18EC8
- Orwell, George. *Animal Farm*. Fingerprint Classics, 2016.
- Prasad, Bhagwati. *Poetics of Literature, Memory, and the Fantastic: A Study of Tzvetan Todorov's Select Work*. University of Lucknow, 2016. <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/190224>.
- Shaikh, Naushad Umarsharif. *Structuralism and Poststructuralism: A Comparative Study*. 2009. <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/79301>
- Smithson, Isaiah. "Structuralism as a Method of Literary Criticism." *College English*, vol. 37, no. 2, 1975, pp. 145–159. National Council of Teachers of English, www.jstor.org/stable/375060.
- Taum, Yoseph Yapi. "The Problem of Equilibrium in the Panji Story: A Tzvetan Todorov's Narratology Perspective." *International Journal of Humanity Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1,

Sanata Dharma University, 2018, pp. 90-100, DOI: [10.24071/ijhs.2018.020110](https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.2018.020110).

Todorov, Tzvetan, and Arnold Weinstein. "Structural Analysis of Narrative." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 3, no. 1, Duke University Press, 1969. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1345003>

Todorov, Tzvetan. "The Two Principles of Narrative." *Diacritics*, vol. 1, no. 1, Autumn 1971, pp. 37–44. Johns Hopkins University Press, www.jstor.org/stable/464558.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2006.

Wolfreys, Julian, ed. *The Edinburgh Encyclopaedia of Modern Criticism and Theory*. Edinburgh University Press, 2002.