UDC 821.111.09-31 Orwell G.
821.111.09-31 Burgess A.
https://doi.org/10.46630/jkm.2023.22
Ljubica Matek
Jelena Pataki Šumiga
University of Osijek, Croatia
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

THE (AB)USE OF LANGUAGE IN TWENTIETH CENTURY BRITISH DYSTOPIAS

Abstract: The idea that words possess power to perform existed even before the publication of J. L. Austin's seminal work *How to Do Things with Words* (1962) and his speech-act theory, but the twentieth century, plagued by several prominent totalitarian regimes, pushed this realization to the forefront of both literary and non-literary texts. The paper will focus on the (ab)use of language in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) and Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* (1962). The two dystopian novels, set in different societies, illustrate how language is used to wield power and construct or deconstruct identity, creating the effect of defamiliarization and inviting the readers to critically assess both the written narratives and the society they live in. More specifically, albeit from opposing angles, both works show how depriving one of language is necessarily linked to loss of power and identity. While *A Clockwork Orange* employs an "anti-language" (Halliday 1976) within the domineering social group that clashes with the expected social behaviour, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* constructs a language with the specific aim of controlling the society.

Key words: language, power, identity, George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Anthony Burgess, *A Clockwork Orange*

Even before the publication of J. L. Austin's seminal work *How to Do Things with Words* (1962) and his speech-act theory, the idea that words possess power to *perform*, that is, to change reality existed as an intuitive, non-theorized concept, most notably in religious rituals. In fact, in Christian worldview, it was the Word that created both the world and man, and not the other way around. In Genesis, God speaks, commands, and names things, materializing them and giving them life through speech (*King James Version*, 1991, Gen. 1:1-26), in Corinthians he *speaks* Light out of darkness (1991, 2 Cor. 4-6). The Psalms claim that "[b]y the word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth. . . . For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast" (1991, Ps. 33:6, 9), and John most famously asserts: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (1991, 1:1). Performative utterances are used to carry out an action (Austin, 1962, p. 6) and thus go beyond describing. But the power of language also lies in its ability to carry out or perform changes in people's way of thinking or perceiving the world, as "the slovenliness of our language makes it easier for us to have foolish thoughts" (Orwell, 1956, p. 355).

This aspect of language, as a tool for social, political and psychological manipulation, was pushed to the forefront of both literary and non-literary texts during the twentieth century, which was plagued by several prominent totalitarian regimes. Although – in light of phenomena such as fake news – the twenty-first century cannot by any means be considered exempt from the practice of the abuse of language, the paper will focus on two twentieth century dystopias as exemplary representatives of such practice: George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) and Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* (1962). The two dystopian novels, set in different societies, illustrate how language is universally used to wield power and construct or deconstruct identity, creating the effect of defamiliarization and inviting the readers to critically assess both the written narratives and the society they live in. Both works show how depriving one of language is necessarily linked to loss of power and identity. While *A Clockwork Orange* employs an "anti-language" (Halliday, 1976, p. 570) within a prominent (teenage) social group that clashes with the expected or even imposed social behaviour, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* exhibits a (de) construction of language with the specific aim of controlling the society.

In the context of Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, language represents a Foucauldian type of discourse created through and representing the social relationships of power. According to Foucault's notions of archaeology or genealogy of knowledge production, power is historically linked to the formation of discourse designed to manage social groups (1994, p. 236-240), ultimately showing that human society is being shaped by language and that language reflects power relationships. In fact, according to Pynchon, Orwell's novel is an embodiment of his realization that the historical totalitarian systems are "first drafts of a terrible future" (2003, p. xiv) because of "the irresistible human addiction to power" (p. xiv). People seem to be drawn to authoritative figures, who make decisions on their behalf and to whom they surrender their independence.

In his 1784 essay titled "What is Enlightenment?" Kant explains that enlightenment occurs when people evolve from their state of immaturity, that is when they are released from "self-incurred tutelage," which is "man's inability to make use of his understanding without direction from another" (2007, p. 29). People are lazy and afraid to take responsibility and to perform competently, so they give in to "guardians" who take over their lives by manipulating them. The guardians "have first made their domestic cattle dumb . . . then show them the danger which threatens if they try to go alone" (p. 29-30). According to Kant, full freedom and enlightenment can occur if people nurture their "propensity and vocation to free thinking" (p. 37). In effect, those who wish to limit people's freedom, first must limit their (free) thinking, which is precisely what happens in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

Considering the issues of language and dogma in Orwell's novel, Steven Blakemore suggests that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* looms large in the Western consciousness and "permeates Western debate over language and ideology . . . [because it] crystallizes a linguistic ideology, reified in the newspeak world through a procrustean violence which narrows human thought by linguistically narrowing the semantic space of language itself" (1984, p. 349). As most of his fictional and non-

fictional texts suggest, Orwell was well aware of the fact that people are linguistic beings who interact with their reality by means of language; for instance, in *Animal Farm* (1945) he uses hymns and commandments as a means of manipulation, and in "Politics and the English Language" (1946), he makes an explicit connection between language, thought, and socio-political situation. In fact, various thinkers have concluded and shown that language is essential both in our psychological development and socialization: Gottlob Frege, Ferdinand de Saussure, Jacques Lacan, Julia Kristeva, and Michel Foucault, to mention just a few. Taking this into consideration, Orwell represents totalitarian authorities as distinctly "anti-linguistic" (Blakemore, 1984, p. 349) because a systematic impoverishment of language prevents human self-expression and limits freedom. For Blakemore, "the degradation of man through the murderous assault on his linguistic reality [is] — an assault that is more sinister than the clumsy torturing of the spirit's flesh" (p. 349). Physical violence is only a secondary means of control because, as Foucault suggests, language is our most essential social function. For him, the most basic codes of a culture are those, which govern "its language, its schemas of perception, its exchanges, its techniques, its values, the hierarchy of its practices" (1994, p. xx), and which determine very early on for every individual "the empirical orders with which he will be dealing and within which he will be at home" (1994, p. xx).

Nineteen Eighty-Four is based on the idea that language is a means of both empowerment and enslavement, so the main strategy used in the novel is an opposition between the old, empowering language and the new, repressive one. Although the Party's new language is called Newspeak, the narrator uses "oldspeak," that is, the conventional way of speaking as known to the readers, as both a form of subversion and of protection of human spirit. Without the old way of speaking, the human spirit would become limited and, ultimately, extinguished; thus, as Blakemore suggests, Orwell contextualizes the totalitarian Newspeak world within the realm of oldspeak values (1984, p. 351). In this way, the contrast between the past and present is achieved and the reader – like the narrator – experiences both worlds: one through a lens of humanist-intoned nostalgia and the other through a sense of fear. Indeed, even the novel's setting, the fictional country of Oceania, is marked by such a contrast: an almost schizophrenic rift between the past and present permeates the pores of the novel's society. The citizens (must behave as if they) know nothing of the past, whereas the Party leaders and the proles acknowledge its existence: the first as an abomination that must be erased from memory, and the latter by continuing to live according to its ways.

Being the official language, Newspeak is constructed in such a way as to sanction this rift, that is, the permanent cognitive dissonance that the citizens of Oceania experience due to the phenomenon of *doublethink*:

> To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them, to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, to believe that democracy was

> impossible and that the Party was the guardian of democracy, to forget whatever it was necessary to forget, then to draw it back into memory again at the moment when it was needed, and then promptly to forget it again: and above all, to apply the same process to the process itself. (Orwell, 2003, p. 40-41)

The sense of duality, or rather conflicting realities arising from this can be seen in the application of the language's ambiguous terms: "'There is a word in Newspeak,' said Syme, 'I don't know whether you know it: *duckspeak*, to quack like a duck. It is one of those interesting words that have two contradictory meanings. Applied to an opponent, it is abuse, applied to someone you agree with, it is praise'" (Orwell, 2003, p. 63). Through a reduced number of artificially formed permitted words, Oceania's vocabulary prevents clear communication. Orwell explains that "the decline of a language must ultimately have political and economic causes" (1956, p. 355). It is designed to unsettle its population by taking away their own stories, and thus their identity as well. As Jean-Jacques Courtine and Laura Willett explain, this kind of "thought standardization . . . produces a new type of man: *the uprooted man*" (1986, p. 70).

Namely, the "process of continuous alteration" (Orwell, 2003, p. 46) of history and present, and their rewriting in the language of the Party disturbs the relationship between past and present, as well as between personal and public memory, disengaging the citizens from their history and, thus, their identity. The Party's radical and direct interventions in the spheres of memory, history, and identity illustrate Foucault's claim that the production of knowledge is regulated by the discourse of power (1990, p. 11-12; 63-65). To illustrate, Winston, the protagonist of the novel, is an employee of the Ministry of Truth. He alters historical records according to the needs of the Party, participating directly in the creation of systems of meaning that gain the status of "truth" and regulate the behaviour and thoughts of the citizens. In this, Orwell has represented the order of a society that Foucault will later refer to as *the order of things*, a knowledge that is taken for granted and that shapes our thoughts, "that which is given in things as their inner law, the hidden network that determines the way they confront one another, and also that which has no existence except in the grid created by a glance, an examination, a language" (1994, p. xx). Thus, the society of Oceania is fully regulated, both by the language and by the strict – and widely advertised – control of its use. As Courtine and Willett explain: "totalitarian power keeps people under a surveillance which is both visible and invisible, continuous and meticulous, which patrols and scrutinizes each one of them" (1986, p. 70). The slogan "Big Brother is watching you" (Orwell, 2003, p. 3) is everywhere, reminding the people that they are never alone, and that, not just symbolically but also literally, their thoughts, words, and acts belong to the state.

Specifically, the spaces in which the citizens of Oceania live and work are equipped with cameras, which enable the Thought Police to monitor all their activities. In this, Orwell provides us with a modern, technologized version of Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon: "Bentham laid down the principle that power should be visible and unverifiable. Visible: the inmate will constantly have before his eyes the

tall outline of the central tower from which he is spied upon. Unverifiable: the inmate must never know whether he is being looked at at any one moment; but he must be sure that he may always be so" (Foucault, 1995, p. 201). All citizens are expected to think the same things and behave in prescribed ways, and the technological disciplinary measures ensure that none of them stray from the expected norms. Any form of individualism is connected to eccentricity, which is encompassed by the Newspeak term "*ownlife*" (Orwell, 2003, p. 94), a negative word.

Blakemore argues that Orwell's representation of totalitarian ideology resembles "perverted Puritanism, obliquely expressed in the incongruous statue of Oliver Cromwell . . . and the reference to a civil war" (1984, p. 352). The age-old Puritan ideas really seem to match some of the traits of Oceania, most notably because of the "puritan goal of reshaping the world around them. . . . Puritans generally asserted the importance of community and bending private aspirations to societal needs" (Bremer, 2009, p. 74). They struggled to enforce a culture of discipline and to ensure the promotion of "true" religion, whereby they limited access to "traditional social activities and pleasures," including theatre (Bremer, 2009, p. 75). In a similar vein, the Oceanians are told to put faith in the Party and abandon reason for obedience, as well as to reject traditional forms of art. It may seem that the proles enjoy greater freedom, as their language and behaviour are less sanctioned, but in reality their social and economic position is radically marginalized. So much so, in fact, that despite their greater number, they seem to pose no threat to the dominant order: "nobody cares what the proles say" (Orwell, 2003, p. 11) because "[t]he proles are not human beings" (p. 61).

As the supreme doctrinal authority, the Ministry of Truth regulates all forms of cultural production, supplying both the citizens and the proles with appropriate and sanctioned media:

> newspapers, films, textbooks, telescreen programmes, plays, novels--with every conceivable kind of information, instruction, or entertainment, from a statue to a slogan, from a lyric poem to a biological treatise, and from a child's spelling-book to a Newspeak dictionary. . . . There was a whole chain of separate departments dealing with proletarian literature, music, drama, and entertainment generally. (Orwell, 2003, p.50)

In his examination of Puritanism and science, John Morgan explains the reasons behind such a strict control of human thought via the policing of literature, entertainment, and learning. He argues that "[r]eason – the cause of the Fall – had therefore to be supervised more closely than any other of man's faculties" (1979, p. 551) because reasoning is a means of emancipation, which is wrong in itself, as humans belong to God.[1] For Puritans, the use of reason was "*dangerous to salvation*"

[1] Morgan refers to William Perkins, a notable sixteenth-century Puritan, to argue this: "He who wishes to be truly wise, that is, to have knowledge of God, explained Perkins, 'must reject his owne naturall reason, and stoppe up the eyes of his naturall minde, like a blinde man, and suffer himselfe wholly to be guided by Gods spirit in the things of God, that thereby he may be made wise unto salvation'" (1979, p. 551).

(Morgan, 1979, p. 552). A similar kind of blind faith is necessary in order to deal with the realities of Oceania, which are neither reasonable nor pleasant, and yet the people continue to believe the dogma instilled by the Party. Additionally, people engage in rituals that suppress individual identity and reinforce collectivist mind-set; these rituals, such as "Two Minutes Hate" (Orwell, 2003, p. 12), serve to unite the people against the common enemy and propagate devotion to the Party as the only true way of living. In this, they resemble religious rituals that also use formulaic phrases and words repeated automatically for the purpose of testifying faith and devotion to God.

Such discourses that restrain the production of knowledge also prevent dissent and difference, and, in transferring power solely to the highest authority, negate individual empowerment. Every notion of individuality, even walking alone, is "always slightly dangerous" (Orwell, 2003, p. 94) because nobody is supposed to deviate from the group. A person does not belong to themselves, but to the Party; otherwise, they become an "*unperson*" – erased from existence (Orwell, 2003, p. 53). The complete lack of autonomy, and the prevention of freedom of both feelings and thought, is illustrated by the term and concept of *facecrime*, a punishable crime of wearing "an improper expression on your face" (Orwell, 2003, p. 71). In this way, the Party is shown to regulate language, and through it the behaviour, thoughts, and feelings of the citizens; it creates the order of things, a code or an *episteme*, which "defines the conditions of possibility of knowledge, whether expressed in a theory or silently invested in a practice" (Foucault, 1994, p. 168).

Shaping Newspeak as a language is described as a deliberate process of "destroying words – scores of them, hundreds of them, every day. We're cutting the language down to the bone" (Orwell, 2003, p. 59) with the aim "to narrow the range of thought" (Orwell, 2003, p. 60). As Syme suggests: "The Revolution will be complete when the language is perfect" (Orwell, 2003, p. 61). In this, the Party disempowers people by preventing them to both speak and think freely. Language becomes a means of control and manipulation, its power of free, creative expression extinguished in favour of the most basic communication. Syme, the proponent of impoverishing language, illustrates this by reducing humanity's most complex moral concerns to a single word (good and its variants: *ungood*, *plusgood*, *doubleplusgood*): "In the end the whole notion of goodness and badness will be covered by only six words – in reality, only one word" (Orwell, 2003, p. 60). People will be "rid" of their language, and, as Courtine and Willet elucidate, "zones of indetermination-ambiguity, equivocation, polysemy wiped out. Signs must be purged and purified of their meaning and bodies of their substance" (1986, p. 70). Indeed, both the language and the body become the arenas in which the Party's influence is performed: "You will be hollow. We shall squeeze you empty and then we shall fill you with ourselves" (Orwell, 2003, p. 293). The Party will thus establish itself as the moral authority and the ultimate decision-maker, annulling the citizens' agency and freedom by means of linguistic control. Such a type of control also appears prominently in the other dystopian novel that the paper focuses on, *A Clockwork Orange*.

Much like Orwell, Anthony Burgess nurtured a great interest in language and its discursive power. It is therefore no wonder that, similar to the academic and

popular influence that the language of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* had in becoming a symbol of oppression, with phrases such as "Newspeak" and "Big Brother" entering the English dictionary,[2] the peculiar language of *A Clockwork Orange* is the most pronounced element of Burgess' story. As Booker argues, dystopian systems often focus on language since it is a "potentially powerful tool with which to control and manipulate their subjects but also because language may harbour powerfully subversive energies" (1994, p. 81), whereby the use of language is usually tied to identity and emphasized individuality.

Even though Orwell's and Burgess's dystopias differ in style, they share the Foucauldian perspective[3] on the power of those who manipulate language in order to manipulate social reality. The new vocabulary in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is the system's deliberate exercise of power, and the constricted language reflects the bleak, ever-shrinking existence of its protagonist, whereas the "linguistic pyrotechnics" (Evans, 1971, p. 408) in *A Clockwork Orange* provide the opposite perspective. Here, the unconventional linguistic expression based on invented words suggests the individuality of a (yet) nonconformed adolescent protagonist, "Alex, the Everyman of this dystopian world" (Goh, 2000, p. 264-65). The term "nadsat" (Burgess, 2011, p. 22), derived from the Russian suffix meaning *-teen*, stands for the jargon of violent teenage gangs who terrorize the streets of Burgess's fictional society. A combination of mostly "Slav roots," "odd bits of rhyming slang," "gypsy talk" (Burgess, 2011, p. 86), and an odd German word or two, nadsat functions as the main differentiator between the socially deviant adolescents and authorities. In fact, the use of conventional language, seen by Alex as stifling to one's true identity, is attributed to all adults, including his parents, whom he sees as brainwashed due to their compliance with the system. Goh notes that "Burgess's use of language makes a statement about the individual's struggle for authenticity under dystopian conditions of social control" (2000, p. 264), once again purporting the idea that language translates to identity.

There is generally nothing problematic in seeing Alex's individualistic approach to language as a reflection of his non-conformed identity, since it is established that language can be both empowering and disempowering, depending on its use(r). However, the jargon employed by the protagonist Alex and his "droogs" (Burgess, 2011, p. 3) is revealed as a powerful dystopian tool for manipulation. This is evident in the actions to which the teenagers refer when using nadsat; apart from describing mundane, socially acceptable activities, the droogs' peculiar speech patterns are most prominent when it comes to their "extracurricular" or criminal activities. In this regard, the teenage jargon functions as what Halliday terms "anti-language":

> The principle is that of same grammar, different vocabulary; but different vocabulary only in certain areas, typically those that are central to the activities of the subculture

[2] "propagandistic language marked by euphemism, circumlocution, and the inversion of customary meanings"; "the leader of an authoritarian state or movement, or an all-powerful government or organization monitoring and directing people's actions" (*Merriam-Webster.com*).

[3] Also interconnected with the Sapir-Whorf's "hypothesis" of linguistic relativity (Hill & Mannheim, 1992, p. 398).

> and that set it off most sharply from the established society. So we expect to find new words for types of criminal act, and classes of criminal and of victim . . . for police and other representatives of the law enforcement . . . and the like. (Halliday, 1976, p. 571)

Consequently, Alex and his gang oppose the "millicents" by "peeting moloko plus," "crasting of pretty polly," "tolchoking old vecks," and performing "the ultra-violence" on (starry) "ptitsas" (Burgess, 2011, p. 1-4). In other words, they go against the police officers (the system) by using drugs, stealing money from shops and private homes, beating up old men, and raping women. All these violent crimes give the gang a sense of profound pleasure they call "horrorshow" (p. 2), which is a twisted, and highly suggestive, version of the Russian word *harasho*, meaning *good* or *favourable*. As with Newspeak and the abovementioned example of the word *duckspeak*, employed in such a way that it can mean two opposite things depending on the context one uses it in, "horrorshow" is also a very ambiguous expression. According to standard English, it clearly suggests an atrocity, but when Alex and his droogs use it, they attribute to the word the original Russian meaning (of *harasho*), so that it means a positive thing (but only for the gang, and not their victims). In that particular sense, the odd teenage jargon has a typical dystopian function that resonates with Foucault's theories of discourse and power by being "a way of controlling the perception of reality" (Booker, 1994, p. 81). Just as with Orwell's Ministries of Truth and Love, among the other two, aimed at spreading lies and hate as the exact opposites of what they claim to represent, Alex's strange words are ambiguous enough to contain both positive and negative meanings of his actions at the same time.

Deceptive language of this kind has a vital social function in dystopian societies and is always carefully devised to be presented as the opposite of what it stands for, desirable even. Hence, the crimes performed by Alex's gang, delivered in their strange jargon, become an enticing curiosity to the reader by creating a cognitive dissonance between the almost exotic-sounding words and the horrors they denote. In his "Politics and the English Language," Orwell also terms this as "inflated style" (1956, p. 363). Such a manner of expressing oneself marks a political use of language characterized by pompousness and deliberate equivocalness in relation to what is actually being said, used "if one wants to name [socially and morally controversial] things without calling up mental pictures" (Orwell, 1956, p. 363). This claim finds its proof in, among others, the phrase "ultra-violence," which is mentioned (and performed) on the very first pages of *A Clockwork Orange*, but its meaning – that of a brutal rape that resulted in the death of its victim – is only explicitly stated toward the end. Furthermore, that Burgess's extreme teen vocabulary is a socio-cultural phenomenon deeply rooted within language can be seen even today, and in languages other than English. Namely, in Serbian and Croatian, phrases such as *strava* and *brutalno* (n. *horror* and adj. *brutal*), which denote something bad and undesirable in terms of the standard language, have also come to mean *exceptionally good*, *awesome* even, in teenage jargon and popular culture.

To return to the concept of language as an expression of freedom and identity, or a lack thereof, Alex's verbal dexterity is the strongest marker of not only his "creativity

and imagination," two of the most undesirable traits in conforming dystopian societies, but also of his "individuality" (D'Haen, as cited in Goh, 2000, p. 264). Alex is well aware of his individuality being enabled through the discursive power of language, and he often manipulates it to his benefit. To illustrate, his unconventional speech patterns are displayed mostly when on his own or with his hooligan friends, who likewise oppose the system, on their nightly rampages. When surrounded by adults, however, whom he deems as enemies or simply "gloopy lewdies" (Burgess, 2011, p. 15) because they do not share his passion for destruction and violence, Alex uses "a real gentleman's goloss" (9), his term for a standard manner of speech in English. He consciously trades his deviant teenage jargon for a socially acceptable standard, even resorting to servile language, because Alex knows it gives him power in social relations, such as when lying to his parents about his night-time activities and to his Post-Corrective Adviser P. R. Deltoid (Burgess, 2011, p. 37-38; 29-30).

Yet, unlike in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, where there seems to be a clear-cut division between the traditional language as "good," and *Newspeak* as controlling and "bad," in *A Clockwork Orange* both ways of expression, the teenage jargon and the conventional, standard language, are revealed as tools for manipulation, and used not only by Alex. The nominally expressive teenage jargon does hide atrocities, but the socially accepted standard turns out to be equally "deceptive and dehumanising" (Goh, 2000, p. 265), a type of Foucauldian discourse employed by authorities, whose main purpose is not to protect the individual(ity), but to maintain the order of society. When Alex is forced to undergo Ludovico's Technique, a cognitive-behavioural treatment which curbs his desire for violence, he is simultaneously stripped of both individuality and the basic human freedom of (moral) choice, while the authorities claim: "We're not concerned with motives, with the higher ethics. We are concerned only with cutting down crime!" and "with relieving the ghastly congestion in our prisons" (Burgess, 2011, p. 94). A side-effect of the treatment, apart from the loss of passion for violence and classical music (which he feels incites him to violence), is Alex's loss of linguistic dexterity. He is standardised, conformed "made into a good boy, [and a number] 6655321. Never again [to] . . . to offend in any way whatsoever against the State's Peace" (p. 71). By forcefully approximating his vocabulary to standard language, the system betrays the fact that this applies to all other adults, who have appropriated this (subdued) manner of speech, and with it the manner of behaviour, which rejects individuality in favour of conformity.

Ultimately, it is Alex's unconventional use of language that epitomises his identity when, toward the end of the novel, F. Alexander finally recognises him as the member of the gang who raped and (consequently) killed his wife at the beginning of *A Clockwork Orange*. As an intellectual and a critic of the State, F. Alexander at first unknowingly defended Alex against the dehumanisation of the system, since the teenager's masked face at the time of the crime did not indicate his identity. This convergence between language and the individual, upon which F. Alexander surrenders the teenager to the very authorities he wanted to protect Alex from as an individual, shows that identity is inextricably linked to language and that the performance of language can save, but also condemn an individual within the society.

In conclusion, the two dystopias differ in style and depict different sources of the newly invented languages, but their message seems to be complementary. The new language of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* creates a Foucauldian discursive field of the Party for the purpose of controlling the society, whereas *A Clockwork Orange* focuses on the "anti-language" (Halliday, 1976, p. 570) of those who subvert the hegemonic discourse and clash with the expected norm.

Rather than containing a multitude of discourses representative of any given society, Oceania's discursive field is reduced to a single narrative proposed by a simplified and ambiguous language, and designed to "convert" the heretic and "capture his inner mind" (Orwell, 2003, p. 292). Newspeak gives power to the Party, in that it organizes all processes in Oceania, and fully disenfranchises the citizens. Only the proles, perceived as subhuman, continue to live at the margins of the society and speak in the old language, but their marginalized status hardly allows a real claim of liberty. In line with the notion of Bentham's Panopticon, the Party polices both the language (mind) and body of the citizens by means of surveillance, and various disciplinary technologies.

Contrary to a positive view of the old ways as represented by Orwell, *A Clockwork Orange* represents tradition and its language as oppressive. Burgess additionally rejects Orwellian binaries of good vs. bad, and suggests that both the language of droogs and the conventional language are oppressive in their own ways. The droogs create a language which expresses their individuality and the rejection of norms, but their identity latches on to the anarchical view of life, which finds its expression in violence and crime. The dominant order subdues their criminal behaviour, but forcibly extinguishes their individual identity along the way as well.

Both novels demonstrate that control over language equals power, and the manipulation of language allows for the manipulation of reality. Through many instances that exhibit the performative power of language, Burgess and Orwell confirm that language possesses the power to constitute both identity and human reality, and the ways in which they discuss the position of an individual within the society is still relevant as ever.

References

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Blakemore, S. (1984). Language and Ideology in Orwell's *1984*. *Social Theory and Practice, 10*(3), 349-356. JSTOR, Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/23556571.

Booker, M. K. (1994). *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Bremer, F. J. (2009). *Puritanism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Burgess, Anthony. (2011) *A Clockwork Orange*. London: Penguin Books.

Courtine, J.-J., & Willett, L. (1986). A Brave New Language: Orwell's Invention of 'Newspeak' in *1984*. *SubStance*, *15.2*(50), 69-74. JSTOR, Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3684756.

Evans, Robert O. (1971). Nadsat: The Argot and Its Implications in Anthony Burgess' 'A Clockwork Orange.' *Journal of Modern Literature*, *1*(3), 406-410. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3831064?seq=3.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The History of Sexuality. Vol. 1: An Introduction*. Translated by R. Hurley, New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1994). *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by A. Sheridan. New York: Vintage.

Goh, R. B. H. (2000). 'Clockwork' Language Reconsidered: Iconicity and Narrative in Anthony Burgess's 'A Clockwork Orange.' *Journal of Narrative Theory*, *30*(2), 263-280, JSTOR. Retrieved from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/30224562.

Halliday, M. (1976). Anti-Languages. *American Anthropologist*, *78*(3), 570-84. Retrieved from https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1525/aa.1976.78.3.02a00050.

Hill, J. H., & Mannheim, B. (1992). Language and World View. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *21*, pp. 381-406. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/2155993.

The Holy Bible. King James Version. (1991). New York: Ivy Books.

Kant, I. (2007). "Was ist Aufklärung?" Translated by L. White Beck. In S. Lotringer (Ed.), *The Politics of Truth by Michel Foucault* (pp. 29-37). Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Morgan, J. (1979). Puritanism and Science: A Reinterpretation. *The Historical Journal*, *22*(3), 535–60. JSTOR. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2638654.

Orwell, G. (2003). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin.

Orwell, G. (1956). Politics and the English Language. In *The Orwell Reader: Fiction, Essays, and Reportage* (pp. 355-66). New York: Harcourt Brace.

Pynchon, T. (2003). Introduction. In G. Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (pp. v-xxv). London: Penguin.

Ljubica Matek
Jelena Pataki Šumiga

ZLOUPOTREBA JEZIKA U BRITANSKIM DISTOPIJAMA DVADESETOG VEKA

Čak i pre objave prelomnoga dela Dž. L. Ostina *Kako delovati rečima* (1962) i njegove teorije o govornim činovima, misao da reči poseduju performativnu moć, odnosno moć da menjaju stvarnost, postojala je kao intuitivan koncept, prvenstveno u verskim ritualima. No dvadeseti vek, s nekoliko istaknutih totalitarnih režima, pogurao je tu spoznaju u prvi plan književnih i drugih tekstova. Ovaj se rad stoga usredsređuje na zloupotrebu jezika u delima *1984* (1949) Džordža Orvela i *Paklena pomorandža* (1962) Entonija Burdžesa. Dva distopijska romana, smeštena u različita društva, pokazuju da se jezik koristi za posedovanje moći i konstrukciju ili dekonstrukciju identiteta,

stvarajući učinak defamiliarizacije i pozivajući čitatelje da kritički procenjuju i priče i društvo u kojem žive. Tačnije, mada iz suprotnih uglova, oba dela pokazuju da je ograničavanje jezika nužno vezano za gubitak moći i identiteta. Dok *Paklena pomorandža* koristi „anti-jezik" (Halliday 1976) unutar dominantne društvene skupine koja se kosi s društveno prihvaćenim ponašanjem, *1984.* kreira jezik isključivo s namerom kontrolisanja društva.

lmatek@ffos.hr
jpataki@ffos.hr