LANGUAGE AND CONTROL – GLOSSOPOESIS IN ORWELL'S *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR* AND ELGIN'S *NATIVE TONGUE*

Israel A. C. Noletto[1]

Sebastião A. T. Lopes[2]

ABSTRACT: With this article, we propose a comparative reading of the use of artificial languages as plot devices by George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) and Suzette Haden Elgin's *Native Tongue* (1984) in relation to their views of language and control. Pierre Bourdieu (1991) Guy Deutscher (2010), and Conley and Cain (2006) greatly subsidy our research. As a result, we demonstrate how similar the authors' impressions are.

Keywords: Glossopoesis. George Orwell. Suzette Haden Elgin. Power.

RESUMO: Com este artigo, propomos uma leitura comparativa do uso de línguas artificiais como ferramenta narrativa em *Mil Novecentos e oitenta e quatro* (1949) de George Orwell e *Native tongue* (1984) de Suzette Haden Elgin atinente à relação entre língua e controle. Pierre Bourdieu (1991), Guy Deutscher (2010) e Conley e Cain (2006) subsidiam largamente nossa pesquisa. Os resultados demonstram a similaridade de pensamento entre os dois autores.

Palavras-chave: Glossopoese. George Orwell. Suzette Haden Elgin. Power.

Introduction

In spite of all the discrepancies regarding ideological focus, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, authored by George Orwell and published in 1949 as well as *Native Tongue*, written by Suzette Haden Elgin in 1984, bear a great many notorious similarities. To name only a few, leaving the obvious numbers in titles and dates aside, both texts deal with dystopian pseudo prophecies of a near future in which citizens of an English-speaking country (the USA and the

---

[1] Teaches English Language and Literature at IFPI (Piauí Federal Institute); holds a Master's Degree in Letters from Piauí Federal University; also works as the leader of Anglolit (CNPq Research Group on English language and Anglophone literature).

[2] Teaches English Language and Literature at UFPI (Piauí Federal University); holds a Doctor's Degree in English Language and Literature and two Postdocs in Literature respectively from the University of Winnipeg and University of London; a member of Anglolit (CNPq Research Group on English language and Anglophone literature).

UK) have their most basic rights repealed, and as a result, what was once known as strong and solid democracies become a complete display of horror, authoritarianism and fascism. This theme of deprivation of freedom, sudden loss of democracy and civil rights has always shown relevant in any stage of human development regarding the relation between those in and under control. In addition to that, the two texts use glossopoesis as a tool to demonstrate how much power and control can be and is exerted through language and by dictatorial regimes. Both of the artificial languages created by the writers, Newspeak and Láadan, are also admittedly glossopeias; they were not meant to pose as natural vernaculars, which is rather uncommon (CHEYNE, 2008).

Together *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *Native Tongue* are high quality social and scientific treatises. There is so much to dissert about the two texts that one article is not enough to approach them entirely. Consequently, for the sake of brevity and focus, we keep our discussion uniquely on the use of glossopoesis, and the correlated points of intersection in the novels.

Glossopoesis has been defined as the creation of artificial languages, or tongues that have not evolved naturally through a people's usage, but rather were constructed by an individual in order to feature in a work of fiction. Commenting on the use of such lingos in Anglophone literatures, Stockwell (2006) points out that whether the invented language is intended for a chief thematic purpose, fictional terms and pragmatic outlines, it plays a significant role in inaugurating the audience's perception of escapism or political observation, which means that defining the dissimilarity between the textual realm and the reader's realm is the first stage in shaping the importance of the work, in building identifications for empathy or satire, in being able to generalize the specifics of the story-world onto principles for the reader's world.

Discussing the use that is often undertaken of glossopoesis in literature, Istvan Csicsery-Ronay Jr. (2008, p. 18) postulates that fictional glossopeias, or according to the nomenclature he uses, "science fictional neology", operate between two termini. First, there are semantic modifications of words and sentences that remain familiar in structure and form, but have been "appropriated by imaginary new social conditions to mean something new". The conlanging jargon classifies that kind of artificial languages as *a posteriori* (Peterson,

2016). Next, there is the glossopoeia "in the strong sense", or the construction of new words that have no connexion to pre-existing natural languages. That is called *a priori* artificial languages by most glossopoeists (Peterson, 2016). The unambiguousness of such "neologisms" does not hinge on social fluctuations in usage, but in their aptitude to evoke imaginary differences of culture and consciousness (Csicsery-Ronay Jr. 2008). These definitions fit flawlessly the properties of the invented languages that constitute the scope of our research, since Newspeak is clearly a derivation of English, consciously designed to remain intelligible, whereas Láadan is completely alien to the English-speaking audience.

In the case of *Native Tongue* (1984), the author constructed Láadan, a glossopoeia meant to serve as women's language. It was devised allegedly based on the ideas advocated by feminist theories in contrast to western natural languages, thought to be patriarchal. That justifies the defamiliarisation that the language causes, that is, part of its main purpose was to be different from any existing and known language, causing a sense of estrangement in the audience, something common in the genre. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), contrariwise, the writer created Newspeak as a replacement for today's English, in a communist Britain of the future.

In Elgin's text, a group of oppressed women uses language to break free, whereas in Orwell's, the Party uses language to refrain people from having diverging thoughts from theirs. Although, the objectives may sound truly opposing, the underlying idea is the same: language can control or shape thinking. This belief is known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, a very disputable linguistic theory that has proven to be the number one showcase ever in sci-fi prose, either in literature or even in cinema.

There are also noteworthy differences concerning the nature of the glossopoeias of each text. Whereas Newspeak does not go much beyond a fictional language, not much further than the conceptual stage, encompassing a grammar sketch and a limited lexicon, Láadan can be considered a full-fledged lingo, which means it consists of a comprehensive vocabulary and a level of completeness rarely seen in literature; something comparable to Sindarin and Quenya, the notorious creations of J.R.R. Tolkien as well as Dothraki and Valyrian by David Peterson. Still, this unlikeness is not enough to prevent a close

comparative reading of the texts, since we propose to analyse their concepts and application in the plots.

In the pages to follow, we explore the authors' use of glossopoesis in relation to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. This initial part of the paper focuses on the reading of Guy Deutscher (2010) regarding the Whorfianism. Then, we debate on the writings of Pierre Bourdieu (1991) about the relation between language and power. Concomitantly, we include Conley and Cain's (2006) considerations on the use of glossopoesis in Anglophone Literatures. Finally, we produce a critique on the political philosophy of each work while also highlighting its connexions with the contemporaneity.

1. The Power of Language for the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and Bourdieu

There is no denial that language exerts power in the political world. Vis-à-vis that, it is of great significance at this point to underscore that language as we treat here refers to the tongue someone speaks, rather than to the humanly innate instinct of verbal communication. In that sense, English, for example, has gained the status of a global lingua franca, and because of that, native English speakers have an inherent advantage when it comes to worldwide communication that others will have to struggle to keep up with by learning the language. What is more, the amount of content generated in English is unmatched when compared to any other modern language.

Sapir and Whorf, well-known linguists of the past, also considered that the power of words was reality-controlling. They became convinced that the intense distinctions between languages must result in impacts that go beyond small syntactic arrangements and must be connected with intense divergence in manners of thought (DEUTSCHER, 2010). In further words, they asserted that our mother tongue determines the way we think and perceive the world. Conspicuously, it is easily noticeable how strong words can be. People have been striving very hard to refrain others from using what they take as offensive, sexist, racist or derogatory vocabulary. For example, political correctness often requires people to use expressions like undocumented immigrant instead of illegal alien, or contingency operations instead of wars.

Contemporary linguists, nevertheless, have placed this theory into disrepute, considering that Sapir and Whorf had attributed implausible cognitive consequences to what were in fact mere changes in grammatical organization. Subsequently, mentions of Whorfianism have been largely proliferated in areas such as mystical philosophy, fantasy and science fiction (DEUTSCHER, 2010), besides also playing an unadmitted role in gender discussions. Indeed, philosophers, literary critics and especially sci-fi, fantasy and dystopia writers have repeatedly and immarcescibly shown abundant interest in it.

Despite the general scepticism in the linguistic scholarly community regarding language powers to sway perceptions of actuality, it is rather fascinating that languages like the one spoken in the Murray Islands do show some evidence that points towards the plausibility of the Whorfian thinking. As Guy Deutscher refers to them, they are "the people who call the sky black" (2010, p. 67). For them, it was usual to apply the term "black" (*golegole*) to the bright blue of the sky and sea, and it was not that they used the same term to diverse hues of colour, they really viewed blue as a different shade of black, for they would contentedly associate the colour of the sky to that of dark dirty water (DEUTSCHER, 2010).

Slobin (1987, p. 435) has put forward that language may influence thought during "thinking for speaking" episodes. Languages force us to attend to certain aspects of our experience by making them grammatically obligatory. Consequently, speakers of different languages may be prejudiced to attend to and translate different facets of their experience while speaking.

Harley (2001) writes of the case of the empty gasoline barrel, used by Whorf to reach his conclusions, another instance that juts out. He recounts that accidents at times happened because people were fooled by words. In one circumstance, a worker would throw a cigarette's fag into what was considered to be an empty gasoline barrel. As it happens, far from the truth, even though empty of gasoline, the barrel was full of vapour, which would implicate in much more danger of explosion. Expressly, then, the mother tongue or the language one speaks can influence their view of reality through the words, which reflect, scilicet, the labels that they have promptly available.

There is another theory regarding how language is capable of exerting power, which, regardless of apparent incompatibilities with the Whorfian hypothesis, does display

applicability in the manner the authors view this matter. For Bourdieu (1991), language also has symbolic power, that is, the power to define meaning, and in due course what is legitimate.

> The almost magical power of words comes from the fact that the objectification and *de facto* officialization brought about by the public act of naming, in front of everyone, has the effect of freeing the particularity (which lies at the source of all sense of identity) from the unthought, and even unthinkable (BOURDIEU, 1991, p. 224).

Put differently, those who control language will in the long run become the dominant class. Language, therefore, can and is used as an instrument to institutionalise systems of dominance in line with established social structures. Bourdieu's theory centres its argument in a broader assessment that implicates more on the belief that social values are learnt through modelled standards or behaviours rather than solely by being communicated via the use of language. By that view, language is merely one of the many categories through which dominant classes control their subalterns; other classifications being art and religion. Moreover, even when it comes to language, there are subcategories, which conjointly with words also include tone, gestures and facial expressions (BOURDIEU, 1991).

Bourdieu also argues that language has a strong association with groups' or classes' identities. One example thereof that stands out for being highly interrelated with our discussion is what happened in Spain under the dictatorship of Francisco Franco whose harshest period spanned from the 1940's to the 1950's. Under his linguistic policies, Spanish was declared the only official language, and the use of any other tongues was either banned or exceedingly discouraged. Even the naming of new-borns with non-Castilian names was prohibited.

In clear association with that, feminists like Julia Kristeva (1974) and Hélène Cixous (1974) have advocated variations on the idea that language as we know it encodes masculinist perceptions and values, in effect rendering women silent. Basically, that is the critical premise in Elgin's discourse. With reference to that, Bourdieu points out:

> What is at stake here is the power of imposing a vision of the social world through principles of di-vision [*sic*] which, when they are imposed on a

> whole group, establish meaning and a consensus about meaning, and in particular about the identity and unity of the group (1991, p. 221).

In essence, a closer reading of the texts reveals that, for the authors, language can influence thought, and still, the greatest power it exerts is not the innate one, but rather that attributed to it by its users, and/or imposed to its users by the dominant classes. Such is precisely what happens in the case of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In its plot, the dominant class, Ingsoc, or the socialist party, modifies the English language, creating Newspeak, and thus, redefining meaning, and as a result what is legitimate. Ultimately, it can be said that they were even meddling in the proles' identity in order to weaken them. As for *Native Tongue*, the group of women at the Barren House uses their constructed language to redefine meaning and what is legitimate for their own sake, in order to break free from oppression, and at the same time, to strengthen or devise a sense of identity, non-existent up until then. While the ends are one other's perfect opposites, the means, conversely, are identical. What follows, then, is a closer look at each case and how each author developed their discussions in the light of the two views we relayed here and in liaison with their use of glossopoesis in the narratives.

2. The Case of Newspeak

Winston Smith, the story's protagonist and anti-hero, lives right at the infant stages of the construction of Newspeak, and because of that, he will be one of the last ones ever capable of committing *thoughtcrime*, which stands for thinking contrary to the Party (ORWELL, 1949, p. 45). His name must by no means be accredited to chance. Winston is a clear reference to Winston Churchill, a man of power in the past of Britain, while Smith is one of the most common family names in England, which may amount to signify that the story's central character has the potential for something great, but is harnessed by the system to mediocrity.

While describing the glossopoeia, Conley and Cain (2006) put that Newspeak, albeit presented as a new language, constitutes rather a diminishment of the English language. In the novel, the Ingsoc is an Anglicized satirical version of the communist Soviet Union. The lingo is intended to replace Oldspeak, or the regular English language, as a day-by-day

communication device among the "proles", or the oppressed working class of unimportant citizens of Oceania, according to the description Syme offers Winston.

> It's a beautiful thing, the destruction of words. Of course the great wastage is in the verbs and adjectives, but there are hundreds of nouns that can be got rid of as well. It isn't only the synonyms; there are also the antonyms. After all, what justification is there for a word which is simply the opposite in itself. Take "good", for instance. If you have a word like "good", what need is there for a word like "bad"? "Ungood" will do just as well – better, because it's an exact opposite, which the other is not. Or again, if you want a stronger version of "good", what sense is there in having a whole string of vague useless words like "excellent" and "splendid" and all the rest of them? (ORWELL, 1949, p. 48)

Next in the narrative, the glossopoeia is described as being comprised of three categories of vocabulary; groups A, B and C. Vocabulary A consists of concrete, denotative words. Newspeak's objective is to reduce words, language complexity and lexicon to a minimum. Orwell proposedly exaggerates the hyperrationalizing application of social scientific principles of language. And though, there are many instances of the language throughout the text, for the most part, "the narrative remains in lucid familiar prose" (CSICESERY-RONAY JR., 2008, p. 31).

Examples of this so-called simplification of language are the changes in the plural form of "men" to "mans", the substitution of "thought" for think in any case, and the regularization of grammar (CONLEY; CAIN, 2006). Successively, vocabulary B involves the use of proper invented words. Examples hereof include *goodthink*, thinking according to the parameters of the Party, *thoughtcrime*, heretical thought, not following the Party's orthodoxy, *doublethink*, contradictory thought to accommodate conflicting ideas that the Ingsoc imposes on people even if they make no sense, *joycamp*, concentration camps, *Minitrue*, or the Ministry of Truth, which was responsible for altering history registry in favour of the Party's interest.

That is analogous to Nazi's "welcoming" phrase at the entrance gates of concentration camps such as Auschwitz that read: "*Arbeit macht frei*" or "working sets free" in loose translation. They modified words of negative connotation, swapping their words for better sounding terms, morphing their semantics, expecting to also change the way people would regard such places. Once the captive Jews experienced the horrors of those camps, obviously, the words used to name them could not improve a single bit their views.

The objective of all that was to indoctrinate the people, making everyone not only behave, but also think according to the 'government's book'. Poetic license apart, Ingsoc believed that if the people did not have words to express dissatisfaction with their horrible lives under their oppressive regime, then they would simply not think of that, they would grow so accustomed to their situation, knowing no other forms of reality that they would never question the imposed reality. Bourdieu's theory of symbolic power was being taken to its fullest (1991).

> Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it. Every concept that can ever be needed will be expressed by exactly one word, with its meaning rigidly defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten (ORWELL, 1949, p. 49).

In that sense, it seems obvious that people who had grown up at the beginning or middle of this process of language engineering would only appear to think accordingly. Winston is the perfect metaphor to illustrate that. In order to protect himself, he would show off to those around him that he agreed with everything concerning the Party's indoctrinations while secretly nurturing sentiments of rebellion. As for the children growing up after such process was finished, however, the probable outcome would be perfect brainwashing.

As Csicesery-Ronay Jr. (2008) writes, dystopias are the most likely places for transformations of words and their meanings. The gap between words and permitted meanings must be radically abridged. Dystopias often depict such tyranny of an excessive rationality that attempts to control the range of imaginable possibilities by controlling the number and range of signification it will permit rather than letting those evolve naturally. The following comments on the Láadan language and the plot of *Native Tongue* demonstrate just how similar the models of Elgin's and Orwell's glossopoeias are in this matter.

3. The Case of Láadan

Elgin agreed with the purported connexions between language and social concepts and, for her, language ever or nearly ever favours men against women. Elgin makes it very clear how she views the issues we are discussing here through the words of Showard:

> First principle: there's no such thing as reality. We make it up by perceiving stimuli from the environment – external or internal – and making statements about it. Everybody perceives stuff, everybody makes up statements about it, everybody – so far as we can tell – agrees enough to get by, so that when I say 'Hand me the coffee' you know what to hand me. And that's reality. Second principle; people get used to a certain kind of reality and come to expect it, and if what they perceive doesn't fit the set of statements everybody's agreed to, either the culture has to go through a kind of fit until it adjusts...or they just blank it out. (ELGIN, 2000, p. 205)

Consequently, Láadan, the language built by her as the chief plot device in *Native Tongue*, is an attempt to make things right concerning characteristics that feminists see as a defect in English, the author's native language (ROMAINE, 1998). Commenting on stereotypes generated by language, Suzanne Romaine ponders that gender is inherently a communicative process that is largely constructed through language. When one hears names like Paul, George and Henry, she continues, the immediate image to come in mind is that of a man. Female English names, on the other hand, are frequently derivations of their male equivalents, but hardly ever the other way around: Paula, Georgina and Henriette (ROMAINE, 1998).

Obviously, there are always contradicting factors in other languages. German, for instance, has totally different words for Mr. and Mrs., which are "*Herr*" and "*Frau*". Moreover, also in German, the definite article that marks the plural in the nominative case is exactly the same as the one that marks the feminine singular, or "*die*", and that is precisely what happens with the equivalent for the word "they", or "*sie*", which is identical to the word for "she", "*sie*". All those features have never helped Germany to become a matriarchal society, nor even less sexist, for that matter. Analogous quirks can be observed in English as well, for there is plethora of gender-neuter words, like teacher, friend, lover, worker, doctor, among many others that simply do not prompt in mind masculine labels. That seems to

expose the innate sexism of western languages, or at least that of English, as mostly circumstantial.

Láadan, "the women's language", was thought to express female perspectives in such a manner to influence on the discursive constructions that form the concept of social reality. To illustrate, consider some of the peculiarities of the glossopoeia: It has a neuter pronoun *be* that means "he", "she" or "it". The word for "woman", *with*, also translates "person". It also has a discourse marking particle, *wa*, which may be added to the end of a sentence to indicate that a person believes in what is being said. Another particle, *wi*, means that what is being said is obvious to everyone (OKRENT, 2009). Other words include *lowithláad*, "to feel, as if directly, another's pain/grief/surprise/joy/anger; *radíidin*, "non-holiday, a time allegedly a holiday, but actually a burden because of work and preparations that it is a dreaded occasion"; *rathoo*, "non-guest, someone who comes to visit knowing perfectly well that they are intruding and causing difficulty"; *wonewith*, "to be socially dyslexic, uncomprehending of the social signals of others"; *doroledim*, a woman that has no resources of her own, but has to provide for others" (OKRENT, 2009, p. 247).

Láadan also marks sensations or experiences only peculiar to women. The menstruation, for instance, has six different words to describe it, something similar to the Greek language that has many different words for "love", or Inuit that has many different words for the many types of snow. That is in essence an intended reference to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. The semantics of these words vary from menstruate for the first time to even menstruate joyfully. Likewise, there are specific words for "pregnancy" or "being pregnant" or "menopause". Chornyak and the other women at the Barren House, responsible for the encoding of the language, did something quite similar to what the Party was doing to the English language, that is, swapping bad or unideal sounding terms for nicer sounding ones. Nonetheless, the effort to capture the female perspective in words is not limited to women's physiological particularities. Other terms cover a great variety of situations that could naturally be experimented by men, being, yet coined to serve the women's communications urges, making everything more practical, rendering less necessary to talk much (OKRENT, 2009). The problem with those "encodings", however, is that they sound like a stereotypical image of women as well, that is, that every and any woman talks more than men and, hence, would

benefit from a more concise language. Yet some other words have been designed to cover a range of female sensations that are allegedly not currently attended by existing languages, but which represent women's cogent necessities. Such is the case shown in the excerpt below:

> She stopped, because there was no word for it in any language she knew, and she wanted to use the *right* word.
> "Oh," she said. "I know… They are *héenahal*." And she sighed. "Such a relief, to have a language with the right words in it!" (ELGIN, 2000, p. 267)

The author's concerns lay obviously on those 'said' defects found in the majority of western languages. The one trouble here is that some or even most of those features, however interesting they are, do not really convey the language a feminine spirit, since other existing languages also thought to be sexist already possess similar or identical structures. That is the case of Japanese, which also requires speakers to reveal their intentions or the extent of their knowledge regarding their statements (SALZMANN et al., 2015). That must partially represent the reason why nor Láadan or *Native Tongue* never really experienced a reception like many other glossopoeias, as Klingon.

The similarities of Elgin's and Orwell's projects begin to show more considerably when the narrator tells that Michaela could never help with the encoding of the language: "She was no linguist and never could be, she couldn't help them with their language and would only be a burden to them if she tried" (ELGIN, 2000, 281). Just like in the case of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the construction of the language was the product of an elite, the women of the Lines, something that ran from top to bottom. It was not a collective enterprise. The women of the Lines, though also oppressed by men, were a secondary dominant class over the other women, regarding language, at least.

This view can be compared to the notion of metropolitan superiority and generalisability described by Gayatri C. Spivak as "a sort of ideological blindness, which constitutes the failure of metropolitan feminist deconstruction to be sufficiently deconstructive or sufficiently feminist" (SPIVAK, 1986, p. 226 *apud* FREEDMAN, 2000, p. 138).

Of course, it is perceivable that Elgin's intentions are not limited to providing a prescription of a solution to all of feminists' issues and, thus, this sense of realism is

welcome. However, as well referred by Mahoney (1996, p. 126), many scenes do not provide realistic answers to the question of what a language such as Láadan offers. Mahoney continues:

> Láadan draws attention to what the construction of such a language would leave out. Ethnicity is an obvious 'silence' throughout the text, despite the claim that Láadan is deliberately made up of sounds which do not prioritise English-speaking women […] this same language is based in the experiences, perceptions and desires of a small group of highly-educated linguist women (1996, p. 26).

As previously stated, according to Bourdieu's views, the women of the Lines had "the power of imposing a vision of the social world […] establish meaning and a consensus about meaning, […] about the identity" (BOURDIEU, 1991, p. 221). In other words, they also had symbolic power. The women who learned Láadan would in first analysis break free from the men's yoke, only to become subalterns of another controlling group. Idealistically, this could represent an improvement, since women in *Native Tongue* were subject to a double subordination, but only if every member of that society learned and spoke that language in everyday communication. Then again, would it be possible for things to happen otherwise?

Conclusion

Nineteen Eighty-Four and *Native Tongue* are similar in yet another aspect: both fail consistently in proving their points. Just like it is not recognized that deleting words from people's vocabulary can prevent them from thinking this and that, a language that would promote women empowerment did not succeed to demonstrate such possibility. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which underlies both of the premises postulated by the authors is not sufficiently verified by science, particularly to the extent needed in the texts, though it is apparently accepted by popular sense.

Nonetheless, both stories are compelling and communicate the intended horror of a dystopian future very efficiently. With respect to the way the glossopoeias support the idea of symbolic power, however, they seem to have been quite more successful. Their discussion is deep in metaphorical grounds, and while the notion of exerting control through glossopoeias

require large doses of poetic license, the texts' diegesis is effective in provoking the thought experiments that Orwell and Elgin so explicitly desired.

Dystopias are generally not meant to be taken literally and such is the situation of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The absurdity of the destruction of a nation's vernacular is not really proposed to sound perfectly plausible. It appears that the idea is to extrapolate on how far an abusive government or authority, political or cultural, can go without being questioned.

As for *Native Tongue*, something similar applies. The thought that the women needed to resort to such farcicalities as having to go all the way to creating their own language from scratch in order to feel represented is in the end what demonstrates the weight of the burden of subjugation. And at the same time, however, also unintentionally, we take it, it serves the purpose of illustrating how challenging it seems that true and total equality be achieved. The mechanics of society always appears to require the existence of controllers and controlled ones, as Bourdieu postulated, which makes the allegorical reading of the texts the most meaningful, especially in contrast with contemporaneity.

Because of that, both novels succeed in providing us with perfect metaphors of problems humankind face today and do not pay enough attention to. Orwell's and Elgin's texts, however pseudo prophecies, seem to point to contemporaneity's realities. Governments are still oppressive and use tax money to propagate their own ideas and interests. Women are still deprived of basic human rights in many places, most emphatically in Sharia-controlled countries; they are still regarded as second class citizens and own blind obedience to men, either fathers, brothers or husbands. Free speech has become relative and dangerous sometimes. The pseudo prophecy of the Ingsoc's *thoughtpolice* and the heretic *thoughtcrime* came to be after all.

It is important to note that each piece of text is a product of the national and historical moments at which they were written. As the years of publication for each story displayed at the beginning of this paper have already shown in an undoubted manner, the historical moment of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) was in the midst of the so-called Cold War, right after the World War II, whereas *Native Tongue* (1984) was written when most feminists were concerned with questions regarding the nature of gender differences, if natural and biological, or socially and linguistically constructed.

Since then, people have taken the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and the strongest view thereof, or the linguistic determinism, very seriously, surely unintentionally, since this theory is not very well spread in common culture, and as a result, there has been severe indoctrinations by the dominant cultural classes that have been defining meaning and what is or not legitimate, what is or not appropriate, and what is or not politically correct. The initial drive might have been to set some free from discrimination and inequality, but things might have gone a little out of hand, and ended up making the oppressed ones become the actual ones to oppress, and this has fomented the rise of new sorts of counterculture movements. Therefore, it seems logical to summarise both texts issue as the very same theme: language and control.

References

BOURDIEU, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Ed. John B. Thompson. Trads. Gino Raymond e Matthew Adamson. Oxford: Polity Press, 1991.

CONLEY, Tim; CAIN, Stephen. *Encyclopedia of Fictional and Fantastic Languages*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2006.

CSICSERY-RONAY, JR., Istvan. *The Seven Beauties of Science Fiction*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 2008. Print.

DEUTSCHER, Guy. *Through the Language Glass: Why the World Looks Different in Other Languages*. New York: Metropolitan Books/Henry Holt and Co., 2010. Print.

ELGIN, Suzette Haden. *Native Tongue*. New York: Feminist Press, 2000. Print.

FREEDMAN, Carl. *Critical Theory and Science Fiction*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 2000.

HARLEY, Trevor. *The Psychology of Language: From Data to Theory*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2001. Print.

MAHONEY, Elisabeth. *Claiming the Speakwrite: Linguistic Subversion in the Feminist Dystopia (in) Language and Gender: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Edited by Sara Mills. New York: Routledge, 1996.

OKRENT, Arika. *In the Land of Invented Languages*. New York: Spiegel & Grau, 2009.

ORWELL, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin Books, 1949.

PETERSON, David J., *The Art of Language Invention: From Horse-Lords to Dark Elves, the Words Behind World-Building*. New York: Penguin Books.

ROMAINE, Suzanne. *Communicating Gender*. New York: Psychology Press, 1998.

SALZMANN, Zdenek; STANLAW, James; ADACHI, Nobuko. *Language, Culture and Society: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology.* Boulder: Wsetview Press, 2015.

SLOBIN, D. *Thinking for Speaking.* San Francisco: Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistic Society, 13, 435-445, 1987.

STOCKWELL, Peter. "Invented Languages in Literature." In: *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Ed. Keith Brown. 2nd. Oxford: Elsevier, 2006. pp. 3-10.