5-1-2014

An Examination of George Orwell's Newspeak through Politeness Theory

Byron Scott Millard
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, byronsmillard@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/theses

Recommended Citation

AN EXAMINATION OF GEORGE ORWELL'S NEWSPEAK THROUGH POLITENESS
THEORY

by

Byron Millard

B.A., Middle Tennessee State University, 2011

A Thesis
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts of Applied Linguistics

Department of Linguistics
in the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
May 2014

THESIS APPROVAL

AN EXAMINATION OF GEORGE ORWELL'S NEWSPEAK THROUGH POLITENESS
THEORY

By

Byron Millard

A Thesis Submitted in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the field of Linguistics

Approved by:

Dr. Karen Baertsch, Chair

Dr. James Berry

Dr. Laura Halliday

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
April 4th, 2014

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

BYRON MILLARD, for the Master of Applied Linguistics degree in LINGUISTICS, presented on April 4th, 2014, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

TITLE: AN EXAMINATION OF GEORGE ORWELL'S NEWSPEAK THROUGH POLITENESS THEORY

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Karen Baertsch

This thesis aims to analyze the formation of politeness in the use of Orwell's artificial language, Newspeak. Multiple theories of politeness will be utilized for the examination but with primary focuses on Brown and Levinson's (1987) original theory and Watts' (2003) views on politic behavior. Orwell's (1949) original novel will be used for the grammatical and lexical basis of the language as well as the source for the language's sociolinguistic aspects. It will be shown that politeness is present within the society and its language, even though it is mechanically altered due to the structure of Newspeak. The largest changes are through the realization of face in INGSOC where a hybrid of Western and Eastern social principles are present.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. INTRODUCTION

The exchange of information is a central factor of human communication and this hinges
on several social factors dictating the need for certain words, certain forms, and certain
intonations. These strategies can be used for politeness and have been of great interest to
pragmaticists for some time. The majority of research still has its foundation in the work by
Brown and Levinson (1987) who created a theory of how politeness functions linguistically.
Over the years, there have been many modifications amendments to what they called politeness
theory and while it still stands as the dominant theory—or at least the basis—for much of the
research that followed, there have also been many researchers attempting to account for the areas
where it is believed to be deficient and many of them believe this lies in the base principles for
the theory itself. Brown and Levinson argued that their theory was universal across cultures and
languages, but many have countered that it is not for multiple reasons, the largest being that their
conception of face—the perceived standing an individual has during discourse—does not
translate perfectly across all social systems. There has been much resultant research in linguistic,
cognitive, and social approaches to the theory but most is simply reactionary, in that it was
simply imperfect at its creation—as all theories are—and needs modification based upon further
research.

George Orwell's novel, *1984*, modifies these discourse strategies and tells of a world
dominated by a restrictive and controlling language which prevents individualism and abstract
thought. England and its territories (now called Oceania) are controlled by a government titled

INGSOC (English socialism), representing Orwell's heavy criticisms of socialism and what it could do if implemented globally. Monitoring, both visual and social, is the primary instrument the government uses to ensure that citizens are complying with what is expected of them. Any deviance is met with death or reeducation. As well, the citizens themselves are their own police by spying on one another and ensuring that they follow the rules of the very system they help maintain. To help facilitate this control, the government has instated an English-based language called Newspeak. Normal discourse is broken down by this environment and while many of the same operations still exist, they are quickly being changed. Normal English is an element of the novel but it is quickly fading in large sectors of the society and being replaced with Newspeak which is designed through several means—heavily regulated morphemes, lexical limitation, and highly regimented syntactical structures—to control the ideas that language can create. The less creative the populace is, the less chance they have of deviation.

In these measures, the language violates some of the principles set out by Brown and Levinson thus creating the need for amendments that can account for these oddities. More importantly, how citizens perceive themselves and others—face—is a delicate issue as it is severely altered by the functions and policies of the society present in *1984*. A descriptive analysis of Newspeak through politeness theory will function as an oddity of both how face alteration can alter politeness and how a language that runs counter-intuitive to the normal development of code systems can change the processes of politeness within that language. Brown and Levinson's standard principle will be largely utilized as a theoretical basis, but other cognitive and social models will be enlisted as modifications for the original politeness principles. Politeness theory has largely been under attack for its failures regarding variances across languages and cultures, but if modifications originating from other developed models can

help further develop the original theory to be able account for such an extreme case as Newspeak, the resulting modified system could most certainly handle a variety of normal linguistic systems.

It must be stated, though, that the goal of this research is not to create a new theory of politeness, but simply to provide another testing ground for the current theories in circulation. While Brown and Levinson's theory will be largely utilized, many others will as well since a full examination of Newspeak will require analysis of both its linguistic and social components. The greatest difficulty, however, lies in the collection and utilization of data. There are very little examples present throughout the novel and while Orwell presents a detailed guide of how the language functions lexically and morphologically, there is also little evidence of how the language has developed. There are no speakers, extensive acts of discourse, or clues towards intonation or non-linguistic communication. Consequently, this research is highly hypothetical and is well deserved to be considered a thought-experiment as much as anything else.

The following chapter will be a review of linguistic theories of politeness, cognitive ones, and more social oriented models followed by alternative examinations of face and a grammatical description of how Newspeak operates. The analysis will have two main sections. The first will examine how face operates within Newspeak. The second will demonstrate possible executions in Newspeak of structures that are often considered polite in Standard English and will also analyze small examples of discourse translated from English into Newspeak. The findings will then be discussed.

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND

2.0 BACKGROUND

The following sections will describe the past research and relevant information that forms

the basis for this research: politeness theory and other pragmatic principles; relevance theory and

other cognitive principles; social models of politeness; Goffman's notion of face; non-Western

views of face; real world artificial languages which provided a background for Orwell's creation;

and finally, an explanation of how Newspeak will be examined in light of its mechanics.

2.1 POLITENESS THEORY AND OTHER PRAGMATIC PRINCIPLES

The majority of politeness research finds its foundation in Brown and Levinson's original

work which set out the principles of politeness theory. These concepts are believed by many to

hold true and one of the primary principles is the concept of face which is the social perception

one has of oneself within a group at its smallest consideration and a whole society at its largest.

This is a construction of both the individual and the group where people have a concept of their

worth and respect, but its maintenance lies primarily within social interaction in that "normally

everyone's face depends on everyone else's being maintained, and since people can be expected

to defend their faces if threatened, and in defending their own to threaten others' faces, it is in

general in every participants' best interest to maintain each others' face" (Brown and Levinson

1987:61). For a proper maintenance of face across a group, a strong effort of give and take is

required amongst all individuals and parties involved and this necessitates the use of language

and actions that do not impinge on others. Every person, though, is concerned with this in two

directions: internal and external, or negative face and positive face respectively. Every

functioning member of a group desires that his wishes and actions are not constrained by the

wishes and actions of others forming negative face. Asking someone a favor could be counted as

a violation of that person's negative face since it would impinge on freedom of action. There is

also the need for an individual's wishes to be accepted by the group, or at least part of the group,

which forms positive face (Brown and Levinson 1987:62). Stating something like, 'Yeah, I

would have done the same,' would be an example of complimenting someone's positive face as it

is a way for the speaker to communicate agreement; he wants the hearer to understand that his

actions are acceptable because they conform to the group's actions and expectations. Most

interaction involves some aspect of preserving face—whether one's own or another's—and in this

way, it is realized as a truly social action that modifies behavior and language. In contrast to

Brown and Levinson's theory, the society of INGSOC devalues both negative and positive face as

citizens are forced into conformity both in their own desires and their respect for the desires for

others. Face is still present, although, a weakened and altered version of what it is in comparison

to the standard Western model.

  From this need to preserve face stems the concept of face threatening acts (FTAs), or acts

that are counter to either the positive face or negative face of the speaker or hearer. Brown and

Levinson categorize several different types of acts that can help maintain or endanger face and all

of these involve some level of manipulation of how information is conveyed. The actions of *on*

record and *off record* denote how ambiguous the speaker is with his intent, one being clear and

the other being indirect respectively: 'Would you turn on the heat?' as opposed to 'Do you think

it's cold in here?' Following this are *bald* acts which are unambiguous, efficient, and to the point;

they disregard face in this manner for many different reasons such as immediate danger, urgency,

or implicating relational factors. These are often sentences in the imperative: 'Get out!' Bearing the design and function of Newspeak, it could be viewed that all utterances are designed to be *off record* or at least *on record*. The attention to a specific type of face while utilizing these strategies forms two types of politeness with the first being *positive politeness* which centers on promoting the positive face of the listener by trying to promote the idea that the wants of both interlocutors are at least somewhat analogous, such as 'Since you're so good at working at cars, would you mind working on mine?' Counter to this is *negative politeness*, where the speaker plays in respect to the hearer's negative face so to avoid conflicting with his wants (Brown and Levinson 1987:68-70). An example would be 'If it's really not a problem, would you mind working on my car?' These actions and others form the basis of reactions to face threatening acts and describe the specific social and linguistic measures performed by interlocutors in order to preserve face.

The usage of face threatening acts and politeness strategies in general is neither concrete nor consistent because they depend on several social criteria which affect the relationship between the hearer and the listener. These factors function as the interlocutor's assumptions of the relationship between the two and do not function as a true interpretation of social contingency, vertically or horizontally. The first is the *social distance* between the speaker and hearer as the relative similarities in their culture, beliefs, language, and geography, or their distance in terms of familiarity. Two sisters would presumably have less social distance than two friends. The second is *power* which is generated from the differences in which one interlocutor could apply his own wants and plans to the sacrifice of the other's (Brown & Levinson 1987:76-7). An employer has powers and privileges over his employees that enact certain types of speech. The last is *absolute ranking* which constitutes a "culturally and situationally defined ranking of

impositions by the degree to which they are considered to interfere with an agent's wants of self-determination" (Brown & Levinson 1987:77). This applies to context specific interactions such as speaking with a person at the corner marker as opposed to a business meeting. These three factors interplay depending on the positions of interlocutors at the moment of interaction for determining what politeness strategies are appropriate. In terms of INGSOC, these factors are still present but the society has placed certain stipulations on them. Ultimately, the goal is for social distance and power to be equally maintained for all citizens so everyone has the same standing, and absolute ranking has little influence since they are all part of the same culture. There is also the minimization of subcultures so cultural variance is diminished, if not abolished. This leaves the majority of variations to be involved with situation specific encounters such as dealings with a person within in his domain of power (his place of work, etc.).

The main principle stemming from all of these principles concerning language usage is the notion that being polite is being indirect. The *off record* strategy discussed earlier is used for strong cases of politeness and consequently is the most ambiguous and indirect leading to the most concern for preserving the face of the hearer (Brown & Levinson 1987). This deference can and will change depending on the social criteria stated earlier and its usage will differ by degrees. In this sense, politeness is an extension of the cooperative principle by Grice (1975) in that it is an additive feature of language. To be blunt and direct could be natural while being ambiguous and indirect could add a new layer beyond the basic strategies of speech. Newspeak focuses on reducing the vocabulary and the amount expressions available so at a glance, it seems to fall in line with this quite neatly.

Much of Brown and Levinson's work is inspired by the work of Grice (1975) and his cooperative principle. The principle originally constituted four maxims prescribing how natural

language tended to occur between interlocutors: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. Essentially, these would be to give the correct amount of knowledge, state something that is true, be true to the context, and to be concise and precise. To greatly reduce this, the cooperative principle is that interlocutors must work together with concise and efficient language for meaningful discourse to function. That is not to say that all four of these must occur for a statement to function, but for productive language to happen, individuals already strive to follow as many of these as they can while communicating. As Leech (1983:8) notes, these maxims are not simply met or unmet when discourse occurs. They all occur in shades; each one can be preserved to higher or lesser degrees both by itself and also depending on the context. They may also contradict one another depending on the situation. These maxims are not laws but only regulatory forces.

Leech bases much of his own work on the cooperative principle but also constructs an accompaniment called the politeness principle which is designed to explain why many speakers commonly avoid using efficient language. It is a system of mutual accountability since it has a "higher regulative role" and is designed "to maintain the social equilibrium and the friendly relations which enable us to assume that our interlocutors are being cooperative in the first place" (Leech 1983:82). Cooperative and efficient discourse cannot occur if the interlocutors enter the discussion with aggression or simply from different starting points of expectations, but politeness strategies can ease aggression and moderate these expectations, sometimes through compromise and other times through manipulation. Leech establishes a set of six maxims for the politeness principle that operate in a very similar fashion to those of the cooperative principle in that they must not be met for language to occur, but their presence does facilitate the flow of language and information. The first four maxims—tact, generosity, approbations, and modesty—operate on

bipolar scales; tact for example deals with both "minimize cost to *other*" and "maximize cost to *other*" (1983:132). These two goals can and will operate independently. The last two maxims—agreement and sympathy—function on a single scale.

Leech attempts at making his politeness principle available for use with other languages than English by implying that his maxims will vary in importance depending on the culture and also the very definitions of self and other (1983:82-3). Despite this, he agrees with Brown and Levinson's belief that ambiguity and obscurity in language is an automatic form for politeness: "Indirect illocutions tend to be more polite (a) because they increase the degree of optionality, and (b) because the more indirect an illocution is, the more diminished and tentative its force tends to be" (1983:108). A listener does not want to be limited in choices, and to give the listener choices—or to at least give the illusion of—automatically empowers the listener letting him be more open to suggestion. Leech's use of the word *force* is slightly complicated as there are three types of force that are determined by the context and language use within a set discourse. *Illocutionary force* denotes the utterance's meaning and the speaker's intention with said meaning. *Rhetorical force* relates to how well the utterance complies with rhetorical standards and also uses them. These are essentially the forms and strategies that individuals are habituated to in their culture, such as the rule of three and other rhetorical strategies. Together these form the *pragmatic force* of an utterance (1983:15-7).

The most important note to make for the present discussion regarding Leech's views on politeness is that it is rhetorical in nature. His politeness principle is construed as interpersonal rhetoric; it is an easy view to pull from the principles since both he and Brown and Levinson propose that politeness can be used to ease possible aggression out of a conversation. It is an active strategy and, as such, can be intentionally employed or disregarded as an additive feature

of discourse. The very use of the word strategy denotes something used to gain an advantage in a scenario; Leech's view pushes politeness to be a manipulative force whether for good intentions or ill ones.

Brown and Levinson's original theories form the foundation for this research just as they have formed the foundation for nearly all politeness research for the past forty years. Their concepts of face are integral for the following arguments and will be used to assess both the cause for certain statements being produced as well as their effect on the hearer. Leech's views are important since the language under question stems from a culture of manipulation. The realizations of rhetoric as a possibly manipulative component will help build how face interactions function in INGSOC.

2.2 RELEVANCE THEORY AND OTHER COGNITIVE PRINCIPLES

Politeness theory has come under much criticism since Brown and Levinson's original conception of the theory as well as its subsequent revision. This criticism has come from two main directions: disagreement with Grice's principles which form the theory's foundation and disagreement with Brown and Levinson's assumptions about universal politeness constructions. One theory attempting to remedy the first issue is relevance theory, originally laid out by Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995). They argue that Grice's cooperative principle opened the door for communication being interpreted through inference instead of the original code model of communication where a speaker transmitted a code and the hearer deconstructed the code in the reverse order. Communication is actually carried largely by inference, or assumptions of expectations (Sperber & Wilson 1995). The hearer does not exhaustively and analytically run through every interpretation of an utterance when hearing it to devise the proper meaning, but

instead automatically searches through the utterance for what may be relevant to his schema. A person may only make a valuable judgment based on what he has experience or background knowledge with; the interpretation that the hearer constructs is based on expectations created from his schema—the hearer expects certain stimuli in communication (Sperber & Wilson 1995). The most desired stimulus is a positive cognitive effect which is where the input from the speaker creates a true difference to how the hearer views his world. It is believed to not be false and affects the hearer in some useful way. In a store, a person would ask 'Where are the paper carrots?' and not 'In this store, where are the carrots?' It would be very unlikely that an individual would be asking something of specificity if it is commonly understood. There are other cognitive effects, but the previously stated one has the most pertinence when discussing politeness in terms of Brown and Levinson's work and extending it to Newspeak. A language aimed at minimizing the amount of expressions consequently raises the ratio what expressions could be relevant in any encounter.

All cognitive effect*s* are not isolated bits of code because their interpretation is heavily related to their context. These contextual implications are the entanglement of input and context; they affect one another intimately and are inseparable. An utterance is only relevant for a hearer when its input is valid for the context and the context allows the input to fit appropriately. This is far more complicated than originally proposed, though, as whether a stimulus is relevant or not is not black or white, but a spectrum as there will be multiple stimuli assaulting an individual at all times—maybe even multiple utterances. All of these stimuli could be relevant simultaneously but there will be some that are more relevant than others, and consequently, there will be one that is most relevant even though it may change rapidly. Handling all of these stimuli can be very taxing and raises the concern of processing effort. Essentially—and largely depending on the

context—a stimulus that is difficult to process will be considered less relevant simply due to the effort (Sperber & Wilson 1995). This is very analogous to Grice's cooperative principle in terms of seeking efficiency to provide and effective utterance, but it begins to contrast with Brown and Levinson's principle that lengthened and ambiguous utterances are the most polite. Lengthened utterances would be harder to process and therefore would have a lower relevance forcing the hearer to take less consideration of what was stated. As will be viewed later, this can drastically swing in the other direction because even though Newspeak originally spawned from English, it drastically reduces the amount of words necessary for the statement to be successful. Relevance theory does make way, though, for a more concise argument of Leech's rhetorical view of politeness in that if one understands the context and the expectations associated with it, that person may be able to manipulate the hearer based on what is considered relevant for the discourse.

Attempting to develop a more culturally universal model of politeness theory, Escandell-Vidal argues that relevance theory and a cognitive approach would function as stronger foundations for politeness research. Her largest criticisms of Brown and Levinson's original proposal are the belief that indirectness equals politeness and that since politeness strategies are believed to stem from rational principles, they must be universal (1996:630). Regarding the second criticism, what is rational in one culture may be irrational—or even insane—in another and consequently discourse mechanisms and interactions can differ radically from one society to another. Some cultures value collective face more than individual for example. This causes large disruptions in Grice's maxims that force an alternative view (Escandell-Vidal 1996). In regard to the first criticism, many utterances may be semantically or syntactically indirect—there may be use of modals, less forceful verbs, increasing levels of subordination, and so on—but

12

they are culturally direct since they generally follow culturally specific conventions and expectations. These forms and conventions construct the *frame* which the discourse falls into.

A *frame* in cognitive theory is essentially a base knowledge built upon expectations. As individuals experience life they build a base of background information and experiences in which they refer to when ever encountering a scenario, new or old. In discourse, an individual will have expectations for what will occur—certain things will be said in certain ways at certain times that are dependent on the culture and language (Escandell-Vidal 1996). There is not a single frame for any language or culture even though that overarching frame will influence the others an individual employs. Being German constitutes a different frame from being Chinese, but engaging in speech in a restaurant in either constitutes entirely different frames. This concentration on the context can be resolved with the use of relevance theory as a background for politeness theory which refocuses the theory onto when politeness strategies would be relevant for the current discourse (Escandell-Vidal 1996). Different frames—and the frames within those frames—require different structures of language and politeness strategies for the discourse to be effective, efficient, and essentially pleasing to both the speaker and hearer.

In contrast to both the view of Leech (1983) and Brown and Levinson (1987), Escandell-Vidal (1996) argues that politeness strategies are not necessarily rhetorical in nature unless they are explicitly designed to be manipulative. These strategies are not additive; they are expected and consequently are only relevant when they are absent in discourse. There is a certain level of politeness expected for every frame and in this sense, even an extremely formal and polite utterance can be misconstrued or simply not understood if it does not fit the expectations required for the context. Jary (1998) echoes this contrast between normative politeness theory

and relevance theory in that the use of politeness strategies adds nothing to the semantics unless it is rhetorically designed to do so:

> On Brown and Levinson's norm-based view of communication, the aim of politeness is to communicate politeness, and sincerely engaging in polite behaviour —by using linguistic forms or strategies, for example—necessarily communicates politeness. In contrast, relevance theory predicts that neither politeness nor anything else above and beyond the underlying message will *necessarily* be communicated by the use of these forms and strategies. (Jary 1998:6)

Politeness is an expectation dependent on the frame in which the discourse is occurring. The act of being polite is normative to a situation and acting otherwise will violate the expectations that the hearer has. In a rhetorical context, these expectations can certainly be manipulated both by not meeting them, over meeting them, or simply changing their nature. This is integral to Ermida's (2006) argument concerning the use of politeness strategies within Orwell's world. She argued that politeness and impoliteness were definitely present within the dialogue and actions of the characters in the novel but some of its principles operated inversely. In terms of Standard English, the most impolite characters of the novel were Winston and Julia who had to converse in very blunt and direct ways in order to hide themselves and their relationship. The most polite characters were the ones most under the control of the system and also those trying to capture Winston and Julia.

Relevance theory has important implications for how Newspeak operates on a lexical and syntactic level. As a language that strives to diminish its vocabulary, and consequently the amount of possible phrases, it can be loosely argued that it is an embodiment of relevance theory since it focuses on forcing concise statements that are presumptuous to the context.

2.3 SOCIAL MODELS OF POLITENESS

Post-modernist approaches to politeness can—in a rather general sense—be viewed as social models of politeness as they seek to account for linguistic politeness as a component of larger machinations of human interaction. Often these models arise as reactions to what is viewed as the failings of the Brown and Levinson model, and one such criticism comes from Richard J. Watts and his work *Politeness* (2003). Watts argues for several major revisions of how it is believed that politeness operates, how it is viewed, and also simply what it is. These issues are all fleshed out in his concepts of two-fold politeness and politic behavior.

Watts proposes two conceptualizations of politeness which stem from the same discernment originally formulated by Eelen (2001). In this line of thought, politeness actually encompasses two different fields which are habitually confused when instead a clear line must be draw between them: politeness$_1$ and politeness$_2$. The first politeness may be construed as the layman's concept of politeness which entails the everyday views and opinions of what individuals conceive as polite behavior. The second politeness is the sociolinguistic theory of polite behavior. This distinction is important for Watts (2003) as argues these are two clearly separate concepts and that linguistic and pragmatic research has diverged from the actual study of the phenomenon into examinations focused on occurrences simply deemed as polite behavior. Politeness$_2$ has concentrated and still concentrates on promoting prescriptive doctrines for forming rules and guidelines in polite utterance production but this method can fail to account for more complex connections between realized utterances, their actual implications, and what the hearer extracts from them. Irony and sarcasm in the guise of polite statements are difficult to account for since they may follow the structure of an *off record* statement, which according to Brown and Levinson is technically a polite utterance. Unintentional attacks may also be in the

same sense by a speaker being overly polite for the situation which in turn the hearer could interpret as mockery or a snobbish attitude of the speaker. In regards to these instances—which are quite common in society—Watts (2003) proposes that politeness research too often focuses on polite behavior instead of impolite behavior, thus renaming it as (im)politeness.

The need to examine impolite statements stems more from the natural tendency of individuals to focus more on impolite actions than polite actions. As previously stated with the discussion of relevance theory, this forms a common criticism of Brown and Levinson's original model and Watts (2003) continues this argument by constructing the concept of politic behavior. In essence, this is social and societal generated expectations of a scenario involving interaction between participants. All situations involve some type of politic behavior that acts as a model of how individuals should interact but not necessarily their specified intentions or goals of the interaction. For example, individuals inside a gas station generally follow a set model of interaction: individuals pick their products if they need one from inside the store, they wait in line, they pay, and then they leave. Any deviation can act as a break of politic behavior and also a face threat and to borrow an example from Watts (2003), this can be as simple as cutting in line. All individuals present in a normal situation will understand the expectations of behavior even if it may be modified by their specific context or frame, and this certainly applies to discourse as well since there is a standard process to how the interaction should progress. Either the clerk will lead with a standard introduction common to most greetings or will as the common, 'How can I help you?' The customer will follow with simple declarative statements of what he needs or is purchasing. The clerk will ring the items up and then state the total. After the purchase there will be the common exchanges and 'thank you,' 'have a nice day,' 'please come again,' etc. The clerk will generally be engaged in more behavior that would be deemed as polite because that is

16

encouraged in employees since businesses want customers to be satisfied so they will return. According to Watts's argument, this cannot truly be polite behavior since the interactant is simply complying with the expectations set out to him by the politic behavior of the scenario. If the customer were to employ linguistic code that utilized standard politeness forms—gratitude, modals, and so on—beyond what was required of the scenario, it would count as an act of politeness: 'Excuse me good sir, I do hope that it would not be any trouble at all if you helped me complete my purchase.' This example (while obviously exaggerated) is above what is required from the politic behavior of the situation so it would, at face value, be counted as an act of politeness but the drastic over payment of politeness that it is might be taken as insult by the clerk. Then it would act as a face threat and consequently, a violation of the expected politic behavior. Citizens of INGSOC would hold the same types of scripted situations since they would be integral for how society would operate. If anything, they would be far more regimented since the citizens are under constant surveillance and threat.

This theory of politic behavior and its idea of overpayment of politeness is founded on several other theories that Watts compounded to form a coherent and working descriptive model. At its base is Werkhofer's (1992) view of speech and discourse as monetary exchanges. In this model, both the individual and society are constructed through social practice where continual interaction refines behavior and consequently setting values, beliefs, and principles. One such social construct is money as it is nothing more than a physical representation of a relative value determined both by need and fetishization. In this sense, politeness functions very much like monetary exchange as the value of politeness is subjective to the individuals and relative to the context (specific instance, city, nation, culture) for the discourse. It has use and power, it is malleable with time and changes of values, and it has progressed from being more than a tool to

obtain something else. It is now a desire in itself. Monetary wealth is a sign of prestige and freedom of will. Wealth of proper politeness is a sign of prestige in linguistic ability, and consequently within society itself.

According to Watts (2003), many constructions of politeness$_2$ are viewed either as polite or impolite, without regard to how they are noticed by the common ear. Using Werkhofer's (1992) concept in combination with politic behavior, it is easy to remedy this. Any speech acts that comply with the expected politic behavior of the frame constitute politic behavior as these are the expected payment due to the hearer involved in the exchange. Speech acts that are underpayment fail to meet the expectations of the politic behavior and can be counted as rude or impolite while those that are overpayment for what is expected can be counted as true politeness. These acts of overpayment and underpayment can obviously be intentional, but can be just as unintentional; just like a person traveling to a new country and not understanding how the currency works and its associated values, a person in a context of unfamiliar politic behavior would not be sure of the appropriate values regarding politeness. They would be unsure how much to pay.

Watts' views are important for the development of context when Newspeak is analyzed as it provides an alternative view from Brown and Levinson's. Not all situations focus on whether a statement was polite or not, but simply if it was right for the situation. Since so much of INGSOC rides on fulfilling expectations, there is much that is needed done to simply fit in, like the use of 'comrade' which will be discussed later on.

2.4 Goffman's Notion of Face

     Brown and Levinson's dual concept of face is derived from both the research and work of

Goffman (1967) and, as they state, the common usage of the folk term in English (1987:61).

Many English speakers know the term "to lose face" as a phrase for essentially being

embarrassed by some action that is generally the person's own fault, but not always. For Brown

and Levinson's purposes, face functions as a juggling act of balancing an individual's wants and

the want for those to be accepted with others involved in the same discourse. Politeness, in

essence, is face mitigation in that it is used to counteract FTAs and improve the position of the

speaker towards the hearer.

     There has been criticism of this view of face, though, and Bargiela-Chiappini (2003)

notes that most of the further research has come from non-Anglophone speech communities due

to different views of how face manifests in different cultures. Much of this criticism focuses on

the strategic and rhetorical portrayal of face, particularly negative face and politeness, since many

cultures focus more on social-indexing (a constant act of social conformity between all

individuals involved formed on completing the expected requirements for the situation at hand).

Brown and Levinson's concept of face can be seen to portray the speaker as perfectly cognizant

of all actions and utterances he produces allowing him to be able to judge—to greater or lesser

abilities—how they should be constructed so that he may achieve the desired effect from or in the

hearer. This is far more akin to western rhetoric, though, in that it is the modification of language

in the hopeful reward of modified behavior or belief on the part of the hearer. To reference Watts'

(2003) differing politenesses, this is often not how politeness actually functions in everyday life

as most individuals do not always think through the politeness constructions they use but instead

utilize habituated phrases depending on the circumstances. It has been argued that many cultures

focus more on this conforming through habituated constructions than on strategic usage (Bargiela-Chiappini 2003). This would certainly be the case with the citizens of INGSOC as the constant pressure from the government would force habitualization. They seek phrases and common utterances that would be deemed "safe" and acceptable to state thus creating a more homogenous variety of language across the culture.

Goffman's (1967) original concept of face is far more malleable and amorphous than that presented in Brown and Levinson's work. A person's face is an entirely social construction and the individual cannot actually gain any knowledge of the expectations or parameters of the situation without social interaction, so for this person to have face, he must interact thereby possibly preserving and insulting the faces of others. In this sense, the individual can only have face through the act of social interaction; without interaction, there is only self but no face for any others to see. Every situation carries different variables and frames so the face of an individual is different in every scenario. There will be different individuals making different judgments of the speaker based upon how he engages the frame as well as those individuals. Face is the image the speaker constructs of himself dependent on what he presumes to be the judgments of the hearers, and those presumptions can only be constructed through his own judgments of their interaction with the discourse and frame. As can be seen in this reasoning, face is a temporary and fleeting construction developed from an infinite loop of judgments and presumptions. An examination of Goffman's original work is integral for this study as it is part of the basis for Brown and Levinson's own work. Examining his work helps explain where their ideas originated but it also helps explain part of how Orwell's Big Brother hopes to control the language. As face is determined by a multitude of variations depending on the situation, creating

a much more stable and unchanging environment—a static and homogenous culture—will limit the amount of variety within it.

2.5 NON-WESTERN VIEWS OF FACE

Brown and Levinson's concept of face has been fairly accepted and utilized by many researchers but not without faults. This is not to say that it is a terribly flawed concept, but that it is not applicable to all scenarios and as many researchers have attempted to demonstrate, the most primary of these scenarios is the social difference between eastern and western cultures. China and Japan have had a long succession of researchers since the publication of Brown and Levinson's original work who have attempted to show that the binary—positive and negative— showing of politeness does not always apply well to discourse scenarios not within the confines of Western thought and interaction. At the root of the disagreement is the notion that many eastern cultures value the function of society over the individual while many western cultures— mostly the English speaking ones and those of European descent and colonization—value the priority of the individual. Predating Goffman's (1955) original work on face, the anthropologist Hsien Chin Hu (1944) claimed that the Chinese concept of face delineates from two terms, *lien* and *mien*. *Mien*—*mien-tzu* as other researchers (Ho 1976) have called it—is roughly equivalent with Goffman's concept of face; it is the standing of an individual within the context decided upon by perception of character, merit, prestige, social class, and other social attributes considered to be positive. It is the standing given to the speaker based on individual efforts as perceived by the hearer (Ho 1976: 870). *Lien* is a more communal form of face; it is like the standing given to individual from society upon entry into the culture whether by birth or acceptance.

While the Western concept of face and *mien-tzu* can be viewed as roughly equivalent, in Chinese culture they are seen as reciprocal components or at least different sections of the same scale. An individual may lose *mien-tzu* without losing face as compared to the dichotic Western view of face. According to Brown and Levinson's (1987) principles, an individual in a discourse who makes a faulty action such as inadvertently attacking another's face, whether positive or negative, will lose face. There is no gradation or system of degrees to how much he will lose as this operates like an on-off switch; the speaker must either rectify the action by modifying his behavior and making the appropriate amends so that he falls back in line with the expectation of the discourse or he may continue with the discourse in a consistent bad standing (Watts 2003). There is very little room for alternatives. *Mien-tzu* (Ho 1976, Hu 1944), however, allows for multiple faults and falls outside of the social expectations present within the discourse so that a speaker may slight the hearer—intentionally or not—and still be within good standing. His *mien-tzu* has lessened but he has not lost face. There does come a point where the continuous loss of *mien-tzu* creates a crux point where the individual must make an attempt to correct his actions or he will lose face. Once this face is lost, it can be regained but this is not to be confused with the constant gaining and losing of face associated with Western politeness theories. This is simply a reinstatement of the individual's original position (the perceptions given to him by hearers) as compared to a gaining of face (Ho 1976). This is essentially a balancing act according to Lee-Wong (1999: 24) in that this is not a concentration of wants and desires but maintenance of a well construed give and take of respect and position.

While not as commonly commented on as *mien-tzu*, *lien* stands as an interesting representation of face for this examination of Orwell's creation as it is a satire of socialism. *Lien* presents itself as a more socially obligated form of face and as Ho (1976) notes, it is something

automatically given to members of a society and is lost through refusal of the society's norms. This can be viewed as a collective form of face and is automatically considered when speakers and hearers enter an interaction or discourse. In its simplest terms, this is the respect given to a person simply for being part of a society. Presumably, this can be masked by or be a component of such concepts as nationalism or ethnic pride. A Chinese speaker would automatically grant and recognize a certain amount of face to a Chinese speaker since they are both part of the same society and consequently, the same customs and expectations. Both *lien* and *mien-tzu* would be in play during the interaction but the former would be coming from the angle of societal appreciation while the latter would be focusing on the individuals present. This is not to say that this concept is exclusive to Chinese culture; societal and cultural pride is a large component of every nation and people.

In correlation to this differentiation between collective and individualistic forms of face, Ting-Toomey (1988) argues that these different forms—collective or individualistic—are present in all societies but their ratio of importance are different depending on the culture. Upon thought, this is obvious since no society is purely altruistic with its members functioning essentially as worker insects. Also, there is also not a purely individualistic society in this world as that would not be a society simply by the definition of the term. All cultures exhibit some balance of the two; both individualism and collectivism operate at the same time but with different levels of prioritization. The relation of this to Brown and Levinson's (1987) concepts of positive and negative politeness can be easily seen, especially with regard to negative politeness which focuses on the need for one's actions to free from restraint by others. This is a purely individualistic desire that can be seen as a strong component of western face (Ho 1976, Ting-Toomey 1998).

Even positive politeness, the need for approval and acceptance, can be a truly self centered desire within individualistic culture (Brown & Levinson 1987). There is a strong difference between an individual wanting his actions to be the best for those involved in the social interaction and that same individual simply wanting his actions to be accepted regardless of their merit, validity, or benefit. Alternatively, negative politeness is far easier to see as a purely individualistic notion. This desire to be free from impediment is obviously centered on the self and disregards the overall social context. The confusion between individualism and altruism in the nature of these concepts arises when they are applied in a discourse towards the hearer. Positive politeness strategies may be employed by an individual who seeks the trust of the hearer; he will assure that person that his wants and needs have merit. They should be upheld because they are his and therefore they are just. Ultimately, though, these actions are still centered on the self, whether that be the speaker or hearer's. The speaker in this scenario knows that the hearer values his own personal identity, and consequently, his own actions and ideas so the speaker acts upon those notions promoting and complimenting those individualistic notions. The hearer responds by feeding upon these utterances and using them as confirmation of his own actions or as a ploy by the speaker to win his favor so that the speaker's actions or desires will be met in some way. Both the speaker and hearer are concentrated on self whether it be their own individual or the individual they are conversing with.

Neither the speaker nor the hearer in Brown and Levinson's conceptualization of face have to be concerned with the larger social frame they are in. They may conduct the discourse solely within the context of the specific interaction they have engaged. This is not to say that there would not be any influence from the external components of society and culture as there are always influences from schema and what the social expectations of the situation are (Sperber &

Wilson 1995, Watts 2003). This concentration on individualism will be reflected on how they construct statements and propose information. As Ting-Toomey (1998: 192) notes, many speakers of individualistic societies tend to attribute accomplishment to their own abilities and failure to external influences and factors. Conversely, members of collectivist cultures tend to attribute accomplishment to effort and striving and failure to personal incompetence. This implicates that members of collectivist cultures recognize a stronger sense of social obligations and expectations; there is a societal standard to be maintained.

These theories of face will be very important for the construction of how face operates in the world of *1984* since the society is supposed to be a sort of quasi-socialist government where the citizens are essentially all equal but are trained from birth to hate, mistrust, and betray one another. As will be seen, face forms itself as an amalgamation of these principles with the more western views of negative and positive politeness.

2.6 INFLUENCE OF REAL WORLD ARTIFICIAL LANGUAGES ON ORWELL'S CREATION

Newspeak is not a purely fictional creation of Orwell's designed only to serve his purposes as it is actually based off of actual artificial languages that were in different levels of progress during the time he was writing *1984* as well as the propaganda movements that developed before and during World War II. The first language that acted as inspiration was Esperanto, an artificial language created by Lazar Ludwig Zamenhof in 1887 (Berdichevsky 1988). It was designed to serve as a means for countries and people to communicate without the interference of cultural and political grudges and bigotry so that they could function above these petty things and create a more peaceful existence. While noble, these are some high minded goals that have never come to fruition even though the Esperanto speaking population has been at

substantial numbers for some time and originate from a variety of countries. Part of this comes

from the reticence of speakers of "dominant" languages such as English and many European

languages.   Control is maintained on cultural and linguistic identity. Orwell himself was a

strong proponent of language purity in that languages are things of beauty that should not be

diluted or violated or else they will lose their identity causing the population to consequently be

deprived of their culture and individualism. Esperanto is designed as a positive change of

language but that is not to say it is without flaws, and Orwell chose only to concentrate on what

he perceived as its negative aspects, particularly its structure (Berdichevsky 1988). Severe

regularity is a main component of the language and was designed as such so that it would be

easier to learn by any speaker as compared to other natural languages that can be very difficult—

English is an excellent example due to the many types of irregular forms of words across parts of

speech. To Orwell, these irregularities provided individualism and required individuals to

actually think about their language; it was a form of uniqueness and sublimity.

Another language that Orwell adamantly criticized was Basic English, a creation of the

United States and England during World War II in hopes of an English centered world following

the war (Berdichevsky 1988). The language was designed to be as concise and easy to learn as

possible; it was designed to fit on a single sheet of paper and required only minutes to learn the

structures. There were only 850 words but a person could learn a few hundred more depending

on their need for employment or function. It was heavily regulated and only included eighteen

verbs further limiting the types of expressions that could be readily made or concepts that could

be cognitively made using the language, and this functioned as a large start for Orwell's belief

that a limited language would create a populace with limited capabilities of thought. There are

still other languages—whether entirely new or modifications of existing ones—being created and

used today in hopes to change thought and culture. E-Prime is a modification of English where

all forms of the verb 'be' are absent in hopes to avoid philosophical judging of objects and things

and also to create more precise and intuitive language. While this is possible for many speakers

to use in writing, it has proven to be more difficult in speaking simply due to the vast number of

phrases and prescribed units that English employs that utilize 'be.' While this may show that it is

not as successful a modification as many would hope for it to be, it is still designed for a purpose

that can be met to some degree. All of these languages are centered on the alteration of language

in order to either change thought or the society that uses it implying that while many view

Orwell's creation as a farfetched conclusion of the possibilities of language, it actually has more

truth than fantasy in its framework.

2.7 Reconciling Newspeak Mechanics with Theories of Politeness

Newspeak operates through a simple, although at times convoluted, structure on the

morphological level. As Luchini (2006) noted, Newspeak has two primary principles on which

it operates: parts of speech can be interchangeable in nearly all areas, and heavy regularity,

bearing a few exceptions. The lexicon is based on English but is severely reduced to prevent

issues of ambiguity and metaphor—anything that would encourage creative thought. As a

natural extension of this, there is no need to have opposing words (Orwell 1949). There is no

need for both 'real' and 'fake' since the property of both terms is already within each of the terms,

and consequently 'authentic' and 'false' would not exist because of redundancy issues. The

creation of different parts of speech lies entirely with affixes: 'un-' for negation, '-ful' for

adjectives, '-wise' for adverbs, 'plus-' for emphasis, and 'doubleplus-' for extra emphasis. Noun

and verb forms of words are made identical, so 'think' and 'thought' are reduced simply to the

previous which can function as both a noun and a verb becoming what Orwell called a noun-verb (1949). Irregular forms of of verbs and plurals are eliminated. All verbs use '-ed' for the past tense and there are no changes in spelling except when absolutely necessary. 'More' and 'most' are eliminated with only '-er' and '-est' being used for comparatives and superlatives.

Modals are also affected—even though Orwell spends little time discussing this—which can be a direct concern for politeness strategies (1949). In Newspeak, 'shall' and 'should' are nonexistent because their uses were far too similar and unnecessary because of that. There is nothing said of 'could' but it is presumed that exists because 'can' still does.

These principles are employed in three distinct vocabularies (A, B, and C) which are semantically and pragmatically separated from one another and are only used for distinctive purposes in order to eliminate ambiguity in interpretation (Orwell 1949). The *A* vocabulary contains all words that are used in everyday life such as dog, boy, tree, and so on. The *B* vocabulary contains all words that are associated with politics and includes many words that were invented specifically by INGSOC; these words generally encompass entire philosophical and political beliefs and are designed as such to only create the desired cognitive construction when spoken. 'Politics' does not bring forth the discipline or abstract concept of politics but the entire political system in usage by Big Brother. There is no alternative of thought since the root words used to describe abstract concepts are embedded in the very beliefs distilled by the government. The *C* vocabulary only includes words used for science and technical fields and may only be learned by people who work in those areas. Even then, a person only learns the terms and jargon related to his specific employment or discipline (Orwell 1949). A biologist would never learn the lexical items of an engineer, for example. These limitations and the isolation of one vocabulary from another aids in reducing ambiguity.

To place these vocabularies into context, the word 'berry' provides an excellent example. There are many ways that this word can be ambiguous and carry many misinterpretations and the first is simply from a phonological stance. In many dialects of English 'berry' is a homophone of 'Barry'; it is simply through context that a hearer can distinguish if the speaker is discussing a fruit or a person, and this can become even more complicated when 'bury' is considered as well. In terms of semantics, most individuals would say that a berry is a small edible fruit and examples are blueberries, strawberries, gooseberries, and so on. Botanists have a different interpretation, though, and say that strawberries and blackberries are not berries, but bananas and tomatoes are.

By separating everyday terms from scientific terms, issues of ambiguity can be dealt with but this does not entirely resolve the issue as even within those vocabularies there can be repetition of terms and lexical items. The word 'singularity' has entirely different meanings in the disciplines of astrophysics and artificial intelligence so by only allowing individuals to learn the lexicons they absolutely need ambiguity is lessened even further and the social isolationism acting as a context ensures that they might not accidentally learn something that would create contradictory interpretations.

The primary goal of this research will be to show how politeness theory could account for the discourse operations of Newspeak with possible modifications to the original principles involving relevance theory, politic behavior, and other models. This is neither to say that more modern theories are infallible nor that Brown and Levinson's original concept is without merit, but that the movement towards a more complete idea is continuing. As Chilton notes, no theories are entirely succinct when it comes to the motivation behind them:

Another aspect of the Brown-Levinson framework, one that would for instance be criticized by postmodernists, is the basic assumption of rationality. Many postmodernist approaches tend to throw the baby out with the bathwater. Cognitive-pragmatic approaches, such as Sperber and Wilson tend to forget to fill the bath. (1990:203)

The goal is not to refute and disable what Brown and Levinson have stated—and consequently what Ermida used her theory for; a modification of their principles for a radically different environment for face to operate in—since their politeness theory is generally sound despite its failings. There may be a need, though, for certain modifications to be added so that the theory can appropriately describe such an unorthodox language as Newspeak. There will be multiple processes occurring in the research to reach this point: a detailed analysis of the context of the novel to give some light to the overarching frames of the character's discourse and the politic behavior expected; an examination of the differences in face between Brown and Levinson's hypothetical man and what is expected of individuals within the constraints of Orwell's world; discourse analysis of utterances translated from one language to another to view the lexical, syntactic, and semantic differences; and viewing potential incompatibilities between Newspeak and politeness theory to develop a hypothesis of what possible modifications must be made in order for it to be able to describe the system.

Ermida's (2006) argument is founded in Brown and Levinson's original concepts and she utilizes the dialogue of the characters in Orwell's novel to justify an amendment to those original principles. The factors of social distance, power, and hierarchy do not steadfastly determine the appropriate use of politeness strategies; a person of power can abuse these principles and apply politeness to someone below him in order to achieve a goal (Ermida 2006). Her interpretation is not incorrect but relevance theory can also account for these actions and discourse scenarios. There are three scenarios that Ermida examined—interaction between Julia and Winston,

Winston and O'Brien, and the last confrontation between Winston and O'Brien—and two of these focus largely on true politeness scenarios that have been altered by the world of the novel. She argues that Winston and Julia's interaction conforms readily to Brown and Levinson's original principles and in this way, functions somewhat as a control when she analyzes the other two scenarios. The second scenario of when O'Brien initially attempts to manipulate Winston builds the foundation for her amendment of politeness theory and the third shows how this can be reversed depending on the social context. She uses these situations to establish the argument that politeness is mostly used for manipulation—primarily through O'Brien's torture of Winston—so there is a discrepancy between the use of politeness structures and the parameters of social distance and power. O'Brien was in power in that scenario but he was more polite than anyone else in the novel had ever been.

After examining these instances of dialogue a conclusion can be drawn that politeness theory can account for the discourse present in the novel but there are difficulties when Brown and Levinson's principles are used to examine the rest of the discourse of the novel, primarily Newspeak. The most immediate question at hand for this analysis is the use of Orwell's fictional text as a basis for hypothesis, but this is easily remedied when the usage of dialogue in fiction is realized to be completely based in authentic situations and discourse. As fantastic and otherworldly a novel may be, its elements are always based upon human experiences, expectations, and speculation so language is naturally included. Many authors have embraced trying to replicate authentic discourse in their texts—Twain and Faulkner for example—and this also certainly applies to Orwell as a primary focus of his was language change and usage. To be more specific, he concentrated largely on language manipulation and social variance which extend to "linguistic malfunction and conflict" (Chilton 1984:131). This is an integral concept of

31

1984 itself: how a society can control a language and then utilize that language to control its citizens. Whether this concept is believed or not, it was still one of the questions that the writer brought forth with this work. Similarly, this research will mimic Ermida's in that "the discourse strategies used in fictional worlds are often more than not remarkably attuned to mechanisms used in the 'real' world" (2006:843). Characters are designed to function like individuals in actual existence so their language—while guided by a plot—is still authentic in that it cannot be based on anything but the creations of people who utilize analogous linguistic systems everyday.

These analogous systems all embrace commonalities in form and function so an English author would have dialogue in his work that mimics that of his primary language in terms of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics—unless that author intentionally deviates from standard discourse or employs a different language which would of course require different linguistic conventions. Politeness certainly is one of these aspects and is the entire focus of Ermida's work that is being discussed, but she falls short in her conception of the linguistic systems at play in the novel. She only analyzes the spoken dialogue of the novel in her attempt at modifying politeness theory and fails to recognize Newspeak as an independent system. It is clear that Orwell had labored to make Newspeak appear as an independent language—even if only a sublanguage—that simply lexically and morphologically based upon English, or oldspeak. One of goal of INGSOC was to create a language divide amongst its population: those elite in the party and the masses, or the proles. This aspect of Newspeak is not to separate these two classes by variance of usage or pronunciation in the one language, but to create a barrier through bilingualism (Chilton 1984:134). This is evident in the characters' interactions and is especially evident with Syme, a worker in the Research Department who helps develop subsequent editions of the Newspeak dictionary, when he and Winston have a discussion over lunch about the

progress of Newspeak. Winston's job is essentially that of "correcting" documents which does

entail recoding Oldspeak documents into Newspeak but Syme raises the point that "They're good

enough, but they're translations" (Orwell 1949:46). The implication here is that the translation is

insufficient and might eventually not even be possible as more and more lexical items are

destroyed and twisted, consequently pushing Newspeak to be more independent as a language.

Viewing Newspeak as an independent language grants it the same identity of semantics

and pragmatics that other languages hold, including rules in politeness, but with certain

difficulties. The textual evidence of Newspeak in the novel is mostly in written statements—and

fleeting at that—as compared to character discourse and this barrier forms the difference in

stylistic expectations between spoken and written speech; politeness theory has largely been

aimed at spoken discourse where strategies and standards are used to promote an ease of

conversation. Written discourse undergoes the same process but there are differences in

rhetorical strategy and convention. Even Leech notes this in his own research the intentions of

most pragmatic studies: "I have in mind the effective use of language in its most general sense,

applying it primarily to everyday conversation, and only secondarily to more prepared and public

uses of language" (1983:15). Certainly, the preparedness of discourse drastically alters its form

and function, but Ermida's (2006:860) own alteration of politeness theory with its usage for

"domination and deception" forces a reconsideration of some discourse scenarios. She devotes

much time to the analysis of the character O'Brien and his use of politeness strategies to

essentially win over Winston. From this she derives her amendment to politeness theory but it

also gives many implications to rhetorical strategies since O'Brien was aware of his plan. His

exact words might not have been preconceived but his intentions and mode of thought certainly

were leading his discourse to already be in a frame before he ever spoke with Winston in any

circumstance. While this may not be as planned as a speech or a manifesto, it is not entirely

normal spontaneous discourse either.

This blurring of the line with the analysis of O'Brien does not definitively conclude that

Newspeak can entirely be viewed under politeness theory, but it does bridge the gap to where the

nature of that language can carry it the rest of the way. As stated in the novel's appendix,

Newspeak is designed to be universal and conclusive in regards to transmission and semantics

and in regards to the society, "to make all other modes of thought impossible" (Orwell

1949:246). The goal of the party with Newspeak is to limit thought and to do so, the formulation

and transmission of ideas must be limited. As Chilton (1984:132) notes, Newspeak operates by

eliminating possibly unnecessary words and then further specifying the meanings of those that

are left which essentially reduces the options for variant thought: "The point about Newspeak is

that it is specific in the concepts it encodes, and if some things cannot be expressed, it is not

because of deletion transformations, but because the appropriate words do not exist to start

with." The lexicon and semantics are not all that is limited; the morphology and syntax are

limited and simplified allowing for little if any freedom in word or sentence structure. The

primary differences between most spoken and written speech are lexical items and sentence

structure, but if a language were to be harshly and intentionally limited in these variances, there

would be little difference between the two modes of discourse. Speaking and writing would

lexically and structurally be nearly identical simply for how few options the individual had to

express himself with in terms of abstract concepts, or simply anything that did not exist in

INGSOC.

As detailed and complex as Orwell did construct his language, the novel still does not

entirely flesh out the entire language leaving a troubling gap in potential research and thought.

There are also a lacking amount of examples of fully utilized Newspeak in the novel. The morphology of the language was fully explained in the appendix of the novel and the syntax is the same as English, but Orwell only gave lexical rules instead of a completed lexicon. Like with many creations, though, time and following have carried Newspeak farther than its creator planned. A group of individuals (Newspeak Dictionary 2005) have created a working lexicon for Newspeak based upon the principles explained in the novel and while some may criticize this approach, it must be noted that this embodies the actual psychology of the language. Orwell wanted to create a language that embodied control and restriction partly by taking an existing lexicon and essentially shoving it through a filter—deleting many items and infinitely compounding others—and these people have done just that with the same linguistic goals that INGSOC yearned for. The current research will employ this lexicon in combination with the grammatical principles set out by Orwell as the basis for the linguistic models to be employed for discourse analysis, and there will be the need for translation of English (North American Standard) to Newspeak and consequently, the reverse.

Discourse examples for translation will be borrowed from Watts' text since it has strong examples of authentic dialogue. While it will be integral to fully examine the linguistic specifics of each speech act (syntax, lexical choice, etc.) it also important for this research to combine this with how face has been altered so there will be a preference given to examples that include context. The ultimate goal is to use the analysis of Newspeak as a means to see how the combination of differences in code, frame, and face form differences in politeness for Newspeak.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS

3.0 ANALYSIS

This section will focus on an analysis of Newspeak. The first half will concentrate on how face is constructed in the world of INGSOC. The second half will focus on specific components of the language that have alterations in how politeness is produced and received.

3.1 REALIZATION OF FACE IN INGSOC

The world of *1984* is commonly called dystopian. While this certainly and accurately describes Orwell's creation, most only think of Big Brother and the constant monitoring placed on the citizens where control is placed in the hands of people watching surveillance cameras. This is certainly a major component of the society and how control is created there, but it is only part. Orwell emphasized that this control is attained through multiple levels of invasive monitoring and control. One of the most salient aspects of this society is the utilization of Newspeak as a means of cognitive molding; while its function could never apply to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis as Orwell had dreamed, it is still truly a major aspect of the society. For the purposes of this section, though, it will be reserved simply as one component of a larger scheme. Considering these elements, control over the citizens of Oceania is maintained through physical monitoring, physical force, linguistic barriers, economic barriers, and—most importantly for this discussion of face—social compliance.

This obedience to the social paradigm must be understood for what it truly is and that is a set of social parameters. Citizens are constantly monitored at work and at home; there is no time that they are not under video surveillance so any marked or questionable behavior would lead to an investigation. Citizens must attend parades and hate speeches (the Two Minutes Hate) and any failure to comply is noticed. Anyone suspected of 'thoughtcrime' is either made an 'unperson' or is reprogrammed. If made an 'unperson,' they are not only killed but erased from history. All documents related to the person are altered to show that he never existed; history itself is changed to reflect the new reality. A perpetuating system is then created because if an unperson is ever mentioned, the speaker is guilty of thoughtcrime. The citizens force themselves to believe the new reality which is paradoxical since most of them are appointed in the offices and departments that deal with historical revision and modern propaganda. They embody the very system that affects them and this totality of measures destroys individuality of act and thought.

Ermida (2006) argues that these acts of INGSOC destroy the want and need for face in each of the individuals within the society but—braving the risk of tautology—this cannot be true simply because it still is a society. It is a union of individuals with a common culture and governance that interact for the function of individual and collective needs. As long as there is social interaction, there will be face. Big Brother does control, constrict, and dominate the individuals under his dominion but he does not clear them of their "personalities, desires, needs, conscience, memory and self-respect" in order to do this (Ermida 2006: 847). The citizens are not wiped and then implanted with the desired model or traits but instead are molded into what is needed. Personality does not grant face even though they may affect one another, and the destruction of personality does not cause the elimination of the foundation for face to build itself off of. Face is not constructed by how one feels, thinks, or desires but, as Goffman states, is "an

image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes" that is not created or even owned by the self, but is instead a set of conventions to which the self must be applied (1955: 7). INGSOC has expectations and standards for how individuals should act and therefore there is face within this society, no matter how it manifests or what shape it takes. The citizens of Oceania are rational within their context and have face simply because there are social expectations of interaction placed upon them, but the question of what those expectations and parameters are comes to mind. Simply from the premise of the novel there are certain qualities that can be determined. Negative face is definitely altered because all individuals are being monitored constantly and this obviously would be a violation of every citizen's desire for their actions to not be prohibited.

While Ermida (2006) argues that face is essentially null within Orwell's world, she also argues that Winston, Julia, and O'Brien are exceptions to this in that they have and utilize face. Winston and Julia are engaged in a relationship (an active caring of other human beings) and count themselves as haters of Big Brother. They seek their own freedom and seclusion from the oppressive society and act to ensure that as long as those actions would not immediately cause their deaths. O'Brien does utilize face but only for the purpose of ensuring that Winston and Julia are guilty of thoughtcrime. He uses it as a tool so that he may socially interact on a compatible level with them. He understands that his actions (turning off video cameras and simply writing) are violations against Big Brother, but he does them for the protection of Big Brother. Part of this argument relies on Brown and Levinson's model person as a basis which they state as being a "rational agent with face" (1987: 83). All this implies is that this individual is someone who is of sufficient mental capacities to be capable of passing judgment and making logical decisions. They propose this person to be universal so that all cultures could be covered. The inherent

problem is that their assumptions are based on Western ideas concerning rationale and logic. As could be seen earlier concerning the differences in face between western and Asian countries, there are differences in how cultures believe that individuals should tackle interaction and consequently there are different views on how social problems should be solved (Ho 1976, Hu 1944, Ting-Toomey 1988). These differences in philosophy and cognitive processing constitute variations in rationale and logic. The importance of this is that it could be argued that the citizens of Oceania cannot be considered as viable subjects for analysis as they lack rationality because of the state of society. Thus, they would not be model persons. If rationale and logic are not universal, though, they may be considered as rational within their own context while simultaneously not being such in standard Western cultures.

In this sense, it can be viewed that Winston is outside of the context, or the frame, and this can best be seen in his transformation throughout the novel (Orwell 1949). His original attitude towards Big Brother and the society he lives in would be considered atypical in that he simply deplores it. He wants freedom from the oppression that he is under and is actively seeking ways to obtain that, regardless of how minute and impotent those actions may be. He has negative face because he desires for his actions to be respected and for others to not interfere with them. Since nearly the entire point of Big Brother and INGSOC is to ensure that there is no private sphere, the negative face of Winston and all others like him is constantly under attack by other individuals through specific discourse actions and from society in all other aspects. The small apartment he rents above the antique store amongst the proles is for him to gain some relief from the constant face threatening acts. His whole union with O'Brien is for this same purpose, except for the whole society and not just himself.

One example of how this sense of societal face is present would be the scene where Winston first visits his neighbors' apartment so that he could fix their sink (Orwell 1949: 20-4). The neighbors, the Parsons, are a family of four: a husband, wife, a young boy, and a small girl. In this scene, the husband is absent but the wife is actively engaging Winston in conversation while the two boys tear chaotically through the house. From the outset, the reader is given a strong sense of Mr. Parson's standing in society, even if it is through Winston's atypical thoughts: "He was a fattish but active man of paralyzing stupidity, a mass of imbecile enthusiasms—one of those completely unquestioning, devoted drudges on whom, more even than on the Thought Police, the stability of the Party depended" (Orwell 1949: 22). While obviously unfavorable, the description does provide a good explanation of some qualities that a citizen of Oceania must exhibit and blind faith in Big Brother is the most important. Mr. Parsons has lien. The children exhibit another integral quality that they exhibit far more viciously than the father does and this is the constant attack on the negative faces of those around them. They play violently and call Winston a "thought criminal" in jest but they truly seek to turn in others who have these qualities. They stand as a model of how the citizens of this society should be; all the citizens are to be watch dogs each other and the only way for this to stop is for negative face to disappear. With no desire for the private sphere, there will be no need for negative face.

While this attempt at destroying negative face in the society is successful in creating a strong sense of societal inclusion and promotes recognition of positive face for the sake of conformity, it can paradoxically only be created through the want for negative face. The Parsons' children have a compulsion to turn in those they deem as thought criminals but this only can be accomplished at the expense of the want those individuals have to not be turned in. Also, the children have a desire—they certainly feel that it is an obligation—to not be inhibited in these

actions of theirs. By this, negative face does exist but in a skewed form from that of Brown and Levinson's (1987). Citizens have regard only for their negative face but do not have it for the negative face of others.

At the end of the novel, though, Winston has been tortured and broken; he has been remolded into a model citizen (Orwell 1949). His desire for freedom of action and the same right for others has been destroyed by his reeducation and he actively seeks to violate the negative face of those around him and overall in his society, as can be seen in his daydreams: "He was in the public dock, confessing everything, implicating everybody" (Orwell 1949: 244-5). At this point, his mind naturally leads him to undermine negative face, but he does not view this as wrong or a violation of what is expected of him. Instead, he is thankful for this part of himself and believes it to be correct as compared to his original beliefs: "He had won the victory over himself" (Orwell 1949: 245). He is now congruent with the cultural expectations of society; he is now typical in that he has no negative face nor does he expect anyone else to have it.

In this pseudo-rebirth, Winston has gained a semblance of lien in that he has now been integrated into the society and consequently has obtained a certain aspect of face automatically granted through this entry. He is a member of INGSOC and he is a fanatic of Big Brother. Through these criteria he has a certain standing within the society. In a discourse action, he is given a certain amount of respect because he is a part of this society, but this also places a strain on him in that he is a representative of this society so he must simultaneously fulfill the expectations of the situation and act as a representative of them. His actions in accordance with those expectations—societal norms and customs—are what keep him as part of the society. They are what keep his lien in place. Any citizen born into this society, has the same privilege and responsibilities, but as Ho (1976) stated, this is something that can be lost and also regained.

Winston was born before the implementation of INGSOC and was not fully part of the burgeoning new society unlike the younger generation who are fully integrated. Lien can be regained through a recognition of what was violated and honestly attempting to rectify those actions. After that, it is up to the other members of the society to decide when the violator is allowed his original status once again. In Winston's society this is granted—or forced—through reeducation, but for him this is simply his first education so that he can truly be part of the society.

Under this model of face, several aspects of Brown and Levinson's original typology of strategies are affected and altered. As they state, "negative politeness is essentially avoidance-based" in that the goal is to avoid stepping on anyone's toes (1987: 70). This can easily be seen in discourse involving a large power differential but can also be viewed in many interactions involving equal interlocutors. Since in INGSOC negative face is only focused on the speaker and not on the hearer, negative politeness will take an interesting form. In relation to how the speaker relates to the hearer, Brown and Levinson continue: "negative politeness is characterized by self-effacement, formality and restraint, with attention to very restricted aspects of H's self-image, cent[e]ring on his want to be unimpeded" (1987: 70). Restraint will no longer be present when the speaker inquires of the hearer's actions as the goal of every citizen is to be a form of police against each other. One of the speaker's goals is to discover whether or not the hearer has negative face. Self-effacement will also be destroyed as every citizen uses nearly every moment to try to prove their love of Big Brother. Ultimately, the goal of INGSOC is to have citizens that simply cannot think of any type of deviance so eventually all aspects of negative face will be eliminated both for the self of all speakers and their considerations of the selves of others.

3.2 LINGUISTIC QUALITIES CONCERNING POLITENESS IN NEWSPEAK

This section of the analysis will attempt to explain how Newspeak is syntactically, morphologically, and pragmatically realized. It will begin with a cross analysis of House and Kasper's (1981) taxonomy of politeness structures and how those are realized in Newspeak. The analysis will then focus on other constructions: apologies and greetings and titles. It will finish with discussing the semantic qualities and pragmaticalization of Newspeak.

3.2.1 TAXONOMY OF POLITENESS STRUCTURES

Before looking at specific utterances and discourse examples, an analysis of common politeness markers and structures would be useful. House and Kasper (1981) developed a taxonomy of structures in English and German which they claimed commonly promoted politeness. While Watts (2003) argues that these do not inherently push politeness and only act as markers for politeness by incident, this line of thought is simply beyond the scope of this research. For the purposes of the present analysis, they will be viewed as common markers of potential politeness. These structures will be evaluated to see how they would be formed in Newspeak and if they are even present at all.

The first type are *politeness markers* which essentially are a plea for cooperation between the two interlocutors. Common examples involve the use of modals. The goal behind this usage is to show deference to the hearer in the basic sense that he does not have to perform the task being asked of him. For example, 'Turn off the light.' is generally considered impolite because of the command form, but 'Will you turn off the light?' is considered more polite because it shows

deference to the hearer and avoids a power dynamic in the situation. Examples like this are also still present in Newspeak despite involving some syntactic differences. For example, 'Unon the light.' is equivalent to the command form would be consequently considered impolite. As an equivalent to the more polite form, 'Will you unon the light?' could be used.

Modals are still present in Newspeak and 'will' and 'would' actually show stronger importance since 'shall' and 'should' were purged from the lexicon according to Orwell (1949:249). Interestingly, the most common *politeness marker* is 'please' but this is absent from the lexicon. The reason is unknown and it can only be speculated that it is missing because of the so called socialist nature of the society; 'please' and 'thank you' might have been viewed as superfluous as their intent can be covered by other means.

Covering a wide range of syntactic structures are *play-downs* which are used to soften the perlocutionary effect on the hearer. In Standard English, these involve a variety of tense and modal uses. For example, the past tense can be used for statements such as 'I thought if...' and that tense can be combined with the progressive for an utterance like, 'I was thinking you could...' is more direct than just the simple past. Interrogatives can be used with modals, such as 'Could I...', but they can also combine with negatives for more indirect statements. For example, 'Wouldn't it be good if...' is less direct. These examples show that modals are very important to politeness structures and also that there is some overlap to House and Kasper's taxonomy. Regardless, all of these structures can be produced in Newspeak to some degree. The past tense could be realized as 'I thought if...' and the past progressive could be realized as 'I was thinking...' which is simpler than the Standard English example but carries roughly the same meaning. The

interrogatives could also be duplicated with a similar meaning: 'Could I...' and 'Would it be ungood if...' respectively.

The only structure that could pose a problem in Newspeak is the negative interrogative. In Newspeak, 'not' is absent from the lexicon but any word can be made negative simply by using the prefix 'un-' so a few options are presented the speaker. He could either make 'would' negative or 'good' depending on his intention. The above example in Standard English is the question of if something would be bad if it happened: 'Would it be bad if we got a drink?' The use of 'wouldn't' is present for indirectness and consequently politeness, as Brown and Levinson have noted (1987). The Standard English version replaces one word ('good' for 'bad') and adds another ('not'), but the Newspeak version only leaves the choice of morphological modification. The modal cannot be modified because it would create a semantic paradox; 'unwould' would be the negation of the hypothetical occurrence the speaker is trying to produce with the sentence structure.

Consultative devices are very similar to the previous two structures in that they also generally use modals but they do so by involving orientating the subject to the hearer. For example, 'Could I' would be a *play-down* but 'could you' would be a *consultative device*. This construction is primarily used to involve the hearer and hopefully his help with the matter at hand. This structure is obviously easily produced in Newspeak and there is no real semantic or politic change when done so.

The next three politeness structures are not truly grammatical or syntactic formations but instead are rhetorical plans or lead-ins. *Forewarning* is when the speaker leads into the discourse with an utterance that could be considered common knowledge or simply is hard to dispute: 'It's

not really my place say anything but...', 'you're the best fisherman I know...', etc. These set up a

context for following statements and strategies. *Scope-staters* are when the speaker establishes

his opinion about the issue at hand: 'It's bad that you didn't do...', 'It's a pity that...', etc. These as

well establish a context for the following discourse but on a more personal note for the speaker.

Agent avoiders allow the speaker to remove the agents involved in the discussion as much as

possible. It is easier to hear and to accept something when it is not the hearer that personally did

it; 'You tend to procrastinate when...' as opposed to 'Many people don't use their time well

when...' has a softer impact on the hearer. These three politeness structures are all easily created

in Newspeak since they are rhetorical in nature and not syntactic. Politeness can certainly be

used in this way (Leech 1983) and as previously discussed in the analysis on face, this would

certainly be a use of politeness in the culture of INGSOC.

The following structures appear to be changed more significantly by the translation into

Newspeak: *hedges, understaters, downtoners,* and *committers*. All of these structures are short

and utilize a large lexical variety in Standard English. *Hedges* allow the speaker to not be precise

and as well leave some volition open to the hearer in terms of the interpretation: 'kind of,'

'somewhat,' 'rather,' and so on. *Understaters* allow the speaker to avoid not presenting the true

gravity of what is being stated: 'a bit,' 'briefly,' 'quickly,' and so on. *Downtoners* modify the

impact of the utterance by making seem less than it really is: 'just,' 'really,' 'really just,' or

'simply.' *Committers* allow the speaker to demonstrate a certain degree of uncertainty on his part

concerning the propositional content: 'I think,' 'I feel,' and so on. All of these examples are for

Standard English but they face some issues when translated into Newspeak. The difficulty with

translating these elements into Newspeak and then trying to view them as politeness structures

does not stem from them losing their ability function to produce politeness, but in their possible pragmaticalization. Despite these items being grouped by some researchers, there are still many choices available to speakers when deciding to use them—or some that they unconsciously refer to automatically—because of the sheer amount of lexical variety there is. For instance, the *downtoners* 'just' and 'simply' have different meanings: the former implying that it is the only matter and the latter implying that it is not a complicated matter. While there are shades of meaning and interpretation that a hearer may pull from these, they are primarily understood to have identical meanings in discourse because they have become pragmaticalized. They stand for their action in the sentence and not for their original semantic meaning.

The variety of these structures does keep them from being highly rigid in use, though. There is an element of choice and, as stated, a shade of interpretation available to the members of the discourse. In Newspeak, there are few options available to the speaker. If 'just' and 'simply' are translated in Newspeak, they could be 'just' and 'easywise' which are not terribly different from a shallow perspective. The use of 'just' could be the same in both languages but 'simply' and 'easywise' have very different meanings. In Standard English, 'I simply want coffee' and 'I easily want coffee' have different meanings, the first being that all the speaker wants is some coffee and nothing else while the second proposes that the speaker tends to enter the mood for coffee with little effort. In Newspeak, a person might say 'I easywise want coffee' which conveys the meaning of the Standard English phrase, 'I easily want coffee' but 'easywise' is the closest semantic equivalent of 'simply' available in the lexicon. While 'just' and 'simply' may be interchangeable at times in Standard English, their equivalents in Newspeak are not.

The last type of politeness structure in the taxonomy is of little of importance to the present research but it must be stated. *Hesitators* are sounds produced by the speaker that are not lexical items: 'uh,' 'ah,' and so on. When these are performed rhetorically they may give the appearance of hesitation on the part of the speaker which may be beneficial in that he appears not to want to damage the negative of the hearer. He does not want to be a burden or the bearer of bad news, so to say. It can easily be presumed that the citizens of Oceania are capable of producing monosyllabic, guttural noises to their benefit.

3.2.2 APOLOGIES

Examining the linguistics of how politeness is realized in Newspeak is terribly difficult for several reasons despite the language essentially being an English derivative. Most of these reasons deal with the issue of semantic equivalency; since the design of Newspeak is to limit thought and expression, there are many common ideas in communication which are near impossible to express and some which are simply nonexistent. The following example taken from Watts (2003:2) highlights this—as a note, all examples will be shown as they were in their original texts with the Newspeak translation directly underneath the discourse line it corresponds to.

(1)

[1]R: supposing you say

     to me <LOW BURP>   beg your pardon\   supposing you

  B: oo: <@pardon me@>\ yes\ <@@@>

   R: if you say

     to me <LOW BURP>   doubleplusask you unremember\   if you

  B: oo: <@me unremember@>\ yes\ <@@@>

[^2]R: say to me...

    B:

       R: say to me...

   B:

This is a fairly simple piece of discourse with a glaring moment of politeness interaction in Standard English. The original speaker burps causing an interruption in his speech. Many bodily expulsions tend to be viewed as impolite when performed in public so this does affect face. The speaker's positive face is most likely damaged because his inclusiveness is no longer as stable as he appears to be someone who has no control over his body. This requires an apology signifying that he is cognizant of performing a wrong action and hopes to rectify this situation to the best of his ability. Now the second speaker, B, could have acted in several different ways to not only the burp but the apology as well. Her initial reaction of 'oo' is most likely a vocal marker for calling attention to the wrong action, whether it truly offends her or not. After the apology, she jokes with R in the attempt to show him that it did not offend her that much and she is fine with the action; she has not been offended.

There were several options available in Standard English for R after the apology other than the one she chose. She could have said nothing either sending the signal of being offended or stoicism. She could have said, 'It's alright' or an equivalent signifying that both speakers were once again on a level field. She instead chose to joke with B which could have two potential outcomes depending on his perlocutionary interpretations: one, he could take it as ridicule and thus suffer face loss; second, he could take it as a true signal of R not caring and therefore acts as an inclusiveness marker. There is no reveal in what he says since he simply continues with his original line of speech instead of giving the incident any more verbal consideration. B does

49

laugh, though, which can readily be seen as a signal of her intent that R should not take the incident as anything serious.

When viewing this in the Newspeak translation, the question of whether or not a burp would constitute as impolite in INGSOC can be raised and it is honestly a rather insignificant detail that Orwell never discussed—it is noted to occur from the gin that everyone incessantly drinks, but it is not directly explained. It can be presumed through several instances in the novel that it would still be considered impolite and the most salient one being the presence of the junior anti-sex league which is discussed at some length (Orwell 1949). INGSOC presumes that physical instinctual drives are the most difficult to control they implement an organization that trains women from a young age to not have sex. It is vulgar and below them; it is something the proles engage in and not party members. This indoctrination into believing that certain physical actions are immoral pushes the implication that citizens are supposed to be disgusted with physical operations in general, and this includes burps.

In the dictionary used for this analysis, there are no words to cover the semantic field for 'apology.' The words 'forgive,' 'pardon,' or 'sorry' are absent and this is understandable for a culture so heavily invested in mutual blame and indictment amongst its citizens. A person does not forgive; to forgive is to not follow Big Brother. With absence of a way of saying 'I'm sorry' and even the notion of such a concept, a semantic equivalent is difficult to determine. The closest approximation that could be determined is for the speaker to ask the hearer not to remember the offense, as noted in the Newspeak translation: 'ask you unremember.' The original phrase in English, 'beg your pardon' is a condensed—the 'I' is dropped—but often used chunk of language as a means of asking for forgiveness. More specifically, it is asking the hearer to take

action in pardoning the speaker who has committed an offense. The translation does not lack the request for volition on the part of the hearer that the original has, but it does take a very different nature. In the example, R would be asking not for forgiveness but for omission. He has still lost face, but instead of attempting to rectify that action by showing his own recognition of the fault so that B may pass a judgment, he is asking that she act as if the action never occurred. He is asking for an omission of part of the dialogue. Consequently, this leads to an interesting point in politeness where in this culture actions leading to a loss of face are possibly not repaired but forgotten.

There is politeness on B's part, though, in that he simply does not give the command of forgetting the action. Many individuals simply say 'pardon me' in an instance such as this which is easier to use since it is shorter, but it is far more direct and an attack on the hearer's negative face since it is the use of the imperative tense making it a command and not a request. R did not do this and instead not only asked, but begged for B's pardon of his action. Begging is semantically a much more vehement version of asking and thus illustrates the severity to which he hopes to correct the situation. In the *Newspeak* translation, the speaker could have followed the same path and simply used the imperative form: 'unremember.' There is no semantic equivalent of 'beg' in Newspeak, however, because 'ask' can be viewed as the semantic field. The use of 'doubleplus' for emphasis with 'ask' does create an equivalent. So that while the overall goal of the interrogative does not remain the same, the severity of which it is desired does.

Brown and Levinson propose that apologies are used primarily for admitting that the speaker's wants will hinder the wants of the hearer or to show reluctance when communicating a want (1987:187-90). The first purpose is the same as shown in (1); the speaker has committed a

violation of social expectations or has done some action offending the hearer's negative face. Essentially, it can be used before or after the action depending on whether or not the speaker realizes his action will offend. The second purpose is more like cushioning a statement or showing reluctance such as, 'I don't mean to bother...' As previously discussed, though, these options are more limited for a speaker of Newspeak as the lexicon is more limited. In (1), the apology is given in a reactionary and not preemptive manner—in both languages—which seems to function succinctly even though the semantics may have changed somewhat. A preemptive usage of the apology would have been much more akin to Leech's (1983) views of politeness but it is doubtful that his views of politeness would have much ground since a preemptive use would be dangerously impolite. Since conformity is integral in the society, leading into a conversation by essentially announcing that one's proposition is somewhat deviant from the norm would be catastrophic. It could be reasoned that an individual would not make an utterance like this since it would damage his societal face, his *lien*. The example translation shown may be accurate— possibly not in scenario but in principle—since the concern may not be for impinging on the negative face on the hearer but for the speakers place in society. To violate a societal expectation is to be marked and to be marked is dangerous. Asking someone to 'unremember' would be the most direct and truthful desire of the violator. Forgiveness still leaves the memories of the incident act which can still be dangerous.

3.2.3 GREETINGS AND TITLES

One of the most basic components of politeness is a greeting. The opening of a conversation is generally considered integral because it can set the context for the rest of the discourse. The following example from Watts (2003:156) shows a common greeting.

(2)

¹H: welcome Mrs George\ how do you do madam\ don't be formal\ Dick's the name\
G: hello Mr 'Hatch

H: comrade George\   you do comrade\ unbe planful\ Dick's the name\
G: comrade 'Hatch
²H: oh\ right\ <@well you c- you call me 'Richard'@>
G: yes\ I know\ and I prefer Richard\   <@@@>   I think when you've got a nice

H: oh\ true\<@why you c- you name me 'Richard'@>
G: yes\ I know\ and I choice Richard\   <@@@>   I think when you have a good

While Watts argues that the participants are simply fulfilling the expectations of the social scenario, it will be argued here that they exchanging pleasantries so as to establish a quasi-inclusiveness; they are acknowledging each other's positive face in that they are choosing to have a conversation, although brief and impersonal. Continuing this notion, H literally tells G in Standard English in the first line to not be formal and to call him by his nickname 'Dick.' This may be a traditional ploy on his part to win over his audience since he is a radio host, but regardless, it is still a move towards further inclusiveness. He is striving to decrease the social distance between them and to attend to her positive face.

The first point of interest is that there is no word in the Newspeak dictionary for greeting someone. 'Hello,' 'welcome,' and 'greetings' are all absent but 'bye' is not. There is the possibility that this was simply a mistake by the creators of the dictionary, but since Newspeak is focused on minimalization it can be understood that a variety of greetings are not needed. The most basic vocal way of greeting someone is simply stating their name while looking at them. This was

53

more than likely seen to be the most concise and expedient means by the creators of the dictionary. As well, 'Mr.' and all of the female titles are absent. Every citizen is simply called 'comrade' despite a mental preference as Winston notes in the novel: "Perhaps 'friend' not exactly the right word. You did not have friends nowadays, you had comrades; but there were some comrades whose society was pleasanter than that of others" (Orwell 1949:43). So while there is only one word used for this, there still can be an unspoken differentiation in the minds of people —or at least the mind of Winston—when speaking to others.

In many languages, such as Japanese, honorifics are an important grammatical aspect. Unlike in English, these are morphological elements denoting rank and deference. They are elements that directly alter the syntax of the utterance and consequently, directly alter how one speaks to individuals of differing rank. Misuse of honorifics can lead to dire offenses towards the face of the hearer so the speaker must be very conscious of how they address someone. While English does not place as much emphasis on titles, they are still important. 'Mr' and 'Mrs/Ms/Miss' are generally seen as moderately polite in everyday conversation as they prevent the speaker from being too personal or from presuming that an individual of too high rank. There are also 'sir' and 'ma'am' which operate as more polite titles for strangers, elders, and individuals of power. There are other, more specific titles such as 'professor' and 'doctor' which are used to denote a person's achievements. These create variances in how a person is addressed and consequently, can be used to increase the politeness or impoliteness of an utterance.

As the Newspeak translation showed and as Winston noted in the novel, in Newspeak there is no other title than 'comrade,' no matter if one is speaking to a friend, acquaintance, colleague, or employer. Also, as shown in the scene referenced earlier concerning Winston's neighbors, familial relations are also weakened and while the lexical items 'father,' 'mother,'

'brother,' 'sister' and so on exist, a person is still forced to call any person in one of those categories comrade. This does not leave any room for extra polite statements or utterances that exceed the requirements of the situation; there is only possible a situation of impoliteness when someone either neglects to call them comrade or calls them by an inappropriate title such as the ones previously listed. This harkens both to Watts' (2003) argument on politic behavior where many linguistic forms of politeness are simply conformity to situational expectations and some arguments of relevance theory (Escandell-Vidal 1996, Sperber &Wilson 1995) where the usage of a polite statement is not truly polite as it is only noticed when it is absent. Either argument is applicable as this is a situation where INGSOC is trying to apply conformity amongst its citizens through uniformity of language; one word dictates the politeness of titles.

Greetings in general, however, present a much more difficult point of analysis since they are much more varied and irregular. As noted earlier, in Newspeak many of the simple greetings such as 'hello' and 'welcome' are absent—the same applies for farewells—leaving the language void of common, simple ways of acknowledging someone's presence or entrance into a situation. More complex ways appear to still be possible, although, since there still are a number of possible ways to construct simple utterances that could pragmatically convey the desired meaning. There are many phrases which deviate from the semantic meanings of their individual components in Standard English; 'how are you' can function as a legitimate interrogative of the well being of the hearer but for many individuals it is simply another way of greeting an individual. It carries the same pragmatic force as 'hello' and 'greetings' but little more semantic meaning. As Watts' (2003) would argue, it has become pragmaticalized and its usage is now dictated to that specific scenario where it creates a quasi-ritual between the interlocutors. Once again, its usage would not directly indicate politeness but its absence would indicate

55

impoliteness. There is nothing proving that this could not happen in Newspeak despite its

limitations and such phrases as 'good morning' are creatable since the vocabulary is available. An

individual could honestly wish someone to have a good morning but simply since the lexical

items are available, it is possible for it and other statements to become pragmaticalized—

especially since they already exist in Standard English, the parent of Newspeak. Vocabulary B of

Newspeak, as Orwell describes, is mostly composed of broad political and ideological concepts

condensed into single lexical items which is a form of semantic narrowing but also can be seen

as pragmaticalization, so the concept is already present in the language. While one of the main

points of Newspeak is heavily restricted and controlled usage, INGSOC would have to apply

constant effort to ensure that this actually occurred.

3.2.4 SEMANTIC CHANGES AND PRAGMATICALIZATION

Many of the problems that arise with the use of Newspeak stem from semantic loss.

Taking another look at the discourse example in (2) shows a strong example of how meaning is

changed and sometimes, difficult to discern. 'Formal' is not within the dictionary so it begins a

chain of forms trying to decide which word would work the best. 'Formal' comes from someone

following the expected forms of a situation so he is being methodical in his actions; there is a

method or plan to how he is behaving so 'formal' could become 'planful' when translated into

Newspeak. This may seem like a semantic stretch, but that is because it is. The concept of

formality probably does not even exist within the culture because all party members are

supposedly equal under the governance of INGSOC. Without any class difference—economic,

educational, or opportunistic—there may not be the distinction between formal or informal. The

citizens may be expected to handle any situation as they would any other, and this may explain

why the word 'polite' is not even in the dictionary. While this may be the case, there are still standards or expectations placed upon them concerning how they interact. The word 'planful,' though, is a peculiar transition in that it summons the thought that G's whole behavior is thought out and heading towards a goal. She wants something and she is trying to utilize speech to obtain that. That is not really the case concerning the scenario as she really only wants to comment in regard to something stated on the show, but in the Newspeak translation it does seem that G is warning her not to be manipulative. The discourse acquires a very different tone because of this.

There is little difference between the versions of the conversation in line two of (2) other than another matter of semantics. In Standard English G states that she 'prefers' Richard which is a common enough turn of phrase but the closest Newspeak equivalent is 'choice.' This produces another difference in emphasis on the part of the speaker. 'Preferring' and 'choosing' are two different actions but pragmatically, she is making a choice by calling him Richard. Stating that she prefers to call him Richard is simply her justification. In this sense, the Newspeak translation is more frank than the original causing it to be considered less polite by Brown and Levinson (1987) standards but the only other option she really has at that point is not to say it. Her intention was to state that she has to chosen to call him Richard because she prefers it; in this sense, the two terms are both applicable and actually applied at once by the use of 'choice.' This might be a decision of hers at closing the social distance, but since it is really the only semantic option available in Newspeak, it is an automatic *forewarning*. She is opening a certain line of discussion which she intends to follow and it is the most polite way to begin that road. H goes along with this and lets her know that he is fine with her choice of 'Richard.' To state otherwise would be an attack on her negative face since he would be disallowing her to take her own

action. Conversely, her initiative to call him by a different name could have been taken as an attack on his negative face. In the same line, H's utterance presents a problem when translated to Newspeak. He uses the word 'privately' as indication of his true feelings on the matter and as a compliment to G's positive face since he is trying to increase a sense of inclusiveness by divulging this information. There is no word for 'private' in Newspeak or anything that could come close in terms of meaning which is to be expected since the entire society is built upon intrusion and observance. Excluding this word from the Standard English form leaves two utterances which are fairly similar in construction and meaning. The aspect of politeness in this utterance hinges on the use of that word for the previously stated reasons. It also produces a secondary effect to the conversation should G choose to act upon the invitation towards inclusiveness; if G accepts the invitation towards a closer social distance, the need for politeness structures will be diminished both in quantity and manner. The need for indirectness will would allow the interlocutors the possibility of being more direct after a statement like this.

The rest of the discourse in (2) holds little in terms of any utterances that show any striking differences regarding how they would portray politeness. Overall, however, the discourse introduces some enlightening principles behind how Newspeak could actually function. One goal of the language's creation was to limit the variety of thought possible by limiting the number of lexical items present in the vocabulary. Upon first thought, this would seem to be a type of semantic funnel through the reduction of synonyms and the condensing of multiple meanings into single words while most of the functors remain in the language but many parts of everyday language are common phrases that involve certain patterns concerning propositions and such. The limiting of the lexical items affect the use of functors by proxy as can be seen in line 4

of the previous translation. The utterance in Standard English is a fairly common syntactic

structure but the translation poses some problems:

(3)

SE: *but when you've been Dick as long as I have because your family started it*

Newspeak: *but when you've been named Dick for the amount of time I have been*
because your family started it

To begin, in Standard English it is acceptable to state that someone 'is' a name (i.e. She

will be Mary) without a semantic issue. In Newspeak, though, there is a distinct rule in removing

ambiguity and abstract concepts so the Standard English utterance could imply that H is actually

two different individuals or two different incarnations of the same individual. It is unacceptable

to say that someone is his name. To work around this in Newspeak, it must be stated that a

person is called something which is covered by 'name.' The following prepositional phrase after

H's nickname is also altered. 'Long' only refers to physical length in Newspeak so a length of

time is an abstract concept. Time is measured in countable units so there would be an amount of

them but time is not considered a physical property that occupies space so it cannot have length.

To create this actually required making it longer than the Standard English equivalent which

should violate the principles of Newspeak. This shows that many complex utterances are capable

of being produced in Newspeak, but they tend to be convoluted and laborious to produce.

Overall, however, the discourse introduces some enlightening principles behind how

Newspeak could actually function. One goal of the language's creation was to limit the variety of

thought possible by limiting the number of lexical items present in the vocabulary. Upon first

thought, this would seem to be a type of semantic funnel in relation to what was discussed in the

section on greetings and titles; semantic meaning is neither a one-to-one correlation nor a fixed

and stagnant system. Standard English contains a multitude of lexical items that carry inherent, insinuated, connotative, grammaticalized, and pragmaticalized meanings. From the previous example, 'formal' has its standard meaning of compliance to rules but from there the possible meanings are many. It can be an insult. It can be a compliment. A formal person could be too rigid or he could be very respectful depending on the context and the speaker. It can be used in literal and figurative speech. People have very little problems communicating despite all of these different meanings and semantic broadening, but it could easily be seen how a language could still function without this word. As seen in one of the few examples of Newspeak in the novel, there are many more changes than have been described in this research:

(4)

Newspeak: times 3.12.83 reporting bb dayorder doubleplusungood refs
unpersons rewrite fullwise upsub antefiling.

SE: The reporting of Big Brother's Order for the Day in the *Times* of December
3rd 1983 is extremely unsatisfactory and makes references to nonexistent persons.
Rewrite it in full and submit your draft to higher authority before filing.
(1949:40)

This is a job order, a written request given to Winston which he mentally provides the translation for. The semantic connections can be seen even if they are strained at times. The most important issue here is that the translation provided by Orwell is far more concise than the translations provided in this research. There are a few possible reasons for this with the most likely being that Orwell had a much more clear vision and design of Newspeak than he was able to articulate. The other most important factor is the nature of the message. It is a work order which are often syntactically and lexical reduced just to save time. The translation that Winston provides is not superbly polite but it something much more familiar to speakers of Standard English due to semantic detail. The Newspeak version contains lexical items that are

60

combinations of Standard English items and concepts; the term 'nonexistent persons' becomes

'unpersons' which is that far of a semantic deviation but would only be understood by someone

familiar with the language. Most complex ideas and concepts are distilled down to the minimal

form of being able to convey them, if at all.

Simple concepts, though, such as basic concrete nouns do not go through a semantic

condensing but more of a semantic restriction. The question at hand through this is how well

does a language function when this happens across the entire vocabulary? As Orwell states about

Vocabulary A, the resulting gaps and semantic narrowing is intentional:

> It was composed almost entirely of words that we already possess—words like *hit,*
> *run, dog, tree, sugar, house, field*—but in comparison with the present-day English
> vocabulary, their number was extremely small, while their meanings were far more
> rigidly defined. All ambiguities and shades of meaning had been purged out of
> them. So far as it could be achieved, a Newspeak word of this class was simply a
> staccato sound expressing *one* clearly understood concept. (1949:247)

This is clearly the objective and it is obvious how this could restrict both thought and

expression, but it is unclear how this can be maintained. Semantic fluctuation and

pragmaticalization are constants in language usage and the very process of communication

would naturally change their usage unless there was constant and adamant monitoring. In

this sense, Newspeak can be seen as quasi-ultimate form of relevance theory in that the

language is economic and efficient. Every utterance is supposed to be direct and

indisputable in meaning. Every response is automatically the most relevant conclusion

because there are no other possibilities. As seen, though, in the previous translations this

is not entirely possible and is even discussed in passing in the novel by Winston's

coworker Syme who was a developer for the Newspeak dictionary. He discusses a specific

word, 'duckspeak*,'* which is semantically ambiguous and is intentionally designed to be so:

"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 a praise" (Orwell 1949:48). The word references any person who is essentially spouting off incoherent but important sounding nonsense for his cause.

There are two important points to draw from 'duckspeak.' The first is that it proves that face is variable leading words and utterances to be capable of damaging or helping depending on nothing but the context and intention. The hierarchy of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts still exists. Controlling words and structures will have an effect on the language and its people, but interpretation is something far more difficult to control and intention even more so. The second is that Newspeak does allow for semantic ambiguity because there is no possible way anyone could know who all of their allies and enemies are. Unless one is omniscient, it is impossible to have that kind of knowledge.

The final question then is that if this word is allowed to operate in the fashion that it does, how can it be claimed that Newspeak is designed to limit thought? It has allowed the possibility for ambiguity and consequently, conceptual growth. The answer lies in another Newspeak term, 'doublethink,' which is to believe two contradictory things and accept them as truth. The word 'duckspeak' is odd but the citizens do not recognize its contradiction in meanings or maybe even that it has two meanings. The word exists because the party allows it to exist. Ambiguity exists in situations where the party allows and regulates it. The goal of Newspeak is to limit thought through limiting the variety of

expressions that can be made and can be seen at the basic levels of society where creativity

and heretic thoughts would be limited simply by lacking any way to express the ideas.

Reducing the lexicon, however, will not fully accomplish INGSOC's goals as meaningful

interaction can be accomplished with even a limited vocabulary. The basics of politeness,

or at least amicable discourse, are possible with formulaic expressions. To counter this,

Newspeak has some lexical items that have variable semantics.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

4. CONCLUSION

What has been determined, though, is that politeness in Newspeak does not entirely follow Brown and Levinson's (1987) original theory both in terms of face and linguistic realization. In contrast to Ermida's (2006) argument, face does exist for the citizens of INGSOC even though it is rather different from standard Western beliefs and practices. For them, face is composed of equal individual and societal components. All individuals are encouraged to protect their negative face, as well as to impose on the negative face of others, so that they may police one another. This is not to say that positive face is not as important as the culture is quasi-inclusive. Everyone is equal, but equally oppressed and in danger. All citizens want to fit in and part of this involves policing their fellow citizens so positive face dictates negative face. The collective nature of the society forms a collective, shared face by all of the citizens which must be upheld. To make a slight of positive face is to make a slight against all of society.

The linguistic realization of Newspeak reflects this aspect through the modification of several structures that commonly portray politeness in Standard English. Apologies, greetings and titles are far more limited than in Newspeak which reflects both the semantic restrictions and collective nature Orwell wanted to instill in the language. The largest changes are in semantic narrowing and what at best can be described as semantic paradox. Almost all words are limited to a single meaning and those that are exempt, are contradictory in nature. Long and indirect statements can be produced (in the hopes to

create standard politeness structures) but due to the lack of vocabulary and expression, they are heavily convoluted and laborious to produce. In Standard English, the longer an utterance is, the higher the possibility that may be misunderstood or not understood at all. In Newspeak, this happens at a much faster rate. Politeness would be far easier realized as short, concise, and habitualized utterances so not to show deviation from the collective face of society.

Politeness can exist in Newspeak. That is obvious, but determining how it forms has been difficult due to many factors. The most salient one is simply a lack of information as Orwell only created the lexical, morphological, and syntactic rules for the language, but even then, his assigned lexical limitations were only theoretical. He did provide some examples, but there is much left to speculation on what is allowable for a phrase to be produced. He did implement some examples within the novel itself but they are limited and there is little given in terms of a semantic link. Simply, there is much unstated concerning how to formulate utterances and this research functioned largely on assumptions and honest speculation for the areas with translations. Viewing the examples that Orwell provided, it could be argued that the translations created for this research would be reduced even further by someone with a more refined tongue for the language. In line with this and in retrospect, an examination through politeness theory may not have been the best place to start with the language since there are so many assumptions that have had to have been made. There are many types of structures counted as polite that have been unaccounted for and could not have been accounted for simply due to the lack of evidence. This applies simply to single utterances and to more dynamic examples of

discourse. A more regimented and layered approach to the examination (or even multiple

examinations) would have provided more accurate and succinct results. A start with a pure

and exhaustive grammatical description would have been very beneficial followed by a

semantic study. As it stands, this research barely begins to tackle the issue that is

presented.

REFERENCES

BARGIELA-CHIAPPINI, FRANCESCA. 2003. Face and politeness: New (insights) for (old) concepts. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 35. 1454-69.

BERDICHEVSKY, NORMAN. 1988. A look into the world of "utopian" languages and their political assumptions: Esperanto, , and Basic English. *Geolinguistics.* 14.28-41.

BOURLAND JR., D. DAVID. 1996. E-Prime: Speaking crisply. *ETC.: A Review of General Semantics.* 53(1). 26-38.

BROWN, PENELOPE, AND STEPHEN C. LEVINSON. 1978/1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHILTON, PAUL. 1984. Orwell, language and linguistics. *Language & Communication.* 4(2).129-46.

CHILTON, PAUL. 1990. Politeness, politics and diplomacy. *Discourse Society.* 1.201.

COLE, PETER AND JERRY L. MORGAN (eds.) 1975. *Syntax and semantics,* Vol. 3. *Speech acts.* New York: Academic Press.

EELEN, GINO. 2001. *A Critique of Politeness Theories.* Manchester: St. Jerome.

ERMIDA, ISABEL. 2006. Linguistic mechanisms of power in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: Applying politeness theory to Orwell's world. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38.842-62.

ESCANDELL-VIDAL, VICTORIA. 1996. Towards a cognitive approach to politeness. *Language Sciences* 18(3-4).629-50.

GOFFMAN, ERVING. 1955. On face-work. *INTERACTION RITUALS: ESSAYS ON FACE-TO-FACE BEHAVIOR.* CHICAGO: ALDINE PUBLISHING COMPANY.

GRICE, H. PAUL. 1975. Logic and conversation. In Cole and Morgan, 41-58.

HO, DAVID YAU-FAI. 1976. On the concept of face. *American Journal of Sociology.* 81(4).867-84.

HU, HSIEN CHIN. 1944. The Chinese concepts of "face." *American Anthropologist.* 46(1).45-64.

JARY, MARK. 1997. Relevance theory and the communication of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 30.1-19.

LEECH, GEOFFREY. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics.* New York: Longman Inc.

LEE-WONG, S. 1999. *Politeness and Face in Chinese Culture*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

DICTIONARY. 2005. Dictionary 1st Edition. http://forums.dictionary.com/viewtopic.php?t=2238&start=0

ORWELL, GEORGE. 1949. *Nineteen eighty-four.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co.

SPERBER, DAN AND DEIDRE WILSON. 1986/1995. *Relevance: Communication and cognition.* Oxford: Blackwell.

TING-TOOMEY, STELLA. 1988. Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory. In Y.Y. Kim and W. Gudykunst (Eds.). *Theories in intercultural communication.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

TING-TOOMEY, STELLA AND ATSUKO KUROGI. 1998. Facework competence in intercultural

conflict: An updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations.* 22(2).187-225.

WATTS, RICHARD J. 2003. *Politeness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WERKHOFER, K. 1992. Traditional and modern views: the social constitution and the power of politeness, ed. by Richard J. Watts, Sachiko Ide, and Konrad Ehrlich. *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Byron S. Millard

byronsmillard@gmail.com

Middle Tennessee State University
Bachelor of English, Literature, May 2011

Thesis Title:
    An Examination of George Orwell's Newspeak through Politeness Theory

Major Professor: Karen Baertsch