



An Examination of the Pragmatism and Practical Application of Orwell's Newspeak via the Application of Saussure's Theory of Semiology

Rishabh Walia

Research Scholar (English)
Graphic Era Hill University
Dehradun, India.

Dr. Laxmi Rawat Chauhan

Associate Professor (English)
Graphic Era Hill University,
Dehradun, India.

Abstract

Set in the authoritarian country of Oceania, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by George Orwell demonstrates how a government may attain complete control over its citizens via observation, manipulation, and, most significantly, language. Using a structuralist paradigm based on Saussure's research on semiology and the discourse framework, this article examines the viability of Newspeak as a language. This is achieved by comparing George Orwell's Newspeak with Ferdinand de Saussure's theory of language function via the lenses of rigidity, diversity, communal identity, and flexibility. Additionally, it examines potential readings of the work that may reveal these language alterations. The study article reaches the conclusion that other parts of the totalitarianism of the authority are necessary for the real implementation of Newspeak adoption, as language, according to semiology, is a collaborative product and cannot be developed by a group of people. Since Newspeak's syntax will eventually resurface during mind coalescence, this study contends that the language cannot be realistically developed since it will inevitably change to suit the needs of the linguistic society.

Keywords: *Structuralism, Semiology, Newspeak, Sign, Linguistic Community*

Introduction

Newspeak aims to be a much reduced form of the discourse, with a restricted vocabulary and simplified semantics, yet Oldspeak, the current language of Oceania, bears notable resemblances to 21st century English. The purpose of this analysis is to use Saussure's semiology to George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, paying close attention to the ideas of inflexibility, importance, variation, and adaptability. The purpose of this analysis is to determine whether or not these ideas could be included in the book, to determine how Newspeak would function in the Oceanian language culture, and to determine what effect it would have on the characters from 1984 inside that society. This essay seeks to provide a different perspective on how language is portrayed in the dystopian classic by comparing George Orwell's Newspeak with Saussure's research on signs and symbols and the discourse framework.

In order to analyse Newspeak from a Saussurean perspective, it is necessary to provide a theoretical groundwork first. We start by looking at previous research on Newspeak and the syntax of 1984, then we go on to structural semantics and Saussure's semiology, and finally we provide a quick rundown of all the nuances of Newspeak. Following up on the previous section's discussion of the informational basis, we now go on to a semiological analysis of Newspeak in 1984, using Saussure's facets. This research paper takes a detailed look at the narrative style and protagonists' conversations to determine how the execution is visible in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. To fully understand the literature review, it is necessary for the reader to have a working knowledge of a few essential words before moving on to the text. Arbitrariness theory holds that a symbol's meaning is unpredictable and relies exclusively on linguistic community agreement (Saussure 67). The sign has no intrinsic relationship to its referent. There is no intrinsic desire to link a symbol to its referent (Sturrock 35). Saussure believed that a language symbol's meaning depends on its place in the language and its relationships to other signs and their differences. How we interpret words determines their relevance (Sturrock 38).

Examining the variations is essential to grasping the meaning of a term. Our ability to compare and differentiate one expression or concept from another is crucial to comprehending the significance of a language sign or thought (Tyson 213). The semantic group, according to Ferdinand de Saussure, is the collaboration. The responsibility for learning the names and features of language signs lies with the group as a whole. Saussure notes that we decide what to call these indicators and how to interpret them as a group (71–74). As soon as members of the community see a gap in the language, they will work to fix it. The extraordinary capacity of the language to change across time was highlighted by Saussure. Some parts of language are fluid and subject to change, while others are static, says Saussure. The symbolic components of language, like its arbitrary nature, are one of the qualities that enable it to evolve across time.

Investigating Saussure's Theories, Structural Linguistics, and Semiology

Structuralist philosophy holds that our worldview is the outcome of mental structures (Tyson 214). Structured linguistics was created to study human cognition and communication. My research focused on language meaning construction and its cultural differences. Linguist Saussure is famous for his breakthrough work. His semiotics and signs theories influenced language research (Sturrock 5). He transformed linguistics by moving from philology to modern language studies. He stressed the necessity of understanding languages as dynamic systems with their own structures and patterns rather than just studying history. In structural linguistics, the underlying principles of language and their practical application in everyday life are explored. It studies language's structure and inner workings (Tyson 213). Saussure believed language should be analysed as a complex system of interrelated components. He focused on studying phrase connections and how their elements shape language (Tyson 213). Structuralism highlighted language study's norms, structure, and interactions, offering a fresh perspective. After Saussure died, his students published his *Course in General Linguistics*, which shares his linguistics views (Fry 96). Saussure pioneered the theory that language is passively absorbed by the speaker. Language cannot be manipulated. Collective ownership, not individual control, is considered. In "Language and Ideology in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*," Blakemore argues that Orwell's book proposes a discourse based on the idea that people are communicative and learn from discourse (349).

The discipline of semiotics was established by Saussure's seminal contributions to *The Course in General Linguistics*. The idea that words have functions beyond just designating an item or abstract idea was central to Saussure's work (Tyson 213). A word, on the other hand, is a sign in language that has two parts, the signifier and the signified, that work together. The signifier stands for the sound-image, which is usually communicated via language but may also include objects, sounds, images, and actions. The concept that the signifier alludes to is known as the signified. The idea was shown graphically by Saussure (Saussure 67). Put the idea, the signified, on top of a line. A signifier—a sound-image—lies behind the line. All of these parts work together and depend on one another. Just take the word "tree" as an example. Words, particularly those with apostrophes appended to them, function as signifiers in this context. In contrast, the signified is the real, tangible tree that we can see in the environment and associate with the sound-image. A word, or symbol, may only be formed by combining the two. This is a short explanation of semiology.

The Complicated Aspects of Newspeak

The ironically named Ministry of Truth fabricated lies rather than spreading facts. Its avowed goal was "information, pleasure, learning, and the creativity" (Orwell 7). The veneer hid a well planned propaganda campaign to influence Oceania's population. Minitrue used several methods to spread its lies. The Research Department's work is important to this thesis. Winston first encounters the department when he meets Syme (Orwell 63), who is working on the 11th and last Newspeak Dictionary. Newspeak evolved from Oldspeak, a

simplified English. Newspeak is purposely created to be quite different from Oldspeak, so people must learn the language to understand and express themselves (Orwell 66). It was estimated to take until 2050 to complete this massive project. Newspeak did not develop naturally or expand from existing languages. The focus was on language decline. Newspeak was promoted to strengthen Ingsoc's cultural biases. Syme reveals Newspeak's intentions to Winston in the ministry cafeteria.

You think, I dare say, that our chief job is inventing new words. But not a bit of it! We're destroying words – scores of them, hundreds of them, every day. We're cutting the language down to the bone. The eleventh edition won't contain a single word that will become obsolete before the year 2050. (Orwell 66)

Zazulak says language evolves differently, extending its vocabulary and adding new words and concepts each year. Newspeak reduces its vocabulary rather than increasing its ideas and ideals, reducing its variety and breadth of expression. This promotes using language to influence ideas and inhibit autonomous thinking (Orwell 392). The Inner Party believes that restricting word choice would limit the presentation of views that differ from Ingsoc doctrine. Crimethink in Newspeak is examined in Orwell's book (Orwell 392). Beyond the story's premise, the Newspeak appendix discusses how the language was established and how the Ministry of Truth handles language, which helps explain Newspeak's technical features. The vocabulary expansion objective was to guarantee that every word had a definite explanation without overlapping or slang phrases (Orwell 392). To achieve this constraint, words that might be removed from an ideologically pure Ingsoc vocabulary were excluded. Some new terminology were introduced, but the major emphasis was on deleting those that were unnecessary or may be used for thoughtcrime, or non-conformist ideas. Modern English speakers may struggle to envision such a transition, but "free" may help:

The word *free* still existed in Newspeak, but it could only be used in such statements as 'This dog is free from lice' or 'This field is free from weeds.' It could not be used in its old sense of 'politically free' or 'intellectually free' since political and intellectual freedom no longer existed even as concepts, and were therefore of necessity nameless. (Orwell 392).

It was quite difficult to have philosophical or unusual conversations due to the linguistic limitations. What remained were simple, direct thoughts, often involving physical objects or actions (Orwell 394). During that time, its primary objective was to create unambiguous associations between terms in the language. The result was that the Oceanians were severely limited in their ability to think for themselves and to come up with concepts that contradicted the Newspeak meanings that the Inner Party had already decided upon.

A Critical Examination Of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* Via The Lens Of Semiology

Saussure posits that signs have several dimensions that provide light on how they function, how their meaning is constructed, and how each symbol fits into the larger scheme of language. This research will first explain the operation of Newspeak, whether Orwell's language is in line with Saussurean theory, and the viability of its implementation. It will then analyse and compare these aspects with written testimony from *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and its appendix. Things like changeability, community consciousness, arbitrariness, worth, and diversity will be considered. Looking at some literary examples that illustrate the relevance of these concepts to *Nineteen Eighty-Four* follows. But there are a few things to bear in mind when looking at the plot of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* through the prism of Newspeak as an applied language from Oceania. First of all, the story of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is recounted from an omniscient third-person perspective. The narrator's words and expressions cannot be used to evaluate the success of Newspeak as they are not intrinsic characters in the book. In his defence of the "Oldspeak narrator who asserts the individual's mind through language," Blakemore argues that the narrator's words are a statement against the linguistically dominant culture and that they proclaim the linguistic "past" (349). Given the lack of proof of the narrator's affiliation with Oceanian culture or the story's intention to discredit or attack Newspeak, any comments directed at the narrator's language shall be refrained from. Nonetheless, we may highlight the disparities between the characters' and our own interpretations of Newspeak by using the narrative voice. The discourse is our only hope for deciphering the inner workings of Newspeak, an Oceanian language. Although the events of the tale unfold in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the Inner Party's goal of full language adoption is not achieved until 2050, a full six decades after the year in which the story takes place. As a result, the likelihood of the language's adoption by Oceanian people is uncertain. If someone is keeping tabs on the language's development and if the Inner and Outer Parties have adopted the Newspeak lexicon, then we know for sure. Along with the above mentioned variables, the following will also be taken into account to see whether Orwell's fictional language of Newspeak is plausible, how it would function, and what effects it would have on the Oceanian people if implemented.

Absurdity of the Signifier-Signified Relationship

The correlation between a linguistic phrase and its meaning is totally accidental since there is no underlying relationship (Saussure 67). In a similar vein, the symbol-reference link is based on human choice rather than any inherent importance. Traditions within a society decide the primary and secondary meanings of signals (Tyson 218). Even when the sign's meaning is uncertain, a "linguistic community" creates an irreversible linguistic sign, says Saussure (Saussure 68). Due to their inherent randomness, the meaning of language symbols may only be deduced by comparison with other symbols or by picking the brains of those with greater knowledge in the field (Sturrock 84). The arbitrary character of language becomes significant when evaluating diverse language

civilizations, especially when one considers the Structuralist idea that language determines our vision of the world instead of the other way around. As a result of linguistic distinctions in signals and vocabulary, every language group has its own distinct perspective on the world (Sturrock 37). One goal of developing Newspeak was to counter the structuralist view of language, which holds that language is more than just a system of conventionally designating the objects in our universe (Orwell 392). Their main point is that there's a limit to how likely this categorization theory of language is if one

restricts the inventory of things waiting to be named to straightforward categories of physical objects or actions. If a language were all nouns and verbs, the argument might hold. But because languages contain other categories of sign, and because the signs enter into complex logical relations with one another when they are used, the nomenclature argument becomes wholly inadequate. (Sturrock 36)

When looking at real languages like English, the argument about terminology may not appear relevant. However, when we look at Newspeak, it becomes more legitimate. By analysing the novel 1984, we can see that the goal of Newspeak is to do away with everything except nouns and verbs. Orwell (394) states that the only other thing it can do is add affixes to noun-verbs, such as -ful to produce descriptors and -wise to make adverbs. Given the rarity of surviving adjectival phrases from Oldspeak, there is now no discernible pattern of compatibility or difference among words and their constituent parts of speech. Opposite the Outer Party in the terminology discussion is the Inner Party, whose goal is to undermine the complex interconnections between signs. A remarkable shift in language is shown by newspeak, when the meanings of signals become very set and exact. "All ambiguities and shades of meaning had been purged out of them," Orwell says, clearly indicating that the signs had all subtleties and ambiguities removed. The indicators now only indicate one clear notion, eliminating any possibility of misunderstanding. It seems like newspeak is trying to disprove the idea that words and their meanings are connected in some complicated and subjective way. It does this by imposing linguistic changes that Saussure and Sturrock find unlikely. When applied to Newspeak, Saussure's claims on the complexity of signals become irrelevant since the goals and intended uses of the English language are totally different. If the components of language were closely connected to their real-world corresponding ideas, this theory suggests that Newspeak would seem remarkably similar. According to Saussure's thesis, if the Inner Party fully adopted Newspeak, the language would be devoid of complexity and logical connections. Oceanians would be unable to articulate any views contrary to the Inner Party's doctrine if they were to speak this language. This is due to the fact that they would be completely oblivious to any verbal cues or possible alternatives.

Utility of the Signs

Saussure argues that the relative importance of these indications depends on where they are located in the system of signs that constitutes language. The many associations they have with other signals in the target language increase their worth (Sturrock 38). Rather than being valuable in and of themselves, Sturrock argues that linguistic indicators are valuable because of what they are not (Sturrock 39). He stresses that signs and meaning are distinct concepts, with the latter being used to think about the practical applications of signs. Also, Saussure gives two instances that show how this idea works, and they show how signals are different in value and how they are intrinsically linked to their identities. A comparison of the French and English terms for sheep is first covered by the author (Saussure 115–116). While he acknowledges that both have "significance," he argues that their relative importance is irrelevant. Instead of "sheep," most people would say "mutton" while they're eating lamb. There is no differentiation in contemporary French between a living sheep munching on its pastures and one being cooked into a meal. Any one of them may be called a "mouton." The ability to distinguish between signals is one area where English excels over French. Consequently, there is a unique relationship between these signals that is absent in French. Thus, words might have several meanings depending on the conversation. For Newspeak's development to be feasible, this is a huge hurdle. According to the appendix, the word "free" should only be used in terms like "this dog is free of lice" (Orwell 392) when talking about the removal of its related values in English. According to popular belief, political and intellectual freedom were both stifled when non-conformist terms and ideas were outlawed. However, beyond the simple removal of words, it does not provide a thorough description of its technique. This narrow view may not be enough to get rid of the word's meaning and core. However, not every word would inevitably face similar challenges. Simplifying the changes, such changing the word "thought" (Orwell 394) to the verb "think," would likely face less obstacles. This is because, despite their differences in symbolism, the meaning and importance we give to these two terms are essentially the same. Words in Newspeak may have their meanings and values manipulated by the Inner Party as by a copywriter to suit their political goals. This is because they have complete control over the ideas conveyed by words as they are themselves generated. Also, let's go back to when Winston and Syme met in the canteen. Winston overhears bits of a discussion in Newspeak as he listens, giving us an unusual opportunity to hear the language in action rather than only in written form in 1984. The narrator tells Winston that when he describes the sound:

from the stream of sound that poured out of his mouth it was almost impossible to distinguish a single word. . . it was just a noise, a quack-quack-quacking. And yet, though you could not actually hear what the man was saying, you could not be in any doubt about its general nature. . you could be certain that every word of it was pure orthodoxy, pure Ingsoc. . . It was not the man's brain that was speaking, it was his larynx. The stuff that was coming out of him consisted of words, but it was not speech in the true sense: it was a noise uttered in unconsciousness, like the quacking of a duck. (Orwell 70-71)

Winston makes out the language as Newspeak, but he has a hard time understanding what the guy is saying, other than that it fits with Ingsoc's worldview. This is not due to a lack of familiarity with the terms but rather to his inadequate understanding of their meanings and substance. Winston probably couldn't understand a lot of what he heard since political jargon was full of freshly invented compound terms that were meant to sound nice but ended up making people appear repetitious and basic (Orwell 397). "Goodthink" (Orwell 400) is an example of a compound word in Newspeak that is based on the Oldspeak phrases "good" and "think." It should be noted, however, that in Newspeak, these terms have entirely different meanings. Winston is utterly bewildered and unable to understand Newspeak because of the radical change in language standards. Minitrue, miniplenty, minipax, and miniiluv are just a few of the four Ministry names that the reader sees throughout *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, making the humour stand out (Blakemore 352). Orwell makes an interesting point in his writings on how these definitions are inconsistent (283). To illustrate the point, while one ministry addresses matters of love, another addresses matters of truthlessness. That's an interesting point to consider. Winston disregards these phrases as insignificant acronyms, utterly unaware of the sarcasm in them. Blakemore claims that Winston and the other Oceanians don't understand the real value of words in history. The rich historical context linked with language is slowly being obliterated by the Party's tireless battle against Oldspeak. In the post-apocalyptic society of 1984, Winston misses the mark when it comes to understanding the significance of these expressions (Blakemore 352). "I love you" is a customary and significant term, and Winston understands it when Julia writes it on a message to Winston (Orwell 140). When it comes to miniluv, however, Winston seems to have trouble grasping the irony of the same term. As a result, larger linguistic communities may come to tolerate Newspeak in part, even if it means rearranging the relative importance, meaning, and implications of language signals without resisting the elimination of their historical associations. It suggests that people from Oceania don't understand the influence of their shifting speech on their worldview.

Relationship of Differences

In discourse, the sign and the signifier interact to establish a relationship based on differences. Linguistic signals may be better understood by focusing on word differences and inconsistencies. According to Fryer (99), these variants are often linked to negative connotations. The capacity to recognise and use certain linguistic cues in our vocabulary gives us control over the words we use to express ourselves. According to Fry (102-103), this procedure entails picking out indications that are apart from one another with great care. According to Fry, knowing the meaning of a word isn't enough to comprehend it; what really matters is the context in which it appears and its relationships to other words. To demonstrate how the differences we see impact our perspective, Tyson gives a convincing example:

Red is red only because we perceive it to be different from blue and green". If we did not differentiate between colour, we would not need the linguistic sign red... We understand up only in relation to down, and good in relation to evil. Without the opposites, the meaning would be lost." (Tyson 213).

This school of semiotics suggests that people who use Newspeak may have trouble understanding words that do not connote anything unpleasant. It may be easier to determine a word's meaning when there are fewer comparisons to make, however there are examples of Newspeak when the differences are obvious but not as strong. If one examines *Nineteen Eighty-Four* thoroughly, they will see that the author uses the prefix un-instead of awful and excellent, two polar opposites, since he thinks it's illogical to expect such differences (Orwell 67). When Winston remarks on the lack of consideration in the canteen talk, the characters from 1984 come to life. Syme echoes this aspect of Newspeak when he claims that commonly held beliefs and concepts do not need conscious thought. According to Orwell, "Orthodoxy is unconsciousness" (69). The users of this system might state the obvious without thinking critically (Shadi 185), classify languages without considering their parallels and differences, and ultimately support Ingsoc via pointless speech. Compound words and acronyms helped reduce words' denotative meanings, separating them from their "conscious and unconscious connotations" (Shadi 185), which led to a significant reduction in linguistic variety. "a punishable thought or formulation that is considered unorthodox or against Ingsoc" is easier to phonetically generate than "thoughtcrime," which demands more mental effort but is more challenging to pronounce. By boiling down language to its barest components, newspeak de-skills the human intellect.

Mutability

A language's mutability, or its ability to change, is very improbable, says Saussure (Saussure 74–78). A linguistic revolution, in his view, is an implausible concept. The fact that certain parts of language may be both static and dynamic is something he does concede, however. We give words more and more weight throughout time, weight that includes both their literal and inferred meanings. Changes to the way something sounds or how we interpret its meaning always cause a shift in the relationship between the expression and its representation (Saussure 75). The Inner Party's use of language has undergone a dramatic shift, with members claiming that Oldspeakers would need to undergo re-education since the new language is so different (Orwell 66). Saussure would argue that this endeavour is inherently impossible. However, Saussure's ideas of changeability are consistent with how they do this. The relationship between a sign and its signifier or signified is undeniably changed when one of them is changed. Textual evidence suggests that The Inner Party is well aware of a major change. Rather than just changing, the language will be converted into something entirely opposite to its original shape, as Syme's observation suggests (Orwell 69). It appears to imply that we may change the way a term is used by removing any extra meanings or connotations from it, which may change its meaning entirely. Rumour has it that Newspeak is trying to change our perception of language by making words less meaningful or by doing away with related terms

and their differences. The language and lexicon are heavily influenced by the Inner Party, who shape them according to their preferences. It is thought to be an impossible undertaking to revolutionise language, according to Saussure. The philosophy and dominion over Oceania practiced by Newspeak, however, disprove this idea. Language evolution is more likely to take place under Oceania's ruling body, which uses coercion to force its ideological views and intended changes on the public rather than allowing for natural linguistic growth. Unlike in real life, the governing authorities in the world of 1984 go to unprecedented lengths to restrict its inhabitants' speech and language (Shadi 183). It is not surprising that the language in Oceania has transformed into Newspeak and that the people are oppressed due to linguistic limits, given that the dictatorship in power has the ability to control language and rewrite history, as well as a strong dedication to imposing a single ideology on its subjects (Shadi 183).

Even while Oceanian residents may be hesitant to admit that Newspeak was imposed on them, they would eventually come to accept and even love it, which would give them the ability to regain control of their language. The dynamic character of language may be preserved by reintroducing it to the linguistic community, which would reawaken its potential for arbitrariness, worth, diversity, and collective expression. If Ingsoc and The Inner Party didn't meddle, the language would evolve naturally to meet the needs of the linguistic community. Some have speculated that the next Newspeak version will not serve as the language's definitive codification. Language may alternatively be able to modify and adapt within the linguistic community if it follows a more conventional path of development, as suggested by Saussure's semiology and discourse theories.

Conclusion

In this study, we have examined Newspeak from the perspective of Saussure's semiology and linguistic theories in order to uncover its many purposes. The study looks at how well Newspeak fits with his views, how feasible it is to implement in Oceanian culture, and what effects it may have on the people living there. A systematic review of previous research on the language of 1984 was first carried out. The next step was to explain Newspeak's complexities and go further into Saussure's theoretical foundation on semiotics. A semiotic analysis was performed to investigate the linguistic functions in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by analysing certain passages from the book. For the purpose of assessing Orwell's Newspeak in light of Saussurean theory, the investigation probed elements including arbitrariness, value, difference, and mutability. Forcibly imposing a language is, in most situations, quite difficult, according to structuralist views. On the other side, the Inner Party may defend its principles by using strategic psychological methods. Newspeak seems to be disregarding certain language subtleties in its development, which would cause it to progress more slowly. An theory that exemplifies this is the concept of difference, which states that the significance of symbols is fundamental to the operation of language. Newspeak finds the concept of value to be an additional obstacle. This line of reasoning holds that words have their identity and meaning even when their implications are removed.

The article concludes that once the collective understands the grammar of the discourse, the Inner Party will no longer be able to control the spread of Newspeak or restrict individual awareness. Research topics included one that sought to understand how the novel's protagonists and secondary characters made use of Newspeak and how the language would have functioned in the brains of ordinary Oceanians. According to the findings, it seems that very few people in the Inner Party are making light use of Newspeak, mostly via the usage of specialised vocabulary. Nonetheless, its use does indicate that Newspeak implementation has started. Unfortunately, we can't study its traditions since the narrative takes place in 1984 and we don't get to see how it changes over time. The actual efficacy of Newspeak in Oceania may therefore not be ascertained. From what we can see, Newspeak manages to control its residents' minds in a subtle way, even if they don't realise it. If this approach were strictly implemented, the result would be a language devoid of logic and complexity. People living in such a society would be completely unable to think outside the box or articulate their ideas in any way other than the usual language. As a result, the authoritarian regime would feel less threatened. The result would be that Oceanian people see the universe as an expression of unadulterated Ingsoc. A deeper dive into Orwell's thoughts on languages and Newspeak would strengthen this article. Some scholars have interpreted his Appendix on Newspeak as parody; it would be fascinating to see whether he was really suspicious of the language and concepts he provides. A more comprehensive analysis of the subject would be achieved by including these remarks and factors. The emphasis of this study was on analysing the linguistic systems of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, hence these features were neglected. In particular, it looked at how Oldspeak gave way to Newspeak, a new language that was both a continuation of Oldspeak and a vehicle for moral advocacy. It will be fascinating to see how we can dissect Newspeak and analyse its structure as a constructed language as we anticipate future research directions. We have shown in this research that by disregarding the distinctions and significance of linguistic indicators, the use of Newspeak would lead to several issues. It is intriguing to consider if any languages that are not built have challenged these characteristics or put up an argument against Saussure's theories on the development of language. Finally, if the opportunity presents itself, it would be fascinating to investigate the effects of authoritarian languages on people's minds by using Saussurean linguistics as a prism.

Works Cited

- Blakemore, Steven. "Language and Ideology in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *Social Theory and Practice*, vol. 10, no. 3, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. JSTOR, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23556571>. Accessed 1 December 2023
- Courtine, Jean-Jacques. "A Brave New Language: Orwell's Invention of 'Newspeak' in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." Translated by Laura Willett. *SubStance*, vol. 15, no. 2, 1986, pp. 69–74. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3684756. Accessed 1 December 2023.
- Fowler, Roger. *The Language of George Orwell*. London, Macmillan, 1995.

- Fry, Paul. "Semiotics and Structuralism." *Theory of Literature*. Yale University Press, 2012. ProQuest, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/kristianstad-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3420824>
- Lang, Berel. "Nineteen Eighty-Four: Newspeak, Technology, and The Death of Language." *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, vol. 72, no. 1, 1989, pp. 165–177. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/41178472. Accessed 1 December 2023.
- Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Toronto, HarperCollins, 2014
- Pool, Jonathan, and Bernard Grofman. "Language as Political Control: Newspeak Revisited." *The Nineteen Eighty-Four Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association*, Washington, D.C., 30 Aug.-2 Sept. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, <https://old.panlex.org/pubs/etc/langpolcontrol.pdf>. Accessed 3 December 2023.
- "Red." Cambridge Dictionary, *Cambridge University Press*. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english-chinese-simplified/red>. Accessed 3 December 2023.
- Saussure, Ferdinand. *Course in General Linguistics*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/cb41/a70d25abce8718dd680894c8c68edfb3ffe5.pdf>. Accessed 3 December 2023.
- "Semiotics." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/science/semiotics>. Accessed 4 December 2023.
- Shadi, Mehran. "The Principles of Newspeak or How Language Defines Reality in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *The Journal of International Social Research*, vol. 11, no. 59, 2018. ResearchGate, <http://dx.doi.org/10.17719/jisr.2018.2627>. Accessed 4 December 2023.
- Shippey, Tom. "Variations on Newspeak: The Open Question of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *Hard Reading: Learning from Science Fiction*, Liverpool University Press, 2016, pp. 233–254. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1gn6c93.29. Accessed 4 December 2023.
- Sturrock, John. *Structuralism: With an Introduction by Jean-Michel Rabate*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2003.
- Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. 2nd ed., New York, Routledge, 2006.
- Zazulak, Steffanie. "How the English Language has Changed Over the Decades." *Pearson*, 23 Jun. 2016, <https://www.english.com/blog/english-language-has-changed/>