GRAU D'ANGLÈS

Treball de Fi de Grau

Language and Violence in *A Clockwork Orange*

ÁLVARO LÓPEZ NEILA

UNIVERSITAT ROVIRA I VIRGILI

DEPARTAMENT D'ESTUDIS ANGLESOS I ALEMANYS

2022

Language and Violence in *A Clockwork Orange*

ÁLVARO LÓPEZ NEILA

TUTOR(A): Dr(a). Jordi Lamarca Margalef

UNIVERSITAT ROVIRA I VIRGILI

DEPARTAMENT D'ESTUDIS ANGLESOS I ALEMANYS

2022

'We hadn't done much, I know, but that was only like the start of the evening and I make no appy polly loggies to thee or thine for that. The knives in the milk-plus were stabbing away nice and horrorshow now.'

A Clockwork Orange **(Burgess, 2013, p. 14)**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my tutor in this TFG, Dr. Jordi Lamarca Margalef. For all the guidance and help provided to face one of the biggest challenges in this degree.

To my parents, Olga and Pedro, and my brother, Sergio. Thanks for all the support and kind-hearted help you have given me, and most importantly, for staying at my side until the end.

To my classmates and friends, Andrei and Laia. I hope I have given you as much help as you have through this tough journey. Sometimes strength is better found in others rather than yourself. I wish you the best for this project and for what is to come after it.

ABSTRACT

Violence and language are often related in everyday language even though people tend not to see it. The study of this relation between language and violence is a complicated one as violence is often associated with physical means. This dissertation aims to analyse the role that language plays in the portrayal violence, one of the main topics in the novel *A Clockwork Orange* by Anthony Burgess. Moreover, the question on whether Nadsat is actually violent or not is discussed through the analysis of Nadsat both in violent and non-violent contexts, and of everyday speech for violent purposes. Through this analysis, it is observed that this relationship between language and violence is mostly affected by the speaker who puts its violent intentions into the language that is being used. For instance, Nadsat and everyday speech share devices such as euphemisms, dysphemisms, and irony that work towards a violent intention. For this reason, it is thought that within act of communicating, it is the person who choses violence and language only works as the mean through which it is conveyed.

KEY WORDS: Language; Violence; *A Clockwork Orange;* Anthony Burgess; Nadsat; Euphemism; Dysphemism; Sarcasm

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION

A Clockwork Orange, originally published in 1962 by Anthony Burgess, is an important satirical-dystopic novel of the 20th century. The novel features an artificial language named Nadsat, which besides the crude depictions of violence, gave the novel its recognition within the genre. Burgess' novel has been featured in the list of the 100 all-times best novels by Time (2005), and it has been praised as a "cheerful horror" (K. Amis, 2012) in magazines such as The Observer or The Times. The novel has since become more acclaimed with the controversial 1971 film adaptation by Stanley Kubrick which managed to portray the book's violence in the big screen (Dalrymple, 2022).

1.1. ANTHONY BURGESS

Anthony Burgess (born John Burgess Wilson) was born in Manchester, in 1917. Son of Joseph Wilson, a pianist and door-to-door encyclopaedia salesman, and Elizabeth Burgess, a music hall singer and dancer. Lewis (2014) explains that Burgess was born into a culturally rich household, which would be a source of influence for his career. Only a year after his birth, Burgess' mother and sister died of Influenza, a loss that would affect his life and future creations. (International Anthony Burgess Foundation [IABF], 2022). Dix (1972) says that "Burgess had a remarkable ability and facility with languages of all kinds and with words in general. He wrote poetry as a boy, but he originally intended to be a musician. He studied English language and literature and has been fascinated by the close relationship between words and music ever since" (pp. 3-4). Despite this fascination with language, he did not do too well in university where he graduated in 1940 obtaining a BA (Bachelor of Arts) in English literature.

Lewis (2014) explains that Burgess served in the Royal Army Medical Corps and got transferred to the Army Educational Corps between 1940 and 1946, during this time

he is switched back and forth between England and Gibraltar. Meanwhile, he married Llewela (Lynne) Jones as his first wife. While she is in London, Lynne is allegedly attacked and mugged by deserters in 1943, which causes her to miscarriage the child she was expecting (Lewis, 2014). This can be seen as highly influential to his novel *A Clockwork Orange* as the wife of the writer is assaulted by Alex. According to Dix (1972), he became a teacher and briefly worked for the Ministry of Education from 1950 to 1954. Around this time as a teacher, he wrote his first two novels: *A Vision of Battlements*, inspired by his time in Gibraltar, and *The Worm and the Ring*. As most of his works, neither of them would be published until several years later.

In 1954 Burgess and his wife moved to Kuala Kangsar in Malaya where he continued to work as a teacher in a Malayan College. Two years later he published his first novel *Time for a Tiger* using the pseudonym "Anthony Burgess". In the following years he published the following books of his *Malayan Trilogy* (IABF, 2022). Lewis (2014) explains that it is in this time teaching in Malaya, Burgess collapsed during a class. Because of this, he is wrongly diagnosed with a brain tumour.

According to the IABF (2022), from this diagnosis in 1959 until 1962, Burgess published seven novels including *A Clockwork Orange* in 1962, intending to provide for his wife once he is dead. In the following years it would become clear that Burgess was no longer dying of a tumour. Biswell (2013) explains that after his most prolific years, Burgess published five more novels before the end of the sixties, as well as a series of translations and literary criticism (p. xvii). He continued to work as a novelist, poet, screenwriter, broadcaster, and composer. In 1980 Burgess published another one of this most influential novels *Earthly Powers,* for which he is awarded the Charles Baudelaire Prize and the Prix du Meilleur Livre Etranger (IABF, 2022).

From the beginning of his career Burgess wrote a total of 33 novels and 25 non-fiction works, composed over 200 pieces of music, and provided several pieces of literary criticism until his dead from lung cancer in the 22nd November 1992 (IABF, 2022).

1.2. CONTEXT OF THE NOVEL

Now that it has been stablished that the novel was published in 1962, it is important to know what was happening at that time in Burgess' life and his surroundings. In Europe and specially in the United Kingdom, the fifties and even more so the sixties supposed an ideological and cultural shift for western societies, and thus, the novel is a response to the changing times Burgess experienced in this decade. The Second World War had barely ended a decade ago and the continent is still living under its repercussions. Burgess returns to England from Malaya in 1959 and sees a country that has changed from a rigid to a more permissive state: the new youth culture and the counterculture, the rock and roll and pop music, the recreational use of drugs, the Teddy Boys, and the violence that they caused. Burgess (1985) himself says that in Britain around 1960 "respectable people began to murmur about the growth of juvenile delinquency and read in certain sensational articles in certain newspapers that the young criminals . . . were somehow an inhuman breed and required inhuman treatment" (p. 91). Furthermore, the echoes and rise of Communism in the north seem to be getting bigger at the time and the fear of totalitarianism as in Orwell's *Nineteen-Eighty-four* have a deep effect on Burgess' novel.

1.3. PLOT

The book is narrated by Alex, a young teen who lives in an almost totalitarian futuristic version of England. He and his gang are often described as committing hard acts of violence, he gives a drunken bum a kicking, has a ruck with a rival gang, drugs and ravishes two ten-year-olds, and robs and murders an elderly splinter (Amis, 2013, pp.

viii, ix). Each of these acts is described using Nadsat, an artificial language created by Burgess with the purpose of transmitting this violence that Alex and his friends cause. The first part of the book takes a turn after Alex is caught and has to face justice for his crimes. In prison, he is offered the possibility to undergo a treatment named 'Ludovico's Technique'. As Amis (2013) says, "a crash course on aversion therapy" (p. xiii). In other words, a form of brainwashing which is supposed to free him of any violent thoughts and get stop his evil desires.

By the end of the treatment, a supposedly cured Alex is released into the streets unable to see or perform any violent acts. There he is defenceless against his earlier victims and friends who now want revenge. Alex ends up in the house of one of his victims, whose wife he has previously raped, and he now learn she died. The man learns his guest's identity and tries to make him commit suicide as an act of revenge and as an attack on the government. Alex's only way out is to jump out of a window, "I shut my *glazzies* and felt the cold wind on my *litso*, then I jumped" (Burgess, 2013, p. 181).

Now in the hospital, Alex has survived the fall to learn that the doctors have reversed the treatment and he is now able to be violent again. By the end of the novel though, in the famous twenty-first chapter, which was left out in Kubrick's film adaptation for not representing the whole of the novel, Alex is said to have grown old of all the violence which had surrounded him as a teen. He now looks forward to a future, leaving violence behind, wishing to form a family and have a child. Alex has matured, and feels that being young is exactly what his story is about: making mistakes.

1.4. DYSTOPIA AND LANGUAGE

As it has been mentioned, the novel is set in an almost totalitarian England which highly resembles the setting of a Dystopian novel. This novel in fact belongs in some part

to the Dystopian genre. There are hints of a socialist totalitarian government and the processes that Alex endures through the Ludovico's Technique treatment also resemble the mind control and brainwashing that some other novels of the genre. as *Nineteen-Eighty-Four*, so accurately portray in their narratives. Still, *A Clockwork Orange* differs in some aspect from the common characteristics of Dystopian literature, as Samantha Moya argues. Moya (2011) describes the narrative as occurring within a "society in its pre-dystopian hours, in the beginnings of totalitarianism" (p. 1) and that Alex as a narrator does not fully understand the society in which he lives in. Moya (2011) also says that Burgess takes advantage of that situation to portray a different type of Dystopian narrative, but also defends that the agenda of the government is the same as in any other Dystopic novel: "the prioritization of social control and efficiency over human nature" (p. 1).

Within the Dystopian genre, language and its usage become another important aspect in the story as it helps define the world in which the narrative is set. A great example of this is, again, Orwell's *Nineteen-Eighty-Four*. The novel, set in a totalitarian society, features in many ways the tools that the government employs to control its people. It ranges from surveillance to news control, even to manipulation of language. To do that Orwell employs Newspeak. Through this device the party in power manages to control people, but most importantly, how people think. This new language removes, substitutes, and alters words in order to make ideas such as disobedience and rebelliousness unconceivable (Berkes, 2000). The other important concept in Orwell's novel is Doublethink, the famous "WAR IS PEACE" or "TWO AND TWO MAKE FIVE" (Orwell, 1949, pp. 6, 349). Doublethink is described in the novel as "to know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory

and believing in both of them" (Orwell 1949, p. 44). It is said that in most part Doublethink is accomplished through Newspeak. So, not only does language shape how people think, but how they perceive reality.

Another example of the clever usage of words within a Dystopian setting is Huxley's *Brave New World*. The world of *Brave New World* is highly scientific, and it is seen reflected in the language used as it implements Greek letters, Latin affixes, and highly descriptive technological vocabulary. Leeves (2017) say that the use of those "signify how scientifically-minded the community is". By limiting and specifying the language choices people have, Huxley manages to demonstrate how language defines a society and manages to limit one's freedom of choice and expression.

Burgess does similarly, even though to another level, by implementing Nadsat. As previously mentioned, Nadsat is the language the Alex and his band use regularly, and which is highly associated to violence. In the novel's setting, Nadsat is understood to be just another idiolect, spoken by Alex's gang but understood by other teens and criminals. The language is said to be based around Russian and as described in the novel itself, its roots are "Slav. Propaganda. Subliminal penetration" (Burgess, 2013, p. 125), which hints to that propaganda and artificial talk that has been seen in other novels. Even though the language does not work in relation to the whole society of the narrative, Burgess manages to shape Alex's reality by modifying his manner of speaking, and thus provides the reader with a new experience and perspective of the use of language in the Dystopian genre. In Orwell's *Nine-teen Eighty-four* and Huxley's *Brave New World* language works as a device for violence, considering censorship and manipulation of language as a way of committing violence through it.

2. VIOLENCE IN LANGUAGE

The main focus of study for this paper is the relation between language and violence. It is an important relation as seemingly these two belong to different realms. According to Pratt (2011), most people often recognise language and violence as "mutually exclusive", and that it is often understood that one begins when the other ends, she argues that "when people stop talking, they start fighting, when they stop fighting they start talking". In order to establish this relation, the definitions for language and violence must be addressed first.

According to The Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary (n.d.-c) language can be defined as "the words, their pronunciation, and the methods of combining them used and understood by a community". Other descriptions convey the idea of a system of sounds or signs used to communicate or transmit meaning. Most of them agree in the fact that it is a tool for communal use, an ability inherent and used only within the human species. The definition is broad enough as to have many fields that study the several aspects of language. As a topic of discussion within linguistic studies, it can also be argued that language helps speakers shape their perception of the world and the ideas and thoughts they build around it (Maden, 2019).

On the other hand, violence does not have a consensus for its definition either. The Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary (n.d.-e) describes violence as "the use of physical force so as to injure, abuse, damage, or destroy", but it is also defined as a "an instance of violent treatment or procedure". It is important to note the appearance of the word 'physical' in this definition. That is because this same idea has been the cause of previous debate on whether language can be violent in the past. Litman-Navarro (2019) explains this issue in his online article *Wittgenstein on Whether Speech Is Violence* where he

narrates the discussion between psychologists Lisa Feldman Barrett, and social psychologists Jonathan Haidt and Greg Lukianoff. Feldman argued in an article in the New York Times that long-term stress can inflict serious damage on a body. Haidt and Lukianoff responded that her notion were wrong and even “dangerous”. Their argument was based on that same idea that violence is something purely physical, and therefore different to the verbal nature of speech and language. Lemke (n.d.) addresses this topic saying that “Violence is not simply material force: It is the use of force as a tool for some human purpose, individual or social”, which is the definition chosen for this dissertation as violence throughout the novel ranges from physical to verbal in its many appearances.

Having established the definition, the questions on how language and violence relate to each other still resides. Still the answer is not simple. Litman-Navarro tries to explain it in a simplistic way by saying referring to the intentionality of the action:

> When is speech violence? It depends on how we define it. If we define violence as a physical act, then speech is never violence. If we choose to define violence as causing harm to a person, then speech is often violence. If we choose to define violence as intentionally causing harm, then sometimes speech is violence (Litman-Navarro, 2019).

If there is agreement in the fact that violence goes beyond the physical boundary, then it can be agreed that violence and language can be related in some way. Pratt (2011) says that there is an accompaniment relation between the two. That most often language accompanies whenever there is violence and that it is the discursive accompaniment in the language that gives violence its meaning. In other words, language serves to describe that violence.

But as a matter of fact, violence can be encountered used as direct violence within language in our day to day. The most common example of this is the use insults towards other people. Furthermore, other examples of more subtle violence in language can attributed to the manipulation of it for a specific purpose, as it can be the case of lies or other linguistic devices. Krupansky (2021) describes instances when people might resort to the use of violence in language. Some of those are: as a shortcut to someone's ends, fulfilling a need to dominate others, as practical need such in political or economic competition, for fun, for the thrill of violence itself, or as a means to defend their ego or status. Violence in language might also appear not in content, as it has been said in insults, but in the tone of an utterance. Krupansky adds that tone helps in conveying a sense of force or violence, and that even non-explicit words might convey violence with the help of the later. That brings the discussion an important aspect for the analysis of the books: the idea of the Euphemism, Dysphemism, and Sarcasm or Verbal Irony.

2.1. EUPHEMISM

According to The Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary (n.d.-b) a euphemism consists of "the substitution of an agreeable or inoffensive expression for one that may offend or suggest something unpleasant". The word comes from Greek, for which the literal translation can be interpreted as a "word for good omen". It can also be described as the use of a "a word or phrase used to avoid saying an unpleasant or offensive word" (Cambridge Dictionary, 2022). On Dictionary.com (n.d.) the adjectives offensive, harsh, and blunt are added to the words that might be substituted, and Collins Dictionaries (2022) specifies providing examples of those unpleasant or embarrassing topics as it can be sex, the human body, or death.

Most authors coincide on that idea of the euphemism as a word or an expression replacing another which is considered to have negative connotations. Pan (2013) explains the appearance of the euphemism in a social context, where using language certain words might appear unhappy, impolite, or embarrassing if directly spoken, and thus make communication unpleasant or render it ineffective. Those words which are considered unpleasant might be so due to the language's cultural background, that is why different words are considered taboo in different languages. The euphemism then appears, as it has been stated in the definitions, as a way to avoid those words and the embarrassment that comes with uttering them. Pan (2013) concludes by saying that the euphemism plays an important role facilitating social interaction between individuals.

Euphemisms are not inherently violent as, as most linguistic devices, their violent connotations might vary depending in the context in which they feature. The violent nature of euphemism is fruit of linguistic debate. The interpretations which define their use are different in accordance to different authors. Still, the euphemism can be considered an important violent linguistic device as it misleads by candy coating reality and sanitizes or disguises reality (Johns & DellaSala, 2017, p. 174). That misleading and disguising of an expression can be attributed as a general characteristic of the euphemism or as a dependant of its many functions,

Regarding how the euphemism can be used, there are different interpretations that establish the same ideas of the usage of such devices. They all mark the same utilities despite selecting different boundaries that each function covers. Pan in his article A Tentative Study on the Functions and Applications of English Euphemism (2013) describes four basic pragmatic functions of a euphemism. But looking forward to the

analysis of the book, it has been preferred the classification by Burridge (2012) which establishes six more precise types.

- The **protective euphemism**, which the most common used to avoid expressions considered harmful or unpleasant in specific linguistic contexts. Those expressions are referred to as Taboos and might range from sex, body parts, disease, death, or religion.

- The **underhand euphemism**, which is used to mystify or misrepresent a specific thing which might not even be considered harmful or bad. Then this euphemism in not design to conceal offense but to disguise a topic which might come with a benefit for the user of this euphemism.

- The **uplifting euphemism**, which simply consist of substituting an expression for another with better connotations and so making a neutral topic become positive.

- The **provocative euphemism** which are used to reveal sensitive topics with the use of an expression deliberately provoking, and which might even be Taboo. It is commonly used by comedians and as a satirical device. They help remove stigma or negative connotations of the Taboo expressions by challenging the prejudices against them.

- The **cohesive euphemism** is one used within a community as a sign of social cohesion. It is a communal device used to designate membership to that community and display a group's identity, and within the use of those euphemisms are shared ideals and taboos of the group. It is often used by gangs or criminal groups, and it has an added sense of secrecy to it.

- The **ludic euphemism** which is one used for fun or entertaining of a person. Oftentimes it is used in comedic contexts.

Burridge (2012) also explains the different process of linguistic formation a euphemism. The three main groups are Analogy, Distortion, and Borrowing:

- An **analogy** is defined as the generalization of forms to new situations. Within this group fit metaphors, in which the taboo topics is paired with a more pleasurable option. In this type of formation, the speaker seeks vagueness, and the replacement involves a high level of abstraction for the process to be understood.

- **Distortion** is defined as a modification of the original taboo word or expression. Some strategies involving distortion are shortening, as well as turning longer expressions into acronyms or initials. The offensive word can be simply left out by using ellipsis, which results in a semantic shift of the expression that remains. Circumlocution, or re-ordering a sentence is also considered distortion. There are several other ways to distort a word or expression as in remodelling its phonological features, by adding affixes, blending words, reduplicating, alliterating or even rhyming (most common use in slang).

- **Borrowings**, or the incorporation of words from elsewhere, can also happen as a euphemism. Borrowing can be internal as from sub-varieties of jargon and slang, or external as from other languages.

2.2. DYSPHEMISM

Linguistically speaking, the word euphemism has a wide enough definition to fit different meanings or interpretations, and as it has been seen, many functions with both

positive and negative connotations. That is where the idea of the dysphemism comes in place. The Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary (n.d.-a) defines the dysphemism as "the substitution of a disagreeable, offensive, or disparaging expression for an agreeable or inoffensive one". In simpler terms and as Duda (2011) puts it, it means speaking offensively. Burridge (2012) says that in contrary to euphemism being the polite thing to do, dysphemism have the objective of breaking social conventions.

Then, the question that arises is whether a provocative euphemism and a dysphemism are different or not. To settle this doubt for the continuity of this essay, the answer will be provided by Litman-Navarro. He explains the ideas of the philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein who proposes that language and conversation work as context-sensitive exchanges with malleable rules (Litman-Navarro, 2019). Each social communicative interaction work as its own micro-dialect affected by several aspects influential to the speakers. To understand better his idea, an example by Allan and Burridge (2006) can be used, saying that among a group of soldiers, using the word loo may be perceived as a dysphemism because negative connotations, as if someone was talking to them with baby language.

Burridge (2012) explains that the strategies used in the creation of dysphemisms are often the same as euphemisms. Analogies like metaphors and hyperboles in the form of insults often appear in language and appearance of borrowings from jargon or slang often appear as dysphemisms as well.

2.3. VERBAL IRONY AND SARCASM

Irony is the described as "the use of words to convey a meaning that is the opposite of its literal meaning" (Dictionary.com, n.d.-a). This ideas of conveying a different meaning resembles the previous idea of the euphemism and the dysphemism that have

been proposed. Within the concept of irony there can be found three types: verbal irony, dramatic irony, and situational irony (Malewitz, 2022). The one that concern us for the purposes of this paper is Verbal Irony.

Verbal Irony is described in Dictionary.com as “irony in which a person says or writes one thing and means another, or uses words to convey a meaning that is the opposite of the literal meaning” (n.d.-b). Baker (2000) adds to this definitions that verbal irony works creating contrast between the literal meaning and what is being said. As this research is done through a written medium and it concerns the analysis of a language, this is a crucial concept to have in mind.

Sarcasm is a form of verbal irony. It is defined by The Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary (n.d.-d) as “a sharp and often satirical or ironic utterance designed to cut or give pain”, as a well as being said to be “a mode of satirical wit depending for its effect on bitter, caustic, and often ironic language that is usually directed against an individual”. Willis (2011) makes reference to that definition by remarking the words bitter and irony as well as the fact that it might be directed towards and individual with the intention to cut or give pain. Related to those ideas, the word come from the Greek and can be translated as tear the flesh or speak bitterly. Willis defends that through this description it can be argued that sarcasm is violence in language. As Skalicky (2018) says that sarcasm works by involving an incongruity between what has been stated and what is actually represented in the real world.

3. NADSAT AND EUPHEMISMS

> ‘WHAT’s it going to be then, eh?’
>
> There was me, that is Alex, and my three *droogs*, that is Pete Georgie and Dim. (Burgess, 2013, p. 7)

Those are the opening lines of the novel. The first one, a sentence that will be repeated throughout the novel changing in meaning each time it is uttered. The second containing the first instance of the use of Nadsat in the whole book. Through the first set of chapters Burgess builds what will effectively be the language of the protagonist, and with this new idiolect, it is introduced this artificial set of expressions and words that will be continuedly used as the book progresses. The reader is shown words as *rassoodocks* (minds), combined within expressions like “a *flip*[1] [great, big] dark chill winter bastard though dry” (Burgess, 2013, p. 7) that convey a sense of a poetical rhetoric. They are not simple words or made-up sentence used sparingly through the text. What the reader cannot really grasp by only reading those introductory paragraphs is the importance and meaning that Nadsat has for the novel and the plot.

It does not take more than a couple of pages for the reader to realise that Nadsat is not designed to work as a normal language. In those first paragraphs Alex, the protagonist of the story, narrates how he and his *droogs* make their way out of the Korova Milk Bar where they have consumed *moloko*, in other words milk, laced with what can be interpreted to be drugs of that fictional universe.

[1] Any Nadsat-specific word or expression appearing in a quote within the analysis will be provided in Italics for emphasis, and accompanied- if necessary- by its English counterpart in brackets.

> So you could *pet* [drink] it with vellocet or synthemesc or drencrom or one or two other *vesches* [things] which would give you a nice quiet *horrorshow* [good, well] fifteen minutes admiring *Bog* [God] And All His Holy Angles And Saints in your left shoe with lights bursting all over your *mozg* [brain]. (Burgess, 2013, p. 7)

After his usual drinking session, they are ready for *a bit of the dirty twenty-to-one*. Making their way through the streets the gang looks for a "*malenky* [little] jest to start the night with" as they walk into a "schoolmaster type *veck*" who is walking out of the library with some scientific books. The group assault and mock him as Alex says, "you need to be taught a lesson, brother" (Burgess, 2013, pp. 11-12). Not long after that the gang beats him:

> Pete held his *rookers* [hand, arm] and Georgie sort of hooked his *rot* [mouth] wide open for him and Dim yanked out his false *zoobies* [tooth], upper and lower. … The old *veck* began to make sort of chumbling *shooms* [noise] - "wuf waf wof" - so Georgie let go of holding his *goobers* [lips] apart and just let him have one in the toothless *rot* with his ringy fist, and that made the old *veck* start moaning a lot then, then out comes the blood, my brothers, real beautiful. (Burgess, 2013, pp. 12-13)

At this point, the reader is not even seven pages into the actual book, and it has become apparent the way in which Burgess takes advantage of language for Alex's purposes. It is a language essentially created with the idea of violence in mind. Nadsat in style is very rushed, hurried. It is in some way as reading a child's narration of a story, as if many ideas came to his mind at once and he just wanted to spit them all out before forgetting them. That might be up to some point a reference to the use of drugs and inability to control his speech. However, it might also be a natural feature of the language

at the other members of the gang use similar constructions through the course of the novel. It shows Alex enthusiasm for that same violence that Nadsat communicates.

Besides style in which it is described, there is the intention or purpose that the language is used. Nadsat as it has been already posed, is a language intended to convey violence, but it is not only a means of violence for Alex and his *droogs*, but also a euphemism, and in some brief instances, a dysphemism of the same violence it is trying to represent. Then, at the same time it is designed to show or illustrate violence, and to mask it through euphemisms. That reinforces the point that euphemism can in fact be a source of violence in language.

To illustrate this, take the description of the first pages which has been provided on the last paragraphs. On a first glance the words *droogs* or *moloko* might not seem to fulfil the role and function of a standard euphemism. But, from my point of view, they are doing so context wise. The word *droog* is translated in the Nadsat glossary at the end of the book as 'friend', but it becomes obvious given the gang connotation that Alex would not simply call their violence colleagues 'friends' in this setting. Instead, he is providing a euphemism for a word that is not really appropriate, which does not have the appropriate (violent) connotations, in that context. In some way, it resembles the use of the words 'brother' or 'dog' to a member of a group in an informal, slang-alike setting.

It is the same as with the word *moloko*, it might not seem appropriate to call your drug mixture 'milk', even if it contains some part of it, but something more appropriate to the context in which Alex is speaking. Given the circumstances and intent of those two euphemisms and in relation to Burridge's classification, they can fit into the categories of underhand or cohesive euphemisms. Underhand as it works to mystify and misrepresent something for the speaker's benefit. Meanwhile, cohesive as they are used within a

specific social group, a gang in this case, and work as a communal device, to build the group's identity. In that same sense, at first glance they both work as an analogy, and they rely on the vagueness of the expression for the device to work. Although if some research is done, it can be learnt that these two specifically and many more of these words are borrowings from Russian.

The sentence *a bit of the dirty twenty to one* can be considered a different type of euphemistic formation. In this case, the sentence is as specified in the Notes section at the end of the book, "'Twenty to one' is the rhyming slang for 'fun'" (Burgess, 2013, p. 207). Then, fitting into Burridge's classification, it is again an underhand euphemism, although this one can be understood as a ludic euphemism due to its rhyming and playful nature, and in this case, it works through distortion, more specifically through rhyming.

Regardless, the examples shown only represent a fragment of what Nadsat accomplishes. Both *droog*, *moloko*, and *a bit of the dirty twenty to one* are euphemism for non-violent ideas. When it comes to violent descriptions and expressions, Nadsat heavily relies on euphemistic sentences and play of words. For instance, Alex saying that the man needs to be taught a lesson shows how he has no intention of educating him, but instead is using it as a euphemism to say that the group is about to beat him. Again, this is a common underhand euphemism used to misrepresent the speaker's message, accomplished through analogy. Furthermore, when they finally seize him before hitting him, Alex names the man using the word *veck*, and refers to his body parts with many other Nadsat words. By changing the substantives used to name all those things, Alex is alienating both himself and the person, and somehow dehumanizing him of his characteristics. He is shaping his own perception of reality by using different words and

expressions in the most Orwellian fashion. Putting it in other words, it is not considered as violent if someone hits a *veck* and not a man, as seen through Alex's perspective**.**

That same idea can be seen all throughout the book as when Alex talks about the doing "the old in-out-in-out" (Burgess, 2013, p. 45) as a way of referring the sexual act. This euphemism is formed through the shortening of the sentence 'in and out', referring to the act of sexual penetration, into the form 'in-out' that has been reduplicated for the desired effect. Something similar happens when Alex narrates how one of his cellmates is masturbating. Alex paints the picture saying the man is "saying like dirty *slovos* and stroke stroke stroking away" (Burgess, 2013, p. 95). This might be again an example of an underhand euphemism, although it can be understood that, as Alex never really utters the word sex or any other explicit form of it, he is using it as a protective euphemism.

A similar event is also seen at the beginning of the novel, when the group assaults the man with the books. Alex says "What is this filthy *slovo*? I blush to look at this word" to what Georgie responds, "There's one slovo beginning with an f and another with a c" (Burgess, 2013, p. 12). Furthermore, it can be seen the same type of distortion happening when Alex narrates how Billyboy and his mates are about to rape a girl, and he says that "they'd probably just been doing the dirty *slovo* [word] part of the act before getting down to a *malenky* bit of ultra-violence" (Burgess, 2013, p. 21). These previous examples share the similarity of Alex or a member of his gang avoiding saying any expression related to the field of sexual acts and classifying them as dirty and unpleasant.

On the other hand, examples of dysphemism can also be found in Nadsat. The most notable example is the word *cancer* used to refer to cigarettes. It might be that on Alex's morality system, cigarettes are considered to be bad or wrong. This example works through an analogy as it just replaces one word with another forming what can be

understood as a metaphor. It is also especially curious the appearance of that sort of dysphemism as Nadsat mainly works as a euphemism of violence. Nadsat serves, as it has been said before, to mask violence behind meaningless words, so the reader does not expect to find as explicit as word as cancer in the middle of a sea of neutral/good-sounding euphemism.

Nadsat has been defined as working as a euphemism and modifying language, managing then to shape Alex's reality. Recalling previous ideas, it has been stablished that Nadsat is used to describe violence but also as a euphemism of it. That is to some extent a contradiction of its functions. As a result of this thought, Nadsat can be compared to the already mentioned Doublethink in Orwell's *Nineteen-Eighty-Four*. They both are able to transmit contradictory ideas which result in the shaping of a new reality. For instance, Winston finally admitting that two and two is five in Orwell's novel and submitting himself to the state, can be compared to the state of mind in which Alex lives. Alex does not seem to be bothered by all the violence surrounding him. In both cases, the direct cause of those unfaithful realities is the use of language.

That same state of believe can be better seen when Alex is caught and sent to prison just before the start of part two of the novel. Alex is woken in the middle of the night to be told the news that the old lady he has beaten (and for who's death he is imprisoned) is dead. Alex realises just before the guards tell him that "the old *ptitsa* [lady] with the *kots* and *koshkas* [cats and tomcats] had passed away". Moreover, he thinks to himself "I'd cracked her a bit too hard, like. Well, well, that was everything. … That was everything. I'd done the lot, now. And me still only fifteen" (Burgess, 2013, p. 81). In this case, it can be considered that Alex is employing a protective euphemism when saying that the lady *passed away* and that he has done *the lot*. The first one a protective euphemism for 'died'

and the later for ‘murder’. This last one can be understood both as a protective and an underhand euphemism, as if he did not want to tell himself what has been done. Although this example is as morally vague as anything that Alex says in the book, I think that he is feeling bad for his actions. From my point of view, Alex has been so alienated from reality with the use of Nadsat and the shaping of his reality that has been discussed, it is not until this point that he realises what he has done.

Moreover, this Orwellian approach to the language used in the novel can be related to the title itself. *A Clockwork Orange*, apart from being the title of the book, it is the title of a manuscript that the writer F. Alexander is writing in the universe of the narrative. Alex reads what can be interpreted to be the abstract which says:

> The attempt to impose upon man, a creature of growth and capable of sweetness, to ooze juicily at the last round the bearded lips of God, to attempt to impose, I say, laws and conditions appropriate to a mechanical creation. (Burgess, 2013, pp. 27-28)

The meaning behind this title is deeply related to the topic of free-will, one of the other important themes discussed in the novel. It is that attempt made by the government to control the population, and which is better portrayed by the already mentioned Ludovico Technique. By undergoing it, Alex is said to lose his capability to choose violence and thus losing his free-will. Personally, I think that the title can also be compared to Nadsat and its consequences. From my point of view, at the start of the novel Alex is already his own Clockwork Orange that has been sucked deep into a parallel vision of the world. He himself has made that happen by using Nadsat causing the already discussed shaping of his reality.

Lastly, focusing on the discussion on whether Nadsat is violent or not, I think there is an argument to be made regarding the subjectivity of language. As it has been said, Nadsat is used by Alex to portray violence, but it is never said how much violence there really is in Nadsat. Alex portrays violence because that is what he does best. Violence is the nature of the world that he lives in. And even then, Alex is so used to violence that he does not seem to perceive it anymore. He is in his cocoon made up of words that does not allow him to see all this violence that he is causing. As much as Nadsat is transmitting this violence, it is not doing so for Alex. For him it is just a normal manner of speech. That is to say that if Alex is living in his own reality, he will not consider his own actions to be violent. Then, how can a language be conveying violence, when the speaker himself does not perceive that violence he is talking about?

As far as the analysis goes, it has been established how Nadsat works as a euphemism of violence. It has been discussed the relation between Nadsat and violence, and what that relation supposes for Alex and his perception of reality. But still the question remains whether Nadsat can be considered to be violent after all. Is Nadsat violent or is the person using Nadsat the violent one in this case?

4. THE DUALITY OF LANGUAGE

> The I pulled the lovely Ninth [Symphony] out of its sleeve, … and I set the needle hissing on to the last movement, which was all bliss. (Burgess, 2013, pp. 51-52)

Although the main perception of the novel is that Nadsat is mainly violent, it is complicated to assume that a language is only specified for a single function instead of another. It can be argued that is simply complicated to assume that language as a whole is specified for anything besides communication. Even if Nadsat is used mainly with the purpose of violence in mind, the reader might suddenly be surprised by fragments where it looks like there is a shift from violence to what can be attributed as beauty or poetry. Most of those fragments where Alex is not depicted as enjoying violence show him enjoying music instead. More specifically classical music. The fact that Alex likes classical music is not a surprise knowing the fascination that Burgess himself had with it. Knowing that he composed and published several pieces of music besides his most known novels and writings, better illustrate why the topic of music was chosen for Alex's delight before any other.

The first example of Alex feeling amazed by music is in the third chapter of the first part of the book. Alex and his *droogs* go back to the Korova Milkbar and whilst they are around enjoying themselves, a lady from the TV studios asks for the music that is being played to be turned off and starts singing.

> And then the disc on the stereo twanged off and … , and in the like interval, the short silence before the next one came on, one of these *devotchkas* [girls] … suddenly came with a burst of singing, … and it was like for a moment, O my

> brothers, some great bird had flown into the milkbar, and I felt all the little *malenky* [little] hairs on my *plott* [body] standing endwise and the shivers crawling up like slow *malenky* lizards and then down again. Because I knew what she sang. It was from an opera by Friedrich Gitterfenster called 'Das Bettzeug', and it was the bit where she's snuffing it with her throat cut, and the *slovos* are 'Better like this maybe'. Anyway, I shivered. (Burgess, 2013, p. 33)

At this point of the novel, Alex does not seem to be interested in anything besides the typical beating of an old man, robbing or raping. He is a man of simple pleasures. Therefore, one could assume that he does not have any concerns or anxieties when it comes to art and culture. In fact, not even fifteen pages prior to this, he has stripped a man of his books and torn them apart just for the fun of it. The simple fact that he knows the title and author of the opera is surprising to the reader. But how he talks about it is even more surprising knowing Alex's character.

Alex compares the greatness of the moment to a great bird flying into the *milkbar*, moving him so much that he shivers out of excitement. It is probably the biggest moment emotionally speaking since the novel started and Alex does not hold a bit when describing it. If it is compared with one of the previous quotes (when they beat the old man), one would expect a lot more feeling coming from Alex with the adrenaline of the whole fight, but he simply says, "then out comes the blood, my brothers, real beautiful." (Burgess, 2013, p. 13). His descriptions of violence and graphic and accurate but plain. Even when describing that the drugs are taking a higher effect on him, he describes the whole situation as *horrorshow*, as just great. Continuing, the scene with the lady singing is perturbed by Dim makes a series of noises and gestures. The reader can once again see the emotional investment that Alex has in the music as he feels "all of a fever and like

drowning in the redhot blood, *slooshing* [hearing] and *viddying* [watching] Dim's vulgarity" (Burgess, 2013, p. 34), and as he proceeds to punch him in the mouth.

Some says an image is worth a thousand words. Knowing that, the same scene can be seen in Kubrick's film adaptation to better perceive the portrayal of the music and the reaction Alex has to Dim's actions. Alex is seen with his eyes focused in the singer, who in this case is said to be performing a "bit of the glorious Ninth, by Ludwig van" (Kubrick, 1971, 0:15:01). He is deeply lost within the music, that is made clear by the camera zooming in on him. The moment is made significantly more abrupt as what makes the music stop is a mouth-made fart noise by Dim. Alex brutally responds hitting him with his staff.

The theme of music is also recurring throughout the novel. Every now and then, Alex will have a moment of appreciation for music, whether it is his beloved Ludwig van, Mozart or Handle, where he puts forward his passion for this type of music. Again, those types of scenes will be depicted through the use of Nadsat which serve to show the duality of this language. A device which works both to describe something as violent as a rape and something as beautiful as music.

There are plenty of examples related to music in the novel. The next two that I want to point out to are, first on part one, chapter one; and secondly in the same part, chapter four. The first one contains a similar description of the music as in the segment of the singer. Alex is laying naked in his bed, with his eyes closed as he blasts music through his speakers. He describes listening to a concerto by Geoffrey Plautus in the following manner:

> Oh, it was gorgeousness and gorgeosity made flesh. The trombones crunched redgold under my bed, and behind my *gulliver* [head] the trumpets three-wise

> silverflamed, and there by the door the timps rolling through my guts and out again crunched like candy thunder. Oh, it was wonder of wonders. (Burgess, 2013, pp. 38-39)

The description of the music is emotional on another level, up to the point where it has certain sexual connotations. The pleasure inflicted by the music is such that those connotations end up becoming true as the chapter ends. Recalling the previous part of the paper on the euphemism and Nadsat, Alex narrates in the most euphemistic way how he spatters and cries ‘aaaaah’ with the bliss of the music (Burgess, 2013, p. 39), as it can be presumed, he was just masturbating to the sound of the music.

On the second scene, something similar happens as Alex narrates how he brings two ten-years-old girls home after buying a Beethoven record at the record store. When they get home, Alex plays the girls’ little records, which he describes as pathetic pop music (Burgess, 2013, p. 51). After drugging and getting the girls drunk, he sexually abuses them. The scene reads as it follows:

> There it was then, the bass strings like *govoreeting* [speaking] away from under my bed at the rest of the orchestra, and then the male human *goloss* [voice] coming in and telling them all to be joyful, and then the lovely blissful tune all about Joy being a glorious spark like of heaven, and then I felt the old tigers leap in me and then I leapt on these two young *ptitsas* [women] (Burgess, 2013, p. 52).

Again, this example shows the sexuality and emotional degree to which Alex perceives music. The emotional highness is such that he is elevated to a sexual level and somehow the music is what leads him to his cruel actions.

This series of examples also lead the discussion to another focus. Alex does not perceive the beauty in the music as other people do. He perceives the beauty in the violence that the music reflects. As an example of this, we can look again at the scene with the singer at the bar. Alex specifically finds beauty in it because he knows what she was singing. He is referring to the content of the opera, to the lyrics and the story. He says it is about "the bit where she's snuffing it with her throat cut" (Burgess, 2013, p. 33). In the fragment where he masturbates to sound of the music, right after doing so Alex thinks about F. Alexander and his wife, which he has raped, and says he wishes he had hit them both harder and even killed them (Burgess, 2013, p. 40). Also, in the example of the rape to the little girls, he is decided to do so, but is finally encouraged by the sound of the music. Even more, after finishing abusing of the girls he sits back and enjoys the Ninth Symphony once again. Therefore, it can be argued that he is mostly excited about the violence he finds in the music that in the music itself.

Finally, and to reinforce this point, Alex hates pop music. It might be simply because of his musical taste, but it would make sense to say that this type of music does not transmit to him the same violent emotions that classical music does. Also, later in the novel when Alex is in prison, he has a nightmare involving music. He dreams he is in an orchestra directed by a conductor described as a mixture of Handle and Beethoven. Alex says he is playing a flute-like instrument which has grown of his body. When he blows it, it makes him tickle and as he laughs the conductor gets mad at him. In that dream can be seen that relation between music and violence that Alex has created in his own mind.

It could be argued that if Alex perceives beauty in the violence of music then Nadsat is not as dual or versatile as it has been proposed. In other words, if Nadsat is used for violence and the music is violent, then Nadsat loses its duality. Nevertheless, I personally

think that it is a question of perception and what Alex really considers violent. As it was said with Nadsat, it is complicated to assume that Nadsat itself is violent and it might be considered that Alex is the violent one. With music, the same happens. It cannot be presumed that something as subjective as music itself is violent, and thus, even if Alex enjoys the violence he perceives in music, he is still using Nadsat to transmit the beauty of it. . In other words, when Alex perceives violence in music, he translates it into a message of beauty of delight. That in itself makes Nadsat a rather versatile language

How come then, if music is not considered violent, it makes Alex sick after the treatment? From my perspective, it relates to the method of association that Burgess proposes for Ludovico's Technique. It is not that the music itself is violent and it makes Alex feel sick. It is the association he makes between the music and the violence that makes him feel bad. In some way that also works for Nadsat and violence. Nadsat might not be violent per se. If it were, it would make Alex feel sick. But instead, it is Alex who uses it to convey violence making the person the violent one. That links to the discussion in the previous section, which leads it a step forward to the conclusion on whether Nadsat should be considered violent or not.

5. OTHER INSTANCES OF VIOLENCE

> ‘I won't say one single solitary *slovo* [word] unless I have my lawyer here. I know the law, you bastards.’
>
> ‘Righty right, boys, we'll start off by showing him that we know the law, too, but that knowing the law isn't everything.’ (Burgess, 2013, p. 76)

The first third of the novel is a crystal-clear depiction of Alex’s ability for violence. On it, Alex and his gang indirectly confront this Dystopic world, which might be the most probable cause of Alex’s violence and absence of morality (obviously excluding any psychological traits from the equation). Alex is shown to be against the established system, which other people dare to criticise, but none other really confront in a serious manner. On this first third, it is just Alex being himself and none opposing it. That is until he is betrayed by his band and right away caught.

Alex first virtual confrontation with the system is when he is shown talking with P. R. Deltoid, his Post-Corrective Adviser. After the fight with Billyboy and his gang, P. R. Deltoid comes to talk to Alex as someone has mentioned the boy’s name. They do not have anything liable to frame him, but still, they suspect of him and his *droogs* and Deltoid knows well that Alex is not innocent. Deltoid quickly says, “next time, as you very well know, it's not going to be the corrective school anymore. Next time it's going to be the barry place and all my work ruined” (Burgess, 2013, p. 44). That in itself is a threat to Alex. Within a normal person’s speech, it is contained both a threat and a euphemism. Deltoid refers to the prison as the “barry place“ which might be conceived

as a provocative euphemism as Deltoid is not trying to protect Alex in any way, instead he is trying to scare him out of it through the use of language.

Alex's actual first encounter with violence, which has not been committed by him in any way, is in the police station. That is the quotation used as the heading of the section. Alex mentions his first moments there as he hears police officers beating some other inmate. He even mentions how they are hitting the person so hard he can even hear "the *zvook* [sound] of like somebody being *tolchocked* [hit] real *horrorshow* [well]" (Burgess, 2013, p. 75). After that, when the officers finally take him to another room to question him, he says he wants a lawyer and that he knows the law. One of the policemen responds saying "Righty right, boys, we'll start off by showing him that we know the law, too, but that knowing the law isn't everything" (Burgess, 2013, p. 76) in what is described as a standard, even formal English. The sentence "we know the law, too" can be said to be working as a device of verbal irony. It is not a statement on whether both officers have learnt the penal code before or not, it is implying that they both know they have the power to beat him and not be sanctioned for it. Right after saying that, the other officer in the room punches Alex in the stomach and they both laugh at the sight of Alex leaned against the now bloody wall.

These two scenes of the book are quite significative for the idea of violence and language. It has been assumed that Nadsat is violent just because Alex is violent. But these two fragments show different people committing violence using English. In fact, those sections are narrated by Alex, thus appearing in the novel descripted through Nadsat, but the characters in them do not use that language at all. Therefore, it can be said that violence appears in language no matter what. In fact, violence in language appear almost in the same way as Nadsat.

As it has been stablished before, the main way in which Nadsat becomes violent is through its function as a euphemism. This device is used to disguise and mislead people as well as Alex himself. In standard English, euphemism can also appear as violent devices. Examples of this use can be found during Alex's treatment while in prison. Most of the times, doctors and nurses will not tell Alex what they are doing, why they are doing it for, or what is the treatment expected to do to Alex. Instead, they rely on euphemism and such to manipulate Alex into thinking something completely different. For instance, on the second session of the treatment, Alex feels sick during and after the treatment and he is told he will have to do it again. The doctor then explains how "violence is a very horrible thing" and that "that's what [Alex's body is] learning now". The doctor then says, "you felt ill this afternoon, … because you're getting better" (Burgess, 2013, p. 119). This whole explanation works as a euphemism for what they are actually doing to him. The idea that Alex's body is learning is nothing but an underhand euphemism of the fact that they are conditioning Alex, reprogramming his brain into associating violence to the sickness. But they do not say so because it would affect Alex's opinion of it.

Another common case of violence in normal speech is the use of devices which involve the use of verbal irony, such as sarcasm. This type of tool usually works by misrepresenting reality and denoting bad implications towards the receiver of such. One example sarcasm in the novel is one of the policemen of the police station saying, "Show him to his bridal suite" (Burgess, 2013, p. 81) whilst directing Alex to his cell. As it is his first night there, the sarcasm is in the incongruity of associating a cell to a bridal suite as a reference to a just-married couple. Instead, Alex is shown a small, crammed cell.

As it has been said, misleading can be considered violence in speech. It can be achieved as well through a play of words by mocking another person's original utterance.

For instance, in the novel Alex constantly uses the word *horrorshow* to attribute a positive aspect of a thing, in other words, it is a synonym of great. When he is starting the Ludovico Technique treatment, Alex is told that he will have to watch a movie and he responds, "This must be a real *horrorshow* film if you're so keen on my *viddying* it". The nurse who is carrying him with his wheelchair responds, "*Horrorshow* is right, friend. A real show of horrors" (Burgess, 2013, p. 112). The violence in this segment is in the fact that Alex does not know yet why he is being made watch all these movies which will actually make him suffer. Through the rearranging of the words of his sentence, the nurse is mocking Alex and his current situation, and therefore, his inability to act otherwise.

Violence can be found much more directly as in insults. Perhaps when the guard says to Alex, “answer you filthy young swine” (Burgess, 2013, p. 101). But also, in much more subtle ways as it is religious speech. Even if not the entirety of religious speech is based on these premises, many Biblical verses and the subsequent speeches made about them focus on the idea of eternal suffering as a punishment for sin which can be interpreted as a threat in language. An example of this sort of subtle violence in the novel is the chaplains sermon where he asks the crowd of prisoners whether they will reform or not. He asks if they “are going to attend to the Divine Word and realize the punishments that await the unrepentant sinner in the next world, as well as in this”, describing hell as:

> A place, darker than any prison, hotter than any flame of human fire, where souls of unrepentant criminal sinners like yourselves … scream in endless and intolerable agony, … their skin peeling and rotting, a fireball spinning in their screaming guts. (Burgess, 2013, p. 89)

Despite this not being a direct threat made to the inmates, this religious speech has those same violent connotations of endless suffering as this punishment, that have been

mentioned before. Still religion is not considered violent as a whole nor it is considered as having a violent language.

That brings us to a final idea. The fact that there is violence in language does not make language as a whole unit violent. That same principle can be translated into Nadsat. The fact that Nadsat is used for violence does not make it any more violent than any other language. If it was so, then it could be argued that since English uses the same devices for violence as Nadsat, then English would be a violent language. Nevertheless, an idea that should be kept in mind is the fact that the human species is the one in power to exert their ability to be violent. I will not go in much depth, but it might be that violent is inherent to humans after all and that some of us are more willing than others to include it in our actions, and even in our tool for communicating. In any case, it still prevails the idea that a language should not be a bearer of such adjectives as violent, and it should be the user of it the one fit to do so. In the context of the novel, Nadsat can be interpreted as not bearing any violent intentions from the start, but as it is Alex who uses it for its violent purposes, the language contains many harmful devices that make it look violent.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Through this dissertation there have been presented several ideas that relate to the relationship that language and violence have both in a normal language and in the language of the novel, Nadsat.

It has been concluded that language as a unit can be considered to have a close relation to violence. As it has been showed, if violence is conceived as the idea of using force as a tool for a human purpose, then it can appear in language in different forms and situations. A common example of this are insults or lies used to offend or mislead, but other examples of violence appearing in language can be the use of euphemisms, dysphemisms, and verbal irony such as sarcasm.

Parting from this theoretical framework, it was first proposed that Nadsat is the means through which Alex describes violence in the novel. It does so by employing the use of euphemism and dysphemism to mask or show that violence at pleasure. For instance, the use of the words '*droogs'* or '*tolchock'* as euphemisms for gang members or hitting somebody to adequate the language to the violent setting. Through that proposition one could understand that Nadsat is a violent language, but the fact is that the language that Alex employs manages to work on a whole new level. As it was discussed with Doublethink in Orwell's *Nineteen-Eighty-Four*, Nadsat manages to shape Alex's reality into omitting the effects or consequences of his own violence. In other words, he is never conscious of his violent actions.

Then, it has been also proposed that Nadsat works as a dual device as Alex uses Nadsat both for violence, and for beauty as well. That is so as Alex finds classical music delightful and uses Nadsat to convey that beauty and bliss he feels whilst listening to it. In addition, it has been discussed that Alex's fascination with music comes from the

violence that he associates with it. That association of music with violence can be compared to the one made between language as violence, since both are subjective topics and might not be able to bear the characteristic of being violent.

Finally, it has been looked at the violence appearing in the standard English of the novel. That has been done since Alex is not the only character who performs violent acts throughout the narrative, and those other people do it with English as its device for their cruelty. In order to achieve this, English employs the same devices as Nadsat, including euphemisms and verbal irony such as sarcasm. From this last part of the dissertation it can be inferred that since both English and Nadsat use the same devices for violence and people only attribute that violent nature to Nadsat, it might be that Nadsat is not violent after all and the harsh nature in that discourse comes from the people perpetrating it. That is to say that humans have the possibility and ability to be violent, and language and communication is only one of the means through which we can do it.

REFERENCES.

Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (1993). Euphemism and Dysphemism: Language Used as Shield and Weapon. *Language*, 69(2). https://doi.org/10.2307/416552

Amis, K. (2012, May 13). *From the Observer archive, 13 May 1962*: *A Clockwork Orange reviewed*. The Guardian. Retrieved June 1, 2022, from https://www.theguardian.com/news/2012/may/13/kingsley-amis-a-clockwork-orange-review

Amis, M. (2013). Forewords. In A. Biswell (Ed.), *A Clockwork Orange* (Restored Edition, pp. vii–xiv). Penguin Books.

Baker, L. A. (2000, November 30). Critical Concepts: Verbal Irony. Critical Concepts. Retrieved May 23, 2022, from https://www.k-state.edu/english/baker/english320/cc-verbal_irony.htm#:%7E:text=Verbal%20irony%20is%20a%20figure,meaning%20of%20what%20he%20says.

Berkes, J. (2000). *Language in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1984). Jem Berkes. Retrieved May 17, 2022, from https://berkes.ca/archive/berkes_1984_language.html

Biswell, A. (2013). Introduction. In A. Biswell (Ed.), *A Clockwork Orange* (Restored Edition, pp. xv–xxxi). Penguin Books.

Brooks, J. (1962, May 13). A Bedsitter in Dublin. Sunday Times, 32.

Burgess, A. (2011). *A Clockwork Orange* (M. Rawlinson, Ed.; Reprint Edition). W. W. Norton.

Burgess, A. (2013). *A Clockwork Orange* (A. Biswell, Ed.; Restored Edition). Penguin Books.

Burgess, Anthony. 1985. London: Hutchinson, 1978.

Cambridge Dictionary. (2022, May 11). E*uphemism*. Retrieved May 16, 2022, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/es/diccionario/ingles/euphemism

Collins Dictionaries. (2022, May 16). *Euphemism*| Diccionario Inglés Collins. Retrieved May 16, 2022, from https://www.collinsdictionary.com/es/diccionario/ingles/euphemism

Dalrymple, T. (2022, January 6). *A Prophetic and Violent Masterpiece*. City Journal. Retrieved June 1, 2022, from https://www.city-journal.org/html/prophetic-and-violent-masterpiece-12926.html

Dictionary.com. (n.d.). *Definition of Euphemism*. Www.Dictionary.Com. Retrieved May 16, 2022, from https://www.dictionary.com/browse/euphemism

Dictionary.com. (n.d.-a). Definition of Irony. Www.Dictionary.Com. Retrieved May 23, 2022, from https://www.dictionary.com/browse/irony

Dictionary.com. (n.d.-b). Definition of verbal irony. Www.Dictionary.Com. Retrieved May 23, 2022, from https://www.dictionary.com/browse/verbal-irony

Dix, C. M. (1972). *Anthony Burgess (Writers and Their Work)*. Liverpool University Press.

Duda, B. (2011). Euphemisms and dysphemism: in search of a boundary line. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a La Comunicación*, 45(0). https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_clac.2011.v45.1

International Anthony Burgess Foundation. (2022, February 8). *A brief life*. Retrieved February 24, 2022, from https://www.anthonyburgess.org/burgess-a-brief-life/

Johns, D., & DellaSala, D. A. (2017). Caring, killing, euphemism and George Orwell: How language choice undercuts our mission. *Biological Conservation*, 211, 174–176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.03.030

Kubrick, S. (Director). (1971). *A Clockwork Orange* [Film]. Polaris Productions.

Lemke, J. L. (n.d.). *Violence and Language: The Sing the Hurts*. University of Columbia: Special Section Violence. Retrieved May 14, 2022, from http://www.columbia.edu/cu/21stC/issue-1.2/Language.htm

Lewis, R. (2014). *Anthony Burgess: A Biography*. Thomas Dunne Books.

Litman-Navarro, K. (2019, July 2). *Wittgenstein on Whether Speech Is Violence*. JSTOR Daily. Retrieved May 14, 2022, from https://daily.jstor.org/wittgenstein-whether-speech-violence/

Maden, J. (2019, May). *How the Languages We Speak Shape Our Realities*. Philosophy Break. Retrieved May 16, 2022, from https://philosophybreak.com/articles/language-shapes-reality/

Malewitz, R. (2022, April 1). What is Irony? | Definition & Examples. College of Liberal Arts. Retrieved May 23, 2022, from https://liberalarts.oregonstate.edu/wlf/what-irony#:%7E:text=The%20three%20most%20common%20kinds,or%20what%20the%20situation%20requires.

Modern Library. (n.d.). *100 Best Novels*. Retrieved June 1, 2022, from https://www.modernlibrary.com/top-100/100-best-novels/

Moya, S. (2011). *A Clockwork Orange: The Intersection Between a Dystopia and Human Nature*. The University of New Mexico. https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/best_student_essays/1/?utm_source=digitalrepository.unm.edu%2Fbest_student_essays%2F1&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages

Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen-Eighty-Four*. Planet eBook. https://www.planetebook.com/1984/

Pratt, M. R. (2011, March 21). *Violence and Language – Social Text*. Social Text Online. Retrieved May 14, 2022, from https://socialtextjournal.org/periscope_article/violence_and_language_-_mary_louise_pratt/#:%7E:text=When%20people%20describe%20linguistically%20inflicted,of%20language%20to%20inflict%20harm.

The Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary. (n.d.-a). *Dysphemism*. Retrieved May 16, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dysphemism#:%7E:text=Definition%20of%20dysphemism,also%20%3A%20an%20expression%20so%20substituted

The Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary. (n.d.-b). *Euphemism*. Retrieved May 16, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/euphemism

The Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary. (n.d.-c). *Language*. Retrieved May 16, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/language

The Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary. (n.d.-d). *Sarcasm*. Retrieved May 16, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/sarcasm

The Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary. (n.d.-e). *Violence*. Retrieved May 16, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/violence

Time. (2005, October 16). Is Full List one of the All-TIME 100 Best Novels? TIME.Com. Retrieved June 1, 2022, from https://entertainment.time.com/2005/10/16/all-time-100-novels/slide/all/