

Beyond Nadsat:

The Many Invented Languages of Anthony Burgess¹⁴

JIM CLARKE

DOI: [10.53720/LULB8005](https://doi.org/10.53720/LULB8005)

Anthony Burgess is best-known for his 1962 novella, A Clockwork Orange, which is famously written in Nadsat, the invented language of the protagonist Alex and his gang of droogs. Burgess's invention of Nadsat has gone on to inspire the proliferation of invented languages in fiction, especially in Science Fiction. Just as Burgess's other fictions are less well-known, however, so too are his other forays into invented literary languages. Burgess spent almost the entirety of his career exploring the parameters of invented language in his fiction, and this article aims to describe and taxonomise these many linguistic inventions.

INTRODUCTION

Nadsat is Anthony Burgess's best-known invented language, just as Elvish is J. R. R. Tolkien's. But Tolkien did not only invent Elvish, nor indeed only one version of Elvish. Indeed, he created multiple Elvish variants, and a whole raft of other invented languages besides. What is less well-known is that so did Anthony Burgess. This article seeks to explore Burgess's *other* encounters with invented languages.

There is no clear scholarly consensus on the identification of what an invented language is. Even the terminology shifts from context to context,

¹⁴ Special thanks are due to M. Yves Buelens for his immeasurable assistance, and to the International Anthony Burgess Foundation for hosting my visits to their archives.

and scholar to scholar. The vast majority of constructed languages, that is, languages which are consciously devised rather than arising organically via the development of human communication, are created for either aesthetic or philosophical purposes, to assist in computer programming or machine learning, or to facilitate experimentation in cognitive or linguistic science. These attract a range of specific terms, such as artificial languages, planned languages, or conlangs (an abbreviation of constructed language). In the field of literature, we are dealing with the subset known as art languages or fictional languages. These are languages which exist primarily or entirely for the purpose of conveying an artistic vision, usually fantastical, and are most commonly found in fantastical sub-genres, such as science fiction or high fantasy literature. However, this article intends to demonstrate, via close examination of the novels of Anthony Burgess, that linguistic invention need not be solely restricted to such fantastical silos.

Art languages are most commonly associated with J. R. R. Tolkien. In his famous essay *A Secret Vice* (2016), he explained how his fictional world of Middle Earth developed out of his obsessive interest in inventing languages. The extensive invented linguistic sub-structure in Tolkien's mythos was the product of what he termed *glossopoeia*, deriving from *mythopoeia*. He extensively theorised, alongside the mythopoeic methodologies he described in "On Fairy Stories," this glossopoeic practice as his chosen method of story-telling, or myth-making (Fimi and Higgins 10). For Tolkien, this practice of inventing languages began in childhood and was a lifelong hobby which inspired his creative work. For Anthony Burgess, himself a polyglot and philologist, it arguably began with the creation of *A Clockwork Orange*, though there are hints and precursors in the macaronic *mélange* of languages found in the *Malayan Trilogy* (1956–1959).

There is a clear distinction between the Tolkienian practice of fully inventing languages, which are then judiciously inserted into a creative text, and Burgess's creation of Nadsat, which functions as a pervasive lexical superimposition upon a grammatical basis of standard English (Vincent and Clarke 249–254). A wide range of modes of linguistic invention exist in literature, from fully functioning Tolkienian languages to mere allusions as to the existence of an invented language. This article aims to identify the varying forms which Burgess's other invented languages take.

Most writers who have engaged with glossopoeic creativity have not taken it to the extremes of Tolkien, whose totalising approach finds its lineage primarily among communities of Conlangers, who aim to invent fully functioning languages for fun or for philosophical inquiry. One exception is Suzette Haden Elgin, who developed the invented feminist language Láadan out of her novel *Native Tongue* (1984). Instead, most writers who invent languages tend to be minimalist in two modes. Firstly, they tend not to create full languages but instead offer only fragments and hints, or alternatively, for the benefit of the reader, they base their “language” on a new lexicon while retaining the basic syntactic structure of English or another existing organic language. As Yaguello notes, “the modern science-fiction novels which contain a fully worked-out original language are few and far between” (56). To present a science fiction novel (henceforth SF), or any other text, entirely in a constructed language would obviously not be conducive to reader comprehension. Burgess, a trained philologist, was well aware of this, hence Nadsat accounts for barely 6.5% of the total text of *A Clockwork Orange* (Vincent and Clarke 256) with the remainder delivered in various forms of standard English.

Most linguistic invention in literature takes place within the genre of SF, with a further large sub-set occurring in the related sub-genre of Fantasy fiction. Indeed, SF is replete with invented art languages, often attributed to sentient alien cultures, but also occasionally located in extrapolated terrestrial futures, since the estranging quiddities of sentient aliens, artificial intelligence, or future existence presuppose significant shifts from our existing languages and modes of communication. Additionally, the emphasis on language invention in SF as a means to express aspects of speculative philosophy, as in Elgin’s novel, has its origins at the dawn of Utopian literature, in the invented language and script created for Thomas More’s *Utopia* by the book’s dedicatee (and a character therein), Pieter Gillis. Equally, following Tolkien’s lead, linguistic invention in Fantasy literature has become a regular component of fantastical worldbuilding or sub-creation.

Therefore, we must look to SF studies to find the most fully developed taxonomy of invented languages in literature. Ria Cheyne examined how invented languages in SF function in terms of reader reception. Though largely focused on languages attributed to alien civilisations, Cheyne's taxonomy is useful, because it attempts to examine the totality of invented languages which feature in SF, no matter how fragmentary they appear or how they manifest in the text. For Cheyne, "a science-fictional created language exists and is complete in the totality of information given about the language in the text (or texts) in which it appears" (390). This does not mean that constructed language development outside of the text, for example, in Tolkien's notebooks, or fiction by fans, is irrelevant. Cheyne is rather saying that we can adequately address the nature of an invented language by way of examining what we are given of it, in its in-text manifestation. This suggests a stylistic approach to invented languages. Based on this approach, Cheyne gives us nine possible forms:

1. Utterances in, or purported to be in, the created language.
2. Translated utterances from the created language.
3. Information about how a word or phrase from the language was translated.
4. Subjective impressions of the created language's sound, or shape in the case of written languages.
5. Information about how the sounds in a particular language are to be pronounced.
6. Phonemic information.
7. Information about grammatical structure.
8. A glossary of terms from the language.
9. Descriptions or discussions of other properties of the language, or of notable features within the language. (391)

This refocuses attention beyond the mere alien utterance; Cheyne emphasises rather "how created languages consist of more than simply the words in the language: the examination of neologisms alone does not fully address the created language" (391–392). We can see how Cheyne's model might

apply to *A Clockwork Orange*. There is the Nadsat uttered by Alex and the droogs (1); and both in in-text contextualisations by Alex or others we get explanations if not full translations of Nadsat terms (2); Dr Branom speculatively defines the characteristics of Nadsat (9); and in many instances commencing with Stanley Edgar Hyman in the 1963 Norton edition of *A Clockwork Orange*, we find the publication of a glossary accompanying the text (8), though this was against Burgess's own wishes. *A Clockwork Orange* is an SF novel, and Nadsat is, therefore, an invented SF language by Cheyne's taxonomy, qualifying on multiple criteria.

But can this schema be usefully applied to texts outside of the SF genre? Burgess is a valuable case study to test the hypothesis. He was not primarily an SF author, yet invented languages appear in many of his notably non-SF texts. Cheyne's focus on the reader reception of invented language allows for an expansion beyond the kind of fully-developed functioning languages developed by Tolkien, which are otherwise rare in literature.

Burgess might be thought of as more of a dabbler in invented literary languages than a fully-committed glossopoeiac. However, he consistently introduced elements of linguistic invention into his work throughout a lengthy career in fiction, and was even at one point commissioned to invent a language for a screenplay. Initially, however, Burgess's foray into linguistic invention with Nadsat was anomalous. The other novels he allegedly wrote during his infamous "death sentence" year do not feature any invented languages, with the exception of his other great dystopian novel, *The Wanting Seed*, which depicts a Malthusian future Britain oscillating politically between authoritarianism and excessive liberalism. As a result of the population crisis and the concomitant increased demand for food and goods, there is a shortage of paper, hence readers have to deal with phonetically truncated texts in a pre-digital era. This is illustrated in the novel when a commuter is seen reading a book entitled *Dh Wks v Wlm Shkspr* (Burgess, *The Wanting Seed* 76). This spavined reduction of a title synecdochally suggests how literature itself has been debased linguistically in the dystopia Burgess created in *The Wanting Seed*.

This is a linguistic as well as cultural diminution of quintessential literary English. It goes beyond the bowdlerisation and simplification work done by Charles and Mary Lamb, for example. Indeed, it fulfils two of Ria

BEYOND NADSAT

Cheyne's criteria for a created language in its sole appearance—we get phonemic information (her point 6), in that the phonemes have been replicated in truncated presentation; and we get a description of properties and features of the language (Cheyne's point 9), implicit in the minimalist quality of English intended to reduce length and hence paper.

One might cavil that an unorthodox representation of English is, nonetheless, still English and hence not an invented language. This opens up an interesting debate about the extent to which Nadsat is also English, or indeed whether James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* (1939) is a novel written in English. If we accept that *Finnegans Wake* is Anglophone literature, despite its extensive multilingual punning lexis and elaborate morphological creativity, then obviously so is Nadsat with its dual sources of lexis and minor morphological amendments. However, neither case is an instance of orthodox use of English, and both require some intellectual exertions on the part of the reader beyond mere knowledge of English to fully comprehend them.

Bettina Beinhoff, in responding to Cheyne, notes that if we, like Cheyne, define an artificial language as “a deliberate construct designed at a particular time for a particular purpose”, then “technically any language which has been (re)constructed is a conlang” (5), or constructed language. This, therefore, applies to Burgess's reconstructed English in *The Wanting Seed*. Perhaps then, we can expand our understanding of invented literary languages to encompass the concept of invented literary dialects also. In that case, we can then account for Nadsat and Wakese as linguistic inventions that function not as invented languages but rather as invented dialects or grammatical variants of English. Certainly, Nadsat is demonstrably an idiolect, the endpoint of dialect, in that *A Clockwork Orange* is narrated solely in his voice. In Cheyne's schema (and Beinhoff's gloss), I will argue that the many creative variants of English invented by Anthony Burgess, including Nadsat, all qualify as invented languages, or dialects thereof.

MOCK-ELIZABETHAN

Burgess's fiction abounds in linguistic invention. Following Nadsat, Burgess's next extensive experiment occurs in *Nothing Like the Sun* (1964), which is written in an utterly convincing attempt to replicate the Elizabethan

English of Shakespeare's day. Burgess took enormous care to avoid any lexical anachronism in the text, including only one word, "spurgeon," which did not exist in Shakespeare's time as a sly tribute to Caroline Spurgeon, the Shakespearean scholar. The text is an invented language due to its form rather than lexical content, however. It attempts to execute a modern prose narrative in a form of English current four centuries previously. It is fundamentally anachronistic in this respect due to the disconnect between the lexis and the genre, and hence structurally dissimilar to actual Elizabethan prose such as might be found in prose pamphlets, like Thomas Nashe's *Pierce Penniless* (1592). Rather, it is a modern novel in structure, characterisation, and pacing, delivered through the linguistic medium of a reproduction of early Modern English.

It could be a clever fake except it does not purport to be a genuine Elizabethan (or Jacobean) narrative. Instead, it is, like Nadsat, an invented literary dialect. Writing of Walter Scott, Burgess once described such contrivedly archaic forms as "Wardour Street English," named after a street in London famed for shops selling fake antiques (Burgess, Introduction 9–10). But this does a disservice to Scott's historical novels and to Burgess's achievement in *Nothing Like the Sun*. In both instances, the inventive purpose is not to fool the reader into thinking they are reading a genuinely archaic text, but to instead generate a sense of immersive diachronic distance via language, akin to the distance generated between reader and Alex by Nadsat. *Nothing Like the Sun* is, therefore, a modernist novel written in a plausible mimicry of Elizabethan voice.

Burgess slyly acknowledges this sleight of hand to attentive readers, as his narrative is actually a nested one, located within a frame in which a lecturer in Malaya, a metafictional "Mr Burgess," is telling students in his farewell class the story of Shakespeare while becoming progressively drunker on rice spirit (*You've Had Your Time* 80). The frame is not only metafictional but implausible—who could lecture in perfect Elizabethan, after all? Furthermore, the narrative is no less lengthy than those of Conrad's Captain Charles Marlow, who purportedly tells the entirety of *Heart of Darkness* in a single evening. A sample paragraph will give a sense of how effective Burgess's mock-Elizabethan is:

BEYOND NADSAT

January 13th

So cold and kibey a day that I laugh in scorn of our trade that we represent midsummer, all leafy and flowery. She has kept indoors, her house all muffled up with shutters as it too feels the cold. I am sick of these sugar rhymes. I dream after dinner (a drowsy one of fat pork and a pudding) that I am ass-headed Bottom in the bower of a tiny golden Titania. Thou art as wise as thou art beautiful. The mirror shows bad teeth and beard fast greying, a wormy skin. Old dad. (Burgess, *Nothing Like the Sun* 146)

The Elizabethanisms are self-evident: archaic adjectives, like “kibey,” and pronouns, like “thou,” catch the eye of modern readers due to their contemporary unusualness. Nevertheless, this is utterly unlike any prose actually written in Elizabethan times. It is 1960s English prose with an Elizabethan veneer. It has standardised spelling, and critically, a modern sensibility towards characterisation and plot. It is additionally a novel, a literary genre dating from the eighteenth century rather than the Elizabethan era. In the passage above, a diary section, the narrative voice in first person moves from descriptive mode to personal, to oneiric, then back to prosaic reality. This is not merely poignant, but also a very modern (and modernist) narratology for all the antiquated setting and language. When we recall that this diary entry is purportedly part of a larger narrative which functions in both first and third person, with at times an omniscient narrator who, in fact, transpires to be a lecturer in a nested narrative, we can even see postmodernist complexities at work.

In practice, this is also how Burgess claimed the linguistic invention came about. In a 1973 interview, he told Charles Bunting that his intention was to avoid his “mock Elizabethan” from becoming “Wardour Street English”:

What I had to do ... was to try and teach myself the language and make it sound as though people meant it. It meant for a long time I was thinking in Elizabethan, using it in shops and in the home, and looking for a means of eventually seeing how far I could sit down and write it naturally. After a long

labour I was able to do this, I think, to some extent, although it is not completely Elizabethan English; it's rather Joycean. (qtd. in Ingersolls 79)

Though the suggestion that Burgess spoke in Elizabethan locution in shops sounds extremely fanciful, it is certainly true that the (re)construction of Shakespeare's language owes a debt to James Joyce, and specifically to his linguistic experimentation in *Finnegans Wake*. Additionally, it qualifies under Cheyne's first point in her schema for invented languages, as it purports to be Elizabethan English and illustrates Beinhoff's argument that (re)constructions are also invented languages. The inventive component herein relates to adapting the reconstructed lexis to a modern genre form.

Burgess was to replicate this particular linguistic experiment for one of his final novels, *A Dead Man in Deptford* (1993). Just as *Nothing Like the Sun* presents the life of Shakespeare, so does the latter novel the brief life of Christopher Marlowe, about whom Burgess had written his undergraduate thesis at the University of Manchester. A sample paragraph from Kit Marlowe's last supper scene gives a flavour of how Burgess's command of mock-Elizabethan has actually improved in the intervening decades since *Nothing Like the Sun*:

The Widow Bull herself brought in the crusted mound, her girl the trenchers and horn spoons not knives. It was, said the widow, stewed soft for them without teeth. But all had teeth and strong ones. They ate smokily, Frizer left his day-bed limping but limped not in his steady devouring. Good, he said, excellent good. Thou eatest but little, he said daringly to Kit. Thou drinkest overmuch of the wine. Eating and drinking should be nicely in equipoise. (Burgess, *A Dead Man in Deptford* 264)

The slight imbalance of tone found in *Nothing Like the Sun*, wherein he was prone to flights of sub-Shakespearean poesis in between more workaday sections is here elided. The archaisms here all function to serve the purpose of the narrative to render as (hyper)realistically as possible the life

of Christopher Marlowe. Burgess's Kit illustrates the principle espoused by Umberto Eco's *Faith in Fakes* (1973/1995) and Jean Baudrillard's *Simulacra and Simulation* (1981/1983), that the sufficiently developed fake can displace the real. His reconstructed Elizabethan reifies Marlowe in a manner that no sober biography ever could. Despite this, Burgess was obviously self-conscious of how effective his reprised language experiment had been, and especially whether it did serve its purpose of functioning as a fitting tribute to Marlowe.

The final paragraph of the novel sees a sudden switch in narrator. The text up until then has been narrated in the voice of "Jacke Wilson," a self-described "small actor and smaller play-botcher" and intermittent lover of Kit Marlowe. Jacke Wilson was a real Elizabethan actor, but functions also a sort of pseudonym for John Anthony Burgess Wilson. As with *Nothing Like the Sun*, Burgess has positioned himself as the narrator of an Elizabethan playwright's life from a spectator's point of view. On this occasion, though, somewhat like the unveiling of the Wizard of Oz, he shatters the illusion at the end of the novel:

Your true author speaks now, I that die these deaths, that feed this flame. I put off the ill-made disguise and, four hundred years after that death at Deptford, mourn as if it all happened yesterday. The disguise is ill-made not out of incompetence but of necessity, since the earnestness of the past, becomes the joke of the present, a once living language turned into the stiff archaism of puppets. Only the continuity of a name rides above a grumblng compromise. (Burgess, *A Dead Man in Deptford* 269)

Burgess here acknowledges the artifice of his mock-Elizabethan language even as he claims a kind of legitimacy for linking his own name to that of his namesake who worked alongside Marlowe. We are in murky though heartfelt metafictional waters here, but we can at least accept that Burgess himself viewed the Elizabethan veneer he placed over a contemporary novel to be a "grumblng compromise" between attempting, impossibly, to tell the story as the Elizabethans themselves might have, in the style perhaps

of a Nashe or Greene pamphlet, or alternatively taking the road of many other novelists (from Philip Lindsay's *One Dagger for Two* [1932] up to Allison Epstein's *A Tip for the Hangman* [2021]) by rendering the story of Marlowe in straight, contemporary English. Both *Nothing Like the Sun* and *A Dead Man in Deptford*, therefore, are examples of invented dialects, functioning as a kind of diachronous ventriloquism, impossibly channelling the language of Elizabethan England into the modern(ist) novel form.

ENDERBY'S STRINE

Burgess's second volume of the *Enderby* tetralogy features an extended sequence involving a much more overt invented slang. *Enderby Outside* was first published in 1968 as a sequel to his 1963 volume, *Inside Mr Enderby*, which featured the eponymous poet-recluse F. X. Enderby. On the run and suspected of murder, Enderby washes up in Morocco, where he encounters one Easy Walker, a man with an "accent and vernacular" described as "a sort of British colonial English" (Burgess, *Enderby Outside* 117). Walker, whose name may have been inspired by the release of an album of that title by jazz saxophonist Stanley Turrentine in 1966, later admits to being from "West Rothgar in New Sunderland. Fifty or so miles from the capital, boojie little rathole" (Burgess, *Enderby Outside* 118). There is no such place as New Sunderland, so Burgess herein invented not only slang but geography (Rothgar perhaps references the Danish king in *Beowulf*). Nevertheless, much of Walker's vernacular suggests a significant stratum of Strine, the accented demotic language of working-class Australia in the 60s.

Walker, who travels for a period with Enderby, speaks exclusively in a heavy and highly idiosyncratic slang, some of which is Strine, and some of which appears to derive from one of Burgess's favourite sources, Eric Partridge's dictionary of slang. "Strine" first achieved prominence as a cultural object in the mid-1960s, and Burgess may have been exposed to the work of Alistair Morrison, who wrote a series of humorous books on the topic. Douglas Milton's analysis of Easy Walker's slang remains to date the most extensive examination and offers extensive plausible explanations and definitions for most of Easy's utterances. As Milton explains: "Some of the idioms—as earthy and colourful as anything in Burgess—are true examples of Australian

or Strine, while others may be derived from Eric Partridge's *Slang Dictionary* ... but the majority would seem to be the delightful inventions of the man himself ... Burgess reviewed a dictionary of Australian slang round about the same time as he was working on *Enderby Outside*."

Nevertheless, some items of Walker's slang remain without etymology or even explanation, and Burgess may have extrapolated beyond Strine and Partridge to invent some items, just as he expanded beyond the confines of Russian and Partridge in the generation of Nadsat (Vincent and Clarke 255). Easy Walker's language functions much like Alex's Nadsat does, in that it is a superstructure of unusual words and phrases draped over a conventional English grammatical structure. As with Nadsat, it features creative morphology, humour, punning, and a range of other inventive forms, but it lacks the distinctive alienating quality of Nadsat, which was achieved by the superimposition of Russified lexis. Rather, Easy Walker's slang is a strongly opaque allusive form of English, drawing upon Strine and Partridge for some of its qualities while other components, though their broad gist may be discernible from the context, are the product of Burgess's linguistic creativity.

Terms like "sprids" or "jalooty" evaded Milton's attempts to uncover their etymological origins, and it is, therefore, highly speculative to suggest that "sprids" may derive from the Irish "sprid," meaning spirit, or that "jalooty" might be a typographical error for "jabooty," a homonym for Djibouti, and hence a very attenuated reference to the origins of the character Abu, who the term describes. Most of Easy's slang is identifiable either from Strine directly or else from some variant or other of rhyming slang. Easy speaks his own idiolect, in other words, and despite language existing primarily as a means of communication, he lacks the kind of droogs Alex possesses with whom he can engage in his anti-language. The opacity of Easy's slang, therefore, serves to isolate him from society rather than to bond him to others in opposition to it. This fact is not lost on the occasionally perceptive Enderby, who identifies it as "a home-stitched patchwork of patois" (Burgess, *Enderby Outside* 195). This patois, however, is constructed like Nadsat, as a combination of allusive components superimposed on a broadly English grammatical structure.

The early 1970s were somewhat of a golden era for Burgess in terms of language invention. Burgess's fiction began to transcend the novel as genre or form, and migrates beyond created dialects of English. In 1971, following a couple of years digesting the anthropological research of Claude Lévi-Strauss (Clarke, "Anthony Burgess's Structuralist Turn" 107–108), Burgess released one of his most curious and for many people perplexing novels, *MF*. As Clarke notes, "*MF*, despite its misleading brevity, is probably Burgess's most carefully considered work prior to the publication of *Earthly Powers*" (*The Aesthetics of Anthony Burgess* 132). Burgess's inspiration arose from a suggestion by the actor and producer, William Conrad, that someone should update the Oedipus myth (Burgess, *You've Had Your Time* 208). The conflation of myths as well as the structuralist form of the novel suggest that Lévi-Strauss was a major influence.

Both Lévi-Strauss's work and Sophocles' drama are interested in the unfolding of riddles and prophecies in the lived experiences of their subjects and audiences. Likewise, *MF* is predicated on the practice of riddles, and the reader is challenged throughout to puzzling out their meanings. Ultimately, it transpires that this is Burgess's point—his conclusion in *MF* is that meaning is inescapable. There can be no arbitrary relationship between cause and effect, nor between event and interpretation. One of the layers of riddles to be solved by *MF*'s readership is its stratum of invented language. Much of the novel is set on the fictional Caribbean island of Castita, and Burgess offers examples of the Castitan language in terms of fragmentary phrases and placenames. Castitan allegedly "derived from the Romance dialect spoken by the first settlers, who themselves had gone to settle on the Cantabrian coast from some nameless place in the Mediterranean" (*MF* 63). This renders a familiarity to many of the given fragments of Castitan while maintaining an unsettling alien quality. Castitan appears to be cognate with Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese, and may even be recognised by speakers of these languages, yet is clearly not any of them.

For example, the Castitan word for "festival" is "fista," clearly cognate not only with the Portuguese "festa" and Spanish "fiesta" but also with the English word. We see similar broad familiarities with other terms,

such as “senta” for “saint.” Toponyms, however, seem more unfamiliar due to the vowel choices in terms like “Strèta Rijal” (Royal or Regal Street) or “Dwumu” (Duomo, or cathedral). By the time we encounter the phrase “Todij cwéjstijonij” (“all the questions”), even readers familiar with Romance languages may find this occupying the limits of their frame of reference due to its unfamiliar orthography, even though its pronunciation does not deviate severely from Latinate linguistic norms.

MF's earliest critics extrapolated from Castita's similarities to Burgess's home at the time of writing the novel, Malta, and made the reasonable assumption that Castitan's unorthodox spelling was somehow related to Maltese. But the Maltese language is primarily derived from Arabic, despite its Latin alphabet. Eventually, the Maltese scholar Arnold Cassola identified Burgess's key inspiration in creating Castitan. As Cassola explained, “[t]he Castitan language is more closely related to the Italian language and to its Sicilian variants rather than to Maltese” (“Anthony Burgess's *MF*” 29). Drawing on Malta's close cultural relationship with its nearest neighbour, Burgess based Castitan on Sicilian. Cassola even quantified the extent of the Sicilian influence upon Castitan in a glossary (“*MF*: a glossary”). However, this does not mean that Castitan is disqualified as an invented language, any more than we would think to disqualify Nadsat due to the prominence of Russian lexis in its construction. Castitan is the language of Castita, inherently woven physically (via placenames) and culturally into the fabric of the island. And as Cassola and others have noted, Castita also bears a series of parallels with Malta, where Burgess lived while writing the novel. As Cassola explains, “[t]he island of Castita, with its language and customs, would not have been what it actually is in *MF* without the Siculo-Maltese influence” (“Anthony Burgess's *MF*” 31).

Burgess's Castitan, therefore, functions as another riddle in a book which is built upon the concept of riddling. It is not quite Sicilian, just as Castita is not quite Malta and not quite in the Caribbean (its given geolocation, in reality, is open water). *MF* borrows from Sophocles, Anglo-Saxon kennings and structuralism to make a cunningly simple point: nothing is arbitrary. Whether destined, or structured, or simply cleverly euphemised, patterns pervade everywhere, and in particular in art and language. It is the relocation

of Sicilian lexis to the Caribbean, and specifically to a fictional Malta relocated to the Caribbean, which renders Castitan an invented language.

PALEOLINGUISTICS

Burgess's interest in the Oedipus myth progressed further in 1972, when he was commissioned to produce a new translation of *Oedipus Tyrannos* by Sophocles for the Tyrone Guthrie theatre in Minneapolis. It is unsurprising to discover that he incorporated an invented language into his translation. Much of the singing and chanting in the play is conducted in what was referred to by Burgess and the production staff as "Indo-European," a paleolinguistic attempt to dig deep beyond even the roots of European literature represented by Sophocles. The International Anthony Burgess Foundation in Manchester preserves a file on the project which includes "an etymological dictionary," possibly not compiled by Burgess himself, and "draft lyrics for a sacrificial chant in reconstructed Indo-European" (Burgess, *Oedipus the King*, International Anthony Burgess Foundation Archives), though on Burgess's order these chants were not included in published versions of his translation.

According to Burgess's autobiography, *You've Had Your Time*, the idea to do this was that of the Guthrie's artistic director, Michael Langham:

Langham wanted the chorus to sing, not just recite, and had the idea of their singing in a language very remote, to suggest the antiquity of the legend. The remotest language possible was Indo-European (which Langham's typist rendered as "Indoor European"), and this meant dragging out of the more scholarly etymological dictionaries those hypothetical roots marked with an asterisk. (Burgess, *You've Had Your Time* 276)

Despite the clear intent to evoke a lost and hypothetical (hence invented) language, we may argue that these chants do not amount to an invented language at all. It is not possible to derive any semantic meaning from them. However, this experimentation was the basis for Burgess's later paleolinguistic creativity in relation to recreating Proto-Indo-European for Jean-Jacques Annaud's film, *Quest for Fire*.

BEYOND NADSAT

ITALISH AND ANGLIANO

Later in the 70s, Burgess became mildly obsessed with a local literary figure whose statue stood (and still stands) within a few hundred yards of his former home in Trastevere, Rome. The nineteenth-century sonneteer, Giuseppe Belli, is a marginal literary figure, but a curious one. By day a censor for the Vatican, involved in the banning of books, by night he wrote excoriating and often inflammatory sonnets in Romanesco, the street dialect of Rome.

Burgess was neither the first nor the last to translate Belli's work, though there are more than 3,000 extant sonnets in total, many on Biblical themes. Belli's sonnets have been translated into a range of Anglophone dialects, including Tyke (Yorkshire), Strine, and Mid-Ulster Hiberno-English (Clarke, "Dialect to Dialect Translation" 180–181). However, a volume of sonnets translated from nineteenth-century Roman dialect into twentieth-century Mancunian was not a viable publishing project for Burgess, so he prefaced the sonnets with a novella, entitled *ABBA ABBA*, which featured a fictional encounter between Belli and the English Romantic poet, John Keats, in the year of the latter's death.

From an invented language perspective, the sheer proliferation of dialect on display in such a short piece of writing is astounding. Belli's Romanesco poetry is present, as is Burgess's Mancunian translation thereof, though these are organic and not invented dialects. But as Arnold Cassola notes, the text is brimful of other forms of dialectal language, including Scots, French dialects and hybrids, and also what Cassola calls "Italish" and "Angliano"—two hybrid variants of English and Italian conflation which bear structural similarities to the Anglo-Russian of Nadsat ("The Role of Dialects" 220). For Cassola, "Burgess's viewpoint is clear: real, fictitious and semi-fictitious languages and dialects are to be considered on the same footing, and deserve the same degree of dignity" (222). The brief text of *ABBA ABBA*, in fact, teems with forms of language, only two of which are invented creoles based on Italian-English hybridity.

By the late 70s, Burgess had received a series of TV biblical commissions to write scripts for adaptations of firstly the Moses story and later the New Testament. In each case, he repurposed his research and writing for these various televisual commissions into novels, hence his work on *Jesus of Nazareth* was transformed into the novel *Man of Nazareth*, which is notably different to the screenplay and presumably closer to Burgess's own conception of Jesus.

There is an inevitable process of translation and interpretation, complicated in no small measure by theological and doctrinal concerns, when attempting to render an interpretation of the Bible. Indeed, the mere act of comprehending it led to the development of exegesis, the discipline which underpins literary criticism and a number of other critical hermeneutics. The Bible is a heterogenous set of works written over a lengthy period of time by many authors and in a range of ancient languages. There have been attempts, such as Mel Gibson's *The Passion of the Christ* (2004), to adapt Biblical narratives in the languages of the Biblical era. However, the process initiated by the Septuagint in the third century CE, of rendering the Bible into the contemporary language of believers (and by extension non-believers also) is much more common. *Jesus of Nazareth* was the Gospel stories transposed into the language of global television—English. Burgess, however, aspired to retain a slight flavour of the original in his own work.

The archives of the International Anthony Burgess Foundation contain documents which Burgess prepared for his work on *Man of Nazareth*, which feature an as yet unpublished invented language, a kind of fusion of English, Arabic, and Hebrew, again not structurally dissimilar to how Nadsat features Russian grafted onto English. Only three paragraphs from chapter one survive, beginning:

“Not thee, yeled,” they yelled. “We who have been catching samaki are going to be catching raguls now, and thou art a catcher only of evil-reek-ing smoke or aschan in the ria or lungs, and none of this, yedid, is for thee.” (Burgess, Fragment of *Man of Nazareth*)

This functions in terms of reader comprehension in the same way that Nadsat is rendered comprehensible to readers on first encounter. Terms are

embedded in contexts which suggest their meaning (e.g. “yeled,” meaning “boy” in Hebrew, as a dismissive form of address) or else are cleverly glossed by the speaker for the addressee, and by extension the reader, as with “aschan” defined as smoke, and “ria” as lungs. “Yedid,” meaning beloved, is obviously intended sarcastically. “Samaki,” an Arabic word meaning “fish,” and “raguls,” Arabic for men, are not immediately obvious, but as with *A Clockwork Orange*, one assumes Burgess intended for their meaning to become apparent through repetition and context. In any case, the meaning here is to evoke the line attributed to Jesus in Mark’s gospel (1:17): “Come, follow Me,” Jesus said, “and I will make you fishers of men.”

We find “Yeled” again in the sequel novel, *Kingdom of the Wicked*, which is broadly based on the Acts of the Apostles, and which derived from the work Burgess did on the script for *AD* in 1985, the sequel television series to *Jesus of Nazareth*. In a brief interlude between two servants discussing John the Baptist, Burgess depicts one who macaronically blends Hebrew and Arabic with Greek (English standing in for Greek in Burgess’s text). In lieu of excavating the actual Aramaic terms for these words, Burgess uses the related Semitic languages of Hebrew and Arabic somewhat interchangeably, as he did in his early drafts for *Man of Nazareth*. As he carefully embedded them just like Nadsat terms in *A Clockwork Orange* so that their meanings are discernible, it seems that Burgess was inclined to use Semitic terms with which he was already familiar, rather than seek to depict actual first century Aramaic. Here is the passage from *Kingdom of the Wicked*:

“The man that was supposed to have his rosch cut off.” She had the habit of mixing her nurse’s Aramaic into her Greek. “The one who used to catch dagim and then preached, the one with the white sakan,” stroking her pretty smooth chin.

“Speak plainly, child.” Her father was up on his elbow, looking at her fiercely.

“Well, they were all talking about it in the schuk, so old Miriam said, they knew the old yeled whose rosch was really cut off, some of them saw it after it was done, the rosch I mean, and said that’s old whatsisname. And the other one, he got away, and he’s alive in somebody’s cellar, there was a naarah

who saw him, she thought it was his ghost at first but it wasn't. There's been a bit of trickery, old Miriam said, and it's a king's job not to be tricked, she said. That's what I heard in the kitchen," Bernice said. (194)

In this section, "Rosh" or "rosch" is Hebrew for "head," "dagim" are "fish" in the sense of food, "sakan" is Arabic for "house," "schuk" or "souk" is Arabic for "market," while "naarah" is Hebrew for "girl." There is no attempt, as in Gibson's *The Passion of the Christ*, to reproduce the Aramaic of two millennia ago. Nor does Burgess attempt to repurpose the still extant Eastern Aramaic dialects for use. Instead, in both Biblical novel adaptations, he uses a combination of the two most prominent Semitic languages, Arabic and Hebrew, to give a linguistic flavour of the era, albeit one which is no more authentic than the English spoken by Robert Powell in Burgess's telescript. Burgess's biblical rewrite thus is a macaronic invented language, based on elements of Semitic organic languages, intended to suggest Biblical era Aramaic, just as the mock-Elizabethan aims to evoke sixteenth-century England in *Nothing Like the Sun*.

ORWELL AND THE WORKERS

In 1978, Burgess published a tribute to George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, entitled *1985*. This rather odd book is made up of a number of sections, including a dialogue between two aspects of Burgess himself. One section is a novella, an attempt by Burgess to update Orwell's dystopian vision to the 1970s. In it, Britain becomes Tucland, a failing state dominated by union leaders and the infiltration of Arab money. It is, therefore, very much the vision of an expatriate who had not lived in Britain for some time and was reliant upon newspaper reports for his perspective on the nation.

In this Burgessian version of Orwell's dystopia, we find a revisioning of Alex and his gang of droogs. Here, however, they are positive agents of subversive change rather than violent agents of chaos. Implausibly, they arrange underground classes in Latin to keep culture and education alive as civilisation collapses. Perhaps as a nod to the increasingly multicultural nature of 1970s Britain, Burgess calls them Kumina gangs, "kumi na" being

the Swahili equivalent to the English suffix “teen,” just as Nadsat is in Russian. These gangs speak in an in-group anti-language, using a macaronic mix of English and Arabic:

The kumina leader, black with an Aryan profile, pulled out a pack of Savuke Finns and said: “You want a cank?”

“Thanks, but I had to give it up.”

“You out of a job? Union mashaki? You antistate?”

“Yes yes yes.” (Burgess, 1985 133)

It has been suggested elsewhere that this slang was perhaps based on Hindi, but if “mashak,” the Hindi for “leather waterskin” or “mosquito,” was intended, this makes little obvious sense. Alternatively, the word more likely signifies the Arabic for furious—سكاشم, which is in keeping with the plot of the novel, which features an attempted Arabic Islamic overthrow of Britain. In a text purporting to be a reaction to Orwell’s dystopia, Burgess could not resist introducing a linguistic invention in response to Orwell’s famous invention of Newspeak.

In an appendix to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, entitled “The Principles of Newspeak,” Orwell explains the nature and purpose of his futuristic language. Newspeak is not merely “the official language of Oceania,” sitting alongside current English (known as “Oldspeak”) until it can replace it. It is a consciously invented language which “had been devised to meet the ideological needs of Ingsoc, or English Socialism” (Orwell 241).

Orwell’s linguistic vision for Airstrip One was based partly on the development of “Basic” English in the 1930s, a simplified version of English with a vocabulary of only 850 words. In 1930, C. K. Ogden had proposed Basic English as a global lingua franca, a project that surprisingly received strong support from Winston Churchill. But *Nineteen Eighty-Four* also draws upon ideas of linguistic relativity, especially the concept underpinning the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, that language can shape thought. The atomic physicist, Niels Bohr, once stated that “[w]e are suspended in language” (qtd. in Hayles 52), and the ideas of Benjamin Whorf, which derived in part from his teacher Edward Sapir, are an extension of Bohr’s conceit that we cannot psychologically or semantically escape the medium in which

we formulate our own thoughts. Orwell's dystopia attempts to circumscribe language in order to circumscribe what may or may not be thought.

As he writes, the purpose of Newspeak "was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc, but to make all other modes of thought impossible. It was intended that, when Newspeak had been adopted once and for all and Oldspeak forgotten, a heretical thought—that is, a thought diverging from the principles of Ingsoc—should be literally unthinkable, at least so far as thought is dependent on words" (Orwell 241).

In Burgess's dystopia by contrast, the oppressors are syndicalised unions rather than a totalitarian government, and Burgess opted for a class-based satirical language. "Worker's English," he tells us, "represents the rationalization of a general pattern of proletarian language" which was later "made compulsory as a subject and as a medium of instruction in State schools," and was based upon "the urban workers' speech of the Home Counties, with a few additions from the industrial Midlands and North-West" (Burgess, 1985 221). Burgess hereby aggrandises what is a satirical reverse of RP (received pronunciation) snobbery in class terms by grafting it to a satire of the process by which academics and state agents seek to paternalistically guide civilisational development. WE is supposedly "a rational kind of language, in which grammar should be simplified to the maximum and vocabulary should achieve the limitations appropriate to a non-humanistic highly industrialised society" (Burgess, 1985 221). It is denied that this is "part of a political programme" and instead is defended as "a social achievement with no political bias, with the two philologists concerned activated by a scientific desire for the reduction of entities and only secondary ambitions in the fields of class domination and pedagogic economy" (Burgess, 1985 221).

That final clause gives the game away. This is linguistics as class warfare. Burgess distinguishes this from the then nascent, now much more prevalent trend towards degendering pronouns in English by noting that "an attempt, in early pedagogic experiments with WE, to replace she and her with the invariable Lancashire oo (from Anglo-Saxon heo) was greeted, even in Lancashire industrial towns, with strong resistance" (Burgess, 1985 223). WE is not about correcting oppression in general; though it may pay token

tribute, it is neither feminist nor PC. It is a comic aggrandising of demotic working-class urban English, the tongue of Burgess's own youth.

WE is also scathingly anti-intellectual, no less so than Orwell's Newspeak: "WE is not concerned with the abstractions of philosophy or even science, though, for rhetorical purposes, an arbitrary sub-lexis of polysyllables of Latin or even Greek origin is available, whose lexicographical definition is regarded as otiose" (Burgess, *1985* 224–225). Burgess's WE is the institutionalisation of a form of debased demotic English, prone to statements of the obvious and mostly lacking in the facility to express abstract thinking. It is a highly dismissive perspective on the British working class, but by the time Burgess invented WE, he had long ceased to be part of that demographic himself.

For such a slight novella, *1985* is replete with a range of spoken and written Englishes, all of which reiterate Burgess's thesis that society is dumbing down, with the possible exception of his curious droog-students and their Arabic-inflected invented slang. Burgess often used dialect and accent as a shorthand for character differentiation in his fiction, such as the dubiously exaggerated Scots spoken by Bev's fellow prisoner on the train to Sussex: "Sae, ye dullyeart horse-punckin, ye'd hae it that the Laird's worrrd is kilted in a tippit?" he asks, implausibly, later adding "Ach, yon thieveless sook-the-blood. Ye scaut-heid reid-eeen'd knedneuch mawkin'-flee" (Burgess, *1985* 155).

More caustically, Bev's underage daughter Bessie, who is addicted to soft pornographic TV shows, watches "Spiro and Spero" (Latin for "I breathe" and "I hope" respectively), who transpire to be "a pair of cartoon dolphins who spoke English on the Chinese model: You Say He Not Come I Know He Come I Know He Come Soon" (Burgess, *1985* 111). Later, she sends him a postcard from the city of Ghadan (Arabic for "tomorrow"), where she has become part of the harem of an Arab sheikh, which reads "der dad i am alrit ere tely very gud i am ok luv besi" (Burgess, *1985* 216).

As in *A Clockwork Orange*, the prominence of one invented language operates to mask what is actually a rich and inventive linguistic topography. Whereas *A Clockwork Orange* featured three registers of English, as well as three different forms of teen slang, *1985* more perfunctorily features a range of linguistic creativity which seems either jaundiced, ill-considered, or simply intellectually derivative of his own work or Orwell's. By Cheyne's schema for

invented languages, both WE and the Kumina slang qualify. The degraded forms of English found in Bessie's poignant letter and the TV dolphin cartoon, though orthographically and grammatically distanced from standard English in creative ways, are, however, intended to convey the degradation of society and do not function as linguistic invention *per se*.

PALEOLINGUISTICS AND PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN

Burgess's most substantial foray into invented languages was, curiously, not created for a novel. Intended as a (re)creation of Proto-Indo-European, Ulam is a simplistic language with a slender grammar and limited lexis of terms, containing around 160 words in total, according to Andrew Biswell. In this sense, it can be considered as a more fully realised development of the chanting which Burgess had appended to his version of *Oedipus*.

Ulam was created for Jean-Jacques Annaud's 1981 movie adaptation of J.-H. Rosny's 1911 novel *La Guerre du Feu*. Annaud's 1981 film, entitled *Quest for Fire*, required its Paleolithic protagonists to act and speak like the first Europeans who occupied the continent some 80 millennia ago. Working in conjunction with Annaud, and with the zoologist Desmond Morris (the final version of Burgess's Ulam dictionary includes Morris's proposed accompanying gestures), Burgess was charged with generating their language. His preparatory papers are archived at the International Anthony Burgess Foundation.

In an interview with *Starlog* magazine, Annaud explained that

[w]e always wanted to create a new language for the film. But a friend at Fox suggested that we might as well go all the way and have one concocted that was as historically valid as possible. We went to Anthony Burgess. He's a linguist. He speaks 13 languages. Right about that time, we thought of coupling Burgess's work with that of Desmond Morris. We wanted our movie to be as authentic as possible. Since the film is fiction, however, we asked these two great minds to improvise for us. (qtd. in Naha 28)

Improvise they did. Burgess in particular, despite his stated reliance on etymological dictionaries, had to speculate not only what concepts would have been cognitively available to Paleolithic man, but also how they might organise those concepts and then depict them in oral form.

This was obviously a far from straightforward task. It is hypothetically possible to run the kind of linguistic changes over time described by the Grimm brothers and others in reverse, in order to approximate languages, which we know must have existed but for which we have no written examples. The more recent the language, the more accurate this process can be. But as with all forms of archeological research, and this is a form of linguistic archeology, it is subject to a certain amount of guesswork. For Burgess, reaching back to the very dawn of man's existence in Europe, the guesswork had to predominate. Ulam, thus, is very much an act of creativity and invention.

Burgess was a philologist by training but not a professional linguist. "His method was based on the traditional comparative philology he had been taught as a student" suggests Biswell. Burgess initially researched "some of the books he had studied as an undergraduate student at Manchester University in the 1930s. He relied quite heavily on the account of the evolution of Indo-European languages given by Otto Jespersen in his book *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, published in Leipzig in 1930" (Biswell). Burgess's understanding of Proto-Indo-European and how it might be reconstructed was, therefore, informed by very outdated research.

More contemporary research in the field of paleolinguistics is somewhat divided. Advocates of the process, such as Don Ringe, accept that paleolinguistics may be somewhat speculative at times, but insist that it is possible to peer back towards the origins of Indo-European languages. By contrast, critics of long-range historical linguistics question the underlying hypotheses of linguistic paleontology. Some critics, such as Mallory, argue that both the cases for and against paleolinguistics as a discipline or methodology are overstated.

Burgess sought to draw upon "Indian, Armenian, Hellenic, Albanian, Italic, Balto-Slavic, Celtic and Germanic languages" to reconstruct Proto-Indo-European, paying "special attention to Sanskrit" (Biswell). However, Proto-Indo-European did not exist in Europe at the time in which the movie (or indeed Rosny's novel) is set. It is a much later arrival, perhaps as recent

as 6,000 years ago, and the inhabitants of Europe previously would more plausibly have spoken some early Afro-Asiatic language, perhaps a proto-ancestor of Arabic or Hebrew. Even more likely is that whatever rudimentary language existed among Cro-Magnon man in Europe at the time has not directly led to today's tongues, given the process of language death, the multiple waves of human immigration from Africa to Europe, and the lengthy timeframes involved.

It does not assist Burgess's case that, in a media article, he mistakenly identified the film as taking place some half a million years ago ("Creating a Language for Primitive Man" 102), a time when hominids in Europe were not Cro-Magnon man, i.e. modern humans, but restricted to *homo erectus* and *homo heidelbergensis*. Later in the article, he locates the piece as taking place 80 millennia back.

Burgess has also acknowledged that some of his decisions, such as the choice to use "atr-" as the root form for "fire," were utterly arbitrary. Additionally, the "Ulam" language is almost entirely made up of nouns, and these nouns themselves compound, often in metaphoric or imagistic ways, to generate other nouns. "Dondr," meaning "tree," multiplies to become "dondr-dondr" or "forest," which in turn compounds with "tir," meaning "animal," to generate "tir dondr-dondr," meaning "stag." It is literally a forest animal, and metaphorically an animal with a forest of trees, or antlers, on its head. Burgess explained this feature to *Starlog*: "primitive language was what we call agglutinative: it was gluey. Words were glued together in a long stream" (qtd. in Naha 28).

Ulam is a cunningly constructed yet rudimentary form of communication, not designed to facilitate abstract communication, and this was intentional: "There will be no metaphysical discussions or theological wrangles: we are right at the beginning of human society with no agriculture and hence no astronomy and hence no gods, with a fear of the dark and a great awe at the mystery of fire," explained Burgess ("Creating a Language for Primitive Man" 102). In the movie, it is primarily an observational, declamatory language, used to communicate simple concepts. It also relies heavily on suffixes to convey specialisations, distinctions, and even relationships between concepts, and again this was deliberate.

BEYOND NADSAT

Taking into account the choice of pursuing a form of Proto-Indo-European, the decision to agglutinate via suffixes, the somewhat arbitrary choice of word root forms, and the open admission of the director that the process was both creative and collaborative, we must acknowledge Ulam as one of Burgess's most inventive created languages. It is also the closest Burgess ever came to a Tolkienian, fully developed invented language.

MACARONIC MUGGERS

Anthony Burgess's curious compendium novel, *The End of the World News*, was published in 1982, though most of its contents had originated in some form during the late 1970s. A tripartite narrative, it features the story of the dying Sigmund Freud, alongside a musical version of Leon Trotsky's visit to New York. This is glued together via a frame narrative depicting a disaster movie scenario in which an asteroid is set to collide with Earth. All three were developed separately for TV and cinema projects which did not ultimately come to fruition and Burgess salvaged them for *The End of the World News*. Recently, Paul Wake has untangled the *Puma* SF narrative from the other material, and it has since been published as Burgess's lost third SF novel as part of the Irwell Series of Burgess's works.

Despite the presence of a science fictional frame narrative, there is only a single brief paragraph of an invented language, which seems to reprise once more the Hebrew hybrid slang he had intended for *Man of Nazareth*, adding to it elements from other projects which had occupied him during the 1970s. Here is the passage in full: "Underprivileged Teutprot youth picked quarrels with privileged blacks and browns and blackbrowns, jeering and provoking in their underprivileged argot: 'A sniff in the kortevar, that what you crying for, yeled? A prert up the cull, a prang on the dumpendebat?'" (Burgess, *The End of the World News* 58). "Dumpendebat" derives from the hymn "Stabat Mater," and means "while it/he was hanging," but had accrued the slang meaning of "penis" during the Middle Ages, and is an unlikely term of use among the disaffected youth of the near future, though it also appears in *ABBA ABBA*. Burgess was ever imaginative in the slangs he attributed to youth gangs. His perennial favourite "Yeled," the word for boy in Hebrew, replaces droog here. Kortevar is Danish for "short-term" or "short-lived," and

“cull” likely derives from the French “cul” which has a vulgar street usage. “Prert,” though unidentified, suggests some sort of assault in this context.

Burgess clearly relished the enrichment that macaronics or code-switching offer in the creation of invented slangs, and while it is unlikely that such diverse and obscure components would ever organically come together in any “underprivileged” youth dialect, no matter how multicultural, he painstakingly placed these elements within a tight syntax and context to aid comprehension by the reader. As in *A Clockwork Orange*, these exotic lexical imports are legitimised by both the sheer otherness of this alien and debased underclass, and by the underlying standard English structure upon which the vocabulary is suspended.

Burgess acknowledged the implausibility of this lineage of educated teen yobs. In a review of Kenneth Hudson’s *The Language of the Teenage Revolution*, he noted that “[a] major characteristic of our young is their rejection of literature. Their vocabulary is not fed by the past, which has no meaning for them” (Burgess, “Codes of Youth” 26). Burgess reiterated this opinion in the 1987 BBC documentary *Burgess at 70*. In his review of Hudson’s book, he went on to state, following Halliday, that “[t]he language of the young is really an ‘anti-language’—defined as ‘the special language of people who choose to be outside society.’ It is, if you like, a secret code, and its users are always aware of the attempts of the established world outside to break the code” (Burgess, “Codes of Youth” 26). All of Burgess’s teen “codes” are in fact invented anti-languages, and all, from Nadsat onwards, are created primarily through macaronic creolising of existing organic languages in exotic combinations with English, often involving creative morphology.

NAZI NEWSPEAK

With the exception of the reprise of Burgess’s mock-Aramaic in *Kingdom of the Wicked*, and of the mock-Elizabethan language of *Nothing Like the Sun* in *A Dead Man in Deptford*, Burgess’s later years did not feature the plethora of language invention which he had indulged during the 1970s in particular. However, in 1980, his own masterpiece, the epic *Earthly Powers*, which he had been writing for nearly a decade, was finally published. The story of the twentieth century as seen through the eyes of an ageing gay writer,

BEYOND NADSAT

Kenneth Toomey, *Earthly Powers* is widely considered to be Burgess's finest and most substantial fiction.

Midway through its lengthy narrative, Toomey goes to Nazi Germany to meet with Jakob Strehler, the winner of the 1935 Nobel Prize for literature. However, *Earthly Powers* is a kind of alternative history, and Toomey recollects its events from his dotage and hence is an unreliable narrator. In reality, no such prize was awarded in 1935, and Strehler is entirely fictional (no less so than Toomey) in a narrative otherwise jammed with depictions of real-life people and events, and especially writers. Strehler allegedly won the Nobel for a novel called *Vaterdag*, or "Father's Day," in which "the language of the narrator is full of rare slang and Slav loanwords and neologisms" (Burgess, *Earthly Powers* 265), very like *A Clockwork Orange's* Nadsat. In August 1939, the same month as the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, Toomey pleads with Strehler to return with him to safety.

However, Strehler wishes to finish the project he is currently working on first. This is a translation of a poem "of about a thousand lines, Latin hexameters, the title *Vindobona*" (Burgess, *Earthly Powers* 418), which Strehler tells us is Latin for Vienna. The poem is by "a Latin author called Frambosius" (meaning raspberry), who according to Strehler is a pseudonym for "Wilhelm Fahirof of Klagenfurt," who died in 1427 (Burgess, *Earthly Powers* 418). The obscure medieval poem (which, like Frambosius, Strehler, and Toomey, does not actually exist) transpires to be "a remarkable prophecy" in which human-sized rats flood into Austria from the North and occupy it. "Their flag is of four legs stylized on a black ground," says Strehler. "Those who will grow whiskers and glue on long tails and walk like beasts are accepted into the community of rats. The king rat is called Adolphus" (Burgess, *Earthly Powers* 418).

Strehler has 100 lines yet to translate. He is at a place in the poem where the "king rat Adolphus is enforcing the teaching of the rat language in human schools." Strehler, or Toomey, or Burgess does not give us an example of the rat language because he, or he, or he does not need to. We are informed solely that "[i]t has a very limited vocabulary" (Burgess, *Earthly Powers* 419).

Burgess's final foray into the world of invented languages, apart from his swansong with mock-Elizabethan, is in some ways the most audacious despite

not actually involving the work of inventing a language himself. Instead he co-opted perhaps the most famous invented literary language of them all, Orwell's Newspeak, and blew a raspberry at the Nazis by way of an imaginary author, a non-existent Nobel Prize-winner, and a phantom Medieval poet. That we are given no examples of it does not matter. Its mere evocation and description qualify it as an invented literary language by Cheyne's and Beinhoff's criteria, as in various ways, do all of Burgess's invented dialects and languages mentioned.

What is notable about Burgess's fiction, with the exception of the SF novels, *A Clockwork Orange* and *Puma (The End of the World News)*, is that they are not fantastikal. These are primarily realist novels written in a late modernist manner. Nevertheless, by reference to the reader (or, in the case of *Quest for Fire*, audience) response methodology for identifying invented languages introduced by Cheyne for application to SF fiction, we can identify a range of linguistic invention in Burgess's fiction. The boundaries of fantastika in general are acknowledged to be porous, but are not commonly extended to historical fiction, such as Burgess's Bible-based and mock-Elizabethan novels, nor to the more realist mode Burgess utilised in novels like *Enderby Outside*, *MF*, *ABBA ABBA*, or *Earthly Powers*. We can, therefore, conclude that Cheyne's schema, and Beinhoff's gloss may be equally applied beyond the confines of SF to non-fantastikal genres of fiction.

Furthermore, Burgess's prolific and wide-ranging fiction output allows for a potential expansion of what we might consider as art languages beyond the Cheyne-Beinhoff schema. While many of Burgess's linguistic inventions are macaronic dialects constructed from exotic graftings onto English grammarology, many others are not. Burgess's range of linguistic invention extends almost as far as Tolkienian or Conlang totality, as in the case of Ulam, while his careful (re)construction of mock-Elizabethan in two novels functions as an intervention of invented language into the historical novel genre. Therein he evades both the "Wardour Street" archaisms of Scott or the anachronistic approach of most historical novelists, by transposing one era's language into another era's literary mode, thereby extending invented language from being simply a linguistic medium into a (post)modernist strategy in itself.

BEYOND NADSAT

WORKS CITED

- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Paul Foss, Paul Patton, and Philip Beitchman, Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 1983.
- Beinhoff, Bettina. "Why are Alien Languages Inherently Human?" *Foundation: The International Review of Science Fiction* 122 (2015): 5–19.
- Biswell, Andrew. "Quest for Language." *International Anthony Burgess Foundation Blog*. 5 July 2021. Web. 5 July 2021. <<https://www.anthony-burgess.org/quest-for-fire/quest-for-language/>>
- Burgess, Anthony. *The Wanting Seed*. New York: Norton, 1963.
- . *Nothing Like the Sun*. London: Heinemann, 1964.
- . *Enderby Outside*. London: Heinemann, 1968.
- . *MF*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1971.
- . *Oedipus the King*. Personal archive and library of Anthony Burgess, International Anthony Burgess Foundation Archives. GB 3104 AB/ARCH/A/OED. 1972.
- . *Oedipus The King*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1972.
- . Fragment of an early draft of *Man of Nazareth*. Personal archive and library of Anthony Burgess. International Anthony Burgess Foundation Archives. GB 3104 AB/ARCH/A/NAZ/26. 1975.
- . Introduction. *The White Company*. By Arthur Conan Doyle. London: Murray, 1975. 7–12.
- . *ABBA ABBA*. London: Faber and Faber, 1977.
- . *1985*. London: Hutchinson, 1978.
- . *Man of Nazareth*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1979.
- . *Earthly Powers*. London: Hutchinson, 1980.
- . "Creating a Language for Primitive Man." *New York Times Magazine* (15 November 1981): 102.
- . *The End of the World News*. London: Penguin, 1983.
- . "Codes of Youth." *The Observer* (17 July 1983): 26.
- . *Kingdom of the Wicked*. London: Hutchinson, 1985.
- . *You've Had Your Time*. London: William Heinemann, 1990.
- . *A Dead Man in Deptford*. London: Hutchinson, 1993.
- . *Puma*. Ed. Paul Wake. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018.

- Cassola, Arnold. "Anthony Burgess's *MF*: The Mediterranean Background to a Caribbean Island." *Journal of Maltese Studies* 19–20 (1989–1990): 27–33.
- . "MF: A Glossary of Anthony Burgess's Castitan Language." *English Language Notes*, 26.4 (June 1989): 72–79.
- . "The Role of Dialects in Anthony Burgess's *ABBA ABBA*." *Journal of Anglo-Italian Studies*, University of Malta, 3 (1993): 220–228.
- Cheyne, Ria. "Created Languages in Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies* 35.3 (2008): 386–403.
- Clarke, Jim. "Anthony Burgess's Structuralist Turn: Claude Lévi-Strauss and Burgess's Aesthetics." In *Anthony Burgess and France*. Ed. Marc Jeannin. Cambridge Scholars, 2017. 107–126.
- . *The Aesthetics of Anthony Burgess: Fire of Words*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017. <<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66411-8>>
- . "Dialect to Dialect Translation: Belli, Burgess, Garioch." *Trinity Journal of Literary Translation* 2 (April 2014): 180–190.
- Conversations with Anthony Burgess*. Eds. Earl Ingersoll and Mary Ingersoll. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2008.
- Elgin, Suzette Haden. *Native Tongue*. New York: DAW Books, 1984.
- Epstein, Allison. *A Tip for the Hangman*. New York: Doubleday, 2021.
- Eco, Umberto. *Faith in Fakes: Travels in Hyperreality*. London: Vintage, 1995.
- Fimi, Dimitra, and Andrew Higgins. Introduction. *A Secret Vice: Tolkien on Invented Languages*. By J. R. R. Tolkien. Eds. Dimitra Fimi, Andrew Higgins. London: Harper Collins, 2016. 9–44.
- Hayles, N. Katherine. *The Cosmic Web: Scientific Field Models and Literary Strategies in the Twentieth Century*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984.
- Hudson, Kenneth. *The Language of the Teenage Revolution*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 1983. <<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-05597-5>>
- Lindsay, Philip. *One Dagger for Two*. London: Cassell, 1932.
- Mallory, Fintan. "The Case Against Linguistic Palaeontology." *Topoi* 40 (2021): 273–284. <<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11245-020-09691-5>>
- Milton, Douglas. "Walking Made Easy." *Anthony Burgess Center Newsletter*. 6 December 2003. Web. 27 June 2021. <http://www.masterbibangers.net/ABC/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=69&Itemid=108>

BEYOND NADSAT

- Naha, Ed. "Quest for Fire: Action/Adventure at the Dawn of Civilisation." *Starlog* 55 (January 1982): 26–29, 64.
- Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. 1949. London: Penguin, 1981.
- The Passion of the Christ*. Dir. Mel Gibson. Los Angeles: Newmarket Films, 2004.
- Ringe, Don. *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. <<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198792581.001.0001>>
- Tolkien, J. R. R. *A Secret Vice: Tolkien on Invented Languages*. Eds. Dimitra Fimi, Andrew Higgins. London: Harper Collins, 2016.
- Vincent, Benet, and Jim Clarke. "The Language of *A Clockwork Orange*: A Corpus Stylistic Approach to Nadsat." *Language and Literature* 26.3 (2017): 247–264. <<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947017706625>>
- Yaguello, Maria. *Lunatic Lovers of Language: Imaginary Languages and Their Inventors*. Trans. Catherine Slater. London: Athlone, 1991.

CONTRIBUTOR DETAILS

Jim Clarke is the author of *The Aesthetics of Anthony Burgess: Fire of Words* (Palgrave, 2017) and the forthcoming Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* (Manchester University Press, 2022), as well as a monograph on Science Fiction and Catholicism (Gylphi, 2019). He is co-principal director of the Ponying the Slovos project, which examines how invented languages function in translation, especially Nadsat (<https://ponyingtheslovs.coventry.domains/>)—and of the Religious Futurisms project, which examines how religion is envisaged in future-focused art and literature. He has taught at universities in Ireland, Britain and Turkey, and currently works as a researcher with Sapienship, the social impact NGO and thinktank founded by Professor Yuval Noah Harari.