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ABSTRACT: One of the aims of literary text is to say as much as possible by briefly as possible means to say in few words to achieve a maximum effectiveness. Figurative language is the one that uses figures of speech and infact a figure of speech is a way of saying one thing and meaning another. Orwell’s suspicion of literary has stirred debate on whether he is an artist in prose or only a talented pamphleteer. The whole politics and the English language is that ordinary language is not ordinary but exceptional, an ideal that can be achieved only by strenuous discipline.

I. INTRODUCTION:
George Orwell began to work on Nineteen Eighty Four in 1945. It was the same year when his wife died as well as World War II ended. Similarly T.R. Fyvel says:

Following the end of the war, Orwell reminded in London, now successfully, working mainly as a journalist. He was ill and was reportedly afraid of an impending atomic war.

As Orwell’s wife died in 1945 and Orwell was suddenly left with his adopted child. Indeed, 1984, is an unbearable gloomy work, describing and implying conditions and situations of horror and desperation that are usually unequalled in modern literature. According to R.A. Lee:

I am not so convinced, however, that the book is significantly colored by Orwell’s illness. It seems to be that 1984 is rather the inevitable culmination of Orwell’s developed; that in effect, he had been progressing inexorably toward this book since his first essay was printed in 1931.

There are few critics, who questions whether or not 1984 is infact a novel. Irving Howe in this regards says: “it is not, I suppose, really a novel, or at least it doesn’t satisfy those expectations that are mainly the heritage of nineteenth century romanticism with its stress upon individual consciousness, psychological analysis and the study of intimate relations”. He further says:

In 1984, Orwell is trying to present the kind of world in which individuality has become obsolete and personality a crime.

Undoubtedly the most eagerly awaited work of recent Orwell scholarship was Bernard Crick’s official Biography. It deserves a lengthy comment here for it embodies a type of Orwellian criticism which led to considerable obfuscation of the merits and deficiencies of a complex writer, and encouraged the view that:

Orwell must be seen, first and foremost as a political writer. Any more rounded portrait which would show his work to be a coherent whole for which his imaginative writing may well furnish the incompatible with serious scholarship.
It is of important to contest such assumptions because these are damagingly reductive as we see at the end of professor crick’s book where he takes Orwell firmly to task for not having spelt out his message more clearly and simply inevitable, what we end up with professor Crick’s own message‘ and the ironic reflection that, in his refusal to look closely at the complexity of this writer, the official biographers in his own small way keeping to propel us down to the road to Orwell’s 1984.

George Orwell’s 1984 is along with Aldous Huxley, Brave New World is among a few of the twentieth century anti-utopian novels. Similarly Mathew Hodogart says that “Prophecy was the subjects that Orwell could not leave alone. This can be seen in his collected essays and journalist articles, as for example in his letters to the Partisans Review, in which he was keen on trying to forecast and later very honestly analyzed where and why he had gone wrong. He read a good deal about the utopian friction such as Well’s the shaping of things to come and Huxley’s Brave New World, both of them which he despised as lacking a sense of political reality. He greatly professed Jack London’s, The Iron Hell (1907) and E.I.Zamyatin, s,we, written about 1923 and reviewed by Orwell in 1946, which are presumably his closest models of Nineteen Eighty Four along with James Burnham’s Treatise on the Managerial Revolution.

Utopia is the word which used by Sir Thomas More for the imaginary republic in his sixteenth century Latin romance. Utopia has come to be the generic name for literature that creates a non-existent ideal government. Utopias are generally impartial place where all the habitants are virtuous individuals, although this is not always the case. Anti-utopia is simply the reverse of the conventional utopia Gulliver Travels, the brilliant eighteenth century worked by Jonathan swift, is probably the most famous of all anti-utopian novels. The aim of the anti-utopian novel is the same as that of the utopian novels: both have on their objective the improvement of the society. The anti-utopian, however instead of presenting an ideal society, towards which all men should strive, generally presents a highly hideous society. The anti-utopian novel warns that if the tendencies of the real world exaggerated in the world of fiction, are not corrected before it is too late, the hideous has had profound influence on our times. Despite the name of the book, 1984 is not a prediction of the world will be like in which the world drifts is changed, man will lose his most human attributes.

Similarly Hodgort says as long as the issue of Utopian is concerned:

> It is fashionable for literary critics say that utopian and anti-utopian novels are not meant to be prediction, but are metaphors of the present state of society or of the permanent human situation. But this won’t quite do for Orwell, who was almost naively interested in guessing what was going to happen; and so was Huxley, for that matter, as his factual comments on Brave New world revisited, reveal. Orwell asks us to judge the book, not only on grounds of humanity and wit, but on whether or not the world is going the way it foretells.

Orwell’s suspicion of literary language has stirred debate on whether he is an artist in prose or only a talented pamphleteer. The whole point of “Politics” and the English language is that ordinary language is not ordinary but exceptional, an ideal that can be achieved only by strenuous discipline. Everyday language is sick and becoming sicker; the ‘window pane’ of true ordinary language has been altogether darkened and distorted. Modern politics is bad because of the corruption of language, Orwell argues. But he also argues paradoxically, that if language were good-that is, transparent-it would become politically insignificant. He proposes to refine and improve language, in order that language should no longer matter. Nineteen Eighty Four, as its title implies Orwell’s version of the future awaiting mankind. The naturalistic setting of war time London’s combined with brutal characteristics of eightieth century England to emphasis the moral and material regression under ‘ingso’. The people mollify their miserable existence with large doses of acidic gin, prisoners march through the streets in leg irons and public hangings provide popular amusement. It is Orwell’s version of the future, not too distinct.
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but yet so radical in its departure from normative social experience, that seems to be the reason; critics are unwilling to treat 1984 in this way, one should treat any political novel as a novel. It is not the form of this novel that is inimical to convention and expectations, but its context. Orwell has pushed to the existence the basic assumptions which governs mans condition irrationality, individuality and reality.
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