

## Political correctness and the language of theatre

### 1. Introduction

Language is politically incorrect because it reflects reality. If we enter the sequences *when he was \*ed* and *when she was \*ed* into the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA, 1990-2019), the disadvantage will become apparent. On the frequency list, 'when he was' is co-selected with 'elected' at position 3 and with 'appointed' at position 11. 'When she was' is co-selected with 'elected' at position 13 and 'appointed' at position 21. The British National Corpus (BNC, 1980s-1993), which has remained unchanged since the early nineties, is even more politically incorrect: 'when he was appointed' is at position 2, 'when she was appointed' is at position 24, and 'when she was elected' produced no matching records.

This brief search follows in the footsteps of John Sinclair's pamphlet *Phrasebite*, a section of which is reproduced below:

1. The first grammatical collocate of *when* is *she*
2. The first grammatical collocate of *when she* is *was*
3. The vocabulary collocates of *when she was* are hair-raising. On the first page: diagnosed, pregnant, divorced, raped, assaulted, attacked  
The diagnoses are not good, the pregnancies are all problematic.
4. Select one that looks neutral: ***approached***
5. Look at the concordance, first page.
6. Nos 1, 4, 5, 8, 10 are **of unpleasant physical attacks**
7. Nos 2, 3, 6, 7, 9 are **of excellent opportunities**
8. How can you tell the difference?
9. the **nasties** are all of people out and about, while the **nice** ones are of people working somewhere (Sinclair 2006).

A reference corpus is a large, balanced and representative sample of the language in question. According to Contextual Prosodic Theory (CPT), which took its inspiration from Wittgenstein (Milojkovic 2020), a reference corpus is also a sample of the world as reflected through that language. CPT, a corpus stylistic theory, was initiated in Low (2000) on the basis of Louw (1993), and compares authorial usage with the language norm in the reference corpus within *similar events* - situational contexts. It is the main postulate in Louw (1993) that authorial usages that flout the semantic tendencies recoverable in the corpus are indicative either of conscious irony or of unconscious *insincerity*. The latter implies a wish to conceal one's true attitude rather than to construct intentional factual lies.

How applicable is this theory to the notion of political correctness in the context of theatre? Judging by the research of *corpus-derived subtext* within the CPT framework that has accumulated so far, the following hypotheses might be formulated:

a) it will be possible to use co-selection and corpus-derived subtext to uncover implied hostile attitudes to members of disadvantaged groups (cases of insincerity), e.g. as means of characterization;

b) it will be possible to study the precise means of conveying politically incorrect attitudes in cases where they are more overt;

c) it might be possible to probe whether restrictions imposed on authors might lead to forced, uninspired use of language, causing unnaturalness of expression and a confusion as to what is foregrounded in the text and what is the language norm which is the basis for the foregrounding.

This list of possible hypotheses regarding the influence of political correctness on the language of theatre is by no means complete, neither is it feasible to explore all these implications in detail within the scope of this paper. Therefore, to satisfy the conference theme, the paper will investigate the relationship between political correctness and theatre. In order to prepare the ground, bearing in mind the interests of Contextual Prosodic Theory, it will probe into the relations between political correctness and grammar. Contextual Prosodic Theory has never engaged with either politically correct discourse or theatre discourse. The pivotal point of the research will be an excerpt from James Kenworth's adaptation of Orwell's *Animal Farm*, called by the playwright *Revolution Farm*.

## 2. Language, grammar, and the origins of political correctness

John Sinclair was able to establish the states of affairs in the external world by wildcarding *when she was* in his reference corpus because grammar expresses two kinds of logic: the logic of the language it underlies, and the logic of reality. These premises were established by the philosophers of language Russell and Wittgenstein. Russell performed the operation of removing vocabulary in order to arrive at 'logical language' as a language that "will be completely analytic and will show at a glance the logical structure of the facts *asserted* or *denied* [...] It is a language that has only syntax and *no vocabulary whatsoever* [...] *if you add a vocabulary*, [it] would be a logically perfect language" (Russell, 1956: 197, emphasis added).

According to Glock (2005: 215), Wittgenstein connected the logical form of propositions with the logical form of reality they reflect: "Just as each proposition must share its logical form with the state of affairs it depicts, so language, the totality of propositions, must share with what it depicts *the* logical form, 'the form of reality' (TLP2.18 – apparently equivalent to the 'form of world')".

Grammar, therefore, is at the core of the interplay between language and reality, because it represents the structure of reality that the metaphysical fabric of language is meant to reflect. In this light, the beginnings of 'political correctness' are of interest. 'Political correctness' as a term originated out of the necessity to refer to the restrictions imposed in the Soviet Union on what was considered a correct statement. Presumably, the premodifier 'political' was introduced in order to distinguish this kind of correctness from the pure linguistic kind, or those of factual kind. Statements that were persecuted were not grammatically incorrect or counterfactual, they were politically unwelcome. In Orwell's *Animal Farm*, a famous travesty on these practices, such 'political correctness' is ridiculed in slogans such as 'four legs good, two legs bad'. Orwell's fable gives a possible outline for such simplifications. First, Old Major, the dying boar, makes his eye-opening speech:

I merely repeat, remember always your duty of enmity towards Man and all his ways. Whatever goes upon two legs is an enemy. Whatever goes upon four legs, or has wings, is a friend. And remember also that in fighting against Man, we must not come to resemble him. Even when you have conquered him, do not adopt his vices. No animal must ever live in a house, or sleep in a bed, or wear clothes, or drink alcohol, or smoke tobacco, or touch money,

or engage in trade. All the habits of Man are evil. And, above all, no animal must ever tyrannise over his own kind. Weak or strong, clever or simple, we are all brothers. No animal must ever kill any other animal. All animals are equal (p. 10).

The speech is simple yet dignified, its repetitions and parallelisms at the core of the powerful rhetoric. Upon the death of Old Major the Rebellion takes place, the sloppy as well as unsuspecting farmer Jones is driven from Manor Farm, and the pigs Snowball and Napoleon try their hand at self-regulation, including conveying ideological premises to all animals:

They explained that by their studies of the past three months the pigs had succeeded in reducing the principles of Animalism to Seven Commandments. These Seven Commandments would now be inscribed on the wall; they would form an unalterable law by which all the animals on Animal Farm must live for ever after [...] The Commandments were written on the tarred wall in great white letters that could be read thirty yards away. They ran thus:

#### THE SEVEN COMMANDMENTS

1. Whatever goes upon two legs is an enemy.
2. Whatever goes upon four legs, or has wings, is a friend.
3. No animal shall wear clothes.
4. No animal shall sleep in a bed.
5. No animal shall drink alcohol.
6. No animal shall kill any other animal.
7. All animals are equal.

[...] All the animals nodded in complete agreement, and the cleverer ones at once began to learn the Commandments by heart (p. 20-21).

There is some simplification, but the dignified style is retained, and the modal verb 'shall' mirrors its biblical counterpart. But then a hindrance is reported: some animals were having trouble learning the commandments by heart, as was required. A solution was found in further simplification:

It was also found that the stupider animals, such as the sheep, hens, and ducks, were unable to learn the Seven Commandments by heart. After much thought Snowball declared that the Seven Commandments could in effect be reduced to a single maxim, namely: "Four legs good, two legs bad." This, he said, contained the essential principle of Animalism. Whoever had thoroughly grasped it would be safe from human influences [...] **FOUR LEGS GOOD, TWO LEGS BAD**, was inscribed on the end wall of the barn, above the Seven Commandments and in bigger letters. When they had once got it by heart, the sheep developed a great liking for this maxim, and often as they lay in the field they would all start

bleating “Four legs good, two legs bad! Four legs good, two legs bad!” and keep it up for hours on end, never growing tired of it (pp. 28-29).

Ultimately, the ‘essential principle of minimalism’ has been completely stripped of its grammar. What remains is vocabulary alone. A Slavic language translation would still retain some grammatical inflections, but Orwell was writing in English. What does it say of the relations between a statement and the world that it depicts? Where is Wittgenstein’s logical form? Is it not a testimony, at the level of language, of an utter loosening of ties with reality, or even of an utter disregard for reality? A society without its grammar is a society without its reality or its future. Orwell, who was famously careful with his language, must have realized this.

### 3. Orwell’s ideas on stage

On stage, this process of maximal oversimplification and reducing ideology to slogans for the sake of its accessibility has been differently described. The British playwright James Kenworth, in his adaptation of Orwell, *Revolution Farm*, positions it within Snowball’s educational initiative. In the play, Snowball is referred to as Hero, and Napoleon as Smoothie:

*Classroom. The animals are having reading and writing classes. Hullabaloo, commotion; Hero’s barely able to control the class.*

**Hero.** Class, settle down please.

*The class eventually settles.*

Brothers and sisters, remember this, we are nothing without knowledge. Knowledge will set you free. Knowledge will build you up. Knowledge will make you bigger and better than before. But remember this too, brothers and sisters, knowledge is power, and power must be used responsibly.

*Yawns from the animals.*

Warrior, would you read please?

**Warrior.** Why me?

**Hero.** Because I’m asking you.

**Warrior.** You’ll be lucky.

**Warrior** *struggles with the words on the page, he can’t make head or tail of it, exasperated he tosses the book to the floor.*

**Warrior.** Nah, it’s no good, I can’t do it!

**Lil’ Monster.** Warrior!

**Warrior** *storms off.*

**Ducklife.** Can I go as well, Sir?

**Red Hen.** An’ me, Sir?

**Hero.** No. Right, spelling. The 'i' before 'e' rule. 'i' before 'e' except after 'c', but only when it rhymes with 'bee'. Example 1. 'Believe' The 'i' sound rhymes with bee, so 'I' goes before 'e'.

**Ducklife.** Who cares!

**Hero.** It's important.

**Red Hen.** How we supposed to remember all that, Sir?

**Hero.** 'i' before 'e' except after 'c', but only when it rhymes with 'bee'.

**Black Sheep.** But Sir, what if I never use them words? Does that I mean I don't have to learn 'em?

**Hero.** Don't you want to learn to spell?

**Black Sheep.** What for?

**Hero.** So you can educate yourself.

**Black Sheep.** But we're free ain't we?

**Hero.** Don't you want a better future for yourself?

**Black Sheep.** Daddy and Smoothy'll look after us. They said so.

**Hero.** And what if they can't?

**Black Sheep.** What are you saying, Sir? That Daddy and Smoothy ain't heroes of the revolution? That they ain't gonna take care of us? That ain't very loyal of you.

**Hero.** No, I'm not saying that.

**Black Sheep.** That's what you said.

**Hero.** No, I said education is a good thing because you can better yourself, improve yourself, you don't have to rely on others to help you.

**Black Sheep.** Have you told 'em that, Sir?

**Hero.** What?

**Black Sheep.** That you don't wanna rely on others, that you'd rather do your own thing? Are you a rebel, Sir? Is that what you are?

**Hero.** Don't distort my words. Spelling, let's continue. Prefixes and suffixes. Prefixes and suffixes are used to make new words.

**Pigeonhead.** This is boring.

**Red Hen.** Yeah, forget it.

**Lil' Monster.** (*rounding on the class*) Hey, shut up willya, I'm tryin' to learn summin' here!

*The class immediately quietens down. But one of the animals throws something at Lil' Monster. She gets up and hits the culprit. All hell breaks loose.*

**Pigeonhead.** I'm outta here!

**Red Hen.** Same here!

*The animals start to leave.*

**Hero.** Class! Sit down! Where are you going?

**Smoothy** saunters in.

*The class return to their seats immediately.*

**Smoothy.** Good Morning, Hero. And how is our re-education programme going? How is class today?

**ALL.** BORING!!!

**Smoothy.** O dear.

**Hero.** They're a little resistant. This is what the scum have done to them. Kept them in the dark. Kept them down. Kept them ignorant. Brother, I will awaken their minds, I will bring them into the light. I will make them see the truth.

**Smoothy.** Carry on, brother.

**Smoothy** *sits down at the back of the classroom and starts making notes.*

**Smoothy.** Ignore me. I'm not here.

**Hero.** Prefixes and suffixes. You add prefixes and suffixes to a word to change its meaning. A prefix goes where?

**Ducklife.** Do what???

**Red Hen.** What's he say?

*All hells breaks loose again*

**Smoothy.** (to **Hero**) May I?

*He motions for quiet.*

Class, repeat after me: Four legs badass, two legs wasteman.

**ALL.** FOUR LEGS BADASS, TWO LEGS WASTEMAN!

**Smoothy.** Very good. What does it mean?

**Goatface.** Easy. Man is scum!

**Smoothy.** Well done. And what does Revolution Farm mean to you?

**Donkeykick.** It means a punch up!

**Smoothy.** Good work class, good work.

**Hero.** It's slang.

**Smoothy.** It's what they understand.

**Hero.** But that's not education.

**Smoothy.** Easy to remember though isn't it?

**Hero.** And what about reading and writing?

**Smoothy.** Is it strictly necessary? I mean, they're not exactly leadership material are they?

**Hero.** Ain't the point.

**Smoothy.** Hero, we need the muscle, remember. 'Case the scum come back. Books will only confuse 'em. And we need them focussed. Ready to attack at a moment's notice.

**Hero.** They're not an army, Smoothy

**Smoothy.** Army's the most important thing in the revolution. Get them on your side and you're away. (to class) Soldiers of the revolution, I salute you! Are you ready for battle? Are you ready for war? Are you ready for bloodshed?

**All.** YES WE ARE! YES WE ARE! YES WE ARE!

**Smoothy.** Class. These are the new rules. Learn them by heart. Recite them day and night. This is how we live. This is Revolution Farm.

Man is scum!

**Animals.** MAN IS SCUM!

**Smoothy.** Animals are not scum!

**Animals.** ANIMALS ARE NOT SCUM!

**Smoothy.** Clothes are what scum wear!

**Animals.** CLOTHES ARE WHAT SCUM WEAR!

**Smoothy.** Beds are what scum sleep in!

**Animals.** BEDS ARE WHAT SCUM SLEEP IN!

**Smoothy.** Alcohol is what scum drink!

**Animals.** ALCOHOL IS WHAT SCUM DRINK!

**Smoothy.** Killing each other is what scum do!

**Animals.** KILLING EACH OTHER IS WHAT SCUM DO!

**Smoothy.** All animals are the same!

**Animals.** ALL ANIMALS ARE THE SAME!

**Smoothy.** Thank you, class. Carry on, Hero. (*whispering*) Go easy on the grammar, eh? (*He winks at Hero.*)

Kenworth's adaptation has retained the general motifs of *Animal Farm*, but the execution is markedly different. The whole scene revolves around the animals' general intolerance of 'school'. In the original, Orwell describes at length how some animals (such as pigs themselves, who undertake the role of leaders) learn to read and write with ease, as well as mastering skills that can be picked up from books left behind by Jones. Other animals negotiate the alphabet with varying success, some only managing a few letters. There is no indication in Orwell that Snowball's educational efforts were resented as such: '[t]he reading and writing classes, however, were a great success. By the autumn almost every animal on the farm was literate in some degree' (p. 27). Kenworth, however, chooses to connect two issues that receive separate treatment in Orwell: ideology and education, and shows how the one undermines the other. Snowball, whose stage name is Hero, suffers defeat as an educator, and gets accused of treason by the very pupils who are the least able to receive education – the sheep. Crucially, what is being learnt in class is grammar, and this notion is not mentioned in Orwell's *Animal Farm*.

At first, the animals are unwilling to learn. Hero is an innovator and a fighter, but he obviously lacks basic teaching skills. His grammatical terminology (prefixes and suffixes) does not fare well with the pupils. On the other hand, the animals themselves are not even trying to understand, save few exceptions. On top of it all, the sheep, notoriously unteachable in Orwell's original, are very able and willing to twist Hero's words to make them sound treasonous. They keep wondering aloud whether, by insisting that animals gain independence of leaders, Hero questions the leaders' capacity to govern and protect the animals. Hero's words are seen as 'politically incorrect', threatening his survival in the system.

Then Smoothie enters the scene. His first exclamation 'O dear' is suggestive of his good education. This exclamation is characteristic of the middle classes and is now pronounced old-fashioned by the dictionaries. However, when addressing the masses, he resorts to slang. 'Four legs good, two legs bad' becomes 'Four legs badass, two legs wasteman'. 'Badass' is slang for

someone ‘tough and violent’ (Collins), ‘wasteman’ is slang for ‘a stupid person’ (Cambridge Dictionary Online). The choice is between ‘cool’ and ‘uncool’ in accessible terms. Also, Smoothie cunningly exploits the masses’ desire for a ‘punch up’, or fistfight. Hero protests, as an idealist would, but Smoothie is bent on enlisting the animals support as future cannon food: ‘Are you ready for battle? Are you ready for war? Are you ready for bloodshed?’ They enthusiastically are. Why? The grammatical subtext of the question might prove of assistance. In COCA, the searchline ‘are you ADJ for NOUN’ yields the following contexts:

‘are you ADJ for NOUN’

are you **free** for **dinner** 19  
are you **free** for **lunch** 12  
are you **ready** for **bed** 8  
are you **ready** for **dinner** 7  
are you **ready** for **school** 6  
are you **ready** for **love** 6  
are you **ready** for **dessert** 6

Source: COCA

Instead of ‘battle’, ‘war’ and ‘bloodshed’, all the pleasures of life surface in the concordance: ‘dinner’, ‘lunch’, ‘bed’, ‘dessert’, even ‘love’. The pleasurable subtext (with the exception of ‘school, which in the COCA contexts is not always pleasurable), supported by the previous mention of the attractive ‘punch-up’, conceals Smoothie’s declared maneuver to prepare for war. In terms of Contextual Prosodic Theory, this clash between the vocabulary of war and the subtext of peace might be pronounced as an instance of *insincerity* (see Section 1).

To summarise, while the sheep are desirous to see Hero (Orwell’s Snowball) removed as a traitor for trying to teach grammar, Smoothie (Orwell’s Napoleon) makes the judicious move to abandon grammar (‘easy on the grammar’) in favour of slogans because (a) they serve his purpose, and (b) grammar is not ‘strictly necessary’, as well as difficult to teach. This is what transpires at the level of the plot. When it comes to the language itself, instead of talking about how grammar is abandoned in its capacity of a language mechanism, Kenworth foregrounds slang. For the benefit of the audience, he includes an actual reference to it:

**Hero.** It’s slang.

**Smoothy.** It’s what they understand.

**Hero.** But that’s not education.

**Smoothy.** Easy to remember though isn’t it?

While Orwell’s original explores the transition from rhetoric to grammar-less slogans for the sake of the uneducated masses, Kenworth’s adaptation relies on the transition from *education* to *slangy* slogans, well understood by the working class. Unlike Orwell, Kenworth foregrounds learning *grammar* rules as the element of education to be abandoned in the transition: ‘These are



the new rules. Learn them by heart', says Smoothie. By foregrounding this aspect on the stage through vocabulary keywords, Kenworth makes it clear to the audience that in the aftermath of the Revolution progress gives way to regressive policies.

#### 4. Steven Pinker's 'cancellation' in modern times

Since Orwell's times, the term 'political correctness' has undergone considerable modification. From a critical description of censorship and totalitarian rule in the Eastern Bloc, its denotative meaning has been altered to signify speech or writing that upholds the rights of the members of the disadvantaged groups. Its connotative meaning, however, seems to have remained critical. A relatively recent occurrence may clarify how this prevalent critical connotation came about despite the best of intentions (that are far from manipulative or controlling, as in *Animal Farm*). Below is an article by Ronald Bailey from *Reason* magazine (October 2020), containing a short interview with Steven Pinker. The brevity and conciseness of the article may justify it being given here in full:

##### Steven Pinker survives attempted cancellation

In early July, a group of linguistics researchers published an open letter calling for the Linguistics Society of America (LSA) to revoke the organization's distinguished fellow status from linguist and cognitive psychologist Steven Pinker, author of *The Language Instinct*, *The Better Angels of Our Nature*, and *Enlightenment Now*.

The signatories, many of them graduate and undergraduate students, pointed to years-old tweets of Pinker's that they claimed revealed his racist and sexist biases. Almost immediately, a group of established scholars leapt to his defense [...] including linguist (and *Reason* contributor) John McWhorter, leftist firebrand Noam Chomsky, and formal semantics pioneer Barbara Partee.

In a conversation with *Reason* Science Correspondent Ronald Bailey on the day the LSA announced it would not take any action against him, Pinker explained what efforts like the LSA letter tell us about the state of debate in America's elite institutions.

##### **Q: This LSA letter is an astonishing document.**

A: I think it's part of a larger mindset that does not see the world as having complex problems that we fail to understand and ought to try to understand better to diagnose and treat, but rather as a kind of warfare between powerful elites and oppressed masses. In the classic Marxist analysis, these would be economic classes, but they've been transformed to racial and sexual classes.

In this mindset, analysis, debate, evidence are just tools—propaganda exercised by those in power. What has to happen is not a deeper understanding of social problems, but a wresting of power from elites and redistributing it to the disenfranchised.

##### **Q: You've said the letter wasn't specifically about you, but it was quite targeted.**

A: It was quite targeted, but it's part of a larger movement seeking monsters to destroy. That is, to look for prominent people and do "offense archeology," which is to troll through tweets

and statements seeking to find evidence, however tortured, that there's some kind of prejudice behind them.

**Q: The writers of the letter said that by challenging the claim that police are more likely to kill black people than to kill white people, you showed a "willingness to dismiss and downplay racist violence regardless of any evidence."**

A: That's completely wrong. It's an open question to what extent police are racially biased. As a social scientist, I consider it my responsibility to try to understand that in light of the facts. You're literally committing a logical blunder if you hold a belief that police are more likely to shoot unarmed African Americans and you don't count up all the people police shoot. That is by no means a denial of the existence of racism.

There's a distinct question of whether African Americans are subject to more *sublethal* harassment, and I think your former colleague Radley Balko wrote a very good summary for *The Washington Post* that shows there is evidence of racial discrimination in harassment and man-handling and arrests. But when it comes to lethal incidents, the evidence suggests that there isn't.

**Q: I'm trying to get a sense, from your point of view, of why your critics would misread what you are doing.**

A: [There's a] mindset that we evaluate what people mean based on whether the underlying idea is likely to be true or false; that we should use evidence in doing so; that all of us, in large part, start from a position of ignorance when dealing with social problems; and that the imperative is to understand their causes and therefore arrive at the best possible solutions.

There's an alternative mindset in which the content of someone's statements and attempts to evaluate them with respect to evidence are beside the point. The imperative is not to examine ideas that may be true or false; it is to maximize passion and solidarity. Because the elites are already in a position of power and the downtrodden have only their own solidarity and emotional passion as countermeasures, therefore anything that undermines the passion and solidarity is harmful in the struggle. And it is a struggle! It's a kind of warfare that is zero-sum, and the imperative is to change the power balance.

In short, according to the interview, part of the evidence against the famous cognitive scientist Steven Pinker were his old tweets in which he stated that African Americans were not lethally injured by the police more often than white ones. The famous scholar seems to be in possession of data to support his claims; apparently, the data was deemed 'beside the point'. This dramatic moment very closely resembles the one in Kenworth's stage adaptation: we do not need data. Data, science, education reflect reality. That is not a reality we are willing to accept, if it happens to coincide with views that we consider biased. It is remarkable that many junior academics (i.e. new generations) were among the signees of the call to abolish Pinker's distinguished status in the Linguistic Society of America. Is it not Kenworth's school in which education gives way to slogans? The scientific principles described by Pinker in the penultimate paragraph of the interview are ignored in favour of a 'political correctness' issue. This 'logical blunder' is indicative of a split with reality, in which key words rather than findings have primacy. It is regrettable that in both contexts studied in this paper, one imagined and one real, the officially

disadvantaged group is none the better despite all the talking, and the blame is borne by lone individuals who talk about knowledge and insist on evidence.<sup>1</sup>

## 5. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to examine the possibilities of applying Louw's Contextual Prosodic Theory [CPT] to the study of theatre language, on this occasion in the context of political correctness. The excerpt under study came from Kenworth's *Revolution Farm*, a stage adaptation of Orwell's *Animal Farm*. At the level of the plot it was shown that what is a general linguistic tendency in Orwell's original (the gradual abandonment of grammar in the 'commandments') is more ostensibly shown in Kenworth's adaptation in the scene where the animals refuse to learn grammar at school. In the episode, the Orwellian tendency to simplify language is additionally highlighted by the transition from education, which is difficult to acquire, to slang, which is easily understood. Keywords 'education', 'grammar' and 'slang' are resorted to by the playwright to drive his point home. Ultimately, the comparison goes to show that a playwright will be more prone to rely on keywords than a novelist. The playwright's skill depends on visual collocation as much as dialogue, whereas the novelist's visual art is in the text, processed at leisure. Having said this, grammatical subtext (the interaction of lexis and its grammar) will exist in the dramatic dialogue as well as in any other kind of text, confirming hypotheses (a) and (b), stated in the Introduction. An example of such a search is the analysis of 'are you ADJ for NOUN' in Smoothie's address at school, studied in Section 3 as an example of Louw's *insincerity*.

According to Russell, grammar underlies all language and attracts its vocabulary to become 'perfect'. This is illustrated in the Introduction by the strings 'when she was' and 'when he was' attracting certain frequent vocabulary items in natural language, creating certain states of affairs as a result. Grammar also reflects the structure of the world, according to Wittgenstein. Based on these theoretical postulates explained in Section 2, it may be concluded that any writer's language would lose naturalness if they were asked to adjust their knowledge of the world to satisfy others' prejudices. The case of Pinker's failed cancellation, studied in Section 4, shows that such attempts are not impossible in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## References:

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to my Academic Writing class (2023-24) for a discussion of political correctness that partly underpins the discussion in this paper.

- Louw W. E. 1993. Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies. In *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*, M. Baker, G. Fransis and E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds), 152-176. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Louw, W. E. 2000. Contextual prosodic theory: bringing semantic prosodies to life. In *Words in context. In honour of John Sinclair*, C. Heffer, and H. Sauntson (eds), 48-94. Birmingham: ELR.
- Louw, B. & Milojkovic, M. 2016. *Corpus Stylistics as Contextual Prosodic Theory and Subtext*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Milojkovic M. 2020. Is the truthfulness of a proposition verifiable through access to reference corpora? *Journal of Literary Semantics* 49 (2): 119-141.
- Orwell G. 2016. [1944]. *Animal Farm*. eBooks@Adelaide.  
<https://ia800905.us.archive.org/25/items/AnimalFarmByGeorgeOrwell/Animal%20Farm%20by%20George%20Orwell.pdf>
- Sinclair J. 2006. *Phrasebite*. Pescara: TWC.

Dr Marija Milojkovic is Senior Language Instructor at the English Department, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade. She has published a co-authored book, two co-authored book chapters and a number of research articles in the field of corpus stylistics, and presented her research at international conferences specializing in stylistics and corpus linguistics.