

<https://doi.org/10.18485/analiff.2026.38.1.4>

81'42

821.111.09-31 Орвел Љ. 811.111'38

Corpus-derived grammatical subtext and the origins of political correctness in Kenworth's dramatic adaptation of Orwell's *Animal Farm*

Marija M. Milojković*

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philology, Department of English

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4519-6401>

Key words:

collocation,
semantic prosody,
insincerity,
corpus-derived subtext,
grammatical subtext,
quasi-propositional
variables,
Contextual Prosodic
Theory,
corpus stylistics,
Louw,
Orwell

Abstract

In his seminal paper on semantic prosody [SP], Louw (1993) dwells on the deviations from the language norm, proposing that breaches of SP must amount to either authorial irony or inadvertent insincerity. While SP was initially studied from the point of view of lexical collocation, Louw's later work focused on the study of grammatical subtext, but never specifically on its potential to point up irony or insincerity in discourse. This paper connects Louw's understanding of inadvertent insincerity with the notion of political correctness in the context of Kenworth's dramatic adaptation of Orwell's *Animal Farm*, and posits three hypotheses: that grammatical subtext will account for implied negative attitudes in texts (H1); that grammatical subtext will explain hidden rhetorical mechanisms behind overt negative attitudes in texts (H2); and that language suffering under the restrictions of political correctness may be qualified as forced (H3). The methodology deployed relies on Louw's defining grammatical subtext as the sum of the most frequent lexical variables of a grammar string (Louw, 2010). After the study was properly contextualised by interpreting the role of grammar in an Orwellian society, an excerpt from the dramatic adaptation was chosen in which one of the main characters admits to being manipulative and then engages in manipulation. On the basis of two wordings found in the excerpt, the paper defends the first two hypotheses. As for the third, it was found that defending it requires a different context of situation. Ultimately, the findings suggest that it is possible to prove manipulative intent on the basis of lexical collocates of a grammar string, and, additionally, that grammatical subtext alone may be the basis of the rhetorical strategy of faulty emotional appeal. Both findings may be taken as evidence of and as an improvement on the initial speculations of Louw. (примљено: 10. априла 2025; прихваћено: 26. маја 2026)

1. Introduction

1.1. Corpus-derived grammatical subtext within the framework of Contextual Prosodic Theory

Language is politically incorrect because it reflects reality¹. If we enter the sequences 'when he was *ed' and 'when she was *ed' into the Corpus of Contemporary American English [COCA] (time period 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] (time period 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, as cited in Viana et al., 2011: 189)

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 Louw (2000) on the basis of Louw (1993), and compares authorial usage with the language norm in the reference corpus within *similar events* – situational contexts. This 'language norm' is defined by Louw as semantic prosody – "a consistent aura of meaning with which a form is imbued by its collocates"² (1993: 30). The theory is called 'contextual' in acknowledgement of Firth's insistence on the context of situation in the study of 'language events' (Firth, 1957: 182).

1 In this paper, the term 'political correctness' is used based on the extended definition given by Britannica (n.d.).

2 In a large and representative reference corpus of the language; however, studying an authorial semantic prosody in a reference corpus of the author's published works is also possible.

It is the main postulate in Louw (1993) that authorial usages that flout the semantic tendencies recoverable in the corpus by introducing collocates that are at odds with the norm are either indicative of conscious irony or they may point at inadvertent *insincerity*. The latter implies a wish to conceal one's true attitude rather than to construct intentional factual lies. As an example, Louw quotes Director General of the British Council in Harare who commented on the University of Zimbabwe by stating the following: "I mean, it's symptomatic of the University of Zimbabwe which has such a high reputation that there are fifteen links between departments in the university here and equivalent departments in all sorts of institutions, universities, polytechnics in Britain" (1993: 43). Louw provides a concordance of 'symptomatic of' to prove that its usages in his reference corpus (37 million words) are overwhelmingly negative, and puts forward the hypothesis that this is no mere slip of the tongue:

It is plain that the speaker believes that the University of Zimbabwe badly needs assistance from Britain. Truly high standards at the University of Zimbabwe would render assistance in the form of more than a dozen funded links unnecessary. The speaker tries skillfully to avoid making the statement on Zimbabwe's national television that the University is dependent on Britain for assistance in the area of teaching and research. He tries instead to suggest that the links are in place because the University has high standards and a *high reputation*. However, even if this were the case at the level of policy, the choice of the form *symptomatic of* seems to be an indicator of the speaker's own attitude. The standards at the University of Zimbabwe, whatever they are in reality, are momentarily matched against the full paradigmatic range following the form *symptomatic of* in the language as a whole [...]. (Louw, 1993: 44)

This is part of the concordance provided by Louw, with 'symptomatic of' as the node (my emphasis):

17 Air Force were symptomatic of this **organizational monomania** w
18 intake, may be symptomatic of **numerous disorders** some of them
19 , which may be symptomatic of **generalized internal bleeding** m
20 ntury. This is symptomatic of your **new broom**, is it, Director
21 None alone is symptomatic of a **clinical depression**, but the
22 ou, Carter, as symptomatic of a **vain or proud man** who is not

Clearly, the 1993 paper, which has since been widely quoted in research on semantic prosody, primarily dwelled on exceptions that are *in complete opposition* to the corpus norm, hence Louw's insistence on irony as an alternative to inadvertent insincerity. It follows from Louw's reasoning that it would be possible to use 'symptomatic of' ironically, in which case the speaker would be conscious of the intended ironic effect, unlike in the example described, in which the sceptical attitude was inadvertently expressed.

What Louw does not say in 1993 is that the example of inadvertent insincerity in the lexico-grammatical collocation ‘symptomatic of’ may also be considered an attempt at *political correctness*. The speaker does his best to avoid offence, but is outwitted by his own discourse. While Sinclair’s pamphlet discusses the grammar string ‘when she was’ from the point of view of the language norm revealed by the reference corpus, Louw uses the reference corpus to uncover the language norm, which betrays the speaker. Louw (2000) calls such cases “overprovision of the context of situation”, implying that authorial usage may be more positive than the corpus norm.

In later research, it has been shown that generally “accounting for the creation of meaning in literary texts, specifically through the investigation of collocation” (McIntyre/Walker, 2019: 12) may be achieved by resorting to the reference corpus and finding deviations that need not be complete opposites to the majority of usages in the given language. It is in this light that we witness the next relevant development in CPT, *corpus-derived subtext*, which is defined as the most frequent lexical variables (termed ‘quasi-propositional’) within and around a grammar string (Louw, 2010; Louw/Milojkovic, 2016; Milojkovic, 2020). A good example is ‘when she was’ followed by ‘diagnosed’ or ‘approached’ in John Sinclair’s pamphlet quoted above, in which ‘diagnose’ or ‘approach’ are frequent lexical variables in the grammar string ‘when she was *ed’.

Authorial deviations from the grammatical subtext in the general corpus have not so far been checked for insincerity in general terms, but examples of ‘authorial insincerity’ (Louw/Milojkovic, 2016, Chapter 9) have been studied (see also Milojkovic, 2020). For example, in Yeats’s poem “Sailing to Bysantium”, the opening line “That is no country for old men” contains the grammar string ‘that is no * for’. The most frequent lexical variables in this grammar string in various reference corpora are ‘reason’ and ‘excuse’. In Louw’s interpretation (2010), the persona has no reason or excuse to travel to Bysantium, which deepens the reader’s appreciation of the first line of the poem. Thus, corpus-derived subtext is the lexis that is characteristic of grammar strings, unlike semantic prosody in its chronologically primary meaning that took account mostly of lexical collocates of the node. Still, despite these different forms of collocation (lexical collocation recoverable by co-selection, vs. grammatical subtext), the principle remains the same: authorial collocation may be compared to that in the general reference corpus in order to deepen the reader’s appreciation of its meaning.

Contextual Prosodic Theory finds its discussion of corpus-derived grammatical subtext on philosophy of language (Milojkovic, 2020). To go back to Sinclair’s pamphlet quoted in the beginning, 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 the 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’).

Sinclair’s pamphlet quoted at the beginning is therefore a good illustration of how grammatical subtext (or the logical form of a proposition) reflects the ‘form of reality’: the collocates of ‘when she was’ reveal the prospects of ‘she’ in the external world. While Louw’s (1993) notion of *inadvertent insincerity* as deviation from the corpus norm which is unwarranted by considerations of style took into account only lexical and lexico-grammatical collocation, it may now be justified to look at Louw’s (2010) discovery of corpus-derived grammatical subtext from this, purely forensic, perspective. Political correctness, arguably exhibited by the Director of the British Council in Louw’s example, often quoted in the literature, has been taken as a starting point of this paper. Moreover, the consideration that the very notion of *inadvertent insincerity* has never been directly pursued in published research has played its part in the inception of this study.

1.2. Goals and hypotheses

The goal of this paper will be to follow in Sinclair’s footsteps and apply Contextual Prosodic Theory’s focus on grammatical subtext to the notion of political correctness in theatre – in particular, to dramatic dialogue in a dramatisation of a prose text. 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*.

Judging by the research of corpus-derived subtext within the CPT framework that has accumulated so far, the following three hypotheses might be formulated:

H1: It will be possible to use corpus-derived subtext to uncover *implied* disparaging, hostile or otherwise negative attitudes to members of disadvantaged groups (cases of insincerity), e.g. as means of characterization.

H2: It will be possible to study the precise means of conveying politically incorrect (as understood in modern times) attitudes in cases where they are more overt.

H3: It might be possible to probe whether restrictions imposed by political correctness on authors or language users generally 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. Notably, since dramatization is a process of adaptation, pitfalls await the dramaturg that will not be expected in dialogue written from scratch.

This list of possible hypotheses regarding political (in)correctness in the language of theatre as recoverable through corpus-derived subtext is by no means complete. Still, Contextual Prosodic Theory has never engaged with either politically (in)correct discourse or theatre discourse, therefore the three hypotheses will act as a starting point.

The balanced and representative reference corpora chosen for the purpose of studying grammatical subtext in Orwell's fable and in its dramatic adaptation by Kenworth will be the British National Corpus [BNC] (Davies, 2004) and the Corpus of Contemporary American English [COCA] (Davies, 2008–). The notion of using a corpus of American English in the study of British authors requires an explanation. The Corpus of Contemporary American English is the largest *available, balanced and representative* corpus of English, containing more than one billion words. For the sake of comparison, the British National Corpus [BNC] contains 100 million words (one tenth of COCA). When it comes to grammar strings, size plays a crucial role, as the longer the N-gram, the fewer occurrences there will be. On the other hand, the difference in the semantics of grammar will be less crucial than in the semantics of lexis across these two varieties of English. For these reasons, the size of the corpus may even take precedence in such research over the distinction between the British vs. American variety (for an illustration of how the size of the reference corpus contributes to research, e.g. see Louw/Milojkovic, 2016, Chapter 10).

It is at this point that the limitations of the study must be addressed. As has been stated, the forensic aspect of Louw's insincerity has not been sufficiently pursued in subsequent research (see, however, Milojkovic, 2019; 2024 for Russian and English examples of lexico-grammatical collocation in a forensic context). With this in mind, a single research article can only initiate a proper study and dissect several examples. When it comes to the limitations of the method, the first is the size of the corpora consulted: when (much) larger balanced and representative corpora become available, the findings of this study may be corrected. The second limitation has to do with the methodology of the research. A contextual-prosodic study of grammatical subtext focuses on particular sequences *in the particular context of the author's text*. It takes considerable space to analyse a handful of examples and prove the correctness of the analysis to the conscientious reader (as this research article can testify). As a result, research progresses relatively slowly, notwithstanding the rewarding nature of the findings. For this reason, it needs to be assessed in its entirety. Only if we take into account all published examples and analyses may we become aware of the unity of data, and, as a consequence, of the necessity to continue studying grammatical subtext.

2. Grammar and the origins of political correctness

In Section 1 it was shown that grammar is at the core of the interplay between language and reality, because grammar 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 in the view of the Communist Party. Presumably, the modifier 'political' was introduced in order to distinguish this kind of correctness from the pure linguistic kind, or the 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 on the eternal opposition between man and other living creatures:

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. (Orwell, 2016: 10)

The speech is simple yet dignified, its repetitions and parallelisms at the core of the powerful rhetoric. Old Major endeavours to offer precise definitions of the conflicting parties, the possession of two legs vs. four legs or wings being the key distinction. He then goes on to proscribe the unacceptable, consisting of practices associated with humans. 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 Old Major's ideological premises to all animals, this time as seven commandments:

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. (Orwell, 2016: 20–21)

There is some simplification, but Old Major's 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. (Orwell, 2016: 28–29)

Ultimately, the 'essential principle of animalism' has been almost completely stripped of its grammar. What remains of Old Major's dignified rhetoric is vocabulary alone, bar the -s ending for the plural of nouns: all ideological differences are resolved by the number of legs. 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 almost complete loosening of ties with reality, and thus of 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 Kenworth's dramatic adaptation, 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.

[...] **Hero.** 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 quietyens 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, 2022)

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" (Orwell, 2016: 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. 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, so he suffers defeat as an educator. His motivational speech on knowledge as power assists him little. 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.

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 Dictionary, n.d.), 'wasteman' is slang for 'a stupid person' (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.).³ 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

³ Both these online dictionaries were accessed on 19 December 2024.

cannon food: “Are you ready for battle? Are you ready for war? Are you ready for bloodshed?” They enthusiastically are.

To summarise, while Hero (Orwell’s Snowball) tries and fails to empower the animals by handing them knowledge (teaching them 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 in Kenworth’s dramatisation at the level of the plot. When it comes to language itself, instead of showing how grammar is abandoned in its capacity of a language mechanism, as in Orwell’s text, Kenworth foregrounds slang as a language realisation. 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? (Kenworth, 2022)

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 (‘knowledge’, ‘education’, ‘grammar’, ‘slang’, ‘new rules’), Kenworth makes it clear to the audience that in the aftermath of the Revolution progress gives way to regressive policies.

4. A corpus stylistic analysis of Smoothie’s rhetoric in Kenworth’s dramatic adaptation of Orwell’s *Animal Farm*

The pig Napoleon in Orwell’s *Animal Farm*, becoming Smoothie in Kenworth’s adaptation, is no doubt thus suggestively renamed because of his smooth-talking rhetorical strategies. A general corpus analysis of his dialogue with the class in the excerpt under discussion has shown that there are remarkably few examples of its grammar in the reference corpora that shed additional light on Smoothie’s meaning. For example, if we take the slogan “animals are not scum”, COCA yields one truism for the search line ‘NN2 are not NN’, which is ‘corporations are not people’.⁴ In this search line, NN2 stands for ‘plural common noun’ and NN stands for ‘common noun, neutral for number’.⁵ In the BNC, three truisms are yielded by

4 To avoid misunderstandings, each occurrence if the reference corpus is routinely checked by opening the wider context.

5 Although Louw has always opposed the setting of parts of speech in advance (preferring wildcarding and using the symbol “*”), such statements were uttered prior to the active study of grammatical subtext, performed largely by myself. In the cases of extracting grammatical subtext, setting the part of speech in

the same search line: 'schools are not businesses' (2), 'chimpanzees are not people' (1), and 'books are not life' (1). Or, when it comes to the slogan 'alcohol is what scum drink', the search line 'NOUN is what VERB NOUN', COCA yields examples so diverse that they that are impossible to classify (Louw calls such findings 'diluted', personal communication). On close examination it becomes apparent that only one line actually occurs in the corpus twice *in different contexts*, and that line is 'wealth is what people want'. In the BNC, the same search line yields one occurrence of 'confidence is what brings success'.

Still, the excerpt contains two samples of Smoothie's rhetoric that are more than worthy of study by corpus means. In other words, two utterances were found where the reference corpus norm is at odds with Smoothie's usage to a degree that affects our understanding of his motives. This section will focus on these two utterances by Smoothie, provide the analysis of their corpus-derived subtexts and discuss the implications inherent therein that are relevant to Louw's concept of insincerity (1993). As stated in Section 1.2, the relatively small number of examples is a necessary feature of this method.

4.1. "All animals are the same"

In the excerpt under discussion, "all animals are the same" is the last slogan shouted out by Smoothie and seconded by the class. In the play, this is the equivalent of Orwell's famous seventh commandment "All animals are equal", quoted in Section 2. This rewording is of interest and will be discussed in this subsection.

In the British National Corpus, the search string 'all * are the same' yields the following concordance:

```

1 e similar, many are different. Not all worlds are the same, and life
  upon them has strange effects
2 Don Alfonso, who tells them that all women are the same -- fundamentally
  faithless by nature.
3 oman games must've been like.'' All villages are the same,' said Betty.
  She had acquired a copy
4 possible to make distinctions not all trailers are the same. Aside from
  mainstream Hollywood's
5                                     All teachers are the same, that they
  go back on their word.
6 e at their answers. Since not all problems are the same, some call for
  one type of thinking
7 your job. But don't assume that all policies are the same. Here are
  some points that Lloyds Bank
8 51 The carriage settings for all models are the same. B.B. Cancel Key
  and Needle Return Leve
9                                     Well all men are the same, slow!
10 clear writing; make sure that all letters are the same height as the
  narrow lines. Letraset ca

```

advance simply means that the search is not diluted (e.g. in this case one does not get pronouns in lexical slots), and that the N-grams yielded are guaranteed to fit into the grammatical context of the author's passage (e.g. in this case, the corpus will not yield N-grams ending in an adjective).

11 ues. Unless we assume that **all individuals are the same** then presumably
 we may all have different
 12 a deodorant reduces smell. # **Not all fuels are the same** # THE SHELL
 AIR MILES CLUB # For drivers
 13 n Street, Stoke Newington. **All distances are the same** to those who
 don't meet. Halifax was equ
 14 d always been assumed that **all calories are the same**, regardless of
 where they came from. In ot

In this concordance of 14 lines, as elsewhere in this paper, each line was studied for its context of situation as an integral part of the analysis (see Appendix A for the wider contexts of 'all * are the same' in the BNC). In four lines (1, 4, 6, 12), the lexico-grammatical collocation 'all * are the same' is negated by the particle 'not', e.g. 'Since not all problems are the same...' in line 6. Negation in the co-text occurs in lines 7 and 11, and in one more case negation is part of the wider context (in line 14, 'Until recently it had always been assumed that all calories are the same...'). Thus, in seven lines out of the fourteen, the proposition that 'all * are the same' is negated outright.

Then, in the remaining seven lines, in four (lines 2, 3, 5, 9) the generalization that 'all * are the same' is considered true, but it focuses on a negative trait shared by all members of the group. For example, in line 2 'all women are the same – fundamentally faithless by nature'. Here the notion is teasingly employed, and arguably could have belonged to the previous category because of the inherent implication that the proposition is untrue. However, in lines 3, 5, and 9 (featuring 'villages', 'teachers' and 'men', respectively), the generalisation is considered true by its source.

Finally, three lines needed to be disqualified. In line 8, the key collocation is not a syntactic fit for the original: 'The carriage settings for **all models are the same**.' The subject to the predicate 'are the same' is not 'all models', but 'the carriage settings for all models'. Line 10 was also disqualified, since 'the same' here modifies the noun 'height' instead of acting as a nominal. In line 13, the prepositional phrase modifying the statement (all distances are the same *to those who don't meet*) disqualifies the context from further consideration, because (a) in the original the statement is end-stopped, and (b) without the modifier the statement would be unclear.

Having disqualified these three lines, we come to the conclusion that, out of the 11 lines remaining overall, in seven or eight lines, depending on the researcher's stance as discussed in the preceding paragraphs, the proposition is negated. Furthermore, in another four or three lines, the subject of the sentence in which 'the same' is the nominal predicate is viewed in a negative light based on a certain specific characteristic, which is immediately stated

It may seem, therefore, that Smoothie's slogan "all animals are the same", if checked against the background of the BNC, is a rather poor rewording of the original "all animals are equal", as the grammatical subtext points either to the

statement being untrue, or to it being viewed in a negative light. Is the grammatical subtext of Orwell's original line "all animals are equal" more positive? This is the frequency list of 'all * are equal' from the BNC:

```
1 all men are equal 6
2 all things are equal 2
3 all wholes are equal 1
4 all theories are equal 1
5 all poles are equal 1
6 all places are equal 1
7 all nations are equal 1
8 all members are equal 1
9 all individuals are equal 1
10 all advertisements are equal 1
```

The following is the concordance of the top frequency sequence 'all men are equal':

```
1 cist remarks, yet for him' All men are equal before God.' He had grown
accustomed, even in the
2 rms with the paradox: if " all men are equal " only when " men " means
" people like us ", then
3 trine which declares that all men are equal but only if they accept my
point of view. Unfortunately
4 The recognition that all men are equal in the sight of God is fundamental
to liberty as we kn
5 cy is its insistence that all men are equal in esteem. Emphatically,
it is not this: that all
6 lly, it is not this: that all men are equal in esteem -- but those who
are members of the union
```

In the concordance of 'all men are equal', 'men' means 'people generally'. In this way it is applicable to studying Orwell, as 'animals' are also a group of individuals viewed as a society. In the wider contexts of this concordance (lines 5 and 6 coming from the same passage), the doctrine that 'all men are equal' is not questioned in any way only in line 4. The unifying idea of the concordance, with the exception of line 4, is that all men are supposed to be equal in theory, and yet somehow this does not come to pass unconditionally (see Appendix B for the wider contexts of 'all men are equal' from the BNC). If applied to Jones's farm, called *Animal Farm* in Orwell's fable and *Revolution Farm* in Kenworth's adaptation, this semantic prosody works well, since it points up the idealism behind rebellions such as the October Revolution. To compare this picture with the implications of 'all * are the same' from the BNC, 'all * are equal' is neither negated nor negatively coloured – it is idealistic instead. For the sake of comparison, the following frequency list of 'all * are the same' comes from COCA (position 5 was the cut-off point; for the list of concordances, see Appendix C):

1 all men are the same 12
 2 all religions are the same 10
 3 all people are the same 8
 4 all women are the same 6
 5 all Muslims are the same 6

When it comes to the most frequent sequence, 'all men are the same', the lexical variable 'men' is taken to mean 'people of the male gender', and negation occurs in five lines out of 12 (e.g. 'Not all women are the same, just as not all men are the same'). In another six lines the proposition is considered true, but is negatively coloured (e.g. 'They are liars and cheaters'). One line was discarded because the sequence is part of a larger structure ('the hearts of all men are the same').

In the next frequent sequence, 'all religions are the same', the proposition is negated in six cases out of 10 (in one case by the particle 'not', and in five cases by the co-text). The tone is sceptical in two cases, negative in one, and neutral in one case only.

In the sequence at position 3, 'all people are the same', the proposition is negated in three cases out of the eight. In one case it is considered true, but the tone is still skeptical. In three more cases, however, the tone is definitely positive. Most importantly, in these cases 'the same' does mean 'equal' in the Orwellian sense. These three lines are the only instance on the frequency lists of 'all * are the same' in both the BNC and COCA where 'the same' refers to social equality rather than to a particular trait shared by a class.

In the sequence at position 4, 'all women are the same', the proposition is negated in two cases out of six (lines 3 and 4). In the remaining four contexts, it is considered true, but the tone is negative (line 1), cynical (line 2), critical (line 6), and understanding rather than critical (line 5).

In the sequence at position 5, 'all Muslims are the same', the proposition is negated in every instance, i.e. by the particle 'not' in two cases, and by the co-text in the remaining six.

All in all, in the 32 lines discussed above, the proposition is both considered true and not negatively coloured at the same time in four cases only. Namely, the tone is positive in three lines of 'all people are the same', and neutral in one line of 'all religions are the same'.

To proceed with the comparison, this is the frequency list of 'all * are equal' from COCA (position 5 was the cut-off point; for the list of concordances, see Appendix D):

1 all people are equal 25
 2 all men are equal 22
 3 all things are equal 22
 4 all animals are equal 21
 5 all cultures are equal 13

In the case of 'all people are equal', the proposition is considered true in 19 lines (1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25), and is negated by

the co-text in two (lines 9 and 11). In two more lines the irony is Orwellian ('...but some are more equal'). In line 13 the negation of the proposition is put into question ('I struggled with the concept that not all people are equal'). Only in one case the proposition is considered to work only in theory (line 12, 'I'd die happy if at some point all people are equal').

When it comes to 'all men are equal' in COCA, the meaning of 'men' is 'people generally', as was the case in the BNC concordance (e.g. line 8: 'all men are equal in the sight of God'). The proposition is considered true in every context but line 19, in which it is negated by the co-text, and line 21, in which it is the description of a sentiment typical of a population group (the tone is therefore neutral rather than affirmative).

At position 3, 'all things are equal' has the specific meaning of referring to conditions of an experiment, and not the concept of social equality. At position 4, 'all animals are equal' is an allusion to Orwell in all cases. Finally, at position 5, in the concordance of 'all cultures are equal', the proposition is negated by the co-text in eight cases out of 13 (lines 2 and 7–13), and by the particle 'not' in two more lines (lines 1 and 6). It is viewed with skepticism in two more cases (lines 7 and 8), and is considered partially true in line 5 ('All cultures are equal except the Western civilisation').

All in all, in the frequency list of 'all * are equal' in COCA, the sequences deserving of attention are 'all people are equal' at position 1, and 'all men are equal' at position 2, because the lexical variable refers to people generally in the context of social equality. The proposition is not considered unconditionally true in four lines out of 25, and in two lines out of 22, respectively. The overall semantic prosody, therefore, is positive, unlike in the BNC concordance of 'all men are equal', where the proposition is considered to be correct in theory but idealistic in practice in five lines out of six.

To summarise, the overall semantic prosody of 'all * are the same', unlike 'all * are equal', appears not to apply well to the context of Kenworth's adaptation, as the proposition is either negated or stated with a negative colouring in the majority of contexts in both the BNC and COCA. At this point, we may venture two educated guesses. The first is that Kenworth is showing how Smoothie is being insincere, according to Louw (see Section 1), since the positive tone contradicts the negative subtext. The second is that Kenworth, in the process of adaptation, chooses an alternative inaccurate wording that cannot withstand stylistic analysis, thereby confirming the third hypothesis of this paper (see Section 1.2, H3).

However, if one looks at the only three positive contexts of 'all * are the same' (belonging to the sequence 'all people are the same'), the motive behind Smoothie's wording becomes apparent. In fact, all three instances refer to teaching children the premise of social equality in simple terms:

4 GRAPHIC: When you are afraid, without asking why. All people are the same. AMANPOUR-lon-cam: So Muppet diplomacy it says here in the "Sesame Street"

6 little kids. Teach them that all people are equal, all people are the same, it don't matter what colour, what -- whatever, purple, pink

8 importantly, it reinforced the lesson she has always taught: all people are the same, no matter what their race or colour. We all love, hate

Ultimately, Smoothie's motivation for using the wording "all people are the same" instead of Orwell's "all people are equal" makes more sense than meets the eye. It indicates that Smoothie believes he is dealing with creatures of limited intelligence, a situation similar to teaching children. He modifies the concept taught to the animals in order to ensure comprehension, revealing his biased view of their intellectual capacity. It is also possible that Kenworth, while adapting Orwell to the stage, managed to transfer his possible personal scepticism about the idea that all animals are in actual fact equal at the Revolution Farm.

4.2. "Are you ready for bloodshed?"

"Are you ready for battle? Are you ready for war? Are you ready for bloodshed?," asks Smoothie. Why is the response of the class such a resounding "yes we are"? The grammatical subtext of the question might prove of assistance. The following is the full concordance of 'are you ADJ for NOUN' in the British National Corpus:

```
1 are you ready for traffic 1
2 are you ready for tea 1
3 are you ready for sunset 1
4 are you ready for mother 1
5 are you ready for ice 1
6 are you ready for coffee 1
7 are you ready for bed 1
8 are you free for lunch 1
9 are you free for coffee 1
10 are you eligible for rights 1
11 are you alright for vimto 1
12 are you alright for change 1
```

Each of the lexico-grammatical collocations appears in the corpus once. Lines 4 and 5 (in italics) are not end-stopped: in the second lexical slot, 'mother' is part of the syntagm 'mother's question', and 'ice' is part of 'ice cream'. Strictly speaking, neither may be considered a syntactic fit for Smoothie's rhetorical questions, which are end-stopped after the second lexical slot.

In the remaining lines, of which there are 10, let us first consider the first lexical slot. The most frequent lexical variable is 'ready' (5), followed by 'free' (2), 'alright' (2), and 'eligible' (1). Even prior to opening the wider contexts of these lines, one may cautiously observe that all these lexemes carry a positive connotation. Considering the second lexical slot required the opening of each co-text. The first five lines contain the same variable in the first lexical slot as in Smoothie's speech: 'ready'. Contextually, lines 1, 6, and 7 refer to comforts of everyday life, the second

lexical slot being filled with the variables ‘tea’, ‘coffee’ and ‘bed’, respectively. Unlike these, line 3, featuring capitalised ‘Sunset’, refers to a challenge in the context of surfing. The next two lines, with ‘free’ in the first lexical slot, are questions asked to schedule a meeting. The last two lines, containing ‘alright’ in the first lexical slot, signify the speaker’s wish to elicit agreement in the contexts of shopping. The question in line 10, ‘are you eligible for rights?’, is a rhetorical device initiating a general discussion of entitlement to employees’ right. Overall, out of the 10 lines under consideration, eight lines (1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12) contain basic questions asked in daily life, and one context is a general discussion in the field of law. Ultimately, out of these, only one context, which is line 3 (‘are you ready for Sunset?’), containing the first lexical variable of Smoothie’s choice (‘ready’), might be said to relate to Smoothie’s motivational speech, as it refers to a challenge. The situation, however, is surfing – not war, not any kind of conflict, and not any kind of unpleasant duty.

In COCA, the searchline ‘are you ADJ for NOUN’ yields the following contexts at the top of the frequency list (6 was chosen as the cut-off point):

```
1 are you free for dinner 19
2 are you free for lunch 14
3 are you ready for bed 10
4 are you ready for dinner 8
5 are you ready for school 7
6 are you ready for love 6
7 are you ready for lunch 6
8 are you ready for dessert 6
```

This concordance, which is a frequency list, is more uniform than the one from the BNC discussed above. Instead of ‘battle’, ‘war’ and ‘bloodshed’, all the pleasures of life surface in the second lexical slot: ‘dinner’, ‘lunch’, ‘bed’, ‘dessert’, even ‘love’. The grammatical subtext in the first lexical slot makes it all the more telling by replacing Smoothie’s ‘ready’ by the adjective ‘free’. ‘Free’ in the first two lines of the frequency list reinforces the idea of personal choice. This pleasurable subtext (with the exception of ‘school’ in the second slot, which in the seven contexts in COCA encountered four clearly positive responses), 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 peaceful pleasures might be pronounced as an instance of Smoothie’s *insincerity* (see Section 1) in a successful attempt to manipulate the ignorant animals. After all, Smoothie’s declared and most important aim in the excerpt under discussion is to rely on the animals as ‘the muscle’: “Books will only confuse ‘em. And we need them focussed. Ready to attack at a moment’s notice [...] Army’s the most important thing in the revolution. Get them on your side and you’re away.” Smoothie’s use of ‘we’ and of the generic ‘you’ indicate that he plans to make use of the animals in a fight where they are not meant to be the main beneficiaries.

In this fashion, the grammatical subtext of Smoothie's utterance in the play constitutes the basis of an *emotional appeal*, here understood as "speaker's attempt to elicit emotions in hearers" (Jaszczyk et al., 2025). Smoothie's emotional appeal is achieved through the lexical variables in the second slot ('battle', 'war', 'bloodshed') directly contradicting the reference corpus norm. Are you free for some really nice war, asks Smoothie. The wording, however, gains its manipulative power solely on the basis of grammar, as Smoothie makes no attempt to conceal the actual state of affairs as represented by the lexical variables 'war' and 'bloodshed'. Crucially, the type of insincerity revealed in this analysis has as its aftermath both uncovering Smoothie's hidden motive on the part of the analyst *and* the impact his words are bound to have on his listeners in his immediate context of situation.

4.3. The implications of Smoothie's corpus-derived subtext: motive vs. impact

In Sections 4.1 and 4.2, two utterances from the chosen excerpt were shown to deviate considerably from the corpus norm in their corpus-derived grammatical subtext. The subtext of the slogan "all animals are the same" was shown to deviate in the direction of the negative: in the majority of the most frequent sequences from both the British National Corpus and the Corpus of Contemporary American English, the proposition is either negated or negatively coloured in an overwhelming majority of cases. As shown in Section 4.1, this would have been reason enough to pronounce it a case of authorial insincerity, but for the three lines in the concordance of 'all people are the same' in COCA: in all three contexts, the concept of social equality is taught to children. The usage of 'the same' instead of 'equal' by Smoothy could therefore be indicative not of a deviation from the language norm, but of Smoothie's conviction that the animals are below his level of intellectual maturity, as well as of his intention to teach the premise to the class in accessible terms.

When it comes to Smoothie's rhetorical questions "Are you ready for battle? Are you ready for war? Are you ready for bloodshed?", it was shown in Section 4.2 that the overall tone in both reference corpora is decidedly positive and contradicts the lexis of battle, war and bloodshed. The contexts were all peaceful and predominantly referred to pleasures of everyday life. There was also the dominant implication that the addressee was being consulted as to his or her preferences and was expected to declare a personal choice.

Smoothie's use of these two wordings reveals the rhetorical mechanisms behind grammatical subtext. The line "all animals are the same" betrays condescension, as well as Smoothie's motive and intention: teaching a premise to a group cognitively inferior to oneself. In contrast, Smoothie's use of the grammar string 'are you * for *' not only betrays his motive, which is making bloodshed seem a pleasurable activity that one may voluntarily choose or not, but it also explains the animals' positive response and their enthusiasm in accepting a course of action that will certainly inflict pain and death on at least some of them.

Thus, the rhetorical mechanisms are markedly different. "All animals are the same" adheres to the corpus norm in the domain of contextually 'similar events',

whereas “are you ready for war” defies the norm in order to elicit the desired response. Crucially, both authorial usages were prompted by manipulative intent, rather than originating out of mere ‘pains to conceal’. It is in this light that both usages under discussion differ from the use of ‘symptomatic of’ by the Director of the British Council in Harare, discussed in Section 1, whose only motive was in all probability to maintain political correctness in public discourse.

4.4. The implications of Smoothie’s corpus-derived subtext for the research hypotheses

As to the paper’s research hypotheses, the first postulated that corpus-derived subtext will make it possible “to uncover *implied* disparaging, hostile or otherwise negative attitudes to members of disadvantaged groups (cases of insincerity), e.g. as means of characterization” (H1). This was illustrated by Smoothie’s use of “all animals are the same” instead of “all animals are equal”, because it betrays his belief in his own superior intelligence in relation to the class. The second hypothesis posited that “it will be possible to study the precise means of conveying politically incorrect (as understood in modern times) attitudes in cases where they are more overt” (H2). This appears to have found proof in Smoothie’s wording “Are you ready for battle/war/bloodshed?”. It stands to reason that encouraging the population to engage in bloodshed by presenting it as a pleasurable activity of their personal choice will be considered politically incorrect in modern times. The use of ‘battle’, ‘war’ and ‘bloodshed’ is the element of overtness that is crucial in defending H2. So far, both the first and the second hypotheses found their justification in Smoothie’s rhetoric.

This was not the case with the third hypothesis of the paper, that “it might be possible to probe whether restrictions imposed by political correctness on authors or language users generally 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” (H3). This hypothesis was formed along the lines of the deviation from the norm in the wording ‘symptomatic of’ employed by the Director of the British Council, discussed in Section 1. The reason why the third hypothesis was not confirmed may be found in Smoothie’s unique role in postulating the very origins of political correctness. Smoothie is not one of those who toe ‘the party line’, according to the description of the origins of political correctness (Section 2). In case of such origins, Smoothie is the originator. He sets the tone. When others follow suit, we may expect the confirmation of H3 through the deviation from the norm in the classic Louw (1993) sense.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to examine the possibilities of applying Louw’s Contextual Prosodic Theory [CPT] to the study of corpus-derived grammatical subtext, on this occasion in the context of political correctness in theatre. 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 attempt to teach ideology to the underprivileged) is more ostensibly presented in Kenworth's adaptation in the scene where the animals refuse to learn grammar rules at school. Smoothie, Kenworth's version of Orwell's Napoleon, enters the scene and controls the class by resorting to slangy slogans instead of instructing it in grammar rules. 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 deployed by the playwright to drive his point home. Ultimately, this initial comparison between Orwell's text and Kenworth's adaptation 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 dramatic dialogue as well as in any other kind of text. According to Russell (1956), grammar underlies all language and attracts its vocabulary in order to become "perfect". This is illustrated in the Introduction by the strings 'when he was' and 'when she 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 1, it might be concluded that any writer's language would lose naturalness if they were asked to adjust their knowledge of the world to satisfy notions they privately disagreed with.

This allowed three hypotheses to be formulated to do with Louw's (1993) observation of 'insincerity in the writer', this time to do with political correctness. Namely, Louw claimed that a marked deviation from the corpus norm in the writer's usage, especially in the domain of positivity or negativity, will be indicative of inadvertent insincerity, and gave an example indicative of the speaker's attempt at political correctness in public discourse. However, while Louw (1993) dealt mainly with lexis, this paper copes with grammar. H1 stated that grammatical subtext will point up implied prejudice, while H2 claimed that overt political incorrectness would be more open to linguistic analysis if studied for grammatical subtext. H3 suggested that forced language would occur as a result of the author/language user forming utterances they do not quite agree with in private.

H1 was confirmed through the analysis of Smoothie's slogan "all animals are the same". The paper showed that he uses simplified language normally employed when teaching social equality to children. H2 was also confirmed through the analysis of Smoothie's motivational questions "Are you ready for battle? Are you ready for war? Are you ready for bloodshed?". While Smoothie's desire to manipulate the class into engaging in an armed conflict is made obvious by his lexis, the grammatical subtext was shown to be overwhelmingly positive in both reference corpora, as well as to

include the presupposition of the addressee's freedom of choice. H3, suggesting that inadvertent insincerity would simply result in forced language, was not confirmed. This arguably has to do with Smoothie's role in the Revolution: he sets the rules in place to serve his purpose. Concealing one's views to remain politically correct will be the business of others.

In addition, Smoothie's language provided valuable insight into the role of grammatical subtext in politicians' speeches. In the case of "all animals are the same", it pointed up not only Smoothie's prejudice, but also his motive: to teach accessibly. Secondly, his question "Are you ready for war?" was categorised as a faulty emotional appeal because of the clash between Smoothie's negative lexis and his positive grammatical subtext. The role of grammatical subtext in creating emotional appeals, as well as in revealing the speaker's hidden motives, is the original finding of this paper.

Given that the excerpt chosen for the study (a school lesson during which the animals refuse to learn 'boring' grammar rules) was found to contain only two instances of *inadvertently insincere* (Louw 1993) subtext, it is fair to point out that this research article must be read against the background of other literature on corpus-derived subtext in order for the findings not to be considered simply accidental. After all, H1 has been confirmed on only three instances in the reference corpus. Ultimately, two utterances by a dramatic personage are too small a number for the hypotheses to be considered fully proven. Still, the corpus data supporting both H1 and H2 are remarkably coherent (for the sake of comparison, see Sinclair, 2003), which gives reason to assume that more similar findings may be obtained in future research. These considerations point up the need to amass data in support of using CPT to investigate manipulative discourse.

Note: This paper was originally presented at the 17th *International Symposium of Theatre Critics and Theatre Scholars*, 27–28 May 2024, Novi Sad, Serbia.

References

- Britannica. (n.d.). *Political correctness*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/political-correctness>
- Collins Dictionary. (n.d.). <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d.). <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>
- Davies, M. (2004). *British National Corpus*. Oxford University Press. <https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/>
- Davies, M. (2008–). *The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)*. <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>
- Firth, J. R. (1957). *Papers in linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Juszczyk, K., Konat, B., Fabiszak, M. (2025). The heart attack of the Polish health service: metaphors, arguments, and emotional appeals in political debates. *Language and Cognition*, 17, e12. <https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2024.35>

- Kenworth, J. (2022). *Revolution Farm*. London: Playdead Press.
- McIntyre, D., Walker, B. (2019). *Corpus stylistics: Theory and practice*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Louw, W. E. (1993). Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies. In M. Baker, G. Fransis, E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 152–176). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Louw, W. E. (2000). Contextual prosodic theory: bringing semantic prosodies to life. In C. Heffer, H. Sauntson (Eds.), *Words in context. In honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jls-2020-2023>
- Milojkovic, M. (2024). Studying grammatical subtext for the purposes of forensic expertise – a corpus stylistic approach. In *Национальные и международные тенденции и перспективы развития судебной экспертизы: сборник докладов Научно-практической конференции с международным участием, г. Нижний Новгород, 22–23 мая 2024 г. [Proceedings of the Scientific and Practical Conference with International Participants: International and national tendencies and perspectives of the development of forensic expertise]*. Lobachevsky University, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia.] (pp. 241–255). Нижний Новгород: ННГУ.
- Orwell, G. (2016 [1944]). *Animal Farm*. eBooks@Adelaide. <https://ia800905.us.archive.org/25/items/AnimalFarmByGeorgeOrwell/Animal%20Farm%20by%20George%20Orwell.pdf>
- Russell, B. (1956 [2007]). *My philosophical development*. Nottingham: Spokesman Press.
- Sinclair, J. M. (2003). *Reading Concordances*. London: Longman.
- Sinclair, J. (2006). *Phrasebite*. Pescara: TWC.
- Viana V., Zyngier S., Barnbrook G. (Eds.) (2011). *Perspectives on Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Милойкович, М. 2019. Возможности контекстуально-просодической теории для установления диагностических признаков манипулятивного дискурса при производстве лингвистической экспертизы. *Международная научная конференция: Международные и национальные тенденции и перспективы развития судебной экспертизы* (стр. 42–59). Нижний Новгород: ННГУ.
- [Milojkovic M. 2019. Vozmozhnosti kontekstualyno-prosodicheskoi teorii dlya ustanovleniya diagnosticheskikh priznakov manipulyativnogo diskursa pri proizvodstve lingvisticheskoi ekspertizy. *Mezhdunarodnaya nauchnaya konferenciya: Mezhdunarodnye i nacionalynye tendencii i perspektivy razvitiya*

sudebnoy ekspertizy (str. 42-59). Nizhny Novgorod: NNGU. [*Proceedings of the International Conference: International and national tendencies and perspectives of the development of forensic expertise. Lobachevsky University, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia.*]

Марија Милојковић

Сажетак

КОРПУСНИ ГРАМАТИЧКИ ПОДТЕКСТ И ЗАЧЕЦИ ПОЛИТИЧКЕ КОРЕКТНОСТИ У КЕНВОРТОВОЈ ДРАМСКОЈ АДАПТАЦИЈИ ОРВЕЛОВЕ ЖИВОТИЊСКЕ ФАРМЕ

У овом раду се истражује концепт ненамерне неискрености који је у научну литературу увео Лоу (Louw, 1993). Бавећи се одступањима од корпусне норме у лексичким колокацијама, односно ауторским колокатима чија је семантичка прозодија супротна од оне превалентне у референтном корпусу, Лоу је сугерисао да ту долази до изражаја или намерна ауторска иронија или ненамерна неискреност. У овом раду се онај део дихотомије који се односи на ауторову неискреност проучава из перспективе граматике, пре него лексичких колокација као што је то случај код Лоуа. Рад се заснива на Лоуовој корпусно-стилистичкој контекстуално-прозодијској теорији (види Louw 2000, као и његове наредне публикације), а посебно на иновативној идеји да граматички подтекст одаје прототипично значење граматичког низа, а самим тим и дубље значење присутно у ауторском тексту (Лоу, 2010). Конкретно, контекстуално-прозодијска теорија ослања се на радове Расела и Витгенштајна у томе што дефинише граматички подтекст као суму најфреквентнијих лексичких варијабли једног граматичког низа (Milojkovic, 2020). У овом раду, Лоуово схватање ненамерне неискрености се доводи у везу са концептом политичке коректности, и то у контексту Кенвортове драмске адаптације Орвелове *Животињске фарме*. Аутор истраживања прелиминарно нуди своје тумачење наративно-реторичких механизма којима се Орвел служи да би дефинисао своје виђење улоге граматике у револуционарном друштву. Главни део рада садржи корпусно-стилистичку анализу једног фрагмента драмског текста у коме један од главних јунака отворено говори о својим манипулативним намерама пре него што их спроведе у дело. Формулишу се три хипотезе: да се граматичким подтекстом могу објаснити негативни ставови у тексту који постоје на нивоу импликације (X1); да се граматичким подтекстом могу додатно прецизирати скривени реторички механизми у експлицитно испољеним негативним ставовима у тексту (X2); и да се дискурс оптерећен захтевима политичке коректности може сматрати усиљеним (X3). На основу два исказа у фрагменту Кенвортове драмске адаптације за које се испоставља да значајно одступају од корпусне норме, рад пружа доказе заснованости прве две хипотезе.

Што се тиче треће, тврди се да је за њено разматрање неопходан ситуациони контекст друге врсте. У току анализе се такође долази до два битна увида: први је да је могуће доказати постојање манипулативне намере само на основу лексичких колоката граматичких низова, а други је да граматички подтекст може бити основа реторичке стратегије апела на емоције. И један и други могу се сматрати потврдом иницијалних претпоставки Лоуа, као и надоградњом његових хипотеза.

Кључне речи:

колокације, семантичка прозодија, неискреност, корпусни подтекст, граматички подтекст, квази-пропозиционе варијабле, контекстуално-прозодијска теорија, корпусна стилистика, Лоу, Орвел

Appendices

Appendix A. The contexts of 'all * are the same' from the BNC

1 Some are similar, many are different. Not **all worlds are the same**, and life upon them has strange effects upon the body.

2 The two young men, Guglielmo and Ferrando, are teased by Don Alfonso, who tells them that **all women are the same** -- fundamentally faithless by nature. Naturally the two officers protest that their girls are different

3 I begin to get some idea of what the Roman games must've been like.''
All villages are the same,' said Betty. She had acquired a copy of the rules of the various competitions and was reading it.

4 And it is possible to make distinctions not **all trailers are the same**. Aside from mainstream Hollywood's imitation pop videos, there are trash trailers (all corny strap lines and gruff hormonal voice-overs), and old-style hard sell

5 You said there's snowritin'. (SP:JJRPSUNK) (whine) (SP:JJRPSUNK) **All teachers are the same**, that they go back on their word. (SP:JJRPSUNK) (whine) Oh, please sir.

6 methods of thinking to arrive at their answers. Since not **all problems are the same**, some call for one type of thinking rather than another.

7 then you won't get behind with your monthly instalments if you fall ill or lose your job. But don't assume that **all policies are the same**. Here are some points that Lloyds Bank suggests you look out for in the small print.

8 Choose your stitch pattern and apply' double rows' and' all over pattern' quit and No. 4 Knit. # SAMPLE 1 9000 Pattern No 251 The carriage

settings for **all models are the same**. B.B. Cancel Key and Needle Return Levers in Neutral.

9 Derek and I kind of study them for we-- (pause) for hours don't we (unclear)? (SP:PS0GT) Well **all men are the same**, slow! (SP:PS0GU) Here we go! (SP:PS0GV) Slow? (SP:PS0GM) Good boy! (SP:PS0GU) Bloody hell!

10 The lined paper allows for clear writing; make sure that **all letters are the same** height as the narrow lines. Letraset can be used, in which case the letters may be reduced to 3 mm.

11 the individual's perception of values. Unless we assume that **all individuals are the same** then presumably we may all have different values and different perceptions of how to satisfy these values.

12 A special anti-foam additive also gives a more complete fill-up with less spillage, and a deodorant reduces smell. # Not **all fuels are the same** # THE SHELL AIR MILES CLUB # For drivers who are really going places

13 In a sense, Halifax was no further away than 42b Milvain Street, Stoke Newington. **All distances are the same** to those who don't meet. Halifax was equally far from the Norfolk border,

14 Until recently it had always been assumed that **all calories are the same**, regardless of where they came from. In other words a fat calorie was exactly the same as a carbohydrate or a protein calorie.

Appendix B. The contexts of 'all men are equal' from the BNC

1 This is seen most clearly in the song of Eliot's Blackshirts, whose bitter irony should be set against remarks concerning the undesirability of too many free-thinking Jews in After Strange Gods. Eliot has been accused of making racist remarks, yet for him 'All men are equal before God.' He had grown accustomed, even in the work of supposedly enlightened anthropologists, to terms such as 'savage', 'lower races', and 'inferior races', so that when he speaks of 'inequality', he may well be thinking of a vertical model, though he may mean simply 'difference' when he writes that There will probably always remain a real inequality of races, as there is always inequality of individuals.

2 But as communications improved and trade intensified under the aegis of industrial capitalism and European imperialism, it became ever more necessary to come to terms with the paradox: if "all men are equal" only when "men" means "people like us", then where do the "others" fit in? Most of us have not really solved that puzzle even today, but what did the question look like in the eighteenth century? First of all it is important to realize that the anthropology on which the eighteenth-century philosopher-scientists relied reflected an indiscriminate mixture

of biological and sociological concerns. Most of those who discussed human variety were talking about the differences in the physical appearance of human individuals, though they often mixed up characteristics which now seem to be plainly innate, such as skin colour, with characteristics which are plainly cultural, such as mode of dress.

3 For Linnaeus the varieties of men were like breeds of dog, different in their appearance, different in their manifest behaviour, but indifferently equal in their moral quality. I much prefer that kind of viewpoint to the egalitarian doctrine which declares that all men are equal but only if they accept my point of view. Unfortunately it is the latter doctrine which dominates present-day thinking in the Western democracies, not only in the political parties of both the right and the left but also among most of you who are likely to be reading this book.

4 The American Declaration of Independence declared as self-evident truths' that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable Rights: that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness'. The recognition that all men are equal in the sight of God is fundamental to liberty as we know it in modern Western societies. Equality before God leads of necessity to equality before the law.

5 For the essential characteristic of democracy is its insistence that all men are equal in esteem. Emphatically, it is not this: that all men are equal in esteem -- but those who are members of the union are more equal than the others.

6 Emphatically, it is not this: that all men are equal in esteem -- but those who are members of the union are more equal than the others.

Appendix C. The concordances of 'all * are the same' from COCA, the first five positions on the frequency list

1 all men are the same 12

1 Not all women are the same, just as not **all men are the same**. Personally, I felt that some of th

2 c mistake he makes is in assuming that **all men are the same** and all women are looking for the sa

3 following the trend. But the hearts of **all men are the same**, and though you can lead a horse to

4 I just think like a dude... and in my eyes **ALL men are the same**... And until I meet that one person

5 sanrita 7.16.10 1:47 PM # **all men are the same** when they unzip their pants (more o

6 i and Miki. I'm trying to tell you that **all men are the same**. You're real pricks! Why are you so

7 read a quote of yours in an article. All **men are the same**, and all men are shallow and superficial?

8 sound system. I don't trust you. Why? **All men are the same.** They say whatever they have to, [br]
 9 azed degenerate pig, doesn't mean that **all men are the same.** Who is this guy anyway? Art: Men ar
 10 explanation. - There's an explanation: **all men are the same.** They're liars and cheaters. Those
 11 in blaming the guides... intimating that **all men are the same** when the blood begins to pound. I w
 12 ed suits and stick-on name tags. "Not **all men are the same.** Some will do okay in the world that

2 all religions are the same 10

1 I don't, but because I believe **all religions are the same,** basically they all believe in a superio
 2 aciously, not pretending that **all religions are the same,** for they are patently not the same. We
 3 pply only to Islam and Egypt. **All religions are the same.** A 'god' is a shackle they have placed
 4 't one of them. I think that **all religions are the same.** The only difference is how they see thei
 5 use they tend to believe that **all religions are the same** at heart - but favouritism is there# We
 6 cted as naïve the notion that **all religions are the same.** Some religions give a higher value to
 7 ion that, rather than pretend **all religions are the same,** (<cough>Karen Armstrong<cough>), puts
 8 sm, with answers to each. # 1. **All religions are the same,** deep down. " # That is simply factually
 9 erved with the fact that not **all religions are the same?** In fact Catholicism is very different
 10 udaism are equivalent, i.e. **all religions are the same** - stupid. Presented with the opportunity,

3 all people are the same 8

1 asized two things: first, not **all people are the same,** and what works for one doesn't work for a
 2 are not the same anymore than **all people are the same.** Don't judge people by what you yourself d
 3 Is it right to pretend that **all people are the same** when in fact there are those who have the T
 4 fraid, without asking why. **All people are the same.** AMANPOUR-lon-cam: So Muppet diplomacy it s
 5 I don't see differences, **all people are the same.**" Relative to labelling, even the terms intel
 6 that all people are equal, **all people are the same,** it don't matter what colour, what -- whateve
 7 t matter who you love, that **all people are the same** person, all love is love. Or as if she had d
 8 sson she has always taught: **all people are the same,** no matter what their race or colour. We all

4 all women are the same 6

1 probably as loose as Vanity? **All women are the same** [Charles]. You and I need to remain pure. Ha

2 " Theodora is no beauty. But **all women are the same** in the " # " Do not say that, " James snapped.

3 llectual " neural pattern: " **all women are the same.** " # Distortion - e.g., " the color of my c

4 made by several people. Not **all women are the same**, just as not all men are the same. Personally,

5 and for all that deep down, **all women are the same.** They all want the same thing, love and marri

6 the story. No, there isn't. **All women are the same** these days. You claim to be so modern, liberat

5 all Muslims are the same 6

1 black people are the same, not **all Muslims are the same**, not all white people are the same. When

2 very day "... You seem to think **all Muslims are the same** & are extremists. # Do American Muslims

3 n remember. # The video assumes **all Muslims are the same.** Again, a bigoted " Us. v. Them " # We

4 y, Condell seems to think that **all Muslims are the same.** Just like in Christianity, there are hu

5 uslim and OMG he is gay. So NOT **all Muslims are the same.** Not be an ass. # Having lived under

6 on 1.2 billion Muslims and say **all Muslims are the same**, this is dangerous talk. Yeah, there are

Appendix D. The concordances of 'all * are equal' from COCA, positions 1, 2 and 5 on the frequency list

1 all people are equal 25

1 are subject to. And because of, **all people are equal.** Like the prophet, our Elijah could call do

2 aching the damnable gospel that **all people are equal**, or Thoreau, who, when he was asked would h

3 eminism was born of abolition. **All people are equal.** Not all choices are equal. We envision a be

4 ealization that under the skin **all people are equal**, and it surely must have provided some kind

5 t are more equal than others. **All people are equal**, but some are more equal than others.

6 d States for 14 and of age. # > **All people are equal**, but some are more equal than others. # By

7 secular men aren't taking the " **all people are equal** " track. But, nonetheless, there's a lot of

8 secular men aren't taking the " **all people are equal** " track. # It should be expected. Men who d

9 much into the current dogma of **all people are equal**. # http:
 **32;5222;TOOLONG Jason Walling # B
 10 cular men aren't taking the "**all people are equal**" track. " " It
 should be expected. UMen who
 11 iple of this morality is that **all people are equal**. " 16 Professor
 Taylor disagrees. He writes,
 12 I die happy if at some point **all people are equal**, but something tells
 me that won't be happening
 13 he idea it presented that not **all people are equal** and that people
 really do vary in drive and
 14 uslims think racism is a sin: **all people are equal** before Allah.
 Malcolm X came back from the h
 15 ne for toilet paper but where **all people are equal** and theres no rich
 pigs controlling everything!
 16 th God. He came to show that **all people are equal** in the eyes of God.
 " Carter pauses and looks
 17 man bombs. Now if the -- if **all people are equal** before the law,
 surely that would count as jus
 18 son. Further, it states that **all people are equal** because whether
 slave or free, man or woman,
 19 " Indeed, the conviction that **all people are equal** in the eyes of the
 Lord led to the view that
 20 irements of democracy is that **all people are equal**, not matter what
 their religion, not matter
 21 , it not only suggested that **all people are equal**, but also carried
 an implicit charge against
 22 t she taught her children that **all people are equal** and deserving of
 respect. All people. (Unless
 23 little kids. Teach them that **all people are equal**, all people are the
 same, it don't matter what
 24 yon believe. " a. I think **all people are equal**, no group is better
 than another group(underbar)g. 25 atters. The passage says that **all
 people are equal** and that the good and correct acts of judgment

2 all men are equal 22

1 ident Herbert Hoover put it, **all men are equal** before a fish. Also,
 fishing is a pretty good excu
 2 nyway. As my Captain says, "**All men are equal** under the law. " Fin,
 Nick... Those two guys give
 3 of self evident truth, that **all men are equal**. # AuldLochinvar: " the
 Judeo-Christian values up
 4 ld words: mine and thine. "**All men are equal**, all have the same needs
 and the same rights. " Pu
 5 ition of mere nature, where **all men are equal**, and judges of the
 justness of their own fears, c
 6 (as has been shown before) **all men are equal**. The inequality that now
 is has been introduced by
 7 y told the twelve men that "**all men are equal** under the law, whether
 they be rich or poor, black
 8 to uphold the doctrine that **all men are equal** in the sight of God. "
 # becoming a member of the

dition of mere nature, where **all men are equal** and judges of the justness of their own fears,
 tutation of civil government, **all men are equal**. Of one blood all nations are made; from one source sprung. # When we say, that **all men are equal**; we mean not to apply this equality to their virtues
 evious to civil government, **all men are equal**; so, in the same state, all men are free. In such
 of it in our great country. **ALL MEN ARE EQUAL**. These words were written with the knowledge that
 der the skin ", and that " **all men are equal** in God's eyes. " Fine sentiments -- but they don't
 tion of independence that **all men are equal**, endowed with certain unalienable rights, among them
 and out amongst men because **all men are equal**. SN: Do you think anyone has played your position
 powerful beliefs (such as **all men are equal** in the eyes of God) and moral precepts (such as love)
 In a " state of pure nature **all men are equal**. " (n50) The " speculative philosophers " forget
 will tell the tale. There, **all men are equal**, as though levels of talent and expectation are identical
 that of others, -- that **all men are equal** before the law in rights, privileges, and legal capacity
 in lower-class subculture. " **All men are equal** " is a commonly expressed sentiment among the poor
 s committed to saying that **all men are equal** and we can live up to the commitment.' Now, what should

5 all cultures are equal 13

u think that is? # hint: not **all cultures are equal**. # Posted by: Noz July 18, 2012, 8:34 am 8:34
 an article of belief that **all cultures are equal**. That there are no cultural differences. I would
 3 The message seems to be that **all cultures are equal**, but since solidarity is better than deference,
 4 the Prime PC Directive that " **all cultures are equal** "; so the technology diffusion solution is obvious
 5 happening any time soon. # " **All cultures are equal** except Western Civilization, which is uniquely
 6 , but it's the truth. Not **all cultures are equal**. I grant that a Muslim that strives against them
 7 ically correct left is that **all cultures are equal**, and that's just plain stupid. Cultures that
 8 relativistic arguments that **all cultures are equal** because some cultures do indeed establish inferiority
 9 those that do. # To maintain that **all cultures are equal** is to imply that cultural and, therefore,
 10 not support seriousness here. **All cultures are equal**, and by pronouncing all cultures equal on

11 rity. # Yet, the doctrine that **all cultures are equal** does not square
with our everyday observatio
12 , no one really believes that **all cultures are equal**, that all deserve
unconditional recognition,
13 lticultural aspirations, that **all cultures are equal** , that no
qualitative judgments can or shou