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Abstract

This thesis aims to provide a stylistically founded model of pathetic fallacy (PF hereafter). PF is a Romantic literary technique used in art and literature to convey emotions through natural elements (Ruskin, 1856/2012). This technique has been researched mostly from a literary viewpoint, but no linguistic model exists to define it. It is difficult to identify it precisely or consensually because definitions and uses vary, and it is often associated with other techniques (i.e. personification). Despite those inconsistencies, PF is likely to be taught as part of the DfE subject content for students studying English Literature at GCSE and A Level.

I thus conduct a survey of English teachers to collect their definitions of PF, to find out if they can identify it in stimuli, and to collect examples of texts that feature it. Based on their answers and an analysis of the resultant corpus of texts using a combination of (cognitive) stylistic frameworks, I am able to create an updated stylistic model of PF. The model defines PF as a projection of emotions from an animated entity onto the surroundings. Following a stylistic approach akin to Short (1996), I identify three ‘linguistic indicators’ of PF in my corpus: imagery, repetition, and negation. I draw on metaphor research to further analyse the metaphorical nature of PF and its effects in texts from my corpus. Four effects of PF are identified: communicating implicit emotions, building ambience, building characters, and plot foreshadowing.

This thesis contributes to knowledge in multiple ways: firstly, this model is a contribution to the field of stylistics, as it is the first stylistic model of the technique. I also contribute to metaphor research, namely conceptual metaphor theory, by providing a method of identification for the extended metaphor that is PF. Secondly, the field of education could benefit from this research as the model provides a clear definition of PF and it could be adapted for classroom-based activities. Thirdly, this model is a contribution to literary studies: PF being of the Romantic movement, this updated model contributes to a better understanding of the movement’s characteristics.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction and Literature Review

1.1 Introduction

As an English teacher in secondary school, I was often asked by students “what is pathetic fallacy?” or “what is the difference between pathetic fallacy and personification?”. I dreaded answering these questions for my students, as little resources are available to answer them fully in a consistent and clear manner. The gap in knowledge and clarity surrounding this concept in literary studies is what motivated this thesis. Furthermore, I am primarily concerned with the question “how are emotions communicated in texts?”, and although this is too broad a question to answer in one thesis, it is partly answered by discussing pathetic fallacy (hereafter PF). Because PF was defined during the Romantic movement, it shares its values, specifically a free expression of emotions, and prevalence of nature (Wesling, 1967, pp.253, 258, 268; Jeffries, 1993, p.6; Siddall, 2009, pp.36-37), as discussed in section 1.2.1 below. Therefore, PF and emotions are closely linked, in one way or another, as I demonstrate.

This thesis is intended as a contribution to knowledge in the field of stylistics. The primary concern of this thesis is to create an updated model of PF that is systematic, clear, and readily applicable, based on an empirical study of the concept. This thesis is interdisciplinary as it draws on varied fields: stylistics, corpus linguistics, cognitive stylistics, psychology, and literature.

In this chapter, I review existing literature on the concept of PF (section 1.2). I shed light on the clear gap in knowledge that surrounds PF, and on the overlap it has with other related concepts such as personification, prosopopoeia, animation, or anthropomorphism (section 1.2.3). I then provide the rationale for this thesis, detailing
the aims and research questions set; and I finally summarise the structure of each chapter (section 1.3).

1.2 Defining pathetic fallacy

To understand what PF is, researchers, educators, and students alike may first turn to dictionaries, such as the Oxford English Dictionary (henceforth OED). The OED defines PF as “the attribution of human emotion or responses to animals or inanimate things” (“Pathetic Fallacy”, 2021). Problematically, the OED gives a similar definition for personification, stating it is “the attribution of human form, nature, or characteristics to something” (“Personification”, 2021). Therefore, other sources should be explored when seeking the definition of PF, as the OED does not offer a clear picture. In the next sections, I explore how literary and art critics such as Ruskin define PF. I also review how scholars in the fields of literature and linguistics view the technique and analyse it. Finally, I observe how PF is approached in education.

1.2.1 Ruskin’s definition of pathetic fallacy

To start this literature review of PF, I first focus on Ruskin’s work on the topic, before engaging with other literature on the matter, as this is necessary to thoroughly understand other academics’ criticism of Ruskin’s work. The term ‘pathetic fallacy’ was coined by Ruskin in Modern Painters Volume III (1856/2012) which was dedicated to the commentary and criticism of art and literature. However, some critics such as Logan (1940, pp.187-191) argue that “Ruskin’s famous essay had already been enunciated by the poet [Wordsworth]”. Logan (1940, p.191) explains that both artists advocate for naturalism and criticise an untrue representation of objects. However, Wordsworth did not create “a system” to describe the phenomenon (Logan, 1940,
p.191), and Ruskin did, which is why literary critics associate PF with Ruskin (Young, 1949; Rosenberg, 1961; Dick, 1968; Fitch, 1982; Anthony, 1983; Cantwell, 2001; Klugman, 2003; Gill, 2006; Auger, 2010; Langer, 2010; Ford, 2011; Johnson, 2012). Nonetheless, Wordsworth’s work is often cited in example of the technique in accordance with Ruskin’s definition (Earnhardt, 2016, pp.15, 74). In his book, Ruskin criticises painters and writers for using the technique:

I want to examine the nature of the other error, that which the mind admits, when affected strongly by emotion. Thus, for instance, in Alton Locke,—

"They rowed her in across the rolling foam—The cruel, crawling foam."
The foam is not cruel, neither does it crawl. The state of mind which attributes to it these characters of a living creature is one in which the reason is unhinged by grief. All violent feelings have the same effect. They produce in us a falseness in all our impressions of external things, which I would generally characterize as the "pathetic fallacy". […] The temperament which admits the pathetic fallacy, is, as I said above, that of a mind and body in some sort too weak to deal fully with what is before them or upon them; borne away, or over-clouded, or over-dazzled by emotion; and it is a more or less noble state, according to the force of the emotion which has induced it (Ruskin, 1856/2012, pp.154-158, my emphasis).

This extract shows Ruskin’s premise: to him, attributing human emotions to objects is a weakness on the artist’s part. The example he provides clearly illustrates this
phenomenon: the foam is attributed the emotion of being “cruel” and the action of “crawling”, which are characteristics of living entities. However, there are a few limitations stemming from Ruskin’s premise. Firstly, his explanation of what he considers a “fallacy” is ambiguous: it can be understood to be the attribution of human qualities to objects, but it could also be artists’ use of the surroundings to reflect their own emotions, potentially by personifying them. The example provided by Ruskin seems to illustrate the former possibility, but his explanations suggest the latter, thus indicating an underlying ambiguity. Additionally, according to Ruskin (1856/2012), PF was also used in paintings, such as in the works of Turner. For example, Turner’s oil painting *Snow Storm: Hannibal and his Army Crossing the Alps* (1812) displays typical elements of Romanticism, the movement that birthed the use of PF: prominent landscapes of nature and free expression of emotions (Wesling, 1967, pp.253, 258, 268; Jeffries, 1993, p.6; Siddall, 2009, pp.36-37). This is problematic for Ruskin’s premise: art such as Turner’s paintings does use the landscape to convey emotions, but it does not personify it (Wesling, 1967, pp.253, 258, 268), thus further showing the ambiguous nature of Ruskin’s definition.

Furthermore, Ruskin’s criticism of PF is contradictory as he uses it himself. In his lectures *The Storm Clouds of the 19th Century* (1884/2006), Ruskin describes the formation of clouds and comments on “new clouds” that are darker than others, he speculates this is due to the industrial revolution, which he criticises. The extract below from the first lecture shows Ruskin using PF in two ways: he personifies the clouds, the sun, and the weather (see my emphasis), but he does so to convey his own feelings about the industrial revolution situation in London through those natural elements (see the last emphasised sentence):
In healthy weather, the sun is hidden behind a cloud, as it is behind a tree; and, when the cloud is past, it comes out again, as bright as before. But in plague-wind, the sun is choked out of the whole heaven, all day long, by a cloud which may be a thousand miles square and five miles deep. And yet observe: that thin, scraggy, filthy, mangy, miserable cloud, for all the depth of it, can't turn the sun red, as a good, business-like fog does with a hundred feet or so of itself. By the plague-wind every breath of air you draw is polluted half round the world; in a London fog the air itself is pure, though you choose to mix up dirt with it, and choke yourself with your own nastiness (Ruskin, 1884/2006, my emphasis).

With the exception of the last one, the emphasised phrases personify natural elements, whereas the last emphasised phrase is not a personification and directly conveys Ruskin’s negative feeling regarding the industrial revolution’s effect on the quality of the air. The lecture shows Ruskin using the technique he himself described as flawed, and both possible understandings he gives in Modern Painters are present in the extract: not only are elements of nature repeatedly personified, but this also conveys Ruskin’s true feelings about the environment in London, as shown in the last sentence of the paragraph (Rosenberg, 1961; Fitch, 1982; Anthony, 1983; Ford, 2011).

Secondly, other literary and art critics have found Ruskin’s definition and use of PF ambiguous. Earnhardt (2016, p.17) is particularly critical of Ruskin’s work and states that “his uneven application of his own theories, his ideas on poetry and landscape description, and his occasional moralizing condescension and pomposity, all confuse the more sophisticated aesthetic ideas with which he struggles in Modern
Painters”. Dick (1968, pp.27-30) also observes some discontinuity in Ruskin’s idea, observing that PF “is often interchangeable with personification” and offers the following definition of the term, as he suggests that the use of the technique has evolved with time:

Pathetic fallacy [...] is a metaphor through which is a distilled way of looking at reality, it will not always be explicit, and expressions like "raging waves" or "the cruel, crawling foam" will not in themselves constitute successful usage. [...] Not only will nature possess human emotions, but she will display them with all the variations that characterize human behavior. Nature will either share kindred feelings, or her mood will be at variance with man’s.

This definition maintains the personification of nature, but also conveys that PF can feature implicitly because it is an extended metaphor. Similarly, other critics (Logan, 1940; Young, 1949; Sacks, 1985; Auger, 2010; Langer, 2010; Ford, 2011) view PF as a specific type of personification, which provides natural elements solely with human emotions, as opposed to the entire spectrum of human characteristics. Gill (2006, p.463) in particular argues that “personification is ‘larger’ than pathetic fallacy” for this reason. Conversely, Auger (2010, p.221) refutes Dick’s and Gill’s definition of PF, arguing that it is a “convention” and “its use is more substantial than metaphor but less developed than personification. It is often used for literary effect to convey human emotion, or suggest identity between humans and the natural world” (their emphasis).

On the other hand, some critics share Dick’s viewpoint (1968, pp.27-30) and define PF as “the projection of human emotion onto phenomena in the natural world”
(Lodge, 1992, p.85; 2002, pp.127-128, 135, 186), claiming that this projection of emotion is the effect of the personification of those natural elements (Dick, 1968; Klugman, 2003; Johnson, 2012). This thus suggests that PF and personification are closely linked, not only due to the ambiguous definition given by Ruskin, but because PF is the effect of the personification of nature. In fact, most critics provide examples of texts featuring personification when discussing PF. For example, Lodge (1992, pp.86-87) analyses an extract from *Sense and Sensibility* and uses the term ‘personification’ in his explanation of the projection of the characters’ emotions onto the natural world surrounding them.

Some critics view this projection as stemming from the author’s emotions, as opposed to characters themselves. For example, Johnson (2012) suggests that the Japanese poet Bashō projects “his own feelings of grief onto the scene” (Johnson, 2012, p.172). Additionally, Sacks (1985, pp.20-21) defines PF as “the attribution of human feelings to nature”, but in their analysis of a textual example from Greek mythology comments on the mirroring effect the natural elements have on the emotions described:

> the poet makes elements in nature mourn for the death of man, in the shape of a vegetation god or goddess, Adonis, Thammuz or Persephone, thus transferring his own feelings of grief to natural elements. Pathetic fallacy, nature’s lament over the death of man, has a naturalistic basis in the notation of seasonal change (Sacks, 1985, p.21).

In this instance of analysis, the personification of nature is not prominent, but its ability to convey the poet’s emotion transpires.
Finally, critics such as Bennett and Royle (2016, p.168) view PF as a type of ‘anthropomorphism’, providing the example of “the lightning that strikes the old oak tree\(^1\) in chapter 23 of *Jane Eyre* somehow articulates the double threat and temptation that Rochester’s proposal of marriage represents to Jane”. This specific example is discussed in section 5.2.5 of this thesis, but in Bennett and Royle’s analysis, no details on the anthropomorphic qualities of the PF or of those natural elements specifically are provided.

This section has presented Ruskin’s work on PF and academics’ criticism of it. Overall, there does not seem to be a consensual definition of the term, which I argue stems from the ambiguous definition given by Ruskin. In fact, PF has been compared to the concepts of personification, metaphor, anthropomorphism; and defined as either “ascribing human feelings to objects which would not in nature have them” (Gill, 2006, p.462, amongst others) or as the projection of emotions onto the natural world (Lodge, 1992, p.85; 2002, pp.127-128, 135, 186, amongst others). The section below aims to shed light on which definition of the term is most used in the field of literature.

### 1.2.2 Pathetic fallacy in literary analyses

This section aims to review how PF is discussed in literary studies. Unsurprisingly, the discrepancies between the concepts of PF, personification, and anthropomorphism (amongst others) that were pointed out in section 1.2.1 can also be observed in literary studies.

Literary scholars discuss PF as the “mirroring [of] a protagonist’s inner state, usually one of turmoil, in surrounding nature” (Griffiths, 2004, p.15; Ford, 1948;

---
\(^1\) In the original text, Brontë describes a “chestnut tree” (Brontë, 1847/2007, chapter 23). See section 5.2.4.
Gérard, 1964). Some of those scholars such as Thomas (1961), Nishimura (2003), Abel (2013), Earnhardt (2016) focus on ‘pathos’, that is to the say the emotional factor conveyed by PF. However, most literary academics mention PF in combination with other techniques, regardless of which definition they use, thus suggesting that those figures of speech are inherently interchangeable. For example, in their doctoral dissertation, Al-Obaidi (2018, p.12, my emphasis) formulated the following research question: “how is the pathetic fallacy, or prosopopoeia, manifest in their descriptions of places and of their non-human or non-living occupants — animals, plants, objects, buildings, topography, and so forth?”, which directly compares PF to prosopopoeia, as shown by the emphasised phrase. In fact, throughout their doctoral dissertation, Al-Obaidi uses varied terms and definitions to refer to PF, as the selection of examples below demonstrates:

His ‘blue window’ is ‘agonized’ and daylight makes it ‘bleaker’. Blue is the colour of sadness […] Obviously, these are projections via the pathetic fallacy of the poet’s depression and the psychic pain it brings (Al-Obaidi, 2018, p.59, my emphasis)

Closely related to this animal imagery is Plath’s extensive use of pathetic fallacy […] nonhuman entities that become animated in the sense of being given souls include not only traditional personifications like the moon (recurrent to the point of being a motif of its own), the wind, and the sea, but also trees and plants, animals and birds, and domestic objects (Al-Obaidi, 2018, p.88, my emphasis).
Daydreaming has been replaced by an equally imaginary *personification of objects via pathetic fallacy* (Al-Obaidi, 2018, p.97, my emphasis)

The *pathetic fallacy* (*also known as anthropomorphism*) in which the speaker’s surroundings manifest her emotions; and *prosopopoeia*, whereby the speaker is the external creature or object itself (Al-Obaidi, 2018, p.136, my emphasis)

This selection shows that PF is at times considered as anthropomorphism (example 2 and 4), as personification or prosopopoeia (example 2, 3, and 4), and as a projection of emotion (example 1) within the same dissertation which aims to analyse the technique.

Similarly, scholars who view PF as “the ascription of human characteristics to inanimate objects, which takes place when reason comes under the influence of intense emotion” (Nishimura, 2003, p.897; Thomas, 1961; Copley, 1937; Gérard, 1964; Cushman et al., 2012) also refer to it through other terms. Most of those scholars discuss PF in their analysis of personification, which shows the “interchangeable” (Dick, 1968, pp.27-30) nature of the two techniques. In addition, in their discussion of the technique, some overlap with the first definition mentioned (mirroring of emotions) occurs. For instance, Nishimura (2003) comments on the term PF in an analysis of personification in Hardy’s work and suggests that it would be challenging to “imagine a poem about nature in which it would not be ‘humanized’”, and then goes on to review the effect of personification or “the trope of prosopopoeia” (Nishimura, 2003, p.898). They then conclude that in Hardy’s *Nature’s Questioning*, the use of schoolchildren as objects with human faces exhibits their emotional responses and that “this instance of
the pathetic fallacy, *in which nature reflects human emotion*, is typical of Hardy” (Nishimura, 2003, p.903, my emphasis). The emphasised clause shows the overlap of the two possible definitions of PF observed so far in the same research, which might suggest that the latter definition (PF as a projection) might be seen as an effect of the former (PF as personification).

Similarly, Copley (1937) analyses PF in Greek poetry and first defines PF as “an illusion […] that the inanimate world is possessed of human emotions. […] The pathetic fallacy may appear as a single epithet or may be extended over a long passage” (Copley, 1937, p.194), thus seeing PF as a type of personification. However, in the conclusion of their analysis of Homer’s *Hymn to Demeter*, they comment:

> symbolism of this type, in which the emotion of nature accepted as poetic fact and used independently to picture feeling of men, represents a high stage in the development pathetic fallacy. When such passages are detached from human, and the poet’s personality is completely withdrawn, they represent the highest possible point to which the ascription of feeling to the inanimate world can go. The poet views himself and his emotions through the emotions of nature (Copley, 1937, p.203).

Here, it seems that the personification of natural elements (such as attributing emotions to the sea) magnifies the poet’s emotions, projecting them onto the scene for readers to perceive. Although this is more implicit than the example provided above, this nonetheless shows that in this instance, PF is discussed as the personification of nature at the same time as a projection of emotions, thus leading
one to wonder if those two definitions are linked, or if the lack of clarity around the
topic stems from Ruskin’s ambiguous definition, as most literary scholars refer to
Ruskin’s work when defining PF.

Additionally, PF is also associated with anthropomorphism in the field of literary
studies, as in section 1.2.1. Scholars such as Milne (2014), Earnhardt (2016), Al-
Obaidi (2018), or Baylis et al. (2018) discuss PF as the animation of birds. Baylis et
al. (2018, p.68) define PF as “humanlike characteristics onto the birds’ movements”.
They explain that in one of his lectures on Wordsworth’s *The Excursion*, Ruskin “gave
credence to the idea that the consciousness of birds provided fascinating objects of
nonhuman nature onto which projections of human sensations and emotions could be
particularly illuminating for the watching of human nature” (Baylis et al., 2018, p.74).
This shows that the overlap between PF and the concept of anthropomorphism
observed in section 1.2.1 also occurs in the field of literature. In fact, Earnhardt’s
doctoral dissertation (2016) focuses on how the theory of PF can be adapted to the
explains:

As “false appearances” resulting from violent emotions that may also
serve as faithful and powerfully pathetic expressions of feeling, pathetic
fallacies explain just how poetry imagining the lives of animals achieves
its effects while also indicating the quality of the sight and thought of its
characters and lyric personae. Specifically, this reinterpretation of the
theory of the pathetic fallacy examines pathetic fallacies that attribute
humanlike thoughts to birds in an attempt to explain poetic dynamics
around the ancient and “unreconciled affinity between humans and birds” (Milne 364).

This interpretation of Ruskin’s theory of PF is ambiguous, and it can be discussed not only in relation to natural elements such as the sea foam (“the cruel crawling foam”) example put forth by Ruskin, but also to animals - here birds. Therefore, Earnhardt (2016, p.40) draws on Ruskin’s work to reframe the definition of PF, as he argues that the notion of “state of mind” is particularly “unreasonable constitutive of any definition” in Ruskin’s phrasing, as characters do not possess state of minds due to their fictional nature according to Earnhardt (2016). He concludes that the attribution of state of mind to “‘characters of a living creature’ is not necessarily attributing uniquely human characteristics, nor are such characteristics of living creatures defined as the only sorts of false appearances that could constitute a PF” (Earnhardt, 2016, pp.40-41, his emphasis). The notion of animals as characters is further developed in section 4.2.3 of this thesis.

Overall, it is clear that there are inconsistencies surrounding the concepts of PF, personification, prosopopoeia, anthropomorphism and animation in literary analyses. In the next section, I define each of those concepts and argue that their innate overlap does not render them interchangeable concepts.

1.2.3 Defining personification, animation, prosopopoeia and anthropomorphism

As seen so far, PF is discussed either as a projection of emotions onto nature or as the personification of nature. In both uses, PF is consistently associated, or seen as “interchangeable” (Dick, 1968, pp.27-30), with other literary techniques:
personification, prosopopoeia, animation and anthropomorphism. I argue that those techniques are not ‘interchangeable’, and I thus define them below.

I first discuss the concept of ‘personification’, as it is the literary technique most often associated with PF. Despite PF’s definition being inconsistent amongst sources, the definition of personification on the other hand is consistent. Sources unanimously define personification as a device through which “an inanimate object, animate nonhuman, or abstract quality is given human attributes” as suggests Wales (2011, p.314; see also Copley, 1937; Thomas, 1961; Gérard, 1964; Nishimura, 2003; Auger, 2010; Cushman et al., 2012; Cordell, 2018; OED, “Personification”, 2021). Leech and Short (2007, p.159) explain that this attribution of human characteristics can be achieved in two ways: 1) through “the use of inanimate nouns as actors”, or 2) through objects used as “implied subjects of verbs of motion”. The following example can be considered: “the leaf danced in the violent wind”. The phrase “the leaf danced” attributes the human action of “dancing” to an inanimate object (here “the leaf”), thus this personification is achieved through the verb. The phrase “the violent wind” attributes the human trait of being “violent” to the inanimate object “the wind”, and therefore this attribution of human emotion is achieved through the nominal phrase. For the rest of this thesis, analyses of personification detail whether it is verbal or nominal personification.

Secondly, the concept of ‘animation’ arose on multiple occasions in the literature reviewed in the previous sections. According to Wales (2011, p.21), animation is the attribution of human or animal actions (both human and animals possess life and animacy) to inanimate objects, whereas personification exclusively concerns human actions. For example, in the phrase “the pound suffers”, the verb is not exclusively associated to human beings as animals can also suffer when wounded
– therefore the subject “the pound” is animated (as opposed to personified). This suggests that personification is a specific type of animation, focused solely on human characteristics (see also OED, “Animation”, 2021). Therefore, for the rest of this thesis, I make the distinction between personification and animation as does Wales, for the sake of clarity.

Thirdly, the concept of ‘prosopopoeia’ is almost unanimously used interchangeably with personification in the literature reviewed above. Again, however, these are not interchangeable concepts. Wales (2011, p.347) defines prosopopoeia as a “figure of rhetoric whereby an inanimate object is represented as being able to speak” and adds that it is in fact “an extension or a variation of personification” (see also OED, “Prosopopoeia”, 2021; Lanham, 1991, p.123). Wales (2011, p.347) provides examples of prosopopoeia, stating that it is often found in animated cartoons (such as the talking objects in Disney’s Beauty and the Beast), in riddles (for example “my first is in butter but not in bread … what am I?”); and poems like Tennyson’s The Brook (“I come from haunts of coot and hern”). This shows that prosopopoeia is a specific type of personification (concerned with speech), and thus by extension a specific type of animation. This definition of the term is used throughout this thesis.

Finally, the concept of ‘anthropomorphism’ is frequently used in the literature reviewed when discussing PF and personification. Anthropomorphism, similarly to PF, seems to possess two definitions: 1) the attribution of human qualities to gods and goddesses, and 2) the attribution of human qualities to animals (OED, “Anthropomorphism”, 2021; Auger, 2010, p.19). Amongst the sources discussed in section 1.2, the second definition of anthropomorphism seems to be more consensually used, when commenting on texts that feature animals as opposed to gods. This could be because the attribution of human qualities to gods mostly occurs
in ancient literature such as Greek or Roman mythology, and thus renders this sense of the term somewhat archaic, allowing the term ‘anthropomorphism’ to shift and be applied to animals. I propose that in order to be inclusive of both definitions, we can consider anthropomorphism as a specific type of personification providing human attributes to living entities, real or fictional, and this is the definition I use in this thesis.

Overall, by defining those concepts, I demonstrated that there is overlap between the terms: prosopopoeia and anthropomorphism are specific types of personification; personification is itself a specific type of animation. However, despite these overlaps, the terms maintain their own nuances and specifications, meaning that they are not interchangeable concepts. Without a clear definition of PF (or any other concept), it is difficult to analyse how it is produced or how it communicates emotions in a consistent manner, which is what this literature review evidences. Furthermore, without consistent and clear definitions of those terms, their potential overlap cannot be analysed. In section 3.3.1.1, I show that imagery such as verbal and nominal personification is a ‘linguistic indicator’ of PF, and section 4.2.3.1 analyses a text with PF and anthropomorphised rabbits. Clear definitions of these terms (as given here) enable me to comment on the complementary effect of personification or anthropomorphism on PF in the rest of this thesis.

This section defined personification, animation, prosopopoeia, and anthropomorphism, demonstrating that they are not one and the same concept, but extensions of each other’s definition; and this despite scholars and educating bodies using them interchangeably as shown in the literature review. It is clear that techniques associated with PF are types of animism, thus leaving one to wonder if PF is itself also included in this category of imagery. The next section observes how PF is discussed and analysed in linguistics.
1.2.4 Pathetic fallacy in linguistics

This section aims to discuss how linguists, particularly stylisticians, define and analyse the concept of PF. The wider characteristics of the field of stylistics are discussed in sections 2.1 and 3.1.1 where the methodology adopted in this thesis is introduced, and the specific theories and frameworks used in the analyses are reviewed within the chapters that draw upon them for the sake of clarity. Overall, it seems stylisticians either 1) discuss PF as an interchangeable concept with personification, anthropomorphism, and animation, similarly to literary scholars; or 2) discuss PF under different headings. I review both tendencies with examples below.

Firstly, important context for the present research is the work of Miall (2007, 2011), who is interested in “how ordinary readers experience[ing] ordinary emotions construe literary narrative” (Miall, 2011, p.324). He argues that what he calls “animism” is a way to convey emotions to readers, and cites Ruskin’s work on PF, defining it as “the tendency to read human feelings into the landscape” (Miall, 2011, pp.340-342). He further explains that “another important and often overlooked property of feeling is its capacity to promote what is usually termed anthropomorphism, that is, interpreting events or objects in the environment through human properties, such as feelings and intentions” (Miall, 2011, p.341). Here, although the definition he gives is clear and close to Lodge’s definition of PF (1992, p.85; 2002, pp.127-128, 135, 186, amongst others)
2, his explanations show the overlap with the concepts of personification and anthropomorphism, thus rendering his ideas on PF somewhat unclear. However, his

2 Although other scholars define PF similarly to Lodge, I find his definition to be the most clear and concise, and I thus use it throughout this thesis. This could potentially be because Lodge’s The Art of Fiction is not as academically oriented as the other sources. Lodge did discuss PF in an academic oriented book (Language of Fiction, 2002), but his definition of the technique is not as concise or clear to a wider audience.
idea of ‘animism’ is particularly interesting as a global concept covering each of those techniques, and reflects section 1.2.3’s discussion on animism. In fact, in his work on the effect of foregrounding on readers’ perception of emotions (the theory of foregrounding is further developed in section 3.1), Miall (2007) explores the significance of this animism. He refers to Ruskin’s definition of PF in his analysis of the sublime in Shelley’s poem Mont Blanc, and determines that, ironically, Ruskin does use PF himself when describing precipices (“they will always talk to us when we are inclined to converse”), although he criticises poets for doing so (see also the criticism discussed in section 1.2.1). From Shelley’s and Ruskin’s examples of PF and personification, Miall draws the conclusion that “there is a disposition in us to animate the world around us that is enabled by sublime language, a disposition activated not only in the mind but embedded within the body” (Miall, 2007, p.161). He argues that personification, anthropomorphism, or PF are

not only figures of speech. Whether an object is animate (a cat, a bee) or inanimate (a tree, a precipice), we have the capacity to reconstitute in our own minds the forces that make it what it is, whether animate or inanimate, which, in turn, makes it more likely that we will anticipate correctly what it may do or become next [...] the mind itself is a part of the surrounding world, a participant with the land (Miall, 2007, p.161).

This is particularly significant, as it suggests that it is our nature to project our human traits onto our surroundings (should they be animate or inanimate objects) and that this is thus a way for readers to perceive emotions in texts. It is humankind’s egocentric disposition to view one’s human reflection onto the world that surrounds them.
Leech and Short (2007) also present PF as a concept interchangeable with others. Leech and Short (2007, pp.159-160) comment on Hardy’s use of the technique in *The Return of the Native*. They define the technique as “the attribution of human characteristics to inanimate nature, a kind of metaphor which is routinely found in expression such as ‘the cruel sea’” (Leech and Short, 2007, p.159), which suggests that they consider PF and personification as overlapping concepts. They analyse an extract from Hardy’s work, emphasising each expression that they consider to be PF such as “[it] suggests some measure of the animation or the personhood of the natural phenomena”. This includes expressions such as “[the sombre stretch of rounds] *rise and meet* the evening gloom”, “night *showed* itself”, “heavens *precipitated*” (Leech and Short, 2007, p.159, their emphasis), but those verbs “indicate that the anthropomorphism may be only a ‘manner of speaking’” (Leech and Short, 2007, p.160). They conclude:

[the] personifying metaphor is so consistently employed that ‘metaphor’ almost ceases to be the appropriate term: it is as if our literal sense of the division between animate man and inanimate nature has been eliminated. […] Hence the personification of nature produces a tension between reassurance and alienation (Leech and Short, 2007, p.160).

I find this conclusion insightful yet problematic: the observation on the effect of the technique creating tension and alienation for readers is an interesting interpretation of the effect of those “personifying metaphors”. However, there seems to be an inconsistency in terminology: anthropomorphism, metaphors, personification, animation, and PF are all discussed as if they were one and the same technique
present in the extract of *The Return of the Native*. Further, this sheds light on the lack of clarity in the distinction between those techniques. It also seems to disregard some aspects of Ruskin’s premise: the salience of emotions surrounding the concept of PF, should it be considered as a poor choice of style or not.

Stockwell (1999, p.138) also analyses PF and personification as similar concepts. He discusses PF and its effect in Gibson’s *Neuromancer* as part of his discussion of the ‘inflexibility variance’ in Conceptual Metaphor Theory (this is further discussed in section 5.1.2.1). Stockwell (1999, p.138) argues that in *Neuromancer*, the sentence “the sky was the colour of television tuned to a dead channel” features a “reverse” effect of the PF, which he defines as “nature wilfully imitates human activities”. The reverse effect occurs as such:

> to thematize this would be to see that Gibson has reversed the traditional pathetic fallacy in which nature wilfully imitates human activities, to render nature alien and technology the base. (In the embedded metaphor ‘dead channel’, the potential for life is even claimed for technology, not nature.)

In this example, PF is discussed as the personification of natural elements (here the sky). However, similarly to Leech and Short, Stockwell does not seem to explicitly take into consideration Ruskin’s concern of emotions when defining PF, suggesting that when analysed linguistically, the emotional factor of PF could be trivial.

Although there has been little work dedicated to PF as such in stylistics, it has nonetheless been analysed within the frame of wider stylistic analyses and under different headings (see section 5.2). In a project centred around stylistic manifestations
of emotions, Miall (2014) observes participants’ reactions to Woolf’s *Together and Apart*. He observes that “the phrases of the story can be placed in one of two categories: either indicating a possible relationship of the two characters, or describing the setting (which includes the sky and the moon)” (Miall, 2014, p.428). This suggests that the settings of the scene and the emotions expressed are linked. The overall study he conducts shows that the participants used the settings to better understand the characters’ emotions and their relationship. This aligns with PF when it is defined as a projection of emotion onto the natural world, however, Miall does not refer to PF, despite his analysis of its effects (for a full analysis of PF’s effects in Woolf’s *Together and Apart*, see section 5.2.1). This illustrates the fact that PF and its effects are discussed implicitly in the field of linguistics, and that this discussion often occurs under different headings of analysis.

Another example of such an analysis can be observed in Stockwell (2014), which is discussed in further detail in section 5.2.3. In his analysis, Stockwell (2014, pp.369-371) comments on the concept of ‘ambience’ and how it is conveyed in Keats’s *La Belle Dame Sans Merci*. Ambience is linked to emotional affect (Stockwell, 2014, pp.362-365), which would take Ruskin’s idea of expressing emotions into consideration. Literary critics such as Kelley (1987) argue that details of Keats’s life are alluded to in *La Belle Dame Sans Merci*, which could explain the projection of emotions onto the scene, if Copley’s (1937, p.203) argument about PF being an illustration of authors’ emotions is to be considered (see section 1.2.2). Stockwell comments on the shift from positive ambience to negative, which is conveyed through the knight’s description of his dream. He claims this shift constructs the ambience of the poem and ultimately conveys the knight’s feelings (Stockwell, 2014, pp.371). The projection of the knight’s negative feelings onto the scene is one of the definitions of
PF discussed so far, and here it contributes to building the ambience of the poem, which is why the last three lines of the poem’s first and last three lines are interpreted differently despite being identical linguistically. Consequently, at times, PF and its effects are implicitly discussed in linguistic analyses of texts, and the technique is not always named when this occurs, thus highlighting the lack of consistency and clarity surrounding the concept overall.

In this section, I discussed how linguists deal with the concept of PF, demonstrating that the overlap in discussion of concepts such as PF, personification and anthropomorphism is equally present in the field of linguistics as it is in literature or amongst literary and art critics. Additionally, I illustrated that PF is sometimes analysed in stylistics but not as such and under different headings. The next section explores how PF is defined in education.

1.2.5 PF in education

So far I have shown that no clear definition of PF exists, and that researchers identify and interpret it differently. This lack of consistency epitomizes the rationale for this thesis: PF appears in the GCSE subject content as an example of the kinds of features students could mention in their analysis of texts, as I exemplify below, although it does not feature in the GCSE or in the A Level English Literature specifications. It is not compulsory for term ‘pathetic fallacy’ to be taught, it is nonetheless most likely taught because of the texts often used at GCSE and A Levels: for example, A Christmas Carol, Frankenstein, Dracula, Macbeth (see chapter 2). If the texts used in classrooms contain PF, the term and concept is thus likely to be taught. How this concept of PF is defined and taught is what is of interest for this
research: varied teaching resources dealing with PF are inconsistent in their definition, analyses, and examples.

For instance, in the DfE’s *English literature GCSE subject content and assessment objectives* it is stated that students should be “using linguistic and literary terminology for such evaluation (such as, but not restricted to, phrase, metaphor, meter, irony and persona, synecdoche, pathetic fallacy)” (Department for Education (DfE), 2013b, p.5, my emphasis). However, no clear definitions of PF or personification are given in the English National Curriculum, as is exemplified in the *Non-Statutory Glossary for the programmes of study for English* in which those two techniques are not mentioned (DfE, 2013d). This means that teachers must educate students on those figures of speech without being provided clear definitions or examples of the concepts from either the English National Curriculum or academic research, as I have shown in the previous sections.

Examination boards such as the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) and Pearson Edexcel also provide guidance to teachers and students through their exam preparation resources, official guidelines, mark schemes, and reports on examination (again, although PF does not feature in the AQA or GCSE specifications, or in the A Level English Literature specifications). Some examination boards offer vague and general definitions of PF, for example AQA states that “the term ‘pathetic fallacy’ was routinely extended to cover any reference to weather conditions within the text” (AQA, 2018, p.6). Another example of the vagueness that surrounds PF can be observed in a report on examination in which AQA (2017, p.28) explains that “weather as a metaphor (pathetic fallacy) [is used] to indicate strong emotions: feel the fog in my throat; the press of the storm; darkness and cold; the elements rage”. This example

---

3 Note that the English National Curriculum is not statutory in private schools and academies.
is problematic as the definition it provides is not illustrated by the examples that follow: the definition mentions the expression of emotions through the weather, whereas the examples show the personification or animation of natural elements, some of which are not technically related to the weather per se (“darkness”), and some examples (“feel the fog in my throat”, “darkness and cold”) are not metaphorical.

AQA is not the only examination board to provide vague or contradictory definitions and examples of PF, Pearson Edexcel does as well. Pearson Edexcel supplies resources for students, such as the “literary terms: a guide for students” (Pearson Edexcel, 2015a, 2019). This guide claims to provide definitions of literary terms students are expected to know for their GCSE exam. It defines PF as:

the use of setting, scenery or weather to mirror the mood of a human activity. Two people having an argument whilst a storm breaks out is an example. The technique is used to make sure the feelings of readers or audience are moved (Pearson Edexcel, 2015a, p.5).

However, in their English Language Student Handbook, PF is defined as “giving human emotions to nature” and the following example is provided: “delicious breadth of rain” (Addison et al. for Pearson Edexcel, 2016, p.259). This definition and example do not match the previous definition given (environment reflecting mood), thus showing inconsistencies. Furthermore, in the same student handbook, PF and personification are directly linked:

Pathetic fallacy is very similar to personification. It is usually used to make inanimate objects or things reflect what is going on in the scene.
For example, if the weather is hot and sunny, it usually represents a ‘happy’ story. If the weather is dark, cold and stormy, you can usually guess that something bad is going to happen (Addison et al. for Pearson Edexcel, 2016, p.215).

This explanation condenses both definitions stated above but does not clearly state the link between PF and personification’s effects in texts. This could be confusing for students: two definitions are given with their respective examples, but in an exemplary analysis, both notions are associated without clear explanations.

Finally, other school endorsed resources also contribute to a lack of clarity surrounding the concept of PF. For instance, BBC Bitesize, a website promoted in schools for independent learning and revisions, provides the following definitions of PF: “a type of personification where emotions are given to a setting, an object or the weather” and the matching example “the clouds crowded together suspiciously overhead as the sky darkened” (BBC Bitesize, 2021a; see also BBC Bitesize 2021b). In another webpage dedicated to answering “what is pathetic fallacy?”, BBC Bitesize warns students of the distinction between PF and personification, stating that whilst personification “is giving any human attribute to objects”, PF “is always about giving emotions to something non-human” (BBC Bitesize, 2021d, their emphasis). This suggests that BBC Bitesize views PF as a specific type of personification centred around emotions. However, in an example of text analysis also given, the notion that PF is a personification is not clearly demonstrated:

Brontë uses pathetic fallacy when describing Jane’s journey to Lowood School: “raw and chill was the winter morning: my teeth chattered as I
hastened down the drive”. Brontë has used a cold winter morning to emphasise how gloomy Jane's journey will be and therefore how dull her time will be at Lowood. The use of the verb 'chattered' illustrates how cold Jane was, thus exaggerating the weather. The use of PF makes the reader realise the journey to Lowood will not be pleasant, therefore it foreshadows Jane's time at the school” (BBC Bitesize, 2021c, my emphasis).

The verb “chattered” in this instance does not refer to chattiness but to the shaking of teeth when one is cold – akin to shivering. Therefore, no personification occurs in this example, despite the definition given on the website, as discussed above. Additionally, one could argue that being cold is not an emotion per se, but a state, thus further departing from the definition of PF given above. This highlights the lack of consistency that surrounds the concept of PF, and this observation can be applied to each of the sources discussed in this section.

Research in the field of pedagogical stylistics has been dedicated to addressing limitations observed in the English National Curriculum and other board endorsed resources (Cushing, 2018a, 2018b; Giovanelli, 2014, 2016, 2020; Giovanelli and Mason, 2015; Mason and Giovanelli, 2017; Zacharias, 2020). Giovanelli explains that typical ‘Examiner’s Reports’ describe students’ commentaries on language as a distraction to the literary analysis, further evidencing the separation of English literature and language (Giovanelli, 2020, p.3). This is significant for this thesis as PF is a literary concept tied to literature and Romanticism, and little consideration of the

---

4 In practice, this specific example of inconsistency between PF and personification was found by my Year 10 students and caused them much confusion.
language involved in featuring PF in texts has been demonstrated. This thesis aims to take this “lang-lit problem” (Giovanelli, 2020, p.3) into consideration and to holistically approach PF from a literary-linguistic perspective.

This section has shown that no single, clear definition or examples of PF exists across educational institutions such as the English National Curriculum, varied examination boards or student friendly resources, even though texts featuring PF are taught for the GCSE and A Level examinations. This is of course problematic, as one can wonder how this gap in knowledge impacts teaching and learning practices, as well as examinations.

This literature review summarises how PF is defined and analysed by sources such as the OED, literary and art critics, researchers in literature or linguistics, and educators. In each section (from 1.2.1 to 1.2.5), similar observations were made. Firstly, it is evident that no consensual or systematic model of PF exists. This was shown by the lack of consistency in the definitions and examples above. Secondly, despite the varied definitions of PF observed, there seems to be a general consensus that PF is either: 1) a projection of emotions onto the natural world, or 2) the attribution of emotions to inanimate objects. Although both definitions focus on emotions, the second definition is similar to personification’s definition, generating a lack of clarity for analysts or educators. These two definitions were noticed in each field reviewed, and even amongst sources that used one definition or the other, discrepancies arose. Certain characteristics were also recurrent unanimously amongst the sources: it is an implicit metaphor and can at times be extended throughout a text. These characteristics will be further explored in the rest of this thesis. Thirdly, regardless of which definition of PF is mentioned in, it is consistently associated or seen as “interchangeable” (Dick, 1968, pp.27-30) with other literary techniques, namely
personification, prosopopoeia, animation, and anthropomorphism. As discussed in section 1.2.3, I argue that these techniques are not ‘interchangeable’ and hold their own nuances, despite the certain overlap they share.

The next section aims provides an overview of the thesis’ aims, rationale, and research questions.

1.3 Overview of the thesis

As I briefly mentioned in section 1.2.4, the rationale for this thesis stems from its educational implications: there is no systematic approach to PF and no consensus amongst scholars or educating bodies such as the English National Curriculum or examination boards. And yet, PF and other literary techniques mentioned in this chapter (i.e. personification, anthropomorphism) are likely to be taught for the examinations of GCSE and A Level. Additionally, the lack of consistency in its discussion impacts PF’s significance in our understanding of literature and for readers’ (emotive) experiences of texts.

This section presents the aims and research questions of this thesis; it also outlines the structure of each chapter to demonstrate how these aims are achieved.

1.3.1 Aims and research questions

With this thesis, I aim to remedy the lack of clarity and inconsistency that surrounds the concept of PF. Using stylistic tools (each discussed in the chapters that draw upon them), I aim to create an updated model of PF that:

- defines the technique;
- provides an identification method to identify it in texts;
- identifies its metaphorical mappings;
identifies the effects it has in narratives;

This updated model of PF also aims to be interdisciplinary as it draws on stylistics, cognitive stylistics, literature, corpus linguistics, psychology amongst other fields. This updated model’s goal is to be applicable to varied texts for the sake of systematicity and inclusivity, and to thus be adaptable to an educational setting. With this model, the following global research questions are to be answered:

- What is PF and what elements constitute it?
- How is PF featured in texts?
- How can PF be identified in texts?
- What is the effect of PF on the reading process?

1.3.2 The structure of this thesis

The present chapter reviewed existing literature and highlighted a clear gap in knowledge: PF has no set definition or example and is discussed in varied ways across different disciplines. I pointed out problems caused by this gap in knowledge in practice (see section 1.2.4) as PF is likely to be taught for the GCSE and A Level examinations for English Literature. The aims and research questions for this thesis were provided.

In chapter 2, I conduct a survey of English teachers to collect data on PF by the people most likely to use this term on a regular basis. Two hypotheses for the findings of the survey are formulated, based on the literature review in chapter 1, and three criteria of PF are put forward: the presence of emotions, human beings, and surroundings. The data drawn from the survey is analysed question by question. Additionally, corpus linguistic tools are used to analyse the open text box answers.
from participants to test my hypotheses, and ultimately identify the definition most often associated with PF by teachers.

In chapter 3, I detail the stylistic tools of text analysis I use to analyse the corpus provided by the survey participants in chapter 2, namely a combination of Leech and Short’s (2007, pp.61-64) “checklist of linguistic and stylistic categories” and foregrounding theory (Mukařovský, 1932/1964; Short, 1996; Leech, 2008). The process of analysis is exemplified, and key findings are identified: PF has three ‘linguistic indicators’ (Short, 1996): imagery, negation, and repetition. Additionally, it is pointed out that PF is not featured evenly across texts, and that some present it in more ambiguous ways. Moreover, the two hypotheses formulated in chapter 2 are revisited based on the findings drawn from the text analysis conducted in chapter 3, and the three criteria of PF expressed in chapter 2 are reframed.

Chapter 4 first reviews the limitations observed in the analysis process in chapters 2 and 3 and offers solutions to address those limitations. It then describes the identification method of PF proposed by this thesis, and the concepts of context and interpretation are discussed. A step-by-step guide to identify PF (and its converse) is provided. The second part of the chapter presents my updated model of PF, created from the data and findings of chapters 2 and 3. I first detail a ‘prototypical’ example (Stockwell, 2002, pp.29-30) of PF, then other ‘unprototypical’ ones, and an example of what I label the ‘converse of PF’.

Chapter 5 discusses how Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Kövecses, 2002) can be used to explore the metaphorical function of PF. Master mappings of PF (such as EMOTION IS SURROUNDINGS, EMOTION IS VERTICAL ORIENTATION, EMOTION IS NATURAL FORCE, and EMOTION IS COLOUR TONE) are analysed with examples, shedding light on how PF - as an extended metaphor - is perceived in the reading
process. The second part of chapter 5 discusses four effects that PF is found to have in my corpus: the communication of implicit emotions, the building of ‘ambience’ (Stockwell, 2014), the contribution to the ‘process of building characters’ (Culpeper, 2001), and plot foreshadowing.

Chapter 6 concludes this thesis by reviewing what it has achieved: its theoretical and practical contributions to knowledge, its limitations, and what has yet to be addressed and would thus require further research.

1.4 Review of chapter 1

This chapter introduced the concept of PF and my interest in the technique. I reviewed existing literature on the matter, showing that a clear gap in knowledge surrounds PF, despite the fact that it is likely to be taught the GCSE and A Level examinations and is a significant technique used in literary texts to convey emotion. In fact, PF’s aesthetic is linked with readers’ emotional experience of literature as argued by Abel (2013) and Earnhardt (2016) (section 1.2.2). In section 1.3, I set the aims and research questions I intend to address with this thesis and provided a summary of each chapter to highlight how I would accomplish this. In the next chapter, I detail the methodology I use to collect data on PF: I conduct a survey of teachers and analyse their answers to understand how they view PF, as they are most likely the ones using the technique frequently for teaching and learning purposes.
Chapter 2: Survey Studies and Analysis.

In chapter 1, I established the gap in knowledge and inconsistencies surrounding PF: it is defined either as the personification of natural elements or as the projection of human emotions onto the natural world. This chapter aims to evidence the need for the present research through a survey study, and its statistical and corpus analysis. A survey study allows me to collect data on participants' understanding of PF, and in this case the survey is primarily aimed at teachers due to PF likely being taught for the GCSE and A Level (section 2.2). A corpus analysis completes the survey study by analysing the participants' answers to statistically test my hypotheses (section 2.3).

2.1 Pilot and main survey studies design

In this section, I discuss my methods for collecting information on PF and describe the decision-making process in developing a survey which helps me understand if teachers define PF consistently, identify it in textual examples, and provide an extract that contains PF.

From the literature review in section 1.2, it is clear that the concept of PF has been used in many ways by academics and educating bodies. A key finding was that PF is at times discussed under different headings, or interchanged with personification by literary critics, linguists, and the English National Curriculum. Another key finding was that despite those inconsistencies, PF is most often described as “the projection of human emotion onto phenomena in the natural world” (Lodge, 1992, p.85). I find Lodge’s definition of PF the most straightforward definition in the literature review and thus use it throughout the thesis. However, as seen in chapter 1, other academics

Based on this definition, I developed key criteria for PF to be perceived in a text: certain elements must be present to fulfil the definition. I analysed the key words in Lodge’s definition to understand the idea of basic elements needed for PF to occur. The most important words in Lodge’s definition are “projection”, “human”, “emotion”, and “natural phenomenon”, which I propose reflect the following criteria of PF:

(1) the presence of human beings, to generate emotions;
(2) the presence of emotions, so that natural elements have something to mirror;
(3) the presence of natural elements or environment, as without those elements, emotions would have nothing to be projected onto.

The lack of a consistent definition of PF means that there is a lack of clear textual examples that feature it, as it is often difficult to know which definition of the technique authors or critics used. Since I need textual examples to test the three criteria I developed above, this is problematic. To remedy this problem, I decided to collect textual examples of PF myself.

To collect textual examples of PF, I tried to gather texts using anthologies of Romanticism. Indeed, PF is a literary technique developed by Ruskin during the Romantic movement (Ruskin, 1856/2012), although it occurred in older texts (Copley, 1937, p.194; Sacks, 1985, pp.20-21). Therefore, Romantic texts from anthologies could provide examples of PF. However, this proved problematic in two ways. Firstly, I could not find anthologies that consistently referred to PF, meaning I would have to
decide on its occurrence in the texts myself, and this was not an objective or systematic method of selecting texts. Secondly, by restricting my research to Romantic texts, I potentially could miss certain patterns of PF in texts from other genres. Since my aim is to provide an updated and consistent definition of PF, I should analyse a variety of texts to test the three PF criteria identified. I thus decided to gather my own textual examples with a survey. A survey study was an appropriate methodology for my research as it offered three benefits:

(1) Collect teachers’ professional opinions on PF: since the concept is likely to be taught as part of the DfE subject content, teachers must teach it.

(2) Test which definition of PF the participants used. This enables me to test my hypotheses (detailed in section 2.1.1).

(3) Observe the three criteria’s presence in texts provided by participants and analyse their impact. Conducting a survey facilitated testing participants’ responses to those criteria, and therefore helped me to confirm whether they are justifiable and sensible. However, the participants being primarily teachers, the texts collected are predictably related to the English National Curriculum. This is not an issue for testing the PF criteria, but more texts would be required to fully test my updated model of PF.

The survey collected teachers’ answers regarding PF and gathered textual examples featuring PF. Thus, text samples would be derived from the participants’ answers, which is not only an objective method but also a systematic, rigorous, and replicable one (Wales, 2011, p.372).

PF is likely to be taught for GCSE and A Level (DfE, 2013b), meaning that English teachers from Key Stage (KS hereafter) 3 to 5 most likely teach students what
PF is, and its potential textual effects. Therefore, I deliberately shared the survey primarily with English teachers in secondary schools and colleges, as opposed to the general public. This seemed logical as English teachers and students are more primed to use PF or personification in their daily lessons, and hence should have the opportunity to share their knowledge, whereas the general public might be less likely to know what PF is.

In this section, I introduced the reasoning behind my choice of conducting a survey study amongst teachers. I now present my hypotheses and the design of the survey.

### 2.1.1. Hypotheses

Based on the findings that emerged from my literature review, and considering that the specific sample of participants for the survey are teachers, my survey study tests the following hypotheses:

- **Hypothesis 1**: The concepts of PF and personification will be used interchangeably by the teachers in my sample, as was the case for academics and the English National Curriculum in chapter 1.
- **Hypothesis 2**: My three criteria for the presence of PF will be present in all textual examples of PF given by my participants.

To test those hypotheses, I designed a survey which features varied questions in different formats to observe the consistency of the participants’ answers. Both hypotheses relate to the dilemma that the concept of PF presents: I expected to see
that teachers would not define PF consistently, and yet would provide textual examples featuring all three of the criteria I put forward.

I conducted a pilot survey to ensure questions were viable and logical prior to the main survey. Section 2.1.2 reviews the pilot study and the data drawn from it.

2.1.2 Pilot study

Before the main survey, I conducted a pilot study to test each question and ensure the effectiveness of the survey itself. The pilot study was sent to a local secondary school for a period of three weeks. The results were anonymous and besides the answers to the survey, no data was kept from the participants. Overall, nine answers were collected.

I designed the questions specifically to test the participants’ understanding of PF in a way that challenged their consistency in defining PF in varied situations. I asked the participants to define PF and personification in their own words; to identify PF in stimuli, and to quote their own example of PF. The variety of questions made it easier to spot if any tasks caused difficulties or comprehension issues for the participants.

2.1.2.1 Question 1 and 2: what subject do you teach and at what level?

Question 1 asked the participants the subject they taught, and question 2 asked what age group they taught. Seven participants taught English, one taught History, and one taught Geography. All taught KS3-4 students (ages 11-16).
2.1.2.2 Question 3: matrix table with stimuli of PF

In question 3, participants were asked which stimuli examples they thought featured PF. I created my own stimuli to include in the matrix table for two reasons: firstly, I could not find anthologies with specific examples of PF (as I explained in section 2.1). From the literature review, I found that academics are inconsistent in their definitions and examples of PF, often referring to it as personification. Therefore, finding examples of PF from other sources was not a systematic option. Secondly, I wanted to test the participants' responses to the three PF criteria I hypothesised in section 2.1.1 (presence of human beings, emotion, and surroundings). I also wanted to observe the participants' reactions to examples of personification. If I opted to select examples of PF quoted from anthologies or academics, it would be difficult to control the presence of the criteria I wanted to test. Table 2.1 summarises the stimuli I created, and participants' answers to each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimuli</th>
<th>Number of participants that considered the stimuli as featuring PF</th>
<th>Percentage of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The blank page stared back at Sarah, defying her.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah's tears rolled down her cheeks, blending with the heavy rain and wild November wind. She would never be happy again.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah saw the tree move, possessed by the wind.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah could not stop crying; her tears were torrents. Her problems seemed ever-growing, ever-lasting, there was no coming back from that.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.1: Number of participants that considered the stimuli as featuring PF.*
As shown, all nine participants chose the second stimulus, which is the example that features PF according to Lodge’s definition.

2.1.2.3 Question 4: define PF in your own words

Question 4 required participants to define PF in their own words. Table 2.2 summarises the participants’ definitions of PF. I categorised the answers based on their meaning as the participants defined PF in two ways: a projection of human emotions, or the personification of nature. Some participants had mixed uses of the term ‘pathetic fallacy’ and referred to both version of the definition at the same time, which is why I categorised their answers as ‘mixed’ in table 2.2. The full list of answers can be found in appendix 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Number of participants (out of 9)</th>
<th>Percentage of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defines PF as “the projection of emotion onto natural phenomena”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines PF as the personification of natural elements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed result</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.2: Summary of participants’ definitions of PF in pilot study.*

The data indicates some confusion surrounding PF: the participants did not come to a consensus on a definition, as they had for the stimuli. This highlights the inconsistency that surrounds PF.
2.1.2.4 Question 5: define personification in your own words

Question 5 requested participants to define personification in their own words. Eight participants defined personification according to the OED: “the representation of a thing or abstraction as a person” (“Personification”, 2021). The full list of answers to question 4 can be found in appendix 2.2. I then checked how many participants defined PF and personification in a similar way, or used either term in the other term’s definition. Four participants defined PF as personification or used the term “personification” when defining PF. However, all of the participants could identify the stimulus that had PF, despite other stimuli featuring personification in the matrix table (“the blank page stared back at Sarah, defying her”, “Sarah saw the tree move, possessed by the wind”). This further demonstrates the discrepancies between PF and personification.

2.1.2.5 Question 6: examples of PF in existing literature

In question 6, participants were asked to include in a text box a textual example of PF from existing literature with references. Here are the texts quoted:

- *Maud* by Tennyson (entire poem), (Tennyson, 1855/2019)
- *Fahrenheit 451* by Ray Bradbury (“when Clarice disappears”), (Bradbury, 1967).
- *Frankenstein* by Mary Shelley (“chapter 5, the monster come alive”), (Shelley, 1818/2018).
- *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Brontë (chapter 1 “the opening”), (Brontë, 1847/2007).
- *Romeo and Juliet* by William Shakespeare (act 3 scene 2), (Shakespeare, 1597/2012).
• *A Christmas Carol* by Charles Dickens (stave 1 “the comparison of the cold, foggy weather while Scrooge is his usual self”), (Dickens, 1843/2018).

• *Wuthering Heights* by Emily Brontë (one sentence quoted from chapter 9), (Brontë, 1847/2020).

It is worth noting that the texts suggested by the participants are all taught in English classes for KS3, 4, and 5. Chapter 1 of *Jane Eyre* and chapter 5 of *Frankenstein* were suggested by two participants, and one chose not to answer this question. The participant suggesting the extract from *Romeo and Juliet* also included a quote from *Wuthering Heights*, which I decided to include as stimulus in my main survey. This is further discussed in section 2.2.4.

I analysed the texts using a stylistic approach based on Leech and Short’s “checklist of linguistic and stylistic categories” (2007, pp.61-64). This framework includes a list of language levels organised into lexical categories, grammatical categories, figures of speech, context and cohesion (Leech and Short, 2007, pp.61-64). I chose to use this framework to analyse the texts because it is detailed and provides an objective and systematic approach to each text (see section 3.1 for full discussion). I analysed each text using the checklist and observed any foregrounded features, meaning those features that stand out against the rest of the text and deviate from a linguistics norm, or which are brought to the fore of the text through repetition or parallelism (Simpson, 2004, p.49). The theory of foregrounding is further discussed in section 3.1.2. The text analyses gathered in the pilot study were kept brief: I focused on the three PF criteria I hypothesised, and on other recurrent tropes present in more than one text (or other significant linguistic features present in single texts). The method for the text analysis process, particularly for the main survey study, is extensively discussed in chapter 3.
All texts feature PF according to Lodge’s definition and therefore featured the three criteria I identified (presence of human beings, emotions, and natural elements). This validates my second hypothesis on a small scale: those criteria contribute to the identification of PF in texts.

Furthermore, each text also features multiple tropes other than PF:

- 7/8 texts contain personification
- 5/8 texts contain metaphor
- 4/8 texts contain simile
- 2/8 texts contain hyperbole
- 2/8 texts contain allegory
- 1/8 texts contain anthropomorphism
- 1/8 texts contain idiomatic expression
- 1/8 texts contain onomatopoeia
- 1/8 texts contain oxymoron
- 1/8 texts contain euphemism
- 1/8 texts contain consonance
- 1/8 texts contain syntactic iconicity

One of the interpretations for this pattern is that PF is a figure of speech itself, and therefore it is logical that it would be used with other literary techniques. The other interpretation is that, as stated above, the participants had mixed definitions of PF and some of the participants defined PF as personification. Therefore, it is logical that 7/8 texts suggested feature personification.

To further analyse the occurrences of personification, I make the distinction between verbal and nominal personification as discussed in section 1.2.3. The
difference in effects between verbal and nominal personification is that with verbal personification, the personified inanimate is actively behaving like a human being, whereas with nominal personification, the inanimate entity is more passive, the human traits attributed are used purely for description purposes and therefore the entity is not as actively associated with human beings. Out of the seven texts that featured personification, four were verbal (therefore more active), and contained natural elements such as the rain. This activeness of natural elements (conveyed by verbal personification) could be an explanation for why those texts were chosen by the participants. Indeed, the natural elements conduct the typically human actions in those instances, and since the participants defined PF either as the projection of human emotions or as personification, the omnipresence of personification and PF is not surprising. At this stage it is difficult to know if the participants chose the texts for the occurrence of PF or personification, or both. To avoid this ambiguity in the main survey study, I added some stimuli that contained both PF and personification to the matrix table (this will be further discussed in section 2.2.4). The aim was to observe the participants’ reactions to those stimuli, and to create more than one instance of PF, meaning that the odds of a participant agreeing at random that a stimulus contained PF were lowered.

The pilot study helped me to partially confirm my hypotheses on a small scale: it showed that the participants had mixed definitions of PF, and yet were unanimous in their identification of the stimulus that featured PF, thus highlighting the inconsistency surrounding it. It also confirmed the relevance of the three criteria I identified for PF to occur in texts. Going through this methodological process was also helpful to adjust the wording of my questionnaire to obtain the best possible results in the main study. Based on the pilot, I made two changes to the main study. I changed
the order of the questions: the participants would only access the matrix table once they had given their definitions of PF and personification. I also added eleven stimuli to the matrix table so that more than one stimulus contained PF and personification.

2.1.3 Survey design

The main survey was designed using the platform Qualtrics XM. To maximize the number of participants, the survey was short and user-friendly. It was live for four weeks from January 15, 2019 to February 12, 2019. The topic of the survey was disclosed to the participants through the title “Study of Pathetic Fallacy”. The participants were made aware of their ethical rights at the beginning of the survey with information indicating that no data other than their answers would be kept.

Participants were asked to answer six questions. As in the pilot study, the survey contained four open text-box questions, one multiple-choice question, and one matrix table. The matrix table had an even numbered 6-point Likert-scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree, and participants could agree or not if each stimulus contained PF. The lack of a neutral position ensured that the participants made a clear decision regarding each stimulus. No question was compulsory for ethical reasons, and questions could be skipped; however, once a participant had proceeded from a question, they could not return to it. This was particularly useful for questions 3 and 4, as I demonstrate in section 2.2.3. The questions were not displayed in a randomized order to maintain the logical progression of the questions. I wanted the participants to define ‘pathetic fallacy’ in their own words first, then define ‘personification’, and then complete the matrix table featuring examples of both literary techniques. The fact that participants could not return to previous questions meant that they could not alter their answers, which was crucial for exploring potential confusion between PF and
personification. It also meant that they could not check back with their definitions before analysing each stimulus in the matrix table. On the other hand, the stimuli featured in the matrix table were shuffled in a different order at random for each participant: this was to avoid any pattern spotting, such as the correlation between the three criteria I hypothesised and PF. This is explained in greater detail in section 2.2.4.

I also used Qualtrics’ functionality to allow for a background colour to be used, rendering reading easier in case of additional needs, and facilitating reading for participants with reading difficulties (i.e. dyslexia) because of the contrast and overlay it creates on the page.

### 2.1.4 Participants and platforms

The survey was shared with English teachers via social media (Twitter). I used specific networks of teachers to share my survey, particularly ‘Team English’, ‘National Association for Teachers of English’ (NATE). I also sent it to an existing mailing list for English teachers (‘The English Language List’) with permission from its host.

Although GCSE and A Level teachers were the primary target audience of the survey, I also asked academics in Higher Education to complete the survey. I targeted in particular those working in subjects such as Linguistics and Literature because PF could be discussed in their research and teaching. Indeed, to become English teachers, individuals typically study at university level for their undergraduate degree and teacher-training. Both of those qualifications are taught by academics, therefore asking academics about their subject knowledge of PF could be significant. The survey was shared with academics using Twitter and specific contacts. I contacted the secretaries of a variety of relevant associations and journals to ask if they could share my survey onto their own platforms, mailing lists and social media accounts. The
International Association of Literary Semantics (IALS), the Poetics And Linguistics Association (PALA), the language magazine *Babel*, and academics in Linguistics and Literature at the University of Huddersfield shared the survey with their members and colleagues.

After four weeks of the survey being available, 134 participants had answered the questions, rendering 134=100% for the statistics to follow.

### 2.2 Main study: data and results

In section 2.1, I explained my methodological choices for the survey. In this section, I present each question, including my motivations for asking them. For each question, the data collected is reviewed and analysed to outline its significance with regard to my hypotheses concerning PF.

#### 2.2.1 Question 1 and 2

Question 1 was an open textbox asking participants what subject they taught. Table 2.3 summarises their answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects taught by participants</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Percentage of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English (language and literature)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Chi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mostly English teachers (Language and Literature) answered the survey, which was logical when considering the topic and the channels used to share the survey.

Question 2 asked participants what level they taught, giving them a multiple-choice selection of answers from Primary (KS1 and KS2), Secondary (KS3 and KS4), A Level (KS5), University, or none of the above/other. Table 2.4 showcases the answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level taught by participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE - KS3-KS4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Levels - KS5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.4: Age level taught by participants.*

| Table 2.3: Subjects taught by participants. | Table 2.4: Age level taught by participants. |
Most of the participants were teachers in secondary school settings, teaching KS3 and KS4 at GCSE level. This is logical since English teachers of GCSE most likely teach PF and personification, the topic is therefore most relevant to them. The second most common level taught by participants was university level, which is also logical because academics in English language or literature can potentially discuss PF or personification in their research. Additionally, most English teachers learned their subject knowledge when they studied for their degree or teacher training, taught by academics. Therefore, researchers in English language or literature are also susceptible to teaching this concept more frequently than other researchers. These results were unsurprising, primarily due to the platforms on which the survey was distributed and advertised. It is noteworthy that some participants struggled to answer question 2 because they taught across multiple levels (e.g. KS3,4 and 5; see appendix 2.5), but the question did not allow participants to select more than one answer. Similarly, I did not make the distinction between teachers of English as a first or second language (L1 or L2), because in mainstream education students are typically together in classes regardless of their L1 as per the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001 (DfE, 2001), and thus teachers were likely to answer that they taught both. Those are nonetheless limitations to questions 1 and 2 and could be amended for future studies.

2.2.2 Question 3

In question 3, participants were required to define ‘pathetic fallacy’ in their own words. Since most participants were English teachers, I wanted to know how they defined PF, and how it is presented to students. The reasoning behind asking participants to define PF and personification was to establish whether there was
indeed confusion between the two terms. The most important definition gathered by this survey was PF’s definition, because one of the aims of my research is to develop a systematic way of identifying PF. By considering the variety of definitions given to PF, the answers can be clustered as tables 2.5 and 2.6 below show. The definitions were first put into the two main categories of table 2.5 based on their meaning: PF’s definition according to my definition (the projection of human emotion onto the surroundings), or not. The definitions were then categorised in table 2.6 based on their meaning and featured content: personification, anthropomorphism, nature, struggle to define PF, or other. If a participant referred to a specific content (e.g. anthropomorphism) more than once it was only counted as one reference; if they referred to multiple contents (e.g. personification and anthropomorphism), this was counted as two references. Table 2.5 includes a sample of quotes from the participants’ answers to question 3, but the full list of answers is given in appendix 2.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers given by participants for Question 3</th>
<th>Example quotes from the participants</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Percentage of participants: 100% = 130 participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Definition of PF in accordance with Lodge’s definition: the projection of human emotion onto the surroundings. | “When the description of the weather reflects the emotions of the characters.”
“ When the weather mimics or illuminates a character’s mood”
“Where the weather is used to depict and reflect human emotions.” | 69 | 53% |
Definition of PF NOT in accordance with my definition

The belief that inanimate things act in relation to human behaviour or possess human qualities:

“Human emotions attributed to weather or inanimate objects.”

“How humans see animate traits in inanimate objects.”

“A ridiculously flawed idea”.

“A falsehood, based on an emotive or affective reading and not supported by any data.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers given by participants for Question 3 organised by featured content</th>
<th>Example quotes from the participants</th>
<th>Total of references to the content</th>
<th>Percentage of participants: (130=100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reference to "weather" or "nature" | “When nature, most often weather, is described in a manner that reflects a human mood/emotion. Quite often reflects the mood that the writer wants to set.”
   “When nature is given out of the ordinary attributes.” | 102 | 78.5% |
| Definition of PF "type of personification" | “Use of personification to attribute human qualities to nature, often weather.”
   “A kind of personification”.
   “Personification: attributing human things to non-human things”.
| 47 | 36.2% |
| Reference to "anthropomorphism " or "animals" | “A literary device used for the anthropomorphism of inanimate objects, often by ascribing them a human emotion.”
   “Anthropomorphism, projection of human emotion, metaphorical imagery”.
| 6 | 4.6% |
| Struggle to define PF | “Right. I got this one wrong. I was going to write 'a tendency to mis-attribute opinions in a novel to the author'. Then I googled PF and realised I'd mis-remembered what it was!” | 5 | 3.80% |

Table 2.5: Participants’ definition of “pathetic fallacy” categorised to reflect if they follow Lodge’s definition or not.
“Not really”.

Other

“Using characteristic of the natural world as a tool for creative writing”.
“When the audience has information the characters haven’t”.
“A ridiculously flawed idea”.
“A falsehood, based on an emotive or affective reading and not supported by any data.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>“Using characteristic of the natural world as a tool for creative writing”.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“When the audience has information the characters haven’t”.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A ridiculously flawed idea”</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A falsehood, based on an emotive or affective reading and not supported by any data.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.6: Participants’ definitions of “pathetic fallacy” categories by featured content.**

The most common definition of PF was according to Lodge’s definition, and my own. However, 47% of participants defined PF as the attribution of human characteristics to inanimate objects, which is the *OED*’s definition of personification (see “Pathetic Fallacy”, 2021; “Personification”, 2021). In fact, 36% of participants defined PF using the term ‘personification’. This illustrates my argument: PF and personification are often used as interchangeable terms.

References to natural elements such as the “weather” were made by 78% of the participants across all definitions. It shows the important role the surroundings have to play in PF’s definition in both versions: either the personification of nature or a projection of emotions onto natural surroundings.

Five participants mentioned struggling to answer or acknowledged that they could not define PF. Looking beyond the survey responses, five participants who had not mentioned struggling with the task in their answers also reached out to the email address disclosed in the foreword of the survey, or via Twitter where the survey was shared, to state their struggle to accurately define PF and their confusion. The
participants' comments are listed in appendix 2.5. The idea of “lack of context” to be able to define PF was mentioned a few times, for instance, one participant said: “I’d need more context in most of the examples to determine whether it was PF or not”. Another participant stated: “lots of your examples have potential to be PF but can’t be deemed so without some explicit link to text context (plot, character emotion etc.)”. This shows that context and two of the three criteria I hypothesised, namely “character” (i.e. human beings in my criteria) and “emotion” are important, thus further highlighting the relevance of those criteria. The importance of context is further discussed in section 4.1.2. The participants’ comments on Twitter are listed in appendix 2.5.

2.2.3 Question 4

Question 4 asked participants to define ‘personification’ in their own words. Out of 134 participants, six did not answer this question. Table 2.7 summarises the answers collected and includes a sample of quotes from the participants’ answers (see appendix 2.4 for the full list of answers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers given by participants for Question 4</th>
<th>Examples of quotes given by the participants.</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Percentage of participants: 100% = 128 participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of personification in accordance with the OED: &quot;the representation of a thing or abstraction as a person&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;A figurative phrase where a non-human object or being is given human qualities.&quot; &quot;Giving something non-human the characteristics of a human.&quot; &quot;A type of metaphor that gives something non-human human-like characteristics.&quot; &quot;When non-human resource objects or animals are depicted as if they had human attributes.&quot;</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of personification NOT in accordance with the OED</td>
<td>&quot;Embodiment of a stereotype.&quot; &quot;As previous def.&quot; &quot;A real or fictional person embodying, representing or epitomising a concept, force or phenomenon.&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.7: Participants' definitions of “personification”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference to “anthropomorphism” or “animals”</th>
<th>“Talking or writing about things that aren’t alive as if they were alive, or even human.”</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reference to “natural elements” (with my emphasis) | “Giving inanimate objects, animals, or other creatures human traits such as speaking.”  
| | “Attributing human qualities/behaviour/emotions to something that is not human: anthropomorphism.”  
| | “Tropes whereby a non-human entity is described in anthropomorphic terms.” | 0 | 4.7% |
| Reference to “PF” | “The sky smiled at me”  
| | “When an object, piece of nature, etc is given a human characteristic.”  
| | “When a writer will assign human emotions or characteristics to a non-human entity (e.g. the wind moaned).” | 1 | 0.8% |

Natural elements such as the “weather” were mentioned by six participants in this question, as opposed to 102 participants in question 3. This implies that natural elements are associated with PF more than with personification. Further comparisons between questions 3 and 4 will be carried out in section 2.3 using corpus linguistic tools.

2.2.4 Question 5

Question 5 was a matrix table asking participants if they identified PF in a set of stimuli. The Likert scale was a 6-points ordinal scale, meaning that it tested the participants’ attitude towards each stimulus (Jamieson, 2004, p.1217). The Likert scale went from strongly agree to strongly disagree, removing a neutral option to force a decision from the participants, even if their views were moderate. Although some studies have shown that forced responses can at times alter the data collected, in
specific studies with a specialised pool of participants such as mine, forcing answers can be beneficial (Friedman and Amoo, 1999, p.116). By removing neither agree nor disagree, I forced trained teachers to decide their attitude towards each stimulus, even if only moderately (Cohen et al., 2017, p.484). However, for ethical reasons, the overall matrix table was not forced upon the participants, and they could skip the question. Overall, 114 (85%) participants completed the matrix table.

As in the pilot study (section 2.1.2), I created my own stimuli to feature in the matrix table. By creating my own stimuli, I was able to test the participants' reactions to the three PF criteria I hypothesised in section 2.1.1. Some of the stimuli featured those criteria alone or combined, and examples of personification. My intention was to observe which criterion of the three, or which combination of criteria was the most associated with PF.

To produce my stimuli, I used some of the statements from the pilot study, created new ones and included a quote from Wuthering Heights: “My love for Linton is like the foliage in the woods. Time will change it, I'm well aware, as winter changes the trees” (Brontë, 1847/2020). The quote from Wuthering Heights was provided by participants in the pilot study (see section 2.1.2). Wuthering Heights is a romantic novel (Williams, 1985, p.105) and is at times taught at GCSE and A Level. This meant that the participants might recognise the quote from the novel. However, if they did not recognise it, the example also featured the three criteria I wanted to test. I therefore expected this stimulus to be easy for participants to recognise and agree with, particularly since it features emotions, presence of a human being and natural elements, and thus fulfilling Lodge’s and the OED’s definitions of PF. Table 2.8 summarises the stimuli used in the matrix table, as well as the PF criteria they represent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimuli</th>
<th>Criteria for PF featured in stimuli</th>
<th>Any PF or personification featured?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. My love for Linton is like the foliage in the woods. Time will change it, I'm well aware, as winter changes the trees.                                                                                 | Human presence  
Presence of emotions  
Presence of surroundings                                      | PF (all 3 criteria present) |
| 2. Andy screamed after Emma to come back, lonely for the first time in ten years.                                                                                                                       | Human presence  
Presence of emotions                                           | - |
| 3. The leaves flew off the tree branches, carried by the autumn wind.                                                                                                                                     | Presence of surroundings                                      | - |
| 4. Joey stood at the window, looking into the distance at the burning buildings and the rain of ashes falling down. His heart stopped; he would never see Sarah again.  | Human presence  
Presence of emotions  
Presence of surroundings                                      | PF (all 3 criteria present) |
| 5. Matt hiked along the trail, further and further into the mist of the forest.                                                                                                                                 | Human presence  
Presence of surroundings                                      | - |
| 6. Alice laid on the beach, tanned by the sun rays, salt in her hair.                                                                                                                                       | Human presence  
Presence of surroundings                                      | - |
| 7. Kate walked along the beach, thinking it was too cold for a swim.                                                                                                                                     | Human presence  
Presence of surroundings                                      | - |
| 8. The fog was so thick, nothing beyond a few yards could be seen.                                                                                                                                      | Presence of surroundings                                      | - |
| 9. At the sight of her baby, Laura felt joy she never knew possible.                                                                                                                                     | Human presence  
Presence of emotions                                           | - |
| 10. The sun shone, the sky was bright blue when Josh came out of his meeting with a spring in his step. He had to call his mother to celebrate.                                                          | Human presence  
Presence of emotions  
Presence of surroundings                                      | PF (all 3 criteria present) |
| 11. Debra was reading a book at a coffee shop, watching as the barista argued with a frustrated customer.                                                                                               | Human presence  
Presence of emotions                                           | - |
| 12. Mike got in a taxi as the homeless woman cried for change, tears rolling down her cheeks.                                                                                                          | Human presence  
Presence of emotions                                           | - |
| 13. The wind roared during Steve's journey home.                                                                                                                                                         | Human presence  
Presence of surroundings                                      | Personification |
| 14. Lila felt anxious, her throat was tied in a knot and her stomach felt heavier than a brick.                                                                                                         | Human presence  
Presence of emotions                                           | - |
| 15. Sarah sat in the waiting room for an hour.                                                                                                                                                           | Human presence                                                | - |

**Table 2.8: Stimuli and the criteria or PF/personification they feature for Question 5 matrix table.**
Some stimuli deliberately contained multiple criteria. The stimuli were designed to feature one or more of the three criteria I argue are necessary to fulfill PF’s definition. The combination of multiple elements allowed me to assess which criterion was the most or the least important to participants when identifying PF in sentences. Three stimuli featured PF (stimuli 1, 4, and 10), one of which (stimulus 1) was the quote from *Wuthering Heights* (Brontë, 1847/2020) suggested by a participant in the pilot study. One stimulus (13) contained personification only to test if participants judged it to be an example of PF, particularly if they had defined PF as the personification of natural elements. One stimulus (3) was phrased as an animation of natural elements: “the leaves flew off the trees, carried by the autumn wind”. In this instance, the verb “flew off” animates the subject “the leaves”; the passive voice of the verb “carried by” animates the wind as it is the agent of the verb, but there is no personification occurring because flying or carrying are not actions specific to humans. Finally, some of the stimuli had a positive connotation, such as “at the sight of her baby, Laura felt joy she never knew possible” (9), while other stimuli had a more negative connotation, such as “Lila felt anxious, her throat was tied in a knot and her stomach felt heavier than a brick” (14), and others were neutral, such as “Sarah sat in the waiting room for an hour” (15). The aim was to test the participants’ reactions to a variety of scenarios.

Tables 2.9 and 2.10 represent the answers collected for question 5. Table 2.9 displays the answers collected by the matrix table with the 6-point Likert scale, whereas table 2.10 displays the participants’ answers in two categories: *agree* and *disagree*. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimuli</th>
<th>Participants’ view on stimuli containing PF in percentage of 1 place value (and in in numbers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My love for Linton is like the foliage in the woods. Time will change it, I’m well aware, as winter changes the trees.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Andy screamed after Emma to come back, lonely for the first time in ten years.</td>
<td>0.9% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The leaves flew off the tree branches, carried by the autumn wind.</td>
<td>3.5% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Joey stood at the window, looking into the distance at the burning buildings and the rain of ashes falling down. His heart stopped; he would never see Sarah again.</td>
<td>20.4% (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Matt hiked along the trail, further and further into the mist of the forest.</td>
<td>0.9% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alice laid on the beach, tanned by the sun rays, salt in her hair.</td>
<td>1.8% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kate walked along the beach, thinking it was too cold for a swim.</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The fog was so thick, nothing beyond a few yards could be seen.</td>
<td>7.9% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. At the sight of her baby, Laura felt joy she never knew possible.</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The sun shone, the sky was bright blue when Josh came out of his meeting with a spring in his step. He had to call his mother to celebrate.</td>
<td>33.6% (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Debra was reading a book at a coffee shop, watching as the barista argued with a frustrated customer.</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mike got in a taxi as the homeless woman cried for change, tears rolling down her cheeks.</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The wind roared during Steve’s journey home.</td>
<td>9.7% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lila felt anxious, her throat was tied in a knot and her stomach felt heavier than a brick.</td>
<td>2.6% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sarah sat in the waiting room for an hour.</td>
<td>0.9% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.9: Participants’ answers to Question 5 matrix table with 6-point Likert scale.*
### Table 2.10: Participants' answers to Question 5 matrix table with simplified 2-point Likert scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimuli</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td>Percentage of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. My love for Linton is like the foliage in the woods. Time will change it, I'm well aware, as winter changes the trees.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Andy screamed after Emma to come back, lonely for the first time in ten years.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The leaves flew off the tree branches, carried by the autumn wind.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Joey stood at the window, looking into the distance at the burning buildings and the rain of ashes falling down. His heart stopped; he would never see Sarah again.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Matt hiked along the trail, further and further into the mist of the forest.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alice laid on the beach, tanned by the sun rays, salt in her hair.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kate walked along the beach, thinking it was too cold for a swim.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The fog was so thick, nothing beyond a few yards could be seen.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. At the sight of her baby, Laura felt joy she never knew possible.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The sun shone, the sky was bright blue when Josh came out of his meeting with a spring in his step. He had to call his mother to celebrate.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Debra was reading a book at a coffee shop, watching as the barista argued with a frustrated customer.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mike got in a taxi as the homeless woman cried for change, tears rolling down her cheeks.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The wind roared during Steve’s journey home.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lila felt anxious, her throat was tied in a knot and her stomach felt heavier than a brick.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sarah sat in the waiting room for an hour.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants consensually identified PF in three stimuli (4, 10, 13 – see shading in table 2.10). Stimulus 4 was “Joey stood at the window, looking into the distance at the burning buildings and the rain of ashes falling down. His heart stopped; he would never see Sarah again”. This stimulus features PF according to Lodge’s definition and features the main criteria I hypothesised as constituting PF: presence of a human being, natural surroundings, and emotions. Participants also agreed stimulus 10 contained PF: “the sun shone, the sky was bright blue when Josh came out of his meeting with a spring in his step. He had to call his mother to celebrate”. This stimulus features PF according to Lodge’s definition, and also conforms to my hypothesis regarding its criteria. Lastly, participants agreed stimulus 13 featured PF was “the wind roared during Steve’s journey home”. This stimulus does not feature PF according to Lodge; however, it shows the verbal personification of a natural element (“the wind”). This stimulus contains the presence of a human being as well as a natural element, but no emotions are expressed. Interestingly, the eight stimuli with the highest proportion (over 20%) of participants agreeing PF occurred all had natural elements present, thus showing a correlation between PF and natural elements.

Before the main study, I expected the stimulus (1) from Wuthering Heights suggested in the pilot study to be an ‘easy pick’ for participants because it is well-known and features emotions, presence of a human being, and natural elements (thus fulfilling Lodge’s definition of PF). Nevertheless, 54% of participants disagreed that this stimulus contained PF. This stimulus does not contain personification, which could explain why teachers did not agree it contained PF depending on their definition of the term. Overall, out of three stimuli that contained PF, the participants agreed that two (4, 10) did indeed feature PF. This demonstrates that, although there is a confusion that surrounds the concept of PF, overall, half of my participants define PF as a
projection of human emotions onto the environment (whereas only 36.2% defined PF as a "type of personification", see table 2.6), and half identified PF as such in given stimuli. However, the fact that a stimulus that contained personification only was identified by 60% of participants as featuring PF sheds further light on the overlap between both techniques, thus rendering this study necessary.

The lack of consistency around PF in the participants’ answers is problematic: although a majority of participants defined PF in agreement with Lodge’s definition, it could be argued that PF is not a worthwhile concept on its own, simply a specific case of personification of natural elements. Based on the data collected in the survey so far, I refute this argument for two reasons: firstly, 53% of the teachers defined PF as the projection of human emotions onto the natural world, whereas 36% of teachers defined it as personification. This data highlights the confusion that surrounds PF, but it also confirms that Lodge’s definition is the most associated with the term. Secondly, teachers identified two out of three stimuli featuring PF in the matrix table, and those two stimuli did not contain personification. If PF were a specific type of personification, only the stimuli that contained personification would have been identified, which is not the case.

The stimuli in the matrix table offered a combination of the three PF criteria I hypothesised (section 2.1.1) to observe the participants’ reactions, as summarized in table 2.11 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific features put forward in the stimuli</th>
<th>Number of times participants agreed that stimuli contained PF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a human being</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of surroundings</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of surroundings and human being</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.11: Participants’ reactions to PF’s criteria based on specific features in the stimuli.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of human being and emotions</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PF (human beings + emotions + surroundings)</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimuli with personification</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, stimuli that featured PF and therefore the three criteria I hypothesised were overall identified 188 times by participants as containing PF. Stimuli that contained surroundings were identified as featuring PF more than the other two criteria I had put forward in my second hypothesis. In fact, stimuli that contained personification of natural elements were also identified by 119 participants as incorporating PF. This evidences my argument that PF and personification are at times interchanged, and the importance of surroundings in the conceptualisation of PF. On the other hand, emotions did not seem to be as popular a criterion to facilitate PF in the stimuli. This is further discussed in section 4.1.1.

In summary, participants were inconsistent in their identification of stimuli containing PF since 56.2% of participants identified none or one stimulus out of three. Referring to question 3 (section 2.2.2), 53% of participants defined PF according to Lodge, yet only 23.10% of participants identified it in all three stimuli that contained it, meaning that despite having an idea of what PF is, less than half of those participants could consistently identify it amongst a mixture of stimuli.

2.2.5 Question 6

Question 6 requested participants to copy their favourite textual examples of PF from existing literature into an open textbox, and to include the author, the title, and the specific chapter for reference if/when possible. Asking participants to submit their
examples of PF created a selection of texts on which to test my model of PF in a systematic way, unlike using anthologies as discussed in section 2.1.

In total, 59 participants (44%) answered this question. Out of 59 suggestions, one was a video, and I therefore did not include it in my study. Two texts suggested were in a foreign language (one text was in Welsh; one was in Spanish) and did not include a reference to an official English translation. Two texts quoted described Ruskin’s definition of PF and were therefore not suitable for my analysis as they did not contain a text with PF but merely a description of what Ruskin thought it to be. I did not include those examples in my study. Although less than half of the participants answered, the references and texts that were submitted showed a wide variety, and some of them were texts I was not familiar with. This was ideal to develop and test my model of PF. A few participants referred to the same extracts, which was to be expected because they are texts taught at GCSE and A Level.

The length of the extracts was chosen by the participants as they copied and pasted what they wanted. On four occasions, participants gave references to poems, and I therefore kept the full text to analyse. On three occasions, participants did not copy and paste an extract, but referenced the exact chapter from the novel or play they suggested. In those instances, I included the full chapters or scene in my corpus of text as each of the three texts are under 800 words. The three texts were: Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* (1606/2014) act 1 scene 1, Faulkner’s *As I Lay Dying* (1935) section 49 “Vardaman”, and Adams’s *The Long Dark Tea-Time of the Soul* (1990) chapter 19. Finally, five participants referenced a specific quote from a novel referring to a passage. To avoid picking the end of the passage myself, I included the extract that started with the given quote until the end of the chapter.
However, two participants indirectly referenced passages from novels, mentioning the specific part of the story they suggested. In those instances, I read the chapter of the novel they referred to and selected the passage of the action they described. Although this solution was not as systematic or objective as I aimed to be, it was the best solution under the circumstances. The two texts in questions were *Dracula* and *The Woman in Black*. For *Dracula*, the participant referenced the “opening of Dracula (the caleche chase through the woods) is great”; and for *The Woman in Black*, the participant suggested “the scene in The Woman In Black where Spider barks at night because he heard a noise and there is fog in the morning”. For the latter extract, the selection was easier because another participant had provided the same reference with the full extract copied and pasted. Therefore, I ensured that the extract match the suggestion of the scene with Spider barking and that there were no other scenes that could match this description in the novel. For *Dracula*’s extract, I identified the scene the participant referred to and included the full chapter (see section 2.3.1 for further discussion). Those two texts are often used in school settings at KS3 as part of the English Curriculum, and I am familiar with them, having taught them in the past. This means that when I selected the extracts the participants suggested, I was able to make an informed and professional decision, aiming for an approach as objective and systematic as possible under the circumstances.

Table 2.12 details the list of the texts referenced by the participants in the survey. This list summarises the complete corpus of texts collected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts provided by participants in Question 6 of the survey</th>
<th>Number of times texts were suggested by participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Wuthering Heights</em> (Brontë, 1847/2020), chapter 9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud</em> (Wordsworth, 1807/2004)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Christmas Carol (Dickens, 1843/2018), stave 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Expectations (Dickens, 1861/2020), chapter 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Eyre (Brontë, 1847/2007), chapter 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth (Shakespeare, 1606/2014), act 1 scene I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Expectations (Dickens, 1861/2020), chapter 39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleak House (Dickens, 1852/2012), chapter 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde (Stevenson, 1886/2018), chapter 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Woman in Black (Hill, 1983/2011), chapter 9 “In the Nursery”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the Moon (Bysshe Shelley, 1824/2020)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tragedy of King Lear (Shakespeare, 1606/2016), act 3 scene II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth (Shakespeare, 1606/2014), act 2 scene III</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As you like it (Shakespeare, 1623/2015), act 2 scene I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Eyre (Brontë, 1847/2007), chapter 11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Eyre (Brontë, 1847/2007), chapter 23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Christmas Carol (Dickens, 1843/2018), stave 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Slow Regard of Silent Things (Rothfuss, 2014), chapter “a quite uncommon pleasant place”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Dark Tea-Time of the Soul (Adams, 1990), section 19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things Fall Apart (Achebe, 1994), chapter 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As I Lay Dying (Faulkner, 1935), section 49 “Vardaman”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankenstein, or The Modern Prometheus (Shelley, 1818/2018), chapter 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulysses (Joyce, 1920/2019), Episode 9 “Scylla and Charybdis”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord of the flies: A novel (Golding &amp; Epstein, 1954), chapter 8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma (Austen, 1815/2018), volume 12, chapter 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dracula (Stoker, 1887/2013), chapter 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Sleep (Chandler, 1939/2004), chapter 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holes (Sachar, 1998), Part 2: “The Last Hole”, chapter 29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Return of the Native (Hardy, 1878/2020), Book 4, Chapter 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock (Eliot, 1915/2013)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Belle Dame Sans Merci: A Ballad (Keats, 1819/2020a)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Offensive (Owen, 1917/2020)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Flowers (Walker, 1973)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode to a Nightingale (Keats, 1819/2020b)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break, Break, Break (Lord Tennyson, 1842/2020)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sun used to shine (Thomas, 1916/2020)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OF TEXTS: 36</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.12: Texts provided by participants in response to question 6.
In section 2.1.1 I hypothesised that the concepts of PF and personification would be used interchangeably by the participants. My second hypothesis was that the three criteria I argue are necessary for PF to be identified in a text would be present in the participants’ texts suggestions. Those three criteria are the presence of human beings, the presence of emotions, and the presence of surroundings. The survey overview and data presentation in section 2.2 has confirmed my first hypothesis: there were overlaps between the concepts of PF and personification in the participants’ answers. To test my second hypothesis and shed further light on the overlap between PF and personification, I conduct a corpus linguistics analysis of the data drawn from the survey in the forthcoming section.

2.3. Survey data analysis using corpus linguistics

A corpus linguistics approach is used to further analyse the data drawn from the survey. Corpus linguistics is a “branch of computational linguistics which uses large-scale texts of corpora for a better empirical understanding of different aspects of language patterning and use” (Wales, 2011, p.87). A corpus is an electronic collection of texts gathered to be representative of a variety of language (Baker et al., 2006; McIntyre and Walker, 2019). Corpus linguistics allows the comparison of a text or collection of texts against another corpus. I chose this method for two reasons:

1. to illustrate further the overlap between PF and personification (my first hypothesis);
2. to test whether the criteria I argue are necessary for PF to occur in texts will be present in the texts suggested by participants in question 6 of the survey. Those criteria are the presence of human beings, emotions, and surroundings (my second hypothesis).
The data collected from the survey and presented in section 2.2 is helpful in illustrating those points, although I argue using “corpus-driven” linguistic methods would shed further light on those findings and has the potential to validate my hypotheses (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.114). For this “corpus-driven” analysis I used a pre-existing corpus to support the analysis of the corpora that emerged from the survey study (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.26, 114), and which I present below in section 2.3.2.

2.3.1 Methodology: corpus linguistics and Wmatrix

For this analysis I used Wmatrix: a software that can be used on a web browser and in which users can upload their own corpora of texts to compare against samples of the British National Corpus (hereafter BNC). The BNC is a “100-million-word collection of samples of written and spoken language from a wide range of sources, designed to represent a wide cross-section of British English, both spoken and written, from the late twentieth century” (BNC, 2007). Therefore, the BNC represents the English language and an “external norm against which to compare a single text” (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.26, 66). The written part of the BNC combines extracts from a variety of texts such as newspapers, specialist periodicals and journals, academic books and popular fiction, letters and memoranda, school, and university essays (Burnard, 2007). In my analysis, I compare my corpora to the Written Sample of the BNC available on Wmatrix, composed of 968,267 words from the BNC Sampler written corpus (Burnard, 2007).

I use Wmatrix because of the variety of texts included in the BNC: it represents an “external norm” (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.26, 66), and I want to test my corpora against a sample of the English language to observe potential foregrounded
language features that could be specific to PF, such as keywords or key semantic categories. If I used a corpus that is more restrictive, or that only included texts from literary fiction such as the HUM19UK 19th Century British Fiction Corpus (2019), I might not observe those foregrounded features because PF might be featured in some of those texts due to their literariness. My aim is to confront texts with PF against a reference corpus that represents the English language as a whole, which is possible with the BNC.

Wmatrix offers the “production of frequency lists, statistical comparison of those lists, and […] concordances” (Rayson, 2003, p.119). I define those terms below. Not all tools available on Wmatrix are used in this study, as I had a specific agenda when conducting this analysis, and although this is a useful part of my research, it is not its main focus. A more detailed corpus analysis of this research could be beneficial in a later project, but alterations would need to be made, as I point out below when addressing the limitations of this current analysis (see also section 6.2.1).

I put together three distinct corpora for this analysis, and all are taken from the survey answers. The three corpora I collected are:

- corpus 1: the participants’ definitions of PF in question 3. It contained 2,020 words.
- corpus 2: the participants’ definitions of personification in question 4. It contained 1,498 words.
- corpus 3: the texts provided by the participants in question 6. It contained 10,406 words.

Since the texts were provided by teachers, the method of data collection is unbiased by my own research goals. For corpus 1 and corpus 2, the textbox entries provided by the participants are used unaltered to reflect all and only the language
suggested by participants (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.127). The corpus I find to be the most useful in my analysis is corpus 3: it represents texts that contain PF according to teachers. For a corpus analysis, the sampling of texts in corpus 3 might be considered too small a sample, and thus not fully representative of texts featuring PF in general (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.66). Indeed, the limitation of asking participants for texts to create a corpus means that consequently the corpus might not be balanced, that is to say “the proportions of different kinds of text it contains should correspond with informed and intuitive judgements” (Sinclair, 2005, p.8; see also McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.73). Arguably corpus 3 can be considered as imbalanced due to the types of texts that compose it: all are literary texts but of different genres, there are 19 novel extracts, one short story, eight poems, three plays (all are Shakespeare’s), which might not be representative of PF. The consequence of these restrictions could be that drawing general conclusions might be challenging. This could be remedied by collecting more texts in a later project. For the purposes of this research, the corpus collected allows me to test my hypotheses as it provides an indicator of PF’s language features in texts, but I do not claim corpus 3 to be fully representative of texts featuring PF.

The size of corpus 3 is also limited by the time frame of the survey, which was open for four weeks. The length of the extracts included in corpus 3 was chosen by the participants when they copied and pasted their examples. Four participants gave the references to poems and did not provide the texts, so I included the full texts to analyse. Three participants referenced the exact chapters from novels, so I followed a similar approach: I included the full chapters for objectivity purposes (see section 2.2.5). Five participants provided specific quotes from novels referring to extracts. To remain objective, I included in corpus 3 the extract that started with the given quote
until the end of the chapter. Two participants mentioned specific parts of novels without providing a quote or a reference (*The Woman in Black* (Hill, 1983/2011) and *Dracula* (Stoker, 1897/2013) as discussed in section 2.2.5). Those two texts are taught in secondary English lessons. Having taught those two texts at KS3, I was able to use my professional judgement to select the extracts the participants suggested. For the extract from *Dracula*, the problem was the length of the extract (5,685 words). Since it includes most of a chapter it would constitute a third of the total wordcount of corpus 3, meaning that the corpus analysis would not be balanced of PF in a variety of texts (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.73). To address this issue, I created three versions of corpus 3:

- Corpus 3A with the full chapter 1 of *Dracula*: 15,608 words
- Corpus 3B excluding *Dracula* altogether: 9,923 words
- Corpus 3C with an extract from *Dracula* that I carefully selected based on the participant's suggestions: 10,406 words

I conducted the corpus analysis (section 2.3.3) with the three versions of corpus 3 to observe any differences in findings and identify which version of the corpus should be kept for the overall analysis. The results were extremely similar in the keyness analysis at word and semantic categories level. Therefore, I kept corpus 3C (simply ‘corpus 3’ hereafter) and included the extract of *Dracula* I selected myself. Although this process was not as systematic and objective as I aimed to be, the alternative would be to not include the extract of *Dracula* altogether, which I did not want to do due to the low number of texts. The more texts are present in a corpus, the more representative the corpus is likely to be for a language feature, here PF (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.73). The limited time frame of the survey provided a total of 36 texts (for 134 participants). Since my main research methodology was a qualitative approach to text
analysis, as chapter 3 shows, the number of texts collected was sufficient for my study and to test my hypotheses. However, for a wider corpus analysis of PF, a bigger corpus of texts containing PF would be necessary, as corpus 3 collected in this research would be too small and imbalanced for such a project.

For each corpus analysis, the main tools in Wmatrix I used were: keyness analysis at word level and semantic categories level, using word frequency list, log-likelihood, and log ratio compared to the BNC. I define those terms and functions in this section for clarity as I refer to them in the rest of this chapter.

A keyword is “a word that is more frequent in a text or corpus under study than it is in some (larger) reference corpus, where the difference in frequency is statistically significant” (McEnery and Hardie, 2011, p.245). Keyness analysis is a tool that compares keywords from the uploaded corpus to the reference corpus; in the case of this research it is the BNC written sample in Wmatrix. Conducting a keyness analysis allows the analyst to observe potential patterns in words that occur more frequently in the chosen corpus than in the reference corpus.

A word frequency list “lists all words appearing in a corpus and specifies for each word how many times it occurs in that corpus” and can be supplied by a corpus analysis tool such as Wmatrix (McEnery and Hardie, 2011, p.2). It is a useful analytical process to observe the focus of the corpus, and to spot any repetitions occurring within the corpus under scrutiny.

Log-likelihood (LL) is “a test for statistical significance [...]. Log-likelihood compares the observed and expected values for two datasets” (Baker et al., 2006, p.110). The log-likelihood determines the odds of a word occurring in a corpus, and it “tells us whether the word (or item) whose potential keyness we have been calculating is indeed key, thereby avoiding the need for us to rely on subjective judgements about
such matters” (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.156). The log-likelihood is used to determine the cut-off for the data by examining the percentage level of confidence in a significant result based on the log-likelihood critical value. A log-likelihood equal to or higher than 15.13 represents a 99.99% level of confidence in a significant result, whereas a log-likelihood value of 3.84 represents 95% level of confidence in a significant result (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.158). In this corpus analysis, I decided that the cut-off for my data would be a log-likelihood of 15.13 to ensure the highest level of confidence in the significance of my results and findings, and this is applied to tables 2.11, 2.12, 2.16, and 2.17.

The log-likelihood indicates for which item there is most evidence of a higher frequency occurrence in the corpus understudy than in the reference corpus, but it does not account for the difference in size between the corpus understudy and the reference corpus. However, the log ratio value takes into consideration the size of each corpus, and therefore indicates which item whose frequency differs the most in the corpus understudy as opposed to the reference corpus (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.159). Table 2.13 summarises the size of frequency difference between the target and the reference corpus based on the log ratio value (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.162). The table is coloured to visually convey the degree of difference between the target and reference corpus. Those shadings are used to indicate log ratio in the tables of analysis that follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency in target (T) and reference (R) corpora</th>
<th>Log ratio of the relative frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency in T and R is the same</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 times more frequent in T than in R</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 times more frequent in T than in R</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 times more frequent in T than in R</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 times more frequent in T than in R</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 times more frequent in T than in R</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 times more frequent in T than in R</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 times more frequent in T than in R</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 times more frequent in T than in R</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 times more frequent in T than in R</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512 times more frequent in T than in R</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... | ...

Table 2.13: Size of frequency difference between target and reference corpora based on the log ratio of the relative frequencies (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.162).

Wmatrix automatically generates semantic (and grammatical) tags to the words in a corpus. This process is carried out by the Constituent Likelihood Automatic Word-tagging System (CLAWS) (Rayson, 2003, pp.66-67; McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.278). It appoints every word a tag stipulating its category. As McIntyre and Walker (2019, p.278) explain “the semantic tagging is carried out by the UCREL Semantic Analysis System (USAS […]), which assigns semantic tags to each word in the text or corpus based on a scheme developed from McArthur's (1981) Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English”. The list of USAS tagset of semantic categories in Wmatrix can be found in appendix 2.6.

In this section, I introduced my corpora, their limitations and the corpus linguistics tools I intend to use. I now present the findings from my analyses.

2.3.2 Testing hypothesis 1: analysis of corpora 1 and 2

Questions 1, 2, and 5 were already discussed in section 2.2. For questions 3, 4, and 6 (data from which was also presented in section 2.2), I argue there is a need for further analysis to test my hypotheses due to their open textbox nature, which is why I have chosen a corpus-driven approach.
As explained in section 2.2.2, question 3 of the survey asked participants to define PF in their own words, and question 4 asked participants to define personification. When defining PF, 36% of participants associated PF with definition of personification (see table 2.5). To further illustrate the confusion between PF’s definition and personification, I conduct a corpus analysis. I compare the participants’ answers to questions 3 (corpus 1) and 4 (corpus 2) to the BNC written sample in Wmatrix. The settings are the same for both corpora: the keyness analysis tables are sorted by log-likelihood (LL) value up to 15.13. Tables 2.14 and 2.15 summarise my findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Observed frequency of words in corpus 1</th>
<th>Relative frequency of the word in Corpus 1</th>
<th>Observed frequency of words in BNC</th>
<th>Relative frequency of the word in BNC</th>
<th>+ overuse of word\textsuperscript{5} - underuse of word in Corpus 1</th>
<th>LL of word in Corpus 1</th>
<th>Log Ratio of word in Corpus 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weather</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>566.11</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>423.51</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>416.23</td>
<td>11.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mood</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>9.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflects</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>230.84</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>224.46</td>
<td>9.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3233</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>197.56</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characters</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>192.21</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>159.61</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feelings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>151.98</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>145.6</td>
<td>11.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personification</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>141.6</td>
<td>12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nature</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>134.41</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflect</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>120.06</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>112.66</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>111.89</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-human</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>12.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{5} Because I was looking for patterns present in the texts existing more often in my corpus than in the reference corpus (specifically the presence of the three criteria for PF I hypothesised), this means that in the tables throughout this thesis, all words and semantic categories are overused.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>24.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landscape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>24.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>23.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>22.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>22.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>21.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>21.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symbolise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metaphor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreshadow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tendency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phenomena</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protagonist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceptions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mirrors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>65369</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.14: Corpus 1 against the BNC’s written sample on Wmatrix – Keyness analysis.**

The keyness analysis of corpus 1 in table 2.14 represents the key words provided by the participants when answering question 3. The list shows the main ideas expressed concerning PF and its function, with words such as “emotions”, “mood”, “reflects”, “weather”, or “human”, which matches Lodge’s and my definition of PF. These terms have a log-likelihood ≥100, which is compelling since 15.13 represents a 99.99% level of confidence in the significance of those terms' frequency.
However, the confusion with personification is also highlighted in this keyness analysis because terms referring to ‘personification’ and its definition are also present: “objects”, “attributing”, “ascribing”, “inanimate”. On the other hand, the words with a log ratio ≥10 are at least 512 times more frequent in corpus 1 than in the Written Sample of the BNC (highlighted in dark grey). The six terms with the highest log ratio values are: “non-human”, “personification”, “attributing”, “projection”, “ascribing”, and “emotions”. Although those terms could be used in Lodge’s definition of PF, they could equally be used in defining personification according to the OED, thus further illustrating the confusion between PF and personification as I hypothesised in section 2.1.1.

The keyness analysis of corpus 2 in table 2.15 presents the definition of personification as seen by the participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Observed frequency of words in corpus 2</th>
<th>Relative frequency of the word in Corpus 2</th>
<th>Observed frequency of words in BNC</th>
<th>Relative frequency of the word in BNC</th>
<th>+ overuse of word - underuse of word in Corpus 2</th>
<th>LL of word in Corpus 2</th>
<th>Log Ratio of word in Corpus 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>human</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1244.72</td>
<td>9.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>666.34</td>
<td>13.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>507.82</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>441.89</td>
<td>9.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>396.89</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-human</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>364.38</td>
<td>15.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>323.17</td>
<td>9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>205.13</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>given</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>201.33</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>177.69</td>
<td>10.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>174.85</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3233</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>152.03</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metaphor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>136.27</td>
<td>12.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>117.31</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>95.49</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Corpus 2</td>
<td>BNC's written sample</td>
<td>Wmatrix – Keyness analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>94.59</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3573</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personification</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>85.07</td>
<td>12.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>72.34</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>69.08</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human-like</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>65.07</td>
<td>12.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>something</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>51.72</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>features</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>50.55</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>50.32</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>47.05</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wind</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>40.65</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>40.55</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>device</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>38.11</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>8.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>im</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>34.55</td>
<td>10.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9851</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>33.39</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>30.73</td>
<td>9.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inhuman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>29.49</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualities/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>26.03</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-living /</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>26.03</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behaviour/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>26.03</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropomorphism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>26.03</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascribing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>10.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feelings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.62</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>20460</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as_if</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.53</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projected</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.51</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>4985</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>describing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.15: Corpus 2 against the BNC's written sample on Wmatrix – Keyness analysis.
The first six terms with the highest log-likelihood value are “human”, “inanimate”, “characteristics”, “object”, “objects”, and “non-human”. The six terms with the highest log ratio values are: “non-human”, “inanimate”, “attributing”, “metaphor”, “human-like”, and “personification”. Those terms reflect the definition of personification in the *OED* (“Personification”, 2021), showing that there is no confusion regarding the definition of the personification in the participants’ answers to question 4. Overall, 96% of the participants defined personification according to the *OED*, as shown by table 2.7 in section 2.2.3.

Through the keyness analysis of corpus 1 and corpus 2 and the comparison of both corpora’s key word frequency lists, a repetition of key words is observed. The following list of terms is repeated across both corpora as being key words that are more frequent in both corpora than in the reference corpus: “human”, “emotions”, “personification”, “objects”, “inanimate”, “non-human”. The fact that the word “personification” is used by participants in their definition of personification is not unusual as shown in table 2.7 (section 2.2.3; appendix 2.4): most of their answers started with “personification is ...”. However, the term is also present in the participants’ definition of PF as shown by table 2.6, and it is eleventh on the list of the most used terms in corpus 1. This, combined with the repetition of terms across corpus 1 and 2, gives a concrete illustration of the overlap between the concepts of PF and personification, and it shows that the terms are at times used as interchangeable, as I had hypothesised in section 2.1.1.
2.3.3 Testing hypothesis 2: PF criteria in corpora 1 and 3.

In section 2.1.1, my second hypothesis stated that the three criteria I developed for PF to be identified (presence of human beings, emotions, and surroundings) would be present in the participants’ text suggestions. In the sections below, I discuss how the keyness analysis at word level and semantic category level of corpus 1 and 3 supports this hypothesis.

2.3.3.1 PF criteria in corpus 1.

In section 2.3.2, table 2.11 shows the keyness analysis of corpus 1 against the written sample of the BNC (sorted by log-likelihood). The five key words with the highest log-likelihood values are: “emotions”, “mood”, “reflects”, “weather”, or “human”, which illustrates Lodge’s definition of PF as shown in section 2.3.2. Interestingly, amongst those five key words, the three used most frequently in corpus 1 also mirror my hypothesis on PF’s key criteria. In fact, amongst the 91 words listed in table 2.14, I find that the PF criteria are present in various forms:

- 11 words refer to surroundings (i.e. “weather”, “nature”, “natural”, “setting”, “atmosphere”, “environment”).
- 11 words refer to human beings (i.e. “human”, “characters”, “writer”, “entities”, “personification” which I included here as it involves human attributes).
- 7 words refer to emotions (i.e. “emotions”, “mood”, “emotional”, “feelings”, “emotive”).

Table 2.14 contains 29 words matching the three criteria I hypothesised to identify PF, representing 31.9% of the words in the table. The log ratio for the words that represent the criteria is higher than three, and thus occurring at least eight times more often in corpus 1 than in the reference corpus, as shown by table 2.13. This
indicates that participants have used those keywords to describe PF more frequently than those words that were used in the reference corpus, and therefore it corroborates my second hypothesis.

Furthermore, table 2.16 shows a semantic category keyness analysis of corpus 1 against the Written Sample in the BNC: it displays the semantic categories that are key in the corpus. The tagset codes for the semantic categories can be found in appendix 2.6. Again, the log-likelihood value determines the cut off, and I decided to only include semantic categories with a log-likelihood ≥15.13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item with tagset codes from Wmatrix</th>
<th>Observed frequency of category in corpus 1</th>
<th>Relative frequency of the category in Corpus 1</th>
<th>Observed frequency of category in BNC2</th>
<th>Relative frequency of the category in BNC2</th>
<th>+ overuse of category - under-use of category in Corpus 1</th>
<th>LL of category in Corpus 1</th>
<th>Log Ratio of category in Corpus 1</th>
<th>Key Semantic categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>789.48</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>Emotional actions, states and processes, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>2896</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>351.74</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>351.6</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>Weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>220.68</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>Green issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10+</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>4107</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>151.93</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>Open; finding; showing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.2+</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2275</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>53.53</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>Comparing: usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>52.76</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>Objects, generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>50.44</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>The media: books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>49.55</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>4139</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>37.86</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>Thought, belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>37.67</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>Language, speech and grammar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three most key semantic categories in corpus 1 (in terms of log-likelihood and log ratio) represent the three main criteria I hypothesised to identify the occurrence of PF in section 2.1.1. The first three semantic categories are “emotional actions, states and processes”, “people”, and “weather”, and each of those semantic categories has a log-likelihood value ≥350 and a log ratio higher than four. This means that the level of significance of those findings are particularly high, thus further validating my second hypothesis. In fact, there are multiple categories that can be grouped to represent each of those three criteria, such as:

- Four semantic categories can be grouped to represent the criterion of human presence: “people”, “thought and belief”, “language and speech”, and “dead”.

Table 2.16: Corpus 1 against the BNC’s written sample on Wmatrix – Semantic categories analysis.
• Three semantic categories can be grouped to represent the presence of emotion criterion: “emotional actions or states”, “evaluation good/bad”, “evaluation inaccurate”.

• Four semantic categories can be grouped in the presence of surroundings criterion: “weather”, “light”, “green issues”, “the universe”.

Overall, there are 22 semantic categories listed in table 2.16, and 11 (50%) of them represent the criteria I hypothesised to identify PF. This shows that when the participants defined PF in their own words, the most key semantic categories and key words used corroborate my second hypothesis: there must be a presence of human beings, emotions, and surroundings for PF to occur in a text.

2.3.3.2 PF criteria in corpus 3.

Corpus 3 is composed of the texts provided by the participants in question 6 of the survey. The tables below show the keyness analysis of words in the corpus (table 2.17), as well as the keyness analysis of semantic categories (table 18). Both tables are sorted by log-likelihood, which determines the cut-off. I included semantic categories with a log-likelihood value ≥15.13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Words</th>
<th>Observed frequency of words in corpus 3</th>
<th>Relative frequency of the word in Corpus 3</th>
<th>Observed frequency of words in BNC</th>
<th>Relative frequency of the word in BNC</th>
<th>+ overuse of word - underuse of word in Corpus 3</th>
<th>LL of word in Corpus 3</th>
<th>Log Ratio of word in Corpus 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fog</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>178.6</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>103.06</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>100.64</td>
<td>11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrooge</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>100.64</td>
<td>11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>6904</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>98.35</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathcliff</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>82.34</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>78.69</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myop</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rain</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>69.93</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wind</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>68.22</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>28384</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>62.79</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>witch</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>62.28</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thunder</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>57.58</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>54.01</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>52.05</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2603</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>50.09</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upon</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>47.53</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weather</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>45.92</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>45.75</td>
<td>9.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2362</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>42.92</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3407</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>40.44</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>40.33</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sky</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>40.33</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lightning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>39.84</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hath</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaques</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>9.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs._Fairfax</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>9.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auri</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>9.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cloud</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sky</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>35.68</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>35.22</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>34.96</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thou</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>34.89</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>34.59</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'d</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>33.92</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>31.61</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lamps</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>30.71</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saw</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>30.19</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lord</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glorious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>28.59</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mud</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quoth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heath</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haggard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footstep</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blown_out</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adieu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr._Rochester</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Value 3</td>
<td>Value 4</td>
<td>Value 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENNOX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING_LEAR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the_sun</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>26.68</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>25.36</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>24.55</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spider</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dark</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>till</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>river</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stately</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hallo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lord</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hills</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>him</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awoke</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.76</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oak</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bell</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.05</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fool</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twilight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMIENS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>8270</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lamp</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bell</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>window-panes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheezing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>starry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sprightly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solitude</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slovaks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sedge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rubs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rotted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pigpen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peeping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oclock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuncle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nipped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murmurous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miseries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loitering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaden-headed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knight-at-arms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keyhole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faerys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effaced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duke_senior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dead_and_buried</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cawing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zigzag</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple_bar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O_Sea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs._Yeobright</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs._Linton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss_Catherine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandril</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hareton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czekes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘it</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘and</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>freq</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td>rate_goal</td>
<td>keyness</td>
<td>pvalue</td>
<td>keyness_value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stormy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rattling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forlorn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clouds</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melancholy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foul</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deserted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wild</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horror</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breeze</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>streets</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>song</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stream</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>8367</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lonely</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here_and_there</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duke</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beyond</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lake</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eyes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.17: Corpus 3 against the BNC’s written sample on Wmatrix – Keyness analysis.

Some of the key words fall into the main PF criteria I had identified in my second hypothesis (section 2.1.1). They can be categorised as such:

- 38 key words show a presence of human beings (i.e. “Scrooge”, “Heathcliff”, “she”, “lord”, or “slovaks”).
• 37 key words show a presence of surroundings (i.e. “fog”, “rain”, “wind”, “oak”, or “twilight”).

• 16 key words show a presence of emotions (i.e. “glorious”, “horror”, “fury”, “melancholy”, or “lonely”)

Globally, table 2.17 lists 170 key words of corpus 3, and 91 (53.5%) of those key words can be grouped according to the PF criteria I hypothesised in section 2.1.1. This suggests that the texts provided by the participants feature the three PF criteria, thus supporting my second hypothesis.

Furthermore, table 2.18 shows the keyness analysis of the key semantic categories in corpus 3, and the tagset codes for the semantic categories can be found in appendix 2.6. The table is ordered by log-likelihood ≥15.13. The log ratio values is also discussed in the analysis, and therefore the log ratio value of the semantic categories is highlighted as shown in table 2.13 (section 2.3.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item with tagset codes from Wmatrix</th>
<th>Observed frequency of category in corpus 3</th>
<th>Relative frequency of the category in Corpus 3</th>
<th>Observed frequency of category in BNC2</th>
<th>Relative frequency of the category in BNC2</th>
<th>+ overuse of category - underuse of category in Corpus 3</th>
<th>LL of category in Corpus 3</th>
<th>Log Ratio of category in Corpus 3</th>
<th>Key Semantic categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>420.25</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>Weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>274.48</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>5489</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>164.48</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>Anatomy and physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>137.24</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>Darkness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z8</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>72023</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>136.12</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>Pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z99</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>22165</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>99.02</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Unmatched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3.2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>89.09</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Sensory: sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>82.34</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2439</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>77.68</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>Plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>66.94</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>Geographical terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9859</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>60.85</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Location and direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4.6-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>Temperature: cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4.1-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>51.54</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4.3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3747</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>51.08</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Colour and colour patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>50.79</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>Substances and materials: gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>10157</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>48.84</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>Moving, coming and going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3.7+</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>47.89</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>Long, tall and wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2642</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>46.91</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>Parts of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.1.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>37.23</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>Damaging and destroying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4.6+</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>35.65</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>Temperature: hot/on fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z6</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>8052</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2795</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>29.08</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Sensory: sight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>Substances and materials: solid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>28.55</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>Time: general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>The universe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>Alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.49</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Violent/Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.3-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>No caution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3.4+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>Seen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4.2-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>Judgement of appearance: negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.18: Corpus 3 against the BNC’s written sample on Wmatrix – Semantic categories keyness analysis.**

The key semantic categories presented can be categorised into the three PF criteria I hypothesised. In ambiguous cases (e.g. the semantic categories of “disease” or “alive” could be human but also fauna and flora), I looked at the concordance lines to determine if the categories related to the criteria in question. A concordance line is “a list of all of the occurrences of a particular search term in a corpus, presented within the context in which they occur – usually a few words to the left and right of the search term” (Baker et al., 2006, pp.42-43). This ensured that the terms used in those semantic categories referred to human beings. Here are examples of semantic categories categorised into the three PF criteria I hypothesised:

- 14 key semantic categories refer to surroundings (i.e. “weather”, “light”, “darkness”, “plants”, “temperature: cold”),
- 7 key semantic categories refer to human beings (i.e. “anatomy and physiology”, “pronouns”, “disease”, “alive”),
- 6 semantic categories refer to emotion (i.e. “sad”, “damaging and destroying”, “violent/angry”).
Table 2.18 lists 35 key semantic categories featured in corpus 3, and 27 (77.1%) of those semantic categories can be associated with the PF criteria hypothesised in section 2.1.1. The keyness analysis of the key semantic categories in corpus 3 against the BNC’s Written Sample evidences the importance of the three criteria I hypothesised.

The most key criterion in each keyness analysis at word and semantic category level was the surroundings, particularly natural elements. On the other hand, the criterion that was the least key of the three was emotions. This aligns with findings for question 5 of the survey: stimuli featuring human presence and emotions (without surroundings) were less thought of as featuring PF than the other stimuli in the matrix table (see section 2.2.4). Although emotion seems to be the least key criteria for the survey participants, the term “emotion” is used in Lodge’s definition of PF (“the projection of human emotions onto natural phenomena” (1992, p.85)), and it is the primary function of PF in this context: to express emotions through imagery. This could be explained by the implicit nature of PF: it is an extended metaphor, thus not contained within one word (see section 1.2.), and its function is to provide a representation for readers of an emotion that may otherwise be implicit. Additionally, emotions tend to be expressed implicitly in texts, needing to be inferred, which could explain why there are fewer key words reflecting emotions in corpus 3. For example, in the sentence “Sarah started to cry, her tears blending with the rain drops on her cheek”, we understand Sarah’s sadness not because it is explicitly stated (i.e. “Sarah is sad”), but because we can infer her sadness from the terms “cry” and “tears”. This will be further discussed throughout chapters 3 and 4 and in section 5.1.1.

This section applied corpus linguistics tools to analyse the data collected from the survey. Although the three corpora assembled have their limitations, for the
purpose of this research, they allowed me to test my hypotheses. Indeed, the aim of this section was to confirm the findings observed in the survey analysis (section 2.2), and to conduct a preliminary analysis on the texts suggested by participants. Through this corpus analysis, I was able to concretely show that the concepts of PF and personification overlap in their definitions, and arguably in their conceptualisation. This corpus analysis also supported my second hypothesis: the three PF criteria I formulated in section 2.1.1 were present in the participants’ definitions of PF and in the corpus of texts they suggested.

However, for the rest of this thesis, corpus linguistics tools are not used further for a key reason: PF being an extended metaphor as seen in the literature review chapter, the use of concordance lines for a qualitative analysis of my corpus would be problematic. Indeed, the three criteria I hypothesised as necessary for PF to occur (surroundings, emotions, human being) can occur in different paragraphs from one another, which would be particularly difficult to find and analyse in concordance lines as there is no way of knowing if a criterion is on the left or right of a term. Additionally, as I discuss in sections 3.2.4 and 4.1.1, those criteria might be present implicitly in texts, thus requiring to be inferred from further context (see section 4.1.2), which would not be considered in a concordance line. Finally, as my aim is to develop a holistic model of PF, in addition to the three criteria I hypothesised, there might be other linguistic elements linked to PF (such as ‘linguistic indicators’, see section 3.3.1), therefore a more qualitative approach to text analysis allowing me to take into account the context of the texts is needed, as I demonstrate in section 3.1.
2.4 Review of chapter 2

In this chapter, I presented the survey I conducted to collect data on PF. The data consists of teachers’ own definitions of PF and personification, and a participant-built corpus of texts containing PF, which I analyse stylistically in the next chapter. The data analysis and the corpus analysis allowed me to test the two hypotheses stated in section 2.1.1. My first hypothesis suggests there is a confusion between the concepts of PF and personification, which was supported by the participants’ answers to questions 3, 4, and 5. This was further illustrated by the analysis of corpus 1 and corpus 2. My second hypothesis suggests the three PF criteria I hypothesised (presence of human beings, emotions, and surroundings) would be present in the texts suggested by the participants. This was supported by the corpus analysis of corpus 1 and 3. A detailed stylistic analysis of the participants' text suggestions follows in chapter 3.

Overall, this chapter allowed me to test my hypotheses and to find out which definition of PF is used most frequently by a sample of teachers. Lodge’s definition (and my own) “projection of human emotion onto natural phenomena” (Lodge, 1992, p.85) aligns with the one given by the majority of survey participants, despite the confusion between PF and personification. The findings analysed in this chapter therefore support my proposed definition of PF. In the forthcoming chapter, I present the stylistic methods employed to analyse my corpus of texts, and the findings of this analysis, in order to build an updated model of PF.
Chapter 3 – A Stylistic Approach to PF: Analysis and Findings.

3.1 Text analysis methodology

In chapter 2, I conducted a survey to observe what teachers thought the difference between PF and personification was, and to collect textual examples of PF. In section 2.1.1, I hypothesised that there would be an overlap between PF and personification in the teachers’ definitions, which was proven to be correct by the survey. My second hypothesis suggested that for the fulfilment of PF’s definition as according to Lodge (1992, p.85; 2002, pp.127-128, 135, 186), meaning human emotions projected onto the natural world, three criteria must be present in the text: the presence of human beings, emotions, and surroundings. Although there was some indication of the relevance of those criteria in the survey’s data, this chapter further tests my second hypothesis.

In this chapter, I present the qualitative text analysis methodology adopted to analyse the corpus suggested by survey participants. This analysis aims to further test my second hypothesis, and to observe potential patterns of PF across multiple texts. I first review the text analysis methods I chose to use (section 3.1); I then explain the process I went through and provide textual examples (section 3.2). In the last two sections, I discuss the findings that emerged from the text analysis process: I identify specific linguistic patterns of PF (section 3.3), and I review my two hypotheses in light of the text analyses conducted (3.4).

3.1.1 Approach to text analysis: Leech and Short’s Style in Fiction (2007)

The main approach to text analysis I follow is Leech and Short’s Style in Fiction (2007). I chose this framework for two reasons: (1) it is detailed and comprehensive
of all levels of language present in a text; and (2) it is ideal for teachers and students to use, as I demonstrate in section 3.1.1.1. In fact, it englobes most of Giovanelli’s “linguistic toolkit to consider in education” (namely lexis and semantics, syntax, pragmatics, discourse, and graphology), which arguably can be used to help teachers and students approach language (Giovanelli, 2016, pp.17-20). This last reason is essential to consider because PF is likely to be taught as part of the DfE subject content. Therefore, I needed to find a methodology that complied with a stylistics approach to test my hypotheses, and which could also be used in school settings. This methodology could be adapted for teaching and learning in KS3, 4, and 5. In sections 3.1.1 to 3.1.2, I review the framework and its limitations. In section 3.1.2, I offer solutions to address the limitations of Leech and Short’s framework that best fit the purpose of this research.

The difficulty raised by the corpus gathered in the survey lies in the variety of texts, specifically their formats: some are poems in prose, others in verses, novel extracts from a wide range of genres, and extracts from plays. Because of this variety, it was essential to use a framework that is flexible and comprehensive of levels of language. I aimed to analyse each text with the same methodology, thus keeping a systematic approach, and honouring the values of stylistics.

Leech and Short (2007, pp.61-64) provide a methodology combining the different levels of a text to help students in their analysis with the use of a checklist. The “checklist of linguistic and stylistic categories” is divided into four main categories, which in their turn are separated into lower levels of language. The four main categories are: lexical, grammatical, figures of speech, context and cohesion. The breakdown of each category is achieved by listing elements as a checklist, as shown below.
A: Lexical categories
1 general.
2 nouns.
3 adjectives.
4 verbs.
5 adverbs.

B: Grammatical categories
1 sentence types.
2 sentence complexity.
3 clause types.
4 clause structure.
5 noun phrases.
6 verb phrases.
7 other phrase types.
8 word classes.
9 general.

C: Figures of speech, etc.
1 grammatical and lexical.
2 phonological schemes.
3 tropes.

D: Context and cohesion
1 cohesion.
2 context.

(adapted from Leech and Short, 2007, pp.61-64).

Each sub-category is prompted with questions to further students’ understanding and ability to analyse texts (Toolan, 1983, p.136). The aim is to observe
foregrounded elements of the texts, meaning those that stand out either by their deviation from the rest of the text or by their repetitive nature (Simpson, 2004, p.49). In fact, Leech and Short state that “the aesthetic theory of foregrounding or deautomatisation enables us to see the references to transparent and opaque qualities of prose style” (Leech and Short, 2007, p.24). The theory of foregrounding and how it will be used specifically in this research are further discussed in section 3.1.3.

Leech and Short’s aim is to approach texts following the principles of stylistics, but ultimately the list “serves a heuristic purpose: it enables us to collect data on a fairly systematic basis. It is not exhaustive […] but is rather a list of ‘good bets’: categories which […] are likely to yield stylistically relevant information” (Leech and Short, 2007, p.61). Leech and Short explain that although the checklist they provide is a starting point to analyse texts in a systematic way, it is not possible to predict what language features every text will have due to their uniqueness, as they explain:

All writers, and for that matter, all texts, have individual qualities. Therefore, the features which call themselves to our attention in one text will not necessarily be important in another text by the same or a different author. There is no infallible technique for selecting what is significant. We have to make ourselves newly aware, for each text, of the artistic effect of the whole, and the way linguistic details fit into this whole. Nevertheless, it is useful to have a checklist of features which may or may not be significant in a given text (Leech and Short, 2007, p.60).
Toolan reinforces this idea and states that when “confronted by such checklists [...] one is drawn to question how - and why - these particular features have been listed, and whether there is - or can be - a hierarchy of importance of language features in texts” (Toolan, 1983, p.136). For this research on PF, the framework and the linguistic features listed do not hold a specific hierarchy. Despite having hypothesised three PF criteria, they have yet to be tested. I also aim to identify other patterns of PF, and for this to be possible, it is imperative for me to use a framework that covers a wide range of levels of language, as I do not know what those patterns could be, or if there are any at all. For this purpose, Leech and Short’s framework is ideal, as it allows my analysis to be flexible around the variety of my corpus.

Furthermore, the aim of my research is not limited to providing a clear definition of PF, I also aim to help teachers and students in the process of teaching and learning of PF, by offering methods that can be adapted and differentiated to education. Arguably, Leech and Short’s approach to text analysis is not only ideal for university students, but it is also useful for teachers and students of GCSE and A Level, akin to Giovanelli’s toolkit (2016, pp.17-20). The lexical and grammatical tools listed, and the figures of speech are taught as part of the DfE subject content at different levels for different age groups. Therefore, teachers can use this checklist to help guide students in their process of text analysis. To receive a grade 8 or above at GCSE, students must “analyse and critically evaluate, with insight, detailed aspects of language, grammar and structure” (DfE, 2017). The checklist provided by Leech and Short (2007) is inclusive of those linguistic elements listed by the DfE. In fact, the checklist details specifically what constitutes those categories, and prompt questions are provided for further support. The prompt questions provided are useful for the teaching and learning process: having a checklist can help students build habits for text analysis
throughout their time in school in a way that stems from students and lets them “experience how language works in their own terms” (Giovanelli, 2014, p.139), the checklist merely guiding them should they struggle. It can also give students struggling with unseen texts a sense of what they could analyse, as this is part of the GCSE and A Level examinations (Edexcel, 2015, p.24; WJEC Educas, 2019, p.24; AQA, 2021; HM Government, 2017, sections 2.15-2.16; DfE, 2013b, p.6).

Lastly, the concept of aesthetics is recurrent in *Style in Fiction* since “every analysis of style, in our terms, is an attempt to find the artistic principles underlying a writer’s choice of language” (Leech and Short, 2007, p.60). Originally, PF is a technique centred around aesthetics in art and literature (Ruskin, 1856/2012). Using a framework that is designed to analyse not only the language, but its overall effect is important in the case of PF. Additionally, Leech and Short argue that “the aesthetic exploitation of language takes the form of surprising a reader into a fresh awareness of, and sensitivity to, the linguistic medium which is normally taken for granted as an ‘automatised’ background of communication” (Leech and Short, 2007, p.23). Therefore, the aesthetic aspect of a text is a way to capture readers and to elevate the meaning of a text: “the elaboration of form inevitably brings an elaboration of meaning” (Leech and Short, 2007, p.15). This resonates with PF’s definition: the environment is the form which elevates the perception of the meaning – the emotion.

Despite the positive points put forward, Leech and Short’s framework has some limitations. This is addressed in section 3.1.2, along with my solutions to address them.

### 3.1.2 Limitations

Leech and Short’s approach to text analysis has a few limitations, at least for this research on PF. Firstly, although the checklist offers a guide of what to look for in
a text, a certain level of subjectivity remains, which is logical when it comes to text interpretation (Stockwell, 2021, p.176). The danger of having a checklist as inclusive as Leech and Short’s is that one must decide what should be included in the analysis: not every textual element is crucial to the analysis or interpretation process. If every element of the checklist were to be analysed, it would be difficult to observe language features that are significant for the occurrence of PF, in the case of this research. Therefore, selecting linguistic element to analyse, as opposed to analysing them all, is necessary. The selection process remains subjective (Stockwell, 2021), despite following a method as systematic as the one offered in Style in Fiction. In fact, Toolan concurs that there are “inescapable decisions on selecting features to study - and there is no failsafe methodology. Rather, intuition, personal judgement, and subjectivity are ineradicable factors in stylistic analysis” (Toolan, 1983, p.135). To address this limitation and remain as objective in selecting language features to analyse my corpus, I follow the principles of foregrounding theory, which is also encouraged by Leech and Short (2007, p.110).

I apply foregrounding theory (Mukařovský, 1932/1964; Short, 1996; Leech, 2008) to decide which elements of the text (and checklist) should be analysed in the text or contribute to its overall interpretation. This theory argues that certain linguistic elements stand out against the rest of the text, and this linguistic phenomenon enables readers to perceive prominent textual features (Short, 1996, p.11). Foregrounding underpins a stylistic method of analysis, encouraging us to “select some features for analysis and ignore others” (Leech and Short, 2007, p.55), by providing us with tools to do so. This linguistic phenomenon of foregrounding can be divided into two types: ‘deviation’ and ‘parallelism’.
Linguistic deviation means that textual elements stand out against the rest of the text’s norm. The norm in question can be the English language, the genre, the norms of a specific author, or the text itself. When a linguistic element deviates from the text itself, the deviation is ‘internal’: contained within said text (Short, 1996, pp.36-37). This type of deviation requires a pattern to be built within the text first, so that linguistic elements can then deviate from this pattern. For example, if a poem is written with rhymes, but the last line of the last stanza does not rhyme, this would deviate from the internal norm of the poem. However, when the deviation is against the English language in general, the deviation is ‘external’ and is not solely contained within the text. For instance, if a poem is written without verbs, this would deviate from the norm of the English language, and therefore the deviation would be external to the poem. Linguistic deviation can occur on different levels of language, such as discourse, semantics, lexis, grammatical, morphological, and phonological levels.

Foregrounding can also occur by parallelism, meaning linguistic elements of the text are repeated or recurring, and the repetition stands out against the rest of the text. For example, in Shakespeare’s Othello “I kissed thee ere I killed thee”, the two phrases on either side of the adverb “[h]ere” have a similar structure. They are identical; only the double consonants in the verbs “kissed” and “killed” differ. This parallel structure is foregrounded against the rest of a text through its repetitive nature. Furthermore, Short (1996, pp.14-15) claims that the “parallelism rule suggests parallel structures can have parallel meanings”. Short states that in the example sentence “he was kicked, beaten and lapped”, despite the fact that “lapped” is a fabricated term, because it is part of a triplet indicating physical violence, readers are likely to understand it as a synonym of “beaten” or “kicked”, as opposed to “kissed” (Short,
Therefore, parallelism has the power to foreground and to make readers look for associated meaning between parallel elements (Short, 1996, p.5, 63).

By using the framework provided by Leech and Short in *Style in Fiction* and following the theory of foregrounding, I aim to analyse the texts to observe patterns of PF and test my three criteria (presence of human beings, emotions, and surroundings). However, it is important to discuss that the notion of interpretation, which is linked to the process of text analysis, can be ambiguous and subjective. Leech (2008, p.35) argues that:

foregrounding is a relative concept: there are degrees of deviation, and in most cases, there are no absolute grounds for regarding feature A as normal and feature B as foregrounded. So there is room for disagreement on what aspects of a poem require interpretation.

Therefore, since interpretation can be “multivalent and open-ended” (Leech, 2008, p.193), it is necessary for me to address how I intend to proceed with my interpretation of the text analysis I conduct in the rest of this thesis. I intend to focus my analysis on PF, and not consider factors that do not contribute to the effects of PF. The foregrounded elements I analyse and comment on are interpreted in light of PF or its criteria. However, I recognise that since “the burden of interpretation […] falls principally on readers’ response to foregrounding” (Leech and Short, 2007, p.115), the interpretations I provide are my own, and it is possible for other alternatives to be considered. This is further discussed in section 4.1.3.

I faced another limitation using Leech and Short’s framework: some of the categories were not directly useful when analysing my corpus. Indeed, some
categories, particularly in context and cohesion, were not useful for my analysis of PF. This is due to the texts being provided by the participants; I did not choose them myself, and my analyses are framed to specifically analyse PF. However, as Leech and Short explain, the checklist is a guide that does not claim to be exhaustive, and it is up to the user and reader to decide what to include in their analysis. Therefore, if no elements of the texts are foregrounded in a specific category, the category can simply be ignored for that specific analysis. This is the approach adopted the text analyses below.

Furthermore, the category of figures of speech is too broad, as it combines linguistic elements addressed in previous categories of the checklist. It is categorised into three sub-sections: (1) grammatical and lexical, (2) phonological schemes, (3) tropes. First of all, since the categories on lexis and grammar within the checklist itself are inclusive and detailed, having a sub-category on grammatical and lexical figures of speech could be redundant as foregrounded elements could be analysed under both categories. For example, in the phrase “the wind was despoiling” from *Emma* (Austen, 1815/2018; section 3.2.2), the verb *to despoil* means to steal or to plunder and is thus a human action. The wind being inanimate, the phrase is a personification. Therefore, the analysis of the verbal personification in this phrase could be discussed in the lexical category under the verb sub-section, but it could also be discussed in the figure of speech section. To resolve this limitation, in my adaptation of Leech and Short’s checklist, I remove the lexical and grammatical sub-section of the figures of speech category and address any lexical or grammatical imagery within the categories dedicated to that effect.

The trope sub-category of the figures of speech section also has its limitations: it can be argued that the sub-section of “tropes” is broad and could be further detailed.
The term ‘trope’ is general and includes all figurative language. If the checklist is aimed at students, this category has the potential to be confusing due to its vagueness, and terms or categories that are not specific enough might be a source of confusion, resulting in teaching and learning difficulties. To address this limitation, I adapted this category to better fit my research: the sub-categories now are (1) phonological schemes, (2) idiomatic expressions, and (3) imagery. Section 3.1.3 below provides examples of what is included in those categories.

Finally, I added two categories that were not originally featured in Leech and Short’s framework: negation and narrative relations. Negation is prevalent in my corpus, and I wanted a clear method to discuss and analyse this phenomenon. Therefore, in my analyses I note whether the negation is syntactic, lexical, or morphological (see section 3.1.3 below for a brief literature review of negation). This sub-category was added to the main grammatical category of the checklist. Furthermore, in my corpus, references to other narratives or cultural elements are common, often to set the scene or express feelings. To address this phenomenon, I added a category on narrative relations based on Mason’s “narrative interrelation framework” (2019, p.21). I provided subcategories to distinguish if those relations are intertextual or intratextual; they can also be specific, generic, marked, or unmarked. Mason’s framework evolves around narratives, which can be defined as an event evaluated as worth reporting by a teller based on Labov’s work (Mason, 2019, p.29). In my corpus, the narratives and their references are mostly novels and poems. Definitions and examples are provided in the updated checklist below.

This section discussed the limitations of the text analysis framework and offered solutions. I now present the updated checklist of stylistic categories.
3.1.3 Updated checklist of stylistic categories

Due to the variety of texts provided in the survey, it was imperative to have a way to analyse each text with the same method. However, not all texts will display similar language features, meaning the methodology used should also accommodate this. In adapting Leech and Short’s framework, I aim to have a flexible method to analyse all texts objectively and systematically, and to consider all the texts’ aspects, because I only have an idea of what constitutes PF and further criteria, or patterns could emerge from the analysis. Additionally, this approach can help to map the uses and effects of PF on narratives, which is one of my research questions. Since no model of PF exists, using this adapted framework enables me to build my own model.

Once I selected my framework and addressed its limitations, I adapted the checklist to serve my research on PF:

A: First impressions and PF criteria

1 Presence of human beings.
2 Presence of emotions.
3 Presence of surroundings.

B: Lexical categories

1 general.
2 nouns.
3 adjectives.
4 verbs.
5 adverbs.

C: Grammatical categories

1 sentence types.
2 sentence complexity.
3 clause types.
4 clause structure.
5 noun phrases.
6 verb phrases.
7 other phrase types.
8 Negation (lexical, syntactic, morphological).
9 word classes.
10 general.

D: Figures of speech
1 phonological schemes.
2 Idiomatic expressions.
3 Imagery.

E: Narrative relations and references
1 intertextuality.
2 intratextuality.

F: Discussion of PF and interpretation

In section A of the checklist, I included the first impressions of the text before the analysis takes place, and the three PF criteria I hypothesised in section 2.1.1: presence of human beings, emotions, and surroundings. I aim to preliminarily establish if texts feature PF based on the three criteria. However, the analysis should not stop here, as PF might have other patterns I am unaware of, and the criteria can be supported by other linguistic features.

Sections B and C are the lexical and grammatical categories according to Leech and Short’s framework in Style in Fiction. However, in the grammatical category, I included the sub-category of negation.

C (8) Negation
There has been some significant research conducted on negation, though more remains to be explored. This thesis is not centred on negation and thus this review of literature is brief. Negation can be thought of as a way of building from prepositions: for each P proposition that is true, another \(~P\) proposition exists that is false and vice versa (Lyons, 1977; Hidalgo-Downing, 2000a, 2000b; Giovanelli, 2013). A study by Clark and Clark (1977) has revealed that children acquire negative words with more difficulty than positive ones, and thus arguably negative propositions are more difficult to process than positive ones. Leech (1983, p.101) argues with his maxim of “negative uninformativeness” that positive utterances are more informative than their negative counterpart, and thus choosing a negative proposition over a positive one signals an exception to the rule and signposts to the information conveyed by the negation. For example, stating that “Abraham Lincoln was not shot by Ivan Mazeppa” is not as informative as stating “Abraham Lincoln was shot by John Wilkes Booth”. On the other hand, in some instances, negative utterances are equally informative as positive ones, and Leech (1983, p.101) provides the example “our cat is not male” which is as informative as saying “our cat is female”. This violates the maxim of manner and can thus be seen as denial, and Leech (1983, p.101, his emphasis) states that “a negative sentence will be avoided if a positive one can be used in its place [...] when negative sentences ARE used, it will be for a special purpose”, and this is linked to Thompson’s (1996, p.56) claim that “we need a particular reason for talking about what is not rather than what is”. This idea of ‘special purposes’ is further discussed below.

Moreover, the use of negative propositions requires for the preposition to be established and then cancelled (Nørgaard, 2007, p.37; Clark and Clark, 1977, p.110). For example, the sentence “Ann is not a teacher” first establishes Ann being a teacher and then negates it. This view is shared by cognitive linguists such as Lakoff (2004)
as they explain that “negating a frame evokes the frame” in an example on American political parties. However, researchers such as Givón (1989) or Jordan (1998) view this approach to negation as incomplete because it does not account to the contexts in which negation occurs nor to the rich meaning it can have. I discuss the idea of context further below.

There are different types of negation: syntactic negation, also known as non-affixal or clausal negation (Givón, 1993; Huddleston, 1984), (and what Jeffries (2009, 2015) in Critical Stylistics calls adverbial negation) which involves marked negative structure of a preposition such as ‘not’, for example “she is not happy”. For a more in-depth literature review of non-affixal negation see Hidalgo-Downing (2000, 2003). The second type of negation is morphological (also known as affixal) negation, in which prefixes or suffixes are used to mark the negation onto positive terms, such as in “care/less” or “unchallenged”. The third type of negation is inherent negation (Givón, 1993; Nørgaard, 2007; Giovanelli, 2013, amongst others), also known as lexical negation (Tottie, 1991; Hidalgo-Downing, 2000b, p.44; Jeffries, 2009, 2015), for example “she is sad”. Lexical negation “is not marked syntactically or morphologically; rather, it corresponds to the value which tends to be assigned to a term in opposition to a ‘positive’ term (good/bad, dead/alive, crazy/sane)” (Hidalgo-Downing, 2003, p.339).

Researchers consensually agree that lexical negation (I shall employ Tottie’s term akin to Hidalgo-Downing, 2000, p.44) has received less attention than syntactic or morphological negation because it is more complex to analyse. Indeed, Hidalgo-Downing (2003, p.339) states that “given the difficulties in establishing criteria for the identification of negative words of this type, they are not dealt with by Tottie and they are excluded from the present discussion”; or Giovanelli (2013, p.132) states that
“inherent negation [...] has received relatively little interest and coverage than either syntactic or morphological negation” (amongst other examples). Nørgaard (2007, p.37) explains that with lexical negation, “we move from formally marked categories into a somewhat fuzzy area of semantically determined categorisation”, and thus this unmarked grey area renders the analysis of lexical negation not as evident or systematic as it is for syntactic and morphological negation.

I find Jordan’s (1998; see also Werth, 1999; Nahajec, 2009) idea of a contextual view of negation centred around a comprehension that readers do not always deny a positive utterance created sooner in a text particularly salient to lexical negation, particularly in light of this research on PF. Indeed, as I demonstrate in section 3.3.2, the notion of ‘lexical richness’ is particularly present when analysing texts featuring PF, because it allows for the foregrounding of its criteria and linguistic indicators such as negation (this is discussed section 3.3.1). To observe if a term is used negatively within a text, it is crucial to take into consideration the context in which it is articulated, and in the case of texts with PF, this means particularly the emotions and the surroundings described as they are key criteria of the technique. In section 4.1.2 I fully discuss the different types of contexts and offer solutions as to how students or analysts can identify whether those two criteria are presented negatively. Until then, in my analyses, I make the distinction between syntactic, morphological, and lexical negation for the sake of clarity. The purpose of focusing on the different types of negation in this research is to observe potential emotions or opinions regarding surroundings in texts. It is noteworthy that Text World Theory (TWT) research has focused extensively on negation (though less on lexical negation), and although this research on PF does not use this theory, how it could be applied to future project on PF is discussed in section 6.2.2.
The rest of the sections B and C remain the same as in *Style in Fiction* and the prompt questions provided by Leech and Short are used.

Section D details figures of speech into three subcategories: phonological scheme, idiomatic expressions, and imagery.

(1) **phonological schemes:**

Figures of speech or devices producing a sound effect (i.e. phonetic iconicity, rhymes, alliteration, assonance, cacophony, or onomatopoeia, etc.). This subcategory is also present in Leech and Short’s checklist and the prompt questions are used.

(2) **idiomatic expressions:**

Idioms that express specific meaning to native speakers of a language. Idioms are distinct from metaphors because they do not have a standardised meaning specific to a language (Citron et al., 2016, p.92). Therefore, idioms do not translate literally, and languages have their equivalent. For instance, the expression “to be on cloud nine” is an English idiom used to convey the emotion of euphoria or excitement. However, in French the equivalent idiom is “être au septième ciel”, literally translated “to be in the seventh sky”. Since figurative language is used often used to express emotions (Citron et al. 2015, p.93), idiomatic expressions, amongst other figures of speech, can provide information on emotions, characters, and cultural contexts.

(3) **imagery:**
The concept of imagery has been widely discussed in literary studies and linguistics (see Paivio, 1971; Mitchell, 1986, 1993; Scarry, 1999; Abrams and Harpham, 2005; Starr, 2010; Szczepaniak and Lew, 2011; Dancygier, 2014). Di Yanni (2007, p.779) states that imagery is the heart of literature that aids readers to be part of the story, the poem, or the play. It supplies us with all details that are related to sight, taste or sensation which in turn arouse the emotions of the reader.

Without such a literary device, Literature would be dull and boring. Though this might be true, a definition of ‘imagery’ is needed. Nesselroth (1969, p.15) explains that the term “raises problems of definitions”, particularly because of the confusion between ‘image’ meaning ‘mental representation’, and ‘image’ meaning ‘a figure of speech’ such as analogies, and thus there are different definitions of ‘imagery’ used by varied scholars. This section aims to define ‘imagery’ in relation to PF, thus for a detailed historical evolution of the term see Anderson (2021) amongst others.

Despite of the different definitions of ‘imagery’ existing, there seem to be consensus amongst researchers that it involves the senses (Anderson, 2021), meaning it provides a mental representation of an object or idea by providing a sensory (auditory, visual, kinaesthetic, olfactory, tactile) trigger to readers, and this is often accomplished through figurative language, such as metaphors (Nesselroth, 1969; Paivio, 1971; Segal, 1971; Halpern, 1988; Finke, 1989; Ortony, 1975; Boerger, 2005; Zatorre & Halpern, 2005; Herholz, Halpern, & Zatorre, 2012; Green, 2017; Carston, 2018; Nanay 2015, 2016a, 2016b, 2017, 2018; Anderson, 2021). Finkes (1989, p.2) defines mental imagery as “the mental invention or recreation of an experience that at least some respects resemble the experience of actually in perceiving an object or an event, either in conjunction with, or in the absence of, direct sensory stimulation”.
However, as explained by Halpern (1988, p.434), the notion of ‘mental imagery’ has become synonymous with ‘visual imagery’, even though other senses can be stimulated to trigger a mental representation, as Halpern (1988) demonstrates by studying the impact of songs and other auditory experiences on participants’ mental representation of the language they contain.

Figurative language has been categorised by multiple scholars, such as Barlow et al. (1971) or Boerger (2005) which distincts the different effects certain categories can have (i.e. onomatopoeia, irony, or metaphors). Ortony (1975) explains that one of the main roles of figurative language is to describe objects or ideas more economically than literal description might do using fewer words. A consequence of those figurative descriptions is their “ability to produce imagery in the mind of its audience more effectively and more vividly than literal counterparts” (Boerger, 2005, p.34). Additionally, according to metaphor theorists such as Gibbs and Bogdonovich (1999) or Sadoski and Paivio (2001), imagery is crucial in our understanding of metaphors (which PF is), particularly novel metaphors which need imagery for interpretation. Green (2017) concurs with this view and makes the distinction between “image-permitting” metaphors which enable mental representation of images, and “image-demanding” metaphors which require for a mental image to be established for the metaphor to be fully understood. Figurative language techniques such as metaphors, onomatopoeia, similes amongst others provide “a greater richness and vividness of detail, further enabling the construction of mental images” (Boerger, 2005, p.34; see also Ortony, 1975). This idea of vividness and richness is recurrent in my analyses of PF (see section 3.3.2) as it allows for the perception of PF’s criteria, which are often foregrounded through figurative language. In fact, Boerger (2005, p.47) explains that figurative language including imagery is an efficient and effective way to communicate
about unfamiliar topics because “it affords its users the possibility of constructing a perceptual schema to guide its recipients when the context of communication does not afford a shared perceptual environment”. This is also salient to PF’s definition and effects: it communicates implicit emotions for readers to perceive more easily by guiding their schematic knowledge of emotions through their schemas of surroundings as they are portrayed in texts.

Furthermore, Pound (1914, p.469) views ‘images’ in the context of literature as “an equation about sea, cliffs, night, having something to do with mood” which joins Eliot’s views on imagery and emotions. Indeed, according to Eliot (1919, p.941), to expression emotions artistically, one must find an “objective correlative”, meaning objects or events which equate to the emotion in question, and when those objects are referred to through a sensory experience, the emotion is recalled. This is particularly salient to this research on PF for two reasons: 1. It is in accordance with other scholars’ views that imagery triggers a sensory representation (as discussed above), and this is also found in my corpus as I demonstrate in my analyses; and 2. Pound’s and Eliot’s ideas that certain objects such as the environment correlates to triggering and recalling emotion is directly linked to my criteria and definition of PF as I provide it in section 4.2.1.

Dancygier (2014) explores the concept of imagery in connection to readers’ experiences, primarily bodily experiences related to the senses. She explains:

mental imagery can be used figuratively, to evoke other meanings (as in metaphor, simile, allegory, etc.). This pathway to meaning construction is in fact quite common, as the study of conceptual metaphor suggests. It seems to rely on a somewhat different pattern of
evocation. Every image evokes frames of some kind, but it can evoke more than one, often based on the perceived links across different areas of experience (Dancygier, 2014, p.214)

Dancygier builds on Abrams and Harpham’s (2005, p.128) idea that the concept of imagery suggests that the image generated in readers’ mind be “vivid and particularized”. Dancygier (2014, p. 232, p.214) argues that “the concept of ‘vividness’ refers to rich experiential detail, attributed to an experiencing subjectivity which the reader can align herself with”, and that “the contrast we should be talking about is that between ‘experience’ and ‘description’ – the effect of imagery, rather than what it depicts”. Those arguments are salient to PF as the analyses below demonstrate: PF’s criteria are often conveyed through imagery and their rich representation allows for a richer reading experience. It is worth pointing out that it is not possible to provide an exhaustive list of imagery to analyse in text, and Leech and Short refer to Leech’s (2014) *A Linguistics Guide to English Poetry* to address this. It is a good reference for students to start with.

Based on the brief discussion above, in this thesis I define the concept of imagery building on Dancygier’ s (2014, p. 212) definition: “the text’s construction of a vivid image in language which evokes a mental image in the reader’s mind”, though I find the idea of “the text’s construction” too vague, and hence draw on existing research which views imagery as a type of figurative language which highlights the senses to enable readers’ rich and vivid mental representation of a scene.

The category of figurative language in my checklist is divided into sub-categories for a more detailed analysis: idiomatic expressions, phonological schemes, and imagery. In the text analysis process, elements of imagery (i.e. personification,
metaphors) are discussed in the relevant lexical or grammatical categories in which the element is foregrounded. For example, tautology is a form of grammatical imagery, and would hence be analysed in the “clause structure” sub-category of the grammatical section. If an element of imagery does not clearly fit into one of those categories, it is then discussed in the sub-category of imagery (e.g. similes). However, in the interpretation of the analysis, those elements are all referred to as imagery to reflect their figurative nature as this is relevant to the readerly experience.

Section E features narrative relations and is divided into two subcategories: intertextuality and intratextuality. Intertextuality is the link between two distinct texts, and intratextuality is the direct link between two sections of a narrative or volumes of text (Hogan, 2014, p.121; Mason, 2019, pp.21-23). According to Mason (2019, p.78), those relations can be “generic” (i.e. about a genre of literature) or “specific” (i.e. a specific novel). They can also be “marked” or “unmarked”, meaning there is a clear and “detectable” reference, or a simple allusion made (Mason, 2019, p.79). In light of this research, this category will only be commented on when it contributes to one of the PF criteria (most often emotion). A concrete example will be provided in the text analysis of *Holes* (Sachar, 1998) in section 3.2.4.

Section F features a discussion and interpretation of the text analysis, centred around PF.

Overall, the purpose of creating a tailored checklist is to consider all aspects of texts to find specific elements linked to PF. My analysis process was recorded in a grid to observe any patterns.

In this section, I presented the adapted stylistic checklist that would enable me to identify other criteria and patterns of PF, and ultimately to build a model of PF. In the forthcoming section, I provide examples of the text analysis process.
3.2 Data analysis process

In this section, I present the data analysis process and examples of complete stylistic analysis. I first introduce the texts I analysed and explain the results I obtained by categorising them into the following: texts with PF, texts without PF, and ambiguous texts (where one of the criteria was not clearly featured). Each category is illustrated with a detailed example of text analysis. Although the participants suggested texts that in their opinion contained PF, I failed to observe PF in five of them. I discussed in section 2.2 a potential explanation for this: some participants perceived PF as a type of personification, and therefore suggested texts that featured personification. This is further discussed in section 3.4.1.

3.2.1 Texts presentation and the analysis process

Question 6 asked participants to provide examples of existing literature featuring PF. Some texts were suggested more than once; it was particularly the case for texts that are on the English curriculum, as table 2.12 shows (section 2.2.5). After my analysis of the texts, I was able to group them into the three categories, as shown by table 3.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts provided by participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Lord of the flies: A novel</em> (Golding &amp; Epstein, 1954, pp.101-103), chapter 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Woman in Black</em> (Hill, 1983/2011, pp.102-107), chapter 9 “In the Nursery”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ode to a Nightingale</em> (Keats, 1819/2020b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Break, Break, Break</em> (Lord Tennyson, 1842/2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The sun used to shine</em> (Thomas, 1916/2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Flowers</em> (Walker, 1973, pp.110-120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Slow Regard of Silent Things</em> (Rothfuss, 2014, pp.130-131), chapter “a quite uncommon pleasant place”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Texts with PF

- *La Belle Dame Sans Merci: A Ballad* (Keats, 1819/2020a)
- *The Return of the Native* (Hardy, 1878/2020), Book 4, Chapter 5
- *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll And Mr. Hyde* (Stevenson, 1886/2018), chapter 10
- *Frankenstein, or The Modern Prometheus* (Shelley, 1818/2018), chapter 5
- *Emma* (Austen, 1815/2018), volume 12, chapter 3
- *Dracula* (Stoker, 1887/2013), chapter 1
- *The Tragedy of King Lear* (Shakespeare, 1606/2016, pp.76-77), act III scene II
- *Macbeth* (Shakespeare, 1606/2014, p.6), act I scene I
- *Macbeth* (Shakespeare, 1606/2014, pp.34-35), act II scene III
- *As you like it* (Shakespeare, 1623/2015, pp.31-32), act II scene I
- *Jane Eyre* (Brontë, 1847/2007), chapter 1
- *Jane Eyre* (Brontë, 1847/2007), chapter 11
- *Jane Eyre* (Brontë, 1847/2007), chapter 23
- *Wuthering Heights* (Brontë, 1847/2020), chapter 9
- *Great Expectations* (Dickens, 1861/2020), chapter 1
- *Great Expectations* (Dickens, 1861/2020), chapter 39
- *Bleak House* (Dickens, 1852/2012), chapter 1
- *A Christmas Carol* (Dickens, 1843/2018), stave 1
- *A Christmas Carol* (Dickens, 1843/2018), stave 5

### Texts without PF

- *Things Fall Apart* (Achebe, 1994, pp.33-34), chapter 4
- *The Big Sleep* (Chandler, 1939/2004), chapter 1
- *To the Moon* (Bysshe Shelley, 1824/2020)
- *Ulysses* (Joyce, 1920/2019), Episode 9 “Scylla And Charybdis”
- *As I Lay Dying* (Faulkner, 1935, pp.136-137), section 49 “Vardaman”

### Ambiguous occurrence of PF in texts

- *Spring Offensive* (Owen, 1917/2020)

### Table 3.1: Results of text analysis to find PF in texts provided by participants in Question 6.

Twenty-eight texts contain PF, five texts do not feature PF according to Lodge’s definition, and three texts do feature PF after further examination. I obtained those
results by analysing each text using the updated checklist of stylistic categories and foregrounding theory. When texts did not feature PF because one or more of the three criteria I hypothesised (section 2.1.1) were not clearly present, I conducted a second analysis using the same framework but looking at the entirety of the texts, not just foregrounded elements. This process was fruitful: I was able to identify ambiguous occurrences of PF in three texts, and it also allowed me to further develop the three PF criteria I hypothesised. This will be further discussed in section 3.4.1.

As I stated in section 3.1, the aim of following a checklist method of text analysis was to approach each text similarly. As explained in section 3.1, I chose to record elements suggested by the checklist that were not only present but also foregrounded in the text. For instance, in the phrase “the lightning flashed” in the extract from *Holes* analysed below (section 3.2.4), the verb “flashed” is an onomatopoeic verb, that it is to say that the sound produced by the word mimics that produced by the physical action of the lightning. This is foregrounded by external deviation as most words in the text or the English language are not a phonetic representation of the concept they represent. To record this foregrounded element in the checklist, I would record it in the lexical category of “verbs” (onomatopoeic action).

The results of my analysis were added to a grid in which all of the categories in the checklists of both frameworks were listed, additionally to the PF criteria I hypothesised. Each text was also listed in the grid, to allow me to cross-reference my results and ultimately to observe potential patterns of PF, which was the goal of this analysis process. Once the grid was populated with the data I collected, its size was significant, preventing me from including it in this thesis. The relevant findings that emerged from this analysis are discussed in section 3.3, and in sections 3.2.2 to 3.2.4.
I detail how I analysed the texts and provide three detailed text analysis to illustrate the data collection process I followed.

3.2.2 Texts with PF

One example of a detailed text analysis of a text that contains PF is from *Emma*, volume 12, chapter 3 (Austen, 1815/2018). The extract was provided by a participant. The sentence numbering is my own:

   The evening of this day was very long, and melancholy, at Hartfield.(1) The weather added what it could of gloom.(2) A cold stormy rain set in, and nothing of July appeared but in the trees and shrubs, which the wind was despoiling, and the length of the day, which only made such cruel sights the longer visible.(3)

   The weather affected Mr. Woodhouse, and he could only be kept tolerably comfortable by almost ceaseless attention on his daughter's side, and by exertions which had never cost her half so much before.(4) It reminded her of their first forlorn tête-à-tête, on the evening of Mrs. Weston's wedding-day; but Mr. Knightley had walked in then, soon after tea, and dissipated every melancholy fancy.(5)

A: First impressions and PF criteria

In the first paragraph, the weather is the focus of the narration. In the second paragraph, Emma recalls events that occurred at Hartfield during such weather, so the negative weather is not only associated with her current mood but also with ones from the past. Emma’s perspective is conveyed through third-person omniscient narration.
1 Presence of human beings

Varied deictic terms allow readers to understand whose viewpoint the scene is told from. There are personal deictic terms (“her”, “he”, “Mr Woodhouse”, “Mr Knightley”, “Mrs Weston”, “his daughter”) which convey the presence of human beings, a PF criterion in my model.

2 Presence of emotion

The lexical field of emotions is featured throughout the text, such as “gloom”, “melancholy”, “cruel”, “forlorn”. This shows the presence of emotions in the extract, which is another PF criterion.

3 Presence of surroundings.

The scene happens in England on a summer evening as shown by the spatial deictic term “Hartfield” and the temporal deictic terms “evening”, “after tea”, “July”. Furthermore, the lexical field of the “weather” and nature is present (“wind”, “cold stormy rain”, “trees”, “shrubs”), indicating that the criterion of surroundings is featured.

All three PF criteria I hypothesised are present, thus this extract has the potential to feature PF. However, the presence of the three criteria alone is not enough to justify the presence of PF in the text. The mirroring of emotions onto the surroundings must occur for PF to be present in the text, which relies on readers’ interpretation. The analysis below highlights foregrounded linguistic features contributing to the creation of PF and its criteria.

B: Lexical categories
Adjectives are used to describe the weather elements, some of them figuratively, and are thus foregrounded by external deviation. Since, logically, a day has 24 hours and consequently cannot be longer or shorter than other days, the adjective “long” used to describe the nominal group “the evening of this day” is a hyperbole.

This idea of a longer day is repeated in sentence (3): the noun “sights” is personified and described as “cruel”, a human quality requiring emotional capacities. This personification is therefore foregrounded by external deviation. The “cruel sights” are described as making the “length of the day […] longer visible”, which is figurative as a day’s length is unalterable.

These elements contribute to PF because they associate negative emotions with the weather. In fact, through the personification and the exaggeration of the day’s length, the effect of these foregrounded devices is that the weather controls the emotions, which is an explicit representation of PF’s definition.

In sentence (1), the “evening of this day” is also described with the adjective “melancholy”. This metaphor suggests the nominal group embodies the emotion of melancholy, which is not possible in a literal setting. Therefore, this metaphor is foregrounded by external deviation, and highlights the relationship between the surroundings and the emotions in the text.

In sentence (2), the verb “added” has the noun “weather” as its subject, and this is enhanced by the phrase “what it could”, which is an animation of the weather. This is foregrounded by external deviation, as this animation of the weather gives the
impression that the weather is animated, choosing to add the gloom to the scene. This contributes to PF’s definition: the “weather” is not only mirroring the “gloom”, but it is also contributing to it.

C: Grammatical categories

2 sentence complexity.

All of the passage’s sentences are complex, except for sentence (2), which is foregrounded by internal deviation as it is the only simple sentence. The sentence is declarative, and the tense used is past simple, rendering the information provided factual, despite the animation of the weather portrayed in the sentence. Interestingly, it is the sentence in which PF is explicitly expressed: the weather mirrors the negative emotions in the scene by adding gloom.

5 noun phrases.

Noun phrases are used to bolster the description of the scene. In sentence (1), the nominal group “the evening of this day” provides readers with specific information on the setting: the definite determiner “the” and the demonstrative determiner “this” suggest the evening and the day in question are not generic and were mentioned before. Conversely, in sentence (2) the nominal group “a cold stormy rain” is composed of the indefinite determiner “a”, indicating the rain was not specified before in the narration, and thus started falling at this stage of the plot. The contrast between sentences (1) and (2) suggests the action is told in a step-by-step manner for readers to follow, and adjectives like “cold stormy” are used in sentence (2) to set the scene.

In the first clause of sentence (5), the nominal group “their first forlorn tête-à-tête” is composed of the possessive pronoun “their” referring to Mr. Woodhouse and
Emma, and two alliterated adjectives to describe the conversation they shared: “first” and “forlorn”. The adjectives set the scene with precision as they signpost to a past event previously told in the novel: this tête-à-tête is the first of many, it is also described by Emma as a depressing experience, reflecting her present experience.

In sentence (5), the nominal group “the evening of Mrs. Weston's wedding-day” mirrors the nominal group “the evening of this day” in sentence (1). The two nominal groups’ structures are similar, and therefore foregrounded by parallelism. Both start with the definite determiner “the”, are followed by the phrase “evening of”, followed by “Mrs. Weston's wedding” in lieu of the definite determiner “this” as in sentence (1), and ends with the noun “day”. The two noun phrases’ parallel structure conveys the link between the two days: in both instances, the weather was gloomy, and Emma felt melancholic.

6 verb phrases

In sentence (3), the noun “wind” is the subject of the past-continuous verb “was despoiling”. This is a verbal personification: the human quality is attributed to the noun through the action, as opposed to an adjective. The personification is foregrounded by external deviation as it gives the wind the human quality to plunder the trees and shrubs. The past continuous tense suggests the action is long-lasting.

The verbs are in the past simple to narrate the events of the scene. However, Emma recalls past events, creating a shift in the verbs’ tenses from past simple to the past perfect indicating the flashback, which is foregrounded by internal deviation, as it changes from the rest of the text.

8 Negation
Negation is prevalent and thus foregrounded by parallelism: there are ten instances of negation throughout the five sentences. Lexical negation is the most common: “melancholy”, “gloom”, “set in”, “nothing”, “despoiling”, “cruel”, “forlorn”. Those terms convey negation through connotation. There is one instance of morphological negation: “ceaseless”; and one example of syntactic negation: “never”. Negation’s prevalence showcases the weather and the emotions of the scene, two of PF’s criteria. It conveys that the negative emotions are reflected in the negative weather - at least in the characters’ viewpoint. This reflects PF’s definition: the weather is used to mirror the characters’ emotions.

D: Figurative language
1 phonological schemes.

The nominal phrase “their first forlorn tête-à-tête” features an alliteration since the words “first forlorn” both start with the labiodental consonant /f/, this is foregrounded by external deviation. The /f/ sound is a voiceless fricative, meaning the airflow is blocked to create friction so that the sound is produced. The friction repeated with this alliteration could be a phonetic icon of the friction between Emma and Mr. Woodhouse during this tête-à-tête. This can be interpreted as a phonetic embodiment of Emma’s feelings regarding her conversation with her father, and it illustrates her negative feelings through the friction created by the repetition of the /f/ sound. Additionally, this nominal phrase “their first forlorn tête-à-tête” includes an assonance: the elongated lax mid-vowels /ɛː/, /æː/, and /ɔː/ are repeated. The vowels appear in order from sound produced at the front of the mouth (/ɛː/ in “their”), then at the centre (/æː/ in the first syllable of “forlorn”), and at the back of the mouth (/ɔː/ in the second syllable of “forlorn”). This evolution of long vowel sounds could be interpreted as
mirroring Emma’s feelings about the situation: the action seems to drag, just as the vowel sounds are elongated. This contributes to the portrayal of negative emotions that Emma describes as “melancholy”.

**F: Discussion of PF and interpretation**

In the second paragraph, Emma remembers events that occurred at Hartfield and Emma’s feelings for George Knightley are hinted at: Emma recalls his interruption of the tête-à-tête with her father and states he “dissipated every melancholy fancy”. This hints at the current situation: in both instances, Emma feels melancholic, her father is particularly needy due to the weather. It also conveys Emma’s feelings for George Knightley: his presence lightened her “melancholy fancy”.

The three criteria I hypothesised for the fulfilment of PF are present: the human beings are represented by the characters; the surroundings are represented by the weather, and emotions are explicitly stated as shown by the lexical fields, imagery features such as personification or animations, and negation. The weather is described as not being appropriate for the summer month of July and is a physical representation of the “gloom” that is already present at Hartfield. The negative weather and “gloom” mirror the “melancholy” that Emma feels whilst taking care of her father now, and on the eve of Mrs Weston’s wedding. Interestingly, the first paragraph is focused on the weather, which is presented as active, and personified. Therefore, although PF is fulfilled by the three criteria’s presence, the personification of nature is also predominant. This can show that, although PF and personification are not one and the same, they can complete each other: in this extract, the projection of emotions is strengthened by the occurrence of other literary techniques, such as hyperbole and personification.
In this section, I demonstrated the text analysis process to evaluate if a text features PF based on the presence of the three criteria I hypothesised and how they are expressed linguistically. In the next section, I present the analysis process for texts that do not feature PF due to not having the three criteria needed to fulfil PF’s definition.

3.2.3 Texts without PF

In the text analysis process, I found that some extracts were missing one or more PF criteria I hypothesised. If one of those criteria is not present in texts, PF’s definition of a projection of human emotions onto the natural world (Lodge, 1992, p.85, amongst others) cannot be fulfilled, as explained in section 2.1. I nonetheless analysed the texts, particularly to see if there was any personification of nature which could indicate that the participant had defined PF as a type of personification, as observed in section 2.2.

To illustrate the reasoning behind my categorisation of certain texts as not featuring PF, I provide a detailed text analysis example from chapter 4 of *Things Fall Apart* (Achebe, 1994, pp.33-34, my numbering). Interestingly, this is the shortest extract in my corpus provided by participants.

Yam, the king of crops, was a very exacting king. (1) For three or four moons it demanded hard work and constant attention from cock-crow till the chickens went back to roost. (2) The young tendrils were protected from earth-heat with rings of sisal leaves. (3) As the rains became heavier the women planted maize, melons and beans between yam mounds. (4) The yams were then staked, first with little sticks and
later with tall and big tree branches.(5) The women weeded the farm three times at definite periods in the life of the yams, neither early nor late.(6)

A: First impressions and PF criteria

Although the text is written from the women’s perspective, the yam is the focus of the narration: the women are the “focalizer” and the yam the “focalized” (Bal, 1985; Palmer, 2004, p.49). The farming and harvesting process is detailed, showing the importance of food crops in countries such as Nigeria (where the novel takes place) often affected by food shortages.

1 Presence of human beings

Personal deictic terms (“Yam, king of crops”, “the women”) show that the scene is a third-person omniscient narration and convey the presence of human and personified beings.

2 Presence of emotions

There is no emotion explicitly present, but I analysed the rest of the text regardless, aiming to observe any linguistic feature that could justify why a participant recommended this text when asked about PF.

3 Presence of surroundings.

Things Fall Apart is set in Nigeria. Deictic terms of space and time such as “three or four moons” indicate that the Igbo culture portrayed in the novel accounts for time based on the phases of the moon or the position of the sun: “from cock-crow till
the chicken went back to roost”. This contributes to the development of surroundings. Furthermore, the passage contains the lexical field of nature (“yam”, “moons”, “tendrils”, “leaves”, “rains”, “melons”, “tree branches”). The presence of this lexical field reinforces the importance of the vegetation and the crops in the storyline.

**B: Lexical categories**

2 nouns.

The text is a description and contains physical and concrete nouns (i.e. “yam”, “chickens”, “rain”, “branches”, “mounds”). However, some concrete nouns are used in a more abstract manner to represent time and space in the description, which is foregrounded by external deviation. For example, the noun “moons” is used to represent time elapsed in a month in sentence (2). Sentence (6) of the passage expresses time based on the “life of the yams”, which is foregrounded by external deviation because in English time is generally not represented through moon cycles or crops’ harvests. This deviation shows how crucial the yam is to the women farming it: their life is portrayed to evolve around it. Therefore, the yam is not only part of the surroundings, but it is also considered as an animate being at the centre of the story.

3 adjectives.

The adjectives are associated with concrete nouns referring to the vegetation. The adjectives are used to set the scene (i.e. “little sticks” and “tall and big tree branches”). The adjective “exacting” refers to the nominal group “yam, the king of crops”. “Exacting” is foregrounded by external deviation because it personifies the yam, showing its importance and portraying it as a high maintenance, yet vital part of the tribe’s life.
4 verbs.

There are eight verbs in the passage, four have the yams for subject. In sentence (2), the verb “demanded” has for subject “it” which refers to “yam, the king of crops”. This is foregrounded by external deviation as it further personifies the yam: *demanding* requires the yam to speak (a human quality).

In sentences (4) and (6), the subject of the verbs “planted” and “weeded” are “the women”. However, both sentences focus on the yam: the women’s schedule evolves around it, thus showing its importance in the story. This contributes to the foregrounding by repetition of the yam's omnipresence.

These examples of foregrounding contribute in a unique way to the criterion of the presence of beings: here the being is not human but is personified.

**C: Grammatical categories**

4 clause structure.

In sentence (1) the noun clause occurs in the middle of the sentence, separating the subject from the verb through apposition. However, in the rest of the texts, the adverbial clauses are present either at the beginning or at the end of the sentences. This foregrounds by internal deviation the first sentence and its clause as it is the only noun clause and that breaks the flow of the sentence. The clause “the king of the crops” personifies the subject “yam” and sets the tone for the rest of the passage: it stresses to readers that the yam is the main focus.

**F: Discussion of PF and interpretation**
The extract is a description of the yam’s farming process, and the foregrounded linguistic features highlight how villagers’ lives evolve around the yam’s agriculture, because it is linked to their survival.

Two out of the three criteria I hypothesised are present: the presence of human beings with “the women”, but also with the personified inanimate being of “yam, king of crops” to a certain extent. Surroundings are also present (“rain”, “crops”, “moons”). However, no emotions are expressed, explicitly or implicitly. Therefore, according to the definition and PF criteria hypothesised, I argue this text does not feature PF. Interestingly, the text features personification of nature, further highlighting the discrepancies between the concepts of PF and personification by participants.

Overall, five texts were found to not contain PF due to one or more criteria missing. Those texts are discussed further in section 3.3.1.2. So far, I discussed texts that feature PF and texts that do not. However, some instances are difficult to categorise clearly. In the next section, I review ambiguous textual examples of PF and my methods for analysing them despite their open-to-argument nature.

3.2.4 Ambiguous instances of PF in texts

Despite following the checklist presented in section 3.1, for certain texts it was unclear whether PF was featured because one or more criteria were present implicitly, meaning the criteria were not expressed clearly but could nonetheless be inferred. Those texts are ambiguous instances of PF. I illustrate the analysis process of those ambiguous PF criteria by analysing an extract from Holes (Sachar, 1998, pp.55-57, my numbering), Part 2: “The Last Hole”, chapter 29 (provided by a participant), aiming to evidence how those implicit criteria can be inferred and analysed.
There was a change in the weather. (1)
For the worse. (2)
The air became unbearably humid. (3) Stanley was drenched in sweat. (4) Beads of moisture ran down the handle of his shovel. (5) It was almost as if the temperature had gotten so hot that the air itself was sweating. (6)
A loud boom of thunder echoed across the empty lake. (7)
A storm was way off to the west, beyond the mountains. (8) Stanley could count more than thirty seconds between the flash of lightning and the clap of thunder. (9) That was how far away the storm was. (10) Sound travels a great distance across a barren wasteland. (11) Usually, Stanley couldn't see the mountains at this time of day. (12) The only time they were visible was just at sunup, before the air became hazy. (13) Now, however, the sky was very dark off to the west, and every time the lightning flashed, the dark shape of the mountains would briefly appear. (14)
"C'mon, rain!" shouted Armpit. "Blow this way!" (15)
"Maybe it'll rain so hard it will fill up the whole lake," said Squid. "We can go swimming." (16)
"Forty days and forty nights," said X-Ray. "Guess we better start building us an ark. (17)
Get two of each animal, right?" (18)
"Right," said Zigzag. "Two rattlesnakes. Two scorpions. Two yellow-spotted
lizards.”(19)

The humidity, or maybe the electricity in the air, had made Zigzag’s head even more wild-looking.(20) His frizzy blond hair stuck almost straight out (21). The horizon lit up with a huge web of lightning.(22) In that split second Stanley thought he saw an unusual rock formation on top of one of the mountain peaks.(23) The peak looked to him exactly like a giant fist, with the thumb sticking straight up.(24)

Then it was gone.(25)

And Stanley wasn't sure whether he'd seen it or not.(26)

**A: First impressions and PF criteria**

The surroundings are described thoroughly and are important in the storyline. Having read the full novel, I know that a crucial detail is revealed in this chapter, thus contributing to the overall plot: Stanley has finally found and understood what his grandfather had told him years ago by talking about a mountain peak shaped like a thumb. Intertextuality, allusion, and symbolism play a significant part in fully understanding the impact of this specific scene in the storyline, and this is linguistically evidenced in the analysis below.

1 Presence of human beings

Personal deictic terms (“Stanley”, “he”, “Zigzag”, “X-Ray”, “Armpit”) show human beings are present and the scene is a third-person omniscient narration, but Stanley’s perspective is prevalent compared to other characters’.

2 Presence of emotions
There are no explicit emotions expressed in the text. However, throughout the language analysis below, it is shown that implicit linguistic features let us infer the characters’ emotions. Because there are numerous elements that contribute to this criterion, I discuss them in the appropriate categories of the checklist.

3 Presence of surroundings.

The scene is set in a hot and humid desert-like area as shown by spatial deictic terms (“barren wasteland”, “humidity”, “hot”). The sentences “the only time they were visible was just at sunup, before the air became hazy. Now, however, the sky was very dark off to the west” imply that the scene is happening later in the afternoon, East of stormy mountains, which describes the scene’s surroundings clearly.

B: Lexical categories

2 nouns.

The lexical field of the environment/weather is omnipresent (i.e. “air”, “wasteland”, “mountains”, “humidity”, “lightning”). This lexical field is foregrounded by parallelism as it creates a theme, and some of those terms are repeated (“humidity”, “lightning”, “mountain”). This highlights these surroundings.

3 adjectives.

Adjectives are frequent and mostly describe the environment: “humid”, “barren”, “loud” and “dark”. However, some describe characters’ physical appearance in light of the surroundings they are in: “frizzy blond”, “wild-looking” or “giant”, meaning the characters are described based on the weather’s impact on their appearances. This
recurring theme is therefore foregrounded by parallelism, as I further demonstrate throughout this analysis.

4 verbs.

The lexical fields of sight and sound are foregrounded by parallelism and are present throughout the text. Those lexical fields are predominantly composed of verbs to convey the production of sounds and what the characters can hear or see: “sound”, “echoed”, “shouted”, “said” for sound, and sight “saw”, “would appear”, “looked”, “seen it”. Those two lexical fields are not only proving readers with a sensorial description, but further contribute to the description of the surroundings and how the characters experience it.

In sentence (15), Armpit directly addresses the rain by shouting “C’mon rain […] blow this way!”. The verb “blow” is usually transitive in English, but here is used intransitively. The type of transitivity in sentence (15) for the verb “blow” is Material-Action-Event (MAE) as the verb’s subject is an inanimate actor, and the verb is followed by the adverbial phrase “this way” (Leech and Short, 2007, pp. 26-27; see also Halliday 1967, 1968; Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004). The MAE transitivity’s ideological effect is that the participant (here the rain) is an event. However, since Armpit directly addresses the rain using the verb “blow”, I interpret the rain as active. The overall effect on the narration is that it seems the rain is animated and controls its action to rain or not, as if it were an agent in the thematic event process of raining. This animation is foregrounded by external deviation and sheds further light on the importance of the rain and water to the characters, but also on the predominance of the surroundings.
The exclamation employed to address the rain is noteworthy. The MAE transitivity conveys that Armpit is hoping for rain to fall, but it is not directly and explicitly expressed as such. He does not view raining as a simple event; the transitivity used animates the rain, as Armpit was begging it to do something. Therefore, his desperation for water and hope for rain are implicitly expressed through Armpit’s address and punctuation. Furthermore, Armpit shouts the sentence as opposed to saying it, indicating the rainfall’s importance. This sentence is foregrounded by internal deviation because it is the only exclamation in the extract. The emotions of hope and despair are conveyed implicitly (requiring readers to infer), nonetheless validating the presence of emotion PF criterion.

5 adverbs.

In sentence (16), Squid says: "maybe it'll rain so hard it will fill up the whole lake [...] we can go swimming". The modal adverb “maybe” conveys that Squid is hypothesising that it will rain enough for the lake to be filled. Although one could argue that this is not foregrounded against the rest of the text, it is still contributing to PF’s effect. Indeed, the type of modality of the adverb “maybe” is boulomaic (Portner, 2009, pp. 37-37), meaning it expresses what is possible in this situation based on Squid’s desire. Squid is building on what Armpit shouted in sentence (15), hoping for rain. The use of boulomaic modality here to hypothesize enough rain to fill a lake is another manner to express hope. The effect is that Squid is expressing a hypothetical scenario in which there is a solution to the characters’ predicament: the lake is filled by rainwater, offering them a place to cool and swim to remedy the current climate. This further validates the presence of emotions, despite its implicit nature.
C: Grammatical categories

2 sentence complexity.

The extract starts with a simple sentence (1) (“there was a change in the weather”) followed by a subordinate adverbial clause (“for the worse”), although they are separated by a full stop, as if they were two distinct sentences. The passage ends with the simple sentence (25) “then it was gone” followed by the simple sentence (26) starting with the connective “and”, that could be an independent clause in apposition to the penultimate sentence of the extract (“and Stanley wasn't sure whether he'd seen it or not”). This mirroring effect is a foregrounded parallel structure, possibly showing the cycle of misadventures the characters are going through is never-ending, thus mirroring the inescapable trap of Camp Green Lake. This parallelism illustrates the presence of surroundings, and it conveys that the information contained between these two structures is significant to the storyline.

8 Negation

Negation is prevalent and is thus foregrounded by parallelism. Lexical negation is most frequent (i.e. “worse”, “dark”, “barren wasteland”). Morphological negation is also present (“unbearably”, “unusual”), as well as syntactic negation (“not”). The repetition of negation conveys the negative predicament the characters are in, and to an extent it describes the negative environment they are in. This contributes to building PF: the characters’ predicament is not only represented in the environment; but it is also a part of it. Indeed, although the concept of good and bad weather is subject to interpretation (see section 4.1.3), in this case heat and humidity are seen as excessive and negative by the characters: they express their discomfort in the current weather and are hoping for a solution such as rainfall.
D: Figurative language

1 phonological schemes.

Onomatopoeia is frequent and conveys the sounds and sights experienced by the characters and is foregrounded by external deviation. There are instances of onomatopoeia expressed through noun phrases (i.e. “a loud boom of thunder”, “the flash of lightning”, “the clap of thunder”); and verbal phrases (“the lightning flashed”). The effect of the onomatopoeia is the production of sounds that mimic the phenomena described by these phrases, thus potentially painting a detailed picture for readers. In this scene, the onomatopoeia contributes to setting the scene and the environment. This could signpost to readers the importance of the environment to readers.

3 Imagery

- Metaphor:

In sentence (5), the phrase “beads of moisture ran down” is an ‘image metaphor’ (Lakoff and Turner, 1989, p.90; see section 5.1.1) illustrating the shape of Stanley’s sweat, comparing it to jewellery beads gliding on his shovel. This metaphor is foregrounded by external deviation and potentially conveys how uncomfortable and hot Stanley is. This reinforces the heat’s description, and therefore contributes to PF’s criterion of surroundings to an extent.

Sentence (22) contains the phrase “web of lightning”, also an ‘image metaphor’ (Lakoff and Turner, 1989, p.90) foregrounded by external deviation. It compares the lightning’s pattern to a spider web’s. The metaphor’s visual effect provides further description of the settings to readers, contributing to the criterion of surroundings.

- Simile:
In sentence (6), a conditional simile expresses how hot the temperatures are: the use of “as if” in the sentence creates the comparison between the air and the heat, paired with the personification of the air in the phrase “the air itself was sweating”. Sweating is an action specific to animated beings such as humans and animals, therefore the term here is metaphoric. This figure of speech potentially provides a concrete image to describe an otherwise subjective scene, as excessive heat is relative. This stresses the heat and humidity’s importance by contributing to the development of surroundings.

- Sarcasm:

In sentences (18) and (19), X-Ray and Zigzag employ sarcasm to mock Squid’s suggestion that the rain might fill up the lake, enough for them to swim. Zigzag’s mockery is conveyed by the list of animals selected to go on their imaginary ark: “Two rattlesnakes. Two scorpions. Two yellow-spotted lizards”. This triplet includes animals acclimated to deserts, thus reminding Squid that they are stuck at the Camp. The yellow-spotted lizard mentioned in the triplet is recurrent in the novel, and symbolises death in Camp Green Lake, making Zigzag’s statement clearly rhetorical and emphasises how trapped they are. Therefore, this sentence is foregrounded by internal deviation because of the sarcasm and the symbolism used, but it is also foregrounded by parallelism due to the triplet. This is significant because X-Ray and Zigzag’s mockery of the other boys’ hope illustrates how they feel themselves: they have lost hope of leaving the Camp alive and have accepted their situation. The sarcasm and symbolism of the triplet highlights Zigzag’s implicit hopelessness, contributing to PF’s criterion of emotion.

E: Narrative inter and intra relations
1 intertextuality

There is specific marked intertextuality contributing to expression of the characters’ emotions, one of PF’s hypothesised criteria. X-Ray and Zigzag mock Armpit and Squid’s suggestion that potential rainfall could fill the lake enough for them to swim. The mockery is implicit and occurs through a Biblical reference: the paradigm of Noah’s ark. The animals suggested by Zigzag belong in the desert and are often feared by humans: “rattlesnakes”, “scorpions” and “yellow-spotted lizards”. The reference to the Biblical paradigm of Noah is directly marked, and the link between the two texts is rendered explicit. The paradigm of Noah’s ark conveys faith, trust, and hope: Noah must have faith in God in order to be saved. The reference to this paradigm with the cynical change of animals as suggested by Zigzag implies that he has lost hope in the situation, unlike Squid and Armpit. This evidences how the characters feel about their predicament in an implicit manner.

2 intratextuality

The mountains are described and referred to seven times, this repetition is foregrounded by parallelism. In the sentences 20-24, the focus of the narration is on the mountains, and there is a shift from narration (sentence 20-22) to Stanley’s reported thoughts (sentences 23-24). This shift is expressed by the reported thought act “Stanley thought” and combined with the adjective “unusual” before describing rocks at the top of the mountains. This focus on the rock formation is crucial in the narration: it allows readers to focus on the peak’s description.

In sentence (24) another simile is used: “the peak looked to him exactly like a giant fist”. Here, the mountain’s peak is compared to a human fist, allowing for a physical comparison. An extra layer of detail linked to this comparison is added by the
subordinate clause “with the thumb sticking straight up”. The comparison of the peak to a thumb is significant in the storyline: Stanley’s grandfather had described this very peak to him years before this scene, when recalling being in a similar predicament. In chapter 21 it is said that Stanley’s grandfather “had lived so long, he said he ‘found refuge on God’s thumb’” (Sarshar, 1998, p.41). The peak symbolises hope: up to this moment in the novel, Stanley did not know what his grandfather had meant. The intratextuality is marked in sentence (24) with the description of the peak: it is a direct link to an anterior detail in the story, which was unexplained until now. The intratextuality supplies information on the characters’ situation: they are about to discover the solution to their predicament: the peak. This contributes to PF as it further describes the surroundings and implicitly expresses Stanley’s hope.

F: Discussion of PF and interpretation

Two PF criteria are explicitly featured: the human beings ("Armpit", “Zigzag”, “X-Ray”), and the surroundings shown through the lexical field of the environment ("rain", “weather”, “humidity”, “temperature”, “storm”, “mountains”). Emotions are also present, but implicitly, meaning they are not expressed by characters or narrator directly. Nonetheless, the emotions can be inferred from linguistic elements such as sarcasm, intertextuality, or intratextuality. The weather is not only the cause of the characters’ misery, but it also reflects their feelings. The characters are in a predicament and the extreme weather is only a contributing factor that renders their situation dire; it also conveys the characters’ hope for some, and hopelessness for others. However, it is not the only purpose of the surroundings. The narration’s focus on the mountain highlights a crucial detail: the thumb-shaped peak matches Stanley’s grandfather’s description of the location of his escape, decades before this scene.
Stanley had never understood what he meant, up until now. Therefore, while the surroundings stress the characters’ emotions, they also foreshadow what is on the verge of happening, thus generating suspense for readers. By projecting the characters’ emotions of hope onto the surroundings (the peak particularly), PF signposts Stanley’s grandfather’s revelation, hinting the thumb-shaped peak is their only hope for survival and indicating the boys’ next move. Foreshadowing as a function of PF is discussed in section 5.2.4.

Overall, three texts in the corpus are ambiguous examples of PF, due to the implicit presence of one or more of the criteria, meaning although those criteria are present, they are not explicitly expressed and require inferring. This will be further detailed in section 3.3.3.

In section 3.2, I discussed the text analysis process I followed using my adaption of Leech and Short’s checklist. I provided three text analysis exemplifying the three types of texts I found in my corpus with regards to the occurrence of PF: texts with PF, texts without, and ambiguous instances. I now present the main findings emerging from the analysis process: linguistic indicators of PF and the evolution of its criteria.

3.3 General findings from the text analysis

This section presents the findings emerging from the text analyses, as shown above. The findings are discussed following the same categories of texts used in section 3.2: texts with PF, texts without PF, and ambiguous instances of PF. Ambiguous cases of PF are considered as featuring PF and are therefore included in the findings of section 3.3.1. However, those texts also feature specific elements that
no other category contains, hence why these findings are discussed fully in section 3.3.3.

3.3.1 Texts with PF

In my analysis of the corpus, I aimed to observe if PF was featured and to observe patterns of PF, meaning reoccurring linguistic elements across texts with PF. Short (1996, pp.263-267) presents “linguistic indicators of viewpoint” as linguistic elements such as schema-oriented language, value-laden expressions, or deixis (amongst others) which convey point of view in texts. Short describes those linguistic indicators as “small scale linguistic choices on the part of the author” (Short, 1996, p.263). Once the corpus analysis was completed, it appeared that 31 texts contained PF and five did not. Overall, three linguistic elements emerged as being prevalent across the texts with PF (ambiguous instances included), and thus could be labelled as “linguistic indicators” (Short, 1996, p.263) of PF. This is significant because PF is not a foregrounded device, but rather a technique to be interpreted by readers. Therefore, foregrounded linguistic indicators of PF or its criteria could guide readers in their interpretation.

The three prevalent foregrounded language features across the corpus are: imagery (107 occurrences), repetition (73 occurrences), and negation (65 occurrences). I now present how those three linguistic elements contribute to PF, and are therefore linguistic indicators of PF, by providing specific examples for a qualitative analysis.
3.3.1.1 Imagery

Imagery is used in all 36 texts without counting PF to maintain a balanced analysis and to compare the numbers with texts that did not feature PF. In section 3.1.3, I defined imagery by building on Dancygier’s definition (2014, p. 212): “the text’s construction of a vivid image in language which evokes a mental image in the reader’s mind”, in which I view the “text’s construction” as figurative language emphasising the senses to readers and thus allowing for their rich and vivid mental representation of a scene. Imagery is a linguistic indicator of PF because in my corpus, most of the imagery contributed to the foregrounding of the PF criteria I hypothesised: presence of human beings, emotions, and surroundings. In the qualitative analysis below, I review examples of imagery and how they act as a linguistic indicator of PF in their respective texts.

Personification is used in each text of the corpus. In texts with PF, it is predominantly used to describe the environment or the settings of the scene, thus contributing to the development of the criteria of surroundings. Table 3.2 provides examples of personification as a foregrounded linguistic indicator of PF’s criterion of surroundings:
Table 3.2: Examples of personification in corpus 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Examples of personification from the corpus’ texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud (Wordsworth, 1807/2004)</td>
<td>“Golden daffodils …/ fluttering and dancing in the breeze”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Offensive (Owen, 1917/2020)</td>
<td>“the buttercups had blessed with gold their slow boots coming up”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tragedy of King Lear (Shakespeare, 1606/2016, pp.76-77), act III scene II</td>
<td>“Blow, wind, and crack your cheeks! Rage! Blow!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll And Mr. Hyde (Stevenson, 1886/2018), chapter 10</td>
<td>“the wind was continually charging and routine these embattled vapours”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Return of the Native (Hardy, 1878/2020), Book 4, Chapter 5</td>
<td>“So she went on, the air around her pulsating silently, and oppressing the earth with futility”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma (Austen, 1815/2018), volume 12, chapter 3</td>
<td>“the wind was despoiling the length of the day”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock (Eliot, 1915/2013)</td>
<td>“the yellow fog that rubs its back”, “the yellow smoke that rubs its muzzle …/ licked its tongue”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord of the flies. A novel (Golding &amp; Epstein, 1954, pp.101-103), chapter 8</td>
<td>“the butterflies danced”, “the air had seemed to vibrate …/ but now it threatened”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As you like it (Shakespeare, 1623/2015, pp.31-32), act II scene I</td>
<td>“when it the wind/ bites”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleak House (Dickens, 1852/2012), chapter 1</td>
<td>“fog creeping”, “fog drooping”, “fog cruelly pinching”, “gas looming”, “fog lying out”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Eyre (Bronte, 1847/2007), chapter 1</td>
<td>“the wind had brought with it clouds so sombre”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Eyre (Bronte, 1847/2007), chapter 23</td>
<td>“it the chestnut tree/ writhed and groaned while the wind roared”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 3.2 exemplifies, personification is prevalent throughout the corpus and often used more than once in a single text. For example, my corpus contains three extracts from different chapters of *Jane Eyre*: all include personification. It is also noteworthy that most of the personification that occurs is verbal (see sections 1.3.1 and 3.1.2 for the discussion of verbal and nominal personification): the objects are attributed human actions (i.e. “danced”, “groaned”) as opposed to being described with human adjectives or adverbs (i.e. “embattled”). This is significant, because it portrays the objects as being capable of human actions or emotions, thus giving those objects a bigger part to play in the plot than they would otherwise have.
Interestingly, most of the verbs used to personify objects in my corpus have a negative connotation, as is exemplified in table 3.2: “creeping”, “oppressing”, “pinching”, “threatened”, “groaned”, “drooping”. The idea of violence transpires from many of the examples given. This specific type of personification and negation show the importance of the surroundings, meaning those objects appear to have more agency in the plot than one would think. They are also portrayed negatively and emphasize the negative emotions expressed by the characters. The prevalence of negation is discussed in section 3.3.1.3, but since this is specific to personification, it is worth mentioning here.

Throughout the corpus, mostly natural elements such as the weather or the environment are personified. Since one of the PF criteria I hypothesised is the presence of surroundings, the personification of those surroundings foregrounds them by external deviation. This signposts one of PF’s criteria to readers through foregrounding, and potentially draws attention to PF in the text overall. This also has the potential to show how and why the concepts of personification and PF are considered interchangeable: personification is used to focus on the surroundings so the projection of emotions onto those surroundings is obvious. Although this is not the case in every text, it could explain the link between the two techniques.

Similarly, other forms of imagery are widespread throughout the corpus. Table 3.3 provides examples:
Table 3.3: Examples of imagery used to portray the surroundings and emotions in corpus 3.

Table 3.3 depicts imagery from the corpus, showing it is a general phenomenon. The table lists a mixture of metaphor, metonymy, simile, hyperbole and euphemism, each foregrounding lexical choices. Despite the different workings of each technique, they are all used similarly: to enrich the description. In some instances, the imagery relies on: nouns (“foam”, “keenness”) or nominal groups (“a small bundle of shivers”, “mournful reinvasion of darkness”), verbs (“shrink”), adjectives (“soft”, “naked”) and phrases with adjectival functions (“ghost-like”, “like that of a kiln”). The importance of lexis in those techniques indicates that description
through rich language to set the scene is widespread in texts with PF. This is logical as it enables readers to perceive PF through the description and foregrounding of its criteria, thus allowing readers to create a mental picture of the scene. The two criteria mostly described through imagery are the presence of emotions and the surroundings. The use of imagery portrays the surroundings and emotions and foregrounds them by external deviation. Since surroundings and emotions are PF criteria in my model, their foregrounding helps readers perceive PF in the text.

This idea of PF and its criteria enabling readers to mentally represent a scene is salient to the discussion in section 3.1.3 on imagery. Dancygier (2014), and Abrams and Harpham (2005) suggest that imagery generates a ‘vivid’ or ‘rich experiential’ representation of the text in readers’ mind. Dancygier (2014) gives the example of Wordsworth’s poem *I Wondered Lonely as a Cloud* (1807/2004) which is also in my corpus. The poem features multiple examples of imagery:

the description of *dancing daffodils* evokes the image of joyful expressive movement of a human body [...] recreating the source of joy and the Poet’s emotive response, the reader is likely to experience some sense of gaiety herself, as a result of the next step of simulation (Dancygier, 2014, p.220, my emphasis).

She explains the role of imagery and links to readers’ representation and experience of the emotions expressed in the poem. She states:

viewing bodies in a happy scene creates emotions of happiness, which our mind can preserve and reproduce based on the mental
representation of the scene. Finally, it can inspire similar emotions in a reader, whose bodily sense allows her to re-simulate the feeling. Reproducing the feeling may also be paired with prompting the body into a similar state – so that we can imagine the Poet snapping out of the period of pensiveness and getting up from the couch; we can also expect the reader to feel re-energised and more optimistic – which is perhaps the whole point of reading this kind of poetry (Dancygier, 2014, p.220).

Dancygier’s views on the role of imagery in readers’ perception and experience of emotions are particularly interesting in light of my findings in corpus 3: imagery is a linguistic indicator of PF, and PF in itself is a type of imagery. Based on PF’s definition (projection of emotion onto the surroundings), Dancygier’s point on the perception and trigger of readers’ emotions reflects the function of PF observed so far.

Overall, imagery is a linguistic indicator of PF focusing on lexis: personification animates the surroundings and renders them actors in the scene; whereas other forms of imagery are used to describe the scene and focus on the settings. Those techniques allow for the criteria of emotions and surroundings to be foregrounded by external deviation, rendering them easily perceivable by readers. Furthermore, the use of imagery and personification enriches readers’ mental representation of the surroundings, which is necessary if PF is to be perceived.

In this section I discussed the impact of imagery’s presence in texts with PF. I now review the significance of repetition.
### 3.3.1.2 Repetition

Repetition is the second most frequent category of foregrounded elements present: there are 73 occurrences across the corpus. In this analysis, a repetition was defined as a word or structure used more than once in one text. I first provide examples of repetitions in texts (table 3.4), then discuss terms repeated throughout the corpus. The repeated phrases and structures in texts are foregrounded by parallelism and draw attention to certain PF criteria: mostly surroundings, and emotions. Table 3.4 exemplifies repetitions in specific texts and the PF criteria those repetitions highlight:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>Criteria of PF foregrounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Great Expectations* (Dickens, 2020), chapter 39 | “stormy and wet, stormy and wet; and mud, mud, mud, deep in all the streets”  
“the staircase lamps were blown out […] I saw that the lamps in the court were blown out” | Surroundings                 |
| *Bleak House* (Dickens, 2012), chapter 1 | “Fog everywhere. Fog up the river […] fog down the river […] Fog on the Essex marshes, fog on the Kentish heights. Fog creeping into the cabooses of collier-brigs; fog lying out on the yards […] fog drooping on the gunwales of barges and small boats.”  
“mud in the streets”, “muddy streets are muddiest” | Surroundings                 |
| *Jane Eyre* (Brontë, 2007), chapter 11 | “I sometimes regretted […] I sometimes wished”, “hills”                                                                                                                                              | Emotions                    |
| *Jane Eyre* (Brontë, 2007), chapter 23 | “chestnut-tree”, “wind”, “rain”, “lightning”                                                                                                                                                           | Surroundings                 |
| *The Slow Regard of Silent Things* (Rothfuss, 2014, pp.130-131), chapter “a quite uncommon pleasant place” | “No voices. No hooves. No howling.”                                                                                                                                                                    | Surroundings                 |
| *Lord of the flies: A novel* (Golding & Epstein, 1954, pp.101-103), chapter 8 | “He was thirsty, and then very thirsty”                                                                                                                                                                | Emotions, Surroundings       |
| *Dracula* (Stoker, 2013), chapter 1 | “trees”, “dark”, “cold”, “deep”                                                                                                                                                                        | Surroundings                 |
Table 3.4: Examples of repetitions in corpus 3.

As table 3.4 shows, most of the corpus’s repetitions are at the lexical level, more specifically they are terms that add details to the description of a scene. Most terms repeated are either elements of complex noun phrases such as adjectives (“foul”, “forlorn”, “no”, “muddy”, “stormy and wet”, “cold”, “dark”), or nouns (“daffodils”, “tree”, “wind”, “fog”, “sea”). Verbal elements are also repeated: adverbs or adverbial clauses (“sometimes”, “on the cold hill side”), and verbs (“blown out”, “break”, “gazed”). Lexical elements being repeated suggests the scenes’ description is key: the world contained in each story is built through the repeated lexis. PF’s criteria of surroundings and emotions are most often linked to repletion. This is logical in light of PF: surroundings need to reflect emotions; to do that the surroundings must be described in the text, otherwise it is difficult to observe if the mirroring occurs.

Table 3.5 depicts repetition in my corpus and how it signposts to the criteria of surroundings and emotions in my model of PF. There are some key lexical terms that are repeated, not just in one text, but across the corpus. Table 3.5 summarises the
words most often repeated – in two or more instances per text – across multiple texts in the corpus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Word repeated more than once in the corpus</strong></th>
<th><strong>Number of texts the words are repeated in:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunder</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fog</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5: Number of terms repeated in multiple texts across corpus 3.

As discussed above, these terms are lexical elements as part of a nominal phrase: nouns (i.e. “rain”, “weather”, “wind”, “mud”, “sun”), adjectives (“dark”, “wet”). The listed nouns and adjectives refer to the surroundings, a key PF criterion thus indicating its validity. The only exception on this list is the determiner “no”, which is also a lexical term part of a nominal phrase, but it is not an element of surroundings. This is nonetheless significant, because as I explore in section 3.3.1.3, (lexical) negation is a linguistic indicator of PF, so much so that the determiner “no” is repeated throughout the corpus.

Overall, through the examples given above, one can argue that repetition referring to the environment (and at times emotions) contributes to PF as it foregrounds one or more of its criteria. This means that repetition is a linguistic
indicator of PF, helping to draw readers’ attention to the PF criteria, thus contributing to readers’ perception of PF overall.

In this section I discussed the significance of repetitions for texts with PF. In the next section, the significance of negation is reviewed.

3.3.1.3 Negation

Negation is the third most used linguistic element in texts with PF: there are 65 occurrences of foregrounded negation in the corpus. Negation is considered as foregrounded by parallelism when it is reoccurring throughout a text. Out of the three types of negation (lexical, syntactic, morphological), lexical negation was the most widespread throughout the corpus as it was used to convey negative emotions and to set the scene. The determiner “no” is in table 3.5 listing terms repeated across the corpus (section 3.3.1.2), thus showing the significance of negation in texts with PF.

Table 3.6 depicts all three types of negation in specific texts, highlighting the prevalence of lexical negation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Type of negation</th>
<th>Criteria of PF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Slow Regard of Silent Things</td>
<td>“No voices. No hooves. No howling.”</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>Surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rothfuss, 2014, pp.130-131),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chapter “a quite uncommon pleasant place”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Dark Tea-Time of the Soul</td>
<td>“worst”, “frustration”, “claustrophobia”</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adams, 1990, pp.196-197), section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll And</td>
<td>“mournful”, “gloomiest”, “dark”</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>Surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hyde (Stevenson, 2018), chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord of the flies: A novel (Golding</td>
<td>“threatened”, “there was no avoiding the sun”</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Epstein, 1954, pp.101-103), chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>Surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dracula</strong> (Stoker, 2013), chapter 1</td>
<td>“creep”, “gloom”, “neither eyes nor ears”, “painfully”</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>Emotions Surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Return of the Native</strong> (Hardy, 2020), Book 4, Chapter 5</td>
<td>“obscure”, “attack”, “lassitude”, “decreased”, “innumerable”</td>
<td>Lexical Morphological</td>
<td>Emotions Surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Woman in Black</strong> (Hill, 2011, pp.102-107), chapter 9 “In the Nursery”</td>
<td>“unrefreshed”, “nervous”</td>
<td>Morphological Lexical</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ode to a Nightingale</strong> (Keats, 2020)</td>
<td>“sad”, “weariness” “dissolve”, “unseen” “cannot”</td>
<td>Lexical Morphological Adverbial</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The sun used to shine</strong> (Thomas, 2020)</td>
<td>“parted”, “faintness”, “never”, “disagreed”, “undermined”</td>
<td>Lexical Adverbial Morphological</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Tragedy of King Lear</strong> (Shakespeare, 2016, pp.76-77), act III scene II</td>
<td>“unkindness”, “infirm”, “despised”, “neither wise nor fool”, “nor rain”, “horrible”, “I never gave you kingdom”</td>
<td>Morphological Lexical Adverbial</td>
<td>Emotions Surroundings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.6: Examples of negations in corpus 3.**

As illustrated by the examples in table 3.6, lexical negation is the most common type of negation used throughout the corpus. This could be due to the fact that emotions are at times not openly stated by characters, but the use of negative connotation through lexis can provide readers with a clear idea of what the characters are feeling. In the extract from *Emma* (section 3.2.2), negation is mostly lexical: conveyed through the negative connotation of terms such as “despoiling”, “gloom” or “nothing”. Those connotations bolster the sense of negative emotions Emma’s character is expressing in the text.

Only two texts in the entirety of the corpus present surroundings described in a positive light: stave 5 of *A Christmas Carol* and chapter 11 of *Jane Eyre*; all other texts
present negative emotions. For example, in the poem *I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud* (Wordsworth, 1807/2004) the emotion described is negative ("lonely", "solitude") despite some of the surroundings portrayed as positive ("daffodils [...] fluttering and dancing"). Therefore, in light of the link between negation, negative connotation, impressions, and emotions, negation can potentially be a linguistic indicator of PF. Negation contributes to rendering emotions and settings explicit to readers, and as those elements are two PF criteria in my model, negation contributes to the perception of PF overall.

In this section, I reviewed the role of imagery, repetition, and negation in the construction and perception of PF. In the forthcoming section, I discuss the linguistic and literary findings from my analysis of texts without PF.

### 3.3.2 Texts without PF

I followed the text analysis process presented in section 3.1 for each text of the corpus. Overall, five texts in my corpus were found not to contain PF due to one or more criteria being missing. For each text of the corpus without PF according to my model, I provide an extract to illustrate the reasoning behind the missing criteria. An example of a complete stylistic analysis of *Things Fall Apart* was provided in section 3.2.2 to evidence how my adapted checklist of stylistic categories was used to determine if a text had PF, or what linguistic elements contributed to PF overall. Therefore, in this section I do not provide complete texts analysis for those five texts without PF. Instead, I provide extracts and comment on PF’s missing criteria including other emerging patterns. I aim to observe patterns in texts without PF and to explain why participants suggested those texts when asked to submit an example of PF.

The first text is from *To the Moon* (Bysshe Shelley, 1824/2020, my emphasis):
And, like a dying lady lean and pale,
Who totters forth, wrapp'd in a gauzy veil,
Out of her chamber, led by the insane
And feeble wanderings of her fading brain,
The moon arose up in the murky east,
A white and shapeless mass.
Art thou pale for weariness
Of climbing heaven and gazing on the earth,
Wandering companionless
Among the stars that have a different birth,
And ever changing, like a joyless eye
That finds no object worth its constancy?

Although the criterion of emotion is present in the text ("weariness", "joyless"); there are no surroundings or explicit human beings present. Some might argue that the poet is the implied human being expressing the emotions, because there is no direct reference to the first-person (unlike Wordsworth’s *I Wondered Lonely as a Cloud*), I suggest that here the Moon is the entity expressing the emotion as there is no other direct linguistic evidence that it might not be the case. The main character in the poem is “the moon”, which is personified through expressions such as “wandering companionless”, “her”, “dying lady”. The poem is a description of the moon as if it were a woman, however there are no surroundings to reflect the moon’s feeling of loneliness. As the Moon cannot be both the entity and the surroundings, it means that the criterion of presence of surroundings is missing from the poem, thus implicating
that there is no PF according to my model. The concept of implied narrator/speaker and implied author is discussed in greater depth section 4.1.1.

The second extract is from *Ulysses* (Joyce, 1920/2019, my emphasis), Episode 9 “Scylla And Charybdis”:

Urbane, to comfort them, the quaker librarian purred:

- And we have, have we not, those priceless pages of Wilhelm Meister?

A great poet on a great brother poet. A hesitating soul taking arms against a sea of troubles, torn by conflicting doubts, as one sees in real life.

He came a step a sinkapace forward on neat’s leather creaking and a step backward a sinkapace on the solemn floor.

Human beings are present as shown by personal deictic terms (“Urbane”, “quaker librarian”, “them”, “he”). The criterion of emotion is also present in the scene (“comfort”, “hesitating”, “sea of troubles”, “torn by conflicting doubts”). However, the extract does not feature any surroundings that are described to allow readers to perceive the mirroring of emotions. Thus, I argue this text does not feature PF. In this text’s description of surroundings, only spatial deictic expressions indicating basic orientation are provided (“forward”, “backward”, “floor”), which, I argue, is not enough to portray emotions. In fact, it is difficult to tell if the scene is happening indoors or outdoors: the “solemn floor” is mentioned, but floors can be inside or outside (i.e. on a porch). The surroundings are not described richly enough or with enough detail to allow for a full representation of the scene. This therefore raises the point that further context would be needed to better understand the scene. The relation between context
and PF’s criteria is addressed in more detail in section 4.1.2. It is also noteworthy that personification occurs in the last sentence of the extract (in the description of the Urbane’s action, the floor is personified and qualified as “solemn”), thus highlighting the overlap between PF and personification.

The third extract is from *As I Lay Dying* (Faulkner, 1935, pp.136-137, my emphasis), section 49 “Vardaman”:

"You go on back and lay down," Dewey Dell said. "You ought to be asleep." "Where is Darl?" they said.

He is out there under the apple tree with her, lying on her. He is there so the cat won’t come back. I said, "Are you going to keep the cat away, Darl?"

The moonlight *dappled* on him too. On her it was still, but on Darl it *dappled up and down*.

Human beings are present: there are personal deictic terms (“Darl”, “Dewey Dell”, “he”, “her”). Some surroundings are described in the scene, (“apple tree”, “moonlight”). However, there are no emotions expressed, and thus no projection of emotions onto the surroundings, meaning no PF is featured in this text according to my model. However, personification is present: the verb “dappled up and down” has “the moonlight” and “it” for subject, thus giving it human actions and a sense of intentionality in its movements.

The last extract is from *The Big Sleep* (Chandler, 1939/2004, my emphasis), chapter 1:
It was about eleven o'clock in the morning, one day in October. There was no sun, and there were rain-clouds over the distant hills. I was wearing my light blue suit with a dark blue shirt and tie, black socks and shoes. I was a nice, clean, well-dressed private detective. I was about to meet four million dollars. From the entrance hall where I was waiting I could see a lot of smooth green grass and a white garage. A young chauffeur was cleaning a dark red sports-car. Beyond the garage I could see a large greenhouse. Beyond that there were trees and then the hills. There was a large picture in the hall, with some old flags above it. The picture was of a man in army uniform. He had hot hard black eyes. Was he General Sternwood’s grand− father? The uniform told me that he could not be the General himself, although I knew he was old.

Surroundings are present, as shown by spatial and temporal deictic terms (“eleven o'clock in the morning, one day in October”, “green grass”, “large greenhouse”, “trees”, “hills”). Human beings are also presented by personal deictic terms (“I”, “private detective”, “chauffeur”). However, no emotions are expressed, and since it is a key criterion in my model, I argue this text does not contain PF.

Overall, the criteria of emotions and surroundings are missing the most in the five texts. In my model or PF, those two criteria are essential to fulfil PF’s definition. Indeed, without emotions, the surroundings would not have anything to mirror; and without surroundings, there would be nothing to project emotions onto. Moreover, the ubiquity of personification in all five texts has the potential to validate my first hypothesis. The participants who suggested the extracts might define PF as the personification of natural elements (section 2.2.2). Providing a text featuring two out
of three criteria from my model and that includes personification when asked to provide an example of PF indicates a potential confusion between the two concepts.

It is also crucial to note that the five participants who selected the five texts I interpret as not featuring PF because of missing criteria provide them in coherence with the rest of their answers in the survey. Indeed, they defined PF as personification (attributing human qualities to nature) in question 3, and they agreed the stimuli featuring personification contained PF in question 5. Therefore, not only were the participants consistent and coherent in their answers, but it also suggests that they interpret and conceptualize PF as personification (based on their text selection and the fact that the five texts contain personification). It also means that although my interpretation differs from theirs, it does not render theirs any less valid because there are no inconsistencies in their answers.

In this section, I reviewed the texts from my corpus that did not feature PF according to my model, and the common denominator they share: all feature personification. In the next section I discuss ambiguous instances of PF.

### 3.3.3 Ambiguous occurrence of PF in texts

Three texts in the corpus are ambiguous examples of PF, due to the implicit presence of one or more criteria: although those criteria are present, they are not clearly or explicitly expressed and must be inferred. This point is further explored in sections 3.4.2 and 4.1.1. To observe what makes PF ambiguous in those texts and to observe patterns, these texts are discussed below.

The first extract is from *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock* (Eliot, 1915/2013):

The yellow fog that rubs its back upon the window-panes,
The yellow smoke that rubs its muzzle on the window-panes
Licked its tongue into the corners of the evening,
Lingered upon the pools that stand in drains,
Let fall upon its back the soot that falls from chimneys,
Slipped by the terrace, made a sudden leap,
And seeing that it was a soft October night,
Curled once about the house, and fell asleep.

This is the exact text provided in the survey, along with the reference for the full poem. Surroundings are present: “yellow smoke”, “evening”, “soot”, “October night”, however, there are no emotions or human beings in this specific extract. This poem is considered as ambiguous because when the entire poem is analysed, all three PF criteria are present, even if some are implicit. The fog is described with the use of personification, which is foregrounded by external deviation: “rubs its back”, “licked its tongue”, “fell asleep”. Although the fog is personified, there is no explicit being or emotion present, meaning there is no PF in this specific extract. However, in the rest of the poem, beings are indeed present: the poem opens with “let us go then, you and I”. Emotions are also present in the rest of the poem: “tedious argument”, “overwhelming”, “indecisions”, “peacefully”. I interpret PF here as the feelings of indecision and uncertainty mirrored by the fog blurring the vision of the scene, which is personified. Therefore, one can wonder if this stanza was quoted because of the personification of the surroundings, further illustrating the overlap between the concepts of PF and personification. Nonetheless, in this stanza alone, no PF is present due to missing criteria. This raises the importance of context once more: in this instance, the entirety of the poem needs to be considered in order to observe PF.
The second extract reflecting an ambiguous instance of PF is from *Spring Offensive* (Owen, 1917/2020):

By the May breeze, murmurous with wasp and midge,
For though the summer oozed into their veins
Like the injected drug for their bones’ pains,
Sharp on their souls hung the imminent line of grass,
Fearfully flashed the sky’s mysterious glass.
[...]
So, soon they topped the hill, and raced together
Over an open stretch of herb and heather
Exposed. And instantly the whole sky burned
With fury against them; and soft sudden cups
Opened in thousands for their blood; and the green slopes
Chasmed and steepened sheer to infinite space.

The poem features an implicit presence of human beings as the soldiers are referenced through personal deixis (i.e. “they”, “their”). Only in the last stanza is the noun “comrades” employed, rendering the human beings explicit. Surroundings are present (“May Breeze”, “summer”, “grass”, “sky”), as well as emotions (“fearfully”, “pains”). The soldiers’ emotions are mirrored by the weather: at first, the weather described is pleasant, showing the soldiers’ desire of peace and to go home and for peace (“May breeze”, “warm field”, “breathe like trees”). Then, when the attack starts, the soldiers’ fear of the war and death is portrayed by the sky and fire (“the whole sky burned with fury against them”). However, to fully comprehend the emotions
expressed, historical context might be required. This is a poem reflecting on World War I, a reader not familiar with those events would only be able to understand the poem to a certain extent, thus further showing the importance of context. The notion of context, particularly the “extratextual context”, or context that relates to the situation in which a text is produced (Meibauer, 2012, p.11), is discussed in section 4.1.2 in light of this section’s findings.

Finally, the extract from *Holes* (Sachar, 1998, pp.55-57) was analysed in section 3.2.3. The text does contain PF, despite featuring emotions implicitly. However, to understand the extract provided completely, the previous chapters are needed. Indeed, to grasp the mirroring of the characters’ hope onto the mountain’s peak shaped like a thumb, a grasp of the narrative interrelation is needed: Stanley’s grandfather had mentioned “God’s thumb” (Sarchar, 1998, p.41) prior to the scene. To fully understand the significance of PF in this scene, further intratextual context is needed.

The ambiguous instances of PF in my corpus all indicate the importance of context in the analysis process of PF. Context is needed to interpret PF, or to observe the mirroring of emotions in the text. Context is also often crucial to identify implicit PF criteria. The importance of context was raised by the participants in my study as discussed in section 2.2.2 (see appendix 2.5) and is further addressed in sections 3.4.2 and 4.1.2.

### 3.4 Discussion of findings on PF

In my stylistic analysis, I expected to find an overlap between the concepts of PF and personification, and this transpired in the analysis process. However, the three criteria I identified for PF were not inclusive of all texts and needed to be updated and
labelled differently to be more inclusive. Since these two points are linked to the hypotheses I expressed in section 2.1.1, I discuss these hypotheses in light of the findings.

3.4.1 Review of hypothesis 1: PF and personification

In section 3.3.1, I pointed out that imagery was the technique used the most in my corpus of texts. Personification is present in all 36 texts of the corpus. Out of the 36 texts, five do not contain PF, but all of those five texts do feature personification. I argue this is significant in light of my first hypothesis formulated in section 2.1.1: that the concepts of PF and personification would be used interchangeably by the teachers in my sample.

In texts with PF, personification is often seen to foreground the state of the surroundings, thus bolstering the effect of PF. However, this could also mean that there was a confusion between the two techniques, or they might be considered as interchangeable by the participants who suggested the texts. Out of the five texts categorised as ‘without PF’, two have personified entities for subjects: To The Moon personifies the moon and describes it as having human emotions, and Things Fall Apart personifies yam crops (see section 3.3.2). This indicates that in the eyes of some participants, PF and personification are similar concepts.

Furthermore, when cross-referencing the participants’ answers to the survey questions and their suggested texts, the confusion between the concepts of PF and personification became clearer. Table 3.7 indicates the cross-referenced answers of the participants who provided an example in question 6 with their answers to questions 3 and 4, which respectively asked the participants to define personification and PF. The recorded answers note the definition of personification according to the OED,
meaning the attribution of human qualities to inanimate objects (“Personification”, 2021), and PF’s definition according to Lodge’s definition, meaning the projection of human emotions onto the natural world (Lodge, 1992, p.85; 2002, pp.127-128, 135, 186).

Table 3.7: Participants’ answers to questions 3, 4 and 6 of the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of personification according to the OED (question 3 in the survey)</th>
<th>Definition of PF according to Lodge (question 4 in the survey)</th>
<th>Text example contains PF according to my analysis (question 6 in the survey)</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>29 (51.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>21 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3 (5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL: 56 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7 summarises the participants’ answers to questions 3, 4, and 6 of the survey. The fact that some were able to define PF and personification according to Lodge or the OED but provided texts that did not feature PF according to my model (and the definitions they provided themselves) highlights the overlap in participants’ use of these terms. 33.9% of the participants who provided a text in question 6 that was categorised as containing PF after my analysis, did not define PF according to Lodge’s definition. These participants provided similar definitions for personification and PF, showing the overlap between the concepts of PF and personification in the way they are used.
The text analysis process confirms my first hypothesis (section 2.1.1). Further, based on the data from the analysis conducted in this chapter, one could argue PF and personification are also considered to be interchangeable; the data suggests that participants might view PF and personification as similar concepts. As illustrated by the analysis in this chapter, although they are not one and the same, texts with PF often feature personification, as it animates the surroundings and gives them a bigger role in the scene, foregrounding them to readers (see section 3.3.1.1). A possible explanation for this overlap could be that personification can easily be pinpointed in texts through verbs or adjectives, whereas PF is more implicit. PF is an extended metaphor or “megametaphor”, meaning a metaphor that compares two dissimilar concepts throughout a text, here emotions and the environment (Kövecses, 2002, p.51; see also ‘conceit metaphor’ in Wales, 2011, p.78). Since PF is an extended metaphor, it is difficult to pinpoint it specifically as it does not reside within one word or phrase. It is distributed over a longer stretch of text, and runs across multiple sentences, or until the three criteria are present in the text. Therefore, readers could identify texts with PF as containing personification, because it is what is clearly foregrounded by external deviation, whereas PF is not foregrounded in itself.

In this section, I discussed my first hypothesis in light of the text analysis process and offered my explanation for the overlap between the concepts of PF and personification. I now review the three PF criteria expressed in my second hypothesis.

3.4.2 Review of hypothesis 2: PF criteria

In section 2.1.1 I hypothesised that the three PF criteria I expressed would be present in the participants’ texts. The three criteria were the presence of human beings, emotions, and surroundings. However, five texts did not feature PF because
of missing criteria. Those five texts were only missing one criterion each time, and thus contained two out of three of my hypothesised PF criteria. The rest of the 31 texts had all three criteria, including the three texts that had some implicitly featured criteria, thus rendering PF ambiguous.

From the text analysis process, I found that the three criteria I hypothesised were not only relevant to texts with PF, but they were also often foregrounded in one way or another. The presence of human beings was conveyed through person deixis (names, nouns, pronouns). The presence of emotions was conveyed by lexical fields and negation which are linguistic indicators of PF foregrounded by parallelism (see section 3.3.1.3). The presence of surroundings was illustrated through lexical fields, but mostly through imagery (i.e. personification of nature), which is a linguistic indicator of PF foregrounded by external deviation (see section 3.3.1.1). Since the three criteria I formulated are not only present in texts, but also often foregrounded, my second hypothesis is validated.

However, in the same process of analysis, it became apparent that the labelling of those criteria was too restrictive in comparison to what literary texts have to offer. With hindsight, the three criteria I hypothesised are not inclusive to all situations and should be updated. This realisation occurred in the text analysis process, when certain texts would not be categorised as containing PF due to a criterion not being featured exactly as I originally hypothesised it, despite the fact that the function of PF was nonetheless present. To remedy this labelling issue, I argue it is crucial for my model of PF to have criteria that are inclusive of most texts. The updated criteria will be presented in chapter 4, along with my updated model of PF.
3.5 Review of chapter 3

I presented the methodology I followed for the text analysis process, and its application to texts provided by my participants. I provided three detailed text analyses to evidence how I applied this methodology. With the data drawn from the text analysis, I observed that certain foregrounded linguistic elements such as imagery (personification in particular), repetition, and negation are linguistic indicators of PF, as they draw readers’ attention to certain PF criteria such as the presence of emotions or surroundings. Each linguistic indicator of PF discussed evolves around lexis and richness of language, which suggests that a rich description of the scene is needed to build a textual world and to help readers mentally represent it. This shows the importance of building a world within texts in order for PF to be perceived. The lexical richness of texts allows for readers to map the projection of emotions onto the environment, mostly through description, and PF and its criteria are more perceivable to readers.

The need for criteria to be perceivable indicates that in the study of PF, foregrounding signposts to readers key PF criteria in the text, thus rendering PF itself more obvious. It also became clear that all ambiguous instances of PF in my corpus required further context to perceive the three criteria and to be categorise texts as “with PF”, thus raising the importance of context in my model of PF. This is further discussed in section 4.1.2, where I provide a solution to this limitation.

Additionally, I reviewed my two hypotheses based on the text analysis findings. The overlap between the concepts of PF and personification was rendered evident by the analysis and data drawn. The three PF criteria I expressed in section 2.1.1 need to be updated, as their current label does not accommodate for all eventualities in
texts. In chapter 4, I present the updated model of PF I created based on the participants’ answers and the data drawn from the text analysis.
Chapter 4: An Updated Model of PF

4.1 Building a linguistic model of PF

In chapter 3, I presented the text analytical framework used to analyse the 36 texts of my corpus, and the findings that emerged from that analysis. The main findings were: (1) in my corpus, PF has three linguistic indicators: imagery, negation, and repetition; (2) the three criteria I hypothesised in section 2.1.1 need to be updated; (3) the notions of context and interpretation in the analysis process of PF must be addressed. In this chapter, I first address the findings from chapter 3 and offer solutions to the limitations that stemmed from the text analysis process (section 4.1). I then introduce the updated model of PF (section 4.2), including some prototypical and unprototypical examples to ensure an approach as comprehensive as possible.

4.1.1 Updated PF criteria

It is crucial for my PF model to have criteria that are as inclusive as possible of varied texts and situations. This is not the case with the criteria I originally hypothesised, as they are too restrictive: for instance, in my hypothesis, only texts with human beings can feature PF. This means that texts featuring anthropomorphised or personified beings cannot feature PF, which is untrue, as demonstrated in section 4.2.3.1. Additionally, I want my updated PF model to be widely applicable and a tool for others’ analysis: for this to be possible, PF’s criteria must be as inclusive as possible. In the paragraphs below, I remedy these issues by highlighting the limitation I faced in chapter 3 for each criterion and provide a solution aiming for inclusivity.

The first criterion hypothesised was the presence of human beings in texts. However, as seen in To The Moon (section 3.3.1.2) or in Things Fall Apart (section
some of the beings present in the texts are not human. In *To The Moon*, the moon is personified and given human emotions of loneliness. In *Things Fall Apart*, the yam crops are personified and given the human quality of demanding care and controlling the villagers’ lives. Although these two examples do not contain PF, other texts with anthropomorphised beings, animals or personified objects might. For example, in section 4.2.3.1 I analyse an extract from *Watership Down* (Adams, 1972) featuring anthropomorphised rabbits possessing human qualities such as thinking or talking. Therefore, to address this restriction, I change the criteria of presence of ‘human beings’ to *animated entities*, to be less restrictive.

Furthermore, the criterion of presence of human beings did not address storylines with entities implicitly present in the text. This label did not account for omniscient or implied narrators, implied speakers, or texts solely containing pronouns to refer to characters. Many narratologists (Palmer, 2004, pp.16-17; Prince, 1987, pp.42-43; Booth, 1983) agree that fictional literary narratives have an ‘implied author’ (the person writing the text), ‘implied narrator’ (the text’s narrator, should it be omniscient or an unnamed character) or ‘implied speaker’ in poetry (Hühn, 2005, p.152; Eckardt, 2015, pp. 167-168), as well as characters. Therefore, it would technically be impossible to have a text without beings because the implied author, implied narrator, or implied speaker would be present. However, in the model of PF developed here, the implied author, implied narrator or speaker are not necessarily relevant to the analysis: the animated entity displaying emotions is what is needed. Therefore, if a text has an omniscient narrator but does not express emotions, then the text is missing this criterion. On the other hand, it is possible for texts to feature emotions expressed by an implied narrator, or implied speaker in poetry. In such
cases, PF’s criteria may be met. The context of a text is crucial when determining which entity is expressing the emotion, as I discuss in section 4.1.2.

An example of PF being interpreted for an implicit entity is Thomas’s poem *The Sun Used to Shine* (1916/2020) (suggested by a participant): no names or descriptions of the speaker are given. Pronouns are used (“we two”, “we”, “both”), and although the noun phrase “other men” is used, it does not mean that the speaker expressing emotions as part of the “we” is also male-like (or even human-like). Therefore, in addition to changing the label of the criterion to the presence of animated entities, I also suggest acknowledging that not all beings are explicitly featured in texts. For the rest of this thesis, mentioning the presence of an explicit entity means that the entity is named and identified in the text, as opposed to an implicit entity that is not named, described, or addressed in the text. Making the distinction between implicit and explicit entities is more inclusive of varied storylines.

The second PF criterion I hypothesised was the presence of emotions. Since the term emotion can englobe multiple ideas, I first must define it. The concept of emotion has been researched in different fields (i.e. psychology, social and literary studies, cognitive linguistics) and often with disagreements (Whiteley, 2010, p.44). Fehr and Russell (1984, p.464) state “everyone knows what an emotion is, until asked to give a definition. Then no one knows”. One complication in providing a consistent definition is that the terms ‘emotion’, ‘emotional state’, ‘feeling’, ‘affect’, and ‘mood’ are often used synonymously. Kuiken et al. (2004, p.174) view emotion as “discrete and innate psychobiological reaction patterns independent of awareness”, whereas feelings are more of a “bodily sense” and show “awareness” but are more “subtle” and “less readily named” than emotion. Palmer (2004, p.114, my emphasis) makes further distinctions: “emotions last for varying periods of time. When they are short-term, they
are emotional events; medium-term, they tend to be called moods (his emphasis); as long-term states they are closer to dispositions”. Although each of these terms provide a nuance to the concept of emotion, in this research on PF, the general term emotion is nonetheless used because PF can be used to mirror all of those concepts and their nuances. Since I want my updated model of PF to be inclusive, I use the general term emotion in a way that englobes the other, more nuanced terms.

Consequently, I define emotion as a “response to an event, either internal or external, that has a positively or negatively valenced meaning for the individual” (Salovey and Mayer, 1990, p.186) including mood, dispositions, preferences, personality traits, physical feelings, emotional states and affects, lasting any length of time; PF can mirror any of those emotions. Nevertheless, when analysing PF, the type of emotion must be clear, which can be accomplished by answering the questions on context in section 4.1.2.

Emotions can be triggered by an interpersonal event, but they can also occur internally and independently, which is why our personal experience and ancestral past impact our emotions (Tooby and Cosmides, 1990, pp.407-408; Ekman, 1999, p.46). For example, it is possible to be sad because a friend passed away (interpersonal event); but also to cry whilst listening to music, which might remind us of a specific memory (individual event influenced by our experience). Furthermore, Whiteley (2010, p.46) explains that reading can be a personal process. She states: “cognitive and social approaches to emotion are particularly applicable to literary reading […] this is because literary reading […] is a cognitive process involving perception, memory and imagination” (Whiteley, 2010, p.46). This statement is applicable to my model of PF, which involves readers’ perception of the implicit technique (due to its metaphorical nature). I argue that perceiving PF in the reading process is primarily personal and
cognitive, though it differs from the process of interpretation. The role of readers’ interpretation in perceiving PF when reading is further discussed in section 4.1.3.

Secondly, Palmer (2004, p.115) states that emotions can either occur in texts “explicitly” or “implicitly”, which is important in PF’s analysis. After analysing the corpus, it seems not all texts feature emotions similarly, and this should be reflected in the labelling of the criterion I select. In certain texts, emotions are clearly and explicitly stated: in the extract from Emma analysed section 3.2.1, the emotion of “melancholy” is explicitly stated, and the term is repeated twice. Conversely, certain extracts do not feature explicit emotions, as illustrated in section 4.2.3.2. In the extract from Holes analysed in section 3.2.3, the characters’ emotion of hope (or lack thereof) was implicit and had to be inferred through other linguistic elements. In those instances, emotions are nonetheless present. Therefore, for the rest of this thesis, I make the distinction between the implicit and the explicit presence of emotions in texts. Explicit emotions are those that are clearly expressed and do not need to be inferred; and implicit emotions are those that are not directly expressed and must be inferred through language. This distinction is significant for my model of PF, particularly for ambiguous cases of PF: if emotions are considered non-existent because they are not expressed openly, texts such as the extract from Holes (sections 3.2.3, 3.3.3) would be considered without PF. Since emotions are often expressed implicitly and through figurative language (Citron et al. 2015, p.93), only considering texts that have explicitly stated emotions would not be representative of all literature. In fact, it could be argued that PF is itself an important way in which this figurative expression of emotion occurs in literature.

PF’s third criterion hypothesised in section 2.1.1 is the presence of surroundings. This criterion did not fundamentally change but two specifications in its
definition should be made. Firstly, throughout the text analysis process conducted in chapter 3, it became evident that the sole presence of surroundings was not enough to fulfil this criterion. Deixis (i.e. “here”, “there”, “tonight”, “this tree”) can present the surroundings in a text, but unless they are described with a certain richness of language, it will not be enough to mirror the emotions expressed. For example, in section 3.3.2 the extract from Ulysses (Joyce, 1920/2019) contains spatial deictic terms (“forward”, “backward”, “the solemn floor”), but the scene is not described richly enough: we are unable to determine if the scene is set indoors or outdoors, meaning it is not enough to trigger this interpretation of PF’s mirroring effect in readers.

Additionally, the term “surroundings” is general, and inclusive to all situations and plotlines, meaning it can accommodate indoor and outdoor surroundings. In certain texts provided by the participants such as Frankenstein or Macbeth (act 2, scene 3), the scenes occurred indoors and, in both instances, the gloom of the scenes was conveyed through the rain and wind outdoors, and by the dark indoor settings. Therefore, for the rest of this thesis I consider this criterion of presence of surroundings with the following definition: surrounding settings of a scene occurring indoors or outdoors. Section 4.2.3.4 provides an example of a text with PF set indoors.

In this section, I addressed the limitations of the original criteria I hypothesised for PF and provided updated criteria going forward. The next section defines the idea of context and provides insights as to how it can be used to better identify PF in texts.

4.1.2 The relevance of context in the identification of PF

So far in this thesis, the notion of context has been recurrent: participants raised this issue in section 2.2.2 (see also appendix 2.5), in section 3.1.3 when discussing lexical negation, and in section 3.3.3 I encountered difficulties with participants
providing extracts that did not feature PF on their own due lack of context, such as in *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock* (Eliot, 1915/2013). Now that the labelling of the three criteria has been updated, how the notion of context fits within my model of PF can be explored. I find that in texts featuring one or more of the criteria in an implicit way (meaning they must be inferred as they cannot directly be identified from the extract under study), a certain level of context is needed to perceive the presence of those implicit criteria.

First, I should clarify that the notion of context is used frequently, yet broadly, in linguistics and literary studies. In order to be as precise and systematic as possible, I start by introducing the different “dimensions of context” (Meibauer, 2012, p.11) in order to observe which (if not all) must be examined in light of my model of PF. Meibauer (2012, p.11) list the following dimensions of context:

- intratextual context (‘co-text’): the relation of a piece of text to its surrounding text;
- infratextual context: the relation of a piece of text to the whole of the text;
- intertextual context: the relation of a text to other texts;
- extratextual context (‘situational context’): the relation of a text to aspects of the situation in which the text has been produced or interpreted.

In section 3.1.3 I presented the updated checklist of stylistic categories for text analysis, which includes category E: narrative relations and references. This category has two sub-categories: the first deals with the relation the text has with other texts
through references and allusions, meaning intertextuality. The second sub-category deals with the relation the text has with the rest and the globality of the piece, which includes intratextuality and infratextuality. Therefore, these three dimensions of context have already been addressed and considered in my model of PF.

The remaining dimension is the extratextual context, which will be referred to as situational context, as it is more widely used in linguistics and literary studies. Wales (2011, p.86) states that there are two types of situational context: the “world created and inferred in the text, ideological as well as concrete; and the broad situational context of the non-fiction world, past and present, on the given knowledge of which authors and readers inevitably draw”. In the present research on PF, the later type of situational context is not necessary for readers to perceive the technique within a text. Nonetheless, considering the situation in which a text is produced might provide a better or deeper understanding of the emotions expressed. For example, in section 3.3.3, I discussed Spring Offensive (Owen, 1917/2020) portraying soldiers’ feelings about the war. The poem was published in 1918, months before the end of World War I, and describes the series of German attacks referred to as the Spring Offensive on the Western side of France and Belgium between May and July 1918 (Van Meirvenne et al., 2008). A reader unaware of those historical facts can still picture the violence of war, the fear and longing to be home felt by the soldiers, and the mental representation of the sky in smoke from the weapons. PF is still perceivable without the historical background of the poem, but being aware of it would allow readers to have a better understanding and mental representation of the scene described. Nevertheless, since the situational context of texts’ production is nonessential in PF’s perception, it will not be the focus of this discussion on context. Therefore, the situational context to
consider when one or more PF criteria is implicit, the situational context to consider is the world created in the globality of the text.

The notion of situational context is still not specific enough for my new model of PF and for teaching purposes. To address this, I draw on Leech and Short’s (2007) method of providing prompt questions to help students in their analysis. Since PF is taught in schools, the aim of this thesis is to provide a model that is a contribution to the academic field, and that can be utilised for teaching purposes. Texts being unique and of different genres, it is not possible to simply suggest to “read the previous page” or “go back to the previous chapter” as there is no guarantee that the information sought would be there. Consequently, I provide below a list of prompt questions we can ask ourselves to determine if extracts are not sufficient, and if more of the global text should be read to identify PF:

- Is the scene easy to understand on its own?
- Is there an animated entity present in the text explicitly or implicitly (character, narrator, speaker)?
- Is the animated entity named directly or referred to by pronoun or noun?
- What situation is the animated entity in?
- Are any emotions expressed in the text explicitly or implicitly: are the characters displaying any emotion-specific behaviour? (For example, the phrase *she cried* could be considered to express emotions on the spectrum of sadness).
- If there are emotions present, is it understandable as to why they are there: what led the animated entity to feel this way?
- Is it identifiable whether the scene is set indoors or outdoors?
• Are there any surroundings described in the scene (décor, furniture, objects, specific colours, natural elements, weather etc.)?

The list is not exhaustive, but if the answer to any of those questions is “no” or “I do not know”, then further situational context is needed. Through the prompt questions, the missing information can be precisely identified and retrieved from the globality of the text. Moreover, the cultural, social, or historical context of the text’s production could also be considered if the answer to the questions depended on it.

For example, in section 3.3.3, I discussed The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock (Eliot, 1915/2013). The participant provided the reference to the entire poem but quoted the poem’s third stanza specifically. As I point out in section 3.3.3, the stanza quoted does not feature any animated entity or emotions, but the surroundings are personified. It is difficult to fully understand the scene described, and if we were to ask ourselves the list of prompt questions, most of the questions would be answered negatively, and thus more of the text is needed. When studying the entire poem, the prompt questions can be answered positively, and PF is indeed present. This illustrates that a certain level of context is needed to be able to answer the prompt questions. Without this level of context, it is impossible to identify PF in this text. However, with the relevant information present, PF can be perceived in the poem, thus showing the importance of context in the perception of PF in texts.

In this section, I addressed the issue of context with regards to PF, as it was raised by participants in chapter 2, and as I experienced in chapter 3 throughout the text analyses. I defined the notion of context and evidenced how it is given a place in my text analysis method using prompt questions. I now discuss the concept of interpretation in relation to PF.
4.1.3 Interpreting PF

Interpretation is a crucial concept in stylistics and literary studies, and this is particularly true for PF. PF’s definition cannot be fulfilled, or the technique becomes irrelevant, if readers cannot perceive and interpret the mirroring effect between the surroundings and the emotions. In this section, I make the distinction between reading and interpreting texts. I also offer some insight as to how most readers would interpret PF consensually, despite their individual experiences and schemas (for a discussion on schema theory see section 5.2.3).

First, it is important to explain the difference between interpretation and reading, although this is not consensually agreed (compare Stockwell, 2002, p.31) due to the fuzzy boundaries between those concepts. Jeffries (2014, p.480) makes the distinction:

- interpretation is more social, consensual, text-centred, illocutionary and with the text;
- reading is personal, private or ideological, text derived, perlocutionary, and with and/or against the text.

This means that reading is individual because it is based on readers’ schematic knowledge and personal experiences. On the other hand, interpretation tends to be more consensual because it evolves around textual cues which are shared by readers. Jeffries (2014, p.480) states “the difference is [interpretation] refers to the processing of text which will be shared by most reasonably competent readers (possibly at a subconscious level) and stylisticians (at a conscious level)”, whereas reading refers to processing that differs amongst readers. For this research on PF, the main distinction between interpretation and reading – and why interpreting is so important - is that
interpretation is text-centred (closely tied to the text and its cues) whereas reading is text-derived (stems from the text and its cues but interacts with readers' experiences). Those are not watertight categories, and there are grey areas between them, but they are prototypes of ways in which we process text. The fluid boundary between reading and interpreting stems from the fact that schematic knowledge changes with time and experiences, which is likely to impact the reading process and textual meaning for readers.

This does not mean that readers' personal experience, or background (nor the impact it has on text processing) should be dismissed, as it is dependent on schematic knowledge, which is present with readers and specific schemas can be activated by textual cues. Thus this would mostly influence readers' reading of a text as opposed to their interpretation of it. Jeffries (2014, p.478) gives the following example:

While a reader who has certain schematic knowledge (of, for example, the architecture and layout of the city of Bath) might add a layer of personal meaning to their reading of Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey* that would not be shared by a reader who has never been there, there is, nevertheless, a level at which the text of that novel provides information for all readers to construct a mental image of (eighteenth-century) Bath that is adequate for reading the novel.

From this example, it can be understood that readers' interpretation of a text is not necessarily dependant on their personal experience, gender, class, ideology and so forth (Jeffries, 2014, p.479) even though they are present, but rather that those factors can provide an additional layer of detail in their mental representation of a scene.
Therefore, interpretation is not necessarily unique to each individual. Short (2008, pp.13-14, his emphasis), similarly to Jeffries, does not believe that texts only have one interpretation, but argues there is a limited number of possible interpretations for a text:

it is not that obvious to me that all texts have more than one interpretation or that even the more interpretatively-wide texts have a wide range of interpretations. Indeed, I would argue even long and complex texts like Shakespeare’s plays each have a relatively small set of substantially different interpretations (perhaps even countable on the fingers of one hand?). [...] One of the problems I have with the ‘many different interpretations’ notion is that often the differences involved between one account and another do not seem to be enough to warrant the phrase ‘different interpretations’. Rather, what we often appear to have are slightly different instantiations of the same interpretation.

This does not imply that personal experiences are not fundamentally present during the reading process, but simply that they might not necessarily be activated when interpreting the text, and if they are activated, the interpretation might remain the same.

While PF is an extended metaphor (see section 3.4.1) and is not foregrounded in itself: its criteria and linguistic indicators are embedded and foregrounded in the text. Therefore, it is a technique that tends to be perceived as part of a text-centred approach to text. However, it might be predicted that PF as an extended metaphor tends to be noticed after the reading process, or when nearing the end of reading the
text because it is composed of multiple elements, as opposed to a standard metaphor. Regarding PF, Short’s and Jeffries’s views of interpretation are relevant and insightful. If the weather is described as negative in the text, even if readers personally enjoy that type of weather, they would not necessarily project their own personal preferences onto the text. In other words, readers would be able to perceive PF and the emotions through the surroundings because it is constructed in the text through linguistic elements (such as lexical negation), and not based on their own preferences. Their experience might help them mentally represent the scene in more detail, but their bias toward a certain element of their surroundings would not prevent them from interpreting the scene akin to other readers. Readers’ interpretation of a text with PF is likely to occur if they perceive the mapping between the emotions and the surroundings. Although their schemas of said emotion and specific surrounding is activated, it might not interfere with how they perceive that mapping. For example, if a reader loves snow, and positive emotions are associated with it (maybe linked to enjoyable childhood experiences playing in the snow), it does not prevent them from interpreting that in *A Christmas Carol*, the snow and cold are described negatively, akin to Scrooge’s character. Similarly, a reader that has never seen snow in real life, and thus has a more limited schematic knowledge of it, can still perceive that mapping, though their mental representation might not be as detailed as others, and both readers can share the same interpretation of the text. Therefore, in this discussion on PF, the distinction is that schematic knowledge impacts readers’ mental representation when reading more than their interpretation (despite being activated).

The interpretation of surroundings in a consensual way is a key factor in perceiving PF. Readers may be able to perceive the surroundings as positive or negative based on the way they are described. Research in the fields of psychology
and on the impact of surroundings on mood has shown that, ultimately, the main factor determining whether we perceive surroundings as positive or negative is the notion of *comfort* (Cunningham, 1979, p.1947; Persinger, 1975; Howarth and Hoffman, 1984, p.15; Baylis et al., 2018, p.8). For outdoor settings, regardless of our own preferences, if the weather is extreme (too hot, too cold, too wet, too dark, etc.), it is seen negatively because of the discomfort it brings (Grandjean et al., 1973, pp.207-210; Cunningham, 1979; Howarth and Hoffman, 1984, p.20; Keller et al., 2005, p.730; Walter, 2008; Frühwirth and Sögner, 2015; Noelke et al., 2016, p.128; Baylis et al. 2018, p.4; Münster, 2019). Likewise, for indoor surroundings, regardless of our own preferences in décor, if a room is unclean, untidy, dark, or broken, it is considered to be uncomfortable and negative (Grandjean et al., 1973, p.174; Persinger, 1975; Valdez and Mehrabian, 1994, p.394; Yildirim et al. 2007, p.3233; Saxbe and Repetti, 2010, pp.71-72). This means that despite readers’ personal preferences or schema of comfort, in terms of indoor and natural settings, they may be able to consensually perceive if the surroundings presented in a text are positive or negative.

For example, if a reader from Saudi Arabia reads *Wuthering Heights*, although rain might be welcome in their location due to the heat, it does not prevent them from understanding that *Wuthering Heights* is set in England, where rain is overly abundant, and that rain is described as poor weather in the novel, and should therefore be interpreted as negative. Similarly, if a reader from England is likely used to rain and colder temperature reads *Holes* (see section 3.2.4), they would still be able to interpret that in the text, the desertic humid heat is described negatively and as uncomfortable for the characters, even though the reader might personally enjoy that type of weather and thus associate a positive image with their desertic climate schema. A reader viewing negatively desertic climates might have a richer or more engaged mental
representation of the text’s negative portrayal of those surroundings, as it might be directly mapped onto the characters’ experience. Nevertheless, both readers are likely to draw on the linguistic elements and interpret that the surroundings are described negatively, as are the characters’ emotions. This shows that despite of readers’ personal experience and schematic knowledge being activated when reading, it is possible to interpret texts and PF systematically and consensually to a certain extent.

In this section, I explored the concept of interpretation specifically for this research on PF. I showed that it is possible to approach the projection of emotions onto surroundings consensually, despite readers’ personal experiences, due to the text-centred nature of interpretation. In the next section, I discuss the method I developed to best identify PF in texts systematically.

4.1.4 Identification method of PF (IMPF)

I developed the identification method of PF (IMPF henceforth) from the changes that emerged in chapter 3 and from my checklist of linguistic and stylistic categories of analysis. PF being an extended and implicit metaphor, it is unlikely to be foregrounded itself (but rather through its criteria), and consequently having a method of identification would be useful. This method is designed to be teacher and student friendly and can be adapted or differentiated to users’ level of studies and understanding. Additionally, as I discuss in section 5.1.1.3, more established identification procedures for standard metaphors (such as the Pragglejaz (2007) Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP)) are ineffective for PF due to its implicit nature. Figure 4.1 is a flow chart summarising the three key steps to identifying PF:
Figure 4.1: Flow chart of the identification method of PF (IMPF).
Step 1 identifies the three updated criteria in the text. If any of the criteria are implicit, some situational context might be needed to fully identify them or understand the scene. To remedy that, the prompt questions given in 4.1.2 can be referred to. If all of the listed elements are present, then we can proceed to the next step, but if a criterion is missing, then the text does not contain PF, as the definition cannot be fulfilled.

Step 2.1 draws on readers’ interpretations to assess if the emotions and surroundings mirror one another (at this stage, no analysis is required). If that is the case then the text contains PF and step 3.1 is followed. However, if it is not the case, step 2.2 can be followed.

Step 2.2 requires readers to observe a potential gap or contrast between the surroundings and the emotions expressed (i.e. positive emotions stated but the surroundings are described negatively). If there is no foregrounded contrast, the text does not feature PF, nor its converse. However, if there is a contrast between the emotions and the surroundings, step 3.2 can be followed.

Step 3.1 requires a text analysis of PF to assess if any of the criteria are foregrounded through linguistic elements. This step is not needed to identify or interpret PF in texts as this is achieved in step 2, and it is often not completed by readers. However, conducting the analysis would not only allow the confirmation that PF is indeed present in the text, but it would also evidence how richly its criteria are featured through linguistic features, thus further contributing to our grasp of the complexity and aesthetic aspect of PF.

Step 3.2 requires a text analysis to observe linguistic sources of the contrast created between the emotions and the surroundings. If the contrast is supported by linguistic features, then the text contains the converse of PF. The converse of PF is a
foregrounded contrast between the surroundings and the emotions expressed (see section 4.2.3.5).

Steps 1 and 2 are incorporated in my checklist of stylistic categories: category A requires the three criteria to be identified. Categories B-E represent step 3 of the identification method as they are the core of the text analysis. Negation, repetition, and imagery are linguistic indicators of PF and their presence in a text could reinforce PF’s analysis.

This IMPF shows that it is possible for readers to observe PF in texts without having to conduct a full text analysis. The text analysis, in this procedure, is used to confirm and refine an existing interpretation of PF. The step-by-step format can help students identify PF through the tools provided so far. Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 provide full textual examples and their analysis, and each of them follows the checklist and the identification method presented here.

This section addressed the limitations that emerged from my findings in chapter 3: the need to update the labelling of my PF criteria, and a discussion on context and interpretation. I now present my updated model of PF.

4.2 Updated model of PF and examples

In this section, I present the updated model of PF created based on the data collected in chapters 2 and 3. I first introduce the updated definition of PF and the criteria that contribute to its perception in texts (section 4.2.1). I then provide textual examples of prototypical (section 4.2.2) and unprototypical occurrences of PF (section 4.2.3), and an example of the converse of PF (section 4.2.3.5).
4.2.1 Definition of PF and its criteria

In chapter 2, I predicted that PF’s definition used most often by academics and teachers would be “the projection of human emotions onto natural phenomena” (Lodge, 1992, p.85; 2002, pp.127-128, 135, 186, amongst others), despite the lack of consistency across sources. The survey supported this prediction: 53% of participants defined PF according to Lodge’s definition, and my own. However, as I point out in the literature review and survey analysis (sections 1.2, 2.2), the definition and usage of PF’s concept is inconsistent, and often overlaps with personification. Because of this inconsistency, and because PF is likely to be taught for the GCSE and A Level examinations of English Literature (DfE, 2013b), I develop PF’s definition as part of a more precise stylistic model, which could support teachers’ delivery and students’ understanding of PF, in addition to providing a better understand of the technique’s aesthetic impact on readers’ perception of texts.

Therefore, I define PF as follows: a projection of emotions onto the surroundings by an animated entity. The emotions and animated entity in question can be featured implicitly or explicitly in the text. In such instances in which the emotions or the animated entities are implicit, the presence of context is essential to perceive PF. I addressed the notion of context and supplied prompt questions in section 4.1.2. For the rest of this thesis, this is the definition that is used when referring to PF. I hypothesised three PF criteria in section 2.1.1 and updated them in section 4.1.1 based on the analysis process illustrated in chapter 3. Those criteria are necessary in order to fulfil PF’s definition provided above. The updated three criteria are:

1. Presence of an animated entity, implicit or explicit;
2. Presence of surroundings, indoors or outdoors;
3. Presence of emotions, implicit or explicit.
Now that a clear and consistent definition of PF and its criteria is given, I detail varied examples of PF in the forthcoming sections: first a prototypical instance of PF, then some unprototypical examples. Each example follows the IMPF (see section 4.1.4) and the checklist of stylistic categories (see section 3.1.3).

4.2.2 Prototypical example of PF

In this section, I provide a “prototypical” example of PF acting as a “cognitive reference point” amongst other texts (Stockwell, 2002, pp.29-30). As demonstrated in chapter 3, there are three types of texts in my corpus: texts with PF, texts without PF, and ambiguous cases due to criteria being implicit, hence the updated labels in section 4.1.1. There are thus two categories of PF: straightforward instances, or ambiguous instances. However, the idea of ambiguity also suggests that ambiguous examples of PF are lesser examples, which I argue is untrue. For the rest of this thesis, examples that display each PF criterion explicitly (in other words the criteria can be directly quoted) are referred to as “prototypical”, as they make a conventional example of PF. Texts that feature PF but have implicit criteria are “unprototypical” examples because they contain PF and fulfil the definition but in a unique way.

For this updated model of PF, the prototypical example of PF I chose is from my corpus: the opening of Jane Eyre (Brontë, 1847/2007). Jane Eyre as a novel was suggested by multiple participants (twice for chapter 1, once for chapters 11 and 23). Furthermore, PF being a technique of the Romantic movement, it seems fitting to have a prototypical example of PF from Romanticism, as is the case for Jane Eyre. This extract is the opening of the novel, in which Jane (not yet named) describes her living situation with her aunts and cousins in the English countryside (my numbering):
There was no possibility of taking a walk that day. (1) We had been wandering, indeed, in the leafless shrubbery an hour in the morning; but since dinner (Mrs. Reed, when there was no company, dined early) the cold winter wind had brought with it clouds so sombre, and a rain so penetrating, that further out-door exercise was now out of the question. (2)

I was glad of it: I never liked long walks, especially on chilly afternoons: dreadful to me was the coming home in the raw twilight, with nipped fingers and toes, and a heart saddened by the chidings of Bessie, the nurse, and humbled by the consciousness of my physical inferiority to Eliza, John, and Georgiana Reed. (3)

The said Eliza, John, and Georgiana were now clustered round their mama in the drawing-room: she lay reclined on a sofa by the fireside, and with her darlings about her (for the time neither quarrelling nor crying) looked perfectly happy. (4) Me, she had dispensed from joining the group; saying, "She regretted to be under the necessity of keeping me at a distance; but that until she heard from Bessie, and could discover by her own observation, that I was endeavouring in good earnest to acquire a more sociable and childlike disposition, a more attractive and sprightly manner-something lighter, franker, more natural, as it were-she really must exclude me from privileges intended only for contented, happy, little children." (5)

A: First impressions and PF criteria (step 1 of IMPF)
1 Presence of animated entities
There are five animated entities presented through the personal deixis “Mrs. Reed”, “Bessie the nurse”, “Eliza, John and Georgianna Reed”, and the pronoun “I” referring to Jane, who is not yet named.

2 Presence of emotions

Emotions are expressed explicitly in the passage: “glad”, “dreadful”, “heart saddened”, “humbled”, “inferiority”, “contented, happy”.

3 Presence of surroundings.

Surroundings conveyed through special and temporal deictic terms and the lexical field of natural elements: “leafless shrubbery”, “an hour in the morning”, “cold winter wind”, “clouds so sombre”, “rain so penetrating”, “chilly afternoons”, “raw twilight”.

**Step 2.1 of IMPF**

PF’s three criteria are explicitly present in the extract. The emotions expressed are negative and the surroundings described are also negative, meaning those two criteria mirror each other, thus indicating PF’s occurrence.

**Step 3 of IMPF**

B: Lexical categories

2 nouns.

In sentence (4), two nouns are foregrounded by internal deviation: “their mama” and “her darlings”. Compared to the rest of the extract, these two nouns are more colloquial. Combined with the possessive determiners “her” and “their”, these nouns
indicate how Jane fits within the family: Mrs Reed is not her mother, and the Reed children are not her siblings, implicating that Jane does not directly belong to the Reed family. It also reveals how she feels about her living conditions: she does not get along with her aunt and cousins, as the foregrounding of those familiar nouns could be interpreted as sarcasm on Jane’s part. This reveals how Jane feels towards her family, thus contributing to the emotions foregrounding.

3 adjectives.

Sentence (2) personifies the noun “heart”: it is described with the adjective “saddened”. Since sadness is a human attribute, the personification of Jane’s heart is foregrounded by external deviation, and further conveys her feelings.

In sentence (5), adjectives of comparison (“more sociable and childlike”, “more attractive and sprightly”, “lighter”, “franker”, “more natural”) are used repeatedly, and are thus foregrounded by parallelism. These adjectives compare Jane to her cousins, highlighting the contrast between them. It also discloses how criticised and rejected Jane is amongst the Reeds, indirectly painting a picture of Jane’s feelings to readers.

4 verbs

The level of modality used in sentence (5) to convey Mrs Reed’s reported speech highlights how isolated and passive Jane is amongst the Reeds. Deontic modality (“must”, “regrettued to be under the necessity”) showcases Mrs Reed’s viewpoint as it stresses the speaker’s norm and expectation, in this instance Mrs Reed’s ground rules (Pager-McClymont, 2021, p.124; Portner, 2009, pp.2-3). If Jane follows the ‘system of rules’ given by Mrs Reed’s deontic frame by becoming a more pleasant child, she might be awarded privileges akin to her cousins’ (Portner, 2009,
The modality implies Mrs Reed has no choice but to handle Jane this way when she actually chooses to (Pager-McClymont, 2021, p.124). The use of deontic modality in sentence (5) is foregrounded by internal deviation as it illustrates Mrs Reed’s cruel attitudes towards Jane, thus reinforcing Jane’s emotions of sadness and rejection, one of PF’s criteria.

**C: Grammatical categories**

4 clause structure.

Jane is presented as passive and suffering the actions of other characters in the extract. When Jane interacts with others, she is the object of the action, whereas the other characters are the subjects. For example, in sentence (5), the independent clause “me, she had dispensed from joining the group”, Mrs Reed (“she”) is the active subject of the verb “had dispensed”, whereas Jane (“me”) is the object. In fact, this sentence features syntactic iconicity (Pager-McClymont, 2021, p.118; Jeffries, 1993, pp.110-112), and is therefore foregrounded by parallelism. The structure of the independent clause mirrors its meaning, thus further evidencing Jane’s feeling of isolation. The pronoun “me” referring to Jane is separated from the rest of the clause by a comma, similarly to Jane being separated from “joining the group” in the scene. Jane is grammatically isolated from the group, which is an illustration of her emotions, thus foregrounding this PF criterion.

5 noun phrases.

Throughout the extract, the three Reed children are mentioned as a triplet: “Eliza, John and Georgianna”. This triplet is repeated in sentences (3) and (4) and is echoed by the triplet used by Mrs Reed to describe them in sentence (5): “contented,
happy, little children”. This repetition is foregrounded by parallelism and conveys the contrast between Jane and her cousin. In sentence (4), Jane introduces the triplet with “the said” (determiner “the” and adjectival participate “said”), which is foregrounded by external deviation and shows her dislike of them (Pager-McClymont, 2021, pp.123-124). This phrase tends to be found in legal discussions to refer to defendants or victims, and “the use of the phrase ‘the said’ is particularly ludicrous when used to modify a proper name” (Garner, 2001, p.779). Jane employs the phrase to refer to her cousins, stressing their tumultuous relationship: Jane views herself as their victim, braving their “quarrelling” despite her “physical inferiority”. Conversely, the Reed children are seen as the defendants in the eyes of Mrs Reed, wrongly accused by Jane. This contributes to the gap between Jane and the Reeds, thus reinforcing her feelings of sadness and isolation.

8 Negation

Negation is prevalent and foregrounded by parallelism. The extract features lexical negation (“no”, “sombre”, “out of the question”, “inferiority”, “dreadful”); morphological negation (“leaf/less”), and syntactic negation (“never”). This omnipresence reinforces Jane’s negative emotions and the negative weather, thus foregrounding two of PF’s criteria.

10 general.

In sentence (5), Jane recounts her conversation with Mrs. Reed. The way the conversation is narrated is foregrounded by external deviation due to its unusual structure. The use of quotation marks and the speech act “saying” suggest that it could be direct speech. However, the use of the third person “she” instead of the first person
“I” reveals that the statement can be thought of as indirect speech, and the discourse is in the past tense instead of the present tense. These elements point to free indirect speech yet featuring a narrator’s representation of speech act. This speech presentation influences its level of faithfulness: Jane’s voice intercedes between Mrs Reed’s words and readers, creating a distance and placing Jane in charge of the reported speech (Leech and Short, 2007, pp.261, 268; Pager-McClymont, 2021, p.122). This could be interpreted as Jane mocking Mrs Reed with sarcasm, indicating her dislike for her aunt and her feeling of isolation, which draws attention to the criterion of emotions.

D: Figures of speech

1 phonological schemes.

Sentence (2) features two alliterations “winter wind” and “so sombre” which are foregrounded by parallelism as the voiced glide velar sound /w/ and the voiceless fricative alveolar sound /s/ are repeated. The friction of the /s/ sound could be interpreted as mimicking the sound of the rain, and the glide sound /w/ could represent the sound of the wind. This foregrounds the natural elements by providing readers with their sound effects as they are described in the text, thus foregrounding the criterion of surroundings (Pager-McClymont, 2021, p.119; Leech and Short, 2007, p.188).

F: Discussion of PF and interpretation

The negative weather is a representation of Jane’s feelings of rejection and isolation, which is further highlighted by the lexis and syntax used to convey Jane’s living situation. This example of PF is prototypical for three reasons. Firstly, it is a Romantic text; a movement during which PF was of popular use because it embraces
the values of the movement: nature and free expression of emotions were at the heart of Romanticism and constitute two of the PF criteria in my model (Wellek, 1949; Johnson, 1981; Siddall, 2009; Ford, 2011; Furst, 2017). Secondly, each of PF’s criteria are present explicitly and are foregrounded. Each criterion is present explicitly and is reinforced by foregrounded linguistic elements, rendering the effect of PF prevalent in the text. Thirdly, the three linguistic elements that emerged as linguistic indicators of PF in section 3.3.1 are present and foregrounded in this extract: imagery, (lexical) negation, repetition.

In this section, I analysed a prototypical example of PF, using my checklist of stylistic categories and the IMPF detailed in section 4.1.4. However, there are instances of PF that are unprototypical: they feature PF in a unique way, due to a criterion being atypical or implicit. The forthcoming sections provide examples of those unprototypical instances of PF.

4.2.3 Unprototypical examples of PF

This section explores unprototypical examples of PF based on possible variations of the three criteria (see section 4.2.1). I provide examples of PF in texts with a personified animated entity, implicit presence of animated entity, implicit presence of emotions, and indoor settings. Finally, I analyse an example of the converse of PF. Each text is analysed using my adapted checklist (section 3.1.3) and the IMPF (section 4.1.4).

4.2.3.1 Personified and anthropomorphised beings

The criterion of the presence of animated entities is essential to PF’s definition. Without it, emotions are not generated, rendering PF’s definition incomplete. All of the
texts from my corpus that contain PF feature human beings as characters. However, this is not always the case, and animals or objects can be animated and express emotions in a fantastical plot. To demonstrate the possibility of PF with a non-human entity showing emotions, an example outside of my corpus is analysed.

*Watership Down* (Adams, 1972) is a novel featuring rabbits as main characters: a colony led by Fiver and Hazel in quest of a warren, who are willing to go to great lengths to reach their destination. The rabbits are anthropomorphised and given the human ability to talk, but otherwise maintain their rabbit nature and activities. Akin to other books featuring anthropomorphism, *Watership Down* was censored in multiple countries such as China because “animals should not use human language and it was disastrous to put animals and human beings on the same level” (Harris, 1987, p.44). This is noteworthy for this research on PF: although the text does not include a human being, the animals are portrayed with similar qualities, which is necessary for PF to occur.

The extract is from chapter 35 “Groping” of *Watership Down* (Adams, 1972, p.283 my numbering):

"You spoke of your friend - the one who knew that that warren was a bad place. He is not the only such rabbit.(1) Sometimes I can tell these things, too: but not often now, for my heart is in the frost."(2)

"Then will you join me - and persuade your friends as well?(3) We need you: Efrafa doesn't need you."(4)

Again she was silent.(5) Bigwig could hear a worm moving in the earth nearby and faintly down the tunnel came the sound of some small
creature pattering through the grass outside.(6) He waited quietly, knowing that it was vital that he should not upset her.(7) At last she spoke again, so low in his ear that the words seemed barely more than broken cadences of breathing.(8) "We can escape from Efrafa.(9) The danger is very great, but in that we can succeed.(10) It is beyond that I cannot see.(11) Confusion and fear at nightfall - and then men, men, it is all things of men!(12) A dog - a rope that snaps like a dry branch.(13) A rabbit - no, it is not possible! - a rabbit that rides in a hrududu!(14) Oh, I have become foolish - tales for kittens on a summer evening.(15) No, I cannot see as I did once: it is like the shapes of trees beyond a field of rain."(16)

A: First impressions and PF criteria (step 1 of IMPF)

1 Presence of animated entity

There are two animated entities present: Hyzenthlay is referred to by the personal deictic pronoun "she" and Bigwig "he"; both use the personal pronoun “I” and “me” in their direct speech. They are referring to other rabbits as “they” or “friends”. All the characters are anthropomorphised rabbits, therefore anthropomorphism is not discussed in the category D “imagery” of the checklist but throughout the analysis. Hyzenthlay is the main character speaking, and she demonstrates supernatural abilities: she can have visions of the future, as shown by sentence (2) “sometimes I can tell these things, too: but not often now” and sentence (16) “no, I cannot see as I did once: it is like the shapes of trees beyond a field of rain”.

2 Presence of emotions
Emotions are expressed explicitly: “upset” (sentence 7), “danger” (sentence 11), “confusion and fear” (sentence 12). Overall, there is a lexical field of negative emotions and connotations. They are also portrayed in more implicit ways, as the rest of the analysis shows.

3 Presence of surroundings.

The surroundings are portrayed through the lexical field of nature: “warren”, “grass”, “earth”, “frost”, “summer evening”, “trees beyond a field of rain”, and “Efrafa”. In the novel, Efrafa is a warren described as a “bad place” founded by General Woundwort, an aggressive and power-hungry rabbit.

**Step 2.1 of IMPF**

All three criteria are present, despite the animated entities being rabbits, not human. The emotion of fear is mirrored by the surroundings: the warren, the frost, and the shape of the trees in the rain. Therefore, this passage features PF.

**Step 3 of IMPF**

B: Lexical categories

1 general.

The lexical field of danger is foregrounded by parallelism due to its prevalence: “bad place”, “danger”, “escape”, “confusion and fear”, “rope”, “vital”, “dog”, “men”, and “upset”. This lexical field illustrates the situation Hyzenthlay and Bigwig are facing: they must rally as many rabbits as they can to escape Efrafa because of the dictatorship-like society it has become. If caught trying to escape, they will be killed,
hence the foregrounded lexical field of danger. It also explains the emotion of “confusion and fear” that Hyzenthlay feels.

Additionally, the lexical field of sound is ubiquitous and thus foregrounded by parallelism: “spoke”, “silent”, “hear”, “quietly”, “low”, “ear”, “cadences”. The emphasis on the sense of hearing is directly linked to the characters: rabbits predominantly use their ears to orient themselves and assess their surroundings. Because Hyzenthlay and Bigwig are plotting to escape, they rely on their hearing to sense any immediate danger.

2 nouns.

The nouns “rabbits” and “warren” are the only two nouns that indicate that the characters in this passage are indeed rabbits. These nouns are foregrounded by external deviation because they provide a clear sense of the anthropomorphism occurring in the novel: rabbits are attributed human qualities despite living rabbits' lives (although somewhat supernatural lives). The rest of the text does portray them as rabbits. This highlights the criterion of animated entities: Hyzenthlay and Bigwig are not human, and yet through anthropomorphism they can express emotions mirrored onto their surroundings.

Moreover, the nouns “rabbits” and “men” are the only two nouns repeated within the same sentences. “Men” is repeated three times in sentence (12) and “rabbits” twice in sentence (14). These nouns are foregrounded by parallelism because of their repetition, and are also internally deviant as the only two nouns repeated. In the novel, men are a great threat to rabbits, and the repetition of the nouns in sentences close together conveys an opposition between the two: rabbits are prey and men hunters.
This highlights the animated entities present in the text and brings context as to why the rabbits feel scared.

3 adjectives.

Most of the adjectives present in the passage stress the urgency of the situation and the sense that the rabbits are threatened: “silent”, “vital”, “low”, “great”, “foolish”. This is foregrounded by parallelism as it portrays a recurring theme: danger is imminent, which is why they feel scared.

4 verbs.

There is a clear contrast in the way the main characters and other creatures are presented. The rabbits are given human qualities (“spoke”, “riding”, “persuade”); but other creatures are not anthropomorphised. In sentence (6) a “worm” is described as “moving in the earth” and a small creature as “pattering through the grass”, which are typical animalistic actions. This reinforces the anthropomorphic qualities of the rabbits: not only are they given human attributes, but they are also superior to other creatures.

Additionally, sentence (4) includes the independent clause “Efrafa doesn’t need you”, in which the subject of the verb “doesn’t need” is “Efrafa” (the warren). A warren being a location, it logically does not “need” someone, and is thus personified. It can also be considered that “Efrafa” here is a metonymy referring to the rabbits that inhabit it who might need Hyzenthlay’s presence or miss her. In both instances, the clause uses imagery: personifying the warren or anthropomorphising the rabbits through metonymy by implying their feelings. This foregrounds the criteria of surroundings (the warren) and of emotions (the rabbits missing Hyzenthlay).
5 adverbs.

Most of the adverbs in the passage refer to time: “sometimes”, “again”, “often now”, “once”. This is foregrounded by parallelism as it creates a repetition echoing and further illustrating the urgency of the rabbits’ dangerous situation.

C: Grammatical categories

1 sentence types.

Sentence (14) is foregrounded by internal deviation as it is the only sentence featuring exclamations. This sentence conveys Hyzenthlay’s vision of what will happen to the rabbits in their escape. The exclamations “it is not possible!” and “a rabbit that rides in a hrududu!” illustrate her fear and incredulity to the situation: “hrududu” is the onomatopoeic rabbit word for car. Despite being anthropomorphised, rabbits do not ride cars in the novel, thus rendering Hyzenthlay’s vision farfetched. The exclamations convey her surprise and panic, she is not sure of the accuracy of her vision either because she does not trust it or because she fears it.

2 sentence complexity.

The passage features two simple sentences (out of 16), and they are therefore foregrounded by internal deviation. The sentences “again she was silent” (5) and “we can escape from Efrafa” (9) illustrate the outcome of Bigwig’s persuasion of Hyzenthlay: after hours of convincing her to leave with him, she agrees to help him. The simple sentences convey the finality of Hyzenthlay’s decision and emphasise the importance of the moment in the overall plot, thus further endangering them.
4 sentence structure.

Sentences (12) to (15) show the use of dashes which separates the clauses of the sentences. This is foregrounded by parallelism as it is a recurrent structure in four consecutive sentences. The dashes convey that Hyzenthlay is narrating to Bigwig a vision she is having: they fragment the sentences as she introduces the different elements she can see. The information Hyzenthlay provides goes from an overview of what she sees (“confusion and fear at nightfall”), to something more focused (“and then men”), and then to specific details (“a rope that snaps”, “a rabbit that rides a hrududu”). Hyzenthlay’s interjections and reaction to what she sees are also present, separated from her narration of her vision by the dashes (“no, it is not possible!”). The fragmented aspect of the clauses in those sentences by the dashes conveys Hyzenthlay’s panic and feeling of endangerment.

5 noun phrases.

There are three complex noun phrases foregrounded by internal deviation as they stand out against the simpler nouns in the passage. The first two complex noun phrases occur in sentence (1), and I analyse them in category E2 as they show an intratextual narrative relation.

Sentence (12) features the noun phrase “confusion and fear at nightfall” which is the opening of Hyzenthlay’s vision. It expresses the emotions of the scene explicitly (“confusion and fear”) and links them to the surroundings (“nightfall”). This highlights PF: the rabbits are scared, and their fear intensifies in the dark.

8 Negation
Negation is omnipresent and foregrounded by parallelism. There is lexical negation ("bad", "no", "danger", "escape", "confusion and fear") and syntactic negation ("not", "cannot"). This omnipresence reinforces the negative situation and sense of danger the rabbits are in. Since most of the negation occurs in the dialogue as opposed to the narration, it directly conveys how the rabbits feel.

The passage features direct speech as well as third person narration from an omniscient narrator (sentences 6 and 7). The direct speech further anthropomorphises the rabbits and gives them the ability to speak. Since rabbits normally cannot speak, the direct speech here is foregrounded by external deviation.

**D: Figures of speech**

1 phonological schemes.

Sentence (13) features the onomatopoeic verb "snaps" with the noun group "a rope" as its subject. The verb is an iconic sound effect because it echoes the sound the rope made when completing the action. This allows readers to mentally represent the scene. In previous scenes of the novel, traps had been set by hunters accompanied by dogs to catch rabbits. Those traps were made of ropes and wood. Therefore, the use of the onomatopoeic verb "snaps" and the noun "rope" suggests that Hyzenthlay sees rabbits being captured in traps, thus further contributing to her feeling of danger and fear.

Sentence (14) contains the onomatopoeia "hrududu" which is the rabbit word for car. This is foregrounded by external deviation because it is not a word in the English language, but it is also a direct parallel with the object it represents: it mimics
the noise of a car’s engine. This illustrates the settings and surroundings, as well as representing the danger the rabbits are in. Additionally, it further anthropomorphises the rabbits: not only do they talk like humans, but they also have their own language.

2 Idiomatic expression

Sentence (15) contains the phrase “tales for kittens on a summer evening”, which is foregrounded by external deviation as it compares Hyzenthlay’s vision to children’s stories. Although this is a metaphor, I consider it an idiomatic expression in the rabbits’ language. As shown above, rabbits in the novel have developed their own language. Therefore, it is possible for them to create their own idiomatic expressions. The metaphor suggests that Hyzenthlay’s visions are fables or children’s stories, but other rabbits would not know what this means as they still have rabbit lives, despite being anthropomorphised. Thus, creating an idiom involving what rabbits can picture such as their own infants (“kittens”) or potentially other animals (such as cats) and surroundings (“summer evening”), ensures other rabbits understand the phrase’s meaning. This is another example of the human qualities given to the rabbits: they have their own language.

3 Imagery

- Similes:

Sentence (13) includes the simile “like a dry branch” referring to the sound of “a rope that snaps”. This simile is foregrounded by external deviation as a comparison is made between a rope and a branch for readers’ mental representation of the sound the rope makes. It is also foregrounded by parallelism in the sentence: it is a visual representation following the auditory representation of the action provided by the
onomatopoeic verb “snaps”. This makes the action clear for readers to grasp the
danger and fear Hyzenthlay feels.

Sentence (16) features the simile “it is like the shapes of trees beyond a field of
rain”, which also includes the metaphor “field of rain”. Overall, the independent clause
is foregrounded by external deviation as it compares Hyzenthlay’s vision to the trees
and the rain. Hyzenthlay’s emotions are tied to her vision, and to ensure Bigwig
understands her, she uses the surroundings to portray her vision and feelings. The
simile describes the shape of trees in the rain, their shape being blurry, almost
unknown. Hyzenthlay is scared not only because of the imminent danger the rabbits
are in, but also because her vision is blurred, uncertain, like their fate. This is explicit
PF: a direct comparison is made between Hyzenthlay’s fear and the visual
presentation of the trees in the rain – the surroundings. The metaphor “field of rain” in
this simile is an image metaphor (Lakoff and Turner, 1989, p.89) and presents the rain
as a space (“field”). This metaphor depicts the thickness of the rain, as if it was taking
up space in a field of vision. Since it is used to convey Hyzenthlay’s blurry vision of the
future, it portrays the shape of the trees as being hidden behind a close space.

- Metaphors:

Sentence (2) shows the metaphor “my heart is in the frost” which links Hyzenthlay’s
“heart” (a metonymy for her emotions) to the “frost”. The preposition “in” suggests that
the frost is a physical space, and since frost is mostly found on the floor, the metaphor
suggests that Hyzenthlay feels low (which joins Lakoff and Johnson’s “orientational
metaphor” BAD IS DOWN, see section 5.1.1). Since she had lost hope of leaving Efrafa
until Bigwig joined the warren, the cold aspect of the frost could represent the
numbness she felt. The metaphor draws links between Hyzenthlay’s emotions and
negative natural elements: the frost (and winter in general) is portrayed as a negative
event for the rabbits. The metaphor and metonymy are foregrounded by external deviation as they compare an abstract concept to a physical one. Therefore, PF is present explicitly here: Hyzenthlay’s emotions are portrayed through surroundings.

Sentence (8) contains the metaphor “the words seemed barely more than broken cadences of breathing” which compare the words said by Hyzenthlay to offbeat breathing. This metaphor is foregrounded by external deviation as it presents speech as breathing. The effect is that readers can mentally represent how quiet Hyzenthlay is: it only sounds like she is breathing. This further contributes to the danger the rabbits are in and how scared Hyzenthlay is: she does not risk being heard by others. It also mirrors rabbits’ behaviour in reality, as they use their noses to communicate with one another.

E: Narrative relations and references

2 intratextuality

Sentence (1) features two complex noun phrases: “the one who knew” and “the only such rabbit”. Since there are only three complex noun phrases throughout the passage, they are foregrounded by internal deviation. In sentence (1) these noun phrases refer to Fiver, one of the main characters, a rabbit who also sees the future. Earlier in the novel, Fiver foresaw the destruction of his warren and urged his family and friends to leave in quest of a safer one. Hyzenthlay makes a direct comparison between herself and Fiver: the use of the adjective “such” suggests a specific state (here of having visions), which she shares. These references to Fiver show an intratextual narrative relation encouraging readers to draw parallels between Fiver’s experience and Hyzenthlay’s, and this parallelism is foregrounded. Since Fiver succeeded in bringing his friends and family to safety despite the perils they faced, the
link suggested by this intratextuality shows hope for Hyzenthlay’s and Bigwig’s predicament.

**F: Discussion of PF and interpretation**

Despite the text not featuring human beings but rabbits for main characters, PF nonetheless occurs in the text. The rabbits are anthropomorphised to some degree: they can speak like humans, but still live their rabbit lives and conceptualise the world as rabbits. This is shown by the creation of their own language which avoids human concepts such as cars or children’s fables. The rabbits’ predicament is richly represented in the text, including linguistic elements that contribute to PF and its criteria’s foregrounding. PF’s three linguistic indicators (imagery, repetition, negation) are also present and foregrounded. In fact, some of the imagery featured in the text conveys PF explicitly: through metaphors and similes, a direct link is drawn between Hyzenthlay’s emotions and the surroundings.

Overall, this text analysis demonstrates that PF can occur in texts that do not feature human beings, but rather personified or anthropomorphised animated entities, thus rendering this an unprototypical example of PF made possible by the fictional qualities of the plot. This validates the labelling of the criterion of presence of “animated entity” as opposed to “human being” as I discussed in section 2.1.1.

**4.2.3.2 Implicit presence of beings**

So far, the analysis has included the explicit presence of animated entities. However, in some cases, the entities are not explicitly present, meaning they are not named either by noun or pronoun. Since the presence of an animated entity is a key criterion in my model of PF, when a text features entities implicitly, it is an ambiguous
and unprototypical example of PF. This section exemplifies an analysis of a text with PF and an implicit animated entity. There was no text in my corpus that contained PF with an implicit entity, so I provide an extract not included in my corpus: chapter 10 of *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (Doyle, 1902/2019, my numbering). The extract is Dr Watson’s report of the event to track the ongoing investigation. The night before the scene described, a stakeout was organised in the Moors, keeping the characters up all night in vain.

October 16th.(1) A dull and foggy day with a drizzle of rain.(2) The house is banked in with rolling clouds, which rise now and then to show the dreary curves of the moor, with thin, silver veins upon the sides of the hills, and the distant boulders gleaming where the light strikes upon their wet faces.(3) It is melancholy outside and in.(4)

**A: First impressions and PF criteria (step 1 of IMPF)**

1 Presence of animated entities

   It is a diary entry, which is conveyed by the date given at the beginning of the extract “October 16th”, suggesting that the character or narrator can write, which is a human quality. This is further analysed below, but this criterion is implicitly featured.

2 Presence of emotions

   Emotions are expressed explicitly: “melancholy”.

3 Presence of surroundings.
Surroundings are expressed through the lexical field of nature: “hills”, “clouds”, “rain”, “light”.

**Step 2.1 of IMPF**

PF’s three criteria are present, although the animated entities are implicit and must be inferred. The emotions are negative and mirrored by the negative weather, thus showing that this text does feature PF.

**Step 3 of IMPF**

**B: Lexical categories**

4 verbs.

Sentence (3) contains two verbal animations: the light is the subject of the verb “strikes”, and the clouds are the subject of the verbs “rise” and “show”. These animations of natural elements are foregrounded by external deviation, attributing them with movements they would not naturally possess. This shows the importance of natural elements in the scene, thus building PF through this criterion.

**C: Grammatical categories**

1 sentence types.

Sentence (1) of the passage is not a complete sentence, but rather a date, written to log a diary entry: “October 16th”. This temporal deictic term contributes to the settings of the scene, and therefore to the surroundings (a key PF criterion in my model). Furthermore, there are no explicit animated entities, and this diary entry suggests that there is a human presence, as diaries require writing – a typical human action. Therefore, this also contributes to portraying animated entities.
4 clause structure.

Sentence (4) is the embodiment of PF in one sentence, describing PF’s definition: emotions projected onto the surroundings. This is achieved through equation: the phrase “outside and in” suggests that the melancholy described is as prevalent “outside”, meaning the bad weather, as it is “in”, meaning within the entity writing the diary entry feeling this “melancholy”. The equation of the two is linguistically illustrated by the coordinating conjunction “and”, suggesting that both “outside” and “in” have the same amount of “melancholy”.

5 noun phrases.

Complex noun phrases are used in sentence (3) to refer to the natural elements described: “banked in with rolling clouds”, “the dreary curves of the moor, with thin, silver veins upon the sides of the hills”, and “the distant boulders”. The length of the noun phrases used to describe the natural elements indicates how central they are in the story. It creates a repetition of complex noun phrases which are foregrounded by parallelism, highlighting the surroundings’ importance in the text.

Sentence (3) features the noun phrase “their wet faces”. The possessive pronoun “their” refers to the hills and boulders, personifying them by attributing them with “faces” - typically associated with human anatomy. This is thus foregrounded by external deviation.

8 Negation
Lexical negation is foregrounded by parallelism due to its predominance: “dull”, “dreary”, “melancholy”. The lexical negation contributes to the portrayal of the emotions, and therefore highlights the presence of PF overall.

**D: Figures of speech**

3 Imagery

In sentence (3), the phrase “the moor, with thin, silver veins upon the sides of the hills” contains an ‘image metaphor’ (Lakoff and Turner, 1989) foregrounded by external deviation. The shape of veins is associated with the moor’s disposition, providing readers with a mental representation of the settings.

**F: Discussion of PF and interpretation**

PF’s three key criteria are present, despite animated entities being implicitly featured. Through inference of linguistic elements, it is possible to deduce the presence of a human being: the text is a diary entry, requiring the human ability to write. This example is unprototypical of PF because of the implicit nature of the animated entity expressing emotions. However, when the text is considered in its context, this is the opening of the tenth chapter of the novel. Therefore, readers would be able to deduce that the diary entry is in fact written by Dr Watson, despite him not being named. Nonetheless, further context (although helpful) is not fully required to infer the presence of a human being in this particular extract. The last sentence (sentence 4) embodies PF’s definition, equating the distribution of “melancholy” similarly outside (the negative weather) and within the entity (negative emotions), thus mimicking PF’s definition.
In this section I discussed how implicit animated entities can be perceived in texts and contribute to PF’s occurrence. In the next section I analyse a text with PF and implicit emotions.

4.2.3.3 Implicit emotions

The third criterion I identified for PF to occur is the presence of emotions, explicit or implicit. For PF’s definition to be fulfilled, an animated entity needs to express an emotion so that it can be projected onto the surroundings. If there are no emotions expressed, the surroundings have nothing to mirror, thus preventing PF from occurring.

Emotions are not always directly stated in the text. Instead, linguistic elements such as negative connotations, “surge features” (outburst of emotions) (Taatvitsainen, 1999, pp. 219-220; Culpeper, 2001, pp. 190-191), and other behavioural traits are used to convey to readers how characters are feeling. We can also infer characters’ feelings from actions based on the plot’s context. Palmer (2004, pp. 113-115) gives an example from Emma in which Emma and Knightley quarrel. Although Emma’s feelings are explicitly stated (anger, sorrow, vexation, agitation), Knightley’s emotions are not explicit but “readers will probably infer from the context that he feels anger and disappointment” (Palmer, 2004, p. 113). The inference is possible because in a scene, emotions are “visible and public: they result in outward signs of behaviour such as turning away, being unable to speak, blushing and crying” (Palmer, 2004, p. 113). In this context, the “visible and public” nature of emotions means they are perceivable by readers and other characters through physical representation. Conversely, invisible and private emotions are emotions only available to the character feeling them and to readers through the “mode of thought report”, but not other characters (Palmer, 2004,
Both visible/public and invisible/private emotions contribute to PF and are referred to as *explicit* when they are directly stated (in Palmer’s example, that is the case for Emma’s character), or as *implicit* if they are not stated and but implied (in Palmer’s example, that is the case for Knightley’s character). Emotions also “play a vital part in the creation of character” (Palmer, 2004, p.113); in other words, by inferring character’s emotions, the characterisation process is enriched by textual cues. The link between emotion, PF, and characterisation is further discussed in section 5.2.3.

To exemplify how texts with PF can feature implicit emotions, I analyse a passage suggested by participants from chapter 8 of *Lord of the Flies* (Golding and Epstein, 1954, pp.101-103, my sentence numbering). The extract depicts Simon running in the heat to escape the other boys hunting him: Simon is thus scared, worried, and threatened by the situation. The text does not feature those emotions explicitly, however, with the context and the language used, readers understand Simon’s distress:

Beyond the screen of leaves the sunlight pelted down and the butterflies danced in the middle of their unending dance. (1) He knelt down and the arrow of the sun fell on him. (2) That other time the air had seemed to vibrate with heat; but now it threatened. (3) Soon the sweat was running from his long coarse hair. (4) He shifted restlessly but there was no avoiding the sun. (5) Presently he was thirsty, and then very thirsty. (6) He continued to sit. (7)

**A: First impressions and PF criteria (step 1 of IMPF)**

1 Presence of animated entities
Simon is the animated entity, though only referred to with the pronoun “he” in this extract. If a reader has not read the rest of the text, the animated entity can be deduced to be an unnamed human male.

2 Presence of emotions

Emotions are expressed implicitly requiring inference. The adverb “restlessly” negatively describes Simon’s physical state whilst he faces the predicament he is in. Although this does not account for his fear or the threat he is under, it does provide a physical manifestation of his more complex emotions.

3 Presence of surroundings.

The surroundings are the sun and the heat, which are prevalent in the storyline, as the lexical field of heat depicts: “sunlight”, “air”, “heat”, “sweat”, and “sun”.

Step 2.1 of IMPF

PF’s three criteria are present although emotions are implicit and require further analysis. Nevertheless, the text contains PF: Simon’s worry and fear are mirrored by the negative weather (extreme heat).

Step 3 of IMPF

B: Lexical categories

2 nouns.

The lexical field of heat is prevalent and foregrounded by parallelism, as discussed above. This illustrates the surroundings of the scene, and draws readers’ attention to this PF criterion.
Furthermore, the lexical field of hunting or tracking is also recurring and is presented negatively: “screen”, “knelt down”, “arrow”, “fell”, “threatened”, “running”, “restlessly”, and “avoiding”. This is foregrounded by parallelism, illustrating Simon’s predicament and feelings: he is chased by the other boys and is hiding, thus implying feelings of anxiety, discomfort, and fear. This lexical field implicitly conveys Simon’s feelings.

3 adjectives.

In sentence (6), the adjective “thirsty” is repeated and foregrounded by parallelism. It further conveys Simon’s discomfort in the situation, which foregrounds the criterion of emotions in my model of PF.

4 verbs.

Sentence (1) contains the verb “pelted down” the subject of which is “the sunlight”. The action ‘to pelt down’ is usually associated with heavy rainfall, meaning its pairing with “sunlight” is an oxymoron as they are opposite concepts associated. This oxymoron is foregrounded by external deviation and draws readers’ attention to the surroundings (a PF criterion).

Sentence (1) also contains personification: the verb “danced” is a human action with “the butterflies” for subject. This personification is foregrounded by external deviation and highlights the surroundings in the process.

Sentence (3) also contains personification: the verb “threatened”, a human action, is associated with the noun “the air”. This is foregrounded by external deviation and highlights two PF criteria in my model. The verb “threatened” has a negative
connotation and draws attention to the subject “the air” (part of the surroundings), but it also gives an insight into Simon’s feelings.

In sentence (4) the metaphor “sweat was running” is foregrounded by external deviation. It associates Simon’s abundant sweating with the action of running, which could signpost to the expression ‘running water’. It generates the mental representation of Simon sweating so much, the sweat is running off of his forehead, as water out of a faucet. This highlights how uncomfortable Simon feels due to his surroundings, thus foregrounding two PF criteria.

5. adverbs

In sentence (5), the adverb “restlessly” is used to describe Simon’s action (“shifted”). It is the only term present in the text that expresses how Simon might be feeling and is therefore foregrounded by internal deviation. It is a physical manifestation of Simon’s fear due to the other boys’ threat, which remains implicit in the passage.

C: Grammatical categories

2 sentence complexity.

The last sentence of the extract (sentence 7) “he continued to sit” is the only simple sentence in the extract: it is foregrounded by internal deviation. It could be considered as conveying how Simon is feeling: despite being overly hot, he stayed where he was to hide from the other boys, thus indicating his (potentially paralysing) fear of being found. The use of a simple sentence to express Simon’s action could indicate that it was a simple decision for him to make because he had no other choice. This foregrounding implicitly conveys Simon’s emotions.
4 clause structure.

Sentences (1) and (2) have similar structures which are foregrounded by parallelism. Both sentences are composed of two independent clauses separated by the coordination conjunction “and”. This leads to both sentences potentially being read as a list of the surroundings’ descriptive features, which is a PF criterion in my model.

5 noun phrases.

In sentence (2), the noun phrase “the arrow of the sun” is a metaphor foregrounded by external deviation. The image vehiculated by this metaphor is that the sun is hunting Simon, causing him harm, akin to the other boys. This is further discussed section 5.1.1.2.

8 Negation

Negation is ubiquitous and is thus foregrounded by parallelism. There is lexical negation (“pelted down”, “fell”, “threatened”, “avoiding”, “thirsty”), morphological negation (“unending”, “restlessly”), and syntactic negation (“no”). This highlights the negative atmosphere and the negative emotions Simon might be feeling, which are two PF criteria.

10 general

Throughout the passage, temporal deictic terms are used repeatedly to convey the development of the action: “now” is contrasted with “that other time” in sentence (3); “soon” is used in sentence (4); and “presently” is contrasted with “and then” in sentence (6). The repeated use of temporal deixis is foregrounded by parallelism and
illustrates the gradual build up that led to Simon’s current situation. This adds a layer of suspense into the storyline, indirectly highlighting Simon’s emotional state.

D: Figures of speech

1 phonological schemes.

Throughout the passage, fricative sounds are repeated: labiodental sounds /f/ (voiceless) and /v/ (voiced); interdental sounds /θ/ (voiceless) and /ð/ (voiced); alveolar sounds /s/ (voiceless) and /z/ (voiced); palatal sound /ʃ/ (voiceless); and glottal sound /h/ (voiceless). Overall, the extract features 79 words altogether, 53 of which contain a fricative sound: this is foregrounded by parallelism. This consonance could be seen as a representation of the frictional situation Simon is in: hunted by the other boys. This repetitive hissing sound helps to build the atmosphere and conveys the danger Simon is in, thus emphasising the surroundings.

F: Discussion of PF and interpretation

All three PF criteria I hypothesised are present: the animated entity is Simon (“he”), the surroundings are “the sun”, “the heat”, and “the air”. The emotions are expressed implicitly but are nonetheless present. Simon is running away in the extremely hot weather and does not have any shade or water to refresh himself. Although his mental state is not explicit, it is rendered evident through his physical state: “he shifted restlessly” or “he was thirsty”, allowing readers to understand how physically and mentally miserable Simon feels. Simon’s physical state draws readers’ attention to his emotional state: despite being uncomfortable, he is scared and worried of the threat the other boys pose, so he remains hidden. His state is conveyed through the weather’s animation: “the arrow of the sun fell on him”, “the air had seemed to
vibrate with heat", or “there was no avoiding the sun”, all of which feature negative connotation (see emphasis). The sun and the air are personified and are described as attacking Simon, which also mirrors Simon’s reality. Here PF permits readers to fully grasp Simon’s predicament: not only is he physically miserable, but he also fears for his life.

In chapter 5, I argue that PF is often used when emotions are implicit in a text, as its main purpose is to render those emotions explicit to readers by projecting them onto the scene. It is for this reason that I made the difference between implicit and explicit emotions here: they do not require the same textual cues to be identified by readers.

In this section, I evaluated the relevance of implicit emotions in texts with PF and showed that it was possible for a passage to feature PF if emotions could be inferred. In the next section, I demonstrate the possibility of PF occurring in scenes set indoors.

4.2.3.4 Indoor settings

Ruskin uses the phrases “external things” and “natural world” in his original definition of PF (Ruskin, 1856/2012), and Lodge (amongst others) also uses the term “natural world” in his definition of PF (Lodge, 1992, p.85). The association of natural elements and PF is popular, as I illustrate in the literature review (section 1.2) and in the survey study (sections 2.2, 2.3): participants frequently defined PF as the personification of natural elements. Ruskin’s examples of PF are all examples of personification of natural elements (i.e. the sea, leaves, primroses). Lodge’s definition is tied to this idea as he opens his section on PF and weather with “we all know that the weather affects our moods” (Lodge, 1992, p.85).
However, I argue that only considering natural elements when studying PF is restrictive and incomplete. In some instances, the projection of emotions is reflected indoors onto objects that are part of the décor and contribute to setting the scene. To illustrate this point, I analyse a textual example of PF set indoors. No text from my corpus accommodated this, so I chose an extract from the short story *Véra* (Villiers de L’Isle Adam, 1874/1985, my numbering). A Count is distraught by his young wife’s death (*Véra*) and visits her vault daily. When he decides to stop visiting the vault because of the pain it brings him, the Count stays in Véra’s room and hallucinates: he sees her, talks to her, feels her. The extract is from the end of the short story: the Count can no longer feel Véra’s presence in the room:

And at that moment, when that word was spoken, the mystic lamp before the ikon was extinguished. The pale, thin light of morning-a dreary, grey, raining morning-filtered through the gaps of the curtain into the room. The candles grew pale and went out, and there was only the acrid smoke from their glowing wicks; beneath a layer of chilling ashes the fire disappeared; within a few minutes the flowers faded and shrivelled up; and little by little the pendulum of the clock slowed down once more into immobility. The certitude of all the objects took sudden flight. The opal stone, turned dead, gleamed no longer; the stains of blood upon the cambric by her side had faded likewise; and the vision, in all its ardent whiteness, effacing itself between those despairing arms which sought in vain to clasp it still, returned into thin air. It was lost. One far faint sigh of farewell, distinct, reached even to the soul of the Count. He rose. He had just perceived that he was alone. His
dream had melted away at one single touch. (10) With one single word he had snapped the magnetic thread of his glittering pattern. (11) And the atmosphere now was that of the dead. (12)

A: First impressions and PF criteria (step 1 of IMPF)

1 Presence of animated entities

The story is told from the Count’s viewpoint with the use of the third-person narrative. Deictic terms such as “that moment”, “that word”, “the Count” make it evident to readers, despite the omniscient narrator, that the animated entity is the Count.

2 Presence of emotions

The emotions expressed are the Count’s feelings generated by his wife’s death and the realisation that he no longer hallucinates her. These emotions are long-lasting throughout the short story and are expressed with the lexical field of grief: “dreary”, “certitude took a flight”, “blood”, “dead”, “despairing”, “faint sign of farewell”, “soul”, “alone”.

3 Presence of surroundings.

Although some of the settings described are outdoors (“grey, raining morning”), most of the description regards indoor surroundings: “lamp”, “ikon”, “curtains”, “room”, “candles”, “wicks”, “fire”, “pendulum of the clock”, “objects”, “opal stone”, “cambric”.

Step 2.1 of IMPF
PF’s three criteria are present despite the surroundings being indoors. Nonetheless, the negative emotions are mirrored by the negative surroundings of the room, suggesting the passage contains PF.

Step 3 of IMPF

B: Lexical categories

3 adjectives.

In sentence (2), a list of adjectives “the pale, thin light of morning” is given, followed by a triplet: “a dreary, grey, raining morning”. The repetition of adjectives to describe settings is foregrounded by parallelism.

4 verbs.

There are multiple animations occurring in the text: “the candles grew pale” (sentence 3), “certitude of all objects took sudden flight” (sentence 4), “the opal stone, turned dead” (sentence 5). These animations attribute actions to inanimate objects that are part of the décor, and therefore those animations are foregrounded by external deviation, but also by parallelism because it is a reoccurring phenomenon in the passage. This emphasises the plot: the Count felt Véra’s presence in the room until the end of the passage, and the animation of the décor brings the room to life, conveying Véra’s presence. Therefore, the animations highlight the surroundings’ importance in the story, and ultimately in my model of PF.

In sentence (10), the metaphor “his dream had melted away” is foregrounded by external deviation due to its figurative meaning standing out against the rest of the text. The metaphor conveys the Count’s emotions to readers: he has lost hope and is
grieving Véra’s death. The metaphor provides a mental representation of the Count’s gradual despair as the verb ‘to melt’ is not an immediate process.

C: Grammatical categories

2 sentence complexity.

The sentence complexity evolves significantly, leading to the main element of the plot: the Count can no longer feel, see or talk to Véra in the room. Sentences (1)-(5) are complex and long, whereas sentences (6)-(12) are simple and shorter. This shift is foregrounded by internal deviation and highlights the Count’s emotional state. The Count feels “lost” and in pain over Véra’s passing, and the complex punctuation used (two dashes, six semi-colons, eleven commas), combined with the shift from complex to simple sentences displays the Count’s rapid stream of consciousness of panic and despair. Furthermore, it could potentially represent Véra’s presence fading away until she is gone completely. The sentence complexity in this passage foregrounds the emotion criterion of PF.

4 clause structure.

Sentences (3) and (5) are complex sentences that share a similar structure which is foregrounded by parallelism due to the repetition it creates. They are composed of independent clauses apposed together, separated by semi-colons and at times linked with the coordination conjunction “and”. The effect of these run-on sentences is that a list is created to describe the surroundings of the room. The room becomes the focus, thus drawing readers’ attention to this PF criterion. In the storyline, the room is a bond between Véra and the Count, and the focus it has in this passage allows for the Count’s grief to be mirrored onto it.
5 noun phrases.

Sentence (5) contains the synecdochical noun phrase “those despairing arms”, which is foregrounded by external deviation. The noun phrase uses “arms” to refer to the Count’s character. This provides insight into the Count’s emotions (“despairing”), and suggests the Count is not whole without Véra.

In sentences (10)-(11), the noun phrase “one single” followed respectively by “touch” and “word” is repeated, and therefore foregrounded by parallelism. This repetition further emphasises how close the Count wants to be to Véra, although he realises that her image is gone.

6 verb phrases

Verbal phrases mirror Véra’s death and her fading presence in the room: “the candles grew pale and went out” (sentence 3), “the flowers faded and shrivelled up” (sentence 3), “the pendulum of the clock slowed down once more into immobility” (sentence 3), “the opal stone, turned dead, gleamed no longer” (sentence 5). Each of these verb phrases has an element of the room’s settings as its subject, and the action described is two-fold: first the action occurs, then it stops. This mirrors Véra’s fading presence for the Count, thus foregrounding the surroundings, and emphasising the Count’s abandonment (two of PF’s criteria).

8 Negation

There is lexical negation (“dreary”, “dead”, “faded”, “faint”, “pale”, “extinct”, “acrid”), and morphological negation (“immobility”, “disappeared”). The negation’s
preponderance is foregrounded by parallelism and showcases the negative atmosphere and emotions described in the scene.

D: Figures of speech

1 phonological schemes.

There are two instances of consonance and alliteration of the fricative voiceless labiodental sound /f/: “a few minutes the flower faded” (sentence 3) and “far faint sigh of farewell” (sentence 7). This repetition of sound is foregrounded by parallelism and mimics Véra’s fading presence. Implicitly, this highlights the animated entities (the Count and Véra), and their emotions, which are two PF criteria.

F: Discussion of PF and interpretation

PF’s three criteria I hypothesised are present, despite the scene happening indoors. The room is crucial to the plot: it is Véra’s room, where the Count hallucinated her. The scene unfolds upon the one-year anniversary of Véra’s death: the Count feels Véra’s presence fade. The extract represents a progression towards silence, stillness, and ultimately, death. The varied elements of the room mirror Vera’s state and the Count’s despair over her loss. PF is embedded in the text by the last sentence “and the atmosphere now was that of the dead”. The extract progressively builds the atmosphere into silence, slowly mirroring death, and grief: “fading” into “whiteness”. Although the outdoor surroundings do contribute to the indoor settings (the time of the day, darkness, rain); nonetheless the indoor settings are the most salient in this extract because it is Véra’s room.

Labelling PF as a projection of human emotions onto ‘natural phenomenon’ as Ruskin or Lodge (amongst others) state is restrictive and does not account for scenes
set indoors. Therefore, in this thesis I consider all surroundings or environmental elements that comply with the following definition of “surroundings” and “environment”. According to the *OED*, surroundings are “those things which surround a person or thing, or in the midst of which he or it (habitually) is” (“Surroundings”, 2021). The environment is “the physical surroundings or conditions in which a person or other organism lives, develops, or in which a thing exists; the external conditions in general affecting the life, existence, or properties of an organism or object” (*OED*, “Environment”, 2021). Both definitions convey the notion of location. Any text is set somewhere, regardless of where that may be, in reality or fiction. As long as the emotions described are mirrored onto the surroundings, regardless of what those are, a text can feature PF. For example, if a text features a passage with a character dreaming of being stuck in a bubble, and their feelings of claustrophobia or being helpless are mirrored on the bubble by turning misty or dark, this scenario has the potential to feature PF: the projection of emotion occurs, even though it is occurring in a dream in a fictional situation. Therefore, the crucial element to consider is whether the surroundings (regardless of what those are) are described in enough detail to allow for the projection of emotions. This is further discussed in section 6.2.2.

This section showed PF can occur in scenes set indoors and is therefore not exclusive to natural world settings. In the next section, I define the idea of the converse of PF and provide an example of analysis.

### 4.2.3.5 Converse of PF

So far I have examined unprototypical instances of PF based on the three criteria (implicit or explicit) needed to fulfil PF’s definition (see section 4.1.1). However, we also must consider texts where all three criteria are featured explicitly, and yet PF
is not present due to a clear contrast between the emotions expressed and the surroundings described. I call this the “converse of PF”. The converse of PF occurs when there is a foregrounded contrast between the surroundings and the emotions, which can be interpreted as character-building.

To illustrate this later point, I analyse a passage (not provided by participants) from chapter 1 of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* (Baum, 1900/2008, my numbering). It presents Dorothy, the protagonist, in her house with her dog Toto. The house was lifted into the air during a tornado, and the extract portrays Dorothy’s reaction to the situation:

Hour after hour passed away, and slowly Dorothy got over her fright; but she felt quite lonely, and the wind shrieked so loudly all about her that she nearly became deaf.(1) At first she had wondered if she would be dashed to pieces when the house fell again; but as the hours passed and nothing terrible happened, she stopped worrying and resolved to wait calmly and see what the future would bring.(2) At last she crawled over the swaying floor to her bed, and lay down upon it; and Toto followed and lay down beside her.(3) In spite of the swaying of the house and the wailing of the wind, Dorothy soon closed her eyes and fell fast asleep.(4)

**A: First impressions and PF criteria (step 1 of IMPF)**

1 Presence of animated entities
There are two animated entities indicated by the personal deictic terms: “Dorothy”, referred to with the pronoun “she”, and her dog “Toto”. “Toto” is only mentioned once, so the entity I focus on is “Dorothy”.

2 Presence of emotions

The emotional state expressed in the passage is explicit: “got over her fright”, “lonely”, “stopped worrying”, “calmly”.

3 Presence of surroundings.

The surroundings described are outdoors and indoors, as shown by the spatial deictic terms: “wind”, “house”, “swaying floor”.

**Step 2.2 of IMPF**

The three criteria are present, meaning the text has the potential to feature PF. However, my first impression of the passage is that Dorothy’s emotions contrast with the surroundings: she is not panicked by the situation and remains calm despite the chaotic and unnatural situation. The emotions are not mirrored by the surroundings, and thus PF does not occur despite its criteria’s presence. The contrast between Dorothy’s emotions and the surroundings indicates the converse of PF. To confirm this first impression, I continue the analysis to see if linguistic elements in the text would corroborate my point.

**Step 3 of IMPF**

**B: Lexical categories**

1. general
Throughout the passage, the lexical field of time echoes: “hours after hours passed”, “hours passed”, “future”, “at first”, “at last”, “soon”. This lexical field is foregrounded by parallelism and emphasises the scene’s duration, despite the text’s short length. It also points out that Dorothy had to stay in those surroundings for an elongated time, potentially justifying the contrast between her emotions and the surroundings: she adapted. This lexical field foregrounds two PF criteria: the surroundings and, indirectly, Dorothy’s feelings.

2 nouns.

The nouns “house” and “wind” are repeated in the extract and are thus foregrounded by parallelism, highlighting the scene’s surroundings.

3. adjectives

The adjective “swaying” is repeated and foregrounded by parallelism. It conveys the surroundings’ never-ending motion.

4 verbs.

The wind is mentioned twice, each time personified with the verbs “shrieked” and “wailing”. The personification is foregrounded by external deviation, but the pattern of the wind only being described through personification is itself foregrounded by parallelism. The personification associates negative emotions to the wind, and thus highlights how extreme the weather is. It foregrounds the surroundings of the scene, which is an essential part of my model of PF.

Sentence (2) features the metaphor “the future would bring”, suggesting time (here “the future”) is something moving towards us (here, towards “Dorothy”). This is
also reflected in sentences (1-2) with the metaphors “hour after hour passed” and “hours passed”. These metaphors could be considered in terms of the conceptual metaphors for time: TIME IS SOMETHING MOVING TOWARDS US OR TIME IS A MOVING OBJECT (see section 5.1.1; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, pp.49-51; Lakoff et al., 1991, p.76). These metaphors are foregrounded by external deviation as they attribute agency to the notion of time, and are mirrored by the lexical field of time. It highlights the length of time Dorothy has to stay in this situation, despite the passage’s brevity and it draws attention onto the scene’s setting.

5. adverbs

Multiple adverbs are used in the text, each to bring an extra layer of precision in the description of the scene: “so loudly”, “slowly”, “quite”, “nearly”, “calmly”, “fast”. Similarly, multiple prepositions are used after verbs (“away”, “over”, “down upon”, “down beside”). The predominance of adverbs and prepositions is foregrounded by parallelism, showing the text focuses on providing a precise description, almost focusing on facts instead of Dorothy’s feelings.

C: Grammatical categories

3. clause type

All clauses in the four sentences of the extract are independent, linked by connectives (“and”, “but”, “first”, in spite of”, “at last”) and semi-colons. Some clauses are simple, others are complex, but all are independent. This pattern is foregrounded by parallelism and could be interpreted as the text cohering throughout the narration, despite a situation disconnected from reality, as the house is flying in the air because of a tornado. This could potentially also mirror a key facet of Dorothy’s personality: she
is independent, and not only is this mirrored onto the syntax, but her emotions show
that too. The last sentence states that “in spite of” the peculiar situation Dorothy is in;
she still remains calm and falls “fast asleep”. The independent clauses contribute to
showcasing Dorothy’s emotions.

8 Negation

Lexical negation is present and foregrounded by parallelism: “fright”, “lonely”,
“shrieked”, “wailing”, “nothing”, “terrible”, “worrying”. This omnipresence of negative
connotation illustrates the predicament Dorothy is in, and thus foregrounds the
surroundings which are essential to PF’s definition.

D: Figures of speech

1 phonological schemes.

Sentence (4) is a potential conclusion as it sums up the situation. It also features
a consonance: the sounds /s/ (alveolar), /z/ (alveolar), /w/ (glide), /f/ (labiodental), /θ/,
and /ð/ (interdentals) are repeated. The phrases “wailing of the wind” and “fell fast”
are alliterated respectively in /w/ and /f/. Those sounds are fricatives and could mimic
the sound of the wind, as Dorothy would hear it. Therefore, this consonance is
foregrounded by parallelism, emphasising the surroundings in my model of PF.

F: Discussion of PF’s converse and interpretation

PF’s three criteria are present: Dorothy is the entity; her emotion is explicitly
stated: “Dorothy got over her fright”. The chaotic weather is the surroundings (“the
wind shrieked so loudly”, “the swaying of the house”, “wailing of the wind”). The logical
emotions to expect from Dorothy would be fear, worry or panic because her
surroundings are a house lifted into the air by a tornado, which is not only extreme weather, but also supernatural. The weather is described negatively, and yet Dorothy remains calm and falls asleep with Toto. Since the weather is portrayed negatively it would be logical for Dorothy’s emotions to be equally negative. Yet they are not, and this shows that it is possible to systematically assess whether emotions and surroundings mirror each other.

Dorothy’s feelings and actions do not mirror the predicament she is in, nor do they reflect the environment. Dorothy’s actions and state of mind are calm and contrast with the surroundings’ chaos. This contrast has two implications: it is significant for her character, particularly because this is the novel’s opening. It suggests that Dorothy is brave, mature, and independent. These qualities are consistent throughout the story and the fact that Dorothy’s emotions are not reflected onto the surroundings suggests these qualities implicitly to readers early in the plot. Additionally, the foregrounded contrast between Dorothy’s reactions to such an unusual situation further emphasizes the fantasy and supernatural aspect of the story, as one could argue that most people would not react as Dorothy does. Therefore, this shows that the converse of PF must be considered as part of my model as it can be character-building similarly to PF (see section 5.2.3), and can also reinforce the supernatural aspect of the narrative. The foregrounded contrast between emotions and surroundings has yet to be explored on the academic stage as the “converse of PF”, though it might be discussed under different headings.

4.3 Review of chapter 4

This chapter addressed the complexities observed in chapter 2 and chapter 3 of this thesis. The labelling of PF’s three criteria was updated to: presence of animated
entity (implicit or explicit), emotions (implicit or explicit), and surroundings (indoors or outdoors). The concepts of context and interpretation were discussed in light of PF and allowed me to put forward a method of identification of PF which is adaptable for teaching and learning. From those tools, a consistent definition of PF was developed, along with prototypical and unprototypical examples of PF.

This chapter has illustrated that not all texts feature PF in the same way. Texts can feature PF and its criteria differently: explicitly or implicitly, with elements of fantasy or supernatural characters, indoors or outdoors. For instance, the extracts from *Watership Down* (Adams, 1972) and from *Lord of the Flies* (Golding and Epstein, 1954) do not feature PF similarly: although both extracts convey the emotion of fear and being threatened, the surroundings and characters differ. In *Watership Down* the surroundings are the frost, the rain, and the trees, whereas in *Lord of the Flies* the surroundings are the heat of the sun and lack of shade. The animated entities in *Watership Down* are anthropomorphised rabbits, and in *Lord of the Flies* a human being. Despite those differences, PF occurs in both texts to reflect fear and being under threat, and the surroundings are described negatively in both texts although they are opposite weather conditions (extreme heat and frost/rain). In both instances, PF’s core definition disclosed in this chapter is fulfilled but the criteria differ, showing that this model of PF is as inclusive as possible of diverse narratives through its criteria.

PF’s function and impact on texts can differ depending on the plot it is featured in. This emerging finding is addressed in the forthcoming chapter: it is a development of the model of PF put forward in this chapter as it outlines the varied functions of PF in texts.
Chapter 5: Functions and Effects of PF

5.1 Metaphorical function of PF

In the previous chapter, I presented PF’s updated model and the identification method (IMPF) I created, based on the data drawn from the survey study (chapter 2) and the results of the text analysis (chapter 3). Now that PF’s definition, criteria, and identification process have been explained, this chapter explores PF’s different functions and effects. As I pointed out at the end of chapter 4, although PF’s definition remains the same in texts, its impact on narratives can differ, and this phenomenon needs to be addressed. In this chapter, first, the metaphorical functions of PF are reviewed by applying metaphor theories to explain PF’s function in texts (section 5.1). Secondly, I discuss the four main effects of PF present in my corpus: communication of implicit emotions, building ambience, building characters, and foreshadowing (section 5.2).

5.1.1 Metaphor theories

Imagery can be found across different levels of language: it can be found on the phonetic level (i.e. onomatopoeia), syntactic level (i.e. syntactic iconicity), and semantic level (i.e. metaphors). Figurative language impacts texts by creating a correspondence between certain concepts. Emotions are often expressed through figurative language due to their personal and abstract nature (Abbott, 2008, p.118; Citron et al., 2015, p.93). Because there is no accurate or scientific way of testing that emotions are equivalent within individuals, our understanding of others’ emotions is based on our own experiences. One way to convey emotions to others through commonplace concepts is figurative language, as it provides a concrete representation
of emotions that would otherwise remain subjective and abstract. In the forthcoming sections, I review Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Kövecses, 2002) and the related concept of image metaphors (Lakoff and Turner, 1989) in relevance to PF, as well as their limitations.

5.1.1.1 Conceptual Metaphor Theory

In Metaphors We Live By, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) show how the study of linguistics and cognition can be combined to observe the conceptual aspects of metaphors. One of the main claims in the monograph is that “metaphor is primarily a matter of thought and action and only derivatively a matter of language” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p.153). This means that although metaphors are verbal phenomena, they are also thought processes, and can frame our perception of the world. This phenomenon can be explained through Conceptual Metaphor Theory (hereafter CMT).

The principle of CMT is that one conceptual domain is understood in terms of another (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p.5; Kövecses, 2002, p.6). In this theory, the ‘target domain’ (hereafter TD) is understood in terms of the ‘source domain’ (hereafter SD), and therefore the metaphor is the ‘cross-domain mapping’ (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p.250). A mapping is the systematic correspondence between the SD and the TD (Kövecses, 2002, p.6). CMT claims that metaphors typically employ a more abstract concept as target and a more concrete or physical concept as their source, and therefore abstract concepts such as arguments, love, and social organization can be understood in terms of more concrete concepts such as war, journey, and plants (Kövecses, 2002, p.6).
In the example “my blood froze”, the emotion expressed is fear, and the verb “froze” indicates cold. The abstract TD FEAR is understood in terms of the concrete SD COLD. The correspondent mapping for this metaphor is FEAR IS COLD. It is possible for different metaphorical expressions to share a similar mapping. In the sentence “he had cold feet”, the emotion expressed is FEAR, which is the TD, and the SD is COLD. Therefore, the correspondent mapping for this metaphor is also FEAR IS COLD. This example differs from the first example given: in the first example, FEAR accounts for a feeling of terror, whereas in the second example, FEAR represents nervousness. Although those two emotions are conceptualised as different types of fear, they tend to be grouped into a larger category, potentially for convenience, and because their SD is the same: COLD. This metaphor is thus a ‘master metaphor’ (MM hereafter): a metaphor whose mapping can be applied to other metaphorical expressions (Kövecses, 2008b, p.382; Kövecses, 2004).

Before exploring PF’s conceptual mappings in my corpus, it is useful to discuss PF as an emotion metaphor (a metaphor with an emotion as TD). Emotions tend to be expressed through metaphorical language such as PF, as I have argued so far. Kövecses (2008b) explores the link between conceptual metaphors and emotions, asking specific questions, some of which are particularly relevant to this thesis: “is there a master metaphor for emotions?”, “what is the precise role of metaphors, metonymies, and related concepts in the cognitive construction of particular emotion concepts?”, and “are emotion metaphors universal?” (Kövecses, 2008b, p.380). I argue that some of the findings I explore in section 5.1.2 are in direct correlation with Kövecses’s findings.

First, Kövecses (2008b, p.382) links conceptual metonymies and emotion metaphors. A metonymy is a figure of speech involving a concept or object being
referred to by substitution to one of its attributes (Wales, 2011, pp.267-268). Kövecses (2008b, p.382) explains that certain physical expressions of emotions (i.e. tears), or behaviours (i.e. turning away) are metonymies of emotions: they are single elements that stand for the emotion itself. Kövecses (2008b, p.382) states:

There is an important connection between emotion metaphors and metonymies; namely, that the metonymies can be said to motivate the metaphors. This motivation is not simply linguistic or conceptual but also physical, in the sense that the metonymies indicate certain physical aspects of the body involved in emotion. The physical aspect indicated by emotion metonymies can be factored into two types: behavioral and physiological.

For instance, in the sentence “Lucy looked at him go, tears rolling down her cheeks as she walked in the pouring rain”, the tears are metonymies of the emotion of sadness felt by Lucy, according to Kövecses’s argument. In this sentence, the rain falling mirrors Lucy’s sadness: the rain and Lucy’s tears have the same downward motion. This is directly linked to the criterion of emotion in the model of PF I formulated in chapter 4 (sections 4.1.2 and 4.2.3.3): emotions are often expressed implicitly, thus behavioural or physiological factors are metonymies of those implicit emotions. Similarly, Bergström and Shimotori (2011), Hillbom and Shimotori (2015), and Shimotori (2017, p.319) argue that emotions can be associated with spontaneous physical reactions through metonymy (i.e. PHYSICAL AGITATION STANDS FOR ANGER, OR A DROP IN BODY TEMPERATURE STANDS FOR FEAR).
Secondly, Kövecses (2008b, pp.382-383) explains that it is possible to have a MM of emotions, since in his findings, emotions such as love or anger have similar mappings: the SD of NATURAL FORCES, which is particularly salient to PF’s criterion of surroundings. Kövecses (2008b, p.382) states:

If two very different emotions such as anger and love share so much metaphorical structure, then we can expect other emotions (at least the basic, or primary ones, like fear, joy, sadness, and lust) to share just as much or more. Indeed, the study of such emotion concepts shows that there is a great deal of overlap among the metaphors that characterize them.

I argue my analysis of PF might provide examples of MMs for varied emotions (see section 5.1.2).

Finally, Kövecses explores the potential universality of emotion metaphors across languages (2008b, pp.393-395; Kövecses, 2004; see also Díaz-Vera, 2014). His research focuses on the emotion of anger, and he suggests that “emotion concepts and metaphors are in general universal […] we find a great deal of commonality in emotion concepts and metaphors both across languages/cultures and through time” despite certain variations (Kövecses, 2008b, p.394). In other words, emotion metaphors such as PF have the potential to reflect universal conceptual mappings of domains. As I explained in section 4.1.3, surroundings, natural forces, and the weather are experienced by all beings. Despite a reader’s personal experience, in a text with PF, the emotions are understood and interpreted in terms of the surroundings described. Therefore, since surroundings are a universal concept, then PF (an
emotion metaphor) is likely to be understood and interpreted consensually by readers. Examples of this are discussed in section 5.1.2.

Additionally, Shinohara and Matsunaka (2003, 2009) describe an emotion metaphor they label “EMOTION IS EXTERNAL METEOROLOGICAL/ NATURAL PHENOMENON THAT SURROUNDS THE SELF, at least in the Japanese language” (Shinohara and Matsunaka, 2009, p.270). They explain:

*Here [with this mapping], the mappings between natural/meteorological phenomena and emotions seem to be experientially motivated.* Changes of weather can affect mental or physical states of human beings. For example, depression can be caused by low atmospheric pressure or by lack of sunshine. [...] As Yamanaka (2003) argues, Japan has a long tradition of regarding the heart as a microcosm, which appears in many old Japanese poems. In such poems, the outside natural phenomena reflect inner emotions of the poet, or the inner emotions are regarded as natural/meteorological phenomena (Shinohara and Matsunaka, 2009, p.270, my emphasis).

The first point to consider is the effect of the metaphor Shinohara and Matsunaka describe (see emphasised sentences): it matches PF when it is defined as a projection of emotion onto the natural world, though the term ‘PF’ is not used in any of Shinohara and Matsunaka’s research. Similarly, Abbott and Forceville (2011, p.109) draw on Shinohara and Matsunaka’s work in their own analysis of manga, pointing out the significance of the weather in multimodal emotion metaphors, providing the following example: “a black thundercloud behind a girl in an indoor scene suggests her anger”
Neither Shinohara and Matsunaka, nor Abbott and Forceville use the term ‘pathetic fallacy’ in their analysis, further illustrating that PF is discussed in linguistics under different headings (for further discussion of this point see section 5.2).

A limitation to Shinohara and Matsunaka’s metaphorical mapping is that it restrains the source domain ‘EXTERNAL METEOROLOGICAL/ NATURAL PHENOMENON THAT SURROUNDS THE SELF’ to the outdoors. However, as I discuss in sections 3.3.2, 3.4.2, 4.1.1 and 4.2.3.4, the projection of emotion can occur indoors. As Shinohara and Matsunaka suggest, this particular mapping might be a “culture-specificity” (2009, p.290), as their research is primarily concerned with verbal and visual metaphors in Japanese manga, and they themselves suggest that this phenomenon “needs more investigation” (Shinohara and Matsunaka, 2009, p.290).

Overall, this section shows that PF has the potential to be a conceptual metaphor as defined by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Kövecses (2002; 2004; 2008b): it is a specific type of metaphor, projecting emotions onto surroundings. I suggest that CMT can be used to explain the metaphorical function of PF in texts. Since emotions are understood in terms of the surroundings as per PF’s definition (section 4.2.1), the TD is EMOTION and the SD is SURROUNDINGS, thus providing the correspondent mapping: EMOTION IS SURROUNDINGS. For instance, in the analysis of the prototypical example of Jane Eyre (section 4.2.2), Jane’s sadness and isolation are mirrored by the surroundings of “cold winter wind”, “rain”, and “leafless shrubbery”. The SD is the SURROUNDINGS which are projected onto the TD, here Jane’s feelings of SADNESS.

Based on this definition, PF can therefore be viewed as a conceptual metaphor: EMOTION IS SURROUNDINGS. However, the specific elements of emotions and
surroundings can present novel creative metaphors or ‘image metaphors’ in certain instances (Lakoff and Turner, 1989, p.89). In the next section, I discuss how PF as a conceptual metaphor can also feature image metaphors.

5.1.1.2 Image metaphors

In More Than Cool Reason, Lakoff and Turner (1989) explore the use of CMT to analyse literary and poetic metaphors. They claim that most creative metaphors can be traced back to conceptual metaphors (Lakoff and Turner, 1989, p.55). For example, the poetic metaphor “ripeness is all” in act 5 scene 2 of King Lear (Shakespeare, 1606/2016) and everyday expressions such as “she’s a late bloomer” can be linked to the conceptual metaphor PEOPLE ARE PLANTS: in the King Lear example, “ripeness” refers to fruit and the second example “bloomer” refers to flowers (Lakoff and Turner, 1989, p.53). Despite this claim, Lakoff and Turner state that “not all metaphors map conceptual structures onto other conceptual structures” (Lakoff and Turner, 1989, p.89). In certain instances, metaphors do not map concepts but images: they are “image metaphors”.

Image metaphors operate similarly to conceptual metaphors: they map the structure of a domain onto another, but those domains are mental images as opposed to conceptual domains. Lakoff and Turner (1989, p.90) give the example “my wife … whose waist is an hourglass” as an image metaphor: it is not conceptual but provides the image of an hourglass’s shape (which readers are likely familiar with) to allow them to visualise the woman’s figure. In certain instances, image metaphors “can trigger and reinforce metaphors that map conceptual knowledge and inferential structure” (Lakoff and Turner, 1989, p.92): the image maps the conventional knowledge of the SD onto the target image described. The example provided by Lakoff and Turner
(1989, p.92) is “my horse with a mane made of short rainbows” and it shows that the beauty and curvy shape of the horse’s mane is associated with the conventional knowledge of a rainbow.

Those examples of image metaphors discussed so far convey images that are contained within the sentences provided. However, it is also possible for image metaphors to generate images: “a source image might be mapped onto a target domain in order to create an image” (Lakoff and Turner, 1989, p.94, their emphasis). The sentence “thoughts are summer lightning” maps readers’ mental image of “lightning” onto the domain of “thoughts” (Lakoff and Turner, 1989, p.94). Since “thoughts” is an abstract concept, it does not readily evoke an image, meaning the image metaphor created the image of thoughts being lightning bolts.

This latter point is the most relevant to PF: texts with PF can feature image metaphors to further illustrate PF and its criteria. For instance, in section 4.2.3 I analysed an extract from Lord of the Flies (Golding and Epstein, 1954, pp.101-103) featuring the phrase “the arrow of the sun”. This phrase is an image metaphor as it conveys the shape and direction of the sun on Simon: the sunrays are a straight shot towards Simon, almost spotlight-like, and the term “arrow” in the context of the novel conveys the threat Simon is under. The sun’s arrow-like shape illustrates that the sun is uncomfortable for Simon, it poses a threat to him, and the spotlight-like image of the sunrays is mapped onto Simon’s predicament of being hunted by the other boys. The spotlight aspect of the sunrays is created with this image metaphor, and the sun is conceptualised with the threat that weapons such as arrows pose. The SD is the ARROW, generating the straight downward sunrays’ shape whilst holding a negative connotation of threat, and the TD is the SUN, which jeopardizes Simon’s survival.
Those examples show that texts with PF (a conceptual metaphor with the 
EMOTION IS SURROUNDINGS for mapping), can also feature novel or image metaphors to 
进一步 enhance its effect and foreground its criteria. Although CMT and the concept 
of image metaphors are applicable to PF, they have some limitations. In the next 
section, I review those limitations and offer solutions applicable to this research.

5.1.1.3 Limitations

CMT and the concept of image metaphors both share a similar limitation: the 
identification process of metaphors. Both theories offer a top-down approach to better 
understand metaphors, but do not include a rigorous method for identifying them 
(Kövecses, 2008b, p.170). Although there are other limitations to CMT (for example, 
see criticisms by Alverson, 1994; Clausner and Croft, 1997; Rakova, 2002; 
Dobrovolskij and Piirainen, 2005; Stefanowitch, 2007; and see Kövecses, 2008a for 
discussion), this specific limitation is the most relevant to PF.

To remedy this limitation of identification method of metaphors, the Pragglejaz 
Group (2007) created a bottom-up step-by-step protocol allowing for the identification 
of metaphors in a systematic way. The Metaphor Identification Procedure (hereafter 
MIP) is a four-step protocol identifying language not used in its literal form (Pragglejaz 
Group, 2007, pp.3-4). The first step of the MIP is to read the text to ensure a general 
understanding. The second step is to determine the lexical units in the text. The third 
step involves determining the meaning of the lexical units in context, considering the 
currency and basic uses of the units. The fourth step requires the analyst to assess if 
the lexical unit is used metaphorically based on its basic meaning. For steps three and 
four a dictionary should be used. This method is systematic in the identification of 
figurative language.
However, PF is not a simple metaphor but an extended, implicit one and only occurs when its three criteria are present. Those tend to be featured implicitly, figuratively, or through foregrounded language, thus using the MIP might not always be fruitful in identifying this specific metaphor. The IMPF (section 4.1.4) is a procedure tailored to specifically identifying PF and hence remedies the MIP limitation. The SD and TD of PF are observed in step 2.1 of the IMPF as the emotion is matched to the surroundings. In my checklist of analysis, this discussion is best suited to appear in category F as it relates to the interpretation of PF in texts.

In this section, I presented CMT (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Kövecses, 2002) and the concept of image metaphors (Lakoff and Turner, 1989) which I find best suited to explain PF’s metaphorical function of PF and its stylistic effect. I discussed CMT’s limitation regarding PF: it does not provide a nuanced method of identification of figurative language such as PF, however, the IMPF developed in section 4.1.4 is a solution to this limitation. In the next section, I apply the theory to observe PF’s conceptual metaphor function in individual texts.

**5.1.2 Analysing PF as a metaphor**

PF is an extended metaphor, meaning a figure of speech that runs throughout sections or the entirety of a text (see also ‘conceit metaphor’ in Wales, 2011, p.78). As explained in section 5.1.1.1, PF is a conceptual metaphor whose TD is EMOTION and SD is SURROUNDINGS. This is the MM of PF. However, in the varied instances of PF the emotion or surroundings differ, thus more specific mappings between the domains can be identified.
5.1.2.1 Mappings of PF and master metaphors

This section explores the metaphors, mappings, and MMs from my corpus of texts featuring PF. The analysis and examples I provide are qualitative, and to illustrate the emotions and surroundings present in my corpus, I created table 5.1, which summarises the surroundings and emotions of each text.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from the Corpus</th>
<th>Surroundings</th>
<th>Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Tragedy of King Lear</em> (Shakespeare, 1606/2016, pp 76-77), act III scene II</td>
<td>Weather (wind, thunder, hurricane, rain, fire)</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Macbeth</em> (Shakespeare, 1606/2014, p.5), act I scene I</td>
<td>Sun, air, heath</td>
<td>Evil, wickedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Macbeth</em> (Shakespeare, 1606/2014, pp.34-35), act II scene III</td>
<td>Wind, air, earth</td>
<td>Worry, uneasiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>As you like it</em> (Shakespeare, 1623/2015, pp.31-32), act II scene I</td>
<td>Woods, winter, wind, cold</td>
<td>Anger, determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em> (Brontë, 1847/2007), chapter 1</td>
<td>Wind, rain, cold</td>
<td>Loneliness, isolation, sadness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em> (Brontë, 1847/2007), chapter 11</td>
<td>Sun, flowers, autumn, green fields fresh air</td>
<td>Gratitude, contentment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em> (Brontë, 1847/2007), chapter 23</td>
<td>Wind, rain, thunder, storm</td>
<td>Love, sadness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wuthering Heights</em> (Brontë, 1847/2020), chapter 9</td>
<td>Storm, wind, rain, dark evening, clouds</td>
<td>Love, uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Great Expectations</em> (Dickens, 1861/2020), chapter 1</td>
<td>River, sea, wilderness, wind</td>
<td>Fear, sadness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Great Expectations</em> (Dickens, 1861/2020), chapter 39</td>
<td>Weather, fog, rain, wind, sea, mud</td>
<td>Loneliness, nervousness,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bleak House</em> (Dickens, 1852/2012), chapter 1</td>
<td>November weather, black drizzle, fog, mud,</td>
<td>Disgust, sadness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A Christmas Carol</em> (Dickens, 1843/2018), stave 1</td>
<td>Cold, snow, wind, hail, sleet</td>
<td>Bitterness, stubbornness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A Christmas Carol</em> (Dickens, 1843/2018), stave 5</td>
<td>Golden sunlight, heavenly sky, fresh air</td>
<td>Joy, gratitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Slow Regard of Silent Things</em> (Rothfuss, 2014, pp.130-131)</td>
<td>Cloud, moon, wood, hill, starry sky</td>
<td>Sadness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Long Dark Tea-Time of the Soul</em> (Adams, 1990, pp.196-197), section 19</td>
<td>Rain, heavy sky, night,</td>
<td>Claustrophobia, frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll And Mr. Hyde</em> (Stevenson, 1886/2018), chapter 10</td>
<td>Gloom, fog, darkness, light</td>
<td>Gloom, fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Frankenstein, or The Modern Prometheus</em> (Shelley, 1818/2018), chapter 5</td>
<td>Night of November, rain, low light</td>
<td>Dread, anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lord of the Flies</em>, William Golding (1954)</td>
<td>Fire, leaves, sunlight, air, heat</td>
<td>Fear, restlessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emma</em> (Austen, 1815/2018), volume 12, chapter 3</td>
<td>wind, trees, cold stormy rain</td>
<td>Melancholia, gloom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dracula</em> (Stoker, 1897/2013), chapter 1</td>
<td>Shadows, glow, snowy mountains, trees, cold darkness, clouds</td>
<td>Fear, gloom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Main Emotions</td>
<td>Surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Woman in Black</em> (Hill, 1963/2011, pp.102-107), chapter 9 “In the Nursery”</td>
<td>Damp air, cold, land, water, sky, drizzle, cloud</td>
<td>Uneasiness, anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Return of the Native</em> (Hardy, 1879/2020), Book 4, Chapter 5</td>
<td>Heat, sun, valley, dried pool, mud</td>
<td>Lassitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock</em> (Eliot, 1915/2013)</td>
<td>Yellow fog, pools, soot, October night</td>
<td>Loneliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>La Belle Dame Sans Merci: A Ballad</em> (Keats, 1819/2020a)</td>
<td>Lake, birds, roots, filly, cold hill side</td>
<td>Love, lust, sadness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Spring Offensive</em> (Owen, 1917/2020)</td>
<td>Grass, sky, trees, cold gust,</td>
<td>Fear, grief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ode to a Nightingale</em> (Keats, 1819/2020b)</td>
<td>Sea, waves, moon, breeze, flowers</td>
<td>Sadness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Break, Break, Break</em> (Lord Tennyson, 1842/2020)</td>
<td>Sea, waves, stones</td>
<td>Grief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The sun used to shine</em> (Thomas, 1916/2020)</td>
<td>Sun, flowers, earth, moonlight, fields</td>
<td>Happiness, contentment, nostalgia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.1: Summary of the main emotions and surroundings present in each text of the corpus.*
From table 5.1, three main findings can be observed. Firstly, most of the texts do not just express one emotion, but a blend of complex emotions. Secondly, only four texts display positive emotions, although they are mixed with negative emotions: *The Sun Used to Shine*, *La Belle Dame Sans Merci*, chapter 11 of *Jane Eyre*, and stave 5 of *A Christmas Carol*, whereas the rest of the corpus displays negative emotions. Lastly, certain surroundings are recurrent throughout the corpus and tend to occur in texts expressing similar emotions.

This last point is the foundation for the development of PF as a conceptual emotion metaphor. Some emotions are recurrent in the corpus and are expressed in a similar way, meaning there is a potential MM. In sections 5.1.2.2 to 5.1.2.4, I provide a qualitative analysis of the conceptual metaphors present in the corpus with examples. The analysis is categorised by the three MM I identified:

- EMOTION IS NATURAL FORCE
- EMOTION IS VERTICAL ORIENTATION
- EMOTION IS COLOUR TONE

The mappings and MMs discussed below revolve around the surroundings in my model of PF. As previously argued, the MM of PF remains: EMOTION IS SURROUNDINGS (section 5.1.2). However, this is a broad mapping since *surroundings* can be any space; the sub-sections below offer more precise MMs and mappings based on the surroundings.

**5.1.2.2 EMOTION IS NATURAL FORCE**

From table 5.1, we can observe reoccurring mappings between specific emotions and specific surroundings. Kövecses (2008b, p.381) illustrates that certain emotions such as anger or love are TDs which can be associated with the SD of
natural forces, thus creating the following metaphors: ANGER IS NATURAL FORCE (i.e. “it was a stormy meeting”), and LOVE IS NATURAL FORCE (i.e. “she swept me off my feet”). NATURAL FORCE as a SD is relevant to PF as it includes surroundings such as weather (wind, rain, or thunder) or other natural elements (i.e. sea tide and waves, volcanic eruptions, or tsunami). Therefore, the cross-domain mapping EMOTION IS NATURAL FORCE is the MM englobing those specific examples. This MM is the most common in my corpus due to the wide use of natural elements and the weather to portray emotions.

Before discussing the three MM of PF identified in my corpus, it is worth discussing how the SD (the surroundings) is used to enhance our understanding of the TD (the emotions), and more specifically what part of the SD is drawn on in the mapping process. According to Stockwell (1999, p.137, his emphasis) “the key idea here is salience”, meaning that only the most important characteristics of the SD are mapped onto the TD. Stockwell (1999, p.138) adds that the notion of salience is “more peculiar to the individual’s worldview and culture, accumulated through social experience”, and therefore the SD’s salient characteristics might differ from one reader or text to the next. For example, in the image metaphor of “my wife … with the waist of an hourglass” (section 5.1.1.2), Stockwell argues the curvy shape of the hourglass is the main characteristic mapped onto the woman’s figure, but most likely not the cold of the glass or its flowing sand (Stockwell, 1999, p.137). Therefore, in the analyses below, I identify the SD and TD that constitute the metaphors; I explain which salient characteristics of the SD are mapped onto the TD; and, finally, I explain the overall effect it has on our understanding of the text.

• SADNESS IS STORM/RAIN
This metaphor occurs in chapters 1 and 23 of *Jane Eyre*, chapters 1 and 39 of *Great Expectations*, chapter 1 of *Bleak House*, volume 12 chapter 3 of *Emma*, chapter 9 of *Wuthering Heights*, and chapter 29 of *Holes*.

In chapter 9 of *Wuthering Heights*, a storm with heavy rain is described. Catherine is agitated and crying because Heathcliff has left her, Edgar Linton proposed marriage to Catherine who accepted, although she loves Heathcliff. The following sentence shows the correlation between the rainstorm and Catherine’s sadness as she waits in the rain for Heathcliff to return: “*the great drops that began to plash around her*, she remained, calling at intervals, and then listening, and then crying outright. She beat Hareton, or any child, at a good passionate *fit of crying*” (Brontë, 1847/2020, chapter 9, my emphasis). In the chapter, the rain starts to fall as Heathcliff leaves: “the great drops that began to plash”, mirroring Catherine’s “fit of crying”. Therefore, the following mapping can be expressed: Catherine’s sadness (expressed through her tears) is the TD, and the rain is the SD, thus creating the metaphor SADNESS IS RAIN. The strength (‘great’) and untamed nature of the rainstorm (the SD) is mapped onto Catherine’s sadness and her uncontrollable love for Heathcliff (TD). Additionally, the downward motion of the rain (SD) could also be mapped onto Catherine’s sadness (TD); this is discussed in section 5.1.2.3. This mapping between Catherine’s emotions and the weather emphasises how unruly her emotions are.

- **GRIEF IS SEA TIDE**

This metaphor occurs in *Ode to a Nightingale* and *Break Break Break*.

In *Break Break Break*, the poet describes his grief for a friend who has passed away. The first stanza conveys the link between the grief and the sea tide: “O Sea! And I would that my tongue could utter the thoughts that *arise in me*” (Lord Tennyson,
1842/2020). The verb “arise” portrays how the poet is seized by his emotion and mirrors the sea tide’s motion. Thus, the following mapping is expressed: the TD is the poet’s grief and the SD the sea tide, which creates the following metaphor: GRIEF IS SEA TIDE. The come-and-go movement and the strength of the waves (SD) is mapped onto the poet’s feelings (TD). This provides a pattern for the poet’s feelings: he is first overwhelmed by a strong emotion of grief (such as the peak of a wave or high tide) which slowly fades away (low tide or the waves withdrawing) before seizing the poet once more. This metaphor illustrates to readers how the poet feels and their emotions’ strength and pattern.

- UNEASINESS IS FOG

This metaphor occurs in chapter 1 of Dracula, chapter 10 of The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll And Mr. Hyde, chapter 39 of Great Expectations, chapter 1 of Bleak House, and chapter 9 of The Woman in Black.

In chapter 1 of Dracula (Stoker, 1897/2013), the narrator Jonathan Harker describes the journey he and the other characters are on towards Count Dracula’s castle in Western Europe. The text includes passages such as “the darkness to be closing down upon us, great masses of greyness […] which carried on the thoughts and grim fancies engendered earlier in the evening”. This extract can be interpreted as the narrator projecting his emotion of uneasiness, conveyed by the phrase “grim fancies”, onto the surrounding fog described as “masses of greyness”. The following mapping can be formulated: the TD is the narrator’s uneasiness, and the SD is the fog, leading to the metaphor UNEASINESS IS FOG. The consistency and opaque qualities of the fog (SD) are mapped onto Harker’s feeling of uneasiness and uncertainty (TD). The metaphor portrays the unknown awaiting Harker: the fog blurs and hides the
surroundings, preventing the characters from seeing what is around them, similarly to how uncertain of his future endeavours Harker feels, generating a sense of uneasiness.

• **ANGER IS STORM**

  This metaphor occurs in act 3 scene 2 of *King Lear* (Shakespeare, 1606/2016).

  Lear is upset and angry at his two cruel daughters and addresses the stormy weather: “Blow, winds, crack your cheeks! Rage! Blow!”. Lear’s address to the coming storm and wind mirrors his anger as shown by the noun “rage”. I thus formulate this mapping: the TD is Lear’s anger, and the SD is the storm, rendering the metaphor **ANGER IS STORM**. The strength and unruly nature of the storm (SD) is mapped onto Lear’s rage (TD). This metaphor showcases Lear's anger and its vehemence, emphasising how wild and violent it is.

• **LASSITUDE IS HEAT**

  This metaphor occurs in chapter 8 of *Lord of the Flies*, chapter 5 of *The Return of the Native*, and chapter 29 of *Holes*.

  In *Lord of the Flies* (Golding and Epstein, 1954, pp.101-103; see section 4.2.3.3), Simon evades the other boys despite the heat and his lack of water. The sentences “he shifted *restlessly* but there was no avoiding the *sun*” and “the arrow of the sun” express Simon’s lassitude (TD) (portrayed by his “restlessness”) mirrored by the unavoidable heat of the “sun” (SD), generating the metaphor **LASSITUDE IS HEAT**. The sunrays’ strength, the spotlight shape of the “arrow of the sun”, and the inescapable nature of the heat (SD) is mapped onto Simon’s feelings and inescapable situation of being hunted. The effect of this metaphor is that it shows readers how
physically and mentally uncomfortable Simon feels: he cannot escape the heat nor the other boys.

- **HAPPINESS IS A SUNNY DAY**

  This metaphor occurs in *The Sun Used To Shine*, chapter 11 of *Jane Eyre*, and stave 5 of *A Christmas Carol*.

  In stave 5 of *A Christmas Carol* (Dickens, 1843/2018), Scrooge is joyful because he has not missed the present Christmas. The following sentence conveys Scrooge’s happiness, mirrored onto the sunlight: “clear, bright, jovial, stirring, cold; cold, piping for the blood to dance to; Golden sunlight; Heavenly sky; sweet fresh air; merry bells. Oh, glorious! Glorious!”. The following mapping emerges: Scrooge’s feeling of happiness is the TD and is pointed out by terms such as “dance” or “glorious” which are conceptual metonymies of happiness (section 5.1.1.1). The SD is the sky’s brightness and freshness, showcased by “bright” or “golden sunlight, heavenly sky”. Therefore, the metaphor *HAPPINESS IS A SUNNY DAY* can be drawn. The air’s quality and the sky’s luminosity (SD) are mapped onto Scrooge’s happiness to not have missed Christmas. In section 4.1.3 I discussed that fresh air and bright spaces are key to the notion of comfort. The quality of the surroundings conveys to readers Scrooge’s ecstasy and his change of character to become a “fresh” and “jovial” new man.

  Interestingly, no metaphor involving the emotion of love was formulated, because in my corpus, texts featuring love also feature sadness, and the sadness is the emotion that stands out, often because it is caused by love. Furthermore, from the list of metaphors that occur in my corpus, a more global MM can be observed. If emotions of sadness, anger, worry, or grief are compiled and referred to as negative
emotions, then the following emotion metaphor can be formulated: **NEGATIVE EMOTION IS PRECIPITATION**, which accounts for all negative emotions in my corpus. Precipitation is water molecules in a liquid or solid state falling from the sky, and as shown section 4.1.3, precipitation is generally seen as a negative type of weather as it generates a low mood. This MM is discussed in section 5.1.2.3 considering the concept of verticality.

### 5.1.2.3 EMOTION IS VERTICAL ORIENTATION

In *Metaphors We Live By*, Lakoff and Johnson (1980, pp.10-11) explore “orientational metaphors”: metaphors involving “spatial orientation: up-down, in-out, front-back, on-off, deep-shallow, central-peripheral”. In my analysis of PF as a conceptual metaphor, it became evident that the orientation metaphors “GOOD IS UP” (“my spirit rose up”) and “BAD IS DOWN” (“my spirit sank”) formulated by Lakoff and Johnson (1980, pp.10-11) are particularly relevant to my findings. Kövecses (2002 pp.36, 85; 2008b, p.386) analyses the metaphor “HAPPINESS IS BEING OFF THE GROUND” which is linked to Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980, pp.10-11) “UP” orientational metaphor. Kövecses (2008b, p.386) argues his metaphor is “not an evaluative ‘orientational metaphor’ in the Lakoff-Johnson sense”. Kövecses’s metaphor focuses on textual cues such as “dancing or jumping up and down [...] typically associated with joy/happiness [which are] seen as a result or effect of this emotion” (Kövecses, 2008b, p.386). In texts with PF, emotions tend to be featured implicitly through terms such as “jumped up and down” (another example of conceptual metonymy). Because emotions tend to be featured through those conceptual metonyms, then the SD of “BEING OFF THE GROUND” might be more appropriate at times as a specification of the GOOD IS UP mapping. However, for consistency and to observe patterns, the metaphors GOOD IS
UP and BAD IS DOWN are used in this chapter in order use the same SD for each instance of the metaphor in my corpus.

As I explain in section 5.1.2.2, one of the MMs that emerged was NEGATIVE EMOTION IS PRECIPITATION. Weather precipitation by definition involves water molecules falling down from the sky in solid or liquid state such as hail, sleet, rain, or snow. Since the key component of precipitation is its downward motion, it makes the metaphor NEGATIVE EMOTION IS PRECIPITATION linked to the metaphor BAD IS DOWN. The metaphor BAD IS DOWN is prevalent in the corpus. For example, in the stave 1 of A Christmas Carol (Dickens, 1843/2018) the following sentences are used to compare Scrooge’s character to the precipitation: “the heaviest rain, and snow, and hail, and sleet, could boast of the advantage over him in only one respect. They often “came down” handsomely, and Scrooge never did”. The emphasis on the phrase “came down” is the author’s and it foregrounds by internal deviation the physical aspect of the phrase against the rest of the text. In this context, the phrase “came down” is an animation of the precipitation, providing readers with the representation of the precipitation having control over its fall. The SD is the downward motion of the precipitation which mirrors the TD of Scrooge’s selfishness and bitterness, thus showing the metaphor BAD IS DOWN. The precipitations’ most salient characteristics are their downward direction and their cold temperature. Those are mapped onto Scrooge’s negative and cold personality, the effect of which is to build his character.

Positive emotions are also expressed through the orientational metaphor GOOD IS UP in my corpus. For example, in stave 5 of A Christmas Carol (Dickens, 1843/2018) the following sentences can be observed: “I am as happy as an angel […] He had frisked into the sitting-room, and was now standing there: perfectly winded”. In this extract, two instances of the GOOD IS UP metaphor occur. First, the TD of the simile “as
happy as an angel" is Scrooge's happiness at his discovery that he has not missed Christmas. The SD is the reference to an angel, which flies up above the ground. Therefore, through this simile, the metaphor GOOD IS UP occurs. Secondly, the phrase “he had frisked” is an example of implicit textual cue suggesting Scrooge’s emotion and an off the ground motion to convey his happiness. In this instance, the metaphor GOOD IS UP emerges: Scrooge’s implied happiness is the TD and the motion of leaping upwards is the SD. The metaphor portrays how Scrooge feels and contributes to his characterisation: Scrooge is a changed man, acting in this stave as he would never have acted in the first part of the story.

Another example of the GOOD IS UP metaphor can be observed in my corpus: chapter 11 of Jane Eyre (Brontë, 1847/2007), where emotions are projected onto elements of the surroundings that are up (i.e. the sun, birds or the sky). In the passage “the chamber looked such a bright little place to me as the sun shone in between the gay blue chintz window curtains [...] that my spirits rose at the view”, there are two metaphorical expressions occurring, both of which follow Lakoff and Johnson’s GOOD IS UP metaphor. The first is the phrase “my spirit rose”, where the TD is Jane’s spirit and happiness, and the SD is the upward motion provided by the verb “rose”, thus creating the metaphor GOOD IS UP. The second metaphor present is the mirroring of Jane’s feelings by the sun: Jane’s happiness is the TD and the sun’s position up in the sky is the SD, thus also reflecting the metaphor GOOD IS UP. In these instances of the metaphor GOOD IS UP, the SD’s upward motion is the most salient feature that is mapped onto the TD. Additionally, this can be linked to the HAPPINESS IS A SUNNY DAY mapping (section 5.1.2.2). The effect of this GOOD IS UP mapping is that it conveys how Jane feels. The extracts from Jane Eyre and A Christmas Carol have the same TD of happiness as a positive emotion in their respective metaphorical instantiation of GOOD
However, the characters’ experience of happiness is not to the same degree: Jane is merely content, whereas Scrooge is ecstatic.

5.1.2.4 EMOTION IS COLOUR TONE

Colours are used to express emotional states: to “feel blue”, to “see red” or to be “green with envy” (Jonauskaite et al., 2020, p.1). The association of emotion with colour can be social or cultural (for instance in Western Cultures such as France or the United Kingdom, white is worn by a bride, whereas in India it is the colour of mourning); it can also be natural and arise due to perceptual pairing (Wang et al., 2014; Jonauskaite et al., 2020, p.3). In my corpus there are multiple instances of colour tones used to convey emotions, and most examples can be divided into two categories: light and dark. Therefore, the third and final MM observed in my corpus is EMOTION IS COLOUR TONE, which also closely relates to surroundings in my model of PF as most texts describe the natural elements present and the spectrum of colours and tones present.

According to a study conducted by Jonauskaite et al. (2020, p.18) “emotion concepts are associated with colour concepts - an abstract representation of colour—rather than specific perceptual or linguistic properties of colour”. In their studies, they explain that in some instances, the affective colour association might not be equivalent across different languages. For instance, the colour yellow has mixed association: in French rire jaune (to laugh yellow) means to laugh with embarrassment; yellow is associated with a negative emotion. However, as Jonauskaite et al. (2020, p.2-3) point out, yellow can also be visually associated with positive emotion, and they provide the example “feeling joyful when the sun is shining” (see section 5.1.2.2). Since the colours are part of the description of the surroundings, they contribute to building a
There is a consensus in metaphor research that positive emotions are associated with light, and negative emotions with darkness, thus generating the cross-domain mappings GOOD IS LIGHT (i.e. “bright day”) and BAD IS DARK (i.e. “dark thoughts”) (Arnheim, 1969; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, pp.50-53; Lakoff et al., 1991, p.190; Meier and Robinson, 2005; Forceville and Renckens, 2013). Arnheim (1969, p.313) explains that these two associations “go as far back as the history of man” across different cultures, and that the general affective associations and contrast between light and darkness is because “day and night become the visual representation of good and evil”. In my corpus, the emerging findings indicate that the emotional associations of light and darkness are linked to the surroundings and to the idea of night and day, as argued by Arnheim. I provide below an analysis of the specific colour tone metaphors present in my corpus, the texts in which they appear, and examples of analyses. The examples are categorised: I first explore the metaphor BAD IS DARK, and then discuss the metaphor GOOD IS LIGHT.

The metaphor BAD IS DARK is common in my corpus, in instances where specific dark colours are present or a simple sense of darkness. An example of the latter can be found in act 2 scene 3 of Macbeth (Shakespeare, 1606/2014, pp.34-35). Lennox expresses his anguish and worry that terrible events have occurred during the night – and rightly so: it is the night King Duncan is murdered. Lennox’s feelings are expressed through terms such as “terrible”, “woeful” or “lamentings” and are mirrored by the dark atmosphere of the night: “the night has been unruly” or “obscure bird”. Therefore, the following mapping can be expressed: Lennox’s anguish is the TD, and the SD is the dark atmosphere of the night, generating the metaphor BAD IS DARK. The opacity and
darkness present in the scene (SD) are mapped onto Lennox’s anguish (TD). The effect of this is to build the suspense and the ambience of the scene, as is discussed in section 5.2.3.

Unlike the example presented above, some texts in my corpus feature specific dark colours (i.e. brown, grey, black):

- **DISCOMFORT IS BROWN**

  This metaphor is present in book 4 chapter 5 of *Return of The Native*, *The Flowers*, and chapter 10 of *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll And Mr. Hyde*.

  In chapter 10 of *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll And Mr. Hyde* (Stevenson, 1886/2018), the passage “a great chocolate-coloured pall lowered over heaven […] and there would be a glow of a rich, lurid brown […] like a district of some city in a nightmare” describes the surroundings with the colour brown to mirror Mr Utterson’s feelings of being ill-at-ease as he is about to visit Mr Hyde. In the storyline, this passage follows the discovery of the Carew murder, killed by Mr Hyde in a struggle between his two personalities: Jekyll and Hyde. Here, the terms “chocolate coloured pall” is an allusion to the Carew murder through the lexical field of death. The terms “chocolate-coloured” and “brown” showcase the colour which is the SD in this correspondence; and Mr Utterson’s discomfort is the TD, expressed through the terms “lurid” or “nightmare”. Therefore, the following metaphor can be formulated: **DISCOMFORT IS BROWN**. The most salient characteristic of the SD is the dirt and decay it suggests, mirroring the character’s discomfort after the Carew murder. Additionally, brown is a colour obtained when mixing other colours together (Edwards, 2004, p. 74), which can be linked to Jekyll and Hyde’s mixed personalities. This mix of personalities is at the heart of the Carew murder: the “nightmare” the city of London awoke to.
Moreover, the term “pall” suggests death and decay (which is typically brown), alluding to the Carew murder. This metaphor builds the ambience of the scene whilst conveying to readers how Mr Utterson feels and why that might be.

- **UNEASINESS IS GREY**

  This metaphor is featured in chapter 1 of *Dracula* and chapter 9 of *The Woman in Black*.

  In *The Woman in Black* (Hill, 1983/2011, pp.106-107) the passage “I could hardly see the division between land and water, water and sky, all was a uniform grey […] It was not a day calculated to raise the spirits and I felt unrefreshed and nervous after the previous night” shows the mirroring of Arthur’s feeling of uneasiness and depression onto the grey aspect of his surroundings. The terms “unrefreshed and nervous” convey Arthur’s feelings of depressed uneasiness (the TD). The phrase “all was a uniform of grey” convey the colour grey’s omnipresence (the SD). Therefore, the metaphor **UNEASINESS IS GREY** can be formulated. The mixed tone of the colour grey is the most salient characteristic mapped onto the TD: it is a mix of white and black and combined with the lack of clear distinction between the grey tones of the water and the sky thus conveying the uncertainty that Arthur feels and how depressed he is to awaken at the manor.

- **MOURNING IS BLACK**

  This metaphor is featured in chapter 10 of *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll And Mr. Hyde*, and in chapter 1 of *Bleak House*.

  In *Bleak House* (Dickens, 1852/2012) the sentence “smoke lowering down from chimney-pots, making a soft black drizzle, with flakes of soot in it as big as full-grown
snowflakes—gone into mourning, one might imagine, for the death of the sun” illustrates the link between the colour black and death. The terms “chimney-pots”, “black”, and “soot” display the presence of the colour black (the SD). The terms “mourning” and “death” convey the idea of death (the TD), thus generating the metaphor MOURNING IS BLACK. The black colour tone of the chimney is mapped onto the TD of MOURNING and mirrors the traditional funerary colours in Great Britain. Since soot and chimneys are omnipresent in the settings, it conveys that MOURNING is also prevalent in the story.

So far, I have discussed the metaphor BAD IS DARK, but I now explore how the metaphor GOOD IS LIGHT is also featured in my corpus. In section 5.1.2.1, I discussed the metaphor HAPPINESS IS A SUNNY DAY present in my corpus under the MM EMOTION IS NATURAL FORCE. This metaphor is linked to the current metaphor discussed: GOOD IS LIGHT. In section 5.2.4.1 I give the example of stave 5 of A Christmas Carol where the terms “bright” and “sunlight” (in this instance, begat by the sun) refer to the light present in the scene (the SD). It mirrors Scrooge’s happiness (the TD), leading to the metaphor GOOD IS LIGHT.

Similarly, in chapter 11 of Jane Eyre (Brontë, 1847/2007; see section 5.1.2.3), Jane’s positive emotions are rendered explicit by the terms “gay” and “my spirit rose up”; and are mirrored by the light present in the room conveyed by “bright” and “sun shone”. The mapping that emerges is that Jane’s positive emotion is the TD and the light present in the room is the SD, thus providing the metaphor GOOD IS LIGHT. The metaphor conveys how Jane feels in this particular setting, not just in the room but at Thornfield. The extract portrays the first time Jane sees Thornfield in the daytime, and her feeling of contentment and bliss mirrors the rest of the story: Thornfield will become
her home. So far in the story, the description of surroundings featured negative elements, such as the description of the opening discussed in sections 4.2.2 and 5.1.2.3. The positive emotion conveyed through the light present in Thornfield creates a contrast in the narration.

Finally, a specific colour metaphor related to GOOD IS LIGHT is present in the corpus: LUCK IS GOLD. For instance, in *Spring Offensive* (Owen, 1917/2020), the phrase “the buttercups had blessed with gold their slow boots” indicates that the bright colour of the flowers is seen as a rare pleasure for the soldiers, a lucky sighting. The verb “had blessed” personifies the flowers and conveys the factor of luck of the sighting (the TD); the noun “buttercups” and adjective “gold” showcase the colour gold (the SD), thus generating the metaphor LUCK IS GOLD. The colour and the rarity of these flowers on a battlefield are the most salient characteristics of the SD mapped onto the TD: the soldiers are lucky to see these flowers, but also to still be alive despite the ongoing war.

In this section, I demonstrated that PF is a conceptual metaphor, whose general mapping is EMOTION IS SURROUNDINGS, and can at times link to other foundational conventional metaphors (i.e. orientational metaphors). Finally, I presented the most common MM in my corpus, indicating that PF can have a recurrent metaphorical function in texts. These included: EMOTION IS NATURAL FORCE which includes the weather and natural elements, EMOTION IS VERTICAL ORIENTATION which focuses on upward and downward motions, and EMOTION IS COLOUR TONE which includes light and dark contrasts as well as specific colours. This section revolved around the explanation of the processing of such metaphors, however, their wider effects for interpretation were not discussed thoroughly. The next section aims to remedy to this by analysing the four effects of PF identified in my corpus.
5.2 Effects of PF

Although PF’s metaphorical function and definition remain the same in texts, the overall effect of PF during the reading process can differ from text to text and scene to scene. This section aims to present the four main effects of PF identified in my corpus and to provide examples of interpretation. They are:

- communicating implicit emotions explicitly or in a way that readers are able to interpret,
- the building of ambience in the scene,
- the contribution to characterisation,
- foreshadowing in the storyline.

In certain texts, PF can have varied or even combined effects. The sections 5.2.2 to 5.2.5 provide greater details and concrete textual examples of those effects paired with a discussion. However, due to practical reasons, I do not provide the complete texts suggested by the participant, simply the relevant extracts needed to highlight how those effects of PF can be perceived and interpreted in texts.

5.2.1 Effect 1 of PF: communication of implicit emotions

The first effect of PF emerging from my analysis is the communication of implicit emotions in a way that readers are able to interpret. This is the most common effect of PF in my corpus, as it fulfils PF’s basic definition: the projection of emotions onto the surroundings. Each text from the corpus features it to some degree: in some texts, the emotions are explicitly expressed, and the effect of PF is that it reinforces that emotion. However, in other texts, emotions are implicit and need to be inferred through
linguistic elements. In those instances, the effect of PF is to render those emotions inferable by mirroring them through the surroundings.

In section 4.1.1, I defined emotions as an internal or external response to an event holding a positive or negative meaning for individuals (Salovey and Mayer, 1990, p.186). This definition is broad and englobes the following nuances: mood, dispositions, preferences, personality traits, physical feelings, emotional states, and affects, lasting any length of time. According to Palmer (2001, p.113; see also Middleton, 1989) emotions do not need to be explicitly expressed to be “visible and public” as they can “result in outward signs of behavior such as turning away, being unable to speak, blushing or crying”. As discussed in section 5.1.1.1, Kövecses (2008b, p.382) also explains that emotions can be implicitly presented through conceptual metonymies as they “indicate certain physical aspects of the body involved in emotion”. Therefore, since emotions and PF are closely linked, it is possible for emotions to be explicitly or implicitly featured in a text.

Miall (2006; 2014) discusses a study conducted to test how feelings play a role in readers’ understanding. The study had participants read the opening of Woolf’s short story Together and Apart (1936/2012), where Miss Anning and Mr Serle are introduced and start chatting. As Miall (2014, p.428) puts it: “the phrases of the story can be placed in one of two categories: either indicating a possible relationship of the two characters, or describing the setting (which includes the sky and the moon)”. This is particularly interesting as it suggests that the characters’ relationship and the surroundings are ambiguously linked. The participants were divided into two groups: group 1 rated phrases from the story for intensity of feelings and then attempted to recall phrases from their reading. Group 2 rated phrases’ importance. The overall aim
was to determine if the characters’ relationship or the surroundings were more prominent to readers.

Amongst the findings, the first group recalled relationship phrases more frequently than they did for setting phrases. On the other hand, the second group rated the relationship phrases as equally important as the setting phrases. Miall (2014, p.429) explains:

readers were able to draw upon the sky and setting phrases for their felt potential in re-construing the meaning of the story. The strong feeling attached to such phrases, in other words, tended to predict their subsequent importance in understanding the story. Some readers showed an awareness of an undercurrent created by references to the sky and setting, which might either support or cut across the relationship. [...] At first most readers gave prominence to only one – the prospective relationship. But, after the possibility of this declines on the second or third page, responses by the end of the story showed that readers had turned to the sky and setting descriptions to provide an alternative construal of the story. At the same time the traditional romantic associations of the moon have had to shift: the sky and moon now signified emptiness and the impossibility of genuine communication.

The study shows readers drawing on the surroundings to understand and interpret characters’ feelings and relationships: it is an effect of PF. To illustrate that Miall’s
findings depict the effect of PF in Woolf’s *Together and Apart* (1926/2012), I provide the opening of the short story (with my numbering):

Mrs. Dalloway introduced them, saying you will like him.(1) The conversation began some minutes before anything was said, for both Mr. Serle and Miss Arming looked at the sky and in both of their minds the sky went on pouring its meaning though very differently, until the presence of Mr. Serle by her side became so distinct to Miss Anning that she could not see the sky, simply, itself, any more, but the sky shored up by the tall body, dark eyes, grey hair, clasped hands, the stern melancholy (but she had been told “falsely melancholy”) face of Roderick Serle, and, knowing how foolish it was, she yet felt impelled to say:(2)

"What a beautiful night!"(3)

Foolish! Idiotically foolish!(4) But if one mayn't be foolish at the age of forty in the presence of the sky, which makes the wisest imbecile—mere wisps of straw—she and Mr. Serle atoms, motes, standing there at Mrs. Dalloway’s window, and their lives, seen by moonlight, as long as an insect's and no more important.(5)

"Well!" said Miss Arming, patting the sofa cushion emphatically.(6) And down he sat beside her.(7) Was he "falsely melancholy," as they said?(8) Prompted by the sky, which seemed to make it all a little futile—what they said, what they did—she said something perfectly commonplace again:(9)
"There was a Miss Serle who lived at Canterbury when I was a girl there."(10)

With the sky in his mind, all the tombs of his ancestors immediately appeared to Mr. Serle in a blue romantic light, and his eyes expanding and darkening, he said: "Yes. [...]"(11)

The story features PF’s three criteria: animated entities (“Miss Arming” and “Mr Serle”), emotions (“like”, “melancholia”, “romantic”), and surroundings (“sky”, “moonlight”, “light”). The term “sky” is this analysis’s focus, along with the characters’ emotions. The “sky” is foregrounded by parallelism as it is repeated seven times in the extract. The scene showcases an arranged meeting between a male and a female character which ends up being dull and mundane despite Mrs Dalloway’s prediction “you will like him”. Miss Arming and Mr Serle do not dissociate themselves from the framework of “unwritten law and social customs” (Besnault-Levita, 2008, p.6), despite how it might make them feel. There is a “sense of failure” associated with the characters’ conversation, which contributes to their feeling of isolation (Besnault-Levita, 2008, pp.7-8).

The surroundings of the sky highlighted by the moonlight convey how apart the characters are, the space and immensity of the sky mirrors their feelings of irrelevance, as shown by the phrase “and their lives, seen by moonlight, as long as an insect’s and no more important”. The mention of the “moonlight” is also significant as it highlights the sky, and mirrors the characters’ loneliness: they are as alone as the moon, the Earth’s only satellite. The discussion the characters share is brief, they only talk to each other in sentences 3, 6, 10, and 11. Their speech highlights that they are
observing social protocols, but their stream of consciousness is preponderant, using the sky repeatedly to describe the scene and their feelings.

As the title suggests with an oxymoron, throughout their encounter, both characters feel ill-at-ease because, as their inner thoughts show, they do not feel free to be themselves, and inevitably are indeed together yet apart (Besnault-Levita, 2008, p.9). The sky’s vastness and its prevalence in both characters’ thoughts mirrors their feelings of isolation, loneliness, and melancholia: that is the effect of PF in this extract. Emotions that would otherwise remain implicit are reflected and emphasised by the surroundings for readers to interpret. In this instance, the TD is the characters’ feeling of isolation, and the SD is the sky, its most salient feature here being its immensity. Therefore, the following mapping emerges: ISOLATION IS SKY which falls under the MM EMOTION IS NATURAL FORCE (section 5.1.2.2), or the MM BAD IS DARK (section 5.1.2.4) as the scene happens at night ("moonlight"). Both characters are isolated despite the moon’s ‘romantic’ association in the text ("moonlight", “blue romantic light”), which both characters are aware of. This is ironic, as although both characters perceive the setting of the scene as romantic, they are distant from one another, thus further contributing to their sense of loneliness.

Interestingly, this example from Together and Apart can also be considered to be an example of the converse of PF (see section 4.2.3.5) in addition to an instance of PF as argued above. Indeed, the irony of the characters feeling lonely despite being together in a romantic setting ("moonlight", “blue romantic light”) creates a contrast that is foregrounded as it does not comply with the social norms explained above, or with Mrs Dalloway’s expectations. Therefore, depending on readers' interpretation of this text, it can be both PF and/or its converse. This phenomenon aligns with Short’s views on interpretation discussed in section 4.1.3: he argues that those slight
differences (as we have here) are in fact “slightly different instantiations of the same interpretation” (Short, 2008, pp.13-14). In this instance, whether readers interpret the text as featuring PF and/or its converse ultimately leads to a similar overall effect on the perception of the characters’ feelings and relationship which is the focus of the story.

In his analysis, Miall (2006, 2014) discusses this relationship between the surroundings and the characters’ feelings in *Together and Apart*, however, he does not mention the term “PF”. This exemplifies my argument that the effects of PF are discussed in linguistic and literary analysis, but are not always linked to the term itself, as discussed in section 1.2.3.

Another example of this effect of PF from my corpus can be observed in Walker’s *The Flowers* (1973, pp.119-120): a short story following Myop, a ten-year-old girl who leaves her house to gather wildflowers in the woods at the end of a summer day, as she has done many times before. This time, she stumbles across a man’s corpse (“he had been a tall man”; “she stepped smack into his eyes”, “her heel became lodged in the broken ridge between brow and nose”, “she saw his naked grin”, “his head lay beside him”, p.120), possibly killed by lynching as a “noose” is found around the remains of his neck (Walker, 1973, p.120). The first paragraph of the extract is Myop’s reaction leading to her discovery, and the second paragraph is the last paragraph of the story (with my numbering):

She had often been as far before, but the strangeness of the land made it not as pleasant as her usual haunts.(1) It seemed gloomy in the little cove in which she found herself.(2) The air was damp, the silence close
and deep.(3) Myop began to circle back to the house, back to the peacefulness of the morning.(4)

[...] Very near where she'd stepped into the head was a wild pink rose.(5) As she picked it to add to her bundle she noticed a raised mound, a ring, around the rose's root.(6) It was the rotted remains of a noose, a bit of shredding plowline, now blending benignly into the soil.(7) Around an overhanging limb of a great spreading oak clung another piece.(8) Frayed, rotted, bleached, and frazzled-barely there—but spinning restlessly in the breeze.(9) Myop laid down her flowers.(10) And the summer was over.(11)

PF’s three criteria are present: an animated entity is conveyed by personal deictic terms such as “Myop” or “she”. The description of the setting is a focal point in the piece and the surroundings can be identified through the lexical field of natural elements (“cove”, “air”, “wild pink rose”, “flowers”, “soil”, “oak”). No emotion is explicitly featured in the text, but an impression is however clearly stated: “it seemed gloomy in the little cove”, which could be closely linked to emotions. I argue sentence (11) “and the summer was over” is a metaphor for Myop’s emotional state.

First, the lexical field of lynching is observed (i.e. “noose”, “plowline”, “overhanging limb”). The story was first published in 1973 in a book entitled In Love and Trouble: Stories of Black Women, less than a decade after the Civil Rights Movement in the United States. The lexical field combined with the story’s publication context, indicate that the man found by Myop died of lynching. This is linked to Myop’s
characterization and to the event that will change her emotional state, which is reflected by the change of season, thus fulfilling PF’s definition given in section 4.2.1.

Additionally, all sentences in the passages are complex, except for the last two sentences (10-11). Hence, these two sentences are foregrounded by internal deviation. Although they are simple sentences, they are linked by the coordinating conjunction “and”, connecting their meaning as a logical development of the action. This suggests that for the summer to be over, Myop must lay down her flowers first. This is crucial in the narrative: there is a symbolic link between Myop and the flowers she gathers throughout the story. Myop’s habit of singing and collecting flowers are attributed to her age in the story. Logically, the fact that Myop lays down her flowers cannot trigger a season to end. The link between those two simple sentences is symbolic: the term “summer” here is a metaphor for Myop’s childlike innocence, which was represented by her gathering of flowers. The sight of the (likely lynched) man’s remains is a trigger leading Myop to lose her innocence and childhood oblivion. This symbolic metaphor is foregrounded by external deviation, and it contributes to PF and the explicit communication of Myop’s emotions by associating summer with her state of mind.

This extract narrates Myop’s reaction to finding a man’s remains in the woods. Her emotions are not clearly expressed, but through linguistic elements, Myop’s negative feelings can be inferred. The use of PF here allows the text to convey Myop’s state of mind implicitly, which would otherwise not be clear to readers. With the shift in season transpires a shift in Myop’s state of mind, contributing to her characterisation (see section 5.2.4 for a discussion on characterisation). The context of publication of the story and the allusion to lynching suggest that Myop might come to the realisation of the struggles of minorities, which would also contribute to her change of viewpoint.
Therefore, PF in this instance shows this shift in her character, thus contributing to her characterisation overall.

A potential reason why Myop’s emotions are not clearly expressed could be because she is a young girl: she might not be able to process what she is seeing and experiencing, in a way that would allow her to label it. Using PF to portray her state of mind, even in a somewhat vague manner, conveys her feelings to readers, without needing to label those feelings for them to be understood. Therefore, in this extract, the effect of PF is that it expresses Myop’s feelings and state of mind, which would otherwise be implicit, in a concrete way, as a change in seasons is a universal concept. There is a certain realism in the scene as the manner of portraying the emotions involved (implicitly – almost not at all) reflects the only implicit understanding of those emotions by Myop herself, possibly because she is not old enough to deal with or acknowledge the trauma of her experience described in the passage.

PF’s metaphorical function can be analysed as such: Myop’s emotions (regardless of how implicit they may be) are the TD and the season is the SD, thus creating the cross-domain mapping EMOTION IS SEASON, which falls under the MM EMOTION IS NATURAL FORCE. The most salient feature of the seasons mapped onto Myop’s emotions is their everchanging and shifting nature, mirroring the shift of Myop’s emotional state from before to after her discovery and trauma.

In this section, the first effect PF was illustrated: the communication of implicit emotions explicitly, or in a way that readers are able to interpret. In sections 1.2.2 and 1.2.4, I observed that some scholars such as Thomas (1961), Nishimura (2003), Abel (2013), Earnhardt (2016) focus on ‘pathos’, that is to the say the emotional factor conveyed by PF. This section illustrates why the notion of emotion is so central to PF: its primary function is to communicate emotions through imagery, and in an aesthetic
way (Earnhardt, 2016, p.17). Textual examples were provided and analysed to illustrate how this effect of PF can impact our interpretation of a text, particularly regarding characters’ emotions. In the next section, the second effect of PF I identified, building ambience, is discussed.

5.2.2 Effect 2 of PF: building ambience

The second effect of PF I identified in my corpus is the building of ambience in a scene. As seen in chapter 3, the surroundings’ description in a text with PF is crucial to our understanding of emotions, and they are portrayed through linguistic elements (i.e. personification, lexical fields). This description provides information on the surroundings but may also contribute to the atmosphere of the scene, allowing readers to further experience it.

To discuss this effect of PF, it is first necessary to define what is meant by ‘atmosphere’ and ‘ambience’. Stockwell (2014) explains that ‘atmosphere’ is often used interchangeably with the term ‘tone’, although they have their distinct nuances: atmosphere relays readers’ perception of a literary world, whereas tone relays a perception of the authorial or narratorial voice. Atmosphere tends to be associated with spaces, locations, and surroundings (Stockwell, 2014, p.360), but it can also be linked to emotions: “a piece of writing can be ‘atmospheric’ if the description it presents seems to draw readers in and engage in the ambient feeling of the world denoted” (Stockwell, 2014, p.361). Since tone conveys authorial and narratorial voices, connotations and emotions can also be represented. Therefore, atmosphere and tone have the potential to contribute to the effect of PF because both concepts are linked to its criteria.
However, in certain instances it can be difficult to distinguish texts’ atmosphere and tone. Stockwell (2014, p.360) argues that the concepts of ‘atmosphere’ and ‘tone’ are used in a “vague impressionistic sense, roughly covering the notion that a particular passage of a literary work has a discernible ambience, a quality that is often qualified by an emotional effect: sinister, positive, melancholy, playful, elegiac, sunny and so on”. Stockwell (2014, p.365, his emphasis) explains that atmosphere and tone have boundaries that are difficult to pinpoint:

the two concepts of atmosphere and tone are closely related and thus have a fuzzy boundary, and also because the traditional linguistic account of diction, lexical semantics and the systemic-functional version of register are not adequate for our needs here. An alternative, cognitive poetic account might begin by regarding atmosphere and tone as the global effects of *ambience*. By this I mean the delicate sense of a halo of associations, some barely conscious, some subliminal but coalescing cumulatively across a stretch of discourse. A word, phrase, syntactic sequence, verse placement, poetic form, rhyme or extended varied metaphor (and so on) might all contribute to a sense of ambience.

Therefore, for the rest of this thesis, the term ‘ambience’ is used as it combines the notions of atmosphere and tone.

To illustrate how ambience can be analysed in texts, Stockwell uses the example of the poem *La Belle Dame Sans Merci* (Keats, 1819/2020) which also features in my corpus. The poem portrays a wandering knight who meets an enchantress. The enchantress seduces the knight and brings him to her elfin cave
where she gives him intoxicating “roots”. The aim of this example is to comment on Stockwell’s analysis of how ambience is constructed and its effect on the poem. I argue it occurs through PF. It is worth pointing out that, similarly to section 5.2.1, here PF is discussed by Stockwell in terms of ambience, whereas Miall (2006, 2014) discusses it in terms of emotions. This reinforces the point made in section 1.2.3: although little dedicated research of PF has been conducted in stylistics, it is arguably discussed under different headings within other analyses. Below is an extract of the poem also analysed by Stockwell (2014, pp.370-371), with my numbering:

(1) And there she lullèd me asleep,
(2) And there I dreamed—Ah! woe betide!—
(3) The latest dream I ever dreamt
(4) On the cold hill side.

(5) I saw pale kings and princes too,
(6) Pale warriors, death-pale were they all;
(7) They cried—‘La Belle Dame sans Merci
(8) Thee hath in thrall!’

(9) I saw their starved lips in the gloam,
(10) With horrid warning gapèd wide,
(11) And I awoke and found me here,
(12) On the cold hill’s side.

(13) And this is why I sojourn here,
(14) Alone and palely loitering,

(15) Though the sedge is withered from the lake,

(16) And no birds sing.

Literary critics (e.g. Kelley, 1987) observe that La Belle Dame Sans Merci features aspects of Romanticism: the omnipresence of nature and the free expression of emotions. Stockwell (2014, p.370) argues the poem’s ambience allows for the description of the knight’s allegorical qualities, the enchantress, and other objects. As I am primarily concerned with PF, I do not comment on Stockwell’s entire analysis, but on his observations on the mirroring of the knight’s emotions onto the surroundings and the ambience emerging from this mapping.

PF’s three criteria are present: the animated entities are the knight and the enchantress, the surroundings are natural elements (i.e. “cold hill side”, “sedge is withered from the lake”, “birds”), but there is a shift in the scene’s description: when the knight first meets the enchantress (not quoted above), terms with a positive connotation portray the surroundings (“rose”, “lily”, “light”, “fragrant”, “meads”). Once the enchantress puts the knight to sleep in her cave, the terms used to describe the surroundings in his dream have a negative connotation. The emotions present in the scene also shift: when the knight first meets the enchantress, the lexical field of love and lust is present (“anguish moist”, “love”, “sweet moan”, “I love thee true”, “kisses”). However, during the knight’s dream and when he awakens, the enchantress is referred to as “sans merci” (French for ‘without pity’) and negative emotions are expressed (“horrid”, “cried”, “alone”). Therefore, the shift in surroundings mirrors the shift in the knight’s and enchantress’ relationship: the surroundings are positive when they are intimate, and negative when the knight is alone.
Stockwell also comments on the shifts that occur in the poem: he describes a shift in the knight’s experiences. First the narrative portrays a “dream” which is a recurring theme foregrounded by parallelism due to the repetitions present in the extract (“dream”, “lulled”, “asleep”, “awoke”). Although dreams are “almost universally positive [...] associated with happy, vivid scenarios”, here the dream is “more like a nightmare” because of the negative connotation its description has (Stockwell, 2014, p.371; see also Giovanelli, 2013). Lexical negation is foregrounded by parallelism as it is prevalent in the dream’s description: (“pale”, “cried”, “sans” (French for ‘without’), “starved”, “horrid warning”, “alone”, “no”). This shift occurs between the first and the second stanza of the extract: the first stanza portrays the knight falling asleep with a positive connotation, whereas the rest of the extract showcases his nightmare. The last stanza of the poem mirrors the first (not quoted here), but this repetition is not identical due to the shift from positive to negative ambience after the knight awakens. Stockwell (2014, p.371, my emphasis) observes:

The gradual immersive structure into the knight’s narrative, and then into his seduction, and finally into his dream/nightmare is effected not only by the deictic shifts, but also by the increasingly vivid and sensual ambience of the deepest immersion; the sharp contrast then with the pale, bleak ambience of the ending is all the more keenly felt.

He also concludes that the first-person narrative and the shift in ambience allows for readers to perceive the knight’s prominent emotions; the surroundings of the dream allow readers to perceive how the knight feels through the ambience they create. This is PF’s definition (section 4.2.1): the knight’s emotions are reflected onto his
surroundings (real and dreamt), and this reflection builds the ambience for the end of
the narrative. The TD in PF’s mapping is the knight’s emotions: first of love and lust,
and then of loneliness. The SD is the natural elements that surround him, first
abundant and then deprived. Therefore, the following mapping can be observed:
EMOTION IS NATURAL ELEMENTS, and the most salient feature of the natural elements is
their abundance, or lack thereof.

Another type of ambience emphasised by PF is suspense. According to Carroll
(1996, p.147) suspense is dependent on factors of uncertainty in the narrative. Carroll
explains that this factor of uncertainty does not disappear when a reader or audience
are already familiar with the plot: this is called the “suspense paradox” (Carroll, 1996,
pp.147-150). Iwata (2009, p.253) builds on Carroll’s notion of uncertainty and defines
literary suspense as such:

The protagonist faces a conflict with other character(s), narrative
situations, or within the self. In the opposition, the protagonist faces a
situation where he or she fears losing something or someone important
to them. In the case of someone important, the person is a trigger-
character more directly troubled. The situation has two opposing
outcomes—a hoped for one and an unhoped for one—which are readily
foreseeable. Until a resolution or conclusion is presented, a state of
aroused uncertainty continues (for a short while at least).

Iwata’s definition of literary suspense is relevant to my corpus, which is composed of
literary texts. When examining those instances in which PF is used to build the
ambience and convey a suspenseful scene, the protagonist is indeed facing a
conflicting situation causing an uncertain denouement. PF’s effect of building ambience and at times contributing to suspense is common in my corpus and is often combined with other effects. Ambience building can translate to suspense building, particularly when a key event of the plot happens.

To illustrate how PF contributes to building suspense through ambience, I analyse an extract from act 2 scene 3 of Macbeth (Shakespeare, 1606/2014, pp.34-35, my numbering) suggested by a participant. This passage is Lennox’s description of the night during which King Duncan was murdered by Macbeth. The body is on the verge of being discovered and announced to the court. As I am not aiming to analyse PF in the extract but to comment on its effects in terms of ambience and suspense, the analysis is brief.

Lennox:
The night has been unruly: where we lay,(1) Our chimneys were blown down; and, as they say,(2) Lamentings heard i’ the air; strange screams of death,(3) And prophesying with accents terrible(4) Of dire combustion and confused events(5) New hatch’d to the woeful time: the obscure bird(6) Clamour’d the livelong night: some say, the earth(7) Was feverous and did shake.(8)

This extract showcases Lennox’s description of the night of King Duncan’s murder which happened in act 2 scene 3. Lennox is unaware of the murder, but readers know. This dramatic irony (or as Carroll (1996) puts it, “suspense paradox”)
builds the suspense: readers expect the characters (here Lennox) to find King Duncan’s body soon.

PF’s criteria are present: as this is a play, there are characters depicted through person deixis (“Lennox”, “some”, “they”, “we”) indicating the presence of animated entities. There is also a lexical field of the environment: “night”, “air”, “bird”, and “earth”, indicating the surroundings, and a lexical field of negative emotions and impressions: “lamentings”, “woeful”, “terrible”, “confused” highlighting how Lennox feels about his night. The combination of the negative emotions reflected by the eerie surroundings (“the night has been unruly”, “the earth was feverous and did shake”, “strange screams of death”) creates a tense and negative ambience for readers to perceive.

However, Lennox does not know why he has spent such a dreadful night, and he does not know why he feels so “confused” or “terrible”. This adds to the suspense, particularly since the audience knows. This follows Iwata’s idea: until the conflict is resolved – here when Lennox finds out about the murder – suspense is created and keeps the audience engaged. PF contributes to building the scene’s dark and negative ambience to mirror the twisted events that took place in the night, and it represents a step closer for Lennox to discover what happened to Duncan.

The metaphorical function of PF in this text can be interpreted in two ways. Firstly, the scene occurs at night in the dark and those settings mirror Lennox’s anguish. Therefore, Lennox’s negative emotion is the TD, and the darkness is the SD of the cross-domain mapping BAD IS DARK (section 5.1.2.4). Secondly, Lennox’s anguish is mirrored by the storm happening outside. In this instance, Lennox’s anxiety is the TD, and the SD is the wind, thus creating the cross-domain mapping ANXIETY IS STORM. Here the unpredictability and the physical tension of the storm is the most salient feature of the mapping, as it is associated with the plot’s tension.
In this section, I explained the second effect of PF in my corpus: building ambience, using textual examples. In the next section, I discuss the third effect of PF: building characters.

### 5.2.3 Effect 3 of PF: building characters

The third effect of PF in my corpus is its contribution to characterisation. PF provides a representation of the characters’ emotions, and as Palmer (2004, p.113) explains: “the presentation of emotion plays a vital part in the creation of a character”. Therefore, in this section I discuss how the linguistic elements that contribute to PF also contribute to building characters.

Much previous research has focused on categorising characters (Knight, 1963; Harvey, 1965; Chatman, 1978; Margolin, 1983, 2007; Forster, 1985; amongst others). However, this aspect of characterisation is not crucial to the present discussion on PF. In this section I discuss how characters are linguistically built, regardless of the category they belong in, or as Culpeper (2001, p.1) puts it “my concern is mainly the process of characterisation rather than the character - the output of that process”. As McIntyre (2014, p.159) explains, in stylistics, characterisation is “the cognitive process by which readers comprehend fictional characters. In effect, characterisation is the process of forming an impression of a character in your head as you read”.

Culpeper’s (2001) model of characterisation is “the most articulated account of character in fiction to date” (Leech and Short, 2007, p.297). It draws on literature, psychology, stylistics, and cognitive stylistics. It combines ‘bottom-up’ processes (taking cues from the text itself to trigger our impression of characters) and ‘top-down’ processes (our prior knowledge or ‘schemas’ used to inform our impression of characters). ‘Schemas’ are “cluster[s] of concepts […] involving generic knowledge”
used to represent events, precepts, relations, situations, and objects (Eysenck and Keane, 1990, p.275; see also Bartlett, 1995; Culpeper, 2001, pp.63-65). Top-down impressions of characters can be constructed around their social roles (kinship, relations, occupations), their group membership categories (i.e. age, sex, religion, nationality), and their personal categories evolving around their interests, traits, habits, and goals (Culpeper, 2001, pp.75-76). Readers use their own schemas when mentally representing the characters in each of these categories.

Culpeper explains that textual cues can contribute to bottom-up processing of characters, and those cues can be explicit, implicit, or authorial. Explicit cues are how a character is presented (by themselves, other characters, narrator, or author), such as their names, physical and personality descriptions, amongst other cues. Implicit cues, on the other hand, are inferences readers make based on the text, such as conversational implicature and structure, accent and dialect, visual features, amongst others. Authorial cues are cues that “do not directly arise from the character […] [they are] cues over which the character notionally has no power of choice” and are thus more associated with the author (Culpeper, 2001, p.229). However, as McIntyre (2014, p.157) points out: “it would perhaps be more accurate to describe all characterisation cues as authorial but to specify at which discourse level of the text they operate”. Indeed, explicit and implicit cues are ultimately authorial cues as they stem from the author’s choice. Therefore, following McIntyre’s example, when using Culpeper’s model of characterisation, I simply discuss explicit and implicit cues.

Some researchers such as George (2002, p.375) argue that “Culpeper has not gone far enough in his enumeration of textual cues”. Although it is true that not all textual cues are explored in Culpeper’s model, I suggest the list of textual cues provided is not exhaustive but simply an illustration to show the model’s inner
workings, which can then be applied onto other texts. An example of textual cues that has yet to be explored in Culpeper’s model is figurative language such as PF (Pager-McClymont, 2021, p.114, 116). Figurative language is crucial in the portrayal of characters’ emotions, as Abbott (2008, p.118) states: “verbal narration […] draws on figurative language, particularly metaphors. Often on the page what is internal to a character comes out in metaphorical language”. Therefore, this section aims to underpin how PF and its criteria contribute to building characters.

Culpeper (2001, pp.34-37) produces a diagram to show how readers comprehend characters when reading. To understand how PF and its criteria contribute to the characterisation process, I first observe where they occur in the model:
Culpeper does not claim for this diagram to be directly representative but "idealised and simplified" as diagrams are two-dimensional and static, unlike human minds which are dynamic (Culpeper, 2001, pp.34-35). In this diagram, solid boxes are important and identifiable components in text comprehension, whereas the dotted boxes are components specific to characters. Arrows show the link between the

---

**Figure 5.1: PF and its criteria on Culpeper’s diagram of characterisation (2001).**
components and the combination of top-down and bottom-up processes. The main components drawn on in this section are the situation model, textbase, and surface structure (for a full explanation of this model see Culpeper, 2001, pp.36-37). The situation model is a combination of prior knowledge and elements found in the text itself to create a representation of meaning. It includes character inferences such as their emotions, beliefs, personality traits. Textbase is the meaning representation that only includes the prepositional content of text, some of which relates to characters. It also includes the storage of information not immediately needed in the scene, but which can be used later on. Surface structure includes the linguistic choices attributed to characters, it undergoes syntactic and semantic analyses to form the textbase.

Now that I have introduced the key components present in Culpeper’s diagram, I can explain where PF and its criteria feature on it, and why:

\[c\] stands for **PF’s criteria** (animated entities, emotions, surroundings). PF’s criteria are placed at the top-down and bottom-up connection points of the situation model, textbase, and surface structure components. The criteria can be inferred from varied textual cues discussed by Culpeper (i.e. discourse presentation, actions, or descriptions) and this occurs between textbase and surface structure components. However, readers also engage their prior knowledge of these criteria and compare them to their own experiences, which occurs in the situation model. Each of these criteria draw on our existing knowledge: our experience of particular places, natural elements, weather; our experience of feeling a certain way in a specific situation, or our knowledge of real people and fictional characters. Those experiences can be triggered by the text, just as they can influence our experience of the text. Thus, perceiving and representing characters’ emotions through surroundings is a blend of
these processes, which is why I pinpointed the criteria to the connection point of all three components.

PF stands for the concept of PF as an extended metaphor. It is placed on the situation model component of the diagram, as this component reflects readers’ mental representations of the situations presented in texts. This means that mappings from conceptual metaphors such as PF are perceived in this component. Hence, PF’s linguistic indicators and criteria are textual cues of PF, whereas PF (like other metaphors, see Pager-McClymont, 2021) is an implicit textual cue of characterisation in Culpeper’s model, as it contributes to the representation of characters’ emotions within the situation model. As pointed out in section 4.1.1, the definition of emotion used in this thesis is broad and includes personality traits, preferences, moods, feelings, or emotional states, meaning any element of language (such as PF) has the potential to build characters.

To illustrate this point and how figurative language such as PF can contribute to characterisation and to apply Culpeper’s model, I use the opening of Jane Eyre (Brontë, 1847/2007), which is the prototypical example of PF put forth in section 4.2.2. Firstly, readers’ top-down processing of Jane’s character should be discussed based on the analysis in section 4.2.2:

- Social role: she is a child, lives with her aunt and cousins
- Group membership: she is a British female in the 19th century thus likely Christian, middle-class
- Personal categories: she does not enjoy living with her aunt and cousins, does not like cold or wet weather, does not like to walk, sarcastic.
There is a contrast in Jane’s presentation depending on the cues understudy. The top-down processing of Jane’s character is informed by explicit cues originating from Jane herself or by other characters, such as “I never liked long walks”, “dreadful to me was the coming home in the raw twilight”, “heart saddened by the chidings of Bessie”, “she really must exclude me from privileges intended only for contented, happy, little children”. Those cues present Jane as a negative and difficult child, almost ungrateful to Mrs Reed who is raising her despite Jane not being her daughter, as the irony in the discourse presentation shows. This puts Jane’s character in a category of a DIFFICULT CHILD.

On the other hand, when implicit cues highlighting how Jane feels are considered, a “recategorisation” (Culpeper, 2001, pp.84-85) occurs: she goes from being a DIFFICULT CHILD to triggering the schema of the UGLY DUCKLING (Gilbert, 1977, p.783). To explain this recategorization, I analyse implicit cues (such as PF) conveying Jane’s emotions, as I argue the shift in category occurs when Jane’s feelings are taken into consideration, over her explicit description.

An example of an implicit cue contributing to Jane’s bottom-up processing can be observed in the syntactic iconicity of the phrase “me, she had dispensed from the room”, which isolates the subject “me” (Jane) from the rest of the clause, thus mirroring the meaning of the phrase. Furthermore, the last sentence of the extract features Jane’s caricature of Mrs Reed through free indirect speech. This implicit cue contributes to Jane’s and Mrs Reed’s characterisations: Jane’s sarcasm comes through, letting readers know that not only does she disagree with Mrs Reed, but she is also a sarcastic girl (Pager-McClymont, 2021, p.121). On the other hand, we learn that Mrs Reed is a cruel woman, isolating Jane and comparing her to the Reed’s children. This is achieved through deontic modality (“must”, “under the necessity”) as
Mrs Reed pretends not to have any control over the situation, when she clearly does, whilst Jane is passive. Those cues can allow readers to perceive Jane as a victim in the story.

Similarly, the surroundings also contribute to the portrayal of Jane’s emotions. The lexical field of harsh weather and precipitation is featured (“leafless shrubbery”, “winter wind”, “clouds so sombre”, “rain so penetrating” or “chilly afternoons”). Those elements are not described in an objective way; Jane as the narrator (and unnamed protagonist at this stage of the story) presents them to readers with a negative viewpoint and connotation, with terms such as “leaf/less”, “cold”, “chilly” or “sombre”. Therefore, Jane’s viewpoint here contributes to building her character: readers know how she feels about such natural elements and might already have a negative mental representation of British weather, which readers can map onto the text through top-down processing. In fact, the surroundings are so important to Jane that the way she describes them features phonetic iconicity, meaning “sound symbolism [that] has been successfully exploited in poetry and fiction” (Körtvélyessy, 2016, p.29). Indeed in sentence (2) where the surroundings are described, a consonance occurs and the bilabial approximant sound /w/ (‘the cold winter wind’); the palato-alveolar approximant sound /r/ (‘brought’, ‘rain’ and ‘penetrating’); and the fricative sounds /θ/ (‘with’), /ð/ (‘the’, ‘that’, ‘further’), /z/ (‘clouds’, ‘exercise’, ‘was’), and /s/ (‘so’, ‘sombre’, ‘exercise’, ‘question’) are repeated. These sounds mirror the noise of friction the weather described makes (gust of winds and rain falling), thus suggesting its meaning (Leech and Short, 2007, p.188). This phonetic iconicity further foregrounds the criterion of surroundings through an implicit cue: it shows how prominent those surroundings are to Jane, and arguably reflects how much she dislikes them (Pager-McClymont, 2021, p.119).
The weather offers a representation of Jane’s negative emotions. The weather is something we all must bear passively as one cannot control it, and therefore readers’ prior knowledge is likely to be activated when reading this passage. Jane is passive to the weather she so despises, just like she has to passively comply with Mrs Reed’s wishes: both negative experiences are forced upon her without her having any control. Furthermore, the weather mirrors the direction of Jane’s spirit: she feels down with melancholia and isolation, and is put down by Mrs Reed to the benefit of her children, which matches the direction of the precipitation described: falling with a downward motion (Pager-McClymont, 2021, pp.125-126). In terms of conceptual metaphor mappings of PF, it means that Jane’s negative emotions are the TD, and the downward motion of the natural elements described is the SD, thus proving the following cross-domain mapping: BAD IS DOWN (section 5.1.2.3). The most salient characteristic of the SD used in the mapping is its downward trajectory.

Overall, when the implicit cues are considered, the perceived category of a DIFFICULT CHILD for Jane’s character evolves into the category of the UGLY DUCKLING of the family. This schema is activated by the situation: she is raised by another mother with children who pick on her and exclude her as she is “the smallest, weakest, and plainest child in the house, […] an angry Ugly Duckling” (Gilbert, 1977, p.783). This recategorization only occurs when Jane’s feelings are taken into consideration, and PF is part of this characterisation as it amplifies her emotions, foregrounding them to readers.

This example from Jane Eyre shows that PF’s criteria can be presented through implicit and explicit textual cues and that they draw on top-down and bottom-up processes, as does the concept of PF itself. The example also demonstrates that PF acts as an implicit textual cue of characterisation in its own right, allowing for readers’
mental representation of Jane’s emotions, here specifically the downward motion of her spirit, her passivity, and her preferences.

In this section, I evidenced that the third effect of PF is its capacity to contribute to characterisation by representing emotions. In the forthcoming section, I discuss the fourth effect of PF identified in my corpus: foreshadowing.

5.2.4 Effect 4 of PF: foreshadowing

The last effect of PF that emerged from my corpus is foreshadowing. Events in stories are experienced by readers temporally and causally through the logical sequence of occurrence (Bae and Young, 2008, p.156), meaning certain facts can be hidden or provided in advance for dramatic purposes. Foreshadowing and flashbacks accomplish those effects in texts. Foreshadowing is defined by Chatman (1978, p.60) as the “semination of anticipatory satellites”, or, in Genette’s (1983, p.40) words, it is “any narrative manoeuvre that consists of narrating or evoking in advance an event that will take place later”. Genette (1983, p.67) refers to foreshadowing as “prolepsis”, stating that it is less frequent in Western stories than the opposite – flashbacks or “analepsis”. More research in narratology exists on analepsis than on prolepsis (see Chatman, 1978, p.64; Ryan, 1991; Bridgeman, 2007, p.57; Fludernik, 2009, p.34; Herman, 2009, p.181; Rong, 2011). According to Bae et al. (2013, p.2) foreshadowing is an effective narrative technique but “little effort has been made in terms of investigating its operation”. They conclude that foreshadowing has “diverse functions”, including: “maintain[ing] readers’ curiosity, […] increas[ing] the postdictability, […] strengthen[ing] retrospective coherence” (Bae et al., 2013, p.7). There are two ways in which foreshadowing can be featured in a text: implicitly (meaning readers understand its occurrence in retrospect), and explicitly, with partial information,
obliging readers to fill in knowledge gaps in their mental representation of the narrative, and draws attention to a specific event in the plot (Bae and Young, 2008, p.157).

Rong (2011) argues Contextual Frame Theory (hereafter CFT) developed by Emmott (1997) can be used to analyse flashbacks as it aims to track how readers process their knowledge of characters, the time and place of the action linked by a ‘central directory’ (Emmott, 1997, p.125). A current ‘frame’ (or scene) being read is ‘primed’, meaning it is monitored, and characters or objects can also be primed to readers’ attention (Emmott, 1997, p.121; Stockwell, 2002, p.156). If a character or object is not mentioned in a frame they are ‘textually covert’, whereas if they are primed and bound they are ‘textually overt’. The ‘central directory’ is the tracking of primed, bound, and overt factors by readers (Emmott, 1997; Stockwell, 2002, p.156). When a character enters or leaves a frame, a shift occurs called ‘frame modification’. Analepsis and prolepsis create a ‘frame switch’ (Emmott, 1997, p.147) and disrupt the logical temporal and circumstantial order of events in a narrative from the NOW to the THEN (Rong, 2011), and thus draw on readers’ central directory to make sense of the information primed in a frame and to mentally place it on the timeline of the narrative. Emmott (1997, pp.180-186, 191-194) argues that in some instances analepsis alters our understanding of a character and their changes because of earlier events involving the same character. Rong (2011) solely focuses on the NOW and THEN order of narrative events when the THEN in question is in the past. However, in instances of prolepsis, the THEN is in the future, and it is up to readers to use their central directory to mentally represent the logical sequence of events. This ‘contextual monitoring’ (Emmott, 1997, pp.106-107), meaning the tracking of any contextual changes of characters, time, and place, allows readers to perceive sequences of narrative events, as the example provided below shows.
A key effect of foreshadowing is the building of suspense. Bae and Young (2008, p.157) explain that temporal manipulation of discourse (such as foreshadowing) can trigger emotional responses from readers like anticipation, which ultimately creates suspense. Suspense was discussed in section 5.2.2 as a type of ambience, and I suggested that the surroundings are a crucial element in the building of ambience. In instances of PF, foreshadowing occurs almost systematically through an element of surrounding which holds a symbolic value in the story and foreshadows an upcoming key plot development. It is noteworthy that the three texts in my corpus that feature foreshadowing (Jane Eyre, Wuthering Heights, The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr. Hyde) were published between 1847 and 1886, which is the period of Romanticism in art and literature; a movement in which PF was so popular a technique that Ruskin coined the term (Ruskin, 1856/2012). Unfortunately, my corpus does not allow me to test if foreshadowing is an effect of PF that is reserved for Romantic texts due to its variety and to the fact that only three texts feature this effect of PF. I also do not believe that only Romantic texts feature foreshadowing as an effect of PF, as other Romantic texts of the corpus do not feature this effect of PF. Foreshadowing and the building of ambience often occur together, and both evolve around the description of the surroundings. In foreshadowing, the surroundings mirror not only emotions (i.e. suspense), but also what will later happen in the storyline, which can at times be symbolic, as stated above.

Wales (2011, pp.408-409) defines a symbol as an “icon” or a “referent” standing in place of another concept, such as alphabet letters for sounds or the chemical abbreviations for elements in the periodic table. In literature, a symbol may be part of the “literary heritage (roses symbolizing beauty and love)”, or it can be “idiolectal, created by an individual writer” (Wales, 2011, p.408). Poetic symbols can be
metaphoric, and in certain contexts or stories, characters or objects can acquire a symbolic force, and ultimately trigger intratextual references and foreshadowing (see the example of *Holes* in section 3.2.3 with the mountain’s shape of a thumb). This means that in some texts, certain elements of the scene or the surroundings are given specific details representing a forthcoming event, thus giving readers clues about what will happen later on. Bae and Young (2008, p.161) state that the symbolic function of foreshadowing when a specific detail is at the centre of the process can be linked to the literary technique known as “Chekhov’s Gun” after Chekhov’s words (Gilman, 1995, p.60): “one must not put a loaded rifle on the stage if no one is thinking of firing it”. This means certain details (i.e. actions, objects, words) might seem unimportant in a given scene, but might be crucial in a forthcoming scene even if they are covert in certain part of the text, forcing readers to grasp their value retrospectively. Using CFT terminology, this shows the importance of tracking frames and frame switches: some of those details become symbolic as they are recurrent throughout a story.

Chapter 23 of *Jane Eyre* (Brontë, 1847/2007, my numbering) is a good example of the symbolic foreshadowing effect of PF. This chapter sees Jane and Mr Rochester sharing their feelings for each other and getting engaged when a storm interrupts them. Their conversation happens on a bench below a chestnut tree. The passage is a combination of extracts from the text provided by participants. To select these three extracts, I looked specifically at the mentions of the “chestnut tree”, as I argue it holds a symbolic value in the plot.

According to Ross (2012, p.834), “Chekhov first described the idea in a letter to Alexander Lazarev, November 1, 1889, and used the technique in his play Uncle Vanya.”
But what had befallen the night? (1) The moon was not yet set, and we were all in shadow: I could scarcely see my master’s face, near as I was. (2) And what ailed the chestnut tree? (3) It writhed and groaned; while wind roared in the laurel walk, and came sweeping over us. (4) [...] But joy soon effaced every other feeling; and loud as the wind blew, near and deep as the thunder crashed, fierce and frequent as the lightning gleamed, cataract-like as the rain fell during a storm of two hours’ duration, I experienced no fear and little awe. (5) Mr. Rochester came thrice to my door in the course of it, to ask if I was safe and tranquil: and that was comfort, that was strength for anything. (6) Before I left my bed in the morning, little Adèle came running in to tell me that the great horse-chestnut at the bottom of the orchard had been struck by lightning in the night, and half of it split away. (7) [...] I faced the wreck of the chestnut-tree; it stood up, black and riven: the trunk, split down the centre, gasped ghastly. (8) The cloven halves were not broken from each other, for the firm base and strong roots kept them unsundered below; though the community of vitality was destroyed - the sap could flow no more: their great boughs on each side were dead, and next winter’s tempests would be sure to fell one or both to earth: as yet, however, they might be said to form one tree - a ruin, but an entire ruin. (9)
First, I analyse PF’s criteria: animated entities are illustrated by the personal deictic terms “Mr Rochester”, “Jane”, “Adele”. The surroundings are represented by natural elements (i.e. “wind”, “rain”, “chestnut tree”). The emotions are explicit: “joy”, “fear”, and “awe”. The environment, particularly the weather, and the chestnut tree are essential elements of the description, along with Jane’s emotions. This passage is a prototypical example of Romanticism, as it features wild natural elements and strongly expressed emotions.

Sentence (1) “But what had befallen the night?” and sentence (3) “And what ailed the chestnut tree?” are the only two rhetorical questions in the extract and hence are foregrounded by internal deviation. Both questions mention the environment: “night” and “chestnut tree”. These two rhetorical questions signpost to readers what their central directories should focus on specifically in the storyline. The signposting of the importance of the chestnut tree in the plot with this rhetorical question hints at its symbolic nature. The noun “(chestnut) tree”, or pronoun “it”, is repeated (sentences 3, 4, 7, 8, 9), and is thus overt (primed and bound) in the extract. This repetition is foregrounded by parallelism, as it creates a recurring focus point throughout. In sentences (4) and (8) it is personified (“groaned”, “gasped ghastly”) and is thus foregrounded by external deviation. The personification brings focus and agency to the tree and contributes to the PF criterion of surroundings. This varied foregrounding of the tree invites readers’ central directories to keep track of it. Furthermore, it could indicate the chestnut tree is not just any tree: it has sentimental value. Since Jane and Mr Rochester got engaged under the tree, it symbolises their relationship, and personifying the tree conveys that symbolism. I argue the chestnut tree is a symbol of Jane and Mr Rochester’s relationship, and its fate foreshadows theirs.
The lexical field of separation is present: “riven”, “cloven halves”, “broken from each other”, “unsundered”, “one or both”, and “split” (repeated in sentences 7-8). This is foregrounded by parallelism, as it provides the text with a recurring theme of separation, foreshadowing the imminent separation between Jane and Mr Rochester. This lexical field engages readers’ central directories and contextual monitoring: the separation is imminent, and when it occurs readers would be able to track the changes to the relationship, but also to re-order the events that led to or suggested it – here the symbolic foreshadowing. A further indication of this separation can be observed in the noun phrase “one tree - a ruin, but an entire ruin” (sentence 9) as its structure is significant: it mirrors the state of the tree. Indeed, “one tree” represents the trunk of the tree, earlier described as a “firm base and strong roots”. “One tree” is followed by a hyphen, thus showing a contrast and separation with the rest of the phrase “a ruin, but an entire ruin” composed of two clauses “a ruin” and “but an entire ruin”, which are separated by a comma. Therefore, the overall noun phrase includes a base, and two elements separated by a comma, just like the tree is composed of a firm trunk and two split halves. This syntactic iconicity is foregrounded by parallelism as the phrase’s syntax mirrors its meaning. It also describes how Jane sees the tree: she considers the tree to be whole, despite its poor state. This is rendered clear by the clause “but an entire ruin”, which insists on the tree being whole, regardless of the negatively connotated term “ruin”. It also highlights the importance of the chestnut tree by symbolising Jane and Mr Rochester’s relationship, and foreshadowing their future: like the tree, they will soon split up.

Overall, the weather mirrors Jane’s feeling of sadness when she realises that the chestnut tree under which she got engaged to Mr Rochester has been split in half by lightning. This foreshadowing gives readers a warning of what is on the verge of
happening in the plot. The wedding preparations do not run smoothly, and Jane is more and more ill-at-ease with curious events happening at Thornfield. On the day of the wedding, she finds out that Mr Rochester is already married, forcing Jane to leave Thornfield. Both characters go their separate ways and face their own difficulties before being reunited, and even then, the conditions are not ideal as Mr Rochester is blind and handicapped from a fire that burned down Thornfield during their time of separation. Chapter 23 is the last time the chestnut tree is overt in the narrative, until Jane and Rochester meet again. In chapter 37, they are reunited, and Rochester declares “I am no better than the old lightning-struck chestnut-tree in Thornfield orchard, and what right would that ruin have to bid a budding woodbine cover its decay with freshness?”, to which Jane replies “you are no ruin, sir—no lightning-struck tree: you are green and vigorous”. In this chapter, the tree is once again overt in the narrative (it was covert between chapters 23 and 37), and it highlights the symbolic nature the chestnut tree holds in the couple’s relationship. Throughout the story, readers keep track of the chestnut tree, primarily through their central directory when the tree is overt, and through their contextual monitoring when it is covert. Each frame of the novel featuring the foregrounded chestnut tree is stored in readers’ mental representation of the narrative, and eventually sequenced in the logical order of the plot despite the frame switches.

In this passage, PF is a conceptual metaphor in the sense that the MM EMOTION IS NATURAL FORCE applies, but the specific metaphor present is an image metaphor. Indeed, Jane’s emotions and her relationship are the TD, the chestnut tree is the SD, generating the cross-domain mapping RELATIONSHIP IS TREE, which is an image metaphor (see section 5.1.1.2) in this instance as the split shape of the symbolic tree
(conveyed by the syntactic iconicity) is the most salient aspect mapped onto Jane’s and Rochester’s relationship.

5.3 Review of chapter 5

In this chapter, I presented PF’s metaphorical function: it is a conceptual metaphor with the general mapping of EMOTION IS SURROUNDINGS, although more specific MMs were identified. It was demonstrated that some cross-domain mappings are recurrent throughout my corpus and are tied to other known conceptual mappings, namely EMOTION IS NATURAL FORCE (based on Kövecses, 2008b, p.381), EMOTION IS VERTICAL ORIENTATION (based on Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p.10-11), and EMOTION IS COLOUR TONE (based on Arnheim, 1969; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, pp.50-53). It was pointed out that since PF is an extended metaphor, traditional identification methods such as the MIP (Pragglejaz, 2007) may be insufficient. Instead, I suggested using the IMPF as it is tailored to identifying PF in texts.

Additionally, it was observed that PF as a conceptual metaphor can have varied effects: it can communicate implicit emotion, build ambience and suspense in a scene, contribute to characterisation, and foreshadow upcoming plot events. Those effects can occur individually or simultaneously. Overall, the effects of PF have shown the impact the technique has in contributing to our experiences of narratives. In the next chapter, I review the contribution to knowledge achieved by this thesis and explore the limitations and further research questions it poses.
Chapter 6 – Discussion and Conclusion

6.1 Discussion

This chapter aims to discuss the key aspects of this thesis. First, I review the research questions and the overall findings described throughout this thesis (section 6.1.1). I then point out the theoretical and practical contributions to knowledge achieved (section 6.1.2), and this research’s limitations and potential future research (section 6.2).

6.1.1 Review of findings

In section 1.4.1, I presented the aims and research questions I set for this thesis. The aim was to create an updated model of PF that: 1) defined the technique, 2) provided an identification method to identify it in texts, 3) identified its metaphorical mappings, 4) identified the effects it has on narratives. Four global research questions (RQ) were formulated in chapter 1:

1) What is PF and what elements constitute the technique?
2) How is PF featured in texts?
3) How can PF be identified in texts?
4) What is the effect of PF on the reading process?

The paragraphs below detail the key findings of this thesis and point out how and where each RQ was answered in the thesis.

The literature review section of this thesis evidenced the gap in knowledge surrounding PF in diverse fields. Because of that gap, finding texts that featured PF to develop a model of the technique proved to be challenging. I conducted a survey of English teachers. I wanted teachers to be at the heart of this project because they are
the most likely to benefit from this research, as PF is likely to be taught in KS3-5 and is therefore an important concept for them to feel confident teaching. Based on the data collected (chapter 2) and the analysis conducted in chapters 3 and 4, I developed my own definition of PF which builds on the most frequent definition given by teachers and reflected in the corpus of texts they provided: PF is a projection of emotion (implicit or explicit) expressed by an animated entity (implicit or explicit) onto the surroundings (indoors or outdoors). Thus, PF has three criteria that must be present (prototypically or unprototypically) in texts for the definition to be fulfilled: the presence of emotions, of an animated entity, and of surroundings. This addresses RQ1.

Through the analysis process, using my own adaptation of Leech and Short’s “checklist of linguistic and stylistic categories” (2007, pp.60-64), I observed that PF can at times be ambiguously present in texts if its criteria are implicit, thus requiring further context, as developed in section 4.1.2. The analysis also allowed me to determine the three linguistic indicators of PF that were prevalent in most texts from my corpus: imagery, negation, and repetition. These linguistic indicators are often used to foreground PF’s criteria, thus drawing readers’ attention to it (which answers RQ1 and RQ2).

The Identification Method of Pathetic Fallacy (IMPF) was created to identify PF (and its converse) in texts (section 4.1.4). It is a step-by-step guide to identify PF, its criteria, and its converse. Moreover, in sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3, I respectively discuss the concepts of context and interpretation, which are crucial in the identification process of PF: if there is not enough context, one might miss a criterion of PF. Being able to match the emotions to the surroundings is part of the interpretation process and a key step in the IMPF, and addresses RQ3. Additionally, I explained that it is possible for readers to consensually interpret PF and its effects based on the findings
in psychology: our perception of surroundings revolves around the notion of comfort. This means that despite readers’ personal experiences, they can interpret how surroundings are presented in texts.

The metaphorical function and representation of PF was discussed in section 5.1, in which I observed that certain surroundings are often associated with the same emotions across different texts. The MM for PF was thus expressed: EMOTION IS SURROUNDINGS. The SD of ‘surroundings’ was then specified, leading to the identification of three recurring mappings: EMOTION IS NATURAL FORCE, EMOTION IS VERTICAL ORIENTATION, and EMOTION IS COLOUR TONE. These mappings allow us to observe how readers conceptualise PF. This addresses RQ2 and RQ3 as it explores how PF is featured in texts and how it can be identified.

The effects of PF in texts were also discussed (section 5.2), thus answering RQ4. The first effect is communicating implicit emotions explicitly or in a way that readers are able to interpret. This is the most common function of PF as it revolves around the notion of emotion, a key aspect of PF as pointed out in the literature review. The second effect is the building of ambience, including suspense. The surroundings in this instance do not just reflect emotions, but their description also mirrors the ambience, thus creating a more vivid representation of the scene for readers. The third effect is the building of characters. I used Culpeper’s model of characterisation (2001) to demonstrate that PF’s criteria and linguistic indicators are textual cues of PF, whereas PF (as a metaphor) is in itself an implicit textual cue of characterisation. The fourth effect identified in my corpus is foreshadowing. I used Conceptual Frame Theory to show how specific elements of the surroundings (such as a tree) can have a symbolic function and overall foreshadow upcoming plot events. These are the four
effects of PF present in my corpus, but this does not mean that with a bigger sample of texts there would not be any other effects present.

Overall, my updated model of PF has proven to answer each of the research questions discussed above for the texts studied. I do not claim that the indicators, effects, or mappings of PF discussed throughout this thesis are exhaustive, but simply that they occur in my (limited) corpus. Nonetheless, it was shown that the model of PF put forth is versatile, systematic, and could potentially be adapted to the teaching of pathetic fallacy in higher education, as well as in secondary schools, or colleges.

This section reviewed the main findings observed in this thesis. I now discuss the theoretical and practical contributions to knowledge it has achieved.

6.1.2 Contributions

As I state in section 1.4.1, this thesis is interdisciplinary and draws on concepts from literary studies, education, stylistics, cognitive stylistics, metaphor research, psychology, and reader-response methods. Therefore, one could argue that this thesis is a contribution to each of those fields, even if those contributions are minor.

Firstly, this thesis is a contribution to the field of stylistics. The updated model of PF I created is a stylistics model which builds on existing research and takes into consideration the different headings PF has been discussed under in stylistics to date (see sections 1.2.3, 5.2). My updated model of PF is a theoretical contribution to stylistic knowledge as it not only addresses the lack of consistency surrounding PF, but it also draws on existing stylistic research to shed light on its significance in our understanding of literature and for readers’ (emotive) experiences of texts. For example, I have shown that forms of imagery such as PF are implicit textual cues of characterisation, which had yet to be thoroughly discussed in stylistics. Another
example of this thesis’ development of previous stylistics work is the effects of PF identified in my corpus as they correlate existing research on ambience (Stockwell, 2014), suspense (Caroll, 1996; Iwata, 2009), foreshadowing (Bae and Young, 2008; Rong, 2011), and emotions (Miall, 2014).

Additionally, this thesis is also a practical contribution to the field of stylistics that could be adapted to the teaching of PF for the GCSE and A Level. The updated checklist of stylistics tools developed in section 3.1.3 is arguably a detailed approach to text analysis, not just for the study of PF. It has demonstrated how Leech and Short’s (2007) checklist might be adapted to secondary students, students in higher education, or any researcher looking for a systematic approach to text analysis.

Secondly, this research contributes theoretically to the field of metaphor research and builds on work on emotion metaphors by Kövecses (2008b), Shinohara and Matsunaka (2009), and Abbott and Forceville (2011). As I discuss in section 5.1, Kövecses (2008b) wonders if there is a potential ‘universal mapping of emotions’. Although my work on PF is not the ultimate answer to this question, it is nonetheless one aspect of the answer. Indeed, out of 31 texts featuring PF and thus featuring the master metaphor EMOTION IS SURROUNDINGS, three recurring mappings were identified to fit under this MM: EMOTION IS NATURAL FORCE, EMOTION IS VERTICAL ORIENTATION, and EMOTION IS COLOUR TONE - some featuring conventional examples of the mappings, others novel ones. Although most of the texts in my corpus are from British literature, others were not, thus potentially showing that PF is one way to express emotions that would be conceptualised and interpreted consensually by readers from various cultures and backgrounds. In addition to the theoretical contributions highlighted, this research also contributes in practice to metaphor studies. The IMPF allows for analysts, including students, to systematically identify and interpret PF and its
converse in texts. This method considers the extended metaphor nature of PF, which has yet to be done by other identification procedures such as the MIP (Pragglejaz, 2007), or the Metaphor Identification Procedure Vrije Universiteit (MIPVU) developed by Steen at al. (2010), as they rely on the identification of words used metaphorically. Since PF is an extended implicit metaphor, such procedures would not necessarily identify it (although it could identify its criteria or indicators). Forceville suggests that such procedures cannot account for all metaphors as they focus on “verbal manifestations” of metaphors (Forceville, 2013, p.3, his emphasis). He thus developed a framework to identify what he calls “pictorial metaphors” (Forceville, 1996, 2002) based on Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Lakoff and Turner (1989). The framework relies on answering “crucial questions” focused on the TD and SD’s correspondence rather than on the metaphorical use of words (Forceville, 1996, p. 108; 2002, p.12). This method could be applied for PF’s identification, particularly in multimodal texts (see section 6.2.2).

Thirdly, the contributions to the field of literature achieved by this thesis are centred around the movement of Romanticism and the concept of PF as a literary technique. By providing PF with a rigorous definition and examples, this thesis clarifies how PF can be observed and interpreted in texts. With respect to Romanticism, this thesis illustrated how PF embodies the values of the movement: free expression of emotions and omnipresence of nature. Each Romantic text in my corpus displays those values, often through PF. Alternatively, this thesis also showed that, despite being a technique associated with Romanticism (likely due to Ruskin’s work), PF is not bound to this specific literary movement: texts from varied genres and movements other than Romanticism are also part of my corpus and feature PF. It is worth noting that in my corpus, multiple works of the same authors were suggested, namely
Shakespeare, Dickens, the Brontë sisters, and Keats. Interestingly all but Shakespeare wrote in the 19th century (the same century Ruskin wrote *Modern Painters*), although Dickens was not a Romantic. Nonetheless, patterns can be observed in some of those authors’ works: Shakespeare consistently used the wind and the air to portray evil or anger; the Brontë sisters used the wind or rain to emphasize sadness (most often caused by heartbreak); Dickens used the wind, cold, and precipitations to portray sadness. Overall, in my corpus, PF is used almost exclusively to convey negative emotions.

Fourthly, I showed that the representation of surroundings are at the heart of PF. This thesis is thus a contribution to the field of psychology, revolving around the impact of the environment on individuals’ mood, wellbeing, and mental state (section 4.1.3). I discussed how psychologists consensually view the factor of comfort in any indoor or outdoor environment as an impact on our mood and wellbeing. Through the diverse text analyses conducted, I illustrated how this notion of comfort can also be consensually interpreted by readers and how the environment impacts the perception of characters’ emotions.

Lastly, the methodology used to collect data is also a practical contribution to knowledge, for example, in reader-informed studies (and reader-response research to an extent). Indeed, specific participants were targeted, and the survey was used not only to test how those participants interacted with PF in stimuli, but it also used the participants’ answers to build a corpus of texts. This made the collection of texts as objective and systematic as possible. This corpus is the base of this project, thus rendering this type of survey a contribution to methodology that other researchers could potentially duplicate.
This section reviewed the findings as well as the theoretical and practical contributions to knowledge achieved throughout this thesis.

6.2 Conclusion

This section concludes this thesis by highlighting some of its limitations as well as potential research that could stem from this project to further its development. I then provide some concluding remarks.

6.2.1 Limitations

Naturally, this thesis has encountered some limitations. The first limitation can be found at the foundation of this research: the corpus of texts collected in my survey study is limited (10,406 words), and can be considered an imbalanced sample, thus not fully representative of texts featuring PF in general (McIntyre and Walker, 2019, p.66), as I point out in section 2.3.1. Although this does not directly impact the qualitative analysis developed in the rest of the thesis, the corpus itself is not suited for deriving generalisable conclusions about PF. Thus, claiming that my corpus of text is a true representation of all texts with PF is problematic, and it is not a functional corpus for other corpus linguists to use. Therefore, to remedy this, more texts would need to be added to the corpus to enrich it, which could be part of a future project. To achieve this, I could apply the same methodology used for the original corpus, but leave the survey open longer and share it with a wider audience. Alternatively, I could apply my PF model onto varied texts in anthologies, and then include them in the corpus.

Another related limitation linked to my corpus of texts is the diversity of the texts themselves. The texts I was supplied with by the participants were not multilingual;
most texts were British or American literature, only one text was Nigerian (*Things Fall Apart*, and it did not feature PF according to my model). Since the participants are mostly teachers, and most texts provided are taught for GCSE and A Level, one can thus suggest that this lack of diversity is not only a limitation for my research, but one for the English National Curriculum itself. It also means that for the purpose of this research, my view of how and if non-English speaking authors use PF in their writing is limited, although some texts such as *Véra* (French literature, section 4.2.3.4) were studied from outside of my corpus. Overall, PF in texts from other cultures and in different languages could be further researched.

Some of the limitations of this research stem from the survey itself, in addition to the ones mentioned above. Indeed, a reader-informed study inherently has some limitations, although it is one of the only ways to maintain participant anonymity whilst accessing participants' thoughts. There is no guarantee that the participants answer the questionnaire truthfully, or that what they write is truly what they mean. However, the anonymity provided by the survey is likely to encourage participants to answer truthfully, thus attenuating bias, as studies by Mason (2020, 2021), and by Boucher et al. (2020) suggest. This does not mean that the participants are not influenced by their environment when answering or by the manner in which the questions are framed (Stockwell, 2021, pp.166-167). Therefore, this needs to be considered as a limitation, although the survey I conducted was not a reader-response but a reader-informed survey. Despite those limitations, the data-collection methodology used in this thesis allowed for the development of my updated model of PF. An alternative way in which this study could have been developed is by using reader-response. Texts with PF or personification according to examination boards or scholars could be selected, and
readers could react to specific features of those texts (such as PF’s criteria or indicators). This could be a next step in testing the model more practically.

Indeed, although this research is based on an empirical study, the model remains theoretical, despite having been tested on multiple texts. In order to claim that this model is indeed viable for teaching and learning purposes, further practical testing of the model on readers, educators, and students would need to occur to validate the theory. In fact, the model assumes that readers conceptualise characters’ emotions through the surroundings, primarily through PF’s mappings. This is an assumption, and without further testing with a reader-response study, there is no accurate way to determine if readers’ do indeed mentally associate those two domains in their reading processes.

This last point is important as it builds on other specific limitations associated with Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT). Some researchers find underlying issues with CMT (Alverson, 1994; Clausner and Croft, 1997; Rakova, 2002; Dobrovolskij and Piirainen, 2005; Stefanowitch, 2007; see section 5.1.1.3). However, Kövecses (2008a) addresses most common criticism of the theory, and offers solutions, which have been implemented throughout this thesis. One of the criticisms stems from the top-down approach that CMT has, as mappings tend to be formulated and then examples observed. Kövecses (2008a, pp.170-172) explains that using a procedure to identify metaphors (such as the MIP or the IMPF) and then formulating their mapping is a bottom-up procedure, thus remedying this limitation. Other critics of the theory state that the labelling of the mappings can be restrictive, particularly when dealing with emotions. Kövecses (2008a, pp.173-174) counters that the mapping is the first step in the analysis of the metaphor, and analysts should not stop there. The details of the
mappings can thus be clarified in the rest of the analysis, notably when discussing the most salient characteristics of the domains mapped (Stockwell, 1999).

Lastly, what I consider to be the biggest limitation of this thesis is its impact. Indeed, PF and personification (amongst other techniques) have been considered interchangeable concepts for decades, and as the literature review demonstrates, one can thus wonder if they can really be distinguished with this updated model. This thesis aims to offer a distinction between the two techniques, and I demonstrated that although most texts with PF also feature personification, some texts did not. Admittedly, however, most texts with PF also featured personification as a means of foregrounding the criterion of surroundings. This thesis is not a solution to the confusion between the two techniques, and provisions to share and test this updated model with educators could be a way to render the distinction between the two technique more systematic.

In this section, I highlighted the main limitations raised by this thesis, some of which could be addressed by conducting further research. In the next section, I build on this latter point by presenting some future research that could be developed based on this thesis.

### 6.2.2 Future research

Future research based on this thesis could go in several directions. The first one I want to explore is the one closest to the rationale for this thesis: its educational ramifications. A future project in which I explore the model with educators and students to adapt it to teaching and learning would be a way for this thesis to have an impact on education. This project could draw on existing knowledge and methods in the field of pedagogical stylistics, namely Cushing (2019), Giovanelli (2014, 2016), Mason and
Giovanelli (2017). Such developments could occur by working in collaboration with teachers. For example, conducting workshops in schools with teachers and students to test and develop materials to benefits students’ understanding and analysing of PF. This would require adapting the current model of PF developed in this thesis so that it becomes student-friendly (i.e. the criterion of “animated entity” could become “character” for their understanding; or simplifying the IMPF). One way to test the pedagogical efficiency of the model could be to ask two groups of students to analyse a text taught in schools (such as *A Christmas Carol* or *Frankenstein*) and to give the student-friendly version of the model to one of the groups. Students could be asked to discuss and analyse an extract focusing on PF by using tools such as the updated checklist of stylistic categories developed in this thesis or Giovanelli’s “linguistic toolkit to consider in education” (2016, pp.17-20). We could note if the group using the IMPF observes PF in the text more easily than the other group. Additionally, if this future research was successful, the results could be shared on a wider scale to schools, examination boards, or even the DfE.

The second direction I would like to explore is the link between PF and readers’ empathetic responses during the reading process. To explore this further, a reader-response study asking participants to react to a text featuring PF and assessing how empathetic they are through stimuli (Miall and Kuiken, 1995; Stradling, 2019) is presently ongoing in collaboration between myself and Fransina Stradling; the text selected is *The Flowers* (Walker, 1973; see section 5.2.1). Preliminary findings show that PF’s criterion of surroundings influences empathetic engagement in readers.

Thirdly, analysing PF in terms of schema theory could provide interesting findings. I briefly discuss this in section 5.2.3, but further research is needed. I would like to observe if the association of certain surroundings and emotions are so prevalent
that 1) the surroundings become part of our schemas of emotions, and 2) associating those emotions with different surroundings becomes foregrounded, almost defying expectations because of the association made within our EMOTION schema. This would also require a reader-response study and potential interviews.

Fourthly, in section 3.3.1.1, I discussed the lexical richness present in texts with PF, particularly due to PF’s linguistic indicators (imagery, negation, repetition). This idea of lexical richness to provide readers with a mental representation of a text world could be explored using Text World Theory (TWT hereafter). TWT claims that readers process discourse (fictional or factual) by building a representation in their mind: a “text-world” (Werth, 1999, p.46; Gavins, 2007, pp.35-36; Giovanelli, 2010, pp.218-219; Whiteley, 2010, p.18; Lahey, 2014, p.285; Nuttall, 2014, 2017). World-building elements in TWT are linguistic choices indicating the time, location, objects, and enactors of the world described (Werth, 1999, pp.80-84; Gavins, 2007, p.40). Stockwell (2005, p.148; see also Werth, 1999, pp. 70-72) explains: “imagined worlds are rich worlds, fleshed out by the reader drawing on schematic knowledge from his own experience; text worlds thus have a texture that is richer than the underdetermination offered by a mere semantic analysis of the text”. In the case of PF, imagery, repetition, and negation contribute to the lexical richness of the text and to the foregrounding of PF’s criteria. In fact, imagery, repetition, and negation are used to present the criteria of surroundings and animated entities (enactors as TWT puts it, Gavins, 2007, pp.40-41). In TWT, metaphors (micro and mega) and negation create new world-switches: “metaphor worlds” and “negated worlds” (Gavins, 2007, pp. 158-159, 122 respectively). As Stockwell (2005, p.149) explains, “sub-worlds are conceptual spaces triggered by […] metaphors (which are literal in the sub-world but metaphorical in the text world), negatives (positive in the sub-world and negated in the
text world). The prevalence of imagery (i.e. metaphors) and negation in texts with PF likely renders the readers’ processing of those texts more complex. Repeated elements within the text-world are likely to foreground those elements to the reader. Therefore, imagery, negation, and to some extent repetition, could be considered to be world-builders, enriching readers’ representation of the enactors’ emotions onto the surroundings, and contributing to the construction of the text-world overall. Further research on this lexical richness (in terms of amount and quality of instances) and what constitutes it in terms of linguistic world-building elements is needed. A reader-response study could ask participants to interact with texts that have varied levels of lexical richness and observe how the lack of such richness impacts their representation and engagement with those text worlds, and PF’s presence within them.

Another future area of research that could stem from this thesis is the development of a more balanced corpus representative of texts with PF. This could be achieved by gathering more texts to my existing corpus, and those texts could be first analysed using the Identification Method of PF (IMPF) put forth in section 4.1.4. Texts outside of Romanticism or of the English National Curriculum could be considered as a way forward for a more diverse and inclusive corpus. A corpus approach potentially informed by my model of PF could show further linguistic indicators or commonalities shared by texts with PF as opposed to a reference corpus.

Finally, the model of PF created has only been applied to monomodal texts from literature (most of them being canonical). The model could be used by others to analyse a variety of texts such as dystopian fiction, children’s literature amongst others. Analysts could use the model to identify PF in their chosen text, which is likely to deepen their findings. As discussed above, the model could be used in combination
of varied frameworks of analysis such as CMT, TWT, schema theory, contextual frame theory (CFT), and thus could be used alongside other tools to confirm PF’s presence. Its criteria and linguistic indicators could equally be discussed in other terms than foregrounding theory adopted in this thesis. Additionally, it could be interesting to extend the application of the PF model to texts from popular culture (non-canonical monomodal texts and multimodal texts). It could be useful draw on multimodal stylistics (such as McIntyre (2008) and Forceville (2008)), and film studies (McKim, 2013) to observe if and how this stylistic model of PF can be adapted, and potentially developed, to multimodal texts such as film, video games, and music. There is a precedent for this research as one of the survey participants provided a link to a video (a short scene from Friends) as an answer for question 6.

6.2.3 Concluding remarks

My aim with this thesis has been to clarify the differences between PF and other techniques by developing a stylistic model of PF based on empirical research and an interdisciplinary approach. Furthermore, I ultimately wanted to show the aesthetic effect of PF on literature, and how significant PF is in our understanding of literature and for readers’ (emotive) experiences of texts. The model was developed to be systematic and versatile. It was also created with teaching and learning in mind, as education was one of the main rationales for this thesis due to my professional background.

This chapter concludes this thesis by showing how the aims and research questions of this project were addressed and answered throughout the thesis. The theoretical and practical contributions to knowledge achieved by this research project were also pointed out, along with the limitations of the project. Finally, my goals for
future research were expressed, emphasising how I intend to continue this research, however, these avenues might also be interesting for others to explore.
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Appendices

Appendix 2.1: Pilot survey participants’ answers to Question 4 “define pathetic fallacy in your own words”.

- Pathetic fallacy is when inanimate objects are given human feelings and responses, commonly used by presenting the weather as a reflection of an event in a text.
- When Nature is described with human attributes.
- Where the weather reflects emotions or sentiments of the piece.
- It includes that, in Literature, the weather (as part of the setting) can often reflect the action and/or genre of the novel or play.
- Pathetic fallacy is the personification of nature.
- Description of human feelings on the atmosphere.
- Human feelings mirrored onto nature.
- A literary device whereby the weather reflects the mood of a character and/or storyline.
- Type of personification where the weather reflects the mood of the piece.
Appendix 2.2: Pilot survey participants’ answers to Question 4 “define personification in your own words”.

- When inanimate objects are given human characteristics (this blends in definition with pathetic fallacy).
- A metaphorical comparison which involves the introduction of human actions, feelings, opinions.
- When a non-human subject is described as having human like qualities.
- Human characteristics put onto inanimate objects.
- Personification is the attribution of human traits to objects.
- The making of an inanimate object human.
- A literary device whereby an object is given human qualities/feelings/emotions.
- Where are inanimate object is given human characteristics.
- When objects are described as human attributes.
Appendix 2.3: Main survey participants’ answers to Question 3 “define pathetic fallacy in your own words”.

- A figurative phrase that depicts an image of nature (usually weather) to foreshadow events in a story.
- Giving human emotions to objects (non-human).
- Using characteristic of the natural world as a tool for creative writing
- Giving human feelings to animate objects.
- When the description of the weather reflects the emotions of the characters
- Not really
- Giving human emotions/actions to nature. Often associated with the weather and it reflecting the mood or atmosphere.
- Human emotions attributed to weather or inanimate objects.
- When the natural world reflects the mood/atmosphere/tone of what is happening or how someone/something feels.
- Inanimate objects are personified
- The mood of a main character reflected in the weather or surroundings.
- When weather reflects the mood of the scene/characters etc.
- Setting scene using weather to evoke mood and atmosphere.
- Where the weather suggests the mood in a literary text. Although the term is an ironic one, historical used to ridicule less literary literature
- The use of the weather or natural environment to reflect the mood in a text
- A pathetic fallacy is when human beings suppose that inanimate objects have human-like feelings.
- When inanimate entities have feelings attributes to them in art or literature.
• When external setting represents emotions of characters
• The belief that inanimate things act in relation to human behavior or possess human qualities
• Description where elements of the setting or scene mirror the emotions of the events or characters.
• Human feelings are attached to inanimate things, especially weather, colour, nature.
• Use of personification to attribute human qualities to nature, often weather.
• Device where the environment (weather, landscape, setting) reflects a character’s emotion
• When the weather mimics or illuminates a character’s mood
• The weather/environment is used to reflect the emotional state of characters/persona.
• To give emotion to non-human objects or references.
• In literary studies, when the landscape or weather reflects the character’s mood.
• When nature, most often weather, is described in a manner that reflects a human mood/ emotion. Quite often reflects the mood that the writer wants to set.
• When nature is given out of the ordinary attributes.
• In literature, when the writer uses conditions in the natural world, such as the weather, to reflect the emotions of the characters.
• Weather used symbolically for the mood.
• talking animals in books and movies
• When non human entities are depicted as if they have feelings, often in a way that illuminates the narrative in some way.
• Attributing human emotions to non-human objects and beings
• When the weather/situation reflects the mood.
• Where the weather reflects the emotions of the character/s.
• The weather reflecting the tone of the text or mood of a character within a text.
• Pathetic fallacy occurs when the weather/surrounding environment reflects the emotional states of characters in a text.
• When human qualities or feelings are attributed to nature or the weather.
• When a writer uses the weather to reflect a human's mood.
• A kind of personification
• A literary term in which human emotions are attributed to objects of nature.
• A description of the weather reflects the mood and atmosphere in a piece of writing.
• A literary device used for the anthropomorphism of inanimate objects, often by ascribing them a human emotion.
• Personification: attributing human things to non-human things
• How humans see animate traits in inanimate objects.
• Anthropomorphism, projection of human emotion, metaphorical imagery
• when aspects of the scene that are not human behave in a manner that reflects the pervading mood, often reflecting the mood of the characters.
• Use of emotion in setting or weather to create atmosphere or mirror character’s feelings
• The use of setting particularly weather to introduce or develop a particular mood.
Ascribing human emotions to non-humans.

- crediting animals and things with human feelings and intentions
- When sound or visual effects create atmosphere
- Like personification but more specific, nature including weather given emotions in some way to help convey or symbolise mood and atmosphere.
- The attribution of emotion to nature
- The weather/ atmosphere reflects the mood.
- It’s when human behaviour is attributed to non-humans.
- When the weather in a piece of fiction is representative of the mood of a character
- Using the weather to represent mood or character feelings.
- When nature is given human emotion - often to convey mood or emotion.
- When the weather is used to reflect characters' or readers’ mood.
- Weather or setting is used to reflect characters’ emotions. E.g. in Hemingway’s Cat in the Rain, the rain could reflect the loneliness/lack of fulfilment of the wife. Initially seen pejoratively by the New Critics (?): ‘fallacy’.
- A language device whereby the writer uses setting to reflect the feelings of a character
- When the natural world reflects the emotions or feelings of characters in fiction.
  I think there should be an element of metaphor/ personification too.
- Using the natural environmental to create a mood within a text
- Like personification but more focused on emotions
- When the weather or setting reflects the feelings or mood of a character or event in a text.
- Endowing non human objects with human emotions
Pathetic fallacy is a literary device where the weather or nature mirrors the mood or inner thoughts of a character or narrator.

The notion that nature or natural events mirror the experiences of human beings.

The weather mirrors emotions

Ruskin understood a bad metaphor as the pathetic fallacy of ascribing human emotive and sensory aspects to the natural world. Ruskin is, to a certain extent, following Western traditional thinking of the human being as separate from and observant of the natural world. To the contrary, I suggest that “good” metaphors are those that break through the surface level of our conceptual perceptions to enable us to recognize the underlying sensory-motor-emotive nature of our being as participants, not simply observers, of the social, cultural, and natural worlds of our experience.

When a character’s mood or emotions are mirrored in the presentation of the world around them.

When the weather reflects the mood in a literary text

The use of images from nature to convey human feelings

when weather is employed to create/ symbolise a mood or emotion

When the writer’s use of weather reflects human emotion

A form of personification where the environment is given human emotions or characteristics (i.e. the wind howled). However I think it can also mean that the environment is reflecting the protagonist's feelings (i.e. a storm when the protagonist's conflicted). I've seen both taught by teachers.

A description where elements of the setting or scene mirror the emotions of the events or characters.
- Objects being given human qualities; often done in fiction
- Assigning human experience to inhuman objects.
- The use of natural imagery to reflect/amplify human emotion
- Right. I got this one wrong. I was going to write 'a tendency to mis-attribute opinions in a novel to the author'. Then I googled pathetic fallacy and realised I'd mis-remembered what it was! So my new 'in my own words' definition is - a tendency to mistakenly attribute human feelings to non-human things
- When nature reflects emotions or events within a text.
- Where the weather reflects the mood/emotion of characters or the events in a text
- The representation of the mood of a narrative through the description of weather.
- When weather reflects mood of the characters
- When the language in a text describing aspects of the environment reflects a mood
- Weather reflecting the mood or to set the tone of a creative/descriptive piece of writing
- When a writer/artist will use the weather or landscape to mirror the characters mood/internal weather. (E.g. a simple example might be rain to mirror character's sadness - not because it rains when we’re sad, but because we often feel like it should be...)
- attributing human characteristics to non-humans
- Applying negative emotions to the weather in order to foreshadow a demise in a character
• It’s a literary device, when aspects of a described environment (such as the weather or light levels) metaphorically reflect the mood of the piece’s speaker or narrator.

• Attributing human emotions to animals or inanimate object.

• Use of the weather or climate to represent emotions of the character, or create a certain effect for the reader.

• The idea that natural phenomena, especially weather, reflect the mood or emotions of fictional or actual events.

• The weather or environmental atmosphere is a reflection of the inner landscape of the character.

• Giving human emotions to inanimate objects.

• Where emotion is attached to inanimate objects (eg weather).

• Pretty much the same as a metaphor. The thoughtful trees or the anguished sky for example.

• I don’t think about it very much, but I would probably call it the tendency to get around the essential strangeness of the world by interpreting everything in human terms. So, eg, people assume that non-human creatures and objects respond to events with human emotions (or motives or perceptions) or reactions; or they regard the non-human world as conforming to the conventions of human societies and values. It’s a kind of projection that’s both self-protective and hubristic: it expresses a conviction that human experience is the norm or ideal, and it excuses the failure to appreciate the world around us on its own terms. That’s a very long-winded way of expressing things, but I think it’s closer to my understanding than the standard “attribution of motive and feeling to non-human objects etc”.
• Weather reflects mood of text.
• Technically it involves giving human qualities to inanimate objects. However, most people associate it with the weather reflecting the mood.
• a literary technique in which the depiction of the environment reflects the inner state of a character
• It’s a kind of personification of natural elements in poetry: when emotions are given to ‘objects’ found in nature such as rocks or flowers or the sky.
• Human characteristics ‘projected’ onto nature. Often mistaught as the weather reflecting the mood!
• Where a writer uses weather, atmosphere and/or other setting devices to reflect something which has happened, is happening or will happen in a text.
• The use of weather, or nature, to create/reflect an emotional atmosphere for the text.
• The use of the setting, particularly the weather, to reflect the emotions and tone of the events.
• From what I have read it is a kind of personification that attributes human emotions to things.
• Attributing human emotions to nature/animals/weather - a form of personification. (Often assumed by students to apply only to situations where the weather reflects human emotion.)
• The fallacy of believing that Nature is in any way sympathetic with the plight of human beings.
• The attribution of emotions or other human characteristics to (parts of) the natural world, such as rain or a mountain.
• Pathetic fallacy is a kind of personification that gives human emotions to inanimate objects of nature.

• Ascribing emotions to entities that do not have emotions (or that do not exhibit the emotion you are ascribing).

• When a surrounding is made to seem grand in order to make an inhabitant look small or pathetic through description or personification.

• When the audience has information the characters haven’t

• A literary technique in where weather is used to create a particular atmosphere or mood to match the unfolding events of plot.

• When the weather echoes or symbolises the character’s mood/emotions

• A ridiculously flawed idea

• Where the weather is used to depict and reflect human emotions.

• Where the environment is used to create emotion

• A falsehood, based on an emotive or affective reading and not supported by any data.

• When the weather mimics or illuminates the character’s mood/emotions

• Giving human emotions and behaviour to inanimate objects.

• A description of the weather is used to reflect the mood and atmosphere in a piece of writing.

• You qualify with human emotions, feelings, the objects you find in nature

• The intentional connection between the natural objects and phenomena in the text and the characters' moods and feelings, as established in somebody's artistic creation.

• Attributing natural elements (e.g. a landscape) certain mental/emotional states (perhaps also intentions and other intrinsically human characteristics?). It can
be read as a projection of the narrator's (or focalizer character's/or poetic speaker's) inner states.

- Term coined by Ruskin to describe how a person's emotional state affects the perception of external, environmental phenomena.
Appendix 2.4: Main survey participants’ answers to Question 4 “define personification in your own words”.

- A figurative phrase where a non-human object or being is given human qualities.
- Giving human emotions, actions and characteristics to objects of animals e.g. the sky wept.
- Giving something non-human the characteristics of a human
- Allowing animate objects to have human attributes
- When a non-human entity (can be physical or non-physical) is given human attributes
- Attributing personal/human traits or features to non-human subjects
- Making an inanimate object/thing seem animate.
- An inanimate object behaving in the way a human would normally do so.
- Giving human characteristics to objects or things.
- Inanimate objects are treated as human beings
- Attributing human aspects to objects
- Giving human qualities to an inanimate object.
- Giving human characteristics to inanimate objects or non human things
- Type of metaphor. Using human traits to describe non human things e.g the wind shrieked.
- Where an inanimate object is given human features.
- Giving abstract nouns human qualities e.g. fear gripped my heart
- A type of metaphor that gives something non-human human-like characteristics
When non human resource objects or animals are depicted as if they had human attributes.

When human qualities are given to an inanimate object

Attributing human characteristics to non-human objects/creatures

A type of metaphor specifically used to attribute human characteristics or emotions to a non-human object or character.

A metaphor that attaches human qualities to inanimate things.

A device where a non-human object or being is given human characteristics

When a object is given human qualities or attributes

In literary texts, objects or animals show human emotions

A metaphorical device - a non-human thing is given human qualities.

Giving something non-human, human characteristics and traits.

When an inanimate object or an animal are presented or treated as a person.

(As opposed to the anthropomorphism where and object/animal are attributed some human features).

Attributing human attributes/ emotions to something that isn't human

Objects given human attributes.

When an inanimate object or an idea/concept is presented as though it has human qualities such as emotions or intentions.

giving human qualities to non-humans/inanimate objects

Presenting a non-human being, object, or idea as if it were human

Giving the characteristics of people to animals/objects.

Giving human characteristics to non human objects.

Giving human attributes to non-human things
• When human qualities or feelings are attributed to inanimate objects or non-human entities.
• When an inanimate object or animal is given human attributes.
• Attributing human qualities to non-human things
• A literary term in which inanimate objects are described as having human qualities.
• An inanimate object is given human qualities.
• An ancient storytelling device that attributes human-like emotions and actions to inanimate objects.
• To personify an inanimate object or non-person
• Similar to pathetic fallacy, but stronger. The inanimate object becomes a person with human characteristics.
• Giving human qualities to inanimate objects
• Representation of the nonhuman through human characteristics.
• When inhuman objects are described with human qualities such as trees whispering in the wind
• Giving inanimate objects human characteristics/behaviour/feelings
• Describing an inanimate object as having/exhibiting sentient qualities
• Ascribing human traits to non-humans.
• Attributing to things human qualities
• Attaching human qualities to something that isn’t human e.g. Death be not proud
• Giving human characteristics to non-human things. Grey area surrounding animals.
• Attribution of human qualities or actions to the non-human
• Giving human qualities/actions to inanimate objects.
• The sky smiled at me
• A type of metaphor in which a non-human object has human-like characteristics
• Giving an inanimate object human characteristics
• Personification is when inanimate objects are given human characteristics
• When an inanimate object is given human characteristics.
• When non-human entities are given human attributes, e.g. 'The sun smiled down on us.'
• A language device whereby a writer describes something non-human by giving it human characteristics
• When an animate object is given human abilities, qualities or characteristics
• Attributing human characteristics to inanimate objects
• Attributing human features to inanimate objects
• When inanimate objects are given human attributes.
• Giving human characteristics to non human things
• Personification is a literary device where inanimate objects are given human attributes, features or characteristics.
• A real or fictional person embodying, representing or epitomising a concept, force or phenomenon.
• Where inanimate objects take on human characteristics
• Personification occurs when objects are given agency.
• When an inanimate object is given human qualities.
• When an inanimate object is given human characteristics
• Attributing the characteristics of a person to an object.
• when an inanimate object is given human qualities or features
• When an inanimate object is given human qualities

• When an inanimate object is given a human characteristic or emotion. This is a form of metaphor.

• A form of metaphor specifically ascribing human characteristics, behaviour or emotions to a non-human character or object.

• As previous def.

• Considering an object, human or inhuman, as an individual person.

• The use of human attributes given to non human things.

• Our habit of imagining that non-human things have human feelings

• Giving human characteristics to inanimate objects.

• Where a non-human thing is given human characteristics.

• When an inanimate object is giving human characteristics to describe it.

• When an inanimate object or element is given human qualities, thoughts, actions etc

• Giving human qualities to objects/ things that are not human

• Giving inanimate objects human traits

• When a writer will assign human emotions or characteristics to a non-human entity (e.g. the wind moaned).

• Treating something that's non-human as if it were a human

• Giving human characteristics to a non human object

• A type of metaphor, when features of animacy - particularly human-like agency, behaviour or emotion - are projected onto an inanimate object or phenomenon.

• Attributing human characteristics to something which is not human.

• Talking or writing about things that aren't alive as if they were alive, or even human.
- When an inanimate object is imbued with human characteristics
- Giving inanimate objects, animals, or other creatures human traits such as speaking
- Where objects are given human emotions
- Describing an inanimate object as if it was a person.
- Oh, that one’s easier. It’s more playful in my view — it allows an observer to express the effects an experience or object has on them by dressing it up as a character of some sort. So when I personify the wind — whistling, sighing, stamping in fury — I’m trying to figure out how to talk about the impression the wind is having on me. It’s not just the sound I’m after (thin high pitched sustained shrilling, or short stretches of soft lower frequency buzzing) but the way that sound makes me feel. The first may express the feeling I have that the wind is travelling over a long expanse in a sustained fashion, and so I experience a sensation of isolation or insignificance; the second may express the feeling I have that the wind is rising and falling, so softly that I can only hear it when everything else is very still, emphasizing a kind of intimacy. Personification is supposed to be about finding an equivalent human activity or state for a non-human creature, object, or event, but I think it’s more about finding a way of melding the stimulus and its effect on the communicator. Again, not very succinct but I’m trying to avoid the standard definitions.
- Human characteristics given to inanimate objects.
- Attributing human qualities or attributes to inanimate objects.
- the attribution of human characteristics to an inanimate object
- when non-human 'objects' are given human emotions
- Personification is human characteristics projected onto anything that is not human.
- When a writer gives human or ‘living’ attributes to an inanimate object, or something which does not have emotions, such as the wind.
- Applying human qualities/actions to non-human subject. A type of metaphor.
- The act of giving human qualities to inanimate objects.
- It is a literary term for attributing human characteristics to what is non-human.
- Attributing human qualities/behaviour/emotions to something that is not human: anthropomorphism.
- Attributing human characteristics to animals or inanimate objects/phenomena.
- The attribution of human characteristics to something non-human.
- Personification gives human attributes to abstract ideas, animate objects of nature, or inanimate non-natural objects.
- Talking or thinking about an inanimate entity as though it were a person, with the cognitive thinking, volition, and/or physical movement that a person has.
- When something inhuman (an object or thing) is given human qualities.
- To give a thing human characteristics
- A literary technique in where non-living objects are given human-like qualities; it is a certain type of metaphor.
- When an inanimate object is given human qualities or attributes
- Giving human characteristics to non-living things
- Where non-human objects are given human qualities or actions.
- When an object, piece of nature, etc is given a human characteristic
- Embodiment of a stereotype
• Giving the qualities or abilities of a person to inanimate objects. A type of metaphor.

• Where an inanimate object is given human characteristics.

• You attribute to objects human characteristics

• When natural elements are given emotions

• The broad transference of human features to inanimate objects, plants and animals.

• Attributing human characteristics to non-human entities. Leech also talks about animistic metaphors, which are more general than personification.

• Trope whereby a non-human entity is described in anthropomorphic terms.
Appendix 2.5: Main survey participants’ comments on the matrix table.

The comments were made on Twitter, which is a platform where the survey was shared. The participants agreed to their comments being quoted anonymously.

- “Will you later share what you were investigating and what your findings were? Is it the changing use of this term? Your survey did not allow people to say they taught KS3, KS4 AND KS5 by the way.” (January 17th, 2019).

- “I had some real problems with the examples and questions. Maybe me but … I think it’s my eccentricity and misunderstanding – I couldn’t find any examples of pathetic fallacy” (January 19th, 2019).

- “1. Many secondary teachers teach KS3, KS4 AND KS5. 2. I’d need more context in most of the examples to determine whether it was pathetic fallacy or not.” (January 19th, 2019).

- “Lots of your examples have potential to be pathetic fallacy, but can’t be deemed so without some explicit link to text context (plot, character emotion etc.). Interesting survey, I’d be interested to see the results!” (January 20th, 2019).
Appendix 2.6: USAS tagset of semantic categories, Wmatrix.

A GENERAL AND ABSTRACT TERMS
A1 General
A1.1.1 General actions, making etc.
A1.1.2 Damaging and destroying
A1.2 Suitability
A1.3 Caution
A1.4 Chance, luck
A1.5 Use
A1.5.1 Using
A1.5.2 Usefulness
A1.6 Physical/mental
A1.7 Constraint
A1.8 Inclusion/Exclusion
A1.9 Avoiding
A2 Affect
A2.1 Affect: - Modify, change
A2.2 Affect: - Cause/Connected
A3 Being
A4 Classification
A4.1 Generally kinds, groups, examples
A4.2 Particular/general; detail
A5 Evaluation
A5.1 Evaluation: - Good/bad
A5.2 Evaluation: - True/false
A5.3 Evaluation: - Accuracy
A5.4 Evaluation: - Authenticity
A6 Comparing
A6.1 Comparing: - Similar/different
A6.2 Comparing: Usual/unusual
A6.3 Comparing: Variety
A7 Definite (+ modals)
A8 Seem
A9 Getting and giving; possession
A10 Open/closed; Hiding/Hidden; Finding; Showing
A11 Importance
A11.1 Importance: Important
A11.2 Importance: Noticeability
A12 Easy/difficult
A13 Degree
A13.1 Degree: Non-specific
A13.2 Degree: Maximizers
A13.3 Degree: Boosters
A13.4 Degree: Approximators
A13.5 Degree: Compromisers
A13.6 Degree: Diminishers
A13.7 Degree: Minimizers
A14 Exclusivizers/particularizers
A15 Safety/Danger

B THE BODY AND THE INDIVIDUAL
B1 Anatomy and physiology
B2 Health and disease
B3 medicines and medical treatment
B4 Cleaning and personal care
B5 Clothes and personal belongings

C ARTS AND CRAFTS
C1 Arts and crafts
**EMOTIONAL ACTIONS, STATES AND PROCESSES**

E1 General
E2 Liking
E3 Calm/Violent/Angry
E4 Happy/sad
E4.1 Happy/sad: Happy
E4.2 Happy/sad: Contentment
E5 Fear/bravery/shock
E6 Worry, concern, confident

**FOOD AND FARMING**

F1 Food
F2 Drinks
F3 Cigarettes and drugs
F4 Farming & Horticulture

**GOVERNMENT AND THE PUBLIC DOMAIN**

G1 Government, Politics and elections
G1.1 Government etc.
G1.2 Politics
G2 Crime, law and order
G2.1 Crime, law and order: Law and order
G2.2 General ethics
G3 Warfare, defence and the army; weapons

**ARCHITECTURE, BUILDINGS, HOUSES, AND THE HOME**

H1 Architecture and kinds of houses and buildings
H2 Parts of buildings
H3 Areas around or near houses
H4 Residence
H5 Furniture and household fittings

I MONEY AND COMMERCE
I1 Money generally
I1.1 Money: Affluence
I1.2 Money: Debts
I1.3 Money: Price
I2 Business
I2.1 Business: Generally
I2.2 Business: Selling
I3 Work and employment
I3.1 Work and employment: Generally
I3.2 Work and employment: Professionalism
I4 Industry

K ENTERTAINMENT, SPORTS, AND GAMES
K1 Entertainment generally
K2 Music and related activities
K3 Recorded sound etc.
K4 Drama, the theatre and showbusiness
K5 Sports and games generally
K5.1 Sports
K5.2 Games
K6 Childrens games and toys

L LIFE AND LIVING THINGS
L1 Life and living things
L2 Living creatures generally
L3 Plants
M  MOVEMENT, LOCATION, TRAVEL, AND TRANSPORT

M1  Moving, coming and going
M2  Putting, taking, pulling, pushing, transporting &c.
M3  Vehicles and transport on land
M4  Shipping, swimming etc.
M5  Aircraft and flying
M6  Location and direction
M7  Places
M8  Remaining/stationary

N  NUMBERS AND MEASUREMENTS

N1  Numbers
N2  Mathematics
N3  Measurement
N3.1 Measurement: General
N3.2 Measurement: Size
N3.3 Measurement: Distance
N3.4 Measurement: Volume
N3.5 Measurement: Weight
N3.6 Measurement: Area
N3.7 Measurement: Length & height
N3.8 Measurement: Speed
N4  Linear order
N5  Quantities
N5.1 Entirety; maximum
N5.2 Exceeding; waste
N6  Frequency etc.

O  SUBSTANCES, MATERIALS, OBJECTS, AND EQUIPMENT
O1  Substances and materials generally
O1.1 Substances and materials generally: Solid
O1.2 Substances and materials generally: Liquid
O1.3 Substances and materials generally: Gas
O2  Objects generally
O3  Electricity and electrical equipment
O4  Physical attributes
O4.1 General appearance and physical properties
O4.2 Judgement of appearance (pretty etc.)
O4.3 Colour and colour patterns
O4.4 Shape
O4.5 Texture
O4.6 Temperature

P   EDUCATION
P1  Education in general

Q   LINGUISTIC ACTIONS, STATES, AND PROCESSES
Q1  Communication
Q1.1 Communication in general
Q1.2 Paper documents and writing
Q1.3 Telecommunications
Q2  Speech acts
Q2.1 Speech etc.: Communicative
Q2.2 Speech acts
Q3  Language, speech and grammar
Q4  The Media
Q4.1 The Media: Books
Q4.2 The Media: Newspapers etc.
Q4.3 The Media: TV, Radio and Cinema
S1  SOCIAL ACTIONS, STATES AND PROCESSES
S1.1  Social actions, states and processes
S1.1.1  General
S1.1.2  Reciprocity
S1.1.3  Participation
S1.1.4  Deserve etc.
S1.2  Personality traits
S1.2.1  Approachability and Friendliness
S1.2.2  Avarice
S1.2.3  Egoism
S1.2.4  Politeness
S1.2.5  Toughness; strong/weak
S1.2.6  Sensible
S2  People
S2.1  People: - Female
S2.2  People: - Male
S3  Relationship
S3.1  Relationship: General
S3.2  Relationship: Intimate/sexual
S4  Kin
S5  Groups and affiliation
S6  Obligation and necessity
S7  Power relationship
S7.1  Power, organizing
S7.2  Respect
S7.3  Competition
S7.4  Permission
S8  Helping/hindering
S9  Religion and the supernatural

T  TIME
T1  Time
T1.1  Time: General
T1.1.1  Time: General: Past
T1.1.2  Time: General: Present; simultaneous
T1.1.3  Time: General: Future
T1.2  Time: Momentary
T1.3  Time: Period
T2  Time: Beginning and ending
T3  Time: Old, new and young; age
T4  Time: Early/late

W  THE WORLD AN OUR ENVIRONMENT
W1  The universe
W2  Light
W3  Geographical terms
W4  Weather
W5  Green issues

X  PSYCHOLOGICAL ACTIONS, STATES AND PROCESSES
X1  General
X2  Mental actions and processes
X2.1  Thought, belief
X2.2  Knowledge
X2.3  Learn
X2.4  Investigate, examine, test, search
X2.5  Understand
X2.6  Expect
X3 Sensory
X3.1 Sensory:- Taste
X3.2 Sensory:- Sound
X3.3 Sensory:- Touch
X3.4 Sensory:- Sight
X3.5 Sensory:- Smell

X4 Mental object
X4.1 Mental object:- Conceptual object
X4.2 Mental object:- Means, method

X5 Attention
X5.1 Attention
X5.2 Interest/boredom/excited/energetic

X6 Deciding
X7 Wanting; planning; choosing
X8 Trying
X9Ability
X9.1 Ability:- Ability, intelligence
X9.2 Ability:- Success and failure

Y SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
Y1 Science and technology in general
Y2 Information technology and computing

Z NAMES AND GRAMMATICAL WORDS
Z0 Unmatched proper noun
Z1 Personal names
Z2 Geographical names
Z3 Other proper names
Z4 Discourse Bin
Z5 Grammatical bin
Z6  Negative
Z7  If
Z8  Pronouns etc.
Z9  Trash can
Z99 Unmatche