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ABSTRACT

Text Complexity in Graded Readers: A Systemic Functional Look

Utilizing the Systemic Functional Linguistic frameworks of taxis, logico-semantic relation, grammatical metaphor, and appraisal, this thesis examines two of the most popular rewrites: *Jane Eyre* and *The Canterville Ghost* from the Macmillian Reader, Black Cat Reading and Training, Oxford Bookworm, and Penguin ELT graded reader series.

Although a considerable body of literature exists concerning graded readers, the majority of research tends to focus on statistical gains in fluency development or vocabulary acquisition and their retention rather than the linguistic properties of these texts. Furthermore, studies on textual adaptations primarily take a broad corpus-style approach, contrasting altered and unaltered material, rather than materials adapted for beginner, intermediate, and advanced level students.

Selected on the basis of researchers’ and publishers’ ruminations regarding the nature of beginner, intermediate, and advanced materials, the Systemic Functional Linguistic frameworks of taxis, logico-semantic relations, grammatical metaphor, and appraisal structure this investigation of text complexity as both a structural and semantic concern. As far as the researcher is aware, this thesis would appear to be the first of its kind to attempt to explore text complexity in graded readers by comparing semantically equivalent passages across different rewrites of the same title.

The results of this study (in terms of a greater percentage of nestled constituents, incongruent realizations, and conflicting appraisal items in the more advanced texts) are indicative of increased structural and semantic complexity by level. These findings suggest that a consideration of text complexity in context—as opposed to de-contextualized word or grammar lists—may be beneficial for students because “personal authenticity” (Van Lier, 1996) and its attendant increased autonomy and motivation can be enabled by teachers and publishers understanding and scaffolding areas of difficulty.
INTRODUCTION

Graded Readers: A Brief Overview

Commonly defined as “books written for learners of English using limited lexis and syntax” (Hill, 2008), graded readers trace their development back to Michael West whose work with word lists in Bengal in the 1920s led to the publishing of the New Method Reader series (Dawson, 2002). According to Paul Nation and Karen Wang Ming-tzu (1999), West intended for his graded readers to act as a supplement to classroom instruction by consolidating previously learned material rather than encouraging new language acquisition per se (p. 375). As West himself explains, the readers were intended to “give extra practice in reading…review and fix the vocabulary already learned…and “stretch” that vocabulary so that the learner is enabled to give a greater width of meaning to the words already learned…[showing] the learner that what he has learned so far, to encourage him to press on with his study of the language” (West, 1955, p. 69).

From the outset, graded readers can be seen engaging what have come to be two central tenets of TESOL pedagogy: namely, 1) the belief that it is beneficial for material to take into consideration the learners’ current level of competence (a belief that would come to be emphasized by Krashen’s theory of comprehensible input during the 1980s), and 2) the belief that student interactions with the material should be motivating enough that student autonomy is encouraged (an idea later supported by the writings of Van Lier, 1996).

Designed as supplementary material that could sustain independent study removed from the classroom context and an instructor’s continued assistance (i.e. as extensive reading materials), graded readers were necessarily designed to be constitutive. In other words, graded readers were created with the understanding that “the meaning has to be carried fully by the text and be fully explicit” (Hill, 2013, p. 89). The test of a graded reader, according to David Hill, is thus whether the meaning is “transparent” enough that students can “read with confidence in their understanding” (p. 90). This design principle evidently had important considerations for the two types of graded readers that came into being—the “rewrite,” which adapted “classic” texts, and the “simple original,” which was written with the second language learner in mind.

Michael West sought to make his graded readers fully explicit by grading the vocabulary contained within. Explaining the design of his New Method Readers in a 1937 volume of The Modern Language Journal, West writes how:

New words (selected according to their frequency) are introduced at regular intervals, viz., roughly one new word in every 50 or 60 recurring words. New words are repeated three times in the text. Each Reader teaches approximately 300 words. […] After 300 words of progress there are three or more supplementary Readers (Readers containing no new words) in which pupils can get further review and practice of the vocabulary, as well as increased fluency of reading (p. 221).
Whereas the majority of publishers currently embrace the idea of vocabulary control—with headword counts and the grading of syntax through grammatical structure lists often corresponding to textbook syllabi, publishers can also be seen touting the benefits of an intuitive approach. An intuitive approach is where, as the name suggests, writers rely upon their intuition to ascertain the level of text difficulty. Different researchers and publishers are divided, however, over just how much syntax and vocabulary control, as opposed to intuitive adaptation, is beneficial. Although some argue that too much control has the potential to result in a text that is “inauthentic,” others such as David Hill oppose a purely intuitive approach, stating that even though “the resulting texts may read well and be thought more authentic…they do not help the student who is perplexed by word and sentence structures beyond his or her competence” (2013, p. 89).

An emphasis on “authenticity” arose with the communicative language movement in the 1970s which was concerned with using “real language, produced by a real speaker or writer for a real audience and designed to convey a real message of some sort” in the classroom (Gilmore, 2007, in Guo, 2012, p. 197). Standing in stark contrast to “texts that were originally created to fulfill a social purpose in a first language community” (Little et al., 1989), graded readers became controversial. Although “original” graded readers specifically designed for foreign or second language learners certainly had the potential for “inauthenticity,” rewrites in particular were seen to be the worst perpetrators for the way in which they altered the lexis and syntax present in the original text.

A shift had occurred from viewing graded readers as a means to consolidate knowledge to a means of acquiring new vocabulary or grammar structures, and proponents of authentic materials argued that the nature of graded readers meant they were not as beneficial. The nature of graded readers were thought to stunt students’ development of the language competence needed to function within the real world (Guo, 2012).

The promotion of authentic over adapted materials has influenced extensive reading research, with studies investigating whether authentic materials graded with the use of technology can promote language acquisition (Guo, 2012).

Meanwhile, supporters of graded readers petition for a redefinition of authenticity (Day and Bamford, 1998; Claridge, 2005) and also of graded readers as “language learner literature” to raise graded readers to the status of “established genres in their own right” (Day and Bamford, 1998, p. 64). In this authenticity debate, claims for and against graded readers remain difficult to cross-examine due to the differing assumptions they hold regarding what happens when a text is simplified. Not only may graded readers take the form of an original or a rewrite, these texts might also be graded using a number of different approaches from a strict control of vocabulary and grammar to the addition or deletion of material. What gets added or deleted here may be radically different across texts depending on the rationale of the writer, because, as Wan-A-Rom (2008) notes, there are considerable differences across writers’ and publishers’ interpretations of the CEFR frameworks.

Research regarding graded readers can be seen to struggle with notions of “authenticity”—which Van Lier (1996) has shown to be a contextual concern—because of the linguistic paradigm they adopt. The majority
of these studies prescribe to formal linguistic conceptualization whose primary concern is the syntagmatic dimensions of language, in other words, “how constituents may be combined with other constituents in a well-formed structure” (SYSTEMIC-FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR). The grading of language, however, is a paradigmatic concern, i.e. having to do with the choices available for expressing the same meaning in more or less complex ways.

Lacking the means to discuss the paradigmatic dimensions of language, a syntagmatic approach tends to treat meaning as if it can be automatically computed provided that one “knows” a word or structure (Melby & Klemetz, 2005). A universal grammar approach assumes that with adequate exposure to a language, the language acquisition device will do the rest. Consequently, graded readers have tended to be treated as language input that is made comprehensible by adjusting the quantity of unknown words or structures contained within. However, as Nation (2001) shows, language acquisition is not an all or nothing process in that truly knowing a word relies on having met that word in a number of different contexts. When research has been undertaken on vocabulary acquisition through graded readers, the underlying linguistic paradigm of these studies has focused attention on word frequency (i.e. the less frequent the item, the more challenging the item is thought to be), rather than the use of these items in context. Furthermore, where context is considered, this approach treats context in the local sense of the word (i.e. word collocations).

**Systemic Functional Linguistics Outlined**

Attributed to the work of scholars such as M.A.K. Halliday, Hassan, Matthiessen, and J.R. Martin, Systemic Functional Linguistics (hereafter SFL) can be described, not just as being a theory about language, but a “toolkit” for analysis that differs from a formal linguistic tradition in terms of its systemic and functional dimensions.

SFL’s Functional Dimensions:

In contrast to formal linguistic paradigms which theorize about mental grammars or “competence” and regard form as the most valuable focus for language study, functional linguistic approaches, of which SFL is a member, focus on language production and seek to explain how contextual factors make one linguistic form more appropriate than another at satisfying a particular communicative purpose. This premise, that language is a resource for making meaning (Halliday, 1978) lies at the heart of SFL. Consequently, whereas formal linguistics offsets semantics as a separate area of study, SFL gives equal weight to both meaning and form resulting in labels that do not just describe how a clause is constructed (i.e. parts of speech) but integrate form with their semantic functions.

SFL has been hugely influenced by the ideas of Halliday’s mentor, J.R. Firth (and the London School of Linguistics), who oppose Bloomfield’s (1933) statement that semantics is “the weak point in language study” (Bloomfield, 1933, p. 140), asserting that the “context of situation” is of central importance given that one’s
language use is affected by a variety of contextual variables such as one’s status within the social setting and larger cultural influences. In this respect, Firth was influenced by the observations of the anthropologist Malinowski whose difficulty translating texts led him to propose that a translation could only be understood in the context in which it had been spoken. Halliday appears to have influenced by this genealogy of ideas, from Malinowski to Firth, when he adopts a paradigmatic orientation towards language.

The formal linguistic tradition had been concerned with the purely syntagmatic (horizontal) dimensions of language, in other words, “how constituents may be combined with other constituents in a well-formed structure” (SYSTEMIC-FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR) and is thus limited in its ability to discuss the semantic (vertical) dimensions of language. SFL, on the other hand, incorporates the Saussurean concept of “valeur”—the idea that meaning can be tied to the features distinguishing one linguistic form from other contextually viable forms—when it explores “the choices that are open to the speaker at any particular point in an utterance.”

**SFL’s Systemic Dimensions:**

SFL delineates the choices available to a language speaker in terms of system network diagrams. As Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) explain, “systemic theory gets its name from the fact that the grammar of a language is represented in the form of system networks, not as an inventory of structures. Of course, structure is an essential part of the description, but it is interpreted as the outward form taken by systemic choices not as the defining characteristic of language. A language is a resource for making meaning, and meaning resides in systemic patterns of choice” (p. 23).

Systemic functional linguists noticed that these systems seemed to fall within three main groupings within language, as supported by lots of interaction between the systems within one grouping but little interaction between the systems across these groupings. Systemic functional linguists thus propose that “the entire architecture of language is arranged” with regard to these groupings which are seen to embody “the [three main] functions which [have] evolved in the human species” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 31).
Figure 1.1 The Architecture of Language

In order not to cause confusion by naming these groupings “functions,”—because “there is a long tradition of talking about the functions of language in contexts where ‘function’ simply means [the] purpose or way of using language, and has no significance for the analysis of language itself” (Halliday & Hasan, 1985)—systemic functional linguists calls these groupings “meta-functions.” These meta-functions are the interpersonal meta-function, which groups together those systems concerned with the enacting of social relationships; the experiential meta-function, which groups together those systems that have to do with language as a reflection of our world (for instance, how our experience and inner thoughts are represented in language); and the textual meta-function, which concerns those systems related to the organization of meaning within language. In SFL these three meta-functions are seen to function at all layers of the language, or strata, from phonology, to lexico-grammar to discourse-semantics, and to genre. For example, at the level of the clause (the main unit of analysis within SFL), the interactions of these three meta-functions mean that “the clause is not only a figure representing some process—some doing or happening, saying or sensing, being or having…it is also a proposition or a proposal, whereby we inform or question, give an order or make an offer, and express our appraisal of and attitude towards whoever we are addressing and what we are talking about” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 29).

Looking at the way language is represented by SFL here, one can see that SFL is, to use Halliday’s term, “extravagant” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 5). Rather than aiming for an “economical description” of the
grammar, SFL sets itself apart from “traditional compositional thinking about language” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 20) by concerning itself with a holistic approach. In this respect, “whatever is said about one aspect is to be understood always with reference to the total picture” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 19). It is thus believed that the systemic functional linguistic frameworks utilized here will provide beneficial contributions to a discussion of text complexity within graded readers.

**Rationale**

Grading fits well into a systemic functional view of language, which conceptualizes language learning as a process of social interaction. In social interaction, one constantly adapts one’s language use based on one’s perception of the other person by choosing from the choices available in the language system. The grading within teacher-student conversations, referred to as teacher talk, has been thought of as inherently beneficial for students, but, paradoxically, when this grading of material involves textual adaptation, this has undergone attention for being “inauthentic.” Although such criticism may be founded when a strict adherence to word and grammar lists divorced from a consideration of language in context produces texts unrepresentative of natural language, it has been noted that the majority of textual adaptations now tend to take a more flexible approach, with word lists coming to function more like guidelines.

Arguably those choices available to teachers when selecting an appropriate level text for their students are not dissimilar to the options available to a writer when simplifying a text. A teacher can either 1) assess the text intuitively, 2) break the text down in terms of headwords and grammatical structures, or 3) mix these two approaches. These options present a dilemma. An intuitive approach, although not necessarily unreliable, may feel rather unstructured, whereas lists of vocabulary and grammar structures hide what is going on semantically within a text as a result of their de-contextualized form and thus may not be of much value.

The following research thus seeks to employ a systemic functional linguistic approach to investigate where there are any patterns that might characterize material simplified for beginner, intermediate, and advanced proficiency level students. Although much has been hypothesized regarding what happens when a text is adapted, only a handful of studies cite linguistic evidence supporting these claims. Furthermore, where adapted materials are considered for their linguistic features, these tend to be contrasted with the original material, but not other versions created for different proficiency levels. Clearly then an investigation is warranted.

Two of the most popular titles (*Jane Eyre* and *The Canterville Ghost*) were selected from the Macmillian Readers, Black Cat Reading and Training, Oxford Bookworms, and Penguin ELT graded reader series with the view that rewrites could present a number of fruitful areas of exploration. First, a comparison of the rewrites and original material was seen to have the potential to shed light on those elements considered to be too complex for learners in the original text. Second, because the same titles could be found across different series at different levels, there was not only the possibility to discuss how different adaptations make a text a beginner versus an
intermediate text but also how the different publishers’ criteria might be an influencing factor.

**Research Questions and Thesis Overview**

Using SFL as its main theoretical framework, this thesis will attempt to locate patterns that occur within different publishers’ graded reader rewrites of two “classical” texts: *Jane Eyre* and *The Canterville Ghost*. The graded readers were selected from a count of the most popular rewrites across publishers selected from David Hill’s survey of graded readers (2013). All the texts were analyzed using taxis, logico-semantic relation, grammatical metaphor and appraisal to provide insight into the following questions:

1) Are there any patterns that characterize the nature of beginner, intermediate, and advanced graded reader rewrites and might there be any features representative of simplified material in general?
2) Are there any particular features of the original text that undergo alteration in the rewrites?
3) Is there anything noticeable in terms of the interdependency or semantic connections between clauses (taxis and logico-semantic relation)?
4) How are grammatical metaphors within the original texts dealt with in the rewrites?
5) Is there anything interesting about the way Appraisal items are used? How might a reading of the characters change across rewrites?
6) Could any patterns in terms of taxis, logico-semantic relation, grammatical metaphor or appraisal be connected to the publishers’ adaptation approaches?
REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

Graded Readers Design

Graded readers are based on the premise that students’ comprehension and motivation will be impeded when reading “authentic texts.” As Rivers (1981) writes, “when learners are exposed to authentic texts exceeding their ability level, their reading processes are disrupted because they must decipher the meaning by referencing outside sources such as dictionaries. This disruption not only slows down the learner’s reading process, but it may also have a negative affective toll, possibly damaging the student’s language confidence” (in Crossley et al., 2007, p. 18) thus materials created or adapted for English Second or Foreign language learners are pedagogically advantageous.

Graded readers find their place within extensive reading, defined as reading designed to expose learners to “quantities of material within their linguistic competence” (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p. 259). Proponents of extensive reading such as Day & Bamford, David Hill, and Nation hypothesize that graded materials make “an important contribution to the language proficiency of English learners by 1) increasing access to already learnt information and 2) presenting opportunities for the acquisition of vocabulary and grammar structures (Day & Bamford 1998, p. 4; Nation, 1997; Nuttall, 1996, p. 127; Takase, 2007; Soltani 2011). The vast majority of research into textual simplification has sought to find statistic support for these two assertions (i.e. increased fluency (e.g. Bell, 2001), and vocabulary/grammar acquisition).

The idea that graded materials can assist language acquisition has to do with the idea that, because material takes into account “what the reader already knows about the language,” it can easily “allow learners to extend this knowledge” (Davies and Widdowson, 1974). In this respect, it fits well with theories such as Krashen’s theory of comprehensible input, which claims that learners acquire language by being exposed to material slightly beyond their “current level of competence.” By using their pre-existing competence alongside contextual clues, learners can acquire new knowledge when given this form of input.

The Controversy

With the rise of the communicative approach during the 1970s (with theories such as Goodman & Freeman’s 1993 Whole Language Approach and Cummin’s Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (see Crossley et al., 2012), the idea of material created or adapted for foreign or second language learners being pedagogically advantageous was called into question.

Proponents of the communicative language approach argued that exposure to texts other than those “originally created to fulfill a social purpose in a first language community” (Little et al., 1989) would impede language acquisition because texts other than those produced by and for those in the target language community would not provide a true representation of what happens in L2 discourse. Only texts produced by and for those who speak the target language were thought to be truly representative of L2 discourse (O’Donnell, 2009). What
was needed then was not graded readers but a means to grade texts through the selection of authentic materials defined as “real language produced by a real speaker or writer for a real audience and designed to convey a real message of some sort” (Gilmore & Morrow in Guo, 2012).

Although proponents and opponents of graded material unanimously agree that graded readers involve modifications in terms of lexis and syntax, when it comes to what specifically is entailed in these modifications, a number of differing assertions have been made. Compiling supporters’ and opponents’ claims about what happens during the modification process, the common threads seem to be as follows: graded readers may replace difficult lexis with frequent and potentially more polysemous items (Davies and Widdowson, 1974; Honeyfield, 1977; Simensen, 1987; Young, 1999; O’Donnell, 2009). Under this classification comes an avoidance of idioms (Long and Ross, 1993) and alterations to the way words collate (Honeyfield, 1977). As for syntax, textual modifications may involve changes to word order (Oh, 2001) or the extension or simplification of syntactic structures (Meisel, 1980; Mountford, 1976; Simensen, 1987; Young, 1999; O’Donnell, 2009; Long, 2007). The splitting of complex sentences into independent ones (Davidson and Kantor, 1982), alterations to “natural sentence length” through the use of shorter sentences (Mountford, 1976; Honeyfield, 1977; Long and Ross, 1993), and the deletion of unnecessary morphological inflections (Oh, 2001) would also seem to come under this classification. These lexical and syntactic changes may then alter such things as the distribution of information within a text (Honeyfield, 1977) or the embeddedness of linguistic “cues” (Mountford, 1976). Finally, supporters and opponents of graded readers have also claimed that changes may occur in terms of coherence with the use of different cohesive devices, (Honeyfield, 1977; Lautamatti, 1978; Phillips and Shettesworth, 1988; Goodman & Freeman, 1993), and increased or decreased redundancy (Johnson, 1982; Swaffar, 1985; Parker & Chaudron, 1987) related to the use of repetition and certain discourse markers (Swaffar, 1985).

Supporters and critics underpin their arguments with these assertions, but the number of modifications that could take place during the textual adaptation process is clearly diverse. It thus may be helpful to examine these claims in light of the main approaches available when grading material.

**Approaches to Text Adaptation**

According to Rachel Allan (2009), writers have two choices when simplifying a text for a L2 audience: a structural or an intuitive approach. As the name suggest, a structural approach is highly measured, encompassing the use of readability formulas and word lists. Readability formulas are “simple algorithms that measure text readability based on sentence length and word length”—two examples of which would be the Flesch Reading Ease and Flesch-Kincaid Grade level formulas. Those critics, who assert that adapted material involves a detrimental reduction in sentence and word length, are likely referring to this approach, as Davidson & Kantor (1982) state that readability formulas are “weak indicators of comprehensibility,” Goodman & Freeman (1993) write that “traditional readability formulas may omit connectives between sentences in order to shorten the
text’s length to make it more readable [resulting] in a text that is less cohesive and more difficult to comprehend,” and Graesser et al. (2004) write that “reducing complexity through a reduction in word and sentence length creates sentences that are choppy and lack cohesion” (in Crossley et al., 2007, p. 18).

The second option within a structural approach is the use of word lists; in other words, “predefined lists of words and structures [created] for each level of a series” (Nunan, 1999). Michael West, “the father of Extensive Reading”, created his New Method Reader series based on his General Service List of English vocabulary, and “began the principle of vocabulary control in extensive reading materials.” West, who was “particularly concerned with the density of unknown vocabulary in reading texts, developed a principle of readability based on lexical distribution” (Dawson, 2002) in order to solidify previously learned material (West, 1955, p. 69, in Pigada & Schmitt, 2006). The use of word lists took on a new dimension, however, with an increased interest in the potential for vocabulary and grammar acquisition through graded readers.

Tied to the use of word lists, which aim to control the vocabulary and grammar students are exposed to at each level, are a number of studies exploring how many items need to be known for adequate comprehension. Hu and Nation (2000) suggest that learners must know at least 98% of the words in a fiction text for unassisted understanding; Nation’s investigation into the relationship between the amount of known words in a text and reading comprehension recommends a minimum of 95%, which would seem to suggest that students will benefit the most from texts adapted so that no more than 5% of the words (1 in 20) are “unfamiliar” (Nation, 2001, in Horst, p. 361).

Research in this area is complicated, however, by the fact that word knowledge is a continuum. As researchers such as Nation (2001) are keen to emphasize, "vocabulary learning is not an all-or-nothing piece of learning" but is rather "a gradual process of one meeting with a word adding to or strengthening the small amounts of knowledge gained from previous meetings" (in Pigada and Schmitt, 2006, p. 7). Meeting words in context has been tied to a recycling of material. As Pigada and Schmitt write, when “the reader comes across new words in appropriate extensive reading materials, the reader can infer the context-based meaning provided by the text that are not generally found in dictionaries. Therefore, the repetition of words in the reading materials helps the readers…develop a deeper and more accurate understanding of word meaning and foster vocabulary learning” (in Soltani, 2011, p. 165). It is perhaps no surprise then that word-lists have been explored as an aid to the recycling of material.

Investigations into words lists have shown that the theoretical underpinning behind words-lists as a means to guide vocabulary acquisition through the frequency and recycling of material does not always transfer into practice. Analyzing a 741,504 word corpus of 56 graded readers from stage 1 to 6 of the Oxford Bookworm series, Wan-a-rom (2008) found that headwords did not correspond to the actual number of common word families in the texts, and where recycling did take place, it seemed coincidental with less than 1,500 common word families appearing at least 5 times in the entire series. Wan-a-rom also found considerable variation across readers, discovering that books with 400 headwords were listed under the A1/A2 Council of European
Framework descriptors in the Oxford Bookworm series, although the Macmillan Guided Reader series lists books with 1100 headwords as A2. Wan-a-rom has not been the only researcher to make observations about the comparability of graded readers. In personal communication with Gillian Claridge, David Hill also notes, for example, that “some of the readers, especially Penguin Readers, do not progress evenly in difficulty” (Claridge, 2012, p. 113).

Waring and Tataki (2003) discuss the reason for this phenomenon—the tug between the grading of material and the concern that too tight a control will produce inauthentic texts. According to Waring and Tataki, there is a tension among the choices available to publishers: if the publishers wish to focus on maintaining authenticity then they suggest letting the story control vocabulary selections, leaving the recycling of material and thus language acquisition up in the air; if the publishers wish to focus on language acquisition, then they suggest identifying target words to repeat within the title, and risk that the “naturalness of a book may be distorted by vocabulary requirements”; the publishers might also control the number of times a headword appears within a series level, but not necessarily within a title; lastly, graded readers can focus on fluency development rather than language acquisition by presenting “a rich input of already known vocabulary in various contexts and with a variety of collocations and colligations” rather than new items per se (p. 154).

The first option here would fall under the second main approach for adapting a text: an intuitive approach. Under an intuitive approach, the writer follows his or her hunches. As Rachel Allan (2009) writes, rather than strict adherence to a word list, “the author’s experience as a language teacher, language learner, or materials writer (or any combination of these) guides the process of simplification and allow the authors to rely on their own subjective approximations of what learners at a particular level should understand.” According to Simensen (1987) and Young (1999)’s research, even when authors are provided with guidelines for how to adapt a text, and may attest to following a structural approach, intuition may also enter into the equation making an intuitive approach perhaps “the most common strategy in L2 text simplification” (Crossley et al., 2012).

A writer is also presented with the choice between simplification and elaboration. According to Mary O’Donnell (2009), the most common type of textual modification is simplification, namely “decreasing the linguistic complexity of syntactical constructions and lexical items” (Long, 2007). This generally entails the deletion or replacement of difficult elements. A study by Tweissi (1998) investigates whether “variations in type and amount of linguistic simplification resulted in differences in the level of message comprehensibility” found that simplification had a positive effect on reading comprehension, noting that it was the type of simplification (e.g., lexical versus syntactic) rather than the amount that was most important to readers” (O’Donnell, p. 514).

In comparison, “elaboration”, a term reportedly coined by Parker & Chaudron (1987), attempts to increase comprehensibility while “maintain[ing] the complexity of the authentic text” (Yano et al., 2004) by “offsetting unfamiliar linguistic terms” with additional elements (Parker & Chaudron, 1987). In this way, elaborations can be both lexical, i.e. “adding redundancy to the language items anticipated to be unknown to the subjects [through] definitions, synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, and exemplification, prepositional phrases,
apposition, explicit signaling, and coordination” (p. 38) and structural—“adding redundancy to text structure in order to clarify message content and organization through signaling of intersentential relationships, retention of full noun phrases, repetition, supplying omitted elements, using anaphoric rather than cataphoric reference, and paraphrasing for summary statements which make already existing logical relations explicit without adding new information.” (Chung, 1995, pp. 38–39, in O’Donnell, p. 516).

Proponents of elaboration argue that this “mirrors the interactive modifications made during native speaker –non-native speakers oral exchanges (Long, 1983). Citing research that “suggests that readers’ ability to comprehend text seems to be less affected by vocabulary density and sentence length than the level and amount of information made available to readers,” proponents of elaboration suggest that elaboration may be a more desirable approach since it allows for the preservation of existing material, i.e. a high degree of “authenticity.” Unsurprisingly then, a number of studies (Brown, 1987; Ross et al., 1991; Chung, 1995) have sought to compare language acquisition in terms of adaptation type: simplified or elaborated.

Although Meisel (1980) argued that elaboration results “in extended utterances and grammar that can be more complex than those of the original because they formulate hypotheses about language that are approximations or overgeneralizations of the actual rules,” a number of studies would seem to support an elaborative approach (Brown, 1985; Ross et al., 1991; Long & Ross, 1993; Yano et al., 1994). Ross et al.’s 1994 study of 483 EFL Japanese college students found, for example, that the group given elaborated texts were “an average of six grade levels higher in readability,” despite the fact that the text was “twice as complex, and 50% longer than the simplified versions meaning it took longer to read” (in Crossley et al., 2012).

**Semantics: A Cultural Consideration**

Rewrites of “classical texts” in particular have been criticized for their “inauthenticity” on the basis of the original texts’ cultural value as “literature.” Gillian Claridge (2009), in interviews with teachers regarding the nature of a good graded reader, found “a marked bias against the classics, even when it was acknowledged that some classics were popular with learners” (p. 18). On this topic, David Hill (2013) comments that “it is…unhelpful if teachers put on a literary hat and frown upon rewritten versions of classic and modern novels” (p. 89) because extensive reading “is the readiest means by which students can obtain information about culture and history that they need for a deep level of communication” (p. 88). Scott and Huntington (2002) likewise discuss the cultural value of graded readers in encouraging “students to make connections between the target culture and their own knowledge, perspectives, and experiences, while discouraging them from developing rigid cultural stereotypes based on over-generalized typographies.” But what specifically is culture and how is it revealed in a text?

Elley’s (1989) study of text complexity explores “culture” in terms of necessary background knowledge, or schemata. Elley found that when students were given two texts of a similar linguistic level, one from a context familiar and the other alien to the learners (a Japanese folk tale called *The White Crane*), the learners
had trouble comprehending the unfamiliar text. From these findings Elley hypothesizes that language learners need three types of schemata to construct the meaning of a text: text schemata (having to do with grammar and organization), genre schemata (having to do with rhetorical structures), and content schemata (having to do with the topic itself)” (in Kramsch, 1993, p. 124). Without such cultural information, Kramsch (1993) writes “learners [can] badly misunderstand the topic, the tone, the genre, or the purpose of the text, or the intentions, goals and plans of the characters” (p. 125).

There is, however, another dimension to culture if one is to define it as “a gradual accumulation of values which in time become almost self-evident truths governing [peoples’] conception of what is right and wrong, good and bad, beautiful and ugly, courageous and cowardly, generous and mean in their internal and external relations…that over time becomes a way of life distinguishable from other ways of life”—a gradual accumulation of values that gets “carried by language.” (Ngugi, 1986, in Charles, 2011, p.199). If culture is a source of comprehension difficulty, and culture also encompasses the idea of what is “right and wrong…courageous and cowardly,” then text complexity might also arise in the reading of a character’s actions within the text.

On this topic of interpretation, Black Cat’s guide to their graded readers advises “it is sensible to check that [learners have] no problems with the ‘surface meaning’ of the text…and any misunderstanding of the explicit meaning has been cleared up” before asking learners to evaluate a character and discuss the motives for their actions. Although this is undoubtedly pedagogically advisable, this would seem to suggest that the interpretation of a character is more impressionistic and removed from the linguistic features within a text. The position taken here, however, is in line with Ngugi’s understanding that “culture is almost indistinguishable from the language that makes possible its genesis, growth, banking, articulation, and indeed its transmission from one generation to the next.” (Ngugi, 1986, in Charles, 2011, p.199). As Kramsch writes, “It is a truism that teaching language is teaching culture” (1993, p. 177).

**Surveying the Scope of Previous Studies**

When it comes to resolving the simplified versus authentic text debate, Crossley et al. (2007) point out that there has been a lack of empirical evidence because “data-based research [has been primarily concerned] with the effects of [these approaches to] text types (simplified or authentic) on student recall and comprehension, not with the linguistic properties of the texts” (p. 15). Although simplified and authentic texts have been examined in light of readability formulas and vocabulary counts (Goodman & Freeman, 1993; Long & Ross, 1993; Shook, 1997; Bamford, 1984, etc.) few have examined the lexico-grammatical features of simplified materials. Only Crossley and his co-researchers seem to address this area of interest in three studies: one in 2007, another in 2011, and another in 2012.

Crossley, McNamara, McCarthy, and Louwerse (2007) examined the general linguistic patterns of 105 simplified and authentic texts taken from ESL beginner level textbook reading passages (in order to investigate...
claims that simplified or elaborated texts actually become more complex as a result of textual modifications) and found that “authentic” and modified material did differ but not exactly in the manner predicted. In support of “authentic” materials, their study found a higher incidence of causal cohesion, which they suggest might better demonstrate cause and effect relationships, aiding plot line development. They also found more logical operators, such as “if,” which they suggest might result in a limited discourse structure if avoided in a simplified text in an effort to make it more concrete. However, they also found that there were not any significant differences in terms of polysemy, countering concerns that simplified materials may become more unclear, and found that the simplified texts contained redundancy that may aid students in the form of more semantic similarity between sentences and within paragraphs.

A second study by Crossley et al. (2011) addressed the limitations of this earlier study (namely, that the texts examined were not all of the same genre and were treated dichotomously as authentic versus modified material) by investigating the linguistic features of 100 Guardian Weekly news texts intuitively simplified for beginning, intermediate and advance proficiency level students from OneStopEnglish, an English teaching website. Their findings suggest that lower level simplified texts contain more text features related to comprehensible input than advanced simplified texts. Beginner texts were found to display more frequent, meaningful, imageable words, thought to allow for easier decoding, with fewer words before the main verb, creating texts that may be easier for students to parse. They also found that the beginner texts contained a greater amount of redundancy (more cohesive devices, a greater similarity between sentence structures, more noun overlap, etc.).

Semantics and the Authenticity Debate

It is perhaps unsurprising that the majority of studies investigating graded readers have struggled with the “authenticity” debate given their theoretical underpinnings. The majority of these studies work within the bounds of a formalist linguistic framework in which it is taken that a sentence can be decoded on the basis of computing its syntactic structure. In this respect, language is conceptualized as if there is a dyadic sign-signifier relationship in that, provided input is “comprehensible,” a sentence can be processed using one’s Language Acquisition Device (LAD).

Under this model, studies of graded readers have tended to receive a statistical treatment of fluency development and language acquisition. However, as Nation explains, fluency development and language acquisition is not just “a process of connecting word form to word meaning, but a complex development involving the learning of grammatical functions such as parts of speech, sociolinguistic factors such as word connotation, and frequency intuitions such as collocation, all over the course of multiple encounters of target words in diverse contexts” (Nation, 1990, 2001, in Huang, 2007). A mesh of complex variables here suggests the need to look at the lexico-grammatical features of a text in context; for instance, examining the way in which language items collocate rather than the number of times an item is recycled in a title or series (to explore
Pigada and Schmitt’s hypothesis that “the repetition of words in the reading materials helps the readers…develop a deeper and more accurate understanding of word meaning and foster vocabulary learning” (Soltani, 2011, p.165). However, only Wan-a-rom’s (2008) study, which looks at the usage of DRAW across a graded reader corpus, is known to take more of this kind of approach. Wan-a-rom observed that the usage of DRAW tended to be restricted to the sense of drawing a picture, with only single instances of “draw a knife,” “draw the curtains,” “draw a breath,” and “draw [lots].”

Clearly there is no literal meaning of “draw”; rather, contextual clues will inform whether someone is holding a pen or holding a gun. In this way, language is a creative-meaning system—in Halliday’s terms semiogenic—and as such depends on context for meaning. However, the majority of research in this area has not challenged a formalist linguistic paradigm concerned purely with the syntagmatic side of language (in other words, the arrangement of structural elements). Because this paradigm disassociates itself from a discussion of semantics in assuming that “the meaning of a sentence is computable from (a) the words of the sentence, (b) knowledge of the syntactic patterns of that language, and (c) a retrieval from the lexicon of the dyadic meanings of the words in that language” (Melby et al., 2005, p.414), it struggles with a discussion of authenticity, which is more of a semantic (and therefore paradigmatic) concern.

Claridge (2005) defines the issue of authenticity in graded readers as “faithfulness to the content of the original” (p. 155), but what is faithfulness? Perhaps what makes a good rewrite is not dissimilar to the question of what makes a good translation, about which Halliday (2001) writes:

> It is notoriously difficult to say why, or even whether, something is a good translation, since this must depend on a complex variety of different factors that are constantly shifting in their relationship one to another. The central organizing concept is presumably that of ‘equivalence’; but equivalence with respect to what? It seems that one might need some kind of typology of equivalences, which could be assigned different values according to the specific conditions attaching to a particular instance of translation (in Melby et al., 2005, pp. 14–15).

As the “authentic” features of a text will vary widely by text type, this idea of “equivalence” would seem particularly important. Equivalence here gels well with a paradigmatic consideration of language where particular lexicogrammatical items are seen to have meaning based on their selection opposed to others that could have featured instead. If, as Bassett (2005), the editor of the Oxford Bookworm series writes, "there are no new texts…it's how they are told" (Claridge, 2009, p.22), what elements of the original text must be retained in order to a graded reader to be a good beginner, intermediate, or advanced rewrite?
SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS’ CONTRIBUTION

In light of the limitations of graded reader research, which has tended to adhere to considerations of text complexity through a syntagmatic lens thereby struggling to discuss semantics and thus authenticity, it is hoped that a systematic functional linguistics approach can make valuable contributions by incorporating a paradigmatic perspective. Viewing a text to be the result of a number of selections made from a set of available meaning options, this thesis seeks to explore how certain choices function to create what would intuitively feel to be beginner, intermediate, and advanced level rewrites. Systemic functional linguistics is thought to be beneficial here because the theory allows “whatever is said about one aspect is to be understood always with reference to the total picture” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 19). In this respect, this thesis will draw together some of the aspects that have become isolated from each other under a formalist linguistics paradigm.

The Publishers’ Criteria

The publisher’s guidelines, taken from prefaces to the graded readers and PDFs available through their respective websites (Macmillan’s guide to Using Graded Readers in the Classroom; Black Cat’s Guide to Graded Readers; and Oxford’s The Oxford Bookworms Syllabus), seem to exhibit five major themes: 1) vocabulary control, 2) grammar control, 3) “information control,” 4) plot considerations, and 5) cultural considerations.

Regarding vocabulary control, Macmillan discusses “the amount of new and unfamiliar vocabulary [being] controlled” with a mind to the repetition and recycling of vocabulary items. Apart from an increase in the number of “basic words” (600 to 1100), a difference between the two texts (Jane Eyre (A1) and The Canterville Ghost (A2)) would seem to involve a greater “opportunity to meet unfamiliar words in contexts where their meaning is obvious.” The other graded reader that writes a bit more extensively on vocabulary control is Black Cat which emphasizes a “flexible attitude of good sense,” stating that “[while] widely known word-lists are certainly a point of reference…these are not followed dogmatically [since]…there will naturally be words which are essential and high-frequency in [the classic texts] which are usually far less frequent [elsewhere].”

As for grammar control, both Macmillan and Black Cat discuss limiting structures to those “that will be familiar to learners at each level,” and refer to sentence construction and length. Macmillan’s A1 Jane Eyre speaks of “most sentences contain[ing] only one clause, though compound sentences are used occasionally with…clauses joined by the conjunctions and but and or [to give] the text balance and rhythm.” The Macmillan Canterville Ghost likewise mentions “sentences…kept short—a maximum of two clauses in nearly all cases—[with] a balance of simple adverbial and adjectival phrases,” and Black Cat discusses the “careful grading” of sentence structure “[by] moving from short simple sentences at lower levels to longer, more complex sentences as students move further up,” echoed by Penguin that states the greater the increase in level,
the “more and more words and more complex grammar and language structures [which] are gradually introduced.” In comparison, the Oxford Bookworms Syllabus writes “[although] vocabulary and structures are carefully controlled according to the guidelines in the lexical and grammar syllabuses…these are only the surface attributes of the grading process [because] the readability of a text at any level cannot be measured just by lexis, grammar, and sentence length [but by giving] equal care…to…discourse markers, clarity of reference, avoidance of complex embedding, the balance of given and new information, elements of style, and so on.”

The above criteria would seem to subsume information control. With regard to this theme, Macmillan speaks of limiting “the amount of new information in each sentence, paragraph or chapter,” organizing paragraphs and chapters so that information is broken up into “manageable chunks [that] aid chronology” and information “vital to the story is…repeated where necessary.” Here Oxford similarly discusses how “structuring the discourse to suit the developing strategies of the learner plays a very important part” in its grading scheme.

The theme of information control appears to border a consideration of narrative structure. When it comes to a consideration of plot in their graded readers, Macmillan comments on the need to keep sub-plots “to a necessary minimum so that learners can follow the story easily and enjoyably” and discuss restricting the number of main characters to achieve this end. Black Cat and Oxford, on the other hand, link learner motivation to plot considerations with the need for “narratives which are…psychologically intruiging” (Black Cat), and “try to leave out the part that readers tend to skip” (Oxford quoting the crime novelist Elmore Leonard’s Ten Rules of Writing). Oxford in particular seems keen to emphasize a commitment to “good storytelling” by taking care with:

- Continuity, pace, and balance (no loose ends, clear plot signals)
- Density of information (the right amount of information, not too much, not too little
- Characterization
- Suspense and curiosity

Note that a number of the readers discuss language use as a means of engaging students here; Macmillan, for example, mentions “clear and vivid descriptions.”

Last, although only Macmillan’s graded reader seemed to delve into this area in much detail, there was a consideration of culture. Macmillan selects to limit “the amount of cultural background included within the text of the Readers,” though quite what constitutes “cultural background” is unclear. When it does feature, Macmillan claims that it is “made explicit through both words and illustrations.”

**Connections to the Systemic Functional Frameworks**

**Taxis and Logico-Semantic Relations:**

All the publishers mention the grading of grammar having to do with the length and complexity of sentences as a student progresses to more complicated texts. For example, Macmillan’s Elementary level
mentions sentences being kept “short—a maximum of two clauses in nearly all cases,” and the introduction to the Jane Eyre texts states that “most sentences contain only one clause, though compound sentences are used occasionally with the clauses joined by the conjunctions and but and or (parataxis in SFL terms) to “give the text balance and rhythm.” In comparison, the grammar lists for more complicated texts mentions conditionals such as “if” which would suggest sub-ordination (hypotaxis in SFL terms). Additionally there is the mention of relative clauses, which would suggest the potential for more embedded (rank-shifted) elements. Although these indicators of language structures are helpful, these seem disconnected from a discussion of how these feed into the length and complexity of clauses within the text.

Because the grading of grammar is a primary concern for publishers, it would seem that the place to start an examination of text complexity would be tactic and logico-semantic relations. Tactic and logico-semantic relations are helpful here because it links a discussion of what type of lexico-grammatical features make a clause more complex. The grammar lists also mention “clauses of result” (Black Cat) and “clauses of purpose” without mentioning what type of lexico-grammatical features this would involve, so it is difficult to piece together what is taking place here. SFL is of assistance in that it provides the means to discuss text complexity in light of both the lexico-grammatical and semantic features of these texts.

Grammatical Metaphor:

From the publishers’ guidelines it would appear that text complexity increases only with the introduction of “more and more words” rather than items as they are used in certain contexts. Macmillian mentions the “opportunity to meet unfamiliar words in contexts where their meaning is obvious,” but what does this mean for words to be obvious? What does it mean to say that wording is clear and precise? Perhaps what is meant here is an avoidance of metaphorical language. Traditionally, metaphorical language has been treated in terms of vocabulary, but, as established, the separation between vocabulary and grammar is an artificial one—metaphor can also occur within the grammar, hence our research framework of grammatical metaphor.
The Systemic Functional Frameworks:

The Clause

Unlike the syntagmatic approach of formal linguistics, which defines clauses in terms of the components subject, predicate, object, etc., systemic functional linguistic labels integrate semantic concepts. As the clause is the major unit of analysis within the following systemic functional frameworks, a brief explanation of the semantic dimensions of a clause is provided below.

From a semantic perspective, one’s “impression of experience is that it consists of a flow of events or goings-on.” Language functions to chunk or portion this experience into “a quantum of change as a figure” (Halliday & Matthiessen, p. 169). Take the two clauses: “I wanted to read. I opened a book.” The actual flow of events here consist of many more events such as walking to a bookshelf and taking the book, but the language user has chosen to represent this as two distinct quanta of change—the act of wanting and the act of opening. While the boundaries for “wanting” and opening overlap in that one can wanting to read right up to and during the reading process, these are represented in grammar as two distinct figures: one of wanting, another of acting.

Figure 2.1 The Clause as a Semantic Configuration

The clause is what “functions to structure experience as a semantic configuration” (Halliday & Matthiessen, p.175). In other words, the clause is the prototypical realization of the semantic concept of a figure at the level of the lexico-grammar. The grammar of the clause chunks this quanta of change by modeling the change as a figure of happening, doing, sensing, saying, being or having” by representing it lexico-grammatically as a certain process (i.e. verb) type (Halliday & Matthiessen, p.170). All figures necessarily consist of a process unfolding through time, and in this respect, obligatory element of process is the core component of a clause. A figure also necessary entails the involvement of one entity—realized lexico-grammatically as Participants—defined as the entity bringing about the occurrence of the process or being affected by it in some way (Halliday & Matthiessen, p.176). Together these two obligatory elements form the experiential center of the clause. Last, there are optional peripheral constituents lexico-grammatically as
circumstances “augmenting” the experiential center temporally, spatially, and causally.

The Clause Complex

Clause complexes are what are typically realized graphologically as a sentence (Halliday & Matthiessen, p. 371). Complexes function to relate semantic sequences of figures in the flow of events making up the episode structurally (Halliday & Matthiessen, p. 364). Emphasis has been added here because two sentences may be semantically related even if they are not joined in a clause complex, as seen with the two clauses: “I wanted to read. I opened a book” which are clearly linked by causation. As Halliday and Matthiessen explain, “The effect of combining clauses into a clause complex is one of tighter integration in meaning: the sequences that are realized grammatically in a clause complex are construed as being sub-sequences within the total sequence of events that make up a whole episode in a narrative” (Halliday & Matthiessen, p. 365).

Taxis & Logico-Semantic Relations

Taxis and Logico-Semantic Relation are the two basic systems that determine how clauses are related to each other (Halliday & Matthiessen, p.373).

Taxis

Because of the fundamental characteristics of a clause complex set apart from two independent clauses, all clauses linked logico-semantically in a clause complex are necessarily said to be interdependent. However, there is a difference in the degree of interdependence between clauses known as the system of TAXIS. Within the system network options for TAXIS, parataxis presents two clauses as being of equal status—one clause initiating (shown by the number 1) and the other continuing (shown by the number 2) (Halliday & Matthiessen, p.375), whereas hypotaxis presents an unequal relationship with a dominant or main clause (represented by the Greek symbol α) on which another is dependent (shown by the β symbol), thus meaning only one clause could stand on its own as a proposition in its own right. Note that different conjunctions realize paratactic and hypotactic relations. Also note that parataxis and hypotaxis are not used mutually exclusive of each other, and a clause complex will often involve a mixture of the two through nesting. For example:

1 I almost fell,
2 (β) and when I was upright again,
     (α) I stepped back from his chair.

In the example of nesting above one can see that it is not just a case of two clauses being joined through parataxis, but a clause being paratactically joined to a hypotactic clause nexus (i.e. two clauses related by interdependency). In other words, the hypotactic connection is nested within a paratactic connection.
Logico-Semantic Relations

The system of logico-semantic relation is concerned with the “basic semantic motifs that run throughout the language as a whole” (Halliday & Matthiessen, p. 392). There are two options in terms of the logico-semantic relations between clause connections: projection and expansion. Briefly, expansion involves phenomena being treated as the same order of experience, whereas projection treats phenomena as being related to phenomena of a higher order of experience (what people say and think) i.e. a meta-phenomenon. Expansion sub-divides into the categories of elaboration, extension, and enhancement; projection into locution and idea. These sub-categories will be discussed briefly below.

Projection

There are two types of projected clauses: projected clauses of idea, and projected clauses of locution. In projected idea clauses, represented by the symbol ‘ ‘, the projected clause is represented as a construction of meaning. In comparison, a projected locution clause “ ” represents the projected clause as a projection of wording. The difference between these two projected clauses can be conceptualized as the distinction between thought and speech bubbles.

Aiding in the identification of projected clauses is the fact that only processes of a verbal or mental type are able to project and that these correspond with the type of projection (verbal process are involved in projected clauses of locution, mental processes in projected idea clauses). However, it is important to note that, although all verbal processes project, only cognitive and desiderative mental processes are capable of projecting.

Table 1.1 The Four Types of Mental Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptive</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Desiderative</th>
<th>Emotive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) perceive, sense;</td>
<td>1) think, believe, know, suppose, expect, consider;</td>
<td>1) want, wish, would like, desire</td>
<td>1) like, fancy, love, adore, dislike, hate, detest, despise, loathe, abhor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) see, notice, glimpse;</td>
<td>2) understand, realize, appreciate;</td>
<td>2) hope (for), long for, yearn for</td>
<td>2) rejoice, exult, mourn, bemoan, bewail, regret, deplore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) hear, overhear;</td>
<td>3) imagine, dream, pretend;</td>
<td>3) intend, plan</td>
<td>3) fear, dread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) feel;</td>
<td>4) guess, reckon, conjecture, hypothesize;</td>
<td>4) decide, resolve, determine</td>
<td>4) enjoy, relish, marvel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) taste;</td>
<td>5) wonder, doubt;</td>
<td>5) agree, comply, refuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) smell</td>
<td>6) remember, recall, forget;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reason seems to be as follows: perceptive and emotive processes pertain to the border between inner and outer experience. When one sees, feels, likes or hates a phenomenon (represented here by the box symbol), the phenomenon is reacted to, but never becomes deeply involved in one’s mental world, occupying, rather, a border position. In this respect, one can, for example, see or feel something with little conscious mental involvement. Similarly, raw emotions such as like and hate are almost involuntary gut reactions, and do not have to be grounded in rational logic. Compare a verb of raw emotion such “hate” to a desiderative mental verb such as “want.” In order for something to be “wanted,” one’s raw emotions must first be filtered through some sort of thought process. Projected clauses necessarily involve this cognitive filtering—projected clauses of locution must be thought, for example, before they can be uttered (in other words, it began life as an idea before it became a construction of wording and in this sense, Halliday writes, is “twice cooked”). In cases such as these, projection does not have to originate with a phenomenon in the sense that one does not have to physically see clouds to think it might rain.

**Enhancement**

The three main logico-semantic categories for enhancement involve elaboration, extension, and enhancement. In elaboration, represented by the “equals” (=) symbol, one clause elaborates on another (or some constituent of it) by further specifying or describing it. The second clause will not introduce a new element, but rather provides “a further characterization of a pre-existing element by restating, clarifying, refining, or adding a descriptive attribute or comment to it” (Halliday & Matthiessen, p. 396). In extension, represented by the “plus” (+) symbol, one clause extends the meaning of another by adding something new, such as “an addition, a replacement, or an alternative” (Halliday & Matthiessen, p. 405). Lastly, in enhancement, represented by the “times” (x) symbol, one clause “enhances the meaning of another, embellishing around it, by qualifying it in terms of some circumstantial feature of time, place, manner, cause, or condition” (Halliday & Matthiessen, p.410).
Now that the logico-semantic categories for each type of clause have briefly been established: """","" it remains to see how these combine with the system of taxis and clause type together. While logico-semantic relations do not always demonstrate a one-to-one correspondence with items in the lexico-grammar because they are “semantic motifs,” there are certain constructions, listed below, that are suggestive of certain logico-semantic relations.

**Projection:**

The three systems interacting within projected clauses can be seen in the charts taken from Halliday & Matthiessen (2004) below.

**Table 2.1 Projected Propositions**

(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p.444)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition (Statement/Question)</th>
<th>Paratactic</th>
<th>Hypotactic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location (verbal)</strong></td>
<td>1 Brutus said</td>
<td>α Brutus said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ‘Caesar is ambitious’</td>
<td>β that Caesar was ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idea (Mental: Cognition)</strong></td>
<td>1 Brutus thought</td>
<td>α Brutus thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ‘he is ambitious’</td>
<td>β that Caesar was ambitious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2 Projected Proposals
(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p.444)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal (Offers/Commands)</th>
<th>Paratactic</th>
<th>Hypotactic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locution (Verbal)</td>
<td>1 He told her</td>
<td>α He told her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ‘Do it!’</td>
<td>β to do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea (Mental: Desiderative)</td>
<td>1 He willed her</td>
<td>α He wanted her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ‘do it!’</td>
<td>β to do it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that in paratactic projection the two clauses function as if they are of equal status, but in hypotactic projection the beta clause is dependent on the alpha clause (Halliday & Matthiessen, p.375), and thus there is an agreement in tense between the two clauses. Because paratactic projection allows for a change in tense, it is able to represent the wording as it was uttered or thought, whereas hypotactic projecting clauses only give the gist of what is being conveyed.

Expansion:

The following chart summarizes the information available in Halliday & Matthiessen (2004) to aid with the identification of elaborating paratactic and hypotactic clauses.

Table 3.1 Paratactic and Hypotactic Elaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parataxis</th>
<th>Hypotaxis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are three types of elaborating paratactic relationships: exposition, exemplification, and clarification. Exposition can be conceptualized as a kind of appositional relationship between clauses in that the second clause restates the proposition of the first, presenting it from another point of view or reinforcing the message (often with lexical repetition or synonymy). Exemplification also could be regarded akin to apposition in that the second clause develops the proposition of the first by specifying about it (often</td>
<td>Elaborating hypotactic clauses are said to have their own grammar—the non-defining relative clause. Here the beta clause “functions as a descriptive gloss” to the alpha clause. Take the example: “he ate too much at meals, which made him bilious…” Here the alpha clause i.e. “he ate too much” is taken as fully complete, but is further described with the beta clause: “which made him bilious.” This is a common strategy for introducing background information to a text in the form of a characterization/interpretation/evaluation of the alpha clause.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
citing an example), and commonly ties the two clauses together through hyponymy or meronymy. Clarification, in comparison, clarifies the first clause by backing it up with an explanation.

The following chart summarizes the information available in Halliday & Matthiessen (2004) to aid with the identification of extending paratactic and hypotactic clauses.

### Table 3.2 Paratactic and Hypotactic Extension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paraxis</th>
<th>Hypotaxis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ β</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This type of relationship would subsume the coordinating conjunctions of traditional grammar, and sub-divides into three categories: addition, variation, and alternation.

In addition two clauses are joined without any implication of a causal or temporal connection (and therefore should not be confused with the sense of “and then/and so” (hypotactic enhancement) or one of elaboration (“and that/and this”). A relationship of addition is often accompanied by cohesive expressions such as “too,” “in addition,” and “moreover.”

Variation, on the other hand, concerns a total or partial replacement of the first clause, often accompanied by a shift in polarity. Prototypical examples of this type include “instead” and “except.”

Alternation, straightforwardly involves the second clause being presented as an alternative to the first, as is found in the structure: “either A or B.”

Hypotactic extending relationships are relatively rare when compared with their counterpart of paratactic extension. Like paratactic extension, hypotactic extension sub-divide into the three categories of addition, variation, and alternation. Some example relators for these types have been provided below:

**Addition**
- “whereas”
- “while”

**Variation**
- “except that”
- “but for the fact that”

**Alternation**
- “if not [β clause], then [α clause]”

The following chart summarizes the information available in Halliday & Matthiessen (2004) to aid with the identification of enhancing paratactic and hypotactic clauses.
### Table 3.3 Paratactic and Hypotactic Enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parataxis $x_2$</th>
<th>Hypotaxis $x_β$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paratactic enhancing relations always incorporate a circumstantial feature such as time and cause. Some Relators of this type include: then, so, for, but, yet, still and/and then/and there/and thus/and so/and yet and at that time spatial: and there means: and in that way comparison: and so / and similarly effect: and so cause: for condition: 1 and then 2 neg condition: otherwise consequence – still concession – though (p. 413)</td>
<td>A relationship of hypotactic enhancement involves what are known in tradition formal grammar terms as 'adverbial clauses,' and in a finite clause display what formal grammarian would call subordination (non-finite clauses tend to be introduced by a preposition such as “on,” “with,” and “by.”). Some prototypical examples of Relators of this type include: Time: when/as soon as/whenever Place: where Manner: as Comparison: as if Means: whereby Reason: because/since Purpose: so that Result: so that Concession: even though Positive condition: if [$β$ clause], then [$α$ clause] Negative condition: unless [$β$ clause]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The system of taxis and logico-semantic relations combine to form the following possibilities: paratactic projected clauses of locution; paratactic projected clauses of idea; hypotactic projected clauses of locution; hypotactic projected clauses of idea; paratactic expanded clauses of elaboration; paratactic expanded clauses of extension; paratactic expanded clauses of enhancement; hypotactic expanded clauses of elaboration; hypotactic expanded clauses of extension; and hypotactic expanded clauses of enhancement (as shown in the following chart).
Grammatical Metaphor

Grammatical metaphor differs from the typical understanding of metaphor in which a shift from congruent to incongruent is concerned with the “junction of word meanings.” With lexical metaphors, a lexico-semantic item typically expressed by one word comes to be expressed with another in order to carry over some of its semantic properties or characteristics of the new item; for example, he caused suspicion (congruent) is realized incongruently as “he sowed suspicion” (incongruently realized since “sow” typically denotes seed scattering) in order to carry the idea that suspicion can grow like a plant. Grammatical metaphor, on the other hand, is concerned with “reconstruing the patterns of realization…at the interface between the grammar and semantics” (Halliday & Webster, 2009, p.117) so that a grammatical-semantic construct typically expressed with a member of one class is expressed with another.
Grammatical metaphor can be seen to fall into two broad categories: “Interpersonal, having to do with the mood [and] modality… of the clause, and the ideational, having to do with transitivity, the clause in its representational function” (p. 133).

Interpersonal Grammatical Metaphor

According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), “It is not always possible to say exactly what is and what is not a metaphorical representation of modality” as language has developed a multitude of interpersonal metaphorical expressions (p. 616). The reason “this area of the semantic system is so highly elaborated metaphorically,” according to Halliday and Matthiessen, lies with “the nature of modality itself” (p. 618)—grammatical metaphors arise as a result of “pressure to expand the meaning potential [of language]” (p. 626), which marries well with the modality system’s work of creating an area between positive and negative polarity.
Modality falls into two types: modalization (the area between “it is/isn’t”) and modulation (the area between do/don’t). In terms of modulation, an interpersonal grammatical metaphor could involve a shift in mood so that what would congruently be expressed as an imperative becomes expressed incongruently in an interrogative or a declarative mood. An example of this type would be saying “I don’t like questions” to someone who has just asked a question, where it would function to prohibit that person from asking anything further (congruently the imperative: “don’t ask me questions”). An interpersonal grammatical metaphor of the modulation type may also involve the “do” portion being realized as a separate clause. For example, “I would strongly advise you || to do this” or “may I ask you || to do this?”

In an interpersonal grammatical metaphor of the modalization (the area between it is/isn’t) kind, the speakers’ take on the validity of their assertion or correctness of a proposal, congruently realized as a modal adjunct, is made into its own proposition. An example of this type would be “I don’t think it’s going to rain.” Here the grammar would seem to suggest that “I don’t think” is the main assertion being made; however, if one is to probe this with a tag question, the real meaning becomes apparent. The real meaning is not “don’t I think?” here, rather “isn’t it so?” Clearly then, “I don’t think” functions paradoxically, since what is meant (“it’s not going to rain”) is the product of one’s thinking, and, in fact, a number of interpersonal grammatical metaphors work by being paradoxical in this way (“I’m certain she’s gone,” for example, actually serves to admit doubt by objectifying one’s certainty). Interpersonal grammatical metaphor provides the means for a speaker to disassociate themselves from their assertion if they so wish (as in the case of “it is likely that…”).
Ideational Grammatical Metaphor

Note that interpersonal grammatical metaphor tends to “reconstruct patterns of realization at the interface between the grammar and semantics” (Halliday & Webster, 2009, p.117) with a shift to the left. In other words, modality, which would congruently be realized as a modal adjunct in a clause, oftentimes comes to be separated out into a separate clause within a clause nexus of projection (see Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p.614).

On the other hand, the other type of grammatical metaphors, ideational grammatical metaphors, reconstructs the patterns of realization in a shift to the right. When an interpersonal grammatical metaphor might expand one clause into two, ideational grammatical metaphors involve reducing elements:

As Halliday explains, ideational grammatical metaphor involves “a drift towards the concrete, whereby each element is reconstructed in the guise of one that lies further towards the pole of stability and persistence through time (Halliday & Webster, 2009, p. 128). In terms of rank, the semantic category of sequence will be congruently realized lexico-grammatically as a clause nexus, a figure as a clause, and an element as a group or phrase, but in grammatical metaphor these shift to the right. In terms of status, the semantic category of thing (in SFL terminology) will be congruently realized grammatically as a noun or nominal group, a quality as an adjective in a nominal group, a process as a verb or verbal group, a circumstance as either an adverb, adverbial group, or prepositional phrase, a minor process as a preposition, and a relator as a conjunction, but in ideational grammatical metaphor these too are metaphorized using more concrete categories.
Table 4.1 Ideational Grammatical Metaphor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruent</th>
<th>Incongruent (Grammatical Metaphor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A man [Participant] is cleaning [Process] the car [Participant].</td>
<td>The cleaning of the car [Participant]…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here one can see that the congruent version involves a figure being expressed by a whole clause and a process being expressed by a verbal group. Compare the congruent version, then, with the metaphorical version. The figure once realized by a clause now is realized as a part of a noun group, and the process once realized by a verbal group is now realized as a noun. Note here that there is a kind of domino effect. If a sequence (congruently a clause nexus) is metaphorized as a clause, for instance, then those elements that used to occupy either side of the clause nexus must necessarily shift to the right and become elements within that clause. The following is a taxonomy delineating the possible types of incongruent realizations in terms of this “general drift.”

Table 8.3 The “Drift towards the Concrete”
(Halliday & Webster, 2009, pp.129-130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Nexus →</th>
<th>Clause →</th>
<th>Nominal Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relator →</td>
<td>Circumstance →</td>
<td>Process →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event (Verb) → Thing (Noun)</td>
<td>Epithet (Adjective) → Thing (Noun)</td>
<td>e.g. unstable → instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. transform → transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary: Tense (Verb) → Thing (Noun)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. going to → prospect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary: Phase (Verb) → Thing (Noun)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. try to → attempt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary: Modality (Verb) → Thing (Noun)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. could → possibility/potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Process (Preposition) → Thing (Noun)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. with → accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctive (Conjunction) → Thing (Noun)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. if → condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event (Verb) → Epithet (Adjective)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. poverty is increasing → increasing poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An ideational grammatical metaphor shift may start from a sequence (congruently a clause nexus), or a figure (congruently a clause). A distinction between logical grammatical metaphors and experiential grammatical metaphors is drawn on the basis of these different starting points. A logical grammatical metaphor is concerned with an incongruent realization of the Relator in a sequence, while experiential grammatical metaphor subsumes anything under the level of a sequence. The domino effect of the ideational grammatical metaphor shift means that an experiential grammatical metaphor can be expected to accompany a logical grammatical metaphor but not necessarily the other way around.
Logical Grammatical Metaphor

Because logical grammatical metaphors are concerned with the reconstruction of a sequence, congruently a clause nexus, it may be helpful to look at some of the logical grammatical metaphors possible in clause nexuses of projection and clause nexuses of expansion.

Table 5.1 Grammatical Metaphors Possible in Clause Nexuses of Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruently:</th>
<th>Logical Grammatical Metaphor:</th>
<th>Example:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Projecting clause (idea or locution) + projected | Projected clause downgraded to Range (Verbiage or Phenomenon) | He decided || to go
| | | He doesn’t regret [his decision to go] |
| A so I think/say B | Verbs such as proves, shows, demonstrates… | This proves [[that…]] |
| Projected clause | As Embedded fact clause | [[The fact that…]] |
| Projecting clause | Noun of projection as NG head Projected as Qualifier | He asserted A is B
| | | The assertion that A is B |
| “I am troubled by…” | | A is troubling |

Table 5.2 Grammatical Metaphors Possible in Clause Nexuses of Expansion

(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp.646-652.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruently:</th>
<th>Logical Grammatical Metaphor:</th>
<th>Example:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequence of figures (congruently a clause nexus)</td>
<td>One figure realized congruently as clause with another incongruently realized as a circumstantial element within the clause. The relator shifts to the minor process.</td>
<td>Many of these lessons may have gone wrong because of…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sequence of figures | One figure TOKEN Relator to Relational Process One figure Value | A caused B
| | | A led to B
| | | A brought about B |
| | One figure ATTRIBUTE One figure CARRIER | A is B
| | | The growing loss of pilots is troubling and… |
| | One figure TOKEN = Qualifier | Was a result of the slow conspiracy |
Because the two versions share the same semantic origin, there is the potential to “unpack” the grammatical metaphor into a congruent realization. This potential for unpacking does not to mean, however, that these two are synonymous, because, as Halliday emphasizes, grammatical metaphor produces a “semantic hybrid” (Halliday & Webster, 2009, p. 118) sharing both the properties of the original and the new category.

**Appraisal**

Located within the interpersonal meta-function at the level of discourse semantics, the systemic function framework of Appraisal is concerned with the selections that can be made from “a set of [resources giving] language users [a] choice in terms of how they appraise, grade, and give value to social experience” (Martin & White, 2005).

The appraisal system, which has its foundations in analysis of narrative texts, can be accredited to the work of Martin Rose. Martin Rose’s observation that language not only involves an exchange of good and services (i.e., propositions and proposals) but also contains areas of negotiation was monumental to the development of the theory. Martin noticed that “choices in a gradable system of meaning” such as the ability to choose between “dislike,” “detest” or “hate,” “always enter into oppositions concerned with the evaluation of experience.” (1992b, p.366), and thus expressions such as “dislike” can also be considered in opposition to “like.”
The Appraisal system breaks the language of evaluation down into three sub-systems: ENGAGEMENT, ATTITUDE, and GRADUATION: ENGAGEMENT is the means by which an interlocutor can adjust their commitment to a proposition; ATTITUDE is the means by which feeling is encoded; and GRADUATION is the means by which an interlocutor can alter the intensity and force of his or her utterance (Martin & White, 2005). For the purpose of this thesis, only the ATTITUDE system will be utilized. The attitude system subdivides into three main categories representing the three main “sites around which [a] negotiation [of feeling] might take place” (p. 145)—affect, judgment, and appreciation. Briefly, affect is concerned with the appraiser’s emotions, judgment has to do with passing judgment on the actions of the appraised individual, i.e. “moral evaluations of behavior” (pp. 145-146), and appreciation has to do with an aesthetic evaluation of an entity, or “the ‘aesthetic’ quality of semiotic text/processes and natural phenomena” (pp. 145-146).

Affect is the perhaps the most basic form of appreciation, and involves the subcategories of: inclination/disinclination, happiness/unhappiness, security/insecurity, and satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Further divisions within these categories have been charted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIS/INCLINATION</th>
<th>DIS/SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-) Fear</td>
<td>(-) Dissatisfaction: Ennui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire</td>
<td>Yawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-) Dissatisfaction: Displeasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…a heart saddened by the chidings of Bessie…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+) Satisfaction: Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…my fascinated glance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+) Satisfaction: Admiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…his admiring family…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN/HAPPINESS</th>
<th>IN/SECURITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-) Unhappiness: Misery</td>
<td>(-) Insecurity: Disquiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After that I was very unhappy</td>
<td>…shaken as my nerves were by agitation…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) Unhappiness: Antipathy</td>
<td>(-) Insecurity: Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hate you</td>
<td>Mrs. Umney fainted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) Happiness: Cheer</td>
<td>(+) Security: Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They looked happy</td>
<td>…I assure you…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) Happiness: Affection</td>
<td>(+) Security: Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked my Uncle Reed</td>
<td>Entrust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affect then becomes “institutionalized” either as “proposals (about behavior)”—Judgment—or “propositions (about things)”--“JUDGEMENT, AFFECT is re-contextualized as an evaluation matrix for behavior, with a view to controlling what people do, [whereas in] APPRECIATION, AFFECT is
re-contextualized as an evaluation matrix for the products of behavior (and wonders of nature), with a view to valuing what people achieve” (p.147).

According to Halliday and Matthiessen, certain texts tend to preference one or another of these systems (p. 146). In terms of the classical rewrites examined here it is anticipated that alongside affect items and judgment rather than appreciation will constitute the largest majority of appraisal items, because narratives often involve character evaluation. Judgment can be seen to divide into two forms: social esteem and social sanction: “Social esteem involves admiration and criticism, typically without legal implications” as Martin quips, “if you have difficulties in this area you may need a therapist.” This area further subdivides into Normality, Capacity, and Tenacity.

**Table 6.2 The Sub-categories of Judgment: Social Esteem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“is s/he special?” (Usuality)</th>
<th>(+) Normality: a <em>celebrated</em> New York Belle</th>
<th>(-) Normality: <em>eccentric</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“is s/he capable?” (Ability)</td>
<td>(+) Capacity: she was very <em>healthy</em></td>
<td>(-) Capacity: he was very <em>foolish</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“is s/he dependable?” (Inclination)</td>
<td>(+) Tenacity: <em>meticulous</em></td>
<td>(-) Tenacity: <em>cowardly</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social sanction, on the other hand, “involves praise, and condemnation, often with legal implications” so “if you have problems in this area you may need a lawyer” (p.156). Within this area are items of Veracity and Propriety:

**Table 6.3 The Sub-categories of Judgment: Social Sanction**

| “is s/he honest?” (Probability) | (+) Veracity: the *honest* Mr. Otis | (-) Veracity: she’s an *underhand* little thing |
| “is s/he beyond reproach?” (Inclination) | (+) Propriety: a *good* child | (-) Propriety: *wicked* |
DATA SET

For the purpose of this thesis, only graded readers, defined by David Hill as “books written for learners of English using limited lexis and syntax, the former determined by frequency and usefulness and the latter by simplicity” (2008, p. 185), have been considered. Although graded readers do not have to involve a series of levels per se—Collins English readers, for example, involve only upper-intermediate Agatha Christie rewrites—a series of levels did constitute one of the criteria here as the research focus is on how material is adjusted for different learner levels. In order to separate age as a possible variable, as texts may also be rewritten in a simplified manner for children, a decision was made to examine only graded readers catering to an adult readership. With these initial criteria in mind, potential publishers were then identified from David Hill’s (2013) survey of 54 graded reader series.

As Hill notes, “There are two types of graded reader: the rewrite and the simple original” (2008, p.185). According to Hill, “[rewritten] classics and thriller/crime account for over half the titles in the senior [16+] section” (p.86). Here “Original” series such as Heinle Cengage Page Turners were ruled out in favor of rewrites, not only because rewrites are so common, but because a comparison with the original text suggested the potential for insight into what is altered and how—potentially contributing to the current conversations regarding “authenticity” with ESL materials. Rewrites of “classical texts” for English teaching purposes also connects with the teaching of culture, so comparing rewrites with the original would provide the opportunity to examine what is left in and taken out as an indication of what cultural values may be being imparted. This decision led to the choice of the following graded reader series: CIDEB Black Cat Reading and Training; Egmont Easy Readers; ELI Young Adult Readers; Macmillan Readers; Richmond Secondary Readers; Oxford Bookworms; Oxford Dominoes; Pearson Penguin Readers; Penguin Active Reading; Cambridge Readers; and Evans Fastrack Classics.

An examination of the publisher’s websites revealed that the five most commonly occurring “classical” titles (note: Shakespeare was purposely excluded) within these 16+ series were: Jane Eyre (7 out of the 11 series), Frankenstein (7 out of the 11 series), The Canterville Ghost (6 out of the 11 series), The Hound of the Baskervilles (6 out of the 11 series) and A Picture of Dorian Gray (6 out of the 11 series).

During the selection process, there was the question of whether to try and obtain titles from each level within a graded reader series; however, it was determined that the resulting jumble of different genres that might arise from such an approach could present problems when it came to drawing comparisons across these texts, thus it was decided that two titles would be selected and be compared across readers. In order to facilitate comparison, it was also decided that the first chapters of each text would receive attention. It became apparent that comparison between first chapters might be problematic for the Frankenstein and The Hound of the Baskervilles rewrites in particular because different rewrites covered considerably different portion of the original texts. Because The Canterville Ghost and A Picture of Dorian Gray are both authored by Oscar Wilde
and *A Picture of Dorian Gray*, like *Jane Eyre*, tends to be treated as a higher level text across rewrites, the decision was made to select *Jane Eyre* and *The Canterville Ghost*.

Trouble gaining access to some of these readers (the Eli and Richmond series in particular) and the fact that some readers did not carry both *Jane Eyre* and *The Canterville Ghost* (for instance, the Egmont series does not carry *Jane Eyre*, the Eli series does not carry *The Canterville Ghost*, etc.) meant that 4 graded readers were selected overall: Black Cat; Macmillan; Oxford Bookworms; and Penguin.

**Black Cat Reading and training** (6 stages)

Table 7.1 *Jane Eyre and The Canterville Ghost’s Position within the Black Cat Series*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level:</th>
<th>Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step One: A2 Waystage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Two: B1 Threshold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Three: B1 Threshold</td>
<td><em>Canterville Ghost</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Four: B2 Vantage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Five: B2 Vantage</td>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Six: C1 Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Macmillan** (6 stages)

Table 7.2 *Jane Eyre and The Canterville Ghost’s Position within the Macmillan Series*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level:</th>
<th>Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starter: A1 Breakthrough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginner: A1 Breakthrough</td>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary: A2 Waystage</td>
<td><em>Canterville Ghost</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-intermediate: A2-B1 Threshold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate: B1-B2 Threshold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Intermediate: B2 Vantage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Oxford Bookworms (7 stages)**

**Table 7.3 Jane Eyre and The Canterville Ghost’s Position within the Oxford Bookworms Series**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level:</th>
<th>Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starter: A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: A1/A2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: A2/B1</td>
<td><em>Canterville Ghost</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3: B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4: B1/B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5: B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6: B2/C1</td>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pearson Penguin Readers (7 stages)**

**Table 7.4 Jane Eyre and The Canterville Ghost’s Position within the Penguin Series**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level:</th>
<th>Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easystarts: A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2: A2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3: A2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4: B1</td>
<td><em>Canterville Ghost</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5: B2</td>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although selecting texts on the basis of the most popular titles does present gaps in the amount of level coverage being provided here, these gaps may actually be reflective of the current distribution of graded readers by level. As Gillian Claridge (2012) notes, “the largest numbers [of graded readers] are produced for the intermediate range of ability [as] this is where the demand is highest, and [this] is reflected in the lists of all the publishers. There are…fewer produced at the lowest proficiency level, and very few above the 3000 word level [i.e. CEFR: C1 stage]” (p. 113).

On the whole, rewrites of *The Canterville Ghost* tend to be treated as a lower level texts, whereas rewrites of *Jane Eyre* tend to occupy the more advanced end of the spectrum, which led to the research question: are there any features in the original version that suggest that they may be more readily adapted for a certain level learner?
Table 7.5. *Jane Eyre and the Canterville Ghost Across the Series*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEFR Level</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1/A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2/B1</td>
<td><em>Canterville Ghost</em></td>
<td><em>Canterville Ghost</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Canterville Ghost</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1/B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2/C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1/C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a listing of the CEFR criteria for each level:

**Basic User: A1 (Macmillan’s *Jane Eyre*)**

*Global Scale:* Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.

*Understanding: Reading:* I can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentence, for example on notices and posters or in catalogues.

*Overall Reading Comprehension:* Can understand very short, simple texts a single phrase at a time, picking up familiar names, words and basic phrases and rereading as required.

**Basic User: A2 (Macmillan’s *Canterville Ghost*)**

*Global Scale:* Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.
Understanding: Reading: I can read very short, simple texts. I can find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material such as advertisements, prospectuses, menus and timetables and I can understand short simple personal letters.

Overall Reading Comprehension: Can understand short, simple texts on familiar matters of a concrete type which consists of high frequency everyday or job-related language. Can understand short, simple texts containing the highest frequency vocabulary, including a proportion of shared international vocabulary items.

Basic-Independent User: A2/B1 (Black Cat & Oxford’s Canterville Ghost)

See A2 and B1 descriptors.

B1 (Penguin’s Canterville Ghost)

Global Scale: Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes and ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.

Understanding: Reading: I can understand texts that consist mainly of high frequency everyday or job-related language. I can understand the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal letters.

Overall Reading Comprehension: Can read straightforward factual texts on subjects related to his/her field and interest with a satisfactory level of comprehension.

B2 (Black Cat and Penguin’s Jane Eyre)

Global Scale: Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialization. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.

Understanding: Reading: I can read articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems in which the writers adopt particular attitudes or viewpoints. I can understand contemporary literary prose.

Overall Reading Comprehension: Can read with a large degree of independence, adapting style and speed of reading to different texts and purposes, and using appropriate reference sources selectively. Has a broad active reading vocabulary, but may experience some difficulty with low-frequency idioms.

B2/C1 (Oxford’s Jane Eyre)

C1 descriptors:
Global Scale: Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognize implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organizational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.

Understanding: Reading: I can understand long and complex factual and literary texts, appreciating distinctions of style. I can understand specialized articles and longer technical instructions, even when they do not relate to my field.

Overall Reading Comprehension: Can understand in detail lengthy, complex texts, whether or not they relate to his/her own area of speciality, provided he she can reread difficult sections.
METHODS OF ANALYSIS

Taxis: Troubleshooting Clause Boundaries

In order to examine the degree of interdependency between clauses, the systemic linguistic framework of taxis was employed. In order to identify the different type of relations present, analysis began by separating all clause-complexes from each other. Clauses were then identified based on the two obligatory components in a clause—a Process (realized as a verbal group) and Participants (realized as noun groups). An attempt to establish clause boundaries, however, proved to be slightly challenging due to the phenomenon of embedding where “the projected clause of either locution or idea is down-ranked to serve within a nominal group”—typically as a Qualifier (p.469). In order to troubleshoot this problem, the following information from Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) summarized in the following chart, was referenced.

Table 8.1 Act and Fact Clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act [[macro-phenomenon]]</th>
<th>Fact [[meta-phenomenon]]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act clauses treat a process as if it were a meta-phenomenon—in other words, like a snapshot of an event frozen in time. Like fact clauses, act clauses are projected out of nouns, and therefore can be made back into a qualified to “the act of.” For example: “We saw [[her crying]]” can become “we saw the act of her crying.” When the understanding is that the state of affairs being examined resulted from a past event, then this is likely to be a fact clause, since act clauses are bound by the time of feeling or perceiving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact clauses come “ready packaged in projected form” without needing a mental or verbal projecting process. Instead, fact clauses are projected out of nouns. For this reason, fact clauses can be turned into a qualifier to the noun “fact” and can therefore be placed in either a Subject or Complement position within the clause. For example: “that he was mean was obvious” can be rephrased as: “the fact that he was mean was obvious.” Unlike act clauses, fact clauses are not bound by the physical time of feeling or perceiving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial confusion distinguishing between projected beta clauses and embedded clauses prompted a look into the contexts in which embedded act and fact clauses occur. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), both act and fact clauses may occur as the phenomenon of a perceptive or emotive process, but projected clauses can only involve mental processes of desire and cognition, not perception or emotion. Furthermore, as fact clauses come “ready packaged in projected form,” a verbal or mental projecting process would be superfluous,
and thus one can deduce that overlapping contexts should not be a concern. Because embedding involves a locution or idea clause being “down-ranked to serve within a nominal group” (p.469) which fills either the Subject or Complement position within a clause, it should be possible to create a receptive variant of the clause by reversing the subject complement positions. For example, the agnates of “he saw [[that she had fainted]]” and “[[that she had fainted]] was seen by him,” while a little awkward, are not as awkward as “I remembered [[I once saw the ghost]] and “I once saw the ghost is remembered by me”?

Last, the second area of troubleshooting involved the distinction between beta clauses and qualifiers attached to a noun phrase occupying the complement position within a clause. Here orthographic clues were utilized—wherever a comma interceded between a noun and the elements under question, as in the case of: “he ate too much at meals, which made him bilious,” these elements were probed as beta clauses. Clearly, “which made him bilious” not a characterization of “meals” as in “meals which made him bilious” here, but rather a comment on the previous clause, which is complete in and of itself.

Logico-Semantic Relations

As previously mentioned, logico-semantic relations differ for the clause types of projection and expansion. When “one clause is set up as the representation of the linguistic ‘content’ of another,” with projection there are the options of locution—“a representation of wording”—, or idea—“a representation of meaning” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p.443). Where phenomena are “treated as the same order of experience,” with expansion there are the options of elaboration, which provides a “further characterization” of the previous clause, extension, which adds something new to the previous clause, or enhancement, which “embellishes around” the previous clause “by qualifying it in terms of some circumstantial feature of time, place, manner, cause, or condition” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 410).

For projected clauses, the type of process determines what type of relation is present—a verbal process will evidently be locution, and a material process of cognition (such as “think”) or desire (such as “hope”) will be a projected idea clause; however, in the case of expansion, there are a number of conjunctive markers than can realize more than one logico-semantic relation, as shown in the following table.

Table 9.1 Conjunctive Markers Realizing More than One Logico-semantic Relation
(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p.422)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Enhancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>And also</td>
<td>And then (temporal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And so (causal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>On the other hand (adversative)</td>
<td>Nevertheless (concessive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instead (replacive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Martin and Halliday are in disagreement as to the analysis of these items. Whereas Halliday would suggest that the writer’s intention has clearly been to select, for example: “and” instead of “and so,” and therefore analysis should stick closely to the lexico-grammatical items present within the text, Martin proposes a degree of flexibility in interpretation. Because the system of logico-semantic relations concerns the “basic semantic motifs that run throughout the language” (p. 392), it was felt that the reader’s impression of the meaning connection between clauses should be central to a reading of conjunctions within the lexico-grammar—whereas “and” certainly may have been selected instead of “and so,” interpreting that item as (+) instead of (x) would seem to overlook the potential reasons for using “and” in an “and so” context. For instance, could simplified texts include more cases of “and” being used with these different logico-semantic senses than upper texts using more “and then” or “and so”? To return to an earlier example from the taxis portion of this text, two figures may be expressed as two independent clauses, or joined in a clause complex. If it became apparent, by examining the logico-semantic relations that would have been there had they been joined together, that certain meanings tend to feature in clause complexes, and visa versa, then surely something would be gained.

With this rationale in mind, it was decided that “and” would be identified as (+) Extension when it seems to be utilized in the sense of “moreover.” For example: “he was good-looking and/moreover he had a wonderful smile.” Here there is clearly no implication of a causal or temporal relationship between being good-looking and having a wonderful smile. Compare this to “Mr. Otis and his wife told her that they were not afraid of ghosts, and/and then/and so the old housekeeper went to bed.” Not only do the two events seem to occur one after the other, but there also seems to be a causal connection in that Mrs. Umney perhaps might not have gone to bed had she not been reassured by Mr. and Mrs. Otis. Those clause nexuses that seemed to have been joined in a temporal sequence of “A and then B” were thus marked as enhancement, but not those such as “lightning flashed and lit the library” where the two processes seem to occur simultaneously. As for the equally problematic conjunction “but,” reference was made to the following list of “BUT” types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adversative “but”</th>
<th>“she was scared but [in contrast] they weren’t”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacive “but”</td>
<td>“his body was never discovered, but [instead] his ghost still haunts the chase.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“American people are really no different from English people—but [except] they do,”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of course, speak a different language.”

Consessive “but” “people have tried to clean it, but however it will no go away”

Grammatical Metaphor

Central to locating the three types of grammatical metaphors (interpersonal, logical and experiential) was a methodology for distinguishing whether the item under question involved a reconstruction of patterning “at the interface between the grammar and semantics” (Halliday & Webster, 2009, p.117) as opposed to the crossing or overlapping of word meanings.

Particularly pertinent here to sifting out experiential grammatical metaphors was a ruling out of items that have undergone a purely morphological change, as in the case of “he was an excellent dancer.” Although there would seem to be a process meaning contained within this entity, a distinction can be made from an experiential grammatical metaphor of the process to entity type in that this entity refers to one who dances, and not to the process of dancing. A probe for this type of experiential grammatical metaphor thus involved the ability to insert HAPPENING or OCCURRING back into the unpacked clause. Even though “tea” might also involve not just a drink but also food in the clause “tea was ready for them,” this could not be deemed an experiential grammatical metaphor since it does not refer specifically to tea OCCURING or HAPPENING here—no shift has taken place across experiential word categories.

Although a determination of grammatical metaphors of all types is problematized by the inability to see that item before it underwent metaphorization, only being able to see the resultant state of metaphorization would seem to Complicate an unpacking of logical grammatical metaphors in particular. Two sentences can be related semantically even if they are not joined in a clause complex; for example, “I wanted to read. I opened a book” evidently imply a causal connection by virtue of their placement next to each other, but grammatically there is no “so.” Similarly, even though “they started their drive in high spirits” might appear as two figures: 1) they started their drive, 2) they were happy, the grammar does not choose to reflect this reality—the Circumstance of Manner, “in high spirits”, could only be rephrased truthfully to the original as “they started their drive happily” (another Circumstance of Manner), since “they were happy” involves inserting another process that is non-existent here.

A grammatical metaphor is a “semantic hybrid” (Halliday & Webster, 2009, p.118) and thus retains some of the properties that would be present in its congruent realization. The key, then, would be to not insert more than is actually there, but rather work with the “hybrid” elements present. On this, Halliday & Matthiessen (2004) write that the logico-semantic properties of the congruent realization will be retained. Take the logical grammatical metaphor: “the ghost always appears before the death of one of the family” where a clause has been incongruently realized as a circumstance of temporal extent because of an experiential grammatical metaphor enabling the process “to die” to be reconstructed as the entity “death”, and thereby retains the enhancement (x) relation present in the congruent clause-complex: “α the ghost always appears || xβ before one
of the family dies.” According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), prepositions in particular form key targets for logical grammatical metaphorization:

Table 10.1 Circumstantial Elements as a Target for Metaphorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstance Type:</th>
<th>Sub-types:</th>
<th>Grammatical Metaphor:</th>
<th>Congruently:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>He left before his death.</td>
<td>He left, and then he died.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporal → Spatial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>with all her heart</td>
<td>using all her heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means → Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>because of the noises at night</td>
<td>so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reason → Purpose</td>
<td>for ~</td>
<td>in order to/so that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behalf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>In the event of rain</td>
<td>If it rains, …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>regardless of rain</td>
<td>Although/even if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Default</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Accompaniment:</td>
<td>He left with a smile</td>
<td>He left and he smiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Role:</td>
<td>as a young woman…</td>
<td>When…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But it is not just Circumstantial elements—Qualifiers similarly may be unpacked into Beta clauses, as in the case of “the applause [[x when she finished singing]].

The ability to unpack grammatical metaphors here is of key importance because, as Halliday notes,
grammatical metaphors can die out just like lexical metaphors, becoming “systemic options within the meaning potential of a given register,” in which case they often lose this ability. True grammatical metaphors, according to Halliday, are those “created in response to the needs of the unfolding discourse” and hence exclude those expressions for which there is no non-metaphorical mode of expression or for which the non-metaphorical mode of expression has become the marked form, as in the case of “bathe” versus “take a bath.” The approach taken here verges on the side of caution by firstly attempting to identify all possible potential grammatical metaphors before considering the strength of these during the data interpretation phase.

Appraisal

The system of Appraisal was utilized to examine the way the most prominent figures are characterized within the different graded readers, and how evaluative meanings evolve across these different texts (i.e. logogenesis). As previously established, the attitude system is concerned with the appraiser’s emotions (affect), moral evaluations of an appraised individual’s behavior (judgment), and aesthetic evaluations of an entity (appreciation). In order not to give attention to attitude items in one text while neglecting similar items in another, thereby skewering the results, semantically equivalent passages were first placed alongside each other before attitude items were identified and categorized using charts similar to those previously provided, and then marked for who was doing the appraising. Since appraisal items can “be realized through a diversity of grammatical structures and lexis,” the following probes were used to identify affect and judgment items:

The Affect Checklist

1. Construed as either positive or negative
2. Is realized as a surge of emotion or as a kind of predisposition or ongoing mental state
3. Is directed at or reacting to some specific external agency or reflects a general ongoing mood for which one might pose the question “why are you feeling that way?” and get the answer “I’m not sure.”
4. The feeling involves intention rather than reaction with respect to a stimulus that is irrealis rather than realis (in other words, the feelings refer to future, as yet unrealized states, rather than present existing ones).
(Martin & Rose, 2003)

Judgment

With regard to judgment, one is able to ask the questions: is she/he special (normality), capable (capability), dependable (tenacity), honest (veracity), and is she/he beyond reproach (propriety). Because gradable systems occupy a fuzzy area within language, modal items, which occupy a blurry area between yes and no can be utilized to probe Judgment items:
Figure 10.1 The Modality System Network
(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p.618)

Table 11.1 Probing Judgment Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality Type</th>
<th>Usuality (always, usually, sometimes)</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Inclination (determined, keen, willing)</th>
<th>Tenacity</th>
<th>Probability (certainly, probably, possibly)</th>
<th>Veracity</th>
<th>Obligation (required, supposed, allowed)</th>
<th>Propriety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probability ('may be')</td>
<td>“Mrs. Otis had been a celebrated New York Belle.”</td>
<td>“She was brave”</td>
<td>“He was an honest soul”</td>
<td>“you are wicked!”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usuality ('sometimes')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligation ('is wanted to')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclination ('wants to')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis also sought to take into account the possibility of double-codings; for instance, “when he saw me, he laughed” would appear to be a prototypical case of (+) Happiness: Cheer. However, given the context in which this item occurs, there seems to be something sinister about this laugh, and thus it could be coded as a (-) Propriety item reflecting the character’s evil nature. Although every effort was made to distinguish between inscribed (i.e. explicit) and token (i.e. hidden) meanings, token meanings are problematic in that they are items which do not involve direct construal, but rather imply the writer’s emotional response. Clearly, however, “the same lexis and clause can be read differently by a range of readers, depending on the co-text and reading position that is determined by their cultural backgrounds, social positionings, age and gender (Rothery & Stenglin, 2000). Take the following example: “Mrs. Umney lay on the floor and her face was pale.” Will the reader interpret this as ideational in nature, literally discussing her appearance, or will the reader interpret this as, “her face was pale with fear.” Evidently because APPRAISAL items “spread, smear [and] diffuse prosodically over an extended segment of text” (Hood, 2006), the surrounding context will provide valuable clues—in this
case the implication is that Mrs. Umney has fainted with fright, and her face is pale as a result of this.

As Eggins and Slade explain, “appraisal analysis must be sensitive to the potential for different readings or ‘hearings’ of attitudinal meanings” by declaring one’s own reading position (1997). Although the appraisal analysis undertaken was constrained by a native speaker reading of the text, the adopted approach sought to identify items as a teacher in the classroom would perhaps do when teaching these texts as a model of “culture.”
RESULTS

Taxis and Logico-Semantic Relations

*The Canterville Ghost*

1. Simple clauses vs. Clause-Complexes

Although the publishers’ guidelines all reference the use of independent and compound sentence with regard to the grading of their rewrites, it is difficult to ascertain the percentage of independent and “compound” sentences occurring within the beginner, intermediate, and advanced texts. What then are the respective ratios of single clauses to clause-complexes (multiple clauses forming the equivalent of a sentence) within these different level texts? The table below lists the ratio of single to complex clauses and their respective percentages within the four rewrites and the original text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
<th>Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75:35</td>
<td>49: 30</td>
<td>39: 46</td>
<td>40: 56</td>
<td>8: 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(110 total)</td>
<td>(79 total)</td>
<td>(85 total)</td>
<td>(96 total)</td>
<td>(52 total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple: 68%</td>
<td>Simple: 62%</td>
<td>Simple: 46%</td>
<td>Simple: 42%</td>
<td>Simple: 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/C: 32%</td>
<td>C/C: 38%</td>
<td>C/C: 54%</td>
<td>C/C: 58%</td>
<td>C/C: 85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data here clearly show that there is a correlation between text level and the ratio of simple to complex clauses, with the largest percentage of simple clauses occurring in the lower text and the largest percentage of clause complexes occurring in the original text. The gaps of 6% between Macmillan and Black Cat, 16% between Black Cat and Oxford, and 4% between the Oxford and Penguin texts suggest that Macmillan and Black Cat and then Oxford and Penguin can be considered somewhat similar in level, with a jump in level between Black Cat and Oxford. An examination of the publishers’ grading by CEFR level does indeed reveal a close evaluation of i) Macmillan (A2) and Black Cat (A2/B1) and ii) Oxford (A2/B1) and Penguin (B1); however, the CEFR criteria for Black Cat (A2/B1) and Oxford (A2/B1) is not reflective of a 16% gap. While it is too early to posit from this data that there seem to be problems with the use of CEFR descriptors as a means to cross-reference the levels of different publishers’ graded readers, researchers such as Udorn Wan-a-rom and David Hill do suggest issues with the even progression of some readers. Let us therefore pay close attention to differences between Black Cat and Oxford in the following sections.

2. “Simple” vs. “Complex Sentences”

The previous section examined the amount of “simple” parataxis present within these texts, but what is
the amount of “simple” hypotaxis, (i.e. only one hypotactic clause nexus within the clause complex and not $\alpha ^\beta ^\gamma$ or containing nesting), and what is the percentage of all clause complexes that contain only 1 clause nexus joined through parataxis or hypotaxis? The answers to these questions may be found below.

Table 12.2 The Number of Clause Complexes with only one Clause Nexus (The Canterville Ghost)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
<th>Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parataxis: 26</td>
<td>30/35</td>
<td>24/30</td>
<td>34/46</td>
<td>42/56</td>
<td>19/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotaxis: 4</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parataxis: 19</td>
<td>Parataxis: 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parataxis: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypotaxis: 5</td>
<td>Hypotaxis: 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypotaxis: 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, there is a relationship between difficulty level and the percentage of single nexuses constituting a clause complex. Clause complexes that would lie outside of this count would include multiple clauses being joined either paratactically ($1 ^ 2 ^ 3 …$) or hypotactically ($\alpha ^\beta ^\gamma$…), or the presence of nesting (where a clause nexus is nested within one side of a clause nexus). The following chart lists the number of clause complexes that contain nesting.

Table 12.3 The Number of Clause Complexes with Nesting (The Canterville Ghost)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
<th>Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/35 (14%)</td>
<td>6/30 (20%)</td>
<td>12/46 (26%)</td>
<td>13/56 (23%)</td>
<td>25/44 (57%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, there is clearly an increase in the amount of nesting relative to level. When it comes to nesting, there are the options of a paratactic clause nexus with paratactic nesting: $1^2 (1^2)$; a paratactic clause nexus with hypotactic nesting: $1^2 (\alpha^\beta) or 1^2 (\beta^\alpha)$; a hypotactic clause nexus with paratactic embedding: $\alpha^\beta or \beta^\alpha (1^2)$; a hypotactic clause nexus with hypotactic nesting: $\alpha^\beta or \beta^\alpha (\alpha^\beta) or 1^2 (\beta^\alpha)$, a paratactic clause nexus with both paratactic and hypotactic nesting, or finally, a hypotactic clause nexus with both paratactic and hypotactic nesting. The following chart represents the realizations made when it comes to nested clauses within each of the texts.

Table 12.4 The Variety of Nesting (The Canterville Ghost)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options:</th>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P (P)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/12 (25%)</td>
<td>4/13 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (H)</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>5/6 (83%)</td>
<td>5/12 (42%)</td>
<td>6/13 (46%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There appears to be a general cline here toward greater variation in the types of embedding taking place. Note that the most common type here appears to be a paratactic clause nexus with hypotactic embedding. In the Macmillan text, two of these instances are created by the structure “I want to ~” said ~, and two more by hypotactic nesting forming half of a paratactic nexus joined by “but.” The other instance of parataxis with hypotactic embedding is created by a nestled projecting clause using “remember.”

Dividing instances of nesting from the number of clause complexes with more than one layer of nesting, one can see that where nesting does occur in the Macmillan and Black Cat texts, this nesting at most will include only one instance of nesting either side of the main clause nexus.

Table 12.5 Clause complexes with 1+ Layers of Nesting (The Canterville Ghost)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
<th>Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/12 with nesting (17%) of all nesting… 2/46 4% of all c/c</td>
<td>2/13 (15%) of all nesting 2/56 4% of all c/c</td>
<td>14/25 (56%) of all nesting… 32% of all C/C 14/44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparison, around 4% of all clause complexes in the Oxford and Penguin texts include nestled nexuses that also nestled clauses. Unsurprisingly, the original text contains by far the largest percentage of nesting within nesting. For the sake of greater clarification, it may be helpful to represent this data in charts:

Figure 11.1 & 11.2 Nesting in the Macmillan & Black Cat Titles (Canterville Ghost)
Out of lower level texts, one can see that the majority of clause complexes contain no nesting. Out of those with nesting, this forms only one layer. Note, however, that between the Macmillan and Black Cat texts, the percentage of clauses with nesting increases slightly.

![Graph showing nesting in Oxford and Penguin titles](image)

**Figure 11.3 & 11.4 Nesting in the Oxford & Penguin Titles (Canterville Ghost)**

The percentage of clause complexes with no nesting decreases here. Out of those clause complexes with nesting, one can now see clauses with more than one layer of nesting.

![Graph showing nesting in the original Canterville Ghost](image)

**Figure 11.5 Nesting in the Original Canterville Ghost**

Finally, in the original text one can see that clause complexes with more than one layer of nesting constitute a large percentage of the clause complexes with nesting.

**Considering Logico-Semantic Relations**

1. Parataxis vs. hypotaxis as the main clause nexus:

   The publishers’ criteria for the lowest level rewrite featured here (Macmillan’s A1 *Jane Eyre*) mention “most sentences contain[ing] only one clause, though compound sentences are used occasionally with clauses joined by the conjunctions “and,” “but,” and “or.” In systemic functional linguistic terms, the mention of “and”
“but” and “or” hints at the use of paratactic clause complexes (either of the $1 \wedge +2$ or $1 \wedge x2$ type). In comparison, the criteria in the intermediate level texts such as Oxford’s *Jane Eyre* (B2/C1) mention lexico-grammatical features such “clauses of purpose or reason,” which are suggestive of use of hypotaxis (in this case, of the extending type ($x\beta$)). Are there any differences then in terms of the use of parataxis as opposed to hypotaxis?

The following table lists the ratio of parataxis to hypotaxis in each version:

**Table 13.1 The Ratio of Parataxis to Hypotaxis as the Main Clause Nexus (Canterville Ghost)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
<th>Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parataxis: 30</td>
<td>24: 6</td>
<td>33: 13</td>
<td>43: 13</td>
<td>33: 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 35)</td>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td>(out of 46)</td>
<td>(out of 56)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parataxis: 26</td>
<td>26: 6</td>
<td>33: 13</td>
<td>43: 13</td>
<td>32: 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td>(out of 56)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parataxis: 24</td>
<td>24: 6</td>
<td>33: 13</td>
<td>43: 13</td>
<td>33: 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td>(out of 56)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parataxis: 20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Parataxis: 20%</td>
<td>Parataxis: 23%</td>
<td>Parataxis: 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parataxis: 14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Parataxis: 14%</td>
<td>Parataxis: 17%</td>
<td>Parataxis: 19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parataxis would seem to be slightly more prevalent in the lower level texts, and hypotaxis slightly more prevalent in the higher level texts, but how does this finding break down in terms of simple paratactic clauses with extending or enhancing logico-grammatical relations?

**Table 13.2 The Breakdown of Clause Nexuses (Canterville Ghost)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
<th>Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paratactic: 30</td>
<td>24: 6</td>
<td>33: 13</td>
<td>43: 13</td>
<td>33: 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 35)</td>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td>(out of 46)</td>
<td>(out of 56)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(87% of all parataxis)</td>
<td>(79% of all parataxis)</td>
<td>(70% of all parataxis)</td>
<td>(67% of all parataxis)</td>
<td>(42% of all parataxis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(74% of all c/c)</td>
<td>(63% of all c/c)</td>
<td>(50% of all c/c)</td>
<td>(32% of all c/c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Complex”: 4</td>
<td>“Complex”: 5</td>
<td>“Complex”: 10</td>
<td>“Complex”: 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td>(out of 46)</td>
<td>(out of 56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td>(out of 44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(79% of all parataxis)</td>
<td>(79% of all parataxis)</td>
<td>(79% of all parataxis)</td>
<td>(79% of all parataxis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63% of all c/c)</td>
<td>(63% of all c/c)</td>
<td>(63% of all c/c)</td>
<td>(63% of all c/c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Complex”: 5</td>
<td>“Complex”: 5</td>
<td>“Complex”: 5</td>
<td>“Complex”: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td>(out of 30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of 30 paratactic clause complexes, 26 of these join only two clauses in the Macmillan text. In other words, roughly 74% of all clause complexes join only two clauses. In comparison, only 14 out of 33 paratactic clauses join two clauses in the original text—approximately half the amount of the Macmillan text—and only 32% of all clause complexes in the original text involve two clauses being joined together in parataxis. Because “direct speech” forms a considerable portion of most narratives, and this feature is typically expressed paratactically, let us remove simple parataxis involving $1 \wedge 2$ structures to see if this data alters slightly:
Out of the total number of clause complexes, out of which there are 30 instances of parataxis, there are 11 instances of only two clauses being joined paratactically in an enhancement sense. In other words, 31% of all clause complexes join only two clauses in a relationship of enhancement—the other 15 instances are all of a projecting function. In comparison, there are 10 instances of only two clauses being joined in an enhancement sense through parataxis out of 56 clauses in the Penguin text. In other words, 18% of all clause complexes here involve only two clauses being joined together in an enhancing parataxic relationship. On the basis of an examination of the four readers alone, the data shown here (i.e. decreasing percentages with text complexity) would seem to be consistent with the idea that simpler texts may involve a greater percentage of simple sentences, besides projecting clauses, being joined with lexico-grammatical items of paratactic enhancement, such as “and” or “but”; however, the original text displays an increase in the amount of “simple” enhancing parataxis. Upon further examination, it seems that this can perhaps be explained in terms of an increase in the amount of embedding clauses perhaps as a result of grammatical metaphorization. An apparent regression to parataxis in the more advanced texts would seem inconsistent with the hypothesis that parataxis will decrease with the introduction of lexico-grammatical structures of sub-ordination (i.e., hypotaxis) in more complex texts. However, paratactic structures in these higher level texts may be semantically denser than those of the beginner texts because full clausal meanings have been made to function as constituents within a clause (as will be explored in the section on ideational grammatical metaphor). Is it possible to establish then that there is an increased amount of “subordination” (in SFL terms “hypotaxis”) the greater the level? The following chart shows the amount of hypotactic clauses minus cases of “indirect speech” (i.e. $\alpha \wedge \beta$) or thought ($\alpha \wedge \beta$).

### Table 13.4 Beta clauses of Enhancement (Canterville Ghost)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
<th>Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of clauses</td>
<td>2/35</td>
<td>7/30</td>
<td>17/46</td>
<td>14/56</td>
<td>29/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the data become fuzzy between the Black Cat, Oxford, and Penguin texts, there is evidently a marked difference (of 61%) between the Macmillan and original text in terms of the amount of hypotactic enhancing clauses. A look at the structure list for the Oxford Canterville Ghost suggests that the publishers wish to introduce simple “if” clauses. Seeing what lexico-grammatical items are contributing to this large percentage of hypotaxis might warrant further investigation. Let us then look at how hypotactic clause nexuses are being used logico-semantically as the primary clause nexus:

**Table 13.5 Logico-Semantic Relations in the Primary Hypotactic Clause Nexus (Canterville Ghost)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
<th>Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α ^ β</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>α ^ β</td>
<td>α ^ β</td>
<td>α ^ β</td>
<td>α ^ β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α = β</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>α = β</td>
<td>α = β</td>
<td>α = β</td>
<td>α = β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α ^ xα</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>α ^ xα</td>
<td>α ^ xα</td>
<td>α ^ xα</td>
<td>α ^ xα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xα ^ α</td>
<td>6/13</td>
<td>xα ^ α</td>
<td>xα ^ α</td>
<td>xα ^ α</td>
<td>xα ^ α</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only hypotactic clause complexes in the Macmillan text are α ^ ‘β. Upon further inspection, four of these clauses are created with the construction “want to” and one with “remember,” which perhaps arise as a result of being featured on publishers’ word-lists. One also finds beta clauses of enhancement with the more intermediate texts.

2. The use of “and” and “but”

The publishers mention clauses joined by "and" and "but" being a marker of lower level texts, but “and” and “but” clearly do not disappear in more advanced texts. Evidently these join more clause constituents, but are there differences in the way that these are used? An examination of the Canterville Ghost Macmillan, Black Cat, and Oxford texts reveals the following result:
Table 13.6 The Use of “AND” within the Macmillan, Black Cat, and Oxford Readers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>(+) 5/7</td>
<td>(+) 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td></td>
<td>(x) 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that in the lower text, “and” tends to be used in an (+) enhancement sense. The use of “and” as an enhancement meaning seems to come with more intermediate texts. This would seem to suggest that the writers deem the extension use of “and” to be easier than the enhancement meaning. One possible consideration of this is that the enhancement sense fits well with hypotactic clauses.

Jane Eyre

The data for The Canterville Ghost suggest a correlation between text level and the percentage of single clauses versus clause complexes. Let us then ask the same question of the Jane Eyre rewrites: what then are the respective ratios of single clauses to clause-complexes (multiple clauses forming the equivalent of a sentence) within these different level texts? The table below lists the ratio of single to complex clauses and their respective percentages within the four rewrites.

Table 14.1 The Ratio of Simple Clauses to Clause Complexes (Jane Eyre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple Clauses: Clause Complexes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macmillan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45 total)</td>
<td>(41 total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple: 69%</td>
<td>Simple: 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/C: 31%</td>
<td>C/C: 51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table clearly shows a correlation, with the lower level text, Macmillan, demonstrating the largest percentage of simple clauses, as opposed to the Penguin text with a far greater percentage of clause complexes. Let us now compare data from both texts side by side:
Table 14.2 The Ratio of Simple Clauses to Clause Complexes in Both Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Clause Complexes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em>: Macmillan (A1)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Canterville Ghost</em>: Macmillan (A2)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Canterville Ghost</em>: Black Cat (A2/B1)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Canterville Ghost</em>: Oxford (A2/B1)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Canterville Ghost</em>: Penguin (B1)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em>: Black Cat (B2)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em>: Penguin (B2)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em>: Oxford (B2/C1)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trend here seems to be A1/2 levels are high 60%, B2 levels in the 40% range, which would suggest that border between B1 be around 50% or so for simple clauses. This result alone would seem to suggest that the Penguin *Canterville Ghost* be moved up, and that the Penguin and Oxford versions of *Jane Eyre* switch places, giving an order of: *Jane Eyre* Black Cat, Penguin *Canterville Ghost*, Oxford *Jane Eyre*, and then the Penguin *Jane Eyre*. Note that the Macmillan texts, Penguin, and Oxford versions display very similar percentages between their *Canterville* and *Jane Eyre* texts. Although this finding is perhaps understandable for the Macmillan and Penguin series given the closeness of the CEFR levels assigned to these two titles (A1 and A2 in the Macmillan series, and B1 and B2 in the Penguin series), the percentages for these titles in Oxford series, which has a wider gap in terms of CEFR level (A2/B1 for *The Canterville Ghost* and B2/C1 for *Jane Eyre*), are 46% and 45%.

2. Parataxis versus hypotaxis as the main clause nexus:

Although at first there doesn’t appear to be any evidence of an increased amount of parataxis in the lower level texts, the analysis does reveal that there is a difference in how this is used:

Table 14.3 The Ratio of Parataxis to Hypotaxis as the Main Clause Nexus (*Jane Eyre*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parataxis</strong>: 79%</td>
<td>11: 3 (out of 14)</td>
<td>19: 2 (out of 21)</td>
<td>51: 31 (out of 82)</td>
<td>84: 23 (out of 107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 with nesting</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parataxis</strong>: 90%</td>
<td>2+ cl = 1</td>
<td>Parataxis: 62%</td>
<td>19 nesting</td>
<td>Parataxis: 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesting 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subtracting the amount of paratactic clause complexes joining more than two clauses or including embedding reveals that 74% of all clause complexes involve simple parataxis in the Macmillan text, compared with 67% in the Black cat text, 39% in the Oxford text, and 50% in the penguin text. These numbers even out more if one looks at both the simple paratactic and hypotactic clauses:

Table 14.4 The Number of Clause Complexes with only one Clause Nexus (Jane Eyre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of clause complexes only 1 clause nexus joined through parataxis or hypotaxis</td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>15/21</td>
<td>52/82</td>
<td>43/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parataxis: 10</td>
<td>Parataxis: 14</td>
<td>Hypotaxis: 22</td>
<td>Parataxis: 30</td>
<td>Hypotaxis: 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotaxis: 3</td>
<td>Hypotaxis: 1</td>
<td>2+ para = 2</td>
<td>28 nesting</td>
<td>Joining 2+ para 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 case of nesting</td>
<td>1 joining 4 cl.</td>
<td>5 nesting (1 hypo 4 para)</td>
<td>36 nesting</td>
<td>Joining 2+ hyp 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 14 c/c</td>
<td>= 21 c/c</td>
<td></td>
<td>(also another 2 more than 2 paratactic cl but counted under nesting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, there is a relationship between difficulty level and the percentage of single nexuses constituting a clause complex. Clause complexity can happen with multiple clauses being joined either paratactically \( (1 \wedge 2 \wedge 3 \ldots) \) or hypotactically \( (\alpha \wedge \beta \wedge \gamma \ldots) \), or with the presence of nesting. As with the Canterville Ghost text, the number of clauses with nesting increases with text level:

Table 14.5 The Number of Clause Complexes with Nesting (Jane Eyre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Macmillan</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of clauses with nesting out of clause complexes</td>
<td>1/14</td>
<td>5/21</td>
<td>28/82</td>
<td>36/82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As does the number of clauses with more than one layer of nesting:

**Table 14.6 Clause complexes with 1+ Layers of Nesting (Jane Eyre)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of clauses with more than 1 layer of nesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macmillan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the variety of nesting combinations increases significantly:

**Table 14.7 The Variety of Nesting (Jane Eyre)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nesting…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macmillan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This same expansion of variety increases with logico-semantic relations:

**Table 14.8 Logico-Semantic Relations in the Primary Hypotactic Clause Nexus (Jane Eyre)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logico-Semantic Relations in primary hypotactic clause nexus…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macmillan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a ^ 'b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a ^ xβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the publishers’ guidelines all referenced the grading of syntactic structures, the de-contextualized nature of these word-lists meant that it was difficult to see how structures such as “non-defining relative clauses” contribute to the feel or texture a text. Here going the other way round, one can see that there appears to be a diversification of the logico-semantic relations.

**Logical Grammatical Metaphor**

*The Canterville Ghost*

Although it was posited that interdependency would increase with text level, from independent clauses to parataxis and then hypotaxis, a straightforward interpretation of taxis in line with this hypothesis is complicated by the potential for logical grammatical metaphor. Because logical grammatical metaphor involves a sequence of two figures, which would congruently be realized as two clauses, being incongruently expressed as a clause—the prototypical realization for a figure—, a single clause can be just as semantically dense as a clause complex. Moreover, the difficulty level of a text further increases if logical grammatical metaphor constitutes a portion of a clause joined to another through parataxis or hypotaxis, and thus a consideration of text complexity has to consider the potential for the number of clauses when grammatical metaphors are “unpacked.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Clauses with Logical Grammatical Metaphors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original</strong>: 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A common theme in the publishers’ guidelines is a control of sentence length. This discussion, however, hides what is occurring within a sentence in order to make in longer, since it is not just the number of constituents functioning in a group or phrase, but rather the manner in which these function that may contribute to text complexity.

Here the Macmillan Canterville Ghost contains only one clause with the potential to be unpacked—the clause: “*she was so frightened [*that she was ill for the rest of her life*].”* Here the clausal relationship between being frightened and being ill could be expressed as two clauses joined by the Relator “and so” i.e. “she was frightened || and so she was ill for the rest of her life.” The logical grammatical metaphor occurs within an independent clause here. Compare this with its equivalent passage, which also contains logical grammatical metaphor, in the original text:
"We have not cared [[to live in the place ourselves]],” <<2>>

“since my grandaunt, the Dowager Duchess of Bolton, was frightened into a.fit, [[from which she never really recovered]],

by two skeleton hands being placed on her shoulders

as she was dressing for dinner,

and I feel bound to tell you, Mr. Otis,

that the ghost has been seen by several living members of my family, as well as by the rector of the parish, the Rev. Augustus Dampier, [[who is a Fellow of King’s College, Cambridge]]].

<<2>> <<said Lord Canterville,>>

Figure 12.1 Logical Grammatical Metaphor in the Original Canterville Ghost

In “a fit [[from which she never recovered]],” approximate in meaning to “she was so frightened [[that she was ill for the rest of her life]],” one can again see a causal link shifted within the qualifying phrase, but this time, this logical grammatical metaphor is embedded in a clause complex with multiple layers of nesting.

Attempting to unpack the meanings contained only within this first clause of the projected clause complex reveals six or so figures where congruently a clause would only typically express one:

1) she was dressing for dinner
2) WHEN skeleton hands [were] placed on her shoulders
3) AND SO she was frightened
4) AND SO she had a fit
5) AND THEN she never really recovered
6) AND SO we don’t want || to live there

From this initial case, it would not seem an unrealistic hypothesis to propose that logical grammatical metaphors in the original text will be broken down into more congruent realizations as text level decreases.

Jane Eyre

An examination of the logical grammatical metaphors across the Jane Eyre rewrites reveals a similar pattern to The Canterville Ghost texts in that, where logical grammatical metaphor occurs in the more advanced texts, these tend to be embedded deep inside a multiple-layered clause complex, as opposed to the easier texts where these would seem to occupy one side of a single clause nexus. In conjunction with more complicated taxonomic relations in the advanced texts, the different contexts logical grammatical metaphors occupy would seem to suggest the more advanced the text level, the greater the semantic load clause complexes are made to
Table 15.2 Logical Grammatical Metaphors (Jane Eyre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence of figures:</th>
<th>Original:</th>
<th>Penguin:</th>
<th>Oxford:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bessie chides Jane</td>
<td>Dreadful to me was the coming home: Process→Entity in the raw twilight: Relator→Circumstance?, with nipped: Process→Quality fingers and toes, and a heart saddened by the shidings: Process→Entity of Bessie, the nurse, and humbled by the consciousness: Quality→Entity of my physical inferiority: Quality→Entity to Eliza, John, and Georgiana Reed: Sequence/Relator→Participant.</td>
<td>I hated coming home with frozen fingers and toes, with a heart saddened by the rough words of Bessie, the nurse: Process→Entity, and by the consciousness of how weak I was, compared with Eliza, John and Georgiana Reed: Process→Entity: Sequence→β clause.</td>
<td>I used to hate coming home when it was almost dark, with ice-cold fingers and toes, feeling miserable because Bessie, the nursemaid, was always scolding me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Observe include | 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: Process→Entity: Process→Circumstance, that I was endeavouring in good | She had dismissed me from the group, saying that she was sorry she was forced to keep me at a distance, but that until I tried seriously to develop a more friendly and attractive nature, she really could not allow me to join in the pleasures intended only for happy | ‘No, I’m sorry, Jane. Until I hear from Bessie, or see for myself, that you are really trying to behave better, you cannot be treated as a good, happy child, like my children.’ |
|  | 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.” |  |
|---|---|
| **Thinks about being dragged out** | And I came out immediately, for I trembled at the idea of being dragged forth by the said Jack: Relator→Circumstance. | I came out immediately, because I trembled at the idea of being dragged out by John: Sequence→Minor Process; Projected el.→Qualifier. | So I came out immediately, as I did not want him to pull me out. |
| **Large and stout** | John Reed was a schoolboy of fourteen years old; four years older than I, for I was but ten: large and stout for his age, with a dingy and unwholesome skin; thick lineaments in a spacious visage, heavy limbs and large extremities: Process→Qualifier? | John Reed was a schoolboy of fourteen years, four years older than I was; he was large and fat for his age, with an unhealthy skin, unattractive features and thick arms and legs: Process→Circumstance. | John Reed was fourteen and I was only ten. He was large and rather fat. He usually ate too much at meals, which made him ill. |
| **Delicate health** | He ought now to have been at school; but his mama had taken him home for a month or two, “on account of his delicate health”: Relator→Circumstance; Projected→Participant. | He ought now to have been at school, but his mama had brought him home for a month or two, “on account of his delicate health”: Relator→Circumstance” | He should have been at boarding school, but his mother, who loved him very much, had brought him home for a month or two, because she thought his health was delicate. |
| **Believes** | Mr. Miles, the master, affirmed | His schoolmaster said that |  |
Hes hardworking↓
he misses home↓
hes sallow

| that he would do very well if he had fewer cakes and sweetmeats sent from home; but the mother’s heart turned from an opinion so harsh, and inclined rather to the more refined: |
| John’s sallowness: |
| his condition would improve if he received fewer cakes and sweets from his family, but his mother’s heart found such a severe opinion unacceptable, and she preferred to believe that he worked too hard and missed his home. |

Impudent↓
sneaking↓
look↓
so hit

| “That is for your impudence: |
| “That is for questioning Mama,’ he said, ‘and for hiding like a thief behind curtains, and for the look you had in your eyes two minutes ago: |
| ‘That is for questioning Mamma,’ he said, ‘and for your rudeness: |

Start aside +
cry of alarm

| I did so, not at first aware what was his intention: |
| When I saw him lift and balance the book and stand in the act of aiming it, though, I jumped to one side with a cry: |
| He lifted the heavy book and threw it hard at me. It hit me and I fell, cutting my head on the door. |
### Midst of tantrum

He might strike her dead in the midst of her tantrums:

- Process → Entity: (while)
- Relator → Circumstance and then where would she go?

### Strike dead

He might strike you dead in the middle of your anger:

- Quality → Entity: Sequence → Circumstance.

### Process

- God will punish you, Jane Eyre, for your wicked heart: Sequence → Circumstance.

### Hit

- My head still ached and bled from the blow:
- Process → Entity: that I had received and my fall:
- Process → Entity: Relator → Circumstance?

### Fell

- No one had blamed John for striking me without cause:
- Relator → Circumstance.
- ‘Unjust! Unjust!’ I thought.

### Heart aches

- ‘Unjust! — unjust!’ said my reason, forced by the agonizing stimulus into precocious though transitory power:
- Relator → Process: and

#### Resolve

- Process/Quality → Entity,
- equally wrought up, instigated:
- Relator → Process
- some strange expedient: Process → Entity to achieve escape from
- insupportable oppression:
- Quality → Entity — as running away, or, if that could not be effected, never eating or drinking more, and letting myself die.

### Sign of grief

- Perhaps Mr Reed’s ghost might rise before me. This idea, instead of comforting me, filled me with fear:
- Process → Entity

#### Thought

- I was so frightened by this thought: Process → Entity that I hardly dared to breathe.
IF submissive and still ↓ shall liberate

“...and it is only on condition of perfect submission and stillness that I shall liberate you then.”

You will stay here an hour longer, and it is only on condition: Entity of perfect obedience: Quality→Entity and silence: Quality→Entity: Relator→Circumstance that I shall let you out then.'

You will stay here an hour longer as a punishment: Process→Entity for trying to deceive us: Sequence→Circumstance?.”

As one can see, the Penguin text appears to retain a much larger percentage of logical grammatical metaphors than the Oxford rewrite where these tend to disappear or be expressed congruently. For example, the causal connection between John Reed being delicate of health (one figure) and John Reed’s mother taking him home (another figure) has been expressed congruently as two clauses in the Oxford text: “α his mother…had brought him home for a month or two || β because she thought his health was delicate,” but incongruently as a Circumstantial Adjunct of Cause in both the Original and Penguin texts: “his mama had brought him home for a month on account of his delicate health.” It appears that retention of the logical grammatical metaphors within the Penguin text may be connected to Penguin’s approach to text adaptation, which would appear to involve the replacement of lexical items without many changes to the structure of clause-complexes. For example, one can see that “stout” has been replaced with the term “fat,” “dingy and unwholesome” with “unhealthy,” “limbs” with “arms and legs,” and “thick lineaments in a spacious visage” with “unattractive.” Given extra time, the ideational links between semantically equivalent passages such as these would seem to be a fruitful area of exploration here.

John Reed was a schoolboy of fourteen years old; John Reed was a schoolboy of fourteen years,

four years older that I,
four years older than I was

for I was but ten:

large and stout for his age,

he was large and fat for his age,

with a dingy and unwholesome skin;

with an unhealthy skin,

thick lineaments in a spacious visage,

unattractive features,

heavy limbs and large extremities

and thick arms and legs

Figure 13.1 Comparing the Penguin Rewrite and Original Text

Oxford’s treatment of logical grammatical metaphors, on the other hand, may be influenced here by a more flexible approach that appears less concerned with preserving the text in its original form and mentions an
avoidance of complex embedding for pacing and readability purposes. Although the Oxford text may appear slightly less complicated than the Penguin text, this is not to say, however, that this text is not an upper level text, and it might be worth bearing in mind other ways in which this text could be complex, for example, in terms of appraisal items.

**Experiential Grammatical Metaphor**

*The Canterville Ghost*

A preliminary listing of all the experiential grammatical metaphors present within the *Canterville Ghost* rewrites and the original text (see chart below) is suggestive of a higher incidence of grammatical metaphors by level. Although the temptation might be to attribute this feature to an increasing amount of words per level—note the total word-counts for each text are 884 (Macmillan), 802 (Black Cat), 1014 (Oxford), 1172 (Penguin), and 1489 (the original) respectively—the rewritten texts all had the potential to carry over experiential grammatical metaphors from the original text, and, therefore, the fact that they have chosen not to do so is, in itself, telling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text:</th>
<th>Experiential G/M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canterville Ghost: Macmillan (A2)</td>
<td>good-looking; thunderstorm; rain (2); stain (15); remover (1); library floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterville Ghost: Black Cat (A2/B1)</td>
<td>shock; noises; death (2); patriotism; good-looking; stain (4); mark; cleaner (2); flash; boom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterville Ghost: Oxford (A2/B1)</td>
<td>sleep; noises; death (2); good-looking; smile (2); dancing; tricks; sunshine; storm (2); drops; rain; stain (7); cleaner; flash; crash; sound; sleep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterville Ghost: Penguin (B1)</td>
<td>sale (2); experience; noises; death; well-known; fine-looking; fair-haired; good-looking; tricks; drive; journey; storm; rain; stain (6); cleaner; admiring family; crash; sleep; arrangements; increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL</td>
<td>fit; accident; sleep; well-known; death; observations; purchase; middle-aged; appearance; impression; error; fair-haired; good-looking; well-known; delight; tears; drive; flight; drops; rain; request; curtsey; stain (5); remover; admiring family; flash; peal; opinion; emigration; breakages; sleep; blessings; arrangements;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A closer examination furthermore reveals that some of the experiential grammatical metaphors identified when examining the lower level texts, although marked here to verge on the side of caution, are questionable selections. For example, “stain” (n.) has been considered as an experiential grammatical metaphor of the \textit{Process$\rightarrow$Entity} type since “stain” (v.) is possible, and a stain is the result of a Process; however, the contexts in which it is used are not really suggestive of “stain” as “semantic hybrid” (Halliday pp. 118), and this becomes apparent if one compares a sentence in which Mrs Otis asks Mrs Umney to “please remove the stain” with another grammatical metaphor in the original Canterville Ghost: “the purchase was concluded.” Unlike the first sentence in which the Process meaning is located in the Process, the main Process meaning in this second example is actually located within the Entity “purchase,” and as a result the Process “conclude” functions more as a kind of finite element (i.e. unpacked: “they finished purchasing the house”). If one is to remove these more questionable cases based on their contextual usage, then the upper level texts clearly seem to demonstrate more clear-cut experiential “semantic hybrids.”

Unfortunately, it was not possible to match all passages in the original text with semantically equivalent sections within the rewrites, but from those portions that could be approximated, the following experiential metaphors were identified and traced across the rewrites. The texts have been arranged left to right in order of highest to lowest level. Boxed items indicate an incongruent realization (i.e. experiential grammatical metaphor), whereas items \textbf{bolded and in italics} indicate a congruent realization (i.e. no experiential grammatical metaphor). Dashes mean that no semantic equivalent could be found.

Table 16.2 Experiential Grammatical Metaphors Across the Readers (Canterville Ghost)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Canterville Ghost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>celebrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the exception of “sleep,” the data would seem to point toward a general movement, or cline, of incongruent realizations being realized congruently or disappearing altogether, the lower the rewrite level. Furthermore, the aberrant case of “sleep” (n.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sleep</th>
<th>Crash</th>
<th>Boom</th>
<th>Crash</th>
<th>Crashed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emigration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>To emigrate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakages</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep</td>
<td>Sleep</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sleep</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 14.1 Experiential Grammatical Metaphor Involving a Scope Element**

can be seen to reflect a trend taking place within language where experiential grammatical metaphors involving de-lexicalized verbs and scope elements are becoming systemic options rather than true instances of experiential grammatical metaphor which are always created in response to the needs of the unfolding discourse. Since “sleep” and “get sleep” are virtually interchangeable here, with the exception, perhaps, of slight register differences, a general cline seems to hold.

*Jane Eyre*

The first chapter of Macmillan’s *Jane Eyre* opts to skip the red room scene to cover Mr. Brocklehurst’s interaction with Jane. In the original text, however, the scene with Jane in the red room constitutes Chapter 2 of the novel. In order to effect some sort of equivalence, the decision was made to override chapter considerations in selecting the passages leading up to and including Jane’s fainting for analysis. Unfortunately, this decision has produced drastic differences in the word counts for each text: 296 (for Macmillan), 405 (for Black Cat), 1767 (for Oxford), 2449 (for Penguin), and 4681 (for the original).

The same kind of preliminary listing of all experiential grammatical metaphors present within *Jane Eyre* as with *The Canterville Ghost* text again is suggestive of a far smaller amount of experiential grammatical metaphors in the lower level rewrites. Although the large number of items in the original text correlates with a sizeable word count, the fact that a large amount of material has been excised in the lower texts is telling.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Experiential G/M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em>: Macmillan (A1)</td>
<td>voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em>: Black Cat (B2)</td>
<td>memories; loneliness (2); anger; questions; hiding-place; fear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em>: Penguin (B2)</td>
<td>walk (2); heavy rain; exercise; words; consciousness; questions; objections; view; interruptions; hiding-place; sign; blow (2); insults; anxiety; blow; intention; cry; feelings; sense; fear (2); opinion (2); behavior; hold; folded arms; wounding suggestions; anger; prayers; wickedness; fall; escape; thoughts; promise; growing darkness; shaken nerves; sound; noise; scream; tricks (2); orders; condition; obedience; silence; pity; word; faint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jane Eyre</em>: Oxford (B2/C1)</td>
<td>Walk; freezing cold wind; heavy rain; long walks; rain (3); imagination; hiding-place; fear (2); idea; order; rudeness; wickedness; bullying; pain; resistance; help; answer; reminders; mistakes; wind; promise (2); thought; tricks (2); punishment; silence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL</td>
<td>walk; wind; a rain so penetrating; out-door exercise; long walks; the coming home; nipped fingers and toes; chidings; consciousness; inferiority; observation; storm-beat shrub; ceaseless rain; long and lamentable blast; introductory pages; vast whirls; surge; vast sweep; accumulation; broken boat; wreck; inscribed headstone; broken wall; newly-risen crescent; eager attention; interruption; rain; hiding-place; vision; conception; gesture; opinion; refined idea; sallowness; over-application; affection; antipathy; appeal; menaces; inflictions; blow (2); step; impudence; sneaking way; look; abuse; insult; intention; act; cry of alarm; terror; climax; feelings; drop; pungent suffering; sensations; fear; aid; circumstance; mutiny; conduct; wickedness; impulse; guarantee; hold; folded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having established the existence of a general cline from congruent to incongruent realizations the greater the level in the *Canterville Ghost* rewrites, it remains to do so for the *Jane Eyre* rewrites. Because the Macmillan and Black Cat texts contained very few sections where it was apparent that that section corresponded with another in the original text, the decision was made to focus on a comparison of the Penguin and Oxford texts with the original. Penguin classifies its rewrite as a B2 text according to the Council of European Framework descriptors, while Oxford classifies its text above that as a B2/C1 text. Consequently, one could predict that the Oxford text would display a larger percentage of incongruent realizations (i.e., grammatical metaphor) than the Penguin text. However, upon examining these texts, the pattern appears to be reversed:
Table 17.2 Experiential Grammatical Metaphors Across the Penguin and Oxford Readers (Jane Eyre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was no possibility of taking a walk that day.</td>
<td>There was no possibility of taking a walk that day.</td>
<td>We could not go for a walk that afternoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That further out-door exercise was out of the question.</td>
<td>That further out-door exercise was impossible</td>
<td>That we all stayed indoors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A heart saddened by the chidings of Bessie</td>
<td>A heart saddened by the rough words of Bessie</td>
<td>feeling miserable because Bessie…was always scolding me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feared nothing but interruption</td>
<td>I feared nothing except interruption</td>
<td>I was only afraid that my secret hiding place might be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accustomed to John Reed’s abuse</td>
<td>I was so used to John Reed’s insults</td>
<td>I was so used to his bullying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He had required a promise of Mrs. Reed that she would rear and maintain me as one of her own children</td>
<td>he had received a promise from his wife, Mrs Reed, that she would look after me as one of her own children</td>
<td>he had made his wife, aunt Reed, promise to look after me like her own children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I gave orders that Jane Eyre should be left in the red-room till I came to her myself</td>
<td>I believe I gave orders that Jane Eyre should be left in the red room until I came to her myself</td>
<td>I think I told you to leave Jane Eyre in this room until I came</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here it is the Penguin rather than the Oxford rewrite that consistently carries over more incongruent realizations from the original text. Since the first, second, and seventh examples here additionally involve interpersonal grammatical metaphor, let us delay a discussion of these to the next section and begin with “a heart saddened by the chidings of Bessie” – an experiential grammatical metaphor again of the Process→Entity type. Congruently realized “chidings” becomes “to chide;” noting that a synonym of “chidings”—“scoldings”—becomes “to scold” in its congruent form, one can clearly see that the Oxford rewrite presents the figure congruently: “feeling miserable because Bessie was always scolding me.” The Penguin text, in comparison, chooses to retain a grammatical metaphor in “the rough words of Bessie.” In this context, “the rough words of Bessie” evidently contains a process meaning, since these words must necessarily have been spoken for Jane’s heart to become saddened. In the fourth example, one can again see the grammatical metaphor, “interruption” (Process→Entity) being retained in the Penguin version, but then paraphrased in the Oxford rewrite, where interruption comprises Jane’s secret hiding-place being discovered. Even though in the next example, grammatical metaphor is retained across all the texts (“abuse” to “insults” and “bullying” Process→Entity), note that “bullying” in the Oxford rewrite appears closer to a congruent realization than...
As a result of the “-ing” morphology associated with Processes. Last, the sixth example is a straightforward: ‘a promise’ in the original and Penguin texts is realized congruently as a verb in the Oxford text (“made his wife...promise”).

Rather than suggest that this data counters the existence of a general cline from incongruent to congruent realizations the lower the level of text difficulty, could it perhaps be possible to posit that the Penguin rewrite form a more advanced text than the Oxford rewrite? Although this hypothesis remains to be confirmed in terms of Interpersonal grammatical metaphor or appraisal items, the evidence so far in terms of taxis, logico-semantic relations and logical grammatical metaphor all seems to support this possibility.

**Interpersonal Grammatical Metaphor**

*The Canterville Ghost*

The following table aligns sections containing interpersonal grammatical metaphor with semantically equivalent passages across the *Canterville Ghost* texts. Interpersonal grammatical metaphors (i.e. incongruent realizations of mood, modality, or key) have been *underlined, italicized, and bolded* for ease of reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18.1 Interpersonal Grammatical Metaphors (Canterville Ghost)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…as there was no <em>doubt at all</em> that the place was haunted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Canterville…had <em>felt it his duty</em> to mention the fact…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I feel bound</em> to tell you, Mr. Otis, that the ghost has been seen by several living members of my family…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I reckon</em> that if there were such a thing as a ghost in Europe, I’ll be happy to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Europe, we’d have it at home in a very short time… have one. I’ll send it home to America… home to America… American would take one back home.

I fear that the ghost exists… I’m afraid there really is a ghost… I’m afraid that the house really does have a ghost… ‘The ghost really exists…’

“Well, so does the family doctor…” Well, the family doctor appears too, I expect. Lord Canterville… ‘Well, so does the family doctor…’ ‘Well, Sir, in my home the doctor appears…’

…and I guess the laws of Nature are not going to be suspended for the British aristocracy. Believe me, there are no ghosts in any country in the world—not even in very old British families like yours. - - -

I’m afraid something has been spilt there… ‘Something has made a stain there,’ she said to Mrs Umney. ‘Is that a stain on the floor there?’ she asked. ‘What’s that mark?’ she asked. ‘What is this red stain?’ Mrs Otis asked Mrs Umney.

I guess the old country is so overpopulated that they have not enough decent weather for everybody. This country is very full of people. I suppose they don’t have enough good weather for everybody… ‘What terrible weather this country has!’ ‘What a terrible climate… I’m not surprised that people want to emigrate…’ -

There was no doubt, however, that she was extremely upset… There was no doubt that she was very unhappy. …but she looked very unhappy. …but she was still very upset. -

| What seems to emerge from this table are instances of interpersonal grammatical metaphor being carried over to the Penguin rewrite, but only one instance of interpersonal grammatical metaphor transferring to the |
Oxford text, and none crossing over to the Black Cat and Macmillan versions. When grammatical metaphors do occur here, as in the fourth (I’m sure that…) and sixth example (I expect that…), these cannot be found in the original text. In interpersonal grammatical metaphors such as “I guess || they don’t have enough good weather for everybody,” the main meaning is located within the projected material rather than the projecting process; hence the tag question is “do they?” rather than “do I?” Because the main meaning lies within the projected clause, this interpersonal grammatical metaphor might be considered superfluous for a text aimed as simplification, resulting in this projected material (or its close equivalent) coming to feature congruently by itself in the simplified texts (e.g. Original: “I reckon that if there were such a thing as a ghost in Europe…” = Penguin: “if there are ghosts in Europe…”). Interpersonal grammatical metaphors involving incongruent realizations of modality also tend to disappear altogether rather than show up congruently in modal form (e.g. Penguin: “there was no doubt that she was very upset” = Black Cat: “she was still very upset”).

**Jane Eyre**

Let us now explore whether a similarly consistent pattern holds true for the *Jane Eyre* texts by tracing interpersonal grammatical metaphors across semantically equivalent passages. Given an earlier discussion that suggested the Penguin text could possibly constitute a more advanced text than the Oxford rewrite, their places have now been flipped. As with the *Canterville Ghost* texts, interpersonal grammatical metaphors (incongruent realizations of mood, modality, or key) have been underlined, italicized and bolded for ease of reference.

**Table 18.2 Interpersonal Grammatical Metaphors Across the Penguin, Oxford, and Black Cat Readers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Penguin</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Black Cat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was no possibility of taking a walk that day.</td>
<td>There was no possibility of taking a walk that day.</td>
<td>We could not go for a walk that afternoon.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…further outdoor exercise was now out of the question.</td>
<td>…further outdoor exercise was impossible.</td>
<td>There was such a freezing cold wind, and such heavy rain, that we all stayed indoors.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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…she really</td>
<td>She had dismissed me from the group, saying that she was sorry she was forced to keep me at a distance, but until…she really could not allow me to join in…</td>
<td>‘No, I’m sorry Jane. Until I hear from Bessie, or see for myself, that you are really trying to behave better, you cannot be treated as a good, happy child…”</td>
<td>I prefer you to stay away from mean until you learn to be more pleasant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
must exclude me…

...there is something truly forbidden in a child taking up her elders in that manner.

...I don’t like questions. Children should not speak to those older than themselves in such a way.

‘Jane, it is not polite to question me in that way.’

Children shouldn’t ask questions like that…

“She’s in the window-seat, to be sure, Jack.”

“She’s in the window-seat, surely, John.”

‘She’s in the window-seat, John.’

“You have no business to take our books…”

“You have no right to take our books.”

“You have no right to take our books…”

“I’m warning you not to touch my bookshelves again…”

“You have no business to take our books…”

“it is your place to be humble…”

“it is your duty to be grateful…”

“I’m warning you not to touch my bookshelves again…”

“it is your duty to be grateful…”

“I’m warning you not to touch my bookshelves again…”

“it is your duty to be grateful…”

“if you become passionate and rude, Missis will send you away. I am sure”

“if you become angry and rude, Mrs Reed will send you away, I am sure”

‘…if you are angry and rude, Mrs Reed may send you away…’

“I supposed she now regretted her promise.

I never doubted that if Mr Reed had been alive, he would have treated me kindly…

I felt sure that if Mr Reed had lived he would have treated me kindly…

I doubted not—never doubted—that if Mr Reed had been alive he would have treated me kindly.

I can now conjecture readily that this streak of light was, in all likelihood, a gleam from a lantern…

Probably it was from a lamp carried outside across the garden…

It may have been from a lamp outside…

I felt sure it must be a

I was sure my uncle’s
I believe I gave orders that Jane Eyre should be left in the red-room…

I believe I gave orders that Jane Eyre should be left in the red-room…

I think I told you to leave Jane Eyre in this room…

It is my duty to show you that tricks will not succeed.

Jane Eyre, you need not think you can succeed in getting out of the room like this. Your naughty tricks will not work with me.

I must have fainted.

I fainted.

Just as in The Canterville Ghost, one can see interpersonal grammatical metaphors such as: “I believe || I gave orders…” where the main meaning of the clause is located within the projected material rather than the projecting process. One can also see interpersonal grammatical metaphors where modality has been expressed incongruently. The first example “there was no possibility” combining an interpersonal grammatical metaphor of this type with an experiential grammatical metaphor, for instance, can be congruently realized by the modal “could.” Similar examples of this type involve “out of the question” (cannot), “necessity” (must), and “place/duty” (must). Lastly, one can also see interpersonal grammatical metaphor involving an incongruent realization in mood. For example, the statement “I don’t like questions” is an incongruent realization of the command: “don’t ask me questions.”

The pattern that seems to emerge from this table is not dissimilar from that which emerged for the Canterville texts—again the largest percentage of interpersonal grammatical metaphors retained were in the Penguin, rather than Oxford rewrite (in which only three of its five instances could be matched with the original text). Because the Macmillan text contained no interpersonal grammatical metaphor, it has not been featured here, and only one of two instances of interpersonal grammatical metaphor in the Black Cat text (“children shouldn’t ask questions like that”) aligns with a passage in the original. Three of these five instances in The Canterville Ghost and Jane Eyre rewrites where interpersonal grammatical metaphors have been used not existing within the original all involve the use of “sure” (I’m sure that…; I felt sure that…; I was sure that…), suggesting that this particular interpersonal grammatical metaphor may be worthy of further investigation across other graded reader rewrites.
Appraisal

Mapping the appraisal items associated with certain characters reveals a marked increase in both the amount and variety of appraisal items corresponding to text level both within *The Canterville Ghost* and *Jane Eyre* rewrites. Because Appraisal items “accumulate, reinforce, and intensify” each other, the following section examines how differing distributions of Affect (concerned with the appraiser’s emotions), Judgment (concerned with socially desirable standards or social sanctions), and, in some cases, Appreciation items (concerned with aesthetic evaluations) function together to create potentially different readings of the same character across the rewrites.

**Appraisal: The Canterville Ghost**

Lord Canterville

The only Affect items associated with Lord Canterville in the Macmillan text are items of Desire (i.e. “he wanted”), whereas the Black Cat rewrite introduces items of (+) Security: Confidence that continues to feature in the higher-level texts.

These other rewrites are also marked by the potential for a double reading of Affect items. For example, when the Black Cat, Oxford, Penguin, and original text describe Lord Canterville “smiling,” this would seem to combine with items of (+) Security: Confidence to imply that Lord Canterville is skeptical of what Mr. Otis is saying. A double reading of items is also introduced in the two upper rewrites (Oxford and Penguin) in the form of the interpersonal grammatical metaphor: “I’m afraid there really is a ghost,” (since Lord Otis is not actually “afraid”), which would seem to feed into a (+) Propriety judgment of Lord Canterville for politely hedging his assertion. The interpersonal grammatical metaphor and the way Lord Canterville smiles here would seem to suggest that there is (-) judgment of Mr. Otis on his part, but that he is being too good mannered to express anything overtly negative.

When it comes to a Judgment of Lord Canterville’s character by Mr. Otis, the Macmillan text would seem to feature this Judgment more explicitly in that Mr. Otis questions Lord Canterville’s position to testify to the existence of the ghost considering that he had not seen it personally (i.e. “and you haven’t seen the ghost either”). In comparison, a negative judgment would seem to be hidden to a slightly greater degree within the continued back-and-forth assertions of the two parties (“if there really is a ghost in the house”) within the rewrites, although the original text demonstrates a directed snub of Lord Canterville as aristocracy. Within the context of the novel, this snub is significant when one considers that a negative judgment of Washington Otis involves the fact that Washington enjoys the company of the British aristocracy. Although the Oxford and Penguin retain some of this snub with the sentence “there are no ghosts in any country, not even in famous old families”—in other words, implying that Lord Canterville is not as special, Black Cat removes this judgment from being connected directly to Lord Canterville by saying that ghosts are “an out-dated European idea.” This Judgment item, however, would still seem to echo the way in which Mr. Otis seems to suggest that anything
American is superior within the original text, and it is interesting that Mr. Otis’s premise for disbelieving Lord Canterville hinges on the fact that if ghosts existed an American would put one in a show.

When Mr. Otis snubs Lord Canterville with the words “…and I guess the laws of Nature are not going to be suspended for the British aristocracy,” the reader is informed that Lord Canterville “did not quite understand Mr. Otis’s last observation,” and it appears as if Lord Canterville responds with a compliment. While this would appear to be a (-) Capacity judgment that could perhaps be connected to the stereotype of the nobility as being not all that smart, it perhaps demonstrates Lord Canterville unassuming nature to think the best of what Mr. Otis has said. Indeed, the impression the reader receives from the original text is that he is rather good-natured for the way in which he does not respond to his Veracity being called into question.

Although the Macmillan, Black Cat, and Oxford texts allow for a (+) Veracity and Propriety judgment of Lord Canterville in that Lord Canterville informs Mr. Otis of the ghost despite his vested interest in selling the house, the interpersonal grammatical metaphors in the other texts would seem to reinforce this idea—Lord Canterville hedges his adamant assertions about the existence of the ghost because he is an honest individual. While the rewrites explore this to some degree, the original text contains explicit (+) Propriety appraisal from the narrator, who informs the reader that Lord Canterville is “a man of the most punctilious honor” who “feels bound” to be upfront about the ghost. Lord Canterville’s sense of honor here would seem to be connected to his aristocratic status as one of the expected traits of nobility. Arguably a rise-above insult attitude would also seem to be part of this aristocratic code. If this were to be the case, the Oxford Lord Canterville perhaps sticks out in that Mr. Otis’s snub is prefaced by the words “perhaps there are no ghosts in your country,” which would seem to imply that Lord Canterville views America to be inadequate.

Washington Otis

In the Macmillan text one can see (+) Reaction: Quality items discussing Washington’s good-looking appearance. One also sees items implying (+) Security: Confidence, and (+) Propriety (kindness) for helping Mrs. Umney to stand up. In the Oxford text, this picture is expanded in that Washington is not just presented as good-looking ((+)) Reaction: Quality), but also as attention grabbing for his “wonderful smile” ((+)) Reaction: Impact). One gets the impression that he is a capable individual ((+)) Capacity: he is famous for his dancing) and that he himself is proud of his abilities ((+)) Satisfaction: Admiration). Black Cat is very similar when it comes to these items, except that his (+) Capacity for dancing has been construed as liking dancing, and Penguin also references his good-looking appearance, skills as a dancer, and confidence/self-satisfaction. There are some items present within the original text, however, which lend themselves to a more expanded reading of his character. The reader is informed that he rejects the patriotic title of Washington—a positive appraisal item suggesting he has the same traits as the famous leader—by frequenting casinos and embracing the company of the aristocracy. In light of Washington’s love of gambling, the manner in which Washington “rapidly” scours the floor may indicate that Washington’s competitive streak is just as responsible as Pinkerton’s stain remover for
getting the floor clean. The reader gets the impression that Washington is so caught up in what he deems to be a challenge that he is insensitive ((-) Propriety) to Mrs. Umney’s feelings.

**Virginia Otis**

Although all the rewrites appraise Virginia with Appreciation items related to her beauty, these appear to be the only items in the Macmillan text. Furthermore, although Black Cat supplements appreciation items of (+) Reaction: Quality and (+) Reaction: Impact with the affect item “she loved riding,” another reading would perhaps point out that the (+) Capacity judgments of Virginia Otis found within the original text seem to be missing here. It is perhaps important to note that it is not just her eyes that are responsible for her (+) Reaction: Impact, but her capability on horseback that has the young Duke immediately proposing in the Oxford, Penguin, and original text—a causal connection that appears to be lost in the Black Cat text. The original text’s depiction of Virginia Otis using animal imagery (i.e. “she was lithe and lovely as a fawn”) would seem to connect with Mrs. Otis’s “animal spirits,” and the energetic manner in which a connection with nature is equated with being a powerful female (a “wonderful Amazon”).

**Mrs. Otis**

The Macmillan rewrite features no appraisal items when introducing Mrs. Reed. The reader is simply informed that Mrs. Otis has a wife called Lucretia. In comparison, the Oxford rewrite informs the reader that Mrs. Otis was a very beautiful woman ((+) Reaction: Quality), while it is the Black Cat and Penguin rewrites that adds Judgment items: (+) Normality in the Black Cat and Penguin rewrites in terms of being famous for her beauty, and (+) Capacity in the Black Cat rewrite for being healthy. A look at the appraisal items within the original text seems to suggest that she embodies many of the same characteristics as her children in that like Washington she is connected with (+) Normality (being famous), and like Virginia she is connected with (+) Reaction: Quality (beauty) and (+) Capacity (healthiness).

**Mrs. Umney and Mrs. Otis**

The most evident appraisal item that has been retained across the rewrites for Mrs Umney, with the exception of Macmillan text, is the negative judgment by Mrs. Umney: “…what can we do with a woman who faints?” As will be seen, the different appraisal items surrounding this item in the different texts have the potential to encourage different readings of Mrs. Umney’s character here.

In the original text, the reader is first introduced to a neatly dressed Mrs. Umney waiting to meet the family. All the other rewrites omit “neatly” in describing her appearance here, but this description would seem to add to the following characterization of Mrs. Umney as the housekeeper “whom Mrs. Otis, at Lady Canterville’s *earnest request*, had consented to keep in her former position.” In other words, it would seem that these two pieces of information construct the assumption that Mrs. Umney is a capable ((+) Capacity) and
reliable ((+ Tenacity) housekeeper. Note that even though this line is retained in the Penguin text (the highest level rewrite) as “Lady Canterville had asked Mrs. Otis to continue Mrs. Umney’s employment as housekeeper,” this line feels more ideational than interpersonal in content than in the original text where “earnest” suggest Lady Canterville’s (+) Happiness: Affection for Mrs. Umney as a valued housekeeper. Within this context then, Mrs. Umney’s fainting (-) Insecurity: Surprise/Disquiet at the can not just be read as negative tenacity, considering that no-one else faints (i.e. she is cowardly), but also might counter this earlier expectation and read negatively in terms of her capacity and tenacity as a housekeeper (and interestingly, the Black Cat rewrite opts to change “woman” here to “housekeeper”).

The fact that the Mrs. Otis appraises Mrs. Umney in (-) Capacity and Tenacity terms is particular pertinent when one considers how Mrs. Otis has been appraised within the text. By virtue of saying “what shall we do with a woman who faints?” Mrs. Otis demonstrates her (+) Security: Confidence having not fainted at the thunder and lightening, and in the original and Oxford text, an explicit positive Capacity judgment is made regarding Mrs. Otis’s healthiness. It would appear to be that (+) Capacity judgments concerning healthiness link to bravery (+) Tenacity and visa versa in the original text in that Lord Canterville’s aunt is “frightened into a fit from which she never really recovered.” Furthermore, there is the suggestion that Mrs. Otis’s (-) Unhappiness: Dissatisfaction with Mrs. Umney reflects her own beliefs regarding how women should behave. The reader is informed, for example, that “many American ladies adopt an appearance of chronic ill-health on leaving their native land under the impression that it is a form of European refinement, but Mrs. Otis had never fallen into this error.” This item would suggest that Mrs. Otis is aware of a trend of feigned ill health and in choosing not to follow the trend, Mrs. Otis can be read as a honest ((+ Veracity) and wise ((+ Capacity) individual. This point is particularly significant considering how Mrs. Umney’s veracity can be called into question if one considers Mr. Otis’s suggestion to charge Mrs. Umney for fainting as having to do with her prompt recovery thereafter. Furthermore, a (-) Tenacity reading of Mrs. Umney as manipulative appears to be enabled by Mrs. Umney’s success in negotiating a pay raise despite the fact that her employers have just discussed docking her pay. Calling Mrs. Umney an “honest soul” would then seem ironic. While the Penguin and original text leave her means of achieving this implicit, the Oxford text presents Mrs. Umney complimenting her employers for their positive capacity and veracity: “‘You Americans are so strong!’ she said. ‘And so kind!’ ‘You know, I have worked here for many, many years at the same pay, and…’” Given the potential to read Mrs. Umney in negative Veracity terms here, one can perhaps call into question the extent of Mrs. Umney’s (-) Insecurity: Disquiet/Fear. Where the lower level rewrites tend to take Mrs. Umney’s apparent fear at face value: “she was very frightened”—the Penguin and original text can be seen to problematize this by suggesting that Mrs. Umney may have a flair for being overly dramatic; for example, answering in “a low mysterious voice.” ((+ Reaction: Impact).
Mrs. Reed

The only Affect items explicit in the Macmillan text are of (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy toward Jane. Unlike the other rewrites, where (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy items directed towards the character of Jane overlap with a (-) Propriety judgment of Mrs. Reed—in other words, her dislike of Jane serves as a reflection of her unkind character, not only does the Macmillan text contain no explicit or implicit (-) Propriety items appraising Mrs. Reed, but additionally provides room for a reading of Mrs. Reed in (+) Propriety terms as caring (in questioning Jane’s hatred for her), concerned (in stating that Jane “cannot live alone”), and generous or altruistic (in granting Jane’s wish to leave by sending her to her friend Mr. Brocklehurst’s school).

Despite the still largely implicit nature of (-) Propriety items, the potential for a negative judgment of Mrs. Reed’s character is much more distinct in the Black Cat rewrite. A negative Propriety judgment of Mrs. Reed’s character is aided here by the contrast between (+) Happiness: Cheer items involving Mrs. Reed looking happy in the company of her children, and (-) Unhappiness: Misery items appraising Jane’s feelings of loneliness. When Mrs. Reed excludes Jane from their “happy” interactions, or walks away from a distressed and
pleading Jane, there is room to interpret Mrs. Reed as being uncaring of Jane’s feelings. Additionally, the Black Cat rewrite may also provide an opportunity to read Mrs. Reed as somewhat untruthful (+ Veracity) in that, when excluding Jane from their “happy” group with the justification that Bessie has said Jane is “a bad girl,” Mrs. Reed diverts Jane’s request to know what she has done wrong, suggesting Mrs. Reed may be using Bessie as a cover and that this punishment is unfounded, thereby strengthening a (-) Propriety judgment of Mrs. Reed.

Figure 15.2 Appraisal items in the Black Cat Jane Eyre: Mrs Reed

As in the Black Cat rewrite, Mrs. Reed’s (+) Happiness: Cheer also serves as a contrast to Jane’s (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy in the Penguin text, but is also subsidized here by (+) Happiness: Affection items directed towards her own children. These items of (+) Happiness: Affection potentially brings about a (-) Capacity reading of Mrs. Reed in that her affection for her children makes her foolish in blinding her to their true nature. She believes, for instance, that John Reed’s health is “delicate,” as a result of “over-application” (+ Capacity) and homesickness (which suggests (+) Happiness: Affection for his family making him a caring and sensitive individual i.e. (+) Propriety). However, it is John Reed’s gluttony (- Propriety) that is to fault (note: that the reader is informed he is neither intelligent (- Capacity) nor does he care much about his family
((-) Unhappiness: Antipathy and (-) Propriety items), and it is precisely her displays of (+) Happiness: Affection, such as sending cakes and sweets that spoil her children rotten. Having been informed that Mrs. Reed’s children are constantly quarrelling and fighting, Mrs. Reed’s appears foolish ((-) Capacity) for implying that her children are “happy” and “good”—her indulgences fuelled by self-deception have produced children who are unkind and evidently miserable ((-) Unhappiness: Antipathy and (-) Propriety).

As in the Black Cat rewrite, one can see (-) Propriety items presenting Mrs. Reed as unkind or uncaring, but the Penguin rewrite also features (+) Propriety items, not only from a servant who suggests that Mrs. Reed allowing Jane to live with them is a “kindly” action, and implicitly from Mrs. Reed herself when she presents herself as a dutiful parental figure (i.e., “it is my duty to...”). Mrs. Reed’s positive self-appraisal is called into question, however, by a (-) Tenacity judgment because she does not fulfill her parental responsibilities by ignoring John Reed’s abusive behavior. This in turn feeds back into both a (-) Propriety judgment of Mrs. Reed as unfair, and a (-) Veracity judgment since she breaks her husband’s dying wish that Jane be treated equally to her own children in doing so. (-) Dissatisfaction: Displeasure items compound the sense that no matter how well-behaved, Jane is felt to be encumbrance—especially when contrasted with those items of (+) Happiness: Affection Mrs. Reed has for her misbehaving children.

Figure 15.3 Appraisal items in the Penguin Jane Eyre: Mrs Reed
The Oxford rewrite contains very much the same kind of appraisal items as the Penguin text, the only real distinction being that (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy items seem to be framed more explicitly towards Jane, as opposed to items in the Penguin text which hides Mrs. Reed’s (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy for Jane behind the guise of (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy concerning her behavior; for example, “I don’t like questions” implying “I don’t like you asking questions.” On the whole, the Oxford version tends to express appraisal items like these a bit more explicitly.

**Figure 15.4 Appraisal items in the Oxford Jane Eyre: Mrs Reed**

**John Reed**

The Macmillan rewrite demonstrates (-) Propriety judgments of John as unkind, to which the incident in which John continues to hit Jane despite her scream of pain lends support. It also displays token (-) Propriety items of John as selfish, when he forbids Jane from reading a book on the grounds that it is his. However, the fact that Jane can be seen to retaliate without much hesitation would seem to suggest that John Reed does not have the same fear-inspiring presence as in some of the other rewrites. Indeed, a (-) Tenacity judgment may even
be possible here because John Reed calls for his mother to come save him, implying that he is perhaps a somewhat cowardly individual. The overall effect here is thus a medium strength one—John Reed may be unkind and selfish, but he is not dominantly powerful to the extent that one immediately views him to be an abusive individual. Although there is evidence of John’s unkindness, there is not much to suggest that this unkindness stems from deep-rooted antipathy as opposed to the type of feelings typically expressed in a sibling quarrel.

![Diagram of appraisal items in the Macmillan Jane Eyre: John Reed]

**Figure 15.5 Appraisal items in the Macmillan Jane Eyre: John Reed**

In comparison, the Black Cat rewrite can be seen to intensify the degree of (-) Propriety items from unkindness to cruelty when the reader is informed that “John Reed often torment[s] and insult[s]” Jane, leading Jane to fear him. Based on this knowledge, the reader seems to be expected to interpret John’s laugh ((+) Happiness: Cheer) to be sinister—a sign of (+) Security: Confidence in his power as tormentor perhaps. However, a conviction that John Reed is such a tormentor seems somewhat lacking—although we have (-) Propriety items such as John sticking out his tongue, or laughing sinisterly upon discovering Jane’s hiding-place, it is Jane rather than John Reed that initiates a physical fight by throwing a book at him. Furthermore, the impetus for her action, the reader is informed, is John’s “ugly and disgusting appearance” ((-) Reaction: Quality). Where in the other rewrites this (-) Reaction: Quality item serves to show that John Reed has absolutely no redeeming features—that his outer appearance reflects his “ugly” inner characteristics—this aesthetic judgment
here as an impetus for physical violence instead seems to reflect badly on Jane (\(- \) Propriety: unkindness). The other versions clearly demonstrate a different reality here in that it is this thought about John Reed’s appearance that inspires a dirty look, and this look that, when read in Jane’s face by John Reed, triggers him to suddenly hit her.

Figure 15.6 Appraisal items in the Black Cat Jane Eyre: John Reed

In comparison, the Oxford rewrite presents the opportunity to draw a link between the two, in other words, to interpret his “ugly” outward appearance as a result of his “ugly” inner characteristics. John Reed’s egotistical and self-centered nature (\(- \) Propriety) is not only suggested by the way he forbids Jane from touching “his” property but also by the gluttonous behavior that is responsible for his sallow appearance. Just as John Reed has been permitted to indulge in food, so too has John been permitted to indulge in bad behavior, puffing him up mentally—and one sees evidence of this (-) Propriety when he has Jane address him as “Master Reed.” Consequently, when Jane reviles John (\(- \) Reaction: Quality), the reader is perhaps more inclined to perceive this reaction as founded. There also seems to be the suggestion that John is physically powerful (\(+ \) Capacity) in this rewrite, and, therefore, quite capable of inflicting abuse. Given John Reed’s dominating deportment, Mrs. Reed can be considered additionally foolish for considering her son “delicate” of health. While there is the potential for a (-) Tenacity reading of John Reed then, his shout for help seems to come more as a result of (-) Insecurity: Surprise than anything else, which goes to show just how confident (\(+ \) Security:
Confidence) he is in his power to abuse.

Figure 15.7 Appraisal items in the Oxford Jane Eyre: John Reed

The Penguin rewrite demonstrates an overlap with many of the same appraisal items present in the Oxford text. The only real difference seems to be that the Oxford text does not explore why Mrs. Reed believes John Reed’s health to be “delicate,” where the Penguin text suggests this is 1) from “over-exertion” (a (+) Capacity judgment contradicting an earlier (-) Capacity of John as unintelligent), and 2) because “he missed his home” –a belief that would seem to counter the statement that John Reed “was not very fond of his mother and sisters” ((-) Propriety).
Figure 15.8 Appraisal items in the Penguin Jane Eyre: John Reed

That John feels (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy toward everyone and everything is something that appears to get emphasized more within the Penguin rewrite and the original text. For example, in the original text, the reader is informed that he tears his mother’s silk garments (-) Propriety and completely disregards her wishes (-) Tenacity: i.e. he is willful, and yet is treated with (+) Happiness: Affection. This information can be seen to serve as a significant textual consideration by demonstrating that Mrs. Reed’s (+) Happiness: Affection towards John is just as unfounded as her (-) Unhappiness for Jane who tries to do no wrong. The reader is also informed that John Reed “strips the hothouse vines of their fruit” (which marries John’s destructive nature with his glutinous appetite), and yet is tolerated by the servants who “[do] not like to offend their young master”—demonstrating just how much power he has. Last, the original text also informs the reader of John Reed’s cruelty towards animals. Where in the rewrites Jane’s statement: “I really thought him a wicked murderer” has to be interpreted on the basis of his actions towards her, the foundation for this (-) Propriety judgment for the original text may lie in the knowledge that John Reed enjoys “twisting the necks of pigeons.” One thus gets the impression that John Reed revels in senseless violence.
Jane Eyre

In the Macmillan rewrite, it may be difficult to ascertain that the (-) Propriety evaluations of Jane Eyre as a “bad girl” are not justified, since the character of Jane narrates that she “pulled John’s hair” and she “kicked him.” Furthermore, even though the reader is informed that Jane feels (-) Unhappiness: Misery, the extent to which the Reeds are responsible is also somewhat unclear. For example, it seems that Jane is responsible for isolating herself from the group here, claiming that “she wanted to be alone.” Even if one is to accept that the Reeds feel (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy for Jane, Jane responds with like feelings (“I hate you too!”), and a reader may get the impression that this is a childish outburst rather than a justified rebellion.
In comparison, Mrs. Reed’s (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy for and (-) Dissatisfaction: Displeasure with Jane is clearly visible in the Black Cat rewrite with a (-) Reaction: Quality item, implying that Jane is “unpleasant” (“until you learn to be pleasant”). While it was previously suggested that a (-) Propriety reading of Jane could arise as a result of her throwing a book at John, (-) Propriety judgments of Jane also occur before this without any apparent grounding (for example: “Bessie says you’re a bad girl”). Additionally, unlike the Macmillan rewrite, Black Cat explores the source of Jane’s (-) Unhappiness: Misery here: “loneliness, pain, anger, and rebellion.” Although loneliness, as an affect item of Desire, aids a reading of Jane (-) Unhappiness: Misery as she stands at a distance from Mrs. Reed who is “sitting by the fire with her three children...[looking] happy,” the justification for Jane to feel “anger” and “rebellion” (-) Dissatisfaction: Displeasure) seems to be missing. Likewise, although the reader is informed that Jane is “frightened” and “afraid,” these do not appear to really be reinforced or intensified elsewhere in the text resulting in Jane’s fear (“I was frightened, because John often tormented me” and “I was afraid of being in the Red Room...”) and (-) Insecurity: Disquiet: distress) feeling detached. For example, the Black Cat text has Jane exclaim: ‘Aunt Reed!’ I cried. ‘Please don’t leave me here!’ whereas the original text has Jane beg: “O aunt! Have pity! Forgive me! I cannot endure it—let me be punished some other way! I shall be killed if—.”
The Oxford rewrite, on the other hand, contains a far larger percentage of (-) Fear items, which in general tend to cross over with items of (-) Insecurity: Disquiet, which in turn tend to overlap with items of (-) Unhappiness: Misery. For example, while the Black Cat rewrite combines (-) Unhappiness: Misery and (-) Insecurity: Disquiet when the reader is informed that “fear and cold and loneliness” finally overcame [Jane] causing her to faint, the opening lines of the original text and both the Oxford and Penguin rewrites associate these items from the outset with Jane’s statement that she “used to hate coming home…with ice-cold fingers and toes, feeling miserable…” Having noted this particular combination of affect items, the items the different rewrites employ in the scene where Jane is reading are particularly interesting. The original text states that “with [a book] on [her] knee, [Jane] was then happy [and] feared nothing but interruption.” In contrast to the (-) Fear and (-) Unhappiness: Misery combination elsewhere in the text, one finds an item of (+) Security: Confidence (i.e. feared nothing) and (+) Happiness: Cheer (happy).

Figure 15.11 Appraisal items in the Black Cat Jane Eyre: Jane Eyre
Figure 15.13 Appraisal items in the Oxford Jane Eyre: Jane Eyre

These affect items are significant if one considers that the character of John Reed is responsible for a shift between these items—Jane is interrupted by the voice of John calling for her, and when Eliza tells John where Jane is hiding, Jane reveals herself because she fears John will drag her out. The Penguin text retains these affect items almost word for word, while the Oxford text rewrites “with [a book] on [her] knee, [Jane] was then happy [and] feared nothing” as “lost in the world of imagination, [Jane forgot her] sad, lonely existence for a while and was happy. [She] was only afraid that [her] secret hiding-place might be discovered.”

In comparison, Black Cat drops the (+) Happiness: Cheer affect item, writing: “[Jane] felt safe behind the red curtain: no one could see [her] in [her] hiding place. But then John Reed ripped the red curtain open.”

Unlike the other texts where (+) Security: Confidence arises as a result of the escape from reality reading affords, (+) Security: Confidence in the Black Cat rewrite comes from being hidden. Because Jane is the narrator of the text, the reader has to establish that “no-one could see me in my hiding place” is Jane’s thought at that moment in time, rather than the voice of Jane as narrator (which would feel discordant with the next sentence, “John Reed ripped the red curtain open”). The reading scene in the original text not only serves a contrast to following (-) Insecurity: Disquiet and (-) Fear items that arise in the following interactions with John Reed, but, by demonstrating that Jane has what could be considered somewhat of an overactive imagination, also prepares the
reader for (-) Insecurity: Disquiet and (-) Fear items resulting from Jane imagining and then believing that a ghost is in the Red Room with her.

(-) Insecurity: Disquiet items also combine with “rebellion” ((-) Dissatisfaction: Displeasure) in the upper level texts; Jane’s (-) Insecurity: Disquiet at the end of the text, for example: fighting “wildly” with John Reed, contrasts with Jane’s characterization of herself in passive (-) Capacity terms as “weak.” The reader is first presented with Jane as a submissive character; for example, obediently ((+) Propriety) fetching the book John has commanded her to bring him in silence. Such appraisal items are key to understanding that Jane’s rebellion is uncharacteristic—Jane reaching her breaking point—and thus that the (-) Propriety items directed toward Jane are not justified.

In many respects, affect items in the Penguin text are almost identical to those in the Oxford rewrite, with the exception of the servant’s (-) Capacity appraisal of Jane as potentially mad or insane, and Mrs. Reed’s sincerity in believing Jane to be pretending ((-) Veracity).

---

**Figure 15.14 Appraisal items in the Penguin Jane Eyre: Jane Eyre**

A distinction can perhaps be drawn between the rewrites and the original text when it comes to the degree of Jane’s (-) Unhappiness: Misery. From the lower level rewrites, the reader seems more inclined to get
the impression that Jane is going through a phase of childhood rebellion rather than the impression that Jane is seriously depressed as a result of continued abuse. The original text, on the other hand, has both Mrs. Reed and John Reed reference Jane’s (-) Unhappiness: Misery to characterize her in a criticizing manner. John Reed calls her “Madam Mope” and Mrs. Reed punishes her for not having a “sprightly manner.” (-) Capacity which further aids a reading of these characters in (-) Propriety terms, and reveals how Jane has come to possess the mind-set of someone abused and downtrodden when she blames her (-) Capacity; for example, to be a “sanguine brilliant careless exacting” child, responsible for the Reed’s lack of affection towards her. Clearly quite how Jane is supposed to be “sanguine” when subjected to the abuse of John Reed is beyond question here, and Jane’s attempts to rationalize the Reed’s behavior (a portion that gets omitted in the rewrites) only serves to further highlight the Reed’s (-) Propriety.

Figure 15.15 Appraisal items in the Original Jane Eyre: Jane Eyre

The Dynamics of the Appraisal Items within the Original Text

Examining the dynamics of the original text then, one can see that (+) Happiness: Cheer items involving Mrs. Reed being happy in the company of her children serves as a contrast to Jane’s (-) Unhappiness: Misery. An appraisal of Jane by John and Mrs. Reed criticizing Jane for her (-) Unhappiness: Misery thus lends itself to a (-) Propriety judgment because it is their unkindness and unfair punishment (for example: excluding Jane from
their “happy” interactions) that is responsible for her misery. Mrs. Reed’s unfair treatment and (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy toward Jane is hidden behind the guise of a dutiful parent ((+ Tenacity/Propriety) punishing an unruly (-) Propriety) child; however, it becomes apparent that Jane seeks “to do no wrong” ((+ Propriety) and Mrs. Reed does not punish her own “violent and cruel” (-) Propriety) son in the same manner. In punishing Jane while overlooking the faults of her own son, Mrs. Reed breaks the promise she made to her husband on his deathbed (-) Veracity) to treat Jane as if she was one of her own children. A (-) Capacity reading of Mrs. Reed is made possible by the fact that her (+) Happiness: Affection for her children here is just as unfounded as her (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy for Jane—her affection has blinded her to their true nature (Mrs. Reed does not seem to recognize, for example, that John Reed feels (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy towards her). Furthermore, the reader can see that Mrs. Reed’s (+) Happiness: Affection for her children has overindulged them—just as Mrs. Reed’s display of affection in sending John cakes has caused him to become unhealthy, so her indulgence of bad behavior has caused him to become egotistical and selfish (-) Propriety). John Reed’s self-centeredness (-) Propriety) surfaces not only in the way he forbids Jane from touching “his” property, but also his gluttony. Given John Reed’s stout and dominating deportment, Mrs. Reed can additionally be characterized as foolish for considering her son’s health to be “delicate.” Rather, John is a dominating figure who displays (+) Security: Confidence in his power as tormentor—even the servants fear displeasing him. Jane, in comparison, is appraised as a submissive and weak character (-) Capacity) that has come to possess the mind-set of someone abused and downtrodden. When she finally reaches her breaking point, and uncharacteristically rebels against John Reed’s tyranny, Jane is reproved as if this was to be expected (-) Propriety), in turn providing a (-) Propriety judgment of John, Mrs. Reed, and the servants who all make her a scapegoat.

Alternative Interpretations Across Readers

Accompanying an increase in the amount and variety of appraisal items by level comes the possibility for alternative readings of Mrs. Reed, John Reed, and Jane Eyre. As one can see, (-) Propriety judgments of Mrs. Reed become complicated by (+) Propriety appraisals of Mrs. Reed from the servants, and even the character herself. Rather than simply viewing Mrs. Reed as an unkind character, the more advanced texts provide the opportunity to question whether Mrs. Reed is even aware of her unjust treatment of Jane. For example, the reader is informed that “Mrs. Reed probably considered she had kept [the] promise” to her husband “to rear and maintain [Jane] as one of her own children.” Mrs. Reed’s incapacity to find fault with her own children thus becomes pitiable—especially since John Reed clearly does not have any (+) Happiness: Affection for his mother.

The character of John Reed also undergoes metamorphosis between graded readers. Not only does the degree of his viciousness seem to change from sibling bullying to full-blown psychopathic behavior (i.e. “[twisting] the necks of pigeons, [and killing] the little pea-chicks”), but the (-) Tenacity reading possible in the earlier text that was suggestive of some weakness shifts with John as a dominating figure that has Jane
trembling in fear, and the servants not daring to get on the wrong side of him. The extent of his (-) Unhappiness: Antipathy also moves from Jane to anyone and everything.

Last, the character of Jane shifts from a character that is quick to retaliate to John without much hesitation, to a character whose response is the result of having been abused to her breaking point; from a character who screams a childish “I hate you” to a character that is justified in holding pent-up resentment and thinking John Reed ugly.


DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In contrast to the majority of literature on graded readers that primarily concerns itself with statistical gains in fluency or word knowledge, or hypothesizes about the advantages or disadvantages of graded material, this study was motivated by a desire to provide a semantically-oriented description of some of the features that might be indicative of beginner, intermediate, and advanced graded readers. An in-depth examination of the two titles selected here could possibly complement research in this area since a review of the relevant literature revealed that complexity tended to be conceptualized only in terms of word and structure lists and tended to be examined using a statistical or broad corpus-style approach that necessarily couldn’t examine the discourse-semantic features of graded readers up-close in context.

After analyzing four publishers’ rewrites of *The Canterville Ghost* and *Jane Eyre* alongside the original texts, significant patterns emerged in terms of taxis, logico-semantic relations, grammatical metaphor, and appraisal. The findings for each framework are summarized below:

**Taxis**

The SFL framework of taxis was selected based on the publishers’ criteria which mention i) the differential usage of “independent” and “complex” sentences, ii) sentences joined by “‘and,’ ‘but,’ or ‘or’” (suggestive of parataxis) in lower level texts, and iii) structures such “conditionals” (suggestive of hypotaxis) in the immediate and advanced level texts. Based on these criteria, it was anticipated that the more advanced text could be expected to display a greater degree of interdependency, with a move from single clauses to parataxis and then hypotaxis. Although this hypothesis held true in terms of a greater percentage of single clauses as opposed to clause complexes in the lower level texts, there did not seem to be a significant difference across rewrites in the number of clauses with parataxis and hypotaxis as their main clause nexus. A closer inspection, however, revealed that the number of clauses being joined by parataxis or hypotaxis was significantly different (the lower level texts had the largest number of paratactic and paratactic clause complexes connecting two clauses only) as was the amount of nesting within clause complexes (which increased by level), and only the upper level texts could be seen to display more than one layer of nesting. The result was also suggestive of a greater variety of nesting combinations taking place within the upper level rewrites.

**Logico-semantic Relations**

In an examination of logico-semantic relations, trouble was encountered concerning the interpretation of data. Although there did not appear to be any discernable patterns for paratactic main clause nexuses, the variety of logico-semantic relations employed increases with text level, and the most common patterns were $\alpha \wedge \beta$ followed by $\alpha \wedge x\beta$ or $x\beta \wedge \alpha$ and then $\alpha \wedge =\beta$. Because enhancement is concerned with adding *circumstantial* features of time, place, manner, cause, or condition, and the distinction between *circumstantial elements* and...
beta clauses are blurry, it is perhaps unsurprising that the enhancement meaning occurs before that of elaboration.

**Grammatical Metaphor**

As far as one is aware, this study would appear to be the first of its kind to attempt to compare semantically equivalent passages across different level rewrites of the same text. When it came to an investigation of grammatical metaphor, establishing “equivalence” was particularly decisive in demonstrating a shift from incongruent to more congruent realizations in correspondence with text level. Not only did the number of logical grammatical metaphors increase with text complexity, these metaphors also contributed to the texts’ semantic density in the upper level rewrites by being embedded inside multiple clauses with multiple clause nexuses.

When it comes to grammatical metaphor, experiential grammatical metaphor was of particular interest for its ability to contribute to a discussion of text complexity and “vocabulary” choices beyond de-contextualized word-lists. Wan-a-rom charged graded readers with the potential drawback of presenting vocabulary in limited contexts, for example, using “draw” in the sense of drawing a picture, but not in the sense of drawing a breath. The latter example could be considered a case of experiential grammatical metaphor, because the process meaning doesn’t lie in “draw” but rather in “breath.” A study of experiential grammatical metaphor indeed revealed a larger percentage of clear-cut experiential grammatical metaphors in the more advanced texts, and an investigation of what happens to those experiential grammatical metaphors present in the original texts when rewritten showed that only the upper level texts were likely to retain these in their incongruent form.

Given that metaphorical language has to do with language being a higher-order semiotic system, allowing for expansion of the meaning potential within language, these results are perhaps unsurprising. Because grammatical metaphor allows, for example, a process to function as a participant in a clause, one could perhaps predict that the number of instances where a non-human entity features in the subject position will also increase. Unfortunately, it was not possible to study the process and participant types present in these graded readers; however, may be a fruitful area for future exploration. From reading these graded-readers, my impression is that the more advanced texts display a larger percentage of relative clauses with embedded clauses. Furthermore, the more advanced texts are likely to involve processes where the doer is hidden; for example, the clause “my wife couldn’t sleep at night because of all the noises in the house” takes as given that the ghost is the producer of the noise.

**Appraisal**

An investigation of appraisal items within the different rewrites revealed considerably fewer conflicting appraisal items in the lower texts, and where appraisal items did occur, they seemed to be prototypical examples
of the affect category (for instance: “I was happy” (+) Happiness: Cheer). From the publishers’ criteria, the impression seemed to be that lower level texts could be expected to primarily concern themselves with more ideational meanings than “interpretation,” which can be viewed as a higher order task. Given extra time then, it would perhaps be worthwhile seeing how the additional materials the publishers provide in relation to the interpretation of characters relates to the appraisal items contained within the text.

David Hill views graded readers to be the readiest means for students to learn about culture, and as previously discussed, appraisal items certain overlap with a definition of culture. In what ways then do these graded readers reveal “culture”? The *Jane Eyre* text certainly explores what behavior constitutes (-) Propriety (for example: John Reed sticking out his tongue). There are perhaps moral maxims represented here too—spare the rod spoil the child; the rotten apple never falls far from the tree, not to mention a horrid replacement mother figure. Last, we also have an opportunity to explore the servant’s questioning of Jane’s sanity in connection with the madwoman locked away. With the understanding that graded readers have tended to be considered separate from the language curriculum, it might be worthwhile to think about how these cultural elements might be interpreted by students. Obviously, the reading position adopted here is necessarily based on being a native speaker of the language, so given more time, it would be interesting to investigate the way in which these graded readers are interpreted by second or foreign language learners.
CONCLUSION

As one will recall, graded readers have been charged with “inauthenticity” for not qualifying as material “originally created to fulfill a social purpose in the first language community” (Little et al., 1989). Van Lier (1996), however, reframed the debate by countering the chain of reasoning that assumes inauthenticity is detrimental for foreign or second language learners.

Furnishing the example of dentists questioning their patients while knowing them to be incapable of responding, Van Lier demonstrated that authenticity is not the inherent property of a text but, rather, a process that stands relative to a consideration of students’ needs. Dentists’ “inauthentic” questioning is authenticated by its language function (to accommodating the nervous patients’ need to be put at ease). Based on Van Lier’s findings that any conversation necessarily incorporates this element of audience design, an interlocutor’s adaptation of their language is not necessarily “inauthentic” nor problematic, provided that the interlocutor does not hold a skewed perception of the other party.

Although the accommodative language of teacher talk and simplified materials may limit exposure to the full array of features typically found in unmodified language, Van Lier has shown that this concern is not a matter of language authenticity per se. As Van Lier points out, the pedagogical advantages of simplified materials are called into question although the same is not asked of children’s books, which likewise do not display the full range of language features found in materials created for an adult native speaker readership. Given this understanding, Van Lier has shown that any contribution to the authenticity debate must “be based on the intrinsic qualities of the texts [as pedagogical tools], not on the mere fact that their audience is the learner rather than the native speaker” (p. 137). Effective graded materials then will be those that allow for adequate progression and demonstrate a gradation of text complexity based on an in-depth awareness of where students struggle, because, as Van Lier writes, the better one understands the problems one’s interlocutors experience, the more efficient one’s audience design will be when one attempts to adapt the language. The exploration of the linguistic features of the graded readers undertaken here may be seen to contribute to the authenticity debate as outlined in these two respects in that the findings contribute to an awareness of text complexity as a semantic as well as a structural concern that therefore might be suggestive of areas publishers and teachers can take into consideration when grading their language.

Evidently, text complexity is a tangled notion, and any study as such must take into account the possibility that some aspects of language use may become more complex when an effort is made to simplify material. Although it has not been the focus of the present study to address this concern, David Hill (2008) suggests that attempts to simplify material for lower level learners structurally and culturally often produces a text that is harder to interpret as a result of “thinner characterization” (p. 200). Van Lier (1996) similarly embraces the possibility that elementary level texts may be more unrepresentative of the target language, more so even than texts created for L1 children (p. 137). Given additional time, this claim would seem to warrant
further investigation, but at present, our findings are only consistent with the idea that lower level texts are more likely to delete material (the Macmillan version of Jane Eyre excising the whole of the red room scene, for example). Perhaps, however, publishers may use this information, particularly with regards to appraisal and grammatical metaphor, to think about how areas of difficulty might be scaffolded in the texts so that more original material could be retained (i.e. an elaborative rather than simplifying approach). Evidently, complete retention of the original material will not be beneficial, since the original text may be beyond the comprehension of even some L1 speakers; nevertheless, scaffolding, perhaps in the form of glosses, may allow learners to function at a higher level of autonomy, and therefore allow publishers to introduce a greater array of language features. As far as one is aware, there has yet to be a graded reader series that seeks to take a primarily elaborative approach, although this seems to have potential as a fruitful area of future study. Recently, changing literary practices in what has been dubbed the age of digital technology has shifted attention towards the use of technology and graded materials (see Eldridge and Neufeld, 2009). It might therefore be worth thinking about the way in which technology can make possible an elaborative approach that otherwise would be too cumbersome to implement in a paper format—perhaps allowing students to select or grade sentences within a graded reader by tapping on that section of the text.

In a related manner, Van Lier incorporates motivation into a discussion of authenticity in the form of “personal authenticity” defined as a sincere interest in the task at hand. Advocates of graded readers have long maintained that autonomy (and its attendant motivation) lie at the core of graded readers, which were designed with the premise that a disruption to students’ reading processes caused by language beyond students’ competence will have a negative affective toll. In a series of interviews investigating teachers’ and students’ perceptions of what makes an effective graded reader, Gillian Claridge (2012, 2009) discovered students’ typical answers involved the experience of becoming immersed in a book, imagining oneself as one of the characters, and then forgetting the time. Such responses correspond to the concept of “funktionslust” (pleasure in the activity) and Csikszentmihalyi’s notion of a “flow experience,” as cited in Van Lier (1996, p. 106), both of which are dependent on having the adequate skill to meet the language challenges. Based on the connection Van Lier makes between authenticity and true autonomy, fostered by activities harnessing learners’ natural curiosity and appetite for challenge (p. 99), students should be provided with opportunities to extensively read material that is within their ability level. However, Claridge’s research revealed that the teachers she interviewed were primarily concerned with how graded reader could be utilized in intensive reading in-class activities, for the teaching of factual or grammar related information rather than this emotional connection (p. 107). In order to take into account both teachers’ desire to use graded readers as in-class material and students’ need for motivation in the form of personal authenticity, which Claridge’s research reveals is fostered by emotional interest in the texts, it may be fruitful to consider the addition of in-class activities addressing appraisal items as a compliment to students’ extensive reading.

Because “integrative motivation” can take the form of identification with the target culture and appraisal
items are a product of “culture,” students may benefit from the opportunity to interpret the characters’ feelings, and reactions towards other characters and things. With the understanding that language is not just concerned with the exchange of goods and services, but contains sites of interpersonal negotiation, attention to appraisal items may empower students by aiding the construction of a repertoire for self-expression in the L2.

Understandably, some may have concerns regarding a discussion of culture alongside appraisal items, but, as Lantolf establishes, there is a dialectical relationship between culture and mind as semiotically organized functional systems; intrapersonal thought arises as a result of social interaction with others of the same culture (interpersonal), and therefore inner language is also culture-bound. Of note, Lantolf found that “abstract stimulus words” such as “joy” and “rage” (appraisal items) produce the largest discrepancy of culture-specific word-association responses.

It is also important to stress that the appraisal system itself is neutral. Michael Charles (2011) writes that graded readers may have negative cultural consequences if they present a “world of imagination” pertaining solely to Western classical texts (p. 201), but appraisal items can be utilized for graded readers’ representation of English as a world language. Furthermore, because the appraisal system acknowledges the possibility of different reading positions, it allows for the establishment of what Kramsch (1993) calls a “third space” – a middle ground where both the L1 and L2 are examined in order to reach a place of greater intercultural awareness and understanding (see Lantolf, 1999).

Ushakova notes that since language is not required to serve an intrapersonal function in organizing students’ inner world, a learner may approach the L2 as if it is a matter of plugging structures into this pre-existing L1 mental framework, thereby never fully establishing the ability to take on L2 conceptual modes of thought (see Lantolf, 1999). Translation exercises in particular would seem to encourage the notion that one structure is simply a replacement for another, whereas activities that establish connections between other language items in the L2 may be more effective. Because appraisal items demonstrate a prosodic structure, teachers may encourage students to draw on appraisal items found elsewhere in the text to support their readings, thereby making links between like appraisal items.

Advocates of graded readers are keen to emphasize the need for an integration of graded readers into the language curriculum, but, if this is to be the case, graded readers must adhere to the current understanding of good curriculum design. Nation and Macalister (2010) provide 20 principles they believe constitute dependable principles for curriculum design, two of which seem particularly applicable to graded readers: 1) “the language focus of a course needs to be on the generalizable features of the language system,” and 2) “learners should process the items to be learned as deeply and as thoughtfully as possible” (p. 60).

A focus on appraisal items qualifies for the second principle in that a language focus that caters to student interests is more likely to receive deeper processing, and depth of processing may also be created by a level of challenge since students oftentimes are required to sort through contrasting appraisal items to extract the social message of the story. Concerning the first principle, a teaching of the appraisal system provides a way for
students to generalize about the language by categorizing affect, judgment, and appreciation items, thereby allowing students to map how items relate to each other not just semantically but by degree (for example, the difference between feeling “a bit down” and feeling “despondent”). Appraisal items qualify as “generalizable” features of the language system in that “any text worthy of reading will involve inferential and interpretive levels of meaning that are scaffolded in elaborations, even where the literal wording are apparently transparent” (Martin & Rose, 2012, p. 158), and, therefore, appraisal forms part of a mature reader/writer’s repertoire (Martin & Rose, 2012, p. 293). A discussion of the appraisal items prototypically found in story genres thus could segue into a discussion of appraisal items as they occur in other text types (for example, the use of the engagement system in academic writing), thereby allowing students to build up an interpersonal repertoire that enables them to make creative use of the L2.

So far this discussion has been devoted to appraisal items, but the findings of this research also have implications in terms of grammatical metaphor. Interestingly, the examples Nation and Macalister provide for these two principles of good curriculum design (i.e. a focus on generalizable language features and depth of processing) both invite a discussion of grammatical metaphor.

For the first principle, Nation suggests that “when explaining or teaching the meaning of an unknown word, the teacher should try to include the underlying concept of the word rather than just focus on the meaning the word has in one particular context,” explaining “sweet” in a manner that “sweet taste, sweet music and a sweet smile” could all be understood by the student (p. 43). Although a semantic connection certainly might be made between the two in that “sweet” in the sense of a pleasing smile is perhaps an extension of a sweet taste (as a pleasant sensation), one may also note that “sweet” as it is used in the sense of a sweet taste represents a prototypical Quality (i.e. it tasted sweet), whereas the “sweet” of a sweet smile actually involves an experiential grammatical metaphor where a Process (to smile) is represented as an Entity (smile) and the Circumstantial element (smiled sweetly) is represented in the guise of a Quality. While Nation’s point, to focus on patterns within the language system is well-advised, there may be the temptation to equate generalizing the features of the language system with removing these items from their context, where students have been shown to benefit from a treatment of language in context (Martin & Rose, 2012).

For the second principle, deep processing, Nation recommends that a teacher can say something like “I will not allow my children to eat dirty food,” and the language learner can then try to find the appropriate first-language translation. However, “I will not allow” is an interpersonal grammatical metaphor, and metaphorical modes of expression are notoriously difficult to translate considering the manner in which they are “closely linked to the ways in which a culture organizes its world conceptually” (Danesi, 1993, p. 495, in Lantolf, 1999, p. 42). Unless the teacher “unpacks” this metaphor for students, it would seem unrealistic to expect students to undertake this approach with a high degree of success. Furthermore, the teacher would likely need to be a proficient speaker of students’ L1 in order to ascertain whether the sense of the original expression has been adequately understood, since the nature of students’ L1 may force them to select an item that is a close
approximation but still lacks some of the nuances of the L2 expression. It may be more beneficial then to let students work with “unpacking” and “repacking” grammatical metaphors in the L2, perhaps asking students to match up grammatical metaphors with their corresponding congruent expressions.

Given that metaphorical modes of expression underlie a large percentage of all language use, the teaching of grammatical metaphor would seem to cater to Nation’s principles mentioned here. Grammatical metaphors may be scaffolded by in-class interaction, or within the text itself. At present, it would appear that items glossed within graded readers tend to be low-frequency items that are considered central to an understanding of the text; for example, Black Cat glosses the item “stain.” However, in the interest of increased student autonomy, publishers might consider the addition of glosses that unpack grammatical metaphors. As Van Lier reveals, the controversial nature of the authenticity debate arises from concerns over adequate exposure to the necessary language structures needed to become proficient, and our findings revealed that there seems to be almost no grammatical metaphor at the lower levels but a larger amount of unscaffolded items at higher levels. It might therefore be pedagogically advantageous for graded readers to introduce more grammatical metaphors at an intermediate level with such textual scaffolding.

I hope that this brief exploration of text complexity as both a structural and semantic concern will find use in the audience design aspects of teacher-student interactions of the textual “scaffolding” of graded readers that contributes to increased student autonomy and motivation. Of course, this investigation is far from finished, and continued research in this area will shed more light on such areas as the features of different text types adapted for beginner, intermediate, and advanced students. This study, of course, to appropriate Halliday’s metaphor, is an investigation of local weather phenomenon; only with other studies in this area will it be possible to establish whether these findings are representative of the climate of simplified materials in general.
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The Canterville Ghost

Mr Hiram B. Otis was a rich American from New York.
(2) 1 (α) He had come
(xβ) to live and work in England,
2 (α) but he did not want
(‘β) to live in London.
(3) α He did not want
‘β to live in the city.
(4) α He wanted
‘β to live in the countryside outside London.
(5) Canterville Chase was a large and very old house near London.
(6) α Lord Canterville, the owner, wanted
‘β to sell it.
(7) So Mr Hiram B. Otis visited Lord Canterville.
(8) 1 ‘I do not live in Canterville Chase,’
2 Lord Canterville said to Mr Otis.
(9) α ‘I do not want
‘β to live there.
(10) The house has a ghost—the Canterville Ghost.’
(11) 1 ‘I come from America,’
2 said Mr Otis.
(12) ‘America is a modern country.
(13) I don’t believe in ghosts.
(14) Have you seen this Canterville Ghost?’
(15) 1 ‘No,’ <<2>> ‘but I have heard it at night.’
<<2>> <<said Lord Canterville,>>
(16) 1 ‘I don’t believe in ghosts,’
2 Mr Otis said again.
(17) ‘No one has found a ghost.
(18) No one has put a ghost in a museum.
(19) And you haven’t seen this ghost either.’
(20) 1 ‘But several members of my family have seen it,’
2 said Lord Canterville.
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(21) ‘My aunt saw the ghost.

(22) She was so frightened [[that she was ill for the rest of her life]].

(23) 1 Also, the servants have seen it
     x2 so they will not stay in the house at night.

(24) Only the housekeeper, Mrs Umney, lives in Canterville Chase.

(25) Mrs Umney lives there alone.’

(26) 1 (α) ‘I want
         (β) to buy the house,’
     "2 said Mr Otis.

(27) ‘I’ll buy the ghost as well.

(28) Will you sell Canterville Chase?

(29) Will you sell the ghost?’

(30) 1 ‘Yes, I will,’
     "2 said Lord Canterville.

(31) α ‘But, please remember,
         (β) I told you about the ghost
         (α) before you bought the house.’

(32) Mr Hiram B. Otis bought Canterville Chase.

(33) Then his family came to England from America.

(34) He had a wife called Lucretia, three sons and a daughter.

(35) The eldest son, Washington, was almost twenty years old.

(36) 1 He was good-looking
     +2 and had fair hair.

(37) His two young brothers were twins.

(38) They were twelve years old.

(39) The daughter, Virginia, was fifteen years old.

(40) She had large blue eyes and a lovely face.

(41) Mr Otis took his family to live at Canterville Chase.

(42) The old house was in the countryside west of London.

(43) Mr Otis and his family travelled from London by train.

(44) Then they rode to the house in a wagon [[pulled by two horses]].

(45) Canterville Chase was big and old.

(46) Trees grew all around the house.

(47) 1 (α) The Otis family wanted
β to stop and look at the outside of the house,
x2 but the sky darkened.

(48) A thunderstorm was coming.

(49) Rain started to fall,
x2 so the family went inside the house quickly.

(50) Mrs Umney, the housekeeper, was waiting for them by the front door.

(51) She was an old woman
+2 and wore a black dress and white apron.

(52) She lived at Canterville Chase
+2 and looked after the house.

(53) ‘Welcome to Canterville Chase,’
“2 said Mrs Umney.

(54) ‘Would you like some tea?’

(55) ‘Yes, please,’
“2 said Mrs Otis.

(56) The Otis family followed Mrs Umney into the library.

(57) There was a big table in the centre of the room and many chairs.

(58) Mrs Umney put teacups on the table,
x2 then she brought a pot of tea.

(59) The Otises sat in the library
+2 and drank their tea.

(60) They looked out of a large window at the rain.

(61) The rain was falling heavily
+2 and the sky was black.

(62) They heard thunder
+2 and they saw lightening.

(63) Mrs Otis looked around the room.

(64) There were many books on bookshelves.

(65) There were paintings on the walls.

(66) There was also a red stain on the floor.

(67) The red stain was by the fireplace.

(68) ‘What is this red stain?’
“2 Mrs Otis asked Mrs Umney.

(69) ‘It is blood,’
“2 answered the old housekeeper in a quiet voice.
I don’t want a blood-stain in my library,’” said Mrs Otis.

‘Please remove the stain. Please clean the floor immediately.’

The old woman smiled.

‘It is the blood of Lady Eleanore de Canterville.

She was murdered by her husband, Sir Simon de Canterville, in 1575.

The blood-stain has been here for over three hundred years.

It cannot be removed.’

‘Nonsense,’ said Washington Otis.

‘I have some Pinkerton’s Stain Remover from America.

It can remove any stain.

Watch.’

Washington Otis took the stain remover from a bag.

Pinkerton’s Stain Remover looked like a small black stick.

He rubbed the stick on the blood-stain.

A minute later the floor was clean.

The stick had removed the stain quickly and easily.

Mrs Umney looked at the floor.

She was frightened.

No one had removed the blood-stain for three hundred years.

Mrs Umney was very frightened.

‘Pinkerton’s can remove anything,’” said Washington Otis.

‘The blood-stain has gone.’

Lightening flashed and lit the library.

Thunder crashed over the house.

Mrs Umney fainted.

Mr and Mrs Otis ran across the library.

They helped the old housekeeper [who lay on the floor].

Mrs Umney’s eyes were closed and her face was pale.
‘Mrs Umney! Mrs Umney!’ cried Mrs Otis.

‘Can you speak?’ Mrs Umney opened her eyes.

‘Trouble will come to this house,’ she said.

‘I have seen the ghost. The ghost will come to you.’

All the Otises helped Mrs Umney to stand up.

‘The ghost will come,’ she said again.

‘You must not remove the blood-stain.

You must not clean the library floor.

The ghost will be angry.’

Then Mrs Umney went upstairs to her room.

Black Cat

Mr Hiram B. Otis was American.

He was rich and very important.

He wanted to live in an old house in England, so he decided to buy Canterville Chase, the home of Lord Canterville.

Everyone told him that he was very foolish.

‘Canterville Chase is haunted,’ they said.

Lord Canterville himself told Mr Otis why he preferred not to live in the house.

‘Many members of my family have seen the Ghost.

My grandaunt, the Duchess, was dressing for dinner one night when, suddenly, the hands of a skeleton touched her on the shoulders.

She never recovered from the shock.

My wife, Lady Canterville, cannot sleep at night because of the mysterious noises in the house.’

‘My Lord,’ ‘I’ll take the house with the furniture and the Ghost.

said Mr Otis.’

I come from a modern country where we have everything that money can buy].
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If ghosts really existed in Europe, I’m sure [that an American would take one back home].

He would put it in a museum or a show [for everyone to see].

Lord Canterville smiled.

‘The Ghost really exists.

People have seen it many times in the last three hundred years, since 1584 in fact.

‘Well, sir, in my home the doctor appears before the death of any member of my family.’

‘But I’m an American,’ [he continued], ‘and Americans don’t believe in ghosts.

They’re an old-fashioned European idea.’

‘If you don’t mind a ghost in the house, that’s all right.

But please remember that I have told you.’

A few weeks later Lord Canterville sold Canterville Chase to the Americans.

There were six people in the Otis family.

Mr Otis himself was a minister of the United States government.

His wife, Mrs Lucretia Otis, was a beautiful lady.

As a young woman in New York, she had been famous for her beauty.

She was full of energy and very healthy.

They had called their oldest son Washington in a moment of patriotism.

He was tall, blond and good-looking.

He liked dancing very much and his only fault was [[that he enjoyed the company of the British aristocracy]].

His sister, Virginia, was fifteen years old with large blue eyes; she was lovely.

She loved riding her pony in the country.

A young English lord, Cecil, Duke of Cheshire, was in love with her.

The youngest children were twins.

They were often naughty but everybody liked them.
When the family came to live at the house, they drove from the station in a carriage.

It was a lovely July evening.

The sun was low in the sky and the birds were singing.

But as they came near Canterville Chase, the weather changed.

Dark clouds appeared.

Some large black birds flew over their heads.

It began to rain.

In the garden near the house, they saw an old black tree with no leaves or flowers on it.

An old woman dressed in black with a white apron was waiting for them on the steps of the house.

This was Mrs Umney, the housekeeper.

"Welcome to Canterville Chase," she said.

They followed her through the dark wooden hall into the library.

Tea was ready for them.

Suddenly Mrs Otis saw a dark red stain on the floor by the fireplace.

"What's that mark?" she asked.

"It's blood," replied the old housekeeper.

"How horrible!" said Mrs Otis.

"I don't like bloodstains in the sitting room.

Please remove it."

Mrs Umney smiled.

"It's the blood of Lady Eleanore de Canterville.

Her husband, Sir Simon de Canterville, murdered her in that exact place in 1575.

Sir Simon disappeared nine years later and nobody has ever found his body.

But his guilty spirit still haunts Canterville Chase.

And nobody can remove the stain."

"Nonsense!"
cried Washington in a loud voice.

It’s the latest American stain remover.’

He knelt down and rubbed the floor with the ‘Champion Cleaner’.

In a few moments, the blood had disappeared.

“I knew ‘Pinkerton’s” would do it,’ he said triumphantly.

At that moment, there was a great flash of lightning and a boom of thunder.

“They jumped to their feet, and Mrs Umney fainted.

‘What a terrible climate,’ said Mr Otis calmly, lighting a cigar.

‘I’m not surprised [[that people want to emigrate]].’

‘My dear husband, look at Mrs Umney,’ said his wife.

‘What can we do with a housekeeper [[who faints]]?’

‘We’ll reduce her wages,’ said Mr Otis.

As soon as he said that, Mrs Umney recovered, but she was still very upset.

‘Don’t laugh at the Ghost, sir.

I have seen terrible things in this house.’

However, Mr Otis and his wife told her “that they were not afraid of ghosts,” and the old housekeeper went to bed.

When Hiram B. Otis, the American businessman, bought the house called Canterville Chase,
Everybody knew
\(\beta\) that there was a ghost in the house.

Lord Canterville himself told Mr Otis all about it.

‘We don’t like [[to live in the house ourselves]],’
he said.

‘Too many of my family have seen the ghost.

My wife’s grandmother, the Duchess of Bolton, is one of them.

One night, while she was dressing for dinner,
two skeleton hands were put on her shoulders.

She has been ill for years because of that.

And my wife never got any sleep there because of all the noises at night.’

‘Lord Canterville,’ <<2>> ‘I will buy both the house and the ghost.

<<answered Mr Otis,>>

I come from a modern country,
and we can buy nearly everything in America—
but not ghosts,
so if there really is a ghost in the house,
we can send it home to America,
and people will pay to go and see it.’

‘I’m afraid [[that the house really does have a ghost]],’
said Lord Canterville,
smiling.

‘Perhaps there are no ghosts in your country,
but our ghost has been in the house for three hundred years,
and it always appears before the death of one of the family.’

‘Well, so does the family doctor, Lord Canterville.

But there are no ghosts, sir, in any country—not even in famous old British families.’

‘Very well,’
said Lord Canterville.

‘If you’re happy to have a ghost in the house,
that’s all right.
But please remember
that I did tell you about it.’

And so Mr Hiram B. Otis bought the house,
and a few weeks later he and his family went down to Canterville Chase on the train.

Mrs Otis was a very beautiful woman, and looked just as English as an Englishwoman.

American people are really no different from English people— but they do, of course, speak a different language.

Her eldest son, Washington, was a good-looking young man with a wonderful smile, who was famous at all the London parties for his fine dancing.

Miss Virginia E. Otis was a sweet little girl of fifteen with big blue eyes.

She loved to ride horses and could ride faster than a lot of men.

One day the young Duke of Cheshire saw her on horseback, and immediately asked her to marry him— but his family sent him back to school the next day.

After Virginia came the twins—two happy, noisy little boys, who were always laughing and playing tricks.

It was a lovely July evening when the family got off the train.

The fields and trees looked beautiful in the golden sunshine.

The birds were singing sweetly, and the sky was a bright blue.

But when they arrived at Canterville Chase, storm clouds suddenly appeared in the sky.

Then ten or twelve large black birds flew down over their heads, and big drops of rain began to fall.

An old woman in a black dress was standing in the doorway of the house, waiting to meet them.

This was Mrs Umney, the housekeeper.

‘Welcome to Canterville Chase,’ she said.

They followed her into the library—a long, dark room, with a high window at one end.

Here tea was ready for them, so they took off their coats and sat down.
Suddenly, Mrs Otis saw a dark red stain on the floor, near the fireplace.

"Is that a stain on the floor there?"

she asked.

"Yes, Mrs Otis,"

said Mrs Umney quietly.

‘It’s a bloodstain.’

‘Oh, that’s terrible!’

cried Mrs Otis.

‘I can’t have bloodstains on my floors.

The old woman smiled,

and again answered in a quiet voice.

‘It is the blood of Lady Eleanore de Canterville,’

she said.

Her husband, Sir Simon de Canterville, murdered her in 1575,

while she was standing just there, in that place.

He lived for another nine years after her death,

but then he disappeared, very strangely and suddenly.

Nobody ever found his body,

but his ghost is still in the house,

and will not rest.

The bloodstain is famous—

visitors come here specially
to see it.

People have tried to clean it,

but it will not go away.’

‘Of course it will!’

cried Washington Otis.

‘Pinkerton’s Famous Stain Cleaner will clean it up in a second.’

And before the housekeeper could stop him,

he was cleaning the floor with a small black stick.

A minute later, the bloodstain was gone!

‘There you are!’

he said,

smiling at the others.
‘Pinkerton can clean anything!’

But at these words the storm outside suddenly began.

A terrible flash of lightning lit up the room.

And a second later came a great crash of thunder.

Everyone jumped up at the sound of the thunder.

And Mrs Umney fainted.

‘What terrible weather this country has!’ said Mr Otis.

He sat down again, and lit a cigarette.

Mrs Umney lay on the floor, with her eyes closed.

Mrs Otis looked at her.

‘My dear Hiram,’ she cried.

‘What can we do with a woman [[who faints]]?’ said Mr Otis.

‘Tell her she has to pay some money,’ she said.

If she breaks a cup or something, she has to pay for it.

So tell her to pay if she faints.

She won’t faint after that.’

At this, Mrs Umney immediately sat up.

But she looked very unhappy.

‘Be careful, trouble is coming to this house,’ she said, her voice shaking.

‘I have seen things here [[which are too terrible to describe]].

For night after night, I have not closed my eyes in sleep.’

Mr Otis gave her a warm smile.

‘My wife and I are not afraid of ghosts, Mrs Umney.’
(79) The old housekeeper got shakily to her feet.

(80) 1 ‘You Americans are so strong!’
        2 she said.

(81) ‘And so kind!’

(82) You know, I have worked here for many many years at the same pay, and…’

(83) 1 ‘Okay Mrs Umney, we will pay you more money,’
        2 α        said Mr Otis,
        xβ       still smiling.

(84) ‘Oh, thank you.

(85) Dear Mr Otis and dear Mrs Otis, thank you very much.’

Penguin

(1) xβ When Hiram B. Otis, the American Ambassador, bought Canterville Chase,
        α α people told him
        "β that he was doing a very dangerous thing.

(2) "β There was no doubt [[that the place was haunted]],
        α they said.

(3) α Lord Canterville himself told Mr Otis this
        xβ when they were discussing the sale.

(4) 1 ‘We don’t live in the place ourselves,’
        2 said Lord Canterville.

(5) ‘Too many members of my family have seen the ghost.

(6) α My aunt was dressing for dinner one night
        xβ when she felt two skeleton’s hands on her shoulders.

(7) 1 The experience made her very ill,
        +2 and she’s never really got better again.

(8) 1 α After that, none of the younger servants wanted
        ‘β || to stay with us,
        +2 and my wife couldn’t sleep there because of the noises at night.’

(9) 1 ‘Lord Canterville,’
        2 answered the Ambassador.

(10) ‘I will buy the house, the furniture and the ghost.

(11) I come from a modern country [[where we have everything that money can buy]].

(12) xβ And if there are ghosts in Europe,
        α I’ll be happy [[to have one]].
I'll send it home to America, and people will pay to see it +2 and to be frightened by it!'”

Lord Canterville smiled.

‘I'm afraid there really is a ghost,’ he said.

‘It’s been famous for three centuries—since 1584.

It always appears before the death of a member of our family.’

‘Well, [the family doctor appears too], I expect, Lord Canterville,’ said the Ambassador.

‘But the doctor is real, unlike the ghost.

Believe me, [there are no ghosts in any country in the world—not even in very old British families like yours].’

‘Well, if you’re happy to share your house with a ghost, that’s all right,’ said Lord Canterville.

‘But please remember that I warned you.’

A few weeks after this, the sale was completed and the Ambassador and his family went down to Canterville Chase by train.

Mrs Otis, <<when she was Miss Lucretia R. Tappen of West 53rd Street,>> had been a well-known New York beauty.

She was now a fine-looking middle-aged woman, and in many ways she looked like an English lady.

She was an excellent example of the fact [[that there is very little difference between the English and the Americans today, except, of course, for the language]].

Her oldest son, Washington, was a fair-haired, rather good-looking young man.

He was famous, even in London, as an excellent dancer.

He was very sensible, except about certain flowers and about the important families in Europe.

Miss Virginia E. Otis was a lovely girl of fifteen, with large blue eyes.

She was a good sportswoman, and loved to ride horses— and she could ride them faster than a lot of men.
She had once raced old Lord Blinton on her horse twice round the park, winning easily.

She looked wonderful that day, and when the young Duke of Cheshire saw her on horseback he immediately asked her to marry him!

Sadly for him, his family sent him back to school that same night.

He cried all the way there.

After Virginia came the twins.

These were two happy little boys who laughed and shouted a lot.

They liked to play tricks on people and were often punished for them.

Canterville Chase is seven miles from Ascot, the nearest railway station, so Mr Otis had arranged a carriage.

He and his family started their drive happily.

It was a lovely July evening; birds were singing sweetly, and the fields and trees looked beautiful.

At the beginning of their journey, the sun was shining and the sky was blue.

But when they reached Canterville Chase, storm clouds suddenly appeared in the sky.

Before they reached the house, rain was falling heavily.

An old woman in a black dress was on the steps to greet them.

She was Mrs Umney, the woman who looked after the house.

Lady Canterville had asked Mrs Otis "to continue Mrs Umney’s employment as housekeeper at Canterville Chase, and Mrs Otis had agreed."

‘Welcome to Canterville Chase,’ Mrs Umney said to the Ambassador and his family.

She led them through the large hall into the library.

This was a long low room, with a coloured window at one end.

Tea was ready for them, so they took off their coats,
sat down
and began to look round the room.

Mrs Umney poured the tea.

Suddenly, Mrs Otis noticed a dark red stain on the floor, near the fireplace.

“Something has made a stain there,” she said to Mrs Umney.

“Yes, madam,” replied the housekeeper in a low voice.

“It’s a bloodstain.”

“How nasty!” cried Mrs Otis.

“I don’t like bloodstains in a sitting room.

It must go.’

The old woman smiled,
and answered in the same low, mysterious voice.

“It’s the blood of Lady Eleanore de Canterville,” she said.

“What happened to her?” asked Mrs Otis.

“She was murdered on that exact spot by her own husband, Sir Simon de Canterville, in 1575,” said Mrs Umney.

Sir Simon lived for nine years after that,
and then disappeared suddenly and very mysteriously.

His body was never discovered,
but his ghost still haunts the Chase.

The bloodstain has always been admired by visitors to the house,
and it can’t be cleaned.

People have tried,
but it won’t go away.’

‘Of course it will!’ cried Washington Otis.

‘Pinkerton’s Wonder Stain Cleaner will clean it in a second.’

And before the frightened housekeeper could stop him,
and began cleaning the floor with a small black stick.

(71) In a few moments the bloodstain had disappeared.

(72) 1 “I knew Pinkerton could do it,”
   2 said Washington,
   +2 and he looked round at his admiring family.

(73) 1 But at that moment, lightning lit up the room
   +2 and a terrible crash of thunder made them all jump up.

(74) Mrs Umney fainted.

(75) “What an awful climate!”
   2 said the American Ambassador calmly,
   αβ as he lit a cigarette.

(76) “Awful,”
   2 agreed his wife.

(77) “This country is very full of people.

(78) “I suppose [they don’t have enough good weather for everybody],”
   2 said Mr Otis.

(79) Mrs Umney lay on the floor with her eyes closed.

(80) Mrs Otis looked down at her.

(81) “My dear Hiram,” <<she cried,>> ‘what can we do with a woman [who faints]?”
   2 <<she cried,>>

(82) “Make her pay,”
   2 answered the Ambassador.

(83) α ‘She has to pay
   xβ if she breaks something,
   x2 α so tell her to pay
   xβ if she faints.

(84) She won’t faint after that.’

(85) And in a few moments Mrs Umney sat up.

(86) There was no doubt [[that she was very upset]].

(87) “Be careful,”
   2 she warned Mr Otis,
   +2 and her voice was shaking.

(88) ‘Trouble is coming to this house.’

(89) “Trouble?”
   2 said Mr Otis.
He smiled.

‘I’ve seen things with my own eyes, sir, [[that would make your hair stand on end]]’

Mrs Umney continued.

‘For many nights now I haven’t closed my eyes in sleep.

I’ve been too afraid.’

But Mr Otis and his wife told the woman

‘not to worry.

‘We’re not afraid of ghosts,’

said the Ambassador.

So the old housekeeper asked God

|| to be kind to her new employers,

made arrangements for an increase in her pay,

and then went nervously up to her own room.

When Mr. Hiram B. Otis, the American Minister, bought

Canterville Chase,

every one told him

he was doing a very foolish thing,

as there was no doubt at all [[that the place was haunted]].

Indeed, Lord Canterville himself, [who was a man of the most punctilious

honour], had felt it his duty [to mention the fact to Mr. Otis]

when they came to discuss terms.

“We have not cared [[to live in the place ourselves]],”

“since my grandaunt, the Dowager Duchess

of Bolton, was frightened into a fit, [[from

which she never really recovered]],

by two skeleton hands being

placed on her shoulders

as she was dressing for dinner,

and I feel bound to tell you, Mr. Otis,

that the ghost has been seen by several living members of my

family, as well as by the rector of the parish, the Rev. Augustus
Dampier, [[who is a Fellow of King’s College, Cambridge]]

<<2>> <<said Lord Canterville,>>

(4) 1 After the unfortunate accident to the Duchess, none of our younger servants would stay with us,

+2 and Lady Canterville often got very little sleep at night, in consequence of the mysterious noises [[that came from the corridor and the library]].”

(5) “1 “My Lord,” <<2>> “I will take the furniture and the ghost at a valuation.

<<2>> <<answered the Minister,>>

(6) 1 α I have come from a modern country,

=β where we have everything that money can buy;

x2 xβ 1 and with all our spry young fellows painting the Old World red,

+2 and carrying off your best actors and prima-donnas,

α I reckon [[\[\beta\] that if there were such a thing as a ghost in Europe, \|\[\beta\] we’d have it at home in a very short time in one of our public museums, or on the road as a show]].”

(7) “1 α “I fear [[that the ghost exists]],” <<2>>

xβ “though it may have resisted the overtures of your enterprising impresarios.

<<2> α <<said Lord Canterville,

xβ>> smiling,>>

(8) 1 It has been well known for three centuries, since 1584 in fact,

+2 and always makes its appearance before the death of any member of our family.”

(9) “Well, so does the family doctor for that matter, Lord Canterville.

(10) 1 But there is no such thing, sir, as a ghost,

+2 and I guess [[the laws of Nature are not going to be suspended for the British aristocracy]].”

(11) 1 “You are certainly very natural in America,” <<2>>

+2 xβ “and if you don’t mind a ghost in the house,

α it is all right.

<<2> α <<answered Lord Canterville,

=β>> who did not quite understand Mr. Otis’s last observation,>>

(12) α Only you must remember
‘β I warned you.”

(13) / A few weeks after this, the purchase was concluded, x2 and at the close of the season the Minister and his family went down to Canterville Chase.

(14) / Mrs. Otis, <<β,>> was now a very handsome, middle-aged woman, with fine eyes, and a superb profile. <<β>> <<who, as Miss Lucretia R. Tappan, of West 53rd Street, had been a celebrated New York belle,>>

(15) / Many American ladies <<χβ>> adopt an appearance of chronic ill-health, <<χβ>> <<on leaving their native land>>, χβ under the impression that it is a form of European refinement, x2 but Mrs. Otis had never fallen into this error.

(16) She had a magnificent constitution, and a really wonderful amount of animal spirits.

(17) / Indeed, in many respects, she was quite English, x2 and was an excellent example of the fact [[that we have really everything in common with America nowadays, except, of course, language]].

(18) / Her eldest son, <<β,>> was a fair-haired, rather good-looking young man, =β / who had qualified himself for American diplomacy χβ by leading the German at the Newport Casino for three successive seasons, +2 and even in London was well known as an excellent dancer. <<β α >> <<christened Washington by his parents in a moment of patriotism, =β>> which he never ceased to regret,>>

(19) Gardenias and the peerage were his only weaknesses.

(20) Otherwise he was extremely sensible.

(21) / Miss Virginia E. Otis was a little girl of fifteen, =β / lithe and lovely as a fawn, +2 and with a fine freedom in her large blue eyes.

(22) / She was a wonderful Amazon, +2 α and had once raced old Lord Bilton on her pony twice round the park,
winning by a length and a half, just in front of the Achilles statue,
to the huge delight of the young Duke of Cheshire,
who proposed for her on the spot,
and was sent back to Eton that very night by his guardians, in floods of tears.

After Virginia came the twins, who were usually called “The Star and Stripes,” as they were always getting swished.

They were delightful boys, and, with the exception of the worthy Minister, the only true republicans of the family.

As Canterville Chase is seven miles from Ascot, the nearest railway station, Mr. Otis had telegraphed for a waggonette to meet them, and they started on their drive in high spirits.

It was a lovely July evening, and the air was delicate with the scent of the pinewoods.

Now and then they heard [a wood-pigeon brooding over its own sweet voice], or saw, deep in the rustling fern, the burnished breast of the pheasant.

Little squirrels peered at them from the beech-trees as they went by, and the rabbits scudded away through the brushwood and over the mossy knolls, with their white tails in the air.

As they entered the avenue of Canterville Chase, however, the sky became suddenly overcast with clouds, a curious stillness seemed to hold the atmosphere, a great flight of rooks passed silently over their heads, and, before they reached the house, some big drops of rain had fallen.

Standing on the steps to receive them was an old woman, [neatly dressed in black silk], with a white cap and apron.

This was Mrs. Umney, the housekeeper, whom Mrs. Otis, at Lady Canterville’s earnest request, had consented to keep in her former position.
She made them each a low curtsey as they alighted, and said in a quaint, old-fashioned manner, "I bid you welcome to Canterville Chase."

Following her, they passed through the fine Tudor hall into the library, a long, low room, paneled in black oak, at the end of which was a large stained glass window.

Here they found tea laid out for them, and, after taking off their wraps, they sat down and began to look round, while Mrs. Umney waited on them.

Suddenly Mrs. Otis caught sight of a dull red stain on the floor just by the fireplace, and, <<quite unconscious of what it really signified,>> said to Mrs. Umney, "I am afraid [[something has been spilt there]]."

"Yes, madam," <<2,>> "blood has been spilt on that spot."

<<replied the old housekeeper in a low voice,>>

"How horrid!" <<2,>> "I don’t at all care for blood-stains in a sitting-room."

"That is all nonsense,"
“Pinkerton’s Champion Stain Remover and Paragon
Detergent will clean it up in no time,”

<<2>> <<cried Washington Otis;>>

+2 $\alpha \beta$
and before the terrified housekeeper could interfere,
$\alpha$
he had fallen upon his knees,
$x_2$
and was rapidly scouring the floor with a small stick of
what looked like a black cosmetic.

(44) In a few moments no trace of the blood-stain could be seen.

(45) 1 “I knew
$\beta$
Pinkerton would do it,”

2 $\alpha$
he exclaimed, triumphantly,
$x_2$
as he looked round at his admiring family;

+2 $\alpha \beta$
but no sooner had he said these words than
$\alpha$
a terrible flash of lightning lit up the sombre room,
+x2 a fearful peal of thunder made them all start to their feet,
+3 and Mrs. Umney fainted.

(46) “What a monstrous climate!”

2 $\alpha$
said the American Minister, calmly,

$x_2$
as he lit a long cheroot.

(47) “I guess [[the old country is so overpopulated that they have not enough decent weather for everybody]].

(48) I have always been of opinion [[that emigration is the only thing for England]].”

(49) “My dear Hiram,” <<2;>> “what can we do with a woman who faints?”

<<2>> <<cried Mrs. Otis;>>

(50) 1 “Charge it to her like breakages,” <<2;>>

$x_2$
“she won’t faint after that;”

<<2>> <<answered the Minister;>>

and in a few moments Mrs. Umney certainly came to.

(51) There was no doubt, however, [[that she was extremely upset]].

+2 $\alpha$
and she sternly warned Mr. Otis

$\beta$
to beware of some trouble coming to the house.

(52) “I have seen things with my own eyes, sir,” <<2;>> “[[that would

+2 make any Christian’s hair stand on end]],

and many and many a night I have not closed my eyes in sleep for

the awful things that are done here.”

<<2>> <<she said;>>
Mr. Otis, however, and his wife warmly assured the honest soul
“that they were not afraid of ghosts,
and, after invoking the blessings of Providence on her
new master and mistress,
and making arrangements for an increase of salary,
the old housekeeper tottered off to her own room.
(1) In 1825, I was ten years old.
(2) My father and mother were dead.
(3) I lived with my aunt and uncle, Mr and Mrs Reed.
(4) Their house was called Gateshead Hall.
(5) The house was in Yorkshire, in the north of England.
(6) My Aunt and Uncle Reed had two children—a boy, John, and a girl, Eliza.
(7) I liked my Uncle Reed and he liked me.
(8) But in 1825, my uncle died.
(9) After that, I was very unhappy.
(10) My Aunt Reed did not like me.
(11) And John and Eliza were unkind to me.
(12) It was a cold, rainy day in December.
(13) All of us were in the house.
(14) I wanted to be alone.
(15) I wanted to read.
(16) I opened a book.
(17) Then I heard my Cousin John’s voice.
(18) ‘Jane! Jane Eyre! Where are you?’
(19) He came into the room and he saw me.
(20) ‘Why are you reading my book?’
(21) ‘Give it to me!’
(22) John took the book.
(23) He hit my head with it.
(24) I screamed.
(25) John hit me again.
I pulled his hair and I kicked him.

‘Help! Help, Mamma!’

John shouted.

‘Jane Eyre is hurting me!’

Aunt Reed ran into the room.

She pulled me away from John.

‘John hit me with a book,’

I said.

‘I hate him.

And I hate you too!’

‘You are a bad girl, Jane,’

my aunt said.

‘Why do you hate me?’

‘You don’t like me,’

I replied.

‘John and Eliza are unkind to me.

I want to leave Gateshead Hall.’

‘You want to leave!’

Aunt Reed said.

‘Where will you go?

Your parents are dead.

You cannot live alone.’

Aunt Reed thought for a moment.

‘My friend, Mr Brocklehurst, is the owner of a school,’

she said.

‘I will send you to Mr Brocklehurst’s school.’
Black Cat

When I was a little girl, my parents died.

My uncle, Mr Reed, took me to live with his family at Gateshead house, but a year later he died too.

Mrs Reed and her children didn’t like me.

John was fourteen years old, Georgiana was twelve, Eliza was eleven and I was ten.

My memories of Gateshead are all of loneliness, pain, anger and rebellion.

I remember my last day there.

Mrs Reed was sitting on the sofa by the fire with her three children.

They looked happy.

I stood at a distance from them.

“You stay there, Jane!” said Mrs Reed.

’Bessie says you’re a bad girl, and I prefer [you to stay away from me] until you learn to be more pleasant.’

Bessie was the maid.

She was sometimes kind to me, but she thought I was a difficult, disobedient child.

’What does Bessie say I’ve done?’

’How rude you are! Children shouldn’t ask adults questions like that!’ cried Mrs Reed.

I walked into the next room and found a book.

There was a space between the window and the red curtain.

I sat in that space
and began to read.

(20) I felt safe behind the red curtain:

(21) But then John Reed ripped the red curtain open.

(22) I was frightened,

(23) When he saw me,

(24) He was ugly and disgusting.

(25) I threw the book at him.

(26) It hit him on the forehead.

(27) ‘Mummy!’ he cried.

(28) ‘Jane threw a book at me!’

(29) A moment later Mrs Reed and Bessie dragged me down the corridor.

(30) ‘You horrible, violent child!’ cried Mrs Reed.

(31) ‘You must be punished!’

(32) They put me into the Red Room and locked the door.

(33) ‘Aunt Reed!’ I cried.

(34) ‘Please don’t leave me here!’

(35) She ignored me and walked away down the corridor with Bessie.

(36) There was a big white bed in the middle of the Red Room.

(37) That was [[where my Uncle Reed had died]].

(38) The sun was going down, and I was afraid [[of being in the Red Room in the darkness]].

(39) The shadows in the corners of the room grew bigger, and the air grew colder.

(40) I was sure [[my uncle’s dead body was lying on the bed]]!

(41) Fear and cold and loneliness finally overcame me,
and I fainted.

There was no possibility [(of taking a walk that day)].

We had, in fact, been wandering in the leafless garden for an hour in the morning, but since dinner the cold winter wind had brought with it such dark clouds and such heavy rain that further outdoor exercise was impossible.

I was glad of it; I never liked long walks, especially on cold afternoons.

I hated coming home with frozen fingers and toes, with a heat saddened by the rough words of Bessie, the nurse, and by the consciousness of how weak I was, compared with Eliza, John and Georgiana Reed.

Eliza, John and Georgiana were now with their mama in the sitting room at Gateshead.

She lay resting by the fireside, and with her loved ones near her (for the moment neither quarrelling nor crying) she looked perfectly happy.

She had dismissed me from the group, saying that she was sorry she was forced to keep me at a distance, but that until I tried seriously to develop a more friendly and attractive nature, she really could not allow me [(to join in the pleasures intended only for happy little children)].

‘But what have I done?’ I asked.

‘Jane, I don’t like questions or objections.

Children should not speak to those older than themselves in such a way.

Sit down somewhere, and until you can speak pleasantly, remain silent.’

A small breakfast room lay next to the sitting room.
I slipped in there.

It contained bookshelves, and I soon took possession of a book, making sure that it was one full of pictures.

I climbed onto the window seat and, pulling my feet up, I sat cross-legged.

I then closed the red curtains, so that I was hidden from view.

Every picture in the book told a story, [[often mysterious to my undeveloped understanding, but always deeply interesting—as interesting as the stories of love and adventure that Bessie sometimes began on winter evenings, || when she happened to be in a good humour]].

With the book on my knee, I was happy.

I feared nothing except interruption, and that came too soon.

The voice of John Reed called me.

Then there was a silence as he found the room empty.

‘Where in the world is she?’ he cried.

‘Lizzy! Georgy!’ he called to his sisters.

‘Jane is not here.

Tell Mama she has run out into the rain. Bad creature!’

‘It is lucky [[that I closed the curtain]],’ I thought,

and I hoped with all my heart that he would not discover my hiding place.

He would not in fact have found it by himself, as he was neither sharp-sighted nor intelligent,

but Eliza put her head round the door, and said:

‘She is in the window seat, surely, John.’
I came out immediately, because I trembled at the idea [(of being dragged out by John)].

‘What do you want?’ I asked.

‘[Say, “What do you want, Master Reed?”]’ was the answer.

‘I want you to come here.’

Seating himself in an armchair, he made a sign to me [(to move closer and stand in front of him)].

John Reed was a schoolboy of fourteen years, four years older than I was; he was large and fat for his age, with an unhealthy skin, unattractive features and thick arms and legs.

He ought now to have been at school, but his mama had brought him home for a month or two, “on account of his delicate health”.

His schoolmaster said that his condition would improve if he received fewer cakes and sweets from his family, but his mother’s heart found such a severe opinion unacceptable, and she preferred to believe that he worked too hard and missed his home.

John was not very fond of his mother and sisters and he hated me.

He treated me badly, and punished me, not two or three times a week, nor once or twice a day, but continually.

I had no protection from him; the servants did not like [(to offend their young master)], and Mrs Reed never appeared to see [(him strike me)] or to hear [(him insult me)].

Having learnt to be obedient to John, I came up to his chair.

He spent about three minutes in putting out his tongue at me.

I knew
‘β that he would hit me soon,

x2  xβ and while I waited fearfully for the blow,
α  I thought about his disgustingly ugly appearance.

(42) 1  α  I wonder
x2  xβ  whether he read my mind in my face;
α  he struck me sharply and hard.

(43) 1  I almost fell,

x2  xβ  and when I was upright again,
α  I stepped back from his chair.

(44) 1  ‘That is for questioning Mama,’ <<2>> ‘and for hiding like a thief behind
curtains, and for the look [[you had in your eyes two minutes ago]], you rat!’

<<2>>  <<he said,>>

(45) I was so used to John Reed’s insults [[that I never had any idea of replying to them]].

(46) My anxiety was about [[how to receive the blow [[that would certainly follow]]]].

(47) 1  ‘What were you doing behind the curtain?’

  2  he asked.

(48) ‘I was reading.’

(49) ‘Show me the book.’

(50) 1  I returned to the window

x2  and brought it in silence.

(51) ‘You have no right [[to take our books]].

(52)  ‘β  You are a poor relation,
α  Mama says.

(53) 1  You have no money;

=2  your father left you none.

(54) You ought to beg, and not live here with gentleman’s children like us, and eat the same meals as we do,

  and wear clothes [[that our mama has to pay for]].

(55)  α  α  Now, I’m warning you

          ‘β  not to touch my bookshelves again,

    xβ  because they are mine.

(56) 1  The whole house is mine,

+2  or will be in a few years.

(57) Go and stand by the door, out of the way of the mirror and the windows.’

(58)  α  I did so,
not at first realizing his intention.

When I saw [[him lift and balance the book and stand in the act of aiming it]],

though,

I jumped to one side with a cry of fear.

Not soon enough.

The book was thrown,

it hit me,

and I fell,

striking my head against the door

and cutting it.

The cut bled,

and the pain was sharp.

My fear had by now passed its limit,

and other feelings took its place.

‘Wicked and cruel boy!’

I said.

‘You are like a murderer—

you are like a slave driver—

you are like the evil rulers of ancient Rome!’

‘What! What!’

he cried.

‘Did she say that to me?’

Did you hear her, Eliza and Georgiana?

I’ll tell Mama! But first—’

He ran straight at me.

I felt [[him seize my hair and shoulder]],

but now I was desperate;

I really thought him a murderer.

I felt [[a drop or two of blood from my head running down my neck]],

and my sense of suffering for the moment was stronger than my fear.

I fought him madly.

I am not sure [[what I did with my hands]],

but he called me ‘Rat! Rat!’

and screamed loudly.

Help was near;
his sisters had run for Mrs Reed, who had gone upstairs.

(76) Now she came on the scene, followed by Bessie and by Abbot, one of the servant girls.

(77) We were separated.

(78) I heard the words: [[‘Oh! What a wicked little thing, to fly at Master John like that!’]]

(79) ‘Did anybody ever see such evil passion!’

(80) Then Mrs Reed commanded:

x2 ‘Take her away to the red room, and lock her in there.’

(81) Four hands seized me, and I was carried upstairs.

(82) I fought all the way.

(83) This was unusual for me, and greatly strengthened the bad opinion of me [[that Bessie and Abbot already held]].

(84) ‘Hold her arms.

(85) ‘For shame! For shame!’ cried Abbot.

(86) ‘What terrible behaviour, Miss Eyre, [[to strike a young gentleman, your guardian’s son—your young master]]!’

(87) ‘Master! How is he my master?

(88) ‘No, you are less than a servant, because you do nothing [[to support yourself]].

(89) There, sit down, and think over your wickedness.’

(90) They had got me by this time into the room [[named by Mrs Reed]], and had pushed me onto a chair.

(91) I began to rise from it again, but their two pairs of hands prevented me.

(92) ‘If you don’t sit still, you must be tied down,’
said Bessie.

(95) ‘Miss Abbot, lend me your belt.

(96) She would break mine immediately.’

(97) ‘Don’t do that,’

(98) ‘I will not move.’

(99) ‘Take care [[ that you don’t]],’

(100) She and Abbot stood with folded arms,

(101) ‘She never did this before,’

(102) ‘[[But it was always in her]],’ was the reply.

(103) ‘I’ve often given Mrs Reed my opinion of the child,

(104) She’s a deceitful little thing.’

(105) Bessie did not answer,

(106) She supports you.

(107) If she were to send you away,

(108) I had nothing to say to these words.

(109) They were not new to me.

(110) I had heard many suggestions of the same kind before, [[ very painful and wounding to my pride, but only half understood]].

(111) Abbot joined in:

(112) They will have a great deal of money in the future,
and you will have none.

(113) It is your duty [[to be grateful, and to behave well]].’

(114) ‘1 ‘[[What we tell you]] is for your own good,’

2 added Bessie in a softer voice.

(115) ‘You should try to be useful and to please them.

(116) Then, perhaps, you will have a home here.

(117) But if you become angry and rude,

α [[Mrs Reed will send you away]], I am sure.’

(118) ‘1 ‘Besides,’ <<2>> ‘God will punish you.

<<2>> <<said Abbot,>>

(119) He might strike you dead in the middle of your anger.

(120) 1 Come, Bessie,

+2 we will leave her.

(121) Say your prayers, Miss Eyre,

α because if you are not sorry for your wickedness,

xβ 1 something bad might come down the chimney

x2 and take you away.’

(122) They went,

xβ 1 shutting the door

x2 and locking it behind them.

(123) The red room was a square bedroom with dark wooden furniture, a heavy red rug, a very large bed, and red curtains [[always closed across the windows]].

(124) 1 α This room was cold,

xβ because it rarely had a fire;

+2 α silent,

xβ because it was far from the nursery and the kitchen;

+3 α frightening,

xβ because it was rarely entered.

(125) It was here [[that Mr Reed had died nine years before]].

(126) I was not quite sure [[whether they had locked the door]],

x2 and when I dared to move,

α α I went

xβ to see.

(127) Ah, yes! There had never been a surer prison.

(128) My head still ached and bled from the blow [[that I had received]] and my fall.
No one had blamed John for striking me without cause. ‘Unjust! Unjust!’
I thought.
I began to plan some escape, such as running away, or never eating or drinking any more, and letting myself die.

It was past four o’clock, and daylight began to leave the red room.
I heard [the rain beating against the windows, and the wind crying in the trees behind the house].
Gradually I became as cold as a stone, and then my courage sank.
Everyone said that I was wicked, and perhaps I was.

My thoughts turned to my uncle.
I could not remember him, but I knew that he was my mother’s brother, that he had taken me as a parentless baby to his house, and that before he died he had received a promise from his wife, Mrs Reed, [that she would look after me as one of her own children].

A strange idea entered my head. I never doubted [that if Mr Reed had been alive, he would have treated me kindly], and now, in the growing darkness, I began to remember stories of dead men, revisiting the earth. troubled in their graves by the knowledge [that their last wishes were not carried out].

Perhaps Mr Reed’s ghost might rise before me.
This idea, filled me with fear. instead of comforting me.

At this moment, a beam of light shone on the wall.
Probably it was from a lamp ([[carried outside across the garden]],
but to my shaken nerves, [[prepared for terror]], it appeared like a sign [[of
someone coming from another world]].

My heart beat fast,
my head became hot.

A sound filled my ears,
which seemed like the rushing of wings.

I ran in despair to the door
and shook the lock.

Footsteps came hurrying along the outer passage,
the key was turned,
and Bessie and Abbot entered.

‘Miss Eyre, are you ill?’
said Bessie.

‘What a terrible noise!’
cried Abbot.

‘Take me out!’
‘Let me go into the nursery!’
I begged.

‘What for?’
Are you hurt?

Have you seen something?’
Bessie demanded again.

‘Oh, I saw a light,
and I thought
‘a ghost had come.’

I had now got hold of Bessie’s hand,
and she did not take it from me.
‘She has screamed on purpose,’
Abbot said in disgust.

‘And what a scream!’
If she had been in great pain,
there would have been some excuse for it,
but she only wanted
'β to bring us here.

(161) I know her wicked tricks.’

(162) ‘1 What is all this?’
2 demanded another voice sharply.

(163) Mrs Reed was coming along the passage.

(164) α ‘Abbot and Bessie, I believe
β I gave orders [[that Jane Eyre should be left in the red room until I came to
her myself]].’

(165) ‘1 Miss Jane screamed so loudly, madam,’
2 replied Bessie.

(166) ‘[[Let her go]],’ was the only answer.

(167) ‘1 Loose Bessie’s hand, child;
+2 you cannot succeed in getting out by these means.

(168) I hate tricks, especially in children.

(169) It is my duty [[to show you that they will not succeed]].

(170) ‘1 You will stay here an hour longer,
+2 and it is only on condition of perfect obedience and silence that I shall let you
out then.’

(171) ‘Oh, Aunt! Have pity!

(172) Forgive me!

(173) I cannot bear it!

(174) Let me be punished in some other way!’

(175) ‘Be quiet!

(176) This passion is almost disgusting.’

(177) ‘1 She did not believe in my sincerity,
+2 α and really thought
β that I was pretending.

(178) ‘1 Bessie and Abbot left us,
x2 1 and Mrs Reed pushed me roughly and impatiently back into my
prison
x2 and locked me in without a further word.

(179) ‘1 I heard [[her go away]],
x2 xβ and soon after she had left
α 1 my head seemed to go round and round
x2 and I fell to the ground in a faint.
We could not go for a walk that afternoon.

There was such a freezing cold wind, and such heavy rain, that we all stayed indoors.

I was glad of it.

I never liked long walks, especially in winter.

I used to hate coming home when it was almost dark, with ice-cold fingers and toes, feeling miserable because Bessie, the nursemaid, was always scolding me.

All the time I knew I was different from my cousins, Eliza, John, and Georgiana Reed.

They were taller and stronger than me, and they were loved.

These three usually spent their time crying and quarrelling, but today they were sitting quietly around their mother in the sitting-room.

I wanted to join the family circle, but Mrs Reed, my aunt, refused.

Bessie had complained about me.

‘No, I’m sorry, Jane.

Until I hear from Bessie, or see for myself, [[that you are really trying to behave better]], you cannot be treated as a good, happy child, like my children.’

‘What does Bessie say I have done?’ I asked.

‘Jane, it is not polite to question me in that way.

If you cannot speak pleasantly, be quiet.’

I crept out of the sitting-room and into the small room next door, where I chose a book full of pictures from the bookcase.

I climbed onto the window-seat, and drew the curtains.
so that I was completely hidden.

Sometimes I looked out of the window at the grey November afternoon, and saw [[the rain pouring down on the leafless garden]].

But most of the time I studied the book, and stared fascinated at the pictures.

Lost in the world of imagination, I forgot my sad, lonely existence for a while and was happy.

I was only afraid [[that my secret hiding-place might be discovered]].

Suddenly the door of the room opened.

John Reed rushed in.

"'Where are you, rat?' he shouted.

'Eliza! Georgy! Jane isn’t here!' she’s run out into the rain—

what a bad animal she is!’

'How lucky [[I drew the curtain]],’ I thought.

He would never have found me, because he was not very intelligent.

Tell Mamma

she’s run out into the rain—

what a bad animal she is!’

'I drew the curtain],’

I thought.

He would never have found me,

because he was not very intelligent.

'He’s in the window-seat, John,’

she called from the sitting-room.

So I came out immediately,

as I did not want

him to pull me out.

'What do you want?’

I asked him.

'Say,

’What do you want, Master Reed?’”

he answered,

sitting in an armchair.
‘I want you to come here.’

John Reed was fourteen and I was only ten.

He was large and rather fat.

He usually ate too much at meals, which made him ill.

He should have been at boarding school, but his mother, <<who loved him very much,>> had brought him home for a month or two, because she thought his health was delicate.

John did not love his mother or his sisters, and he hated me.

He bullied and punished me, not two or three times a week, not once or twice a day, but all the time.

My whole body trembled when he came near.

Sometimes he hit me, sometimes he just threatened me, and I lived in terrible fear of him.

I had no idea [[how to stop him]].

The servants did not want to offend their young master, and Mrs Reed could see [[no fault in her dear boy]].

So I obeyed John’s order, and approached his armchair, thinking [[how very ugly his face was]].

Perhaps he understood [[what I was thinking]], for he hit me hard on the face.

‘That is for your rudeness to Mamma just now,’ <<and for your wickedness in hiding, and for looking at me like that, you rat!’ <<he said,>>

I was so used to his bullying [[that I never thought of hitting him back]].

‘What were you doing behind that curtain?’
he asked.

(52) 1 ‘I was reading,’
2 I answered.

(53) ‘Show me the book.’

(54) I gave it to him.

(55) 1 ‘You have no right to take our books,’
2 he continued.

(56) 1 ‘You have no money
2 and your father left you none.

(57) You ought to beg in the streets, not live here in comfort with a gentleman’s family.

(58) Anyway, all these books are mine, and so is the whole house, or will be in a few years’ time.

(59) I’ll teach you not to borrow my books again.’

(60) 1 He lifted the heavy book
2 and threw it hard at me.

(61) 1 It hit me
2 α and I fell,
2β cutting my head on the door.

(62) 1 I was in great pain,
2 and suddenly for the first time in my life, I forgot my fear of John Reed.

(63) 1 ‘You wicked, cruel boy!’
2 I cried.

(64) ‘You are a bully!

(65) You are as bad as a murderer!’

(66) ‘What! What!’
2 he cried.

(67) ‘Did she say that to me?

(68) Did you hear, Eliza and Georgiana?

(69) I’ll tell Mamma, but first…’

(70) 1 He rushed to attack me,
2 but now he was fighting with a desperate girl.

(71) I really saw him as a wicked murderer.

(72) 1 I felt [[the blood running down my face]],
2 and the pain gave me strength.

(73) I fought back as hard as I could.

(74) 1 My resistance surprised him,
and he shouted for help.

(75) $\alpha$ His sisters ran for Mrs Reed,

$\beta$ who called her maid, Miss Abbott, and Bessie.

(76) 1 They pulled us apart

and I heard them say, ‘What a wicked girl! She attacked Master John!’

(77) 1 Mrs Reed said calmly,

‘Take her away to the red room

and lock her in there.’

(78) $\alpha$ And so I was carried upstairs,

$\beta$ arms waving and legs kicking.

(79) $\beta$ As soon as we arrived in the red room,

$\alpha$ 1 I became quiet again,

$\beta$ and the two servants both started scolding me.

(80) $\beta$ ‘Really, Miss Eyre,’ <<2,>> ‘how could you hit him?

<<2>> <<said Miss Abbott,>>

(81) ‘He’s your young master.’

(82) ‘How can he be my master?’

(83) ‘1 I’m not a servant!’

2 I cried.

(84) ‘1 $\alpha$ ‘No, Miss Eyre, you are less than a servant,

$\beta$ because you do not work,’

2 replied Miss Abbott.

(85) $\alpha$ They both looked at me

$\beta$ as if they strongly disapproved of me.

(86) ‘1 1 $\alpha$ ‘You should remember, miss,’ <<2,>>

‘$\beta$ that your aunt pays for your food and clothes,

$\beta$ and you should be grateful.

<<2>> <<said Bessie,>>

(87) You have no other relations or friends.’

(88) 1 All my short life I had been told this,

+2 and I had no answer to it.

(89) $\alpha$ I stayed silent,

$\beta$ listening to these painful reminders.

(90) ‘1 $\beta$ ‘And if you are angry and rude,

$\alpha$ Mrs Reed may send you away,’
added Bessie.

(91) ‘Anyway,’ <<2,>> ‘God will punish you, Jane Eyre, for your wicked heart.
<<2>> <<said Miss Abbott,>>

(92) Pray to God,

\[ \alpha \] and say

\[ \beta \] you’re sorry.’

(93) They left the room,

locking the door carefully behind them.

(94) The red room was a cold, silent room, hardly ever used,

although it was one of the largest bedrooms in the house.

(95) Nine years ago my uncle, Mr Reed, had died in this room,

and since then nobody had wanted

‘β to sleep in it.

(96) Now that I was alone

I thought bitterly of the people I lived with.

(97) John Reed, his sisters, his mother, the servants—they all accused me, scolded me, hated me.

(98) Why could I never please them?

(99) Eliza was selfish,

but was respected.

(100) Georgiana had a bad temper,

but she was popular with everybody

because she was beautiful.

(101) John was rude, cruel and violent,

but nobody punished him.

(102) I tried to make no mistakes,

but they called me naughty every moment of the day.

(103) Now that I had turned against John

to protect myself,

everybody blamed me.

(104) And so I spent that whole long afternoon in the red room

asking myself [[why I had to suffer and why life was so unfair]].

(105) Perhaps I would run away,

or starve myself to death.

(106) Gradually it became dark outside.

(107) The rain was still beating on the windows,
and I could hear the wind in the trees.

Now I was no longer angry, and I began to think the Reeds might be right.

Perhaps I was wicked.

Did I deserve to die and be buried in the churchyard like my uncle Reed?

I could not remember him, but knew he was my mother’s brother, who had taken me to his house when my parents both died.

On his death bed he had made his wife, aunt Reed, promise to look after me like her own children.

I supposed she now regretted her promise.

A strange idea came to me.

I felt sure [[that if Mr Reed had live he would have treated me kindly]], and now, as I looked round at the dark furniture and the walls in shadow, I began to fear [[that his ghost might come back to punish his wife for not keeping her promise]].

He might rise from the grave in the churchyard and appear in this room!

I was so frightened by this thought [[that I hardly dared to breathe]].

Suddenly in the darkness I saw a light moving on the ceiling.

It may have been from a lamp outside, but in my nervous state I did not think of that.

I felt sure [[it must be a ghost, a visitor from another world]].

My head was hot, my heart beat fast.

Was that the sound of wings in my ears?

Was that something moving near me?

Screaming wildly, I rushed to the door and shook it.

Miss Abbott and Bessie came running to open it.
“Miss Eyre, are you ill?”

asked Bessie.

“Take me out of here,”

I screamed.

“Why? What’s the matter?”

she asked.

“I saw a light, and I thought it was a ghost,”

I cried,

holding tightly on to Bessie’s hand.

“She’s not even hurt,”

said Miss Abbott in disgust.

“She screamed just to bring us here.

I know all her little tricks.’

“What is all this?”

demanded an angry voice.

Mrs Reed appeared at the door of the room.

‘Abbot and Bessie, I think I told you to leave Jane Eyre in this room until I came.’

“She screamed so loudly ma’am’

said Bessie softly.

’[[Let go of her hands, Bessie]],’ was Mrs Reed’s only answer.

‘Jane Eyre, you need not think you can succeed in getting out of the room like this.

Your naughty tricks will not work with me.

You will stay here an hour longer as a punishment for trying to deceive us.’

“Oh, aunt, please forgive me!

I can’t bear it!

I shall die if you keep me here…”

I screamed and kicked
as she held me.

(145) “Silence!

(146) Control yourself!”

(147) 1 α She pushed me, <<xβ>>, back into the red room

<<xβ>> <<resisting wildly>>

x2 and locked me in.

(148) There I was in the darkness again with the silence and the ghosts.

(149) I must have fainted.

(150) I cannot remember anything more.

Original:

(1) There was no possibility of taking a walk that day.

(2) 1 We had been wandering, indeed, in the leafless shrubbery an hour in the morning;

2 (β) (α) but since dinner <<γ>> the cold winter wind had brought with it

clouds so somber and a rain so penetrating,

<<β>> (α) <<(Mrs. Reed, <<β>>, dined early)>>

<<β>> <<when there was no company>>

(α) that further out-door exercise was now out of the question.

(3) 1 I was glad of it:

2 I never liked long walks, especially on chilly afternoons:

3 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]].

(4) 1 The said Eliza, John, and Georgiana were now clustered round their mama in the

drawing-room:

2 (α) (1) she lay reclined on a sofa by the fireside,

(2) (β) (α) and with her darlings about her

(β) (for the time neither quarrelling nor

crying)

(a) looked perfectly happy.

(5) 1 Me, she had dispensed from joining the group;

2 (1) “|| saying,

(2) (1) “She regretted to be under the necessity of keeping me at a

distance;

(2) (a) but that <<β>> she really must exclude me from
privileges intended only for contented, happy, little children.”

<<β>>

(1) until she heard from Bessie,
(2) 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]]—>>

(6) 1 “What does Bessie say I have done?”
2 “|| I asked.

(7) 1 “Jane, I don’t like cavaliers or questioners;
2 besides, there is something truly forbidden in a child taking up her elders in that manner.

(8) 1 Be seated somewhere;
2 (β) and until you can speak pleasantly,
(α) remain silent.

(9) 1 A breakfast-room adjoined the drawing-room,
2 I slipped in there.

(10) 1 It contained a bookcase:
2 (α) I soon possessed myself of a volume,
(β) taking care that it should be one stored with pictures.

(11) 1 I mounted into the window-seat:
2 (β) gathering up my feet,
(α) I sat cross-legged, like a Turk;
3 (β) and having drawn the red moreen curtain nearly closed,
(α) I was shrined in double retirement.

(12) 1 Folds of scarlet drapery shut in my view to the right hand;
2 (α) to the left were the clear panes of glass,
(β) protecting, but not separating me from the drear November day.

(13) α At intervals <<β>> I studied the aspect of that winter afternoon.
<<β>> <<while turning over the leaves of my book>>

(14) 1 Afar, it offered a pale blank of mist and cloud;
2 (α) near a scene of wet lawn and storm-beat shrub,
(β) with ceaseless rain sweeping away wildly before a long and lamentable blast.

(15) 1 I returned to my book—Bewick’s History of British Birds:
2 the letterpress thereof I cared little for, generally speaking;
3 and yet there were certain introductory pages [[that, child as I was, I could not pass quite as a blank.]]

(16) There were those which treat of the haunts of sea-fowl; of “the solitary rocks and promontories” by them only inhabited; off the coast of Norway studded with isles from its southern extremity, the Lindeness, or Naze, to the North Cape—“Where the Northern Ocean, in vast whirls, boils round the naked, melancholy isles of farthest Thule; and the Atlantic surge pours in among the stormy Hebrides.”

(17) Nor could I pass unnoticed the suggestion of the bleak shores of Lapland, Siberia, Spitzbergen, Nova Zembla, Iceland, Greenland, with “the vast sweep of the Arctic Zone, and those forlorn regions of dreary space,—that reservoir of frost and snow, where firm fields of ice, the accumulation of centuries of winters, glazed in Alpine heights above heights, surround the pole, and concentre the multiplied rigours of extreme cold.”

(18) Of these death-white realms I formed an idea of my own: shadowy, like all the half-comprehended notions [[that float dim through children’s brains,]] but strangely impressive.

(19) 1 The words in these introductory pages connected themselves with the succeeding vignettes,
2 and gave significance to the rock standing up all alone in a sea of billow and spray; to the broken boat stranded on a desolate coast; to the cold and ghastly moon glancing through bars of cloud at a wreck just sinking.

(20) I cannot tell what sentiment haunted the quiet solitary churchyard, with its inscribed headstone; its gate, its two trees, its low horizon, girdled by a broken wall, and its newly-risen crescent, attesting the hour of eventide.

(21) The two ships becalmed on a torpid seat, I believed to be marine phantoms.

(22) 1 The fiend pinned down the thief’s pack behind him,
2 (1) I passed over quickly:
2 (2) it was an object of terror.

(23) So was the black horned thing seated aloof on a rock, surveying a distant crowd surrounding a gallows.

(24) Each picture told a story; mysterious often to my undeveloped understanding and imperfect feelings, yet ever profoundly interesting: as interesting as the tales Bessie sometimes narrated on winter evenings, [[when she chanced to be in good humour; and when, having brought her ironing table to the nursery hearth, she allowed us to sit about it, and while she got up Mrs. Reed’s lace frills, and crimped her nightcap borders, fed our eager attention with passages of love and danger taken from old fairy tales and other ballads; or (as at a
later period I discovered) from the pages of Pamela, and Henry, Earl of Moreland]]).

(25) With Bewick on my knee, I was then happy: happy at least in my way.

(26) 1 I feared nothing but interruption,
    2 and that came too soon.

(27) The breakfast-room door opened.

(28) 1 (1) "Boh! Madam Mope!"
    (2) "|| cried the voice of John Reed;
    2 then he paused:
    3 he found the room apparently empty.

(29) 1 "Where the dickens is she!"
    2 "|| he continued.

(30) 1 (1) "Lizzy! Georgy!
<<2>> "||(calling to his sisters)
    Joan is not here:
    (2) (α) tell mama
    (β) "|| she is run out into the rain—bad animal!"

(31) 1 (β) "It is well I drew the curtain,"
    (α) "|| thought I;
    2 (α) and I wished fervently
    (β) "|| he might not discover my hiding-place:
    3 (1) nor would John Reed have found it out himself;
    (2) he was not quick either of vision or conception;
    4 (1) but Eliza just put her head in at the door,
    (2) (1) and said at once- "||
    (2) "She is in the window-seat, to be sure, Jack."

(32) α And I came out immediately,
    β for I trembled at the idea of being dragged forth by the said Jack.

(33) 1 "What do you want?"
    2 "|| I asked, with awkward diffidence.

(34) "Say, 'What do you want, Master Reed?''' was the answer.

(35) 1 (α) "I want
    (β) "|| you to come here;"
    2 (β) and seating himself in an arm-chair,
    (α) he intimated by a gesture [[that I was to approach and stand before him]].

(36) John Reed was a schoolboy of fourteen years old; four years older than I, for I was but ten: large and stout
for his age, with a dingy and unwholesome skin; thick lineaments in a spacious visage, heavy limbs and large extremities.

(37)  
α  He gorged himself habitually at table  
β  (1) which made him bilious  
(2) and gave him a dim and bleared eye and flabby cheeks.

(38)  
1 He ought now to have been at school;  
2 (α) but his mama had taken him home for a month or two,  
(β) “on account of his delicate health.”

(39)  
1 (α) Mr. Miles, the master, affirmed  
(β) (α) \(|\) that he would do very well  
(β) if he had fewer cakes and sweetmeats sent him from home;  
2 (1) but the mother’s heart turned from an opinion so harsh,  
(2) (α) and inclined rather to the more refined idea  
(β) (1) \(|\) that John’s sallowness was owing to over-application  
(2) and, perhaps, to pining after home.

(40)  
1 John had not much affection for his mother and sisters,  
2 and an antipathy to me.

(41)  
1 He bullied and punished me; not two or three times in the week, nor once or twice in the day, but continually;  
2 (1) every nerve I had feared him,  
(2) (α) and every morsel of flesh in my bones shrunk  
(β) when he came near.

(42)  
1 (α) There were moments when I was bewildered by the terror he inspired,  
(β) because I had not appeal whatever against either his menaces or his inflictions;  
2 (1) the servants did not like to offend their young master by taking my part against him,  
(2) (1) and Mrs. Reed was blind and deaf on the subject:  
(2) (α) she never saw him strike or heard him abuse me,  
(β) though he did both now and then in her presence, more frequently, however, behind her back.

(43)  
1 (β) Habitually obedient to John,  
(α) I came up to his chair:  
2 he spent some three minutes in thrusting out his tongue at me as far as he could
without damaging the roots:

\[(\alpha)\] I knew
\[(\beta)\] ‘|| he would soon strike,
\n\[(\beta)\] and while dreading the blow,
\n\[(\alpha)\] I mused on the disgusting and ugly appearance of him who would presently deal it.

\[(44)\] \[\alpha\] I wonder
\[(\beta)\] ‘|| if he read that notion in my face;
\n\[\beta\] for, all at once, without speaking, he struck suddenly and strongly.

\[(45)\] \[1\] I tottered,
\[2\] (\[\beta\]) and on regaining my equilibrium
\n\[(\alpha)\] retired back a step or two from his chair.

\[(46)\] \[1\] “That is for your impudence in answering mama awhile since,”
\n\[<<2>>\] ‘|| said he,
\n“and for your sneaking way of getting behind curtains, and for the look you had in your eyes two minutes since, you rat!”

\[(47)\] \[1\] (\[\beta\]) Accustomed to John Reed’s abuse,
\n\[(\alpha)\] I never had an idea of replying to it;
\n\[2\] my care was how to endure the blow which would certainly follow the insult.

\[(48)\] \[1\] “What were you doing behind the curtain?”
\[2\] ‘|| he asked.

\[(49)\] “I was reading.”

\[(50)\] “Show the book.”

\[(51)\] \[1\] I returned to the window
\n\[2\] and fetched it thence.

\[(52)\] \[1\] “You have no business to take our books;
\n\[2\] (\[\beta\]) ‘|| you are a dependent,
\n\[(\alpha)\] mama says;
\n\[2\] you have no money;
\[3\] your father left you none;
\n\[3\] (\[1\]) you ought to beg,
\n\[2\] (\[1\]) and not live here with gentlemen’s children like us,
\n\[2\] and eat the same meals we do,
\[3\] and wear clothes at our mama’s expense.

\[(53)\] \[1\] Now, I’ll teach you to rummage my bookshelves:
for they ARE mine;
all the house belongs to me,
or will do in a few years.

(54) “Go and stand by the door, out of the way of the mirror and the windows.”

(55) 1 (α) I did so,  
(β) not at first aware what was his intention;  
2 (β) (1) but when I saw him lift and poise the book  
(2) (α) and stand in act  
(β) to hurl it,  
(a) (1) (α) I instinctively started aside with a cry of alarm:  
(β) (a) not soon enough, however;  
(β) (1) the volume was flung,  
(β) (2) it hit me,  
(β) (3) (a) and I fell,  
(β) (1) striking my head against the door  
(2) and cutting it.

(56) 1 (1) The cut bled,  
(2) the pain was sharp:  
(2) (1) my terror had passed its climax;  
(2) other feelings succeeded.

(57) 1 “Wicked and cruel boy!”  
2 “|| I said.

(58) 1 “You are like a murderer—  
2 you are like a slave-driver—  
3 you are like the Roman emperors!”

(59) 1 I had read Goldsmith’s History of Rome,  
2 and had formed my opinion of Nero, Caligula, etc.

(60) α Also I had drawn parallels in silence,  
β which I never thought thus to have declared aloud.

(61) 1 “What! What!”  
2 “|| he cried.

(62) “Did she say that to me?
Did you hear her, Eliza and Georgiana?

Won’t I tell mama? But first…

He ran headlong at me:
I felt him grasp my hair and my shoulder:
he had closed with a desperate thing.

I really saw in him a tyrant, a murderer.

I felt [[a drop or two of blood from my head trickle down my neck]],
and was sensible of somewhat pungent suffering:
these sensations for the time predominated over fear,
and I received him in frantic sort.

I don’t very well know [[what I did with my hands,]]
but he called me “Rat! Rat!” and bellowed aloud.

Aid was near him:
Eliza and Georgiana had run for Mrs. Reed,
who was gone upstairs:
she now came upon the scene, followed by Bessie and her maid Abbot.

We were parted:
I heard the words—“Dear! Dear! What a fury to fly at Master John!”

“Did ever anybody see such a picture of passion!”

Then Mrs. Reed subjoined—
“Take her away to the red-room,
and lock her in there.”

Four hands were immediately laid upon me,
and I was borne upstairs.

I resisted all the way:
a new thing for me,
and a circumstance [[which greatly strengthened the bad opinion
[[Bessie and Miss Abbot were disposed to entertain of me]]]].

The fact is, [[I was a trifle beside myself; or rather out of myself, as the French
would say]]:
I was conscious [[that a moment’s mutiny had already rendered me

liable to strange penalties]],

and like any other rebel slave, I felt resolved, in my desperation, [[to go all lengths]].

(76) 1 “Hold her arms, Miss Abbot:

x2 she’s like a mad cat.”

(77) “1 “For shame! For shame!”

2 cried the lady’s maid.

(78) “What shocking conduct, Miss Eyre, [[to strike a young gentleman, your benefactress’s son! Your young master]].”

(79) “Master! How is he my master?”

(80) Am I a servant?”

(81) α “No; you are less than a servant,

β for you do nothing for your keep.

(82) 1 There, sit down,

+2 and think over your wickedness.”

(83) 1 1 They had got me by this time into the apartment indicated by Mrs. Reed,

2 and had thrust me upon a stool:

x2 1 my impulse was to rise from it like a spring;

x2 their two pairs of hands arrested me instantly.

(84) “1 If you don’t sit still,

α you must be tied down,”

2 said Bessie.

(85) 1 “Miss Abbot, lend me your garters;

x2 she would break mine directly.”

(86) α Miss Abbot turned

β to divest a stout leg of the necessary ligature.

(87) This preparation for bonds, and the additional ignominy it inferred, took a little of the excitement out of me.

(88) “1 “Don’t take them off,” <<2;>>

x2 “I will not stir.”

<<2>> <<I cried;>>

(89) In guarantee whereof, I attached myself to my seat by my hands.

(90) 1 “Mind you don’t,”

2 said Bessie;

x2 and when she had ascertained [[that I was really subsiding]],
she loosened her hold of me;
then she and Miss Abbot stood with folded arms,
looking darkly and doubtfully on my face, as incredulous of my sanity.

“1
“She never did so before,”
at last said Bessie,
turning to the Abigail.

“[[But it was always in her]],” was the reply.

“I’ve told Missis often my opinion about the child,
and Missis agreed with me.
She’s an underhand little thing:
I never saw a girl of her age with so much cover.”

Bessie answered not;
but ere long, she said—
“You ought to be aware, Miss, [[that you are under obligations to Mrs. Reed]]:
she keeps you:
if she were to turn you off,
you would have to go to the poorhouse.”

I had nothing to say to these words:
they were not new to me:
my very first recollections of existence included hints of the same kind.

This reproach of my dependence had become a vague sing-song in my ear:
very painful and crushing, but only half intelligible.

Miss Abbot joined in—
“And you ought not to think yourself on an equality with the Misses Reed and Master Reed, because Missis kindly allows you to be brought up with them.

They will have a great deal of money,
and you will have none:
it is your place [[to be humble, and to try to make yourself agreeable to them]].”

“What we tell you is for your good,” <<2,>>
you should try to be useful and pleasant,
then, perhaps, you would have a home here;
but if you become passionate and rude,
“Besides,” <<2,>> “God will punish her: He might strike her dead in the midst of her tantrums and then where would she go? said Miss Abbot,>>

Come, Bessie, we will leave her: I wouldn’t have her heart for anything.

Say your prayers, Miss Eyre, when you are by yourself; for if you don’t repent, something bad might be permitted to come down the chimney and fetch you away.”

They went, shutting the door, and locking it behind them.

The red-room was a square chamber, very seldom slept in, I might say never, indeed, unless when a chance influx of visitors at Gateshead Hall rendered it necessary to turn to account all the accommodation it contained: yet it was one of the largest and stateliest chambers in the mansion.

A bed [[supported on massive pillars of mahogany, hung with curtains of deep red damask]], stood out like a tabernacle in the center; the two large windows, with their blinds always drawn down, were half shrouded in festoons and falls of similar drapery; the carpet was red; the table at the foot of the bed was covered with a crimson cloth; the walls were a soft fawn colour with a blush of pink in it; the wardrobe, the toilet-table, the chairs were of darkly polished mahogany.

Out of these deep surrounding shades rose high, and glared white, the piled-up mattresses and pillows of the bed, [[spread with a snowy Marseilles counterpane]].

Scarceless less prominent was an ample cushioned easy-chair near the head of the bed, also white, with a footstool before it; and looking, as I thought, like a pale throne.

This room was chill, because it seldom had a fire;
it was silent,  
because remote from the nursery and kitchen;
solemn,  
because it was known to be so seldom entered.

The house-maid alone came here on Saturdays,  
to wipe from the mirrors and the furniture a week’s quiet dust:
and Mrs. Reed herself, at far intervals, visited it  
to review the contents of a certain secret drawer in the  
wardrobe,  
where she stored divers parchments, her jewel-casket,  
and a miniature of her deceased husband;
and in those last words lies the secret of the red-room—the spell [[which kept it  
so lonely in spite of its grandeur]].

Mr. Reed had been dead nine years:  
it was in this chamber he breathed his last;  
here lay in state; hence his coffin was borne by the undertaker’s men;  
and, since that day, a sense of dreary consecration had guarded it from frequent  
intrusion.

My seat, <<=β,>>, was a low ottoman near the marble  
chimney-piece;  
to which Bessie and the bitter Miss Abbot had left me riveted,>>,  
the bed rose before me;
to my right hand there was the high, dark wardrobe, with subdued, broken  
reflections varying the gloss of its panels;  
to my left were the muffled windows;  
a great looking-glass between them repeated the vacant majesty of the bed and  
room.

I was not quite sure [[whether they had locked the door]];  
and when I dared move,  
I got up and went  
to see.

Returning,  
I had to cross before the looking-glass;  
my fascinated glance involuntarily exploring the depth it revealed.
All looked colder and darker in that visionary hollow than in reality:

and the strange little figure there gazing at me, with a white face and arms
specking the gloom, and glittering eyes of fear moving where all else was still, had the
effect of a real spirit:

I thought it like one of the tiny phantoms, half fairy, half imp, Bessie’s evening
stories represented as coming out of lone, ferny dells in moors, and appearing before the
eyes of belated travelers.

I returned to my stool.

Superstition was with me at that moment;

but it was not yet her hour for complete victory:

my blood was still warm;

the mood of the revolted slave was still bracing me with its bitter vigour;

I had to stem a rapid rush of retrospective thought

before I quailed to the dismal present.

All John Reed’s violent tyrannies, all his sisters’ proud indifference, all his mother’s aversions, all the
servants’ partiality, turned up in my disturbed mind like a dark deposit in a turbid well.

Why was I always suffering, always browbeaten, always accused, forever condemned?

Why could I never please?

Why was it useless to try to win anyone’s favour?

Eliza, <<β>>, was respected.

<<β>> <<who was headstrong and selfish,>>

Georgiana, <<β>>, was universally indulged.

<<β>> <<who had a spoiled temper, a very acrid spite, a captious and insolent
carriage,>>

Her beauty, her pink cheeks and golden curls, seemed to give delight to all who looked at her, and to
purchase indemnity for every fault.

John no-one thwarted, much less punished;

though he twisted the necks of the pigeons,

killed the little pea-chicks,

set the dogs at the sheep,

stripped the hothouse vines of their fruit,

and broke the buds off the choicest plants in the conservatory:

he called his mother “old girl,” too;

sometimes reviled for her dark skin, similar to his own;

disregarded her wishes;
not unfrequently tore and spoiled her silk attire;
and he was still “her own darling.”

I dared commit no fault:
I strove to fulfill every duty;
and I was termed naughty and tiresome, sullen and sneaking, from
morning to noon, and from noon to night.

My heart still ached and bled with the blow and fall I had received:
no-one had reproved John for wantonly striking me;
and because I had turned against him to avert farther irrational
violence,
I was loaded with general opprobrium.

“Unjust!—unjust!” said my reason,
forced by the agonizing stimulus into precocious though transitory
power:
and Resolve, equally wrought up, instigated some strange expedient
to achieve escape from insupportable oppression—as running away,
or, if that could not be effected, never eating or drinking more, and
letting myself die.

What a consternation of soul was mine that dreary afternoon!
How all my brain was in tumult, and all my heart in insurrection!
Yet in what darkness, what dense ignorance, was the battle fought!

I could not answer the ceaseless inward question—why I thus suffered;
now, at the distance of—I will not say how many years, I see it clearly.
I was a discord in Gateshead Hall:
I was like nobody there;
I had nothing in harmony with Mrs. Reed or her children, or her chosen
vassalage.

If they did not love me,
in fact, as little did I love them.
They were not bound to regard with affection a thing that could not sympathise with one amongst them; a
heterogeneous thing, opposed to them in temperament, in capacity, in propensities; a useless thing, incapable
of serving their interests, or adding to their pleasure; a noxious thing, cherishing the germs of indignation at
their treatment, of contempt of their judgment.

I know
that had I been a sanguine, brilliant, careless, exacting, handsome,
romping child—though equally dependent and friendless—

\(\alpha\)
1. Mrs. Reed would have endured my presence more complacently;

\(+2\)
her children would have entertained for me more of the cordiality of fellow-feeling;

\(+3\)
the servants would have been less prone to make me the scapegoat of the nursery.

(138) 1. Daylight began to forsake the red-room;
2. it was past four o’clock,
3. and the beclouded afternoon was tending to drear twilight.

(139) 1.
\(1\)
I heard the rain still beating continuously on the staircase window,
\(+2\)
and the wind howling in the grove behind the hall;
\(2\)
\(1\)
I grew by degrees cold as a stone,
\(x2\)
and then my courage sank.

My habitual mood of humiliation, self-doubt, forlorn depression, dwelt damp on the embers of my decaying ire.

(140) 1. All said I was wicked,
\(x2\)
and perhaps I might be so;
\(2\)
what thought had I been but just conceiving of starving myself to death?

(141) 1. That certainly was a crime:
\(2\)
and was I fit to die?

(143) Or was the vault under the chancel of Gateshead Church an inviting bourne?

(144) 1. In such a vault I had been told did Mr. Reed lie buried;
\(x\beta\)
and led by this thought to recall his idea,
\(\alpha\)
I dwelt on it with gathering dread.

(145) 1. I could not remember him;
\(2\)
\(\alpha\)
but I knew
\(\beta\)
1. that he was my own uncle—my mother’s brother—
\(2\)
that he had taken me when a parentless infant to his house;
\(3\)
and that in his last moments he had required a promise of Mrs. Reed that she would read and maintain me as one of her own children.

(146) 1. Mrs. Reed probably considered she had kept this promise;
\(2\)
and so she had, I dare say, as well as her nature would permit her;
but how could she really like an interloper not of her race, and unconnected
with her, after her husband’s death, by any tie?

(147) It must have been most irksome to find herself bound by a hard-wrung pledge to stand in the stead of a
parent to a strange child she could not love, and to see an uncongenial alien permanently intruded on her own
family group.

(148) A singular notion dawned upon me.

(149) I doubted not—never doubted—that if Mr. Reed had been alive he would have
treated me kindly;

and now, as I sat looking at the white bed and overshadowed
walls—occasionally also turning a fascinated eye towards the dimly
gleaning mirror—

I began to recall what I had heard of dead men, troubled in their
graves by the violation of their last wishes, revisiting the earth to
punish the perjured and avenge the oppressed;

and I thought Mr. Reed’s spirit, <<β>>, might quit its
abode—whether in the church vault of in the unknown
world of the departed—and rise before me in this
chamber.

<<harassed by the wrongs of his sister’s child,>>

(150) I wiped my tears and hushed my sobs,

fearful lest any sign of violent grief might waken a preternatural
voice to comfort me,

or elicit from the gloom some haloed face, bending over me with
strange pity.

(151) This idea, consolatory in theory, I felt would be terrible if realized:

with all my might I endeavoured to stifle it—I endeavored to be firm.

(152) Shaking my hair from my eyes,

I lifted my head and tried to look boldly round the dark room;

at this moment a light gleamed on the wall.

(153) Was it, I asked myself, a ray from the moon penetrating some aperture in the blind?

(154) No; moonlight was still,

while I gazed,

it glided up to the ceiling

and quivered over my head.
I can now conjecture readily that this streak of light was, in all likelihood, a gleam from a lantern
carried by someone across the law:

1. but then, I thought
2. the swift darting beam was a herald of some coming vision from
another world.

I thought the swift darting beam was a herald of some coming vision from
another world.

prepared as my mind was for horror,
shaken as my nerves were by agitation.

My heart beat fast,
my head grew hot;
a sound filled my ears,
which I deemed the rushing of wings;
something seemed near me;
I was oppressed, suffocated:
endurance broke down;
I rushed to the door
and shook the lock in desperate effort.

Steps came rushing along the outer passage;
the key turned,
Bessie and Abbot entered.
“Miss Eyre, are you ill?”
said Bessie.

“What a dreadful noise!
It went quite through me!”
exclaimed Abbot.

“Take me out!
Let me go into the nursery!” was my cry.
“What for?
Are you hurt?
Have you seen something?”
again demanded Bessie.

“Oh! I saw a light,
and I thought
a ghost would come.”

I had now got hold of Bessie’s hand,
and she did not snatch it from me.
“She has screamed out on purpose,”

declared Abbot, in some disgust.

“And what a scream!

If she had been in great pain

one would have excused it,

but she only wanted

to bring us all here:

I know her naughty tricks.”

“What is all this?”

demanded another voice peremptorily;

and Mrs. Reed came along the corridor,

her cap flying wide, her gown rustling stormily.

“Abbot and Bessie, I believe

I gave orders that Jane Eyre should be left in the red-room
till I came to her myself.”

“Miss Jane screamed so loud, ma’am,”

pleaded Bessie.

“Let her go,” was the only answer.

“Loose Bessie’s hand, child:

you cannot succeed in getting out by these means, be assured.

I abhor artifice, particularly in children;

it is my duty to show you that tricks will not answer:

you will now stay here an hour longer,

and it is only on condition of perfect submission and stillness that I shall liberate
you then.”

“O aunt! Have pity!

Forgive me!

I cannot endure it—

let me be punished some other way!

I shall be killed if—”

“Silence!

This violence is all most repulsive:”

and so, no doubt, she felt it.

I was a precocious actress in her eyes;

she sincerely looked on me as a compound of virulent passions, mean spirit, and
dangerous duplicity.

(184)  xβ  Bessie and Abbot having retreated,
α  α  Mrs. Reed, <<xβ,>> abruptly thrust me back and locked me in,
    without further parley.
<<xβ,>  <<impatient of my now frantic anguish and wild sobs,>>

(185)  1  I heard her sweeping away;
  x2  xβ  and soon after she was gone,
  α  α  I suppose
    "β  I had a species of fit:
  x3  unconsciousness closed the scene.
Mr Hiram B. Otis was a rich American from New York. He had come to live and work in England, but he did not want to live in London. He did not want to live in the city. He wanted to live in the countryside outside London.

Canterville Chase was a large and very old house near London. Lord Canterville, the owner, wanted to sell it. So Mr Hiram B. Otis visited Lord Canterville.

‘I do not live in Canterville Chase,’ Lord Canterville said to Mr Otis. ‘I do not want to live there. The house has a ghost—the Canterville Ghost.’

‘I come from America,’ said Mr Otis. ‘America is a modern country. I don’t believe in ghosts. Have you seen this Canterville Ghost?’

‘No,’ said Lord Canterville, ‘but I have heard it at night.’

‘I don’t believe in ghosts,’ Mr Otis said again. ‘No one has found a ghost. No one has put a ghost in a museum. And you haven’t seen this ghost either.’

‘But several members of my family have seen it,’ said Lord Canterville. ‘My aunt saw the ghost. She was so frightened that she was ill for the rest of her life: Sequence→Clause. Also, the servants have seen it so they will not stay in the house at night. Only the housekeeper, Mrs Umney, lives in Canterville Chase. Mrs Umney lives there alone.’

‘I want to buy the house,’ said Mr Otis. ‘I’ll buy the ghost as well. Will you sell Canterville Chase? Will you sell the ghost?’

‘Yes, I will,’ said Lord Canterville. ‘But, please remember, I told you about the ghost: Projected→Circumstance before you bought the house.’

Mr Hiram B. Otis bought Canterville Chase. Then his family came to England from America. He had a wife called Lucretia, three sons and a daughter.

The eldest son, Washington, was almost twenty years old. He was good-looking: Process→Quality and had fair hair. His two young brothers were twins. They were twelve years old. The daughter, Virginia,
was fifteen years old. She had large blue eyes and a lovely face.

Mr Otis took his family to live at Canterville Chase. The old house was in the countryside west of London. Mr Otis and his family travelled from London by train. Then they rode to the house in a wagon pulled by two horses.

Canterville Chase was big and old. Trees grew all around the house. The Otis family wanted to stop and look at the outside of the house, but the sky darkened. A thunderstorm was coming. Rain started to fall, so the family went inside the house quickly.

Mrs Umney, the housekeeper, was waiting for them by the front door. She was an old woman and wore a black dress and white apron. She lived at Canterville Chase and looked after the house.

‘Welcome to Canterville Chase,’ said Mrs Umney. ‘Would you like some tea?’

‘Yes, please,’ said Mrs Otis.

The Otis family followed Mrs Umney into the library. There was a big table in the centre of the room and many chairs. Mrs Umney put teacups on the table, then she brought a pot of tea.

The Otises sat in the library and drank their tea. They looked out of a large window at the rain. The rain was falling heavily and the sky was black. They heard thunder and they saw lightening.

Mrs Otis looked around the room. There were many books on bookshelves. There were paintings on the walls. There was also a red stain on the floor. The red stain was by the fireplace.

‘What is this red stain?’ Mrs Otis asked Mrs Umney.

‘It is blood,’ answered the old housekeeper in a quiet voice.

‘I don’t want a blood stain in my library,’ said Mrs Otis. ‘Please remove the stain. Please clean the floor immediately.’

The old woman smiled. ‘It is the blood of Lady Eleanore de Canterville. She was murdered by her husband, Sir Simon de Canterville, in 1575. The blood stain has been here for over three hundred years. It cannot be removed.’

‘Nonsense,’ said Washington Otis. ‘I have some Pinkerton’s Stain Remover from America. It can remove any stain. Watch.’

Washington Otis took the stain remover from a bag. Pinkerton’s Stain Remover looked like a small black stick. He rubbed the stick on the blood stain. A minute later the floor was clean. The stick had removed the stain quickly and easily.

Mrs Umney looked at the floor. She was frightened. No one had removed the blood stain for three hundred years. Mrs Umney was very frightened.

‘Pinkerton’s can remove anything,’ said Washington Otis. ‘The blood stain has gone.’
Lightening flashed and lit the library. Mrs Umney fainted.

Mr and Mrs Otis ran across the library. They helped the old housekeeper who lay on the floor. Mrs Umney’s eyes were closed and her face was pale.

‘Mrs Umney! Mrs Umney!’ cried Mrs Otis. ‘Can you speak?’

Mrs Umney opened her eyes. ‘Trouble will come to this house,’ she said. ‘I have seen the ghost. The ghost will come to you.’

All the Otises helped Mrs Umney to stand up. ‘The ghost will come,’ she said again. ‘You must not remove the blood-stain. You must not clean the floor. The ghost will be angry.’

Then Mrs Umney went upstairs to her room.

Black Cat

Mr Hiram B. Otis was American. He was rich and very important. He wanted to live in an old house in England, so he decided to buy Canterville Chase, the home of Lord Canterville. Everyone told him that he was very foolish. ‘Canterville Chase is haunted,’ they said.

Lord Canterville himself told Mr Otis why he preferred not to live in the house: ‘Many members of my family have seen the Ghost. My grandaunt, the Duchess, was dressing for dinner one night when, suddenly, the hands of a skeleton touched her on the shoulders. She never recovered from the shock. My wife, Lady Canterville, cannot sleep at night because of the mysterious noises in the house.’

‘My Lord,’ said Mr Otis, ‘I’ll take the house with the furniture and the Ghost. I come from a modern country where we have everything that money can buy. If ghosts really existed in Europe, I’m sure that an American would take one back home. He would put it in a museum or a show for everyone to see.’

Lord Canterville smiled. ‘The Ghost really exists. People have seen it many times in the last three hundred years, since 1584 in fact. It always appears before the death of any member of my family:’

‘Well, sir, in my home the doctor appears before the death of any member of my family,’ laughed Mr Otis.

‘But I’m an American,’ he continued, ‘and Americans don’t believe in ghosts. They’re an old-fashioned European idea.’

‘If you don’t mind a ghost in the house, that’s all right. But please remember that I have told you.’

A few weeks later Lord Canterville sold Canterville Chase to the Americans.

There were six people in the Otis family. Mr Otis himself was a minister of the United States government. His wife, Mrs Lucretia Otis, was a beautiful lady. As a young woman in New York:
Relator→Minor Process, she had been famous for her beauty. She was full of energy and very healthy.

They had called their oldest son Washington in a moment of patriotism (patriotic): Quality→Entity. He was tall, blond and good-looking: Process→Entity. He liked dancing very much and his only fault was that he enjoyed the company of the British aristocracy. His sister, Virginia, was fifteen years old with large blue eyes: Relational Process→Circumstance; she was lovely. She loved riding her pony in the country. A young English lord, Cecil, Duke of Cheshire, was in love with her. The youngest children were twins. They were often naughty but everybody liked them.

When the family came to live at the house, they drove from the station in a carriage. It was a lovely July evening. The sun was low in the sky and the birds were singing. But as they came near Canterville Chase, the weather changed. Dark clouds appeared. Some large black birds flew over their heads. It began to rain. In the garden near the house, they saw an old black tree with no leaves or flowers on it: Relational Process→Circumstance.

An old woman dressed in black with a white apron: (wearing) was waiting for them on the steps of the house. This was Mrs Umney, the housekeeper.

‘Welcome to Canterville Chase,’ she said. They followed her through the dark wooden hall into the library. Tea was ready for them.

Suddenly Mrs Otis saw a dark red stain: Process→Entity on the floor by the fireplace.

‘What’s that mark: Process→Entity?’ she asked.

‘It’s blood,’ replied the old housekeeper.

‘How horrible!’ said Mrs Otis. ‘I don’t like blood stains: Process→Entity in the sitting room. Please remove it.’

Mrs Umney smiled.

‘It’s the blood of Lady Eleanore de Canterville. Her husband, Sir Simon de Canterville, murdered her in that exact place in 1575. Sir Simon disappeared nine years later and nobody has ever found his body. But his guilty spirit still haunts Canterville Chase. And nobody can remove the stain: Process→Entity.’

‘Nonsense!’ cried Washington in a loud voice. “Pinkerton’s Champion Cleaner” will clean it away. It’s the latest American stain: Process→Entity remover:.

He knelt down and rubbed the floor with the ‘Champion Cleaner’. In a few moments, the blood had disappeared.

‘I knew “Pinkerton’s” would do it,’ he said triumphantly.

At that moment, there was a great flash: Process→Entity of lightning and a boom: Process→Entity of thunder. They jumped to their feet, and Mrs Umney fainted.

‘What a terrible climate,’ said Mr Otis calmly, lighting a cigar. ‘I’m not surprised that people want to emigrate.’

‘My dear husband, look at Mrs Umney,’ said his wife. ‘What can we do with a housekeeper who
faints?’

‘We’ll reduce her wages,’ said Mr Otis.
As soon as he said that, Mrs Umney recovered, but she was still very upset.
‘Don’t laugh at the Ghost, sir. I have seen terrible things in this house.’

However, Mr Otis and his wife told her that they were not afraid of ghosts, and the old housekeeper went to bed.

**Oxford**

When Hiram B. Otis, the American businessman, bought the house called Canterville Chase, people told him that he was doing a very dangerous thing. Everybody knew that there was a ghost in the house. Lord Canterville himself told Mr Otis all about it.

‘We don’t like to live in the house ourselves,’ he said. ‘Too many of my family have seen the ghost. My wife’s grandmother, the Duchess of Bolton, is one of them. One night, while she was dressing for dinner, two skeleton hands were put on her shoulders. She has been ill for years because of that:Process→Circumstance. And my wife never got any sleep: Process→Entity there because of all the noises: Process→Entity at night: Relator→Circumstance.’

‘Lord Canterville,’ answered Mr Otis, ‘I will buy both the house and the ghost. I come from a modern country, and we can buy nearly everything in America—but not ghosts, so if there really is a ghost in the house, we can send it home to America, and people will pay to go and see it.’

‘I’m afraid that the house really does have a ghost,’ said Lord Canterville, smiling. ‘Perhaps there are no ghosts in your country, but our ghost has been in the house for three hundred years, and it always appears before the death of one of the family: Process→Entity: Relator→Circumstance.’

‘Well, so does the family doctor, Lord Canterville. But there are no ghosts, sir, in any country—not even in famous old British families.’

‘Very well,’ said Lord Canterville. ‘If you’re happy to have a ghost in the house, that’s all right. But please remember that I did tell you about it.’

And so Mr Hiram B. Otis bought the house, and a few weeks later he and his family went down to Canterville Chase on the train.

Mrs Otis was a very beautiful woman, and looked just as English as an Englishwoman. American people are really no different from English people—but they do, of course, speak a different language. Her eldest son, Washington, was a good-looking: Process→Quality young man with a wonderful smile: Process→Entity: Relational Process→Circumstance, who was famous at all the London parties for his fine dancing: Process→Entity: Relator→Circumstance. Miss Virginia E. Otis was a sweet little girl of fifteen with big blue eyes: Relational Process→Circumstance. She loved to ride horses and could ride faster than a lot of men. Once day the young Duke of Cheshire saw her on horseback, and immediately asked her to marry
him—but his family sent him back to school the next day. After Virginia came the twins—two happy, noisy little boys, who were always laughing and playing tricks.

It was a lovely July evening when the family got off the train. The fields and trees looked beautiful in the golden sunshine. The birds were singing sweetly, and the sky was a bright blue. But when they arrived at Canterville Chase, clouds suddenly appeared in the sky. Then ten or twelve large black birds flew down over their heads, and big drops began to fall.

An old woman in a black dress was standing in the doorway of the house, waiting to meet them. This was Mrs Umney, the housekeeper.

‘Welcome to Canterville Chase,’ she said.

They followed her into the library—a long, dark room, with a high window at one end. Here tea was ready for them, so they took off their coats and sat down.

Suddenly, Mrs Otis saw a dark red stain on the floor, near the fireplace.

‘Is that a stain on the floor there?’ she asked.

‘Yes, Mrs Otis,’ said Mrs Umney quietly. ‘It’s a blood stain.

‘Oh, that’s terrible!’ cried Mrs Otis. ‘I can’t have blood stains on my floors. I must go.’

The old woman smiled, and again answered in a quiet voice. ‘It is the blood of Lady Eleanor de Canterville,’ she said. ‘Her husband, Sir Simon de Canterville, murdered her in 1575, while she was standing just there, in that place. He lived for another nine years after her death, but then he disappeared, very strangely and suddenly. Nobody ever found his body, but his ghost is still in the house, and will not rest. The blood stain is famous—visitors come here specially to see it. People have tried to clean it, but it will not go away.’

‘Of course it will!’ cried Washington Otis. ‘Pinkerton’s Famous Stain Cleaner will clean it up in a second.’

And before the housekeeper could stop him, he was cleaning the floor with a small black stick.

A minute later, the blood stain was gone!

‘There you are!’ he said, smiling at the others. ‘Pinkerton can clean anything!’

But at these words the storm outside suddenly began. A terrible flash of lightning lit up the room. And a second later came a great crash of thunder. Everyone jumped up at the sound of the thunder. And Mrs Umney fainted.

‘What terrible weather this country has!’ said Mr Otis. He sat down again, and lit a cigarette.

Mrs Umney lay on the floor, with her eyes closed. Mrs Otis looked at her.

‘My dear Hiram,’ she cried. ‘What can we do with a woman who faints?’
'Tell her she has to pay some money,' said Mr Otis. 'If she breaks a cup or something, she has to pay for it. So tell her to pay if she faints. She won’t faint after that.'

At this, Mrs Umney immediately sat up. But she looked very unhappy.

'Be careful, trouble is coming to this house,' she said, her voice shaking. 'I have seen things here which are too terrible to describe. For night after night, I have not closed my eyes in sleep.'

Mr Otis gave her a warm smile: 'My wife and I are not afraid of ghosts, Mrs Umney.'

The old housekeeper got shakily to her feet. 'You Americans are so strong!' she said. 'And so kind! You know, I have worked here for many years at the same pay, and…'

'Okay Mrs Umney, we will pay you more money,' said Mr Otis, still smiling.

'Oh, thank you. Dear Mr Otis and dear Mrs Otis, thank you very much.'

Penguin

When Hiram B. Otis, the American Ambassador, bought Canterville Chase, people told him that he was doing a very dangerous thing. There was no doubt that the place was haunted, they said. Lord Canterville himself told Mr Otis this when they were discussing the sale:

'We don’t live in the place ourselves,' said Lord Canterville. 'Too many members of my family have seen the ghost. My aunt was dressing for dinner one night when she felt two skeleton’s hands on her shoulders. The experience made her very ill, and she’s never really got better again. After that, none of the younger servants wanted to stay with us, and my wife couldn’t sleep there because of the noises at night.'

'Lord Canterville,' answered the Ambassador. 'I will buy the house, the furniture and the ghost. I come from a modern country where we have everything that money can buy. And if there are ghosts in Europe, I’ll be happy to have one. I’ll send it home to America, and people will pay to see it and to be frightened by it!'

Lord Canterville smiled. ‘I’m afraid there really is a ghost,’ he said. ‘It’s been famous for three centuries—since 1584. It always appears before the death of a member of our family.'

'Well, the family doctor appears too, I expect, Lord Canterville,' said the Ambassador. ‘But the doctor is real, unlike the ghost. Believe me, there are no ghosts in any country in the world—not even in very old British families like yours.'

'Well, if you’re happy to share your house with a ghost, that’s all right,’ said Lord Canterville. ‘But please remember that I warned you.'
A few weeks after this, the sale was completed and the Ambassador and his family went down to Canterville Chase by train.

Mrs Otis, when she was Miss Lucretia R. Tappen of West 53rd Street, had been a well-known New York beauty. She was now a middle-aged woman, and in many ways she looked like an English lady. She was an excellent example of the fact that there is very little difference between the English and the Americans today, except, of course, of language.

Her oldest son, Washington, was a rather good-looking young man. He was famous, even in London, as an excellent dancer. He was very sensible, except about certain flowers and about the important families in Europe.

Miss Virginia E. Otis was a lovely girl of fifteen, with large blue eyes. She was a good sportswoman, and loved to ride horses—and she could ride them faster than a lot of men. She had once raced old Lord Blinton on her horse twice round the park, winning easily. She looked wonderful that day, and when the young Duke of Cheshire saw her on horseback he immediately asked her to marry him! Sadly for him, his family sent him back to school that same night. He cried all the way there.

After Virginia came the twins. These were two happy little boys who laughed and shouted a lot. They liked to play tricks on people and were often punished for them.

Canterville Chase is seven miles from Ascot, the nearest railway station, so Mr Otis had arranged a carriage. He and his family started their drive happily. It was a lovely July evening; birds were singing sweetly, and the fields and trees looked beautiful.

At the beginning of their journey, the sun was shining and the sky was blue. But when they reached Canterville Chase, clouds suddenly appeared in the sky. Before they reached the house, it was falling heavily.

An old woman in a black dress was on the steps to greet them. She was Mrs Umney, the woman who looked after the house. Lady Canterville had asked Mrs Otis to continue Mrs Umney's employment as housekeeper at Canterville Chase, and Mrs Otis had agreed.

‘Welcome to Canterville Chase,’ Mrs Umney said to the Ambassador and his family.

She led them through the large hall into the library. This was a long low room, with a coloured window at one end. Tea was ready for them, so they took off their coats, sat down and began to look round the room. Mrs Umney poured the tea.

Suddenly, Mrs Otis noticed a dark red stain on the floor, near the fireplace.

‘Something has made a stain there,’ she said to Mrs Umney.

‘Yes, madam,’ replied the housekeeper in a low voice. ‘It’s a bloodstain.’

‘How nasty!’ cried Mrs Otis. ‘I don’t like bloodstains in a sitting room. It must go.’
The old woman smiled, and answered in the same low, mysterious voice. ‘It’s the blood of Lady Eleanore de Canterville,’ she said.

‘What happened to her?’ asked Mrs Otis.

‘She was murdered on that exact spot by her own husband, Sir Simon de Canterville, in 1575,’ said Mrs Umney. ‘Sir Simon lived for nine years after that, and then disappeared suddenly and very mysteriously. His body was never discovered, but his ghost still haunts the Chase. The blood stain has always been admired by visitors to the house, and it can’t be cleaned. People have tried, but it won’t go away.’

‘Of course it will!’ cried Washington Otis. ‘Pinkerton’s Wonder Stain Cleaner will clean it in a second.’

And before the frightened housekeeper could stop him, he went down on his knees and began cleaning the floor with a small black stick. In a few moments the blood stain had disappeared.

‘I knew Pinkerton could do it,’ said Washington, and he looked round at his admiring family. But at that moment, lightning lit up the room and a terrible crash of thunder made them all jump up.

Mrs Umney fainted.

‘What an awful climate!’ said the American Ambassador calmly, as he lit a cigarette.

‘Awful,’ agreed his wife.

‘This country is very full of people. I suppose they don’t have enough good weather for everybody,’ said Mr Otis.

Mrs Umney lay on the floor with her eyes closed. Mrs Otis looked down at her.

‘My dear Hiram,’ she cried, ‘what can we do with a woman who faints?’

‘Make her pay,’ answered the Ambassador. ‘She has to pay if she breaks something, so tell her to pay if she faints. She won’t faint after that.’

And in a few moments Mrs Umney sat up. There was no doubt that she was very upset.

‘Be careful,’ she warned Mr Otis, and her voice was shaking.

‘Trouble is coming to this house.’

‘Trouble?’ said Mr Otis. He smiled.

‘I’ve seen things with my own eyes, sir, that would make your hair stand on end!’ Mrs Umney continued. ‘For many nights now I haven’t closed my eyes in sleep. I’ve been too afraid.’

But Mr Otis and his wife told the woman not to worry.

‘We’re not afraid of ghosts,’ said the Ambassador.
So the old housekeeper asked God to be kind to her new employers: Projected→Range, made arrangements: Process→Entity for an increase: Process→Entity in her pay, and then went nervously up to her own room.

Original
When Mr. Hiram B. Otis, the American Minister, bought Canterville Chase, every one told him he was doing a very foolish thing, as there was no doubt at all that the place was haunted. Indeed, Lord Canterville himself, who was a man of the most punctilious honour, had felt *it his duty* to mention the fact to Mr. Otis when they came to discuss terms.

“We have not cared to live in the place ourselves,” said Lord Canterville, “since my grandaunt, the Dowager Duchess of Bolton, was frightened into a fit: Process→Entity, from which she never really recovered, by two skeleton hands being placed on her shoulders as she was dressing for dinner: Sequence→Qualifier, and *I feel bound to tell you*, Mr. Otis, that the ghost has been seen by several living members of my family, as well as by the rector of the parish, the Rev. Augustus Dampier, who is a Fellow of King’s College, Cambridge. After the unfortunate accident: Process→Entity to the Duchess: Relator→Circumstance, none of our younger servants would stay with us, and Lady Canterville often got very little sleep: Process→Entity at night, in consequence of the mysterious noises that came from the corridor and the library: Relator→Circumstance.”

“My Lord,” answered the Minister, “I will take the furniture and the ghost at a valuation. I have come from a modern country, where we have everything that money can buy; and with all our spry young fellows painting the Old World red, and carrying off your best actors and prima-donnas, I reckon that if there were such a thing as a ghost in Europe, we’d have it at home in a very short time in one of our public museums, or on the road as a show:”

“I fear that the ghost exists,” said Lord Canterville, smiling, “though it may have resisted the overtures of your enterprising impresarios: Process→Entity. It has been well known: Process→Quality for three centuries, since 1584 in fact, and always makes its appearance before the death of any member of our family: Process→Entity: Relator→Circumstance:”

“Well, so does the family doctor for that matter, Lord Canterville. But there is no such thing, sir, as a ghost, and I guess the laws of Nature are not going to be suspended for the British aristocracy:”

“You are certainly very natural in America,” answered Lord Canterville, who did not quite understand Mr. Otis’s last observation: Process→Entity, “and if you don’t mind a ghost in the house, it is all right. Only you must remember I warned you:”

A few weeks after this, the purchase: Process→Entity was concluded, and at the close of the season: Relator→Circumstance the Minister and his family went down to Canterville Chase. Mrs. Otis, who, as Miss Lucretia R. Tappan, of West 53rd Street, had been a celebrated New York belle, was now a very handsome,
middle-aged Process→Quality woman, with fine eyes, and a superb profile: Process→Circumstance. Many American ladies on leaving their native land adopt an appearance: Process→Entity of chronic ill-health, under the impression: Process→Entity that it is a form of European refinement: Projected→Qualifier, but Mrs. Otis had never fallen into this error: Process→Entity. She had a magnificent constitution, and a really wonderful amount of animal spirits. Indeed, in many respects, she was quite English, and was an excellent example of the fact that we have really everything in common with America nowadays, except, of course, language. Her eldest son, christened Washington by his parents in a moment of patriotism, which he never ceased to regret, was a fair-haired: Process→Quality, rather good-looking: Process→Quality young man, who had qualified himself for American diplomacy by leading the German at the Newport Casino for three successive seasons, and even in London was well known: Process→Entity as an excellent dancer: Relator→Circumstance. Gardenias and the peerage were his only weaknesses. Otherwise he was extremely sensible. Miss Virginia E. Otis was a little girl of fifteen, lithe and lovely as a fawn, and with a fine freedom in her large blue eyes: Clause→Minor Process. She was a wonderful Amazon, and had once raced old Lord Bilton on her pony twice round the park, winning by a length and a half, just in front of the Achilles statue, to the huge delight: Process→Entity of the young Duke of Cheshire, who proposed for her on the spot, and was sent back to Eton that very night by his guardians, in floods of tears: Process→Entity: Clause→Circumstance. After Virginia came the twins, who were usually called “The Star and Stripes,” as they were always getting swished. They were delightful boys, and, with the exception of the worthy Minister, the only true republicans of the family.

As Canterville Chase is seven miles from Ascot, the nearest railway station, Mr. Otis had telegraphed for a waggonette to meet them, and they started on their drive: Process→Entity in high spirits. It was a lovely July evening, and the air was delicate with the scent of the pinewoods: Process→Circumstance. Now and then they heard a wood-pigeon brooding over its own sweet voice, or saw, deep in the rustling fern, the burnished breast of the pheasant. Little squirrels peered at them from the beech-trees as they went by, and the rabbits scudded away through the brushwood and over the mossy knolls, with their white tails in the air. As they entered the avenue of Canterville Chase, however, the sky became suddenly overcast with clouds, a curious stillness seemed to hold the atmosphere, a great flight: Process→Entity of rooks passed silently over their heads, and, before they reached the house, some big drops: Process→Entity of rain: Process→Entity had fallen.

Standing on the steps to receive them was an old woman, neatly dressed in black silk, with a white cap and apron. This was Mrs. Umney, the housekeeper, whom Mrs. Otis, at Lady Canterville’s earnest request: Process→Entity, had consented to keep in her former position. She made them each a low curtsey: Process→Entity as they alighted, and said in a quaint, old-fashioned manner, “I bid you welcome to Canterville Chase,” Following her, they passed through the fine Tudor hall into the library, a long, low room, paneled in black oak, at the end of which was a large stained glass window. Here they found tea laid out for
them, and, after taking off their wraps, they sat down and began to look round, while Mrs. Umney waited on them.

Suddenly Mrs. Otis caught sight of a dull red stain on the floor just by the fireplace, and, quite unconscious of what it really signified, said to Mrs. Umney, "I am afraid something has been spilt there."

"Yes, madam," replied the old housekeeper in a low voice, "blood has been spilt on that spot."

"How horrid!" cried Mrs. Otis; "I don't at all care for blood-stains in a sitting-room. It must be removed at once."

The old woman smiled, and answered in the same low, mysterious voice, "It is the Eleanore de Canterville, who was murdered on that very spot by her own husband, Sir Simon de Canterville, in 1575. Sir Simon survived her nine years, and disappeared suddenly under very mysterious circumstances. His body has never been discovered, but his guilty spirit still haunts the Chase. The blood-stain has been much admired by tourists and others, and cannot be removed."

"That is all nonsense," cried Washington Otis; "Pinkerton's Champion Stain Remover and Paragon Detergent will clean it up in no time," and before the terrified housekeeper could interfere, he had fallen upon his knees, and was rapidly scouring the floor with a small stick of what looked like a black cosmetic. In a few moments no trace of the blood-stain could be seen.

"I knew Pinkerton would do it," he exclaimed, triumphantly, as he looked round at his admiring family; but no sooner had he said these words than a terrible flash of lightning lit up the sombre room, a fearful peal of thunder made them all start to their feet, and Mrs. Umney fainted.

"What a monstrous climate!" said the American Minister, calmly, as he lit a long cheroot. "I guess the old country is so overpopulated that they have not enough decent weather for everybody. I have always been of opinion that emigration is the only thing for England."

"My dear Hiram," cried Mrs. Otis, "what can we do with a woman who faints?"

"Charge it to her like breakages," answered the Minister; "she won't faint after that;" and in a few moments Mrs. Umney certainly came to. There was no doubt, however, that she was extremely upset, and she sternly warned Mr. Otis to beware of some trouble coming to the house.

"I have seen things with my own eyes, sir," she said, "that would make any Christian's hair stand on end, and many and many a night I have not closed my eyes for the awful things that are done here." Mr. Otis, however, and his wife warmly assured the honest soul that they were not afraid of ghosts, and, after invoking the blessings of Providence on her new master and mistress, and making arrangements for an increase of salary, the old housekeeper tottered off to her own room.
In 1825, I was ten years old. My father and mother were dead. I lived with my aunt and uncle, Mr and Mrs Reed. Their house was called Gateshead Hall. The house was in Yorkshire, in the north of England. My Aunt and Uncle Reed had two children—a boy, John, and a girl, Eliza.

I liked my Uncle Reed and he liked me. But in 1825, my uncle died. After that, I was very unhappy. My Aunt Reed did not like me. And John and Eliza were unkind to me.

It was a cold, rainy day in December. All of us were in the house. I wanted to be alone. I wanted to read. I opened a book. Then I heard my Cousin John’s voice: Process→Entity.

‘Jane! Jane Eyre! Where are you?’ John shouted. He came into the room and he saw me.

‘Why are you reading my book?’ he asked. ‘Give it to me!’

John took the book. He hit my head with it. I screamed. John hit me again. I pulled his hair and I kicked him.

‘Help! Help, Mamma!’ John shouted. ‘Jane Eyre is hurting me!’

Aunt Reed ran into the room. She pulled me away from John.

‘John hit me with a book,’ I said. ‘I hate him. And I hate you too!’

‘You are a bad girl, Jane,’ my aunt said. ‘Why do you hate me?’

‘You don’t like me,’ I replied. ‘John and Eliza are unkind to me. I want to leave Gateshead Hall.’

‘You want to leave!’ Aunt Reed said. ‘Where will you go? Your parents are dead. You cannot live alone.’

Aunt Reed thought for a moment.

‘My friend, Mr Brocklehurst, is the owner of a school,’ she said. ‘I will send you to Mr Brocklehurst’s school.’

When I was a little girl, my parents died. My uncle, Mr Reed, took me to live with his family at Gateshead house, but a year later he died too. Mrs Reed and her children didn’t like me. John was fourteen years old, Georgiana was twelve, Eliza was eleven and I was ten. My memories of Gateshead: Process→Entity are all of loneliness: Quality→Entity, pain, anger: Process→Entity and rebellion: Process→Entity.

I remember my last day there. Mrs Reed was sitting on the sofa by the fire with her three children. They looked happy. I stood at a distance from them.

‘You stay there, Janet’ said Mrs Reed. ‘Bessie says you’re a bad girl, and I prefer you to stay away from me until you learn to be more pleasant.’
Bessie was the maid. She was sometimes kind to me, but she thought I was a difficult, disobedient child.

‘What does Bessie say I’ve done?’ I asked.

‘How rude you are! *Children shouldn’t ask adults* questions, like that!’ cried Mrs Reed.

I walked into the next room and found a book. There was a space between the window and the red curtain. I sat in that space and began to read. I felt safe behind the red curtain: no one could see me in my hiding place. But then John Reed ripped the red curtain open. I was frightened, because John often tormented and insulted me, and sometimes he hit me too. When he saw me, he laughed, then he put out his tongue. He was ugly and disgusting. I threw the book at him. It hit him on the forehead.

‘Mummy!’ he cried. ‘Jane threw a book at me!’

A moment later Mrs Reed and Bessie dragged me down the corridor. ‘You horrible, violent child!’ cried Mrs Reed. ‘You must be punished!’ They put me into the Red Room and locked the door.

‘Aunt Reed!’ I cried. ‘Please don’t leave me here!’

She ignored me and walked away down the corridor with Bessie. There was a big white bed in the middle of the Red Room. That was where my Uncle Reed had died.

The sun was going down, and I was afraid of being in the Red Room in the darkness. I was sure my uncle’s dead body was lying on the bed! Fear and cold and loneliness finally overcame me, and I fainted.

*Penguin*

*There was no possibility of taking a walk* that day. We had, in fact, been wandering in the leafless garden for an hour in the morning, but since dinner the cold winter wind had brought: Relator—Process with it such dark clouds and such heavy rain that further outdoor exercise was impossible.

I was glad of it; I never liked long walks, especially on cold afternoons: Relator—Circumstance. I hated coming home with frozen fingers and toes, with a heart saddened by the rough words of Bessie, the nurse, and by the consciousness of how weak I was, compared with Eliza, John and Georgiana Reed: Process—Entity. Sequence—β clause.

Eliza, John and Georgiana were now with their mama in the sitting room at Gateshead. She lay resting by the fireside, and with her loved ones near her (for the moment neither quarrelling nor crying) she looked perfectly happy. She had dismissed me from the group, saying that she was sorry she was forced to keep me at a distance, but that until I tried seriously to develop a more friendly and attractive nature, she really could not allow me to join in the pleasures intended only for happy little children.
‘But what have I done?’ I asked.

‘Jane, I don’t like questions: Process→Entity or objections Process→Entity. Children should not speak to those older than themselves in such a way. Sit down somewhere, and until you can speak pleasantly, remain silent.’

A small breakfast room lay next to the sitting room. I slipped in there. It contained bookshelves, and I soon took possession of a book, making sure that it was one full of pictures. I climbed onto the window seat and, pulling my feet up, I sat cross-legged. I then closed the red curtains, so that I was hidden from view.

Every picture in the book told a story, often mysterious to my undeveloped understanding, but always deeply interesting—as interesting as the stories of love and adventure that Bessie sometimes began on winter evenings, when she happened to be in a good humour.

With the book on my knee, I was happy. I feared nothing except interruption: Process→Entity, and that came too soon. The voice of John Reed called me. Then there was a silence as he found the room empty.

‘Where in the world is she?’ he cried. ‘Lizzy! Georgy!’ he called to his sisters. ‘Jane is not here. Tell Mama she has run out into the rain. Bad creature!’

‘It is lucky that I closed the curtain,’ I thought, and I hoped with all my heart: Process→Circumstance that he would not discover my hiding: Process→Quality place. He would not in fact have found it by himself, as he was neither sharp-sighted nor intelligent, but Eliza put her head round the door, and said:

‘She is in the window seat, surely, John.’

I came out immediately, because I trembled at the idea of being dragged out by John: Sequence→Minor Process; Projected cl.→Qualifier.

‘What do you want?’ I asked.

‘Say, “What do you want, Master Reed?: Projected→Participant” was the answer. ‘I want you to come here.’ Seating himself in an armchair, he made a sign: Process→Entity to me to move closer and stand in front of him.

John Reed was a schoolboy of fourteen years, four years older than I was; he was large and fat for his age, with an unhealthy skin, unattractive features and thick arms and legs: Process→Circumstance. He ought now to have been at school, but his mama had brought him home for a month or two, “on account of his delicate health: Relator→Circumstance”. His schoolmaster said that his condition would improve if he received fewer cakes and sweets from his family, but his mother’s heart found such a severe opinion unacceptable, and she preferred to believe that he worked too hard and missed his home.

John was not very fond of his mother and sisters and he hated me. He treated me badly, and punished me, not two or three times a week, nor once or twice a day, but continually. I had no protection: Process→Entity from him; the servants did not like to offend their young master, and Mrs Reed never
appeared to see him strike me or to hear him insult me.

Having learnt to be obedient to John, I came up to his chair. He spent about three minutes in putting out his tongue at me. I knew that he would hit me soon, and while I waited fearfully for the blow, I thought about his disgustingly ugly appearance. I wonder whether he read my mind: in my face; suddenly, without speaking, he struck me sharply and hard. I almost fell, and when I was upright again, I stepped back from his chair.

‘That is for questioning Mama,’ he said, ‘and for hiding like a thief behind curtains, and for the look you had in your eyes two minutes ago: Sequence→Circumstance, you rat!’

I was so used to John Reed’s insults: Process→Entity that I never had any idea of replying to them. My anxiety: Quality→Entity was about how to receive the blow that would certainly follow: Process→Entity (Relative cl. w/ Acir: Matter): Sequence→Process.

‘What were you doing behind the curtain?’ he asked.

‘I was reading.’

‘Show me the book.’

I returned to the window and brought it in silence.

‘You have no right to take our books. You are a poor relation, Mama says. You have no money; your father left you none. You ought to beg, and not live here with gentleman’s children like us, and eat the same meals as we do, and wear clothes that our mama has to pay for. Now, I’m warning you not to touch my bookshelves again, because they are mine. The whole house is mine, or will be in a few years. Go and stand by the door, out of the way of the mirror and the windows.’

I did so, not at first realizing his intention: Process→Entity. When I saw him lift and balance the book and stand in the act of aiming it, though, I jumped to one side with a cry: Process→Entity of fear: Sequence–→β clause. Not soon enough. The book was thrown, it hit me, and I fell, striking my head against the door and cutting it. The cut bled, and the pain was sharp. My fear: Quality→Entity had by now passed its limit, and other feelings: Quality→Entity took its place.

‘Wicked and cruel boy!’ I said. ‘You are like a murderer—you are like a slave driver—you are like the evil rulers of ancient Rome!’

‘What! What!’ he cried. ‘Did she say that to me? Did you hear her, Eliza and Georgiana? I’ll tell Mama! But first—’

He ran straight at me. I felt him seize my hair and shoulder, but now I was desperate; I really thought him a murderer: Sequence→Relational Process. I felt a drop or two of blood from my head running down my neck, and my sense of suffering: Process→Entity for the moment was stronger than my fear: Quality→Entity Sequence→Process. I fought him madly. I am not sure what I did with my hands, but he called me ‘Rat! Rat!’ and screamed loudly. Help: Process→Entity was near; his sisters had run for Mrs Reed: β clause→Circumstance, who had gone upstairs. Now she came on the scene, followed by Bessie and by
Abbot, one of the servant girls. We were separated. I heard the words:

‘Oh! What a wicked little thing, to fly at Master John like that: Projected→Range: Phenomenon!’

‘Did anybody ever see such evil passion!’

Then Mrs Reed commanded:

‘Take her away to the red room, and lock her in there.’ Four hands seized me, and I was carried upstairs.

I fought all the way. This was unusual for me, and greatly strengthened the bad opinion of me that Bessie and Abbot already held.

‘Hold her arms. She’s like a mad cat.’

‘For shame! For shame!’ cried Abbot. ‘What terrible behaviour, Miss Eyre, to strike a young gentleman, your guardian’s son—your young master!’

‘Master! How is he my master? Am I a servant? ’

‘No, you are less than a servant, because you do nothing to support yourself. There, sit down, and think over your wickedness.’

They had got me by this time into the room named by Mrs Reed, and had pushed me onto a chair. I began to rise from it again, but their two pairs of hands prevented me.

‘If you don’t sit still, you must be tied down,’ said Bessie. ‘Miss Abbot, lend me your belt. She would break mine immediately.’

‘Don’t do that,’ I cried. ‘I will not move.’

‘Take care that you don’t,’ said Bessie, and when she had made sure that I really was becoming quieter, she loosened her hold on me. She and Abbot stood with folded: Process→Quality arms, looking darkly and doubtfully at my face.

‘She never did this before,’ said Bessie at last, turning to Abbot.

‘But it was always in her,’ was the reply. ‘I’ve often given Mrs Reed my opinion of the child: Projected→Verbiage, and she agrees with me. She’s a deceitful little thing.’

Bessie did not answer, but before long she addressed me and said:

‘You ought to know, miss, that you should be grateful to Mrs Reed. She supports you. If she were to send you away, who would look after you?’

I had nothing to say to these words. They were not new to me. I had heard many suggestions of the same kind before, very painful and wounding: Process→Quality to my pride, but only half understood. Abbot joined in:

‘And you ought not to think yourself equal to the two Misses Reed and Master Reed, just because Mrs Reed kindly allows you to be brought up with them. They will have a great deal of money in the future, and you will have none. It is your duty to be grateful, and to behave well.’
‘What we tell you is for your own good,’ added Bessie in a softer voice. ‘You should try to be useful and to please them. Then, perhaps, you will have a home here. But if you become angry and rude, Mrs Reed will send you away, I am sure.’

‘Besides,’ said Abbot, ‘God will punish you. He might strike you dead in the middle of your anger. Come, Bessie, we will leave her. Say your prayers, Miss Eyre, because if you are not sorry for your wickedness, something bad might come down the chimney and take you away.’

They went, shutting the door and locking it behind them.

The red room was a square bedroom with dark wooden furniture, a heavy red rug, a very large bed, and red curtains always closed across the windows. This room was cold, because it rarely had a fire; silent, because it was far from the nursery and the kitchen; frightening, because it was rarely entered. It was here that Mr Reed had died nine years before.

I was not quite sure whether they had locked the door, and when I dared to move, I went to see. Ah, yes! There had never been a surer prison.

My head still ached and bled from the blow that I had received and my fall. No one had blamed John for striking me without cause. ‘Unjust! Unjust!’ I thought. I began to plan some escape, such as running away, or never eating or drinking any more, and letting myself die.

It was past four o’clock, and daylight began to leave the red room. I heard the rain beating against the windows, and the wind crying in the trees behind the house. Gradually I became as cold as a stone, and then my courage sank. Everyone said that I was wicked, and perhaps I was.

My thoughts turned to my uncle. I could not remember him, but I knew that he was my mother’s brother, that he had taken me as a parentless baby to his house, and that before he died he had received a promise from his wife, Mrs Reed, that she would look after me as one of her own children. A strange idea entered my head. I never doubted that if Mr Reed had been alive, he would have treated me kindly, and now, in the growing darkness, I began to remember stories of dead men, troubled in their graves by the knowledge that their last wishes were not carried out, revisiting the earth. Perhaps Mr Reed’s ghost might rise before me.

This idea, instead of comforting me, filled me with fear. At this moment, a beam of light shone on the wall. Probably it was from a lamp carried outside across the garden, but to my shaken nerves, prepared for terror, it appeared like a sign of someone coming from another world. My heart beat fast, my head became hot. A sound filled my ears, which seemed like the rushing of wings. I ran in despair to the door and shook the lock. Footsteps came hurrying along the outer passage, the key was turned, and Bessie and Abbot entered.
‘Miss Eyre, are you ill?’ said Bessie.

‘What a terrible noise! It went right through me!’ cried Abbot.

‘Take me out! Let me go into the nursery!’ I begged.

‘What for? Are you hurt? Have you seen something?’ Bessie demanded again.

‘Oh, I saw a light, and I thought a ghost had come.’ I had now got hold of Bessie’s hand, and she did not take it from me.

‘She has screamed on purpose,’ Abbot said in disgust. ‘And what a scream! If she had been in great pain, there would have been some excuse for it, but she only wanted to bring us here. I know her wicked tricks.

‘What is all this?’ demanded another voice sharply. Mrs Reed was coming along the passage.

‘Abbot and Bessie, I believe I gave orders that Jane Eyre should be left in the red room until I came to her myself.’

‘Miss Jane screamed so loudly, madam,’ replied Bessie.

‘Let her go,’ was the only answer: ‘Loose Bessie’s hand, child; you cannot succeed in getting out by these means. I hate tricks, especially in children. It is my duty to show you that they will not succeed. You will stay here an hour longer, and it is only on condition of perfect obedience and silence that I shall let you out then.’

‘Oh, Aunt! Have pity! Forgive me! I cannot bear it! Let me be punished in some other way!’

‘Be quiet! This passion is almost disgusting.’ She did not believe in my sincerity, and really thought that I was pretending.

Bessie and Abbot left us, and Mrs Reed pushed me roughly and impatiently back into my prison and locked me in without a further word. I heard her go away, and soon after she had left my head seemed to go round and round and I fell to the ground in a faint.

Oxford

We could not go for a walk that afternoon. There was such a freezing cold wind, and such heavy rain, that we all stayed indoors. I was glad of it. I never liked long walks, especially in winter. I used to hate coming home when it was almost dark, with ice-cold fingers and toes, feeling miserable because Bessie, the nursemaid, was always scolding me. All the time I knew I was different from my cousins, Eliza, John, and Georgiana Reed. They were taller and stronger than me, and they were loved.

These three usually spent their time crying and quarrelling, but today they were sitting quietly
around their mother in the sitting-room. I wanted to join the family circle, but Mrs Reed, my aunt, refused. Bessie had complained about me.

‘No, I’m sorry, Jane. Until I hear from Bessie, or see for myself, that you are really trying to behave better, you cannot be treated as a good, happy child, like my children.’

‘What does Bessie say I have done?’ I asked.

‘Jane, it is not polite to question me in that way. If you cannot speak pleasantly, be quiet.’

I crept out of the sitting-room and into the small room next door, where I chose a book full of pictures from the bookcase. I climbed onto the window-seat, and drew the curtains so that I was completely hidden. I sat there for a while. Sometimes I looked out of the window at the grey November afternoon, and saw the rain: Process→Entity pouring down on the leafless garden. But most of the time I studied the book, and stared fascinated at the pictures. Lost in the world of imagination: Process→Entity I forgot my sad, lonely existence for a while and was happy. I was only afraid that my secret hiding: Process→Quality-place might be discovered.

Suddenly the door of the room opened. John Reed rushed in.

‘Where are you, rat?’ he shouted. He did not see me behind the curtain. ‘Eliza! Georgy! Jane isn’t here! Tell Mamma she’s run out into the rain—what a bad animal she is!’

‘How lucky I drew the curtain,’ I thought. He would never have found me, because he was not very intelligent. But Eliza guessed at once where I was: Projected→Verbiage.

‘She’s in the window-seat, John,’ she called from the sitting-room.

So I came out immediately, as I did not want him to pull me out.

‘What do you want?’ I asked him.

‘Say, “What do you want, Master Reed?”’ he answered, sitting in an armchair. ‘I want you to come here.’

John Reed was fourteen and I was only ten. He was large and rather fat. He usually ate too much at meals, which made him ill. He should have been at boarding school, but his mother, who loved him very much, had brought him home for a month or two, because she thought his health was delicate.

John did not love his mother or his sisters, and he hated me. He bullied and punished me, not two or three times a week, not once or twice a day, but all the time. My whole body trembled when he came near. Sometimes he hit me, sometimes he just threatened me, and I lived in terrible fear: Process→Entity of him. I had no idea how to stop him: Projected→Qualifier. The servants did not want to offend their young master, and Mrs Reed could see no fault in her dear boy. So I obeyed John’s order: Process→Entity, and approached his armchair, thinking how very ugly his face was. Perhaps he understood what I was thinking: Projected→Range: Verbiage?, for he hit me hard on the face.

‘That is for your rudeness: Quality→Entity to Mamma just now,’ he said, ‘and for your wickedness Quality→Entity in hiding, and for looking at me like that, you rat: Sequence→Circumstance!’
I was so used to his bullying that I never thought of hitting him back.

‘What were you doing behind that curtain?’ he asked.

‘I was reading,’ I answered.

‘Show me the book.’ I gave it to him. ‘You have no right to take our books,’ he continued. ‘You have no money and your father left you none. You ought to beg in the streets, not live here in comfort with a gentleman’s family. Anyway, all these books are mine, and so is the whole house, or will be in a few years’ time. I’ll teach you not to borrow my books again.’ He lifted the heavy book and threw it hard at me.

It hit me and I fell, cutting my head on the door. I was in great pain, and suddenly for the first time in my life, I forgot my fear of John Reed: Projected→Range.

‘You wicked, cruel boy!’ I cried. ‘You are a bully! You are as bad as a murderer!’

‘What! What!’ he cried. ‘Did she say that to me? Did you hear, Eliza and Georgiana? I’ll tell Mamma, but first…’

He rushed to attack me, but now he was fighting with a desperate girl. I really saw him as a wicked murderer. I felt the blood running down my face, and the pain gave me strength. I fought back as hard as I could. My resistance: Process→Entity surprised him, and he shouted for help: Process→Entity.

His sisters ran for Mrs Reed, who called her maid, Miss Abbott, and Bessie. They pulled us apart and I heard them say, ‘What a wicked girl! She attacked Master John: Projected→Phenomenon!’

Mrs Reed said calmly, ‘Take her away to the red room and lock her in there.’

And so I was carried upstairs, arms waving and legs kicking. As soon as we arrived in the red room, I became quiet again, and the two servants both started scolding me.

‘Really, Miss Eyre,’ said Miss Abbott, ‘how could you hit him? He’s your young master.’

‘How can he be my master? I’m not a servant!’ I cried.

‘No, Miss Eyre, you are less than a servant, because you do not work,’ replied Miss Abbott. They both looked at me as if they strongly disapproved of me.

‘You should remember, miss,’ said Bessie, ‘that your aunt pays for your food and clothes, and you should be grateful. You have no other relations or friends.’

All my short life I had been told this, and I had no answer: Process→Entity to it.

I stayed silent, listening to these painful reminders: Process→Entity.

‘And if you are angry and rude, Mrs Reed may send you away,’ added Bessie.

‘Anyway,’ said Miss Abbott, ‘God will punish you, Jane Eyre, for your wicked heart: Sequence→Circumstance. Pray to God, and say you’re sorry.’ They left the room, locking the door carefully behind them.

The red room was a cold, silent room, hardly ever used, although it was one of the largest bedrooms in the house. Nine years ago my uncle, Mr Reed, had died in this room, and since then nobody had wanted to
sleep in it.

Now that I was alone I thought bitterly of the people I lived with. John Reed, his sisters, his mother, the servants—they all accused me, scolded me, hated me. Why could I never please them? Eliza was selfish, but was respected. Georgiana had a bad temper, but she was popular with everybody because she was beautiful. John was rude, cruel and violent, but nobody punished him. I tried to make no mistakes, but they called me naughty. Now that I had turned against John to protect myself, everybody blamed me. And so I spent that whole long afternoon in the red room asking myself why I had to suffer and why life was so unfair: Projected—Range: Verbiage? Perhaps I would run away, or starve myself to death.

Gradually it became dark outside. The rain was still beating on the windows, and I could hear the wind in the trees. Now I was no longer angry, and I began to think the Reeds might be right. Perhaps I was wicked. Did I deserve to die and be buried in the churchyard like my uncle Reed? I could not remember him, but knew he was my mother’s brother, who had taken me to his house when my parents both died. On his death bed: Relator→Circumstance he had made his wife, aunt Reed, promise to look after me like her own children. I supposed she now regretted her promise: Process→Entity.

A strange idea came to me. I felt sure that if Mr Reed had lived he would have treated me kindly, and now, as I looked round at the dark furniture and the walls in shadow, I began to fear that his ghost might come back to punish his wife for not keeping her promise: Process→Entity. He might rise from the grave in the churchyard and appear in this room! I was so frightened by this thought: Process→Entity that I hardly dared to breathe. Suddenly in the darkness I saw a light moving on the ceiling. It may have been from a lamp outside, but in my nervous state: Sequence→Circumstance I did not think of that. I felt sure it must be a ghost, a visitor from another world. My head was hot, my heart beat fast. Was that the sound: Process→Entity of wings in my ears: Process→Circumstance? Was that something moving near me? Screaming wildly, I rushed to the door and shook it. Miss Abbott and Bessie came running to open it.

‘Miss Eyre, are you ill?’ asked Bessie.

‘Take me out of here,’ I screamed.

‘Why? What’s the matter?’ she asked.

‘I saw a light, and I thought it was a ghost,’ I cried, holding tightly on to Bessie’s hand.

‘She’s not even hurt,’ said Miss Abbott in disgust. ‘She screamed just to bring us here. I know all her little tricks: Process→Entity.’

‘What is all this?’ demanded an angry voice. Mrs Reed appeared at the door of the room. ‘Abbot and Bessie, I think I told you to leave Jane Eyre in this room until I came.’

‘She screamed so loudly ma’am’ said Bessie softly.

‘Let go of her hands, Bessie,’: Projected→Participant was Mrs Reed’s only answer.

‘Jane Eyre, you need not think you can succeed in getting out of the room like this. Your naughty
tricks: Process→Entity will not work with me. You will stay here an hour longer as a punishment for trying to deceive us: Sequence→Circumstance.

‘Oh, aunt, please forgive me! I can’t bear it! I shall die if you keep me here…’ I screamed and kicked as she held me.

‘Silence! Control yourself!’ She pushed me, resisting wildly, back into the red room and locked me in. There I was in the darkness again with the silence: Quality→Entity and the ghosts. I must have fainted. I cannot remember anything more.

Original

There was no possibility of taking a walk: Process→Entity that day. 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: Process→Entity had brought with it: Relator→Process clouds so sombre, and a rain so penetrating: Process→Entity, that further out-door exercise: Process→Entity was now out of the question.

I was glad of it: I never liked long walks: Process→Entity, especially on chilly afternoons: Relator→Circumstance?: dreadful to me was the coming home: Process→Entity in the raw twilight: Relator→Circumstance?:, with nipped: Process→Quality fingers and toes, and a heart saddened by the chidings: Process→Entity of Bessie, the nurse, and humbled by the consciousness: Quality→Entity of my physical inferiority: Quality→Entity to Eliza, John, and Georgiana Reed: Sequence/Relator→Participant.

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. 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: Process→Entity, Process→Circumstance, 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.’

‘What does Bessie say I have done?’ I asked.

‘Jane, I don’t like cavillers or questioners; besides, there is something truly forbidden in a child taking up her elders in that manner. Be seated somewhere; and until you can speak pleasantly, remain silent.’

A breakfast-room adjoined the drawing-room, I slipped in there. It contained a bookcase: I soon possessed myself of a volume, taking care that it should be one stored with pictures. I mounted into the window-seat: gathering up my feet, I sat cross-legged, like a Turk; and, having drawn the red moreen curtain nearly closed, I was shrined in double: Advb.→Quality retirement.

Folds of scarlet drapery shut in my view to the right hand; to the left were the clear panes of glass,
protecting, but not separating me from the drear November day. At intervals, while turning over the leaves of my book, I studied the aspect of that winter afternoon. Afar, it offered a pale blank of mist and cloud; near a scene of wet lawn and storm-beat: Process→Quality shrub, with ceaseless rain: Process→Entity sweeping away wildly before a long and lamentable blast: Process→Entity Relator→Circumstance.

I returned to my book—Bewick’s History of British Birds: the letterpress thereof I cared little for, generally speaking; and yet there were certain introductory: Process→Quality pages that, child as I was, I could not pass quite as a blank. There were those which treat of the haunts: Process→Entity of sea-fowl; of “the solitary rocks and promontories”: Projected→Qualifier by them only inhabited; of the coast of Norway, studded with isles from its southern extremity, the Lindeness, or Naze, to the North Cape—

“Where the Northern Ocean, in vast whirls: Process→Entity, boils round the naked, melancholy isles of farthest Thule; and the Atlantic surge: Process→Entity pours in among the stormy Hebrides.”:

Nor could I pass unnoticed the suggestion: Process→Entity of the bleak shores of Lapland, Siberia, Spitzbergen, Nova Zembla, Inceland, Greenland, with “the vast sweep: Process→Entity of the Arctic Zone, and those forlorn regions of dreary space,—that reservoir of frost and snow, where firm fields of ice, the accumulation: Process→Entity of centuries of winters, glazed in Alpine heights above heights, surround the pole, and concentrate the multiplied rigours of extreme cold.”:

Of these death-white realms I formed an idea of my own: shadowy, like all the half-comprehended notions that float dim through children’s brains, but strangely impressive. The words in these introductory pages connected themselves with the succeeding vignettes, and gave significance to the rock standing up alone in a sea of billow and spray; to the broken: Process→Quality boat stranded on a desolate coast; to the cold and ghastly moon glancing through bars of cloud at a wreck: Process→Entity just sinking.

I cannot tell what sentiment haunted the quite solitary churchyard, with its inscribed Process→Quality headstone; its gate, its two trees, its low horizon, girdled by a broken: Process→Quality wall, and its newly-risen: Process→Quality crescent, attesting the hour of eventide.

The two ships becalmed on a topid sea, I believed to be marine phantoms.

The fiend pinning down the thief’s pack behind him, I passed over quickly: it was an object of terror.

So was the black horned: Process→Quality thing seated aloof on a rock, surveying a distant crowd surrounding a gallows.

Each picture told a story; mysterious often to my undeveloped understanding and imperfect feelings, yet ever profoundly interesting: as interesting as the tales Bessie sometimes narrated on winter evenings, when she chanced to be in good humour; and when, having brought her ironing-table to the nursery hearth, she allowed us to sit about it, and while she got up Mrs. Reed’s lace frills, and crimped her nightcap borders, fed our eager attention: Process→Entity with passages of love and adventure taken from old fairy tales and
other ballads; or (as at a later period I discovered) from the pages of Pamela, and Henry, Earl of Moreland.

With Bewick on my knee, I was then happy: happy at least in my way. I feared nothing but interruption: Process→Entity and that came too soon. The breakfast-room door opened.

“Boh! Madam Mope!” cried the voice of John Reed; then he paused: he found the room apparently empty.

“Where the dickens is she!” he continued. “Lizzy! Georgy! (calling to his sisters) Joan is not here: tell mama she is run out into the rain: Process→Entity—bad animal!”

“It is well I drew the curtain,” thought I; and I wished fervently he might not discover my hiding-place: nor would John Reed have found it out himself; for he was not quick either of vision: Process→Entity or conception: Process→Entity; but Eliza just put her head in at the door, and said at once—

“She is in the window-seat, to be sure, Jack.”

And I came out immediately, for I trembled at the idea of being dragged forth by the said Jack: Relator→Circumstance.

“What do you want?” I asked, with awkward diffidence.

“Say, ‘What do you want, Master Reed?’”: Projected→Participant was the answer. “I want you to come here;” and seating himself in an arm-chair, he intimated by a gesture: Process→Entity that I was to approach and stand before him.

John Reed was a schoolboy of fourteen years old; four years older than I, for I was but ten: large and stout for his age, with a dingy and unwholesome skin; thick lineaments in a spacious visage, heavy limbs and large extremities: Process→Qualifier. He gorged himself habitually at table: Relator→Circumstance, which made him bilious, and gave him: Relator→Process a dim and bleared eye and flabby cheeks. He ought now to have been at school; but his mama had taken him home for a month or two, “on account of his delicate health”: Relator→Circumstance; Projected→Participant. Mr. Miles, the master, affirmed that he would do very well if he had fewer cakes and sweetmeats sent him from home; but the mother’s heart turned from an opinion so harsh, and inclined rather to the more refined: Process→Quality idea that John’s kallowness: Quality→Entity was owing to over-application: Process→Entity and, perhaps, to pining after home: Projected→Qualifier.

John had not much affection: Process→Entity for his mother and sisters, and an antipathy: Process→Entity to me. He bullied and punished me; not two or three times in the week, nor once or twice in the day, but continually: every nerve I had feared him, and every morsel of flesh in my bones shrank when he came near. There were moments when I was bewildered by the terror he inspired: Process→Qualifier, because I had no appeal: Process→Entity whatever against either his menaces: Process→Entity or his inflictions: Process→Entity; the servants did not like to offend their young master by taking my part against him, and Mrs. Reed was blind and deaf on the subject: she never saw him strike or heard him abuse me,
though he did both now and then in her very presence; (while she was present) β clause→Circumstance, more frequently, however, behind her back.

Habitually obedient to John, I came up to his chair: he spent some three minutes in thrusting out his tongue at me as far as he could without damaging the roots: I knew he would soon strike, and while dreading the blow: Process→Entity, I mused on the disgusting and ugly appearance of him who would presently deal it: Projected→Circumstance. I wonder if he read that notion in my face; for, all at once, without speaking, he struck suddenly and strongly. I tottered, and on regaining my equilibrium: Relator→Minor Process? retired back a step: Process→Entity or two from his chair.

“That is for your impudence: Quality→Entity in answering mama awhile since: Relator→Circumstance,” said he, “and for your sneaking: Process→Quality way of getting behind curtains: Relator→Circumstance, and for the look you had in your eyes two minutes since: Relator→Circumstance, you rat!”

Accustomed to John Reed’s abuse: Process→Entity, I never had an idea: Process→Entity of replying to it; my care was how to endure the blow: Process→Entity which would certainly follow: Relator→Process the insult: Process→Entity.

“What were you doing behind the curtain?” he asked.

“I was reading.”

“Show the book.”

I returned to the window and fetched it thence.

“You have no business to take our books: you are a dependent: Quality→Entity, mama says; you have no money; your father left you none; you ought to beg, and not to live here with gentlemen’s children like us, and eat the same meals we do, and wear clothes at our mama’s expense. Now, I’ll teach you to rummage my bookshelves: for they are mine; all the house belongs to me, or will do in a few years. Go and stand by the door, out of the way of the mirror and the windows.”

I did so, not at first aware what was his intention: Process→Entity, but when I saw him lift and poise the book and stand in act to hurl it, I instinctively started aside with a cry of alarm: Process→Circumstance?: not soon enough, however; the volume was flung, it hit me, and I fell, striking my head against the door and cutting it. The cut bled, the pain was sharp: my terror had passed its climax: Process→Entity; other feelings: Process→Entity succeeded.

“Wicked and cruel boy!” I said. “You are like a murderer—you are like a slave-driver—you are like the Roman emperors!”

I had read Goldsmith’s History of Rome, and had formed my opinion of Nero, Caligula, etc. Also I had drawn parallels in silence, which I never thought thus to have declared aloud.

“What! What!” he cried. “Did she say that to me? Did you hear her, Eliza and Georgiana? Won’t I tell mama? But first—“
He ran headlong at me: I felt him grasp my hair and my shoulder: he had closed with a desperate thing. I really saw in him a tyrant, a murderer. I felt a drop of blood from my head trickle down my neck, and was sensible of somewhat pungent suffering: these sensations for the time predominated: and I received him in frantic sort. I don’t very well know what I did with my hands, but he called me “Rat! Rat!” and bellowed out aloud. Aid was near him: Eliza and Georgiana had run for Mrs. Reed, who was gone upstairs: she now came upon the scene, followed by Bessie and her maid Abbot. We were parted: I heard the words—

“Dear! Dear! What a fury to fly at Master John!”

“Did ever anybody see such a picture of passion!”

Then Mrs. Reed subjoined—

“Take her away to the red-room, and lock her in there.” Four hands were immediately laid upon me, and I was borne upstairs.

* 

I resisted all the way: a new thing for me, and a circumstance which greatly strengthened the bad opinion Bessie and Miss Abbot were disposed: (inclination) to entertain of me. The fact is, I was a trifle beside myself; or rather out of myself, as the French would say: I was conscious that a moment’s mutiny had already rendered me liable to strange penalties: and like any other rebel slave, I felt resolved: (would), in my desperation, to go all lengths.

“Hold her arms, Miss Abbot: she’s like a mad cat.”

“For shame! For shame!” cried the lady’s maid. “What shocking conduct, Miss Eyre, to strike a young gentleman, your benefactress’s son! Your young master.”

“Master! How is he my master? Am I a servant?”

“No; you are less than a servant, for you do nothing for your keep. There, sit down, and think over your wickedness.”

They had got me by this time into the apartment indicated by Mrs. Reed, and had thrust me upon a stool: was to rise from it like a spring; their two pairs of hand arrested me instantly.

“If you don’t sit still, you must be tied down,” said Bessie. “Miss Abbot, lend me your garters; she would break mine directly.”

Miss Abbot turned to divest a stout leg of the necessary ligature: and the additional ignominy it inferred, took a little of the excitement out of me.

“Don’t take them off,” I cried; “I will not stir.”
In guarantee: Process→Entity whereof β clause (in order to) → Circumstance, I attached myself to my seat by my hands: (using) Process→Participant: Circumstance.

“Mind you don’t,” said Bessie; and when she had ascertained that I was really subsiding, she loosened her hold: Process→Entity of me; then she and Miss Abbot stood with folded: Process→Quality arms, looking darkly and doubtfully on my face, as incredulous: Process→Quality of my sanity: Quality→Entity.

“She never did so before,” at last said Bessie, turning to the Abigail.

“But it was always in her,” was the reply. “I’ve told Missis often my opinion about the child, and Missis agreed with me. She’s an underhand little thing: I never saw a girl of her age with so much cover.”

Bessie answered not; but ere long, addressing me, she said—“You ought to be aware, Miss, that you are under obligations: Process/Quality→Entity to Mrs. Reed: she keeps you: if she were to turn you off, you would have to go to the poorhouse.”

I had nothing to say to these words: they were not new to me: my very first recollections: Process→Entity of existence: Process→Entity included hints: Process→Entity of the same kind. This reproach: Process→Entity of my dependence: Quality→Entity had become a vague sing-song: Process→Entity in my ear: very painful and crushing, but only half intelligible. Miss Abbot joined in—

“And you ought not to think yourself on an equality: Quality→Entity with the Misses Reed and Master Reed, because Missis kindly allows you to be brought up with them. They will have a great deal of money, and you will have none: it is your place to be humble, and to try to make yourself agreeable to them.”

“What we tell you is for your good,” added Bessie, in no harsh voice, “you should try to be useful and pleasant, then, perhaps, you would have a home here; but if you become passionate and rude, Missis will send you away, I am sure.”

“Besides,” said Miss Abbot, “God will punish her: He might strike her dead in the midst of her tantrums: Process→Entity (while) Relator→Circumstance and then where would she go? Come, Bessie, we will leave her: I wouldn’t have her heart for anything. Say your prayers, Miss Eyre, when you are by yourself; for if you don’t repent, something bad might be permitted to come down the chimney and fetch you away.”

They went, shutting the door, and locking it behind them.

The red-room was a square chamber, very seldom slept in, I might say never, indeed, unless when a chance influx: Process→Entity of visitors at Gateshead Hall rendered: Relator→Process? it necessary to turn to account all the accommodation: Process→Entity it contained: yet it was one of the largest and stateliest chambers in the mansion. A bed supported on massive pillars of mahogany, hung with curtains of deep red damask, stood out like a tabernacle in the center; the two large windows, with their blinds always drawn down, were half shrouded in festoons and falls of similar drapery; the carpet was red; the table at the foot of the bed was covered with a crimson cloth; the walls were a soft fawn colour with a blush of pink in it; the wardrobe, the toilet-table, the chairs were of darkly polished mahogany. Out of these deep surrounding...
shades rose high, and glared white, the piled-up mattresses and pillows of the bed, spread with a snowy Marseilles counterpane. Scarcely less prominent was an ample cushioned easy-chair near the head of the bed, also white, with a footstool before it; and looking, as I thought, like a pale throne.

This room was chill, because it seldom had a fire; it was silent, because remote from the nursery and kitchen; solemn, because it was known to be so seldom entered. The house-maid alone came here on Saturdays, to wipe from the mirrors and the furniture a week’s quiet dust: and Mrs. Reed herself, at far intervals, visited it to review the contents of a certain secret drawer in the wardrobe, where she stored divers parchments, her jewel-casket, and a miniature of her deceased husband; and in those last words lies the secret of the red-room—the spell which kept it so lonely in spite of its grandeur: (although) Relator → Circumstance.

Mr. Reed had been dead nine years: it was in this chamber he breathed his last: Sequence → Process?; here lay in state; hence his coffin was borne by the undertaker’s men; and, since that day, a sense of dreary consecration had guarded it from frequent intrusion:

My seat, to which Bessie and the bitter Miss Abbot had left me riveted, was a low ottoman near the marble chimney-piece; the bed rose before me; to my right hand there was the high, dark wardrobe, with subdued, broken reflections varying the gloss of its panels; to my left were the muffled windows; a great looking-glass between them repeated the vacant majesty of the bed and room. I was not quite sure whether they had locked the door; and when I dared move, I got up and went to see. Alas! Yes: no jail was ever more secure. Returning, I had to cross before the looking-glass; my fascinated glance involuntarily exploring the depth it revealed. All looked colder and darker in that visionary hollow than in reality: and the strange little figure there gazing at me, with a white face and arms specking the gloom, and glittering eyes of fear moving where all else was still, had the effect of a real spirit: Cause → Effect = Relator. I thought it like one of the tiny phantoms, half fairy, half imp, Bessie’s evening stories represented as coming out of lone, ferny dells in moors, and appearing before the eyes of belated travelers: Projected → Qualifier. I returned to my stool.

Superstition: Quality → Entity was with me at that moment; but it was not yet her hour for complete victory: my blood was still warm; the mood of the revolted slave was still bracing me with its bitter vigour; I had to stem a rapid rush of retrospective: Relator → Quality thought: Process → Entity before I quailed to the dismal present.

All John Reed’s violent tyrannies, all his sisters’ proud indifference, all his mother’s aversions, all the servants’ partiality, turned up in my disturbed mind like a dark deposit in a turbid well. Why was I always suffering, always browbeaten, always accused, forever condemned? Why could I never please? Why was it useless to try to win anyone’s favour? Eliza, who was headstrong and selfish, was respected. Georgiana, who had a spoiled temper, a very acrid spite,
a captious and insolent carriage, was universally indulged. Her beauty: Quality → Entity, her pink cheeks and golden curls, seemed to give delight: Process → Entity to all who looked at her, and to purchase indemnity for every fault. John no-one thwarted, much less punished; though he twisted the necks of the pigeons, killed the little pea-chicks, set the dogs at the sheep, stripped the hothouse vines of their fruit, and broke the buds off the choicest plants in the conservatory: he called his mother “old girl,” too; sometimes reviled for her dark skin, similar to his own; disregarded her wishes; not unfrequently tore and spoiled her silk attire; and he was still “her own darling,” I dared commit no fault: I strove to fulfill every duty; and I was termed naughty and tiresome, sullen and sneaking, from morning to noon, and from noon to night.

My heart still ached and bled with the blow: Process → Entity and fall: Process → Entity I had received: Relator → Circumstance: no-one had reproved John for wantonly striking me: Relator → ?: and because I had turned against him to avert farther irrational violence: Process → Entity I was loaded with general approbrium: Process (reproached) → Entity.

“Unjust!—unjust!” said my reason, forced by the agonizing stimulus into precocious though transitory power: Relator → Process: and Resolve: Process/Quality → Entity, equally wrought up, instigated: Relator → Process some strange expedient: Process → Entity to achieve escape from insupportable oppression: Quality → Entity—as running away, or, if that could not be effected, never eating or drinking more, and letting myself die.

What a consternation of soul: Process (to be consternated) → Entity was mine that dreary afternoon! How all my brain was in tumult: Process (agitated) → Circumstance, and all my heart in insurrection: Process (to insurrect) → Circumstance! Yet in what darkness, what dense ignorance: Quality → Entity, was the battle fought! I could not answer the ceaseless: Adverb → Quality inward question: Process → Entity—why I thus suffered: Projected → Qualifier: now, at the distance of—I will not say how many years, I see it clearly.

I was a discord: (caused discord) in Gateshead Hall: I was like nobody there; I had nothing in harmony with Mrs. Reed or her children, or her chosen: Process → Quality vassalage. If they did not love me, in fact, as little did I love them. They were not bound to regard with affection: Quality → Entity a thing that could not sympathise with one amongst them; a heterogeneous thing, opposed to them in temperament, in capacity, in propensities; a useless thing, incapable (ability) of serving their interests, or adding to their pleasure; a noxious thing, cherishing the germs of indignation: Quality → Entity at their treatment: Process → Entity of contempt: Process → Entity of their judgment: Process → Entity. I know that had I been a sanguine, brilliant, careless, exacting, handsome, romping: Process → Quality child—though equally dependent and friendless—Mrs. Reed would have endured my presence more complacently; her children would have entertained for me more of the cordiality: Quality → Entity of fellow-feeling: Process → Entity; the servants would have been less prone to make me the scapegoat of the nursery.

Daylight began to forsake the red-room; it was past four o’clock, and the beclouded: Process → Quality afternoon was tending to drear twilight. I heard the rain still beating continuously on the
staircase window, and the wind howling in the grove behind the hall; I grew by degrees cold as a stone, and then my courage sank. My habitual mood of humiliation, self-doubt, forlorn depression, dwelt damp on the embers of my decaying ire: (causality?). All said I was wicked, and perhaps I might be so; what thought had I been but just conceiving of starving myself to death? That certainly was a crime: and was I fit to die? Or was the vault under the chancel of Gateshead Church an inviting: Quality of Mrs. Reed that she would rear and maintain me as one of her own children: Projected—Qualifier. Mrs. Reed probably considered she had kept this promise: Process to stand in the stead of a parent to a strange child she could not love, and to see an uncongenial alien permanently intruded on her own family group: Projected—Qualifier.

A singular notion dawned upon me, I doubted not—never doubted—that if Mr. Reed had been alive he would have treated me kindly; and now, as I sat looking at the white bed and overshadowed walls—occasionally also turning a fascinated eye towards the dimly gleaming: Process—Quality mirror—I began to recall what I had heard of dead men, troubled in their graves by the violation: Process—Entity of their last wishes: Process—Entity, revisiting the earth to punish the perjured and avenge the oppressed: Projected—Range: Verbiage; and I thought Mr. Reed’s spirit, harassed by the wrongs: Process—Entity of his sister’s child, might quit its abode—whether in the church vault of in the unknown world of the departed—and rise before me in this chamber. I wiped my tears and hushed my sobs: Process—Entity, fearful lest any sign of violent grief: Process—Entity might awaken: Relator—Process a preternatural voice to comfort me, or elicit: Relator—Process from the gloom some haloed: Process—Quality face, bending over me with strange pity: Process—Entity. This idea, consolatory in theory, I felt would be terrible if realized: with all my might I endeavoured to stifle it—I endeavored to be firm. Shaking my hair from my eyes, I lifted my head and tried to look boldly round the dark room; at this moment a light gleamed on the wall. Was it, I asked myself, a ray from the moon penetrating some aperture in the blind? No; moonlight was still, and this stirred; while I gazed, it glided up to the ceiling and quivered over my head. I can now conjecture readily that this streak of light: Process—Entity was, in all likelihood, a gleam: Process—Entity from a lantern carried by someone across the lawn: but then, prepared as my mind was for horror, shaken as my nerves were by agitation: Quality—Entity I thought the swift darting beam: Process—Quality was a herald: Process
heralded)→Entity of some coming: Process→Quality vision from another world. My heart beat fast, my head grew hot; a sound: Process→Entity filled my ears, which I deemed the rushing of wings: Process→Entity something seemed near me; I was oppressed, suffocated: endurance: Process→Entity broke down; I rushed to the door and shook the lock in desperate effort. Steps: Process→Entity came rushing along the outer passage; the key turned, Bessie and Abbot entered.

“Miss Eyre, are you ill?” said Bessie.

“What a dreadful noise! It went quite through me!” exclaimed Abbot.

“Take me out! Let me go into the nursery!” was my cry.

“What for? Are you hurt? Have you seen something?” again demanded Bessie.

“Oh! I saw a light, and I thought a ghost would come.” I had now got hold of Bessie’s hand, and she did not snatch it from me.

“She has screamed out on purpose,” declared Abbot, in some disgust. “And what a scream: Process→Entity! If she had been in great pain one would have excused it, but she only wanted to bring us all here: I know her naughty tricks: Process→Entity.”

“What is all this?” demanded another voice peremptorily; and Mrs. Reed came along the corridor, her cap flying wide, her gown rustling stormily. “Abbot and Bessie, I believe I gave orders: Process→Entity that Jane Eyre should be left in the red-room till I came to her myself: Projected→Verbiage.”

“Miss Jane screamed so loud, ma’am,” pleaded Bessie.

“Let her go:” Projected→Participant was the only answer. “Loose Bessie’s hand, child: you cannot succeed in getting out by these means, be assured. I abhor artifice: Process→Entity, particularly in children; it is my duty to show you that tricks: Process→Entity will not answer: you will now stay here an hour longer, and it is only on condition of perfect submission: Quality→Entity and stillness: Quality→Entity: Relator→Thing that I shall liberate you then.”

“O aunt! Have pity: Process→Entity! Forgive me! I cannot endure it—let me be punished some other way! I shall be killed if—“

“Silence! This violence: Process→Entity is all most repulsive:” and so, no doubt, she felt it. I was a precocious actress in her eyes; she sincerely looked on me as a compound of virulent passions, mean spirit, and dangerous duplicity.

Bessie and Abbot having retreated, Mrs. Reed, impatient of my now frantic anguish: Process→Entity and wild sobs: Process→Entity, abruptly thrust me back and locked me in, without further parley: Process→Entity: Clause→Circumstance. I heard her sweeping away; and soon after she was gone, I suppose I had a species of fit: Process→Entity: unconsciousness: Quality→Entity closed the scene.
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