

METAPHOR

aj. In an example cited by Halliday, "a *flood* of protests", the congruent meaning (i.e., the one with less variation in the expression of the meaning) for "They received a *flood* of protests" would be that "They received a large quantity of protests" (1994: 342). Thompson (1996: 163) gives the example, "The north is crippled with the burden of the industrial revolution...". In this case "*crippled with the burden*" is seen as the incongruent expression, while "in a difficult situation because of the effects of the industrial revolution" would be an example of a more congruent way of expressing this meaning. These two examples illustrate **metaphorical experiential** meaning. We will now look at the second type of ideational metaphor: **nominalization**.

In traditional grammar we can say that nouns represent things, adjectives the properties of things and verbs realize states and processes, adverbs the properties of processes etc. (Goatly 1997: 83). In FG, NG usually encode "things", VG usually encode "happenings". If we use NGs to encode "happenings" and/or VGs to encode "things" we are creating and using grammatical metaphor. There are several reasons why nouns referring to things can more directly evoke images than other parts of speech; however, also metaphorically used verbs can indirectly evoke imagery, as Goatly illustrates (1997: 86).

neither form – the congruent or the incongruent – is to be considered as 'better'; neither is one or the other more frequent or even more 'typical'. Actually, in some cases it is the incongruent way of saying that has become the norm. It is also true, however, that the two forms are **not** completely synonymous. As Halliday says regarding congruent and incongruent wordings, "These are plausible representations of one and the same non-linguistic 'state of affairs'...the different encodings all contribute something different to the total meaning." (1994: 344).

Material Processes more easily provoke imagery and they are often used as metaphors of mental Processes (perception, feeling and cognition). For example, in "They *were basking* in the triumphant take-over of the economy.", *basking*, which is defined as "to relax and enjoy yourself by lying in the sun" (Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners of American English, 2002), provokes more imagery than the more congruent form "*were enjoying*" would. Further examples of metaphorical wordings are discussed below.

Examples⁴:

1. Bush *pins hopes* on China (IHT, 2002)
2. US *puts heat on* UN for a tough resolution (Washington Post, reported in IHT, Oct 15, 2002)
3. Pierce *ignites* French passion (The Independent, June 9, 2000)
4. Queen Mary *keeps her head* to seize throne from Martinez (Sunday Express Sport, June 11, 2000)
5. Tempers *burn over* exact meaning of labor pact (IHT Italy Daily July 10)

Discussion:

In Example (1) the metaphorical/ incongruent use of a material Process in this newspaper headline certainly provokes more imagery than its more congruent expression would: *Bush is hoping very much that China will do something*. On the surface, in the incongruent form, we have a material Process (*pins*) with Bush as Actor. However, Bush cannot really physically *pin hope* on something or someone. *Hopes* are abstract, but in this headline they take on materiality. In the more congruent form, the participant role of Bush changes from Actor to Senser.

In Example (2) we can see how *puts heat on* is more effective than its more congruent form which would be *putting pressure on*, still incongruent however. More congruently would be *trying to convince*. *Trying to convince*, as we have seen in Section 6.7, is an extending VGC of conation whose β -verb would be considered a mental Process. The incongruent form construes the efforts of the US as greater, more intense, changes the participant role and certainly brings with it greater imagery of 'fire'.

Examples (3) and (4) both refer to Mary Pierce who won the French Open Tennis tournament in 2002, defeating 1994 Wimbledon champion Conchita Martinez. In Example (3), the congruent meaning could be interpreted as the causative: Pierce *makes* the French people (become) passionate (or excited). In this case Pierce would be an Initiator/Attributor in a VGC and the French people Carrier. In the incongruent wording, the one chosen as the headline of the article, the choice of verb – *ignites* – surely evokes greater imagery than the congruent form; *to ignite* brings the implicit imagery of fire – *to set on fire* – which we have

seen in Example 2, and which can be seen again in Example (5). In Example (4), the author's choice of expression, *keeps her head*, enriches the metaphor already established with 'Queen' and 'seize throne' more than a congruent form would, which could be *stays calm*.

GRAMMATICAL METAPHOR

Examples (6) and (7) below, provided by Halliday (1994: 347), illustrate the transitivity analysis of congruent and incongruent forms:

(6)

<u>In the evening the guests</u>	<u>ate</u>	<u>ice cream and then</u>	<u>swam</u>	<u>gently.</u>
Circ.: Time Actor	Pr.: mat.	Goal	Circ. Time Pr.: mat	Circ.: Manner

(7)

<u>The guests' supper of ice cream</u>	<u>was followed by</u>	<u>a gentle swim.</u>
NG	Pr.: rel	NG

In Example (7), we have a NG encoding a happening, which allows for the information originally expressed in two clauses to be expressed in one; we can say the information has been 'packaged' into a single clause: the two clauses have been transformed into a relational Process with circumstance as Process. These are some of the changes that have taken place as a result of the packaging of information: the Processes have been transformed into things (i) *swam gently* becomes *a gentle swim* and (ii) the happening of 'eating' and the time, *in the evening*, have become nominalized as *supper*; ~~the participants (the guests and ice cream) have become (i) a Modifier/Detector Possessive (the guests') and (ii) a Modifier/Qualifier (of ice cream)~~; the circumstance *gently* has become an Epithet, *gentle*, in the NG and the circumstance of Location: Time, *then*, has become the process, *was followed*. This Example of a Metaphor of Transitivity and its analysis by Halliday (1994: 344) illustrates two different ways of saying. Neither of the two seem completely natural. In fact a totally congruent form can seem too simplistic and a totally incongruent form can seem unnatural. As Halliday says, we "tend to operate somewhere in between these two extremes." (1994: 344). Examples (6) and (7) above illustrate the topic of the next section, **nominalization**, which is the use of NGs to refer to processes.

1. *If someone who has had little experience is also impaired by alcohol, something disastrous may happen.* (more congruent)
2. *To add alcohol impairment to the problem of inexperience is an invitation to disaster.* (more incongruent)

In the more congruent Example, (1), there are two clauses (dependent and independent, hypotactically linked in a relation of cause): the first clause is a passive material Process, with the participant role of *someone who has had little experience* as Goal and with the participant role of *alcohol* as Actor; in the second clause the participant role of the inanimate participant, *something disastrous*, is Actor.

In the more incongruent Example, (2), there is one clause with a relational Process and 2 NGs. While in Example (1) '*alcohol*' has the participant role of Actor, in Example (2) '*alcohol*' is a Classifier modifying '*impairment*', which is a **much lower ranking unit**.

Nominalization is one of the most powerful resources for creating grammatical metaphor. As we have seen above, it typically consists in the use of a nominal form to express the meaning of a process. Processes and properties are reworded metaphorically as nouns – as Things. For example:

Low installment and maintenance costs and affordable monthly rates with no interest makes our product the most advantageous.

In this example above, processes have become nouns: *installing* it and *maintaining* it, which *cost* very little, and *paying* monthly sums which are affordable, and *not paying* interest. Also the following text illustrates the use of nominalization:

Worries that interest rates will rise sooner rather than later have distracted investors from profit reports this earnings season. (IHT April 21, 2004)

In the text, there is no mention of **who** is worrying. The NG which would typically represent the participant involved in the mental Process - **who** is *worrying about the interest rates* – is missing and the process, *worrying*, has been transformed into a NG representing the *worries* themselves (that is, the product of the process). *Worries (that interest rates will rise sooner rather than later)* becomes the participant which has an effect on the other participant, *investors*. The original things (in this case the humans who were worrying) get displaced by metaphoric things (the worries themselves). Nominalization realigns the elements of a message, and the participants often become attributes in the sense of Epithets and Classifiers,

Nominalization therefore, not only takes away a 'happening' or action to be substituted by events or things, but it allows for the realignment of elements and thus a rankshifting of pieces of information. The two examples below will further illustrate this point.

Headline 1: **UN representatives found no evidence of arms in Iraq**

Headline 2: **No evidence of Iraqi arms has been found**

In the first headline, there is a participant, *UN representatives*, as Actor, a material Process (*found*), a Goal (*no evidence of arms*) and a Circumstance (*in Iraq*). In the second headline, not only is there no explicit Actor, thus no one explicitly doing anything, but *Iraq* has been rankshifted from its position in a PP as circumstance of Location: Place (*in Iraq*) to a possessive in an embedded PP in the nominal group *No evidence of Iraqi arms*.