

A Systemic Functional Study of the English Nominal Group as Grammatical Metaphor

Manliang Li

School of Foreign Languages
Inner Mongolia University
Hohhot 010021
Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region
China

Abstract

Grammatical metaphor is a crucial concept in systemic functional linguistics, and it can be investigated from experiential, interpersonal, and textual perspectives. The literature to date indicates that grammatical metaphor is mostly studied in terms of the clauses. The English nominal group is a significant grammatical unit in the English language. It has tremendously complex internal structure and various syntactic and discourse functions. This paper aims to study how the English nominal group is related to grammatical metaphor. The findings show that the English nominal group as grammatical metaphor can be investigated from the experiential perspective.

Keywords: the English nominal group, grammatical metaphor, systemic functional linguistics

1. Introduction

This paper aims to explore answers to the question: How is grammatical metaphor associated with the English nominal group as a whole and with the elements within the nominal group?

Grammatical metaphor is a concept mostly dealt with in systemic functional linguistics (SFL hereafter), and the research on this issue has been conducted in many aspects of the language issues. It is not exaggerated to say that grammatical metaphor exists practically in any different wordings that express more or less the same propositional meaning. The English nominal group is not exceptional, either, and grammatical metaphor is a significant property of the English nominal group.

Generally, grammatical metaphor in connection with the English nominal group lies in two aspects: the nominal group itself as grammatical metaphor in contrast to other kinds of units such as clauses, and the elements of the nominal group as grammatical metaphor. The present paper will deal with this concept just from these two perspectives.

At the beginning, we shall look at the definition of grammatical metaphor and the distinction between grammatical metaphor presented in our analysis and metaphor as a type of figure of speech compared with simile. This is to be followed by the brief comparison and contrast between the lexical metaphor and the grammatical metaphor. Meanwhile, the connection and the distinction between the congruent wording and the metaphorical wording are to be discussed. There follows the concept of the three types of metafunctional grammatical metaphor in SFL, the experiential grammatical metaphor, the interpersonal grammatical metaphor and the textual grammatical metaphor. From there, the discussion proceeds to the central section of this paper, which is concerned with the exploration of one type of grammatical metaphor, the experiential metaphor, relevant to the English nominal group.

2. Metaphor as a Figure of Speech

In the first place, there is great necessity to have a brief overview of the concept of metaphor as a kind of figure of speech, as it has close association with grammatical metaphor in our analysis in this chapter. Simply, figure of speech is “a word or phrase which is used for special effect, and which does not have its usual or literal meaning” (Richards, Platt & Platt, 1992/2000, p. 174). Alternatively, it is “an expression that departs from the accepted literal sense or from the normal order of words, or in which an emphasis is produced by patterns of sound” (Baldick, 1990, p. 83).

These two definitions are respectively taken from a book on linguistic terms and a book of literary terms, but they state much the same idea. To be brief, figure of speech means that we cannot comprehend a certain expression by its literal meaning.

Among the various types of figure of speech, simile and metaphor are two most common ones, together with the others that are less common. Besides, the most important and widespread figure of speech is metaphor in which “one thing, idea, or action is referred to by a word or expression normally denoting another thing, idea, or action, so as to suggest some common quality shared by the two” (Baldick, 1990, p. 134). We shall give a few examples to illustrate this concept in more details.

First, we use a very familiar example taken from Robert Burns’s poem.

O my love is like a red, red rose. (Burns, 1961, p. 126)

In this example, *my love* is compared to *a red, red rose* as *love* and *rose* share common quality of being lovely. This clause contains a simile because of the word *like*, and if it is expressed as *O my love is a red, red rose*, it contains a metaphor in which two things sharing the common quality are compared without the simile marker *like* or *as*.

Actually, the use of metaphor is widely found in many literary works, and in order to further clarify it, we take an example from another literary work, *Wolf Totem*.

As Chen Zhen looked through the telescope from his hiding place in the snow cave, he saw *the steely gaze of a Mongolian grassland wolf. The fine hairs on his body rose up like porcupine quills*..... (Jiang, 2008, p. 1)

The italicized nominal group in the first clause contains a metaphor in which the word *steely* is metaphorically used to modify *gaze*, and the word *steely* is used to indicate the ferocious and horrible characteristics of the wolf. The second clause contains a simile because of the occurrence of the simile marker *like*, and *the fine hairs* is compared to *porcupine quills*.

Metaphor as a type of figure of speech has connections with, as well as distinctions from, the concept of grammatical metaphor in SFL, and the following sections will examine them in detail. In addition, Halliday (1994/2000) broadens synecdoche and metonymy as a subtype of metaphor since metaphor, metonymy, and synecdoche are all concerned with the non-literal use of certain words.

3. Grammatical Metaphor in SFL

Hu (2000, p. 33) claims that grammatical metaphor exists together with the human language in the past, in the present and in the future “so long as men survive”. This argument suggests that grammatical metaphor is a natural phenomenon in language. According to Halliday (1994/2000), metaphor in SFL is actually lexicogrammatical metaphor rather than simply lexical metaphor. In order to explain this concept, we need to pay a visit to the relationship between language form and meaning. It is not always the case that the association between form and meaning is straightforward. Fawcett (2000, p. 197) observes that “it is not the case that a syntactic unit always corresponds in a one-to-one manner to the event or object, to which it refers, *i.e.*, to its equivalent conceptual representation in the belief system”. In other words, nominal groups congruently realize things and verbal groups happenings, but at times nominal groups are employed to express happenings. The incongruence indicates that the relationship between language meaning and form is not straightforward.

The general relationship between language form and meaning is that form is the realization of meaning. This concerns looking at the certain expression from two opposed directions. Synoptically speaking, on the one hand we observe how the same language form expresses different meanings, and on the other hand we investigate how the same meaning is realized by various forms. Actually, any option of expressions or forms must cause different meanings accordingly, and consequently it is hard to find absolutely identical meanings in this sense.

Halliday (1994/2000) sets out two main types of grammatical metaphor with regard to the English clause, the ideational metaphor and the interpersonal metaphor. Martin (1992/2004) and Thompson (1996/2000, 2004/2008) argue that the textual metaphor is also a main property of the English clause. In this section, we shall firstly examine the distinction as well as the connection between the lexical metaphor and the grammatical metaphor and then focus on the one type of metafunctional metaphor, the experiential grammatical metaphor.

3.1 Lexical Metaphor and Grammatical Metaphor

Lexical metaphor and grammatical metaphor are distinguished from each other in many aspects. Lexical metaphor deals with how a particular word is used, either literally or metaphorically. The following example in Figure 1 is an illustration of how the word *crippled* is used differently, either literally or metaphorically. Obviously, the literal meaning of this lexical item is “disabled” as in the nominal group *a crippled child*, and the metaphorical meaning is “in a difficult situation” as in the expression *crippled with the burden of the industrial revolution*. If a child is crippled, he or she cannot use his or her arms and/or legs properly, and in this sense the word *crippled* has the similar meaning to *disabled*. In other words, the item *crippled* is literally used to describe the physical state of a person.

Thus, when an enterprise, for example, is crippled with the burden of the industrial revolution, the enterprise is compared to a person. The enterprise is in a difficult situation and cannot run properly just the same way a person is crippled. To be more specific, the word *crippled* is not used to depict the physical state of a person but the actual situation of an enterprise, and therefore it is used metaphorically.

Table 1 demonstrates the distinction between the lexical metaphor and the grammatical metaphor. This table also proves that metaphor is either “variation in the use of words” (Halliday, 1994/2000, p. 341) or “variation in the expression of meanings” (ibid.). This indicates two ways of looking at the same language form, either from the top or from the bottom.

If we want to express the meaning of a clap with loud noise, the lexical metaphor and the grammatical metaphor are realized in different ways. In the respect of the lexical metaphor, the word *loudly* is used literally, while the word *thunderously* is used metaphorically as the clap just resembles the sound of a thunder. With regard to the grammatical metaphor, in contrast, the nominal group *a loud applause* is metaphorically used to express a happening, which is congruently realized by the verbal group *applauded loudly*. Evidently, the latter concerns the way the same meaning is realized by different expressions.

It was noted that the lexical metaphor here is much like metaphor as a kind of figure of speech as was stated in the preceding section of this paper. The following part will look at the expression from the opposite direction, concerning how the same meaning is expressed differently, either congruently or metaphorically. This is what we term as the grammatical metaphor, and still we take the example used by Thompson (2004/2008, p. 221), as is shown in Figure 2.

The new term *congruent* employed here is simply defined as “closer to the state of affairs in the external world” (Thompson, 2004/2008, p. 222), while metaphorical form is “the expression of a meaning through a lexico-grammatical form that originally evolved to express a different kind of meaning” (ibid., p. 223). In Figure 1, the two different expressions (or forms) denote the same meaning “in a difficult situation”. The expression *crippled with the burden of the industrial revolution* does not meet people’s general expectation, and thus it is regarded as the metaphorical wording.

To sum up, the lexical metaphor is a subtype of grammatical metaphor, and the aim is to see how the same word is used, either literally or metaphorically. Contrastively, grammatical metaphor is to explore how the same meaning is realized, either congruently or metaphorically, instead of examining how a particular word is used. Furthermore, the appropriate use and identification of the grammatical metaphor may help us to understand and use language more properly. The section right below will present more discussion of the congruent and the metaphorical wording in SFL.

3.2 Congruent Wording vs. Metaphorical Wording

The above section provided a brief glance at the grammatical metaphor in SFL, and this section will concentrate on the characteristics of the grammatical metaphor in practice. As to this point, Halliday (1994/2000), Halliday & Matthiessen (1999/2008, 2004), and Thompson (1996/2000, 2004/2008) put forward detailed arguments, which will be summarized very briefly here. Halliday (1985, p. 322) argues that “part of knowing a language is to know what is the most typical ‘unmarked’ way of saying a thing”. In our understanding, the unmarked way is, in a sense, the congruent wording, and the marked way would be the metaphorical wording.

First, the concept of the congruent wording and the metaphorical wording are just a matter of degree, and thus it is not proper to say that a particular expression is either totally congruent or totally metaphorical in delivering more or less the same meaning.

Rather, it is more appropriate to state that this expression is more or less congruent or metaphorical than another one. The two concepts do not have a clear-cut distinction and we are not always operating the two extremes but the intermediate ground between them. Table 2 shows the sense of congruence and metaphor as a matter of degree.

Second, any choice means differently. When we state that the congruent and the metaphorical wordings are different ways of expressing more or less the same propositional meaning, the word *same* here indicates a concept of relativity, for both the congruent wording and the metaphorical wording are “independent realizations, but share a certain core of meaning” (Huang, 2000a, p. 35). It is more appropriate to say that they have the core of meaning than to say that they are expressing the same meaning, because any choice may have different meanings in a certain sense.

Third, neither the congruent wording nor the metaphorical wording is inherently better or worse than the other side, and meanwhile, neither of them is more frequent or normal than the other. Congruence and metaphor simply have different functions and are suitable for specific registers or different contexts in practice. For instance, *in a difficult situation because of the effects of the industrial revolution* is a common denoting, whereas *crippled with the burden of the industrial revolution* is used in registers that are more formal.

3.3 Experiential Grammatical Metaphor

People use language to do different things. In other words, language has different functions, which are termed as metafunctions in SFL. Consequently, grammatical metaphor is connected with the three metafunctions and can be subdivided into the experiential, the interpersonal, and the textual metaphors. Halliday (1994/2000) discusses two types of metafunctional grammatical metaphor, the ideational and the interpersonal metaphor, the former including the Transitivity metaphor and the latter including the Mood and Modality metaphor. Thompson (1996/2000, 2004/2008) and Martin (1992/2004) prove the existence of the textual grammatical metaphor as a significant property of the English clause. This section will briefly look at the experiential metaphor with examples.

The experiential metaphor concerns itself with the transference of participants and processes in the semantic perspective. Specifically, one process can be metaphorized as another process, and accordingly the functional roles of every element in the transitivity structure experience changes of various kinds. As any semantic configuration must be realized at the lexicogrammatical level, or in other words, any meaning is always realized through various forms, the transference is realized at the level of lexicogrammar. In this sense, the experiential metaphor is concerned with the transference of the function between the nominal group and the verbal group. In the following examples, (1a) and (2a) are the congruent forms while (1b) and (2b) are the corresponding metaphorical expressions.

Example 1:

(1a) They arrived at the summit on the fifth day.

(1b) The fifth day saw them at the summit. (Halliday, 1994/2000, p. 343)

Example 2:

(2a) Great changes took place in Guangzhou in 1980.

(2b) 1980 saw great changes in Guangzhou. (Huang, 2000b, p. F33)

Table 3 and Table 4 are the functional analyses of the two examples. Obviously, these two examples have the identical structure. The congruent expressions are realized by the Material Process, but the metaphorical ones are by the Mental Process. Accordingly, the participant roles of those elements in the Material Process also change. The two nominal groups, *the fifth day* and *1980*, which function as the Complement of the prepositional phrase in the congruent expression, become the Senser in the Mental Process, which realizes the metaphorical expression. Likewise, the two Actors in the Material Process, *they* and *great changes*, turn into the Phenomenon in the Mental Process. The Circumstance of Place *at the summit* remains the same function in both Processes.

According to Halliday (1994/2000, p. 352), nominalization is “the single most powerful resource for creating grammatical metaphor”. Simply speaking, nominalization refers to the grammatical process of forming nominal groups from other groups, usually from verbal groups or adjectival groups. Congruently, the Process is realized by verbal groups, and the property of things by adjectives or adjectival groups, while metaphorically both the Process and the property of things are realized by nominal groups instead.

To be more specific, the verbal group and the adjectival group do not function as the Process and the Attribute. Rather, they are nominalized and thus function as the Thing in the nominal group. Naturally, however, when nominalization occurs, certain information in the original structure may lose meantime.

In terms of the metafunctional metaphor, nominalization belongs to the experiential metaphor, which will be analyzed through Example 3.

Example 3:

(3a) Writing comes at the same time as towns develop.

(3b) The coming of writing is associated with the development of towns.

(Thompson, 1996/2000, p. 168)

Admittedly, nominalization is a very complicated process, and the example cited here is a very simple one to help us to have a general view of this phenomenon. Example (3b) is the nominalized version of the example (3a) because of the two nominalized expressions *the coming of writing* and *the development of towns*. Table 5 and Table 6 are the detailed analyses of these two examples.

The analyses in the above two tables indicate that this example is different from those in Example (1) and Example (2), which are concerned with the transference of the Process. Unquestionably, in the transitivity structure, the Process is the central element, and at the corresponding lexicogrammatical level the verbal group is the core element in the clause. The example (3a) contains two clauses, or two Processes, which are realized by two verbal groups, *comes* and *develop*.

Distinctively, the transference in Example (3) does not simply concern the transference of Process. The second clause, *as towns develop*, in (3a) functions as the Qualifier of the nominal group *the same time*, and in both of the clauses *writing* and *towns* function as the Actor in the Material Process. In (3b), both the two Processes are transferred into the Thing of the nominal group. In addition, the two Actors function as the Thing in the nominal group, which serves as the Range in the prepositional phrase where the preposition functions as the Minor Process.

4. The English Nominal Group as Experiential Grammatical Metaphor

The above sections examined the basic contents of grammatical metaphor in SFL, and they are fundamentally based on the English clause. The present section is devoted to explore the relationship between grammatical metaphor and the English nominal group, and the exploration is to be done from the experiential perspective.

According to Halliday (1994/2000), the basic experiential structure of the English nominal group consists of the obligatory Thing and the other optional elements such as Deictic, Numerative, Epithet, Classifier and Qualifier. It is hard to identify the congruent wording and the metaphorical wording among these elements. However, the discussion in the above sections indicated that the nominal group has a close connection with grammatical metaphor, especially with the experiential metaphor. On the one hand, the nominal group participates in the transference of the Process in the transitivity system. It was illustrated in Table 3 and Table 4 that when the Material Process is transferred into the Mental Process, it is the nominal group embedded in the prepositional phrase that becomes the Senser and it is another nominal group functioning as the Actor that turns into the Phenomenon. The simple reason is that the nominal group in English serves as the Participant and as a consequence it has the irreplaceable position in the process of transference between the congruent wording and the metaphorical wording.

The even more obvious illustration is the process of nominalization as a type of experiential metaphor. Nominalization concerns itself with the process during which the element of the verbal group or the adjectival group changes into the element of the nominal group. If we take the nominal group *the arrival of the train* for an example, we find that the corresponding congruent expression would be realized by a clause *the train arrived*. The transitivity is realized by a Material Process, which is realized again by a verbal group, *arrived*. In the nominal group, the Head of the nominal group *arrival* is nominalized from the verbal group *arrive*, and the element embedded in the Qualifier of the nominal group is realized by the Actor *the train* in the Process. On the basis of our analysis, the nominal group is more metaphorical and the clause is more congruent when they are describing the Event. In this sense, nominalization is a typical example in which the English nominal group functions as grammatical metaphor.

On the other hand, however, nominalization as a typical type of experiential grammatical metaphor is far from the whole story. In other words, the nominal group as grammatical metaphor has many more complex situations than nominalization. Halliday (1994/2000, p. 351) argues that “the nominal group is the primary resource used by the grammar for packing in lexical items at high density”. This argument suggests that the nominal group can accommodate the information that must be conveyed in many relevant clauses.

Example 7 below is to investigate how the nominal group is related to grammatical metaphor. The examples from (7a) to (7e) are combined into the clause in (7f).

Example 7:

(7a) The girl is Mary Smith.

(7b) The girl is tall.

(7c) The girl was standing in the corner.

(7d) You waved to the girl when you entered.

(7e) The girl became angry because you knocked over her glass.

(10.7f) *The tall girl standing in the corner who became angry because you knocked over her glass after you waved to her when you entered* is Mary Smith.

(Quirk *et al.*, 1985, p. 1238)

Among these examples, (7a), (7b) and (7c) are three simple clauses describing the property, the name and the height, and the state of the girl. The first two clauses are realized by the Relational Process, and the third is by the Behavioral Process. In these three clauses, the nominal group *the girl* functions as the Subject. Examples in (7c) and (7d) are two clause complexes, each consisting of a dominant clause and a dependent clause, and the nominal group *the girl* functions respectively as the Complement in the prepositional phrase and the Subject of the dominant clause.

Different from the five ones, (7f) is actually a simple clause, and the basic structure is *The girl is Mary Smith*, having the identical structure as that of (7a). The italicized part in (7f) is a nominal group in which *girl* is the Head, *the tall* being the Premodifier, and the other elements being the Qualifier. The complicated Qualifier is a paratactic clause complex that consists of a non-finite clause, *standing in the corner*, and a finite relative clause introduced by the relative item *who*; this relative clause is a hypotactic clause complex composed of a dominant clause, *who became angry*, and a dependent clause introduced by the hypotactic conjunction *because*; this dependent clause is also a hypotactic clause complex made up of a dominant clause, *you knocked over her glass*, and a dependent clause connected by the hypotactic conjunction *after*; this dependent clause is again a clause complex containing a dominant clause, *you waved to her*, and another dependent clause *when you entered*. This simple clause has a very complicated embedding, and the following analysis reveals the logical relationships among the elements within the Qualifier of the nominal group.

(*The tall girl*) ||| *standing in the corner* || *who became angry* | *because you*

1 2á 2â

knocked over her glass | *after you waved to her* | *when you entered* ||| (is Mary Smith)

2â á 2â â

The clauses and the clause complexes from (7a) to (7e) play different new roles in the clause (7f). The information realized in the two clauses (7b and 7c) and the two clause complexes (7d and 7e) is now packed into the complicated nominal group in (7f). This nominal group is more metaphorical than those clauses and clause complexes in expressing the identical propositional meaning. In other words, the nominal group is grammatical metaphor compared with the other expressions.

If the above example has a sense of being created by the grammarians to serve the purpose of explaining the language phenomenon of this type, the following examples are taken from the real texts. We shall discuss them to see how the grammatical metaphor is relevant to the English nominal group. These three examples are taken from the very beginning of the three different versions of the same literary work by Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*. Example (8a) is from the original version, and the other two examples (8b) and (8c) are from the two simplified versions.

Example 8:

(8a) It is *a truth universally acknowledged* that *a single man in possession of a good fortune* must in want of a wife. (Austen, 2003a, p. 1)

(8b) Everyone knows that a single man with a large fortune needs a wife. (Austen, 2003b, p. 1)

(8c) It is well known throughout the world that a single man wants to marry a wife, especially if he is rich and successful. (Austen, 2004, p. 1)

We do not have the necessity to analyze the complexity of the clause or clause complex structure in the three examples. Rather, we just focus on the two complicated nominal groups italicized in the original version and see how they are reworded in the two simplified versions. The information conveyed by the nominal group, *a truth universally acknowledged*, is expressed by two clauses in the two simplified versions, *everyone knows* and *it is well known throughout the world*. This nominal group consists of a Deictic *a*, a Thing *truth*, and a Qualifier realized by a non-finite clause *universally acknowledged*. Comparatively speaking, the nominal group is more metaphorical than the two clauses simply because an Event is congruently realized by a clause. Congruently, the nominal group is supposed to realize a Thing.

The other nominal group in the original version, *a single man in possession of a good fortune*, is substituted by another nominal group with similar structure, *a single man with a large fortune*, and a nominal group, *a single man*, plus a clause, *especially if he is rich and successful*. For the moment, we shall not discuss the degree of congruence of the two nominal groups. Identical to the case of the first nominal group we have just elaborated above, the two nominal groups are more metaphorical than the third version in which the same propositional meaning is expressed by a nominal group plus a clause.

The simplified version uses clauses to express the meaning that is originally expressed by nominal groups because it may intend to deal with the state closer to the external world and thus to make it more easily understood. In other words, the simplified version is supposed to be oriented to the children or the beginners of English language, and therefore the congruent wording is preferred.

To sum up, the nominal group functions as a type of grammatical metaphor compared with the clause in expressing an Event. An Event is typically realized by a clause, and a Thing by a nominal group. In our terms here, an Event is congruently realized by the clause and metaphorically by a nominal group. In fact, this kind of grammatical metaphor belongs to the experiential metaphor.

5. Summary and Conclusion

This paper investigated the connection between the grammatical metaphor and the English nominal group from the experiential perspective with regard to the experiential metafunction in SFL, the experiential grammatical metaphor. The beginning section was concerned with the connection as well as the distinction between several pairs of closely related concepts: metaphor as a type of figure of speech and grammatical metaphor in SFL, the lexical metaphor and the grammatical metaphor, and the congruent wording and the metaphorical wording. In what follows, we gave a brief overview of the basic concepts of the experiential grammatical metaphors in SFL. These principles are mainly oriented at the English clause, but we then conducted an exploratory analysis of the English nominal group as grammatical metaphor from the three perspectives.

The conclusions can be summarized as follows: (1) When there are various options to realize the same propositional meaning, grammatical metaphor finds its place, and this is true to the English nominal group. Besides, the English nominal group as grammatical metaphor can be explored in the experiential perspective. (2) In the aspect of the experiential grammatical metaphor, the English nominal group experiences active participation in the process of grammatical metaphor concerning the English clause. Furthermore, the English nominal group can metaphorically realize the Process, which is congruently realized by the verbal group. In addition, the English nominal group functions as the experiential grammatical metaphor compared with other grammatical units especially clauses in expressing the same meaning. (3) In view of the tremendous complexity of the English nominal group in terms of its internal structure and its syntactic functions, the present paper has only dealt with a very small part of its connection with grammatical metaphor. In other words, the English nominal group as grammatical metaphor can be explored from other perspectives.

References

Austen, J. (2003a). *Pride and Prejudice*. Shanghai: World Publishing Corporation.
 Austen, J. (2003b). *Pride and Prejudice* (Retold by Joan Macintosh). Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
 Austen, J. (2004). *Pride and Prejudice* (Adapted by Wheatley Bernstein). Beijing: Aviation Industry Press.
 Baldick, C. (1990). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 Burns, R. (1961). O my love is like a red, red rose. In O. Williams, 1961. *The Golden Treasury of the Best Songs and Lyrical Poems*. New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc.
 Fawcett, R. P. (2000). *A Theory of Syntax for Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
 Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (1st edition). London: Arnold.
 Halliday, M. A. K. (1994/2000). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd edition). London: Arnold. / Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
 Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen C. M. I. M. (1999/2008). *Construing Experience through Meaning: A Language-based Approach to Cognition*. London: Continuum. / Beijing: World Publishing Corporation.
 Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd edition). London: Arnold.
 Hu, Z. L. (2000). The Role of Process and Nominalization in Grammatical Metaphor. In G. W. Huang, and Z. Y. Wang (eds.), *Discourse and Language Functions*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 26-33.
 Huang, G. W. (2000a). Cleft Sentences as Grammatical Metaphors. In G. W. Huang, and Z. Y. Wang (eds.), *Discourse and Language Functions*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 34-41.
 Huang, G. W. (2000b). Daodu (“Guidance to Reading”). In G. Thompson, 1996/2000. *Introducing Functional Grammar* (1st edition). London: Arnold. / Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, F13-F48.
 Jiang, R. (2008). *Wolf Totem*. (H. Goldblatt, Trans.). New York: The Penguin Press.
 Martin, J. R. (1992/2004). *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. / Beijing: Peking University Press.
 Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
 Richards, J. C., Platt J. & Platt H. (1992/2000). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman. / Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
 Thompson, G. (1996/2000). *Introducing Functional Grammar* (1st edition). London: Arnold. / Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
 Thompson, G. (2004/2008.) *Introducing Functional Grammar* (2nd edition). London: Arnold. / Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Figures and Tables

= ‘disabled’ = ‘in a difficult situation’		meaning
		wording
crippled		
e.g. a crippled child e.g. crippled with the burden of the industrial revolution		
literal use	metaphorical use	

Figure 1: Literal and Metaphorical Meanings of a Wording (Thompson, 2004/2008, P. 221)

‘in a difficult situation’		meaning
		wording
= in a difficult situation because of the effects of the industrial revolution	= crippled with the burden of the industrial revolution	
congruent wording	metaphorical wording	

Figure 2: Congruent and Metaphorical Wordings of the Same Meaning (1)

Table 1: Distinction between Lexical Metaphor and Grammatical Metaphor

clap + loud noise			
(a) lexical metaphor		(b) grammatical metaphor	
① ↘	② ↘	① ↘	② ↘
applauded loudly	applauded thunderously	applauded loudly	a loud applause

(Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999/2008, p. 232)

Table 2: Congruent and Metaphorical Expressions as a Matter of Degree

<i>a crippled child</i>	<i>a disabled child</i>	<i>a child who cannot use his arms and legs properly</i>
more metaphorical	← ----- more congruent ----- →	

Table 3: Analysis of the Congruent Expression

<i>They</i>	<i>arrived</i>	<i>at the summit</i>	<i>on the fifth day.</i>
<i>Great changes</i>	<i>took place</i>	<i>in Guangzhou</i>	<i>in 1980.</i>
Actor	Process: Material	Circumstance: Place	Circumstance: Time

Table 4: Analysis of the Metaphorical Expression

<i>The fifth day</i>	<i>saw</i>	<i>them</i>	<i>at the summit.</i>
<i>1980</i>	<i>saw</i>	<i>great changes</i>	<i>in Guangzhou.</i>
Senser	Process: Mental	Phenomenon	Circumstance: Place

Table 5: Analysis of a Clause Complex without Nominalization

Writing	comes	at	the	same	time	as	towns	develop.
nominal group	verbal group	prepositional phrase						
Actor	Process: Material	Circumstance: Time						
		Process	Range		Deictic	Deictic	Thing	Qualifier
							Circumstance	Actor
								Process: Material

Table 6: Analysis of Nominalization as Grammatical Metaphor

The	coming	of writing	is associated	with	the	development	of	towns.
nominal group			verbal group	prepositional phrase				
Carrier			Process:	Attribute				
Deic.	Thing	Qualifier		Relational	Pro.	Range		Qualifier
		Pro	Range			Deic.	Thing	Pro.
			Thing					Range
								Thing

(Deic. = Deictic; Pro. = Process)