

Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg, Miriam Taverniers and Louise J. Ravelli (2003) *Grammatical Metaphor: Views from systemic functional linguistics*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Pp. 453.

Reviewed by Asunción Villamil

Since the 1980s, lexical metaphor has received a great deal of attention in linguistics, especially since the breakthrough of Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors we live by* (1980). Metaphor was shown to be ubiquitous and not only a feature of crafted literary language. The interest in metaphor spread from cognitive linguistics to functional trends, resulting in Halliday's proposal of the notion of grammatical metaphor. While other schools focus on lexical aspects, Systemic Functional Linguistics focuses on the grammatical dimension and socio-functional aspects. The result of this interest is a rich body of research to which this volume contributes.

The book is a compilation of articles devoted to the study of grammatical metaphor from the perspective of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). It represents the contribution of several distinguished scholars to present the current state of grammatical metaphor theory and its more relevant fields for further research, as well as the history and definitions of grammatical metaphor and problematic issues in the study of lexico-grammatical metaphor. It consists of a preface by J.R. Martin (pp. 1–3), an introductory chapter by one of the editors, and five main parts: Grammatical metaphor: Clarification and application (Part I., p. 35), Development of metaphor in children (Part II, p. 149), Interpersonal metaphor: Enactment and positioning (Part III, p. 221), 'Metaphor' in grammar and in other modes of meaning (Part IV, p. 309) and Metaphor in metalinguistic perspectives (Part V, p. 367).

The book opens with an introductory chapter by Miriam Taverniers ("Grammatical metaphor in SFL: A historiography of the introduction and initial study of the concept", pp. 5–33) that offers a historiographic perspective on the origins and early developments of the term 'grammatical metaphor'. In a very concise and clear way the author includes a description of the term, the different types of metaphors and 'congruent' and 'non-congruent' realizations, all of them key concepts for approaching grammatical metaphor from the point of view of SFL. This provides a valuable help for those readers who are not familiar with the basic tenets of grammatical metaphor theory, while it increases their eagerness to know more about recent definitions and the evolution of the theory.

The next articles address the questions raised in the previous chapter by offering a deeper analysis of the concept of grammatical metaphor together with some of its applications. It is centred on nominalization, considered by Halliday the typical and most abundant example of grammatical metaphor (Halliday 1994:352). The first article by Louise J. Ravelli (“Renewal of connection: Integrating theory and practice in an understanding of grammatical metaphor”, pp. 37–64) gives an insight into the improvements which the theory of grammatical metaphor has received from the practical use of the concept, such as the inclusion of new types of metaphors. She provides some practical and revealing applications of metaphor in the teaching of academic writing and explores possible future developments. The revealing examples are the most remarkable contribution of the article.

The need to re-evaluate theoretical postulates is addressed by Liesbet Heyvaert in her chapter “Nominalization as grammatical metaphor: On the need for a radically systemic and metafunctional approach” (pp. 65–99). The article presents the concepts of ‘enation’ (the relationship between structures which have the same configuration) and ‘agnation’ (the relationship of a nominalization and its non-nominal equivalent), the latter already used in SFL. The author argues that a combined use of both terms would be a source of improvement for the theory of nominalization. The convincing theoretical discussion is exemplified through nominalizations construed by *-ing* and *-er* suffixes. Moreover, she advocates a study of the interpersonal component, since the focus has so far been placed on ideational metaphors.

The article by Jorge Arús Hita (“Ambiguity in grammatical metaphor: One more reason why the distinction transitive/ergative pays off”, pp. 101–126) is also devoted to nominalization but it accounts for the differences in the nominalization of ergative and transitive clauses, with a special focus on ambiguous clauses. Ambiguity (transitive) and vagueness (ergative) are shown to be key factors in these two types of nominalizations, among other features. This hypothesis is again put to the test of a corpus analysis, in this case examples gathered from newspaper headlines. Apart from the theoretical relevance of the paper, the application of these findings and the analysis of examples to second language learning and teaching are undeniable. If the previous article defended the importance of agnates, this study illustrates a practical application of this

notion (a nominalization from an ergative clause is not equivalent to that from a transitive sentence).

Nominalization is also discussed in David Banks' article ("The evolution of grammatical metaphor in scientific writing", pp. 127–147), which explores the origins of this device in scientific writing. Despite being a common feature of scientific style nowadays, it has not always been so pervasive, as becomes evident from the contrasts of articles from different periods since the beginnings of modern science in the 17th century. Apart from variation in time, scientific writing also involved typological variety. Different scientific branches, namely, biological and physical sciences, present dissimilar characteristics in their use of nominalization, especially at their beginning, due to their different pace of development. It is also taken into account how the context may have influenced the differences in the increased use of nominalizations between various branches of science. In all cases, scientific style displays an evolution towards an increased use of nominalizations.

The second part of the volume takes a radically different standpoint and concentrates on the acquisition of metaphor, from preschool children to early adolescence. The first article of this series ("The use of a metaphorical mode of meaning in early language development", by Clare Painter, pp. 151–167) is a longitudinal study of the evolution of ideational metaphor in two children. Children are reported to use lexical metaphor but also grammatical metaphor, as in the use of nominal expressions instead of a whole sentence. At an early stage of development the use of metaphor is restricted to one-word structures and the only metaphors appearing are dead metaphors copied from adult language. The earliest metaphor reported is the use of postmodifiers within the nominal group. Further examples are reported in metalanguage and abstract domains such as time. The examples show that children at very early stages (preschool years) already explore the meaning potential of a limited but existing class of grammatical metaphors. This is pushed further by exposure to written language. Although quite a number of examples are introduced as illustration, it would have been interesting to present them more exhaustively and in a more structured way for clarification.

Preschool children are also the target of Jane Torr and Alyson Simpson ("The emergence of grammatical metaphor: Literacy-oriented expressions in the everyday speech of young children", pp. 169–183). Their

longitudinal study of five children examines the expressions used by children in their exchanges with caregivers. The data is composed of spontaneous spoken language at home and is restricted to interpersonal metaphor, since no productive forms of ideational metaphor are found before five years. Metaphors are organized according to the age of the children and the result is that interpersonal metaphors become more elaborated with time, as systems of mood and transitivity expand, and are especially developed in the preschool years, particularly when children ask for goods and services. This development is related to literacy development: if children's ability to employ these linguistic resources (which are literacy-oriented expressions) is fostered, they build on a path to a successful academic development.

Beverly Derewianka discusses another longitudinal study of two children ("Grammatical metaphor in the transition to adolescence", pp. 185–219). The research is based on the analysis of written production, with some spoken examples, in contrast to the two previous articles which were limited to oral production. Drawing on previous taxonomies, an analysis of the written production is carried out, from precursors of grammatical metaphor, like devices to play with interstratal relationships, to protometaphors and finally examples akin to those of the adult system. The author provides a detailed analysis and classification of examples, in addition to a very careful and systematic organization and discussion of data. The classification allows the reader to see which types of metaphors are developed earlier. Different motivations are suggested for the use of the metaphor in each case. The earliest examples are explained in terms of 'trailer strategies', where the child ventures beyond his current ability to test the potential of the system. A dramatic increase in the use of metaphor is found to take place around age nine, also due to the influence of context, especially teacher encouragement as well as the nature of the writing tasks that the child is required to master at school. It is also revealed that although grammatical metaphor is typical from written mode, much of the experimentation is carried out at the spoken level, where there is not such a strong commitment as in the written text.

Leaving aside metaphor development, the next part aims at interpersonal metaphor and defends the view that metaphorical devices constitute a continuum. The first chapter by Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen ("Lexical metaphor and interpersonal meaning", pp. 223–255) surveys the contrast between grammatical and lexical metaphor.

Lexical metaphor has not been given too much emphasis in Systemic Functional Linguistics, as it does get in cognitive linguistics, but Simon-Vanderbergen claims that the dichotomy between both is artificial, since metaphors are used in larger configurations which include both lexical and grammatical shifts. To illustrate her point she analyses thoroughly a selection of metaphorical expressions of verbal processes from the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (1978, 1987). The connection of these grammatical metaphors with lexical aspects is highlighted before passing on to examine the advantages of that integrated analysis. She categorises the different types of interpersonal meanings that they convey (judgement, appreciation, graduation, etc). Apart from the dictionary data, she looks more closely at the actual use of the expressions *barge into (a conversation)*, *fabricate (a story)*, *plunge into (a description)* and *dish out (advice)*. This analysis supports the thesis that the motivating force behind the creation of lexicogrammatical metaphors is primarily the speaker's attitude towards the judgement of the speech event, that is, an interpersonal motivation. She concludes that lexicogrammatical metaphor can be conveniently studied in Systemic Functional Linguistics, since what were traditionally regarded as lexical metaphors can be related to basic conceptualizations of verbal processes.

The discovery of further examples of interpersonal metaphors is the objective of "The elided participant: Presenting an uncommonsense view of the researcher's role" (pp. 257–278), by Geoff Thompson. Thompson aims at pointing out strategies for eliding world participants (participants assumed to participate in the physical or mental event or state) in the clause. The participant under investigation is limited to that acting as "researcher". Drawing from a corpus of university books and academic papers he explores the following strategies: nominalization, passivization, elision of the Sensor, indexing the participant and metonymy. Discussion and conclusion sections are compared but no differences are visible. Motivations for elisions are argued to be complex, including, among others, conforming to research style conventions, impersonalising a sad event or offering controversial views. Thompson also discusses the process that the metaphor undergoes in order to be recognized by the reader and the status of the strategies commented as grammatical metaphor, as some of them are fundamentally different. He is inclined to consider them examples of grammatical metaphor but he emphasizes that the concept of metaphor has

fuzzy borders, so that some of these strategies might belong to the periphery cases.

The purpose of the following article (“Imperative readings of grammatical metaphor: A study of congruency in the imperative” by Inger Lassen, pp. 279–308) is to discuss the nature of the imperative in grammatical metaphor theory. The imperative has often been presented as a congruent realization of instructions, as well as warnings, recommendations and other speech acts. However, the author questions whether the imperative is always congruent. In order to answer this question, she first reviews and contrasts exhaustively the meanings of lexical and grammatical metaphor by applying Halliday’s theory, alongside indirect speech acts and literal utterances as presented in Searle’s Speech Act Theory. An experiment is conducted to test the status of the imperative, selecting some non-specialist native speakers to react to some extracts from professional texts, providing co-operative and non-co-operative responses, without the aid of context or background knowledge. The author analyses the ways in which the co-operative principle is flouted in the responses as well as the difficulties in suggesting non-co-operative replies; the latter are taken to be congruent since there is coincidence of form and function. The results of this sample, although limited, lead the author to look upon the imperative on a cline of metaphoricity, with lexical metaphor at the one end and grammatical metaphor at the other. The imperative is therefore claimed to be used both for metaphorical and congruent purposes.

Part IV enters a riskier and more challenging field, extending metaphor to modes of meaning other than grammar. The first suggestion by Robert Veltman is the extension of the analogy of grammatical metaphor to phonological metaphor (“Phonological metaphor”, pp. 311–335). Abundant theoretical arguments are presented concerning the nature of semiotic systems, sounds and intonation, focus, attitude, iconicity and arbitrariness, in order to argue that sounds can perform metaphorical realizations, including interpersonal and textual meanings. Furthermore, Veltman introduces a divergence from Halliday’s approach to the treatment of interpersonal metaphor: Halliday argues that interpersonal metaphor is implicitly concise and inexplicit in contrast with the explicit and transparent congruent form; however, Veltman argues that metaphorical realizations are more concise and inexplicit. Evidence is drawn from the analysis of the intonation patterns of a selection of BBC programmes. The recorded utterances are argued to be agnate with a set of (hypothetical)

more complex utterances with an unmarked intonation pattern. The metaphorical recorded utterance is simpler than the possible agnates, in that it expresses far more economically the attitudinal and propositional information transmitted.

The following article is the first to introduce the relationship between metaphor and semiosis, which constitutes the main topic of the last articles of the volume. This last part is concerned with the most abstract field of analysis so far, focusing on metalinguistics. Kay O'Halloran ("Intersemiosis in mathematics and science: Grammatical metaphor and semiotic metaphor", pp. 337–365) discusses the interaction between mathematical symbolism and visual display and the development of grammatical metaphor in scientific writing. Like David Banks' article, O'Halloran takes several examples from early research papers by Newton and Descartes, among others. From the basis of a Hallidayan description of scientific language metaphor, he compares the potential of language to configure processes and participants in comparison to mathematical symbolism. Mathematical symbolism is shown to express configurations of participants and processes as well as change and covariation; these areas being conveyed by symbolism, language evolved to provide causal explanations. Visual representation also comes into play, as it allows for the occurrence of semiotic metaphor, with a mapping from the congruent visual representation to linguistic construal. Thus, the author argues that the co-evolution of these semiotic resources - linguistic, symbolic and visual - leads to a shift in language from the concrete, in terms of entities and cause-effect explanations, to metaphorical language.

Patrick Goethals deals with the nature of language and how different trends in linguistics regard communication in "The conduit metaphor and the analysis of meaning: Peircean semiotics, cognitive grammar and systemic functional grammar" (pp. 369–389). He examines how Peircean semiotics, Cognitive Grammar (CG) and Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) tackle the CONDUIT METAPHOR and its view of communication, which suggests that linguistic meaning is restricted to building up a message that is transferred in a context which does not relate to representational meaning. The article explores the way how these different paradigms include the interactive and performative aspect of meaning which is ignored by the CONDUIT METAPHOR. After a basic description of each school and a lucid and clearly-structured comparison between

them, the author concludes that the three of them avoid the restrictions of the CONDUIT METAPHOR by including the interactive component, even though they present several discrepancies in their approach. The most basic difference lies in the fact that Peircean semiotics makes the most exhaustive categorization of ways of relating the utterance to the context, distinguishing tense and illocutionary force. This distinction is based on the contrast between indexical and symbolic signs: indexical signs identify the illocutionary force or the performative value of an utterance and indicate that there is a speech act taking place, operating on the performative level, whereas symbolic signs (as tense) build up propositional content and therefore work on the content level. In contrast, CG and SFG subsume them under the same category, within the grounding of the utterance and the mood component, respectively. Goethals defends the contrast between these two types of grounding and suggests that the differences between the three schools stem from different concerns about meaning.

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and cognitivism are again contrasted in the following article (“Grammatical metaphor as a cognitive construct”, pp. 391–415). Randalm Holme looks at the possibility of combining systemic and cognitive accounts of metaphor through the example of metaphors that express cause-and-effect. Both descriptions give different emphasis to the description of the same phenomenon: while in SFL the focus lies on the structures that arise from interaction and social context, Cognitive Linguistics studies how properties of cognition affect those structures. In this sense they can be regarded as complementary, inasmuch as they provide different perspectives of analysis: more general and related to cognition vs. more concrete and related to the context of communication. In a search for a path common to both schools, it is suggested that the SFL notion of congruency can be regarded as a metalinguistic device to explain metaphorical meaning and not as an example of a natural use of language, since metaphor is argued to be natural to the mind. Moreover, the author proposes that SFL can cover some weaknesses of cognitive analysis, for instance how a given conceptual metaphor comes to take a given textual form. SFL concepts of genre and register can show how context may affect the preference of one metaphor over another.

The last article by Robin Melrose (“‘Having things both ways’: Grammatical metaphor in a systemic-functional model of language”, pp. 417–442) discusses nominalization and its dual nature. It takes as a starting

point Halliday's description of its features as field- or wave-like: nominalization in discourse functions as a thing but it is also a textual strategy (wave-like). This function as a textual strategy is extended by Melrose to further purposes: nominalization is claimed to be a powerful device to condense information about the context of situation and of culture. For example, nominalization can be used as a way of showing that you have mastered a discipline or that the reader and writer belong to the same social group. In order to account for these extended functions, SFL views on semantics, genre and ideology are taken into consideration. Abundant theoretical evidence and references are presented to support these claims, together with practical analyses of some extracts from a piece of academic writing. The author stresses the fact that nominalization is an open and dynamic device, between the topological and typological poles.

After summarizing the main points of the papers of which the volume consists, let us now turn to some concluding evaluative remarks. The volume will prove of special interest for researchers within the field of metaphor studies, either from systemic linguistics or other trends, as it offers a wide and updated view of the area. Not only does it offer a review of past research in metaphor, but it also opens a way for new and stimulating paths of investigation, especially in the last sections of the volume. The book is notable not just because it provides a rich amount of theoretical background, but also because of the excellent corpus studies which serve as the perfect counterpart for more theoretical approaches. Another significant aspect is the possibilities of communication and cooperation with other frameworks which are discovered throughout the book. This is especially relevant in the case of cognitive accounts (cf. Holme 2003: 391–415 or Simon-Vandenberghe 2003: 223–255). However, most of the articles are restricted to the application of the systemic approach to metaphor, which can prove satisfying but less innovative than the inclusion of other trends. Similarly, nominalization and ideational metaphors are the subject of many of the papers, which demonstrates the weight of early proposals by Halliday. The reader may find the originality of those articles that depart from these central topics more appealing. Especially rewarding are those articles which, like Veltman's (2003: 311–335), bring about controversial modifications of some theoretical aspects. Furthermore, some of the introductions of the articles are somewhat repetitive, as most of them make references to the same theoretical

background, but it should be remembered that this is due to the independent nature of each of the articles, common in compilations.

The above critical remarks are not meant to question in any way the overall quality of the book. On the whole, this work represents a valuable contribution to the advance of the research in grammatical metaphor and a comprehensive overview of the field. It is an extremely worthy attempt at condensing in a unitary compilation the large amount of research that has been and is currently being carried out in metaphor studies.

References

- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd Edition. London: Edward Arnold.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (1980) *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago / London: The University of Chicago Press.

Contact information:

Asunción Villamil Touriño
Escuela Oficial de Idiomas de Las Rozas
Camino del Caño 2, 28230 Madrid. Spain
e-mail: asunvt@yahoo.es