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ABSTRACT

Grammatical Metaphor refers to a set of lexico-grammatical choices offered by a language to create formality of expression and pithiness. Firstly, this linguistic feature was discussed by Halliday in 1985 who classified one of its types -the Ideational Grammatical Metaphor (IGM) into 13 types and regarded it as a scientific or academic discourse characteristic. The IGM phenomenon is now considered central in SFL (Systemic Functional Linguistics)-inspired language teaching and significant for translators in understanding the Metafunctional meanings across SL (Source Language) or TL (Target Language). However, this worthwhile linguistic phenomenon has been understudied in the context of Pakistani languages. This work studies the Saraiki language for its identification and deployment in different English and Saraiki registers. The study follows the SFL Grammatical Metaphor Theory of Halliday (1998; 1999; 2006) as a theoretical framework and Content analysis as a tool for the identification and categorization of IGMs. The text consisted of the undergraduate course books of Saraiki and English, and its sample is delimited to 15 excerpts from both languages. The research results in the identification of all thirteen IGM categories in Saraiki, as in English; while regarding the IGM deployment in different registers of both languages, it is observed that the extent of IGM usage in Saraiki written text (1.14 per Clause) is greater than in English (0.83 per Clause), and academic text of both languages is found to have more instances of Ideational Grammatical Metaphors than the works of fiction in these languages. The study contributes to the body of research on Grammatical Metaphor and SFL-inspired comparative studies on Indo-Aryan languages of the world.
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Introduction

This work analyses the Saraiki language to ascertain different categories of Grammatical Metaphor. GM is a feature of human languages that creates richness, brevity, and syntactic maturity in the text. The use of grammatical metaphors enhances a language user’s ability to create formal expressions and suggest a plethora of choices in any linguistic context. Thompson (2014) suggests that GM has the potential to create meaning extension in any language, while Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) assert that the presence of GMs in the text is the sign of an “advanced level command” of the language user. Velázquez-Mendoza, (2015) in her study also affirms that the higher frequency of Grammatical Metaphors in a text correlates with the linguistic maturity of language-user. Grammatical metaphor usage is therefore considered a sign of linguistic competence (Xue-Feng, 2010).

GM was first highlighted by Halliday (1985, as mentioned in Yang, 2008; 2011; Devrim, 2015b; Xuan, & Chen, 2019) who regarded it as a device for creating the metaphorical variants of grammatical constructions, i.e. the nominalization of a verbal clause (Ideational Grammatical Metaphor) and alternate expressions of Modality and Mood (Interpersonal Grammatical Metaphors). Ideational GMs represent Field, and Interpersonal GMs reflect Tenor (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014); hence, together they form two main sub-groups of grammatical metaphors (Taverniers, 2003; 2004; Memari, 2016; Saragih, 2017).

IGMs (formed by Nominalization) also contribute to the lexical density of the text, by creating a kind of “Packed grammar” (when speech-like clause-complex changes to either a lexically dense clause or a complex noun phrase, as explained by Farreira (2016) see, Fig.1, for example. This process happens specifically in a discourse that is scientific, academic, or formal (Thompson, 1996; as stated in To & Mahboob, 2018). Hence, the presence of the IGM feature in a language also implies that the text is lexically dense and semantically complex (Palumbo, 2008; Kaneso, 2016; Farreira, 2016; To & Mahboob, 2018). Studying the IGM feature is also significant for the translators in understanding the “Metafunctional modes of meaning” (Caffarel et al., 2004) across SL or TL. However, this worthwhile linguistic phenomenon has been understudied in the context of Pakistani languages. The present work, therefore, intends to study the Saraiki language to identify the types of Ideational Grammatical Metaphors (IGMs), i.e., 13 types in total, a concise introduction of which is as follows:

Types of Ideational Grammatical Metaphors

Ideational Grammatical Metaphor is mainly categorized into Experiential Grammatical Metaphors (Metaphors of Transitivity) and Logical Grammatical Metaphors (Derewianka, 2003; Devrim, 2015; Kaneso, 2016; Saragih, 2017; He & Yang, 2018). Experiential IGMs are formed by the Nominalization of processes (verbs) and adjectives, while Logical IGMs are formed either by Nominalization or
verticalization of the conjunctive elements (Martin, 1992, as cited in Devrim, 2015; Kaneso, 2016).

In total, thirteen types of IGMs have been identified in the English language until now, by the theorists of SFL. These categories have been discussed in Halliday (1998), Halliday & Matthiessen (1999), Halliday & Matthiessen (2004), and have also been studied by Yang, 2008; Hu, 2015; Devrim, 2015; Ferreira, 2016; Kaneso, 2016; Saragih et al., 2017, etc., in detail.

Fig. 1: Shows instances of “Packed grammar” because of IGM formation in the written register (adapted from, Ferreira, 2016, pg. 129)

The formation processes of IGMs:

The formation of IGMs, according to Halliday (1998) & Yang (2008), involves two types of grammatical movements, i.e., ‘one in rank, and the other in the structural configuration’. The structural configuration takes place either by a morphological process or by lexical reformulation/substitution of a congruent form with its agnate form (which may belong to another grammatical class). The processes which take part in the IGM structural configuration, have been explained below:

Nominalization

In the process of Nominalization, nouns are formed from verbs, adverbs, adjectives, and conjunctions either through the morphological processes of derivation, for instance, ‘development’ from ‘to develop’; or by converting the verbs into gerunds; or by agnation, for instance, ‘work’ or ‘working’ class from ‘to work’; or by replacing a word with another lexical item, for instance, ‘proximity’ instead of “nearby”. Biagi (1993, as mentioned in Juznic, 2012) explained that
Experiential IGM is a type of Grammatical Metaphor, which is the “reduction of the role of a verb in favor of the noun”. So, Nominalization, after the ‘re-mapping between semantics and grammar’ (in the words of Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, Ryshina-Pankova, 2015 & Devrim, 2015) becomes a Grammatical Metaphor, when a Nominalized expression (explaining an entire situation as an entity) is realized through a phrase instead of a whole clause.

For instance, see the example given (by Martin & Rose, 2008, p.43, as cited in Shibata, 2013):

“

“We reached the precise results because we experimented carefully.”
“Our careful experimentation led to the precise results”.

It’s clear from the rephrased second sentence of the above example, which shows the change of a whole verbal expression (we experimented carefully) into a noun phrase (our careful experimentation) that this phenomenon has created a shorter expression. Such Nominalizations are mainly recognized as IGMs and are regarded as the metaphorical realizations of processes (verbs), qualities (adjectives), and logical relators (conjunctive elements, etc.).

**Verbalization**

Some IGM types are formed when a semantic shift takes place towards the ‘Process’. Such as when the function of a ‘Logical/Causal Relator’ is performed by a process/verb (IGM Type-9), for instance, ‘whereas’ is replaced by ‘contrasts with’, or ‘then’ is substituted with ‘follows’ -Verbalization. Another similar possibility is when a ‘Circumstance’ (adverbial expression) is realized by a ‘Process’ (IGM Type-8), such as ‘instead of’ is substituted with ‘replaces’, or ‘be about’ with ‘concerns’ (Derewianka, 1995). Some SFL theorists refer to this type of semantic choice phenomenon where a semantic category is substituted with a verb, as ‘Verbalization’.

**Lexical reformulation**

Sometimes, IGMs appear not because of a morphological process, but because they come into existence merely due to the replacement with the agnate forms. For instance, sometimes, ‘because’ is substituted with ‘cause’ or ‘will/must’ is replaced by ‘necessary’. This process needs the re-alignment or lexical reformulation of almost all clausal elements.
Table 1: The categories of IGMs adapted from Halliday (1998), Halliday & Matthiessen (1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Grammatical Class Shifts in the Formation of IGMs</th>
<th>Type of Semantic-Shift during the formation of IGMs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type-1</td>
<td>Adjective – Noun</td>
<td>Quality -Thing/Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-2</td>
<td>Verb – Noun</td>
<td>Process - Thing/Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-3</td>
<td>Prep. Phrase - Noun</td>
<td>Circumstance - Thing/Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-4</td>
<td>Conjunction - Noun</td>
<td>Relator - Thing/Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-5</td>
<td>Verb – Adjective</td>
<td>Process - Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-6</td>
<td>Prep. P/Adverb – Adjective</td>
<td>Circumstance -Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-7</td>
<td>Conjunction - Adjective</td>
<td>Logical Relator -Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-8</td>
<td>Prep. Phrase – Verb</td>
<td>Circumstance - Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-9</td>
<td>Conjunction - Verb</td>
<td>Logical Relator -Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-10</td>
<td>Conj. /Prep. P –Adverb /Conjunctive adjunct</td>
<td>Logical Relator - Circumstance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-11</td>
<td>+Noun</td>
<td>Empty Category - Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-12</td>
<td>+Verb</td>
<td>Empty Category - Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-13</td>
<td>Expansion of Noun</td>
<td>Thing - Expansion of Thing as its quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (1) displays the types of Ideational Grammatical Metaphors and the change
of grammatical classes during IGM formation and the semantic shifts, i.e., congruent-incongruent (metaphorical) forms.

**Suggested models for IGM formation**

On the formation process of IGMs (for GM theorization), two models have been observed in different studies by SFL scholars (as stated in Devrim, 2015), Stratal Model, when Grammatical Metaphor is formed due to the ‘Stratal tension’ between two language strata, i.e. Semantics and Lexico-grammar (Halliday & Martin, 1993, as mentioned in Devrim, 2015; Derewianka, 2003), and Semantic Model, which is an extension of the previous, states that IGM appears as a ‘Semantic junction’ between two semantic categories (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999; Yang, 2008; Devrim, 2015). Most of the studies have based their identification and categorization of the GMs on either of these two models, while a few have also employed an integration of these models.

**The deployment of IGMs in different language genres/registers**

Ideational Grammatical Metaphor (IGM) is a sophisticated realization of wording a process as compared to a congruent one and usually is not a feature of our colloquial speech. Instead, it is typical of academic, political, scientific, historical, and legal texts. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) regard IGM –as a dominant lexico-grammatical feature of academic and scientific text. The reason for this is the characteristics of “objectification and abstraction” (to show the existence of a process or quality as an abstract notion/thing) which are typical of these types of registers, and therefore, this “functional objective” is mainly achieved by using the linguistic construct of IGM (Kazemian, 2014., p. 212). Halliday and Matthiessen also explain that there is a significant variation among different genres of the same language for the frequencies of GMs and their types (as cited in Juznic, 2012). Hence, the quantitative investigation of the IGMs’ presence in different genres across languages can be a measure of the linguistic development and formality of expression, which will shed light on understanding the nature of those registers and the differences/similarities of the languages on this basis.

The review of literature shows that many researchers have emphasized giving IGM awareness to second language teachers and learners and have suggested incorporating this linguistic device in English/foreign language instruction, academic writing, and heritage language teaching (Colombi, 2009; Baratta, 2010; Xue-Feng, 2010; Devrim, 2012; 2015b; Ryshina-pankova, 2010; 2015; Ortega, 2008; Ezeifeka, 2015; Velázquez-Mendoza, 2015; Kaneso, 2016; Ferreira, 2016; Nys, 2019; Liardét & Black, 2020; To et al., 2020). In many studies, the teaching-learning practice of IGM has been found an effective strategy to not only improve but also assess the linguistic competence of advanced-level students
(Zhang, 2018; Thomas & To, 2016; Liardet, 2013; 2015). Hence, it is a phenomenon worth studying, specifically in such a bilingual/multilingual academic context, where achieving English language competence is mandatory for the speakers of all indigenous languages; and where translation across the local languages and English, and curriculum designing using English as a medium of instruction are notable practices. However, in the Pakistani context, grammatical metaphor has been the least researched linguistic phenomenon, not only for our mainstream but also for our regional languages. Therefore, this study aims to explore a Pakistani indigenous language Saraiki to investigate the types of IGM, it has. Secondly, because the feature of Ideational Grammatical Metaphor is said to be predominantly present in the academic and scientific registers (Juznic, 2012; Ryshina-Pankova, 2015) and is not a feature of casual discourse, the present study uses Saraiki fiction and academic registers to provide evidence of IGM usage in this language.

**Research questions**

1. How many types of Ideational Grammatical Metaphors (IGMs) are present in the Saraiki language in comparison to English?

2. What is the ratio of IGM deployment in different Saraiki registers in contrast to the comparable English Registers?

**Research methodology**

For the identification and categorization of IGMs in the Saraiki language, and to check their deployment across different registers of both languages, this study has followed the SFL theory of Ideational Grammatical Metaphor developed by Halliday and his co-theorists (1998; 1999). Moreover, the studies of Hu (2015) and Ferreira (2016) have been benchmarked as criteria for IGM identification and their categorization (Table.1 and Fig. 2) in the Saraiki language. Having used Content Analysis as a tool, the research design employed in this study is descriptive-qualitative, along with some quantification. The important points considered during the analysis are as follows:

- The study has considered those terminologies (for coding different patterns of IGMs) that have been previously used in the following studies: Yang, 2008; Devrim, 2015; Hu (2015); Ferreira, 2016; Saragih et. al, 2017, etc.

- The study was delimited to find the main 13 categories of IGMs only.

- Secondly, the IGMs’ deployment in different registers of both languages has been calculated in percentage, using the formula:

  \[ \text{Total Percentage in the text type} = \frac{\text{No of IGMs}}{\text{No of words}} \times 100 \]
The Frequency of IGM instances per clause has been calculated using the formula: Frequency per clause = \( \frac{\text{No of IGM instances}}{\text{No of Clauses}} \)

Moreover, this theory-driven study is thorough, but manual analysis of clauses taken from the written text, and no corpus or software has been used for the identification of IGMs in the Saraiki language.

Data sample

The purposive sampling technique has been used in the study, and the language sample is the textbooks of Saraiki, being taught to under-graduates at Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan, from which one thousand declarative clauses (from 15 excerpts) have been analyzed. Textbooks (digital and hard copies) have been selected as the study sample due to their containing the formal written register authored by acclaimed writers in the form of different genres, such as historical genre, travel memoirs, summaries of academic research, and pure fiction, etc. Secondly, the textbooks, in the words of Hyland (2009) “convey the values and ideologies of a particular academic culture” (as cited in Kaneso, 2016), and may represent more than one register of a language.

Fig. 2. Criteria of IGM identification (Hu, 2015). *Journal of World Languages.* pg. 55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realization forms</th>
<th>Corresponding types</th>
<th>Corresponding lexicogrammatical expressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. quality → entity</td>
<td>adjective → noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. process → entity</td>
<td>verb → noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. circumstances → entity</td>
<td>preposition → noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. relator → entity</td>
<td>conjunction → noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. [zero] → entity</td>
<td>[zero] → noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectivization</td>
<td>5. process → quality</td>
<td>verb → adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. circumstance → quality</td>
<td>adverb/prep. phrase → adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. relator → quality</td>
<td>conjunction → adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. head → modifier</td>
<td>noun → adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbalization</td>
<td>8. circumstance → process</td>
<td>be/go + preposition → verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. relator → process</td>
<td>conjunction + verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. [zero] → process</td>
<td>[zero] → verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositionalization</td>
<td>10. relator → circumstance</td>
<td>Conjunction + prep. prep/rel group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (2) explains the grammatical processes that take place during the formation of different IGM types.

Analysis

This section discusses the identification of each IGM type in Saraiki and the deployment of these types in Saraiki and English, after analyzing the text (written excerpts) from both languages. The study has resulted in the identification of all main categories of Ideational Grammatical Metaphors in the Saraiki text. For explanation, examples of every IGM type have been given in both forms, the
congruent and incongruent/ metaphorical (alone as well as being used in sentences)

**IGM Type-1 [Quality- Thing/Entity]**

IGM Type-1 is a de-adjectival nominalization, involving the process of morphological derivation in English. Such as, unstable – instability etc. This IGM seems to be frequently found in Saraiki, for example,

- جھڑا – جھڑی
- aalsi – alas
- lazy – laziness
- jharalu – jhera
- quarrelsome – quarrel

For more explanation, a few examples of grammatical metaphors (used in sentences) from the text have been written and analyzed here (changed to their congruent forms by the native speakers).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRK</th>
<th>[Metaphorical] / Incongruent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeendi hik khas vajaan een Tal Wasseib di tehzeebi, jughrafiyaai, tareekhi tey sab kanu wadh kraeen lisaani sanjh haee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...of which reason was the cultural, geographical, historical, and more specifically, the linguistic unification in this region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Congruent]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeendi khas vajoohaat taan ey hun jo een Tal Wasseib di tehzeeb sanjhi hai, eenda jughrafiya sanjha hai, eendi tareekh tey sub kanu wadh kraeen ithan diyan zubaana sanjhiyan hun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above example, the word **sanjh** (unification) is an IGM (type-1) which is a nominal expression formed from an adjective **sanjhi** (sanjhi/ unified) and it’s evident from the incongruent form that this IGM usage has created a kind of condensed expression as compared to the congruent expression below.
As far as the deployment of this IGM in both languages is concerned, the calculation has shown that its frequency is higher in Saraiki as compared to English, i.e., 7.6% in Saraiki Academic text as compared to 3.2% in the English Academic text, and 4.6% in Saraiki fiction as compared to 2.8% in English Fiction. So, it can be inferred from these results that Saraiki Language makes more use of Type-1 IGM [Quality-Entity] in comparison with English.

**IGM Type-2 [Process-Thing/Entity]**

This IGM is a de-verbal nominalization, and its formation takes place either through the process of morphological derivation or lexical reformulation. For example, attract-attraction and exist-existence, etc. This IGM is largely present in Saraiki, for instance,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Metaphorical]</th>
<th>[Congruent]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;- رج روونّ تے رج خوش نہیں وسیبی لوکان دی فطرت دا خاصم بنّ گیۓ&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Ey khasiyat Wasseibi lukan di fitret bun gey, jo raj runna vanjey tey raj khush thia vanjey&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Raj rovan tey raj khush theevan Wasebi lokan di fitret da khassa bun gey | Expressing extreme cheerfulness and extreme mournfulness have become the traits of the people of this region.

In the above example, the expressions *Raj rovan* (extreme mournfulness) and *raj khush theevan* (extreme cheerfulness) used in the sentences are things/entities (verbal nouns formed from two processes shown in the congruent forms) have created pithiness and a kind of formality in the written text, as opposed to completing a sentence made from three clauses.
Regarding the deployment of IGM Type-2 in the studied texts, it has been observed that the frequency of this IGM is much higher in Saraiki as compared to English, i.e., 20% in SRK (AT) as compared to 10.4% in ENG (AT) and 23.6% in SRK (F) as compared to 6.4% in ENG (F). Hence, it can be inferred from the results that the Saraiki language tends to make more Nominalized IGMs derived from Processes.

**IGM Type-3 [Circumstance-Thing/Entity]**

This type of IGM is the result of a semantic shift from a Prepositional phrase or an Adverb (Circumstance) to a noun (Thing/Entity) i.e., the ‘down-gradation of a single rank, from figure to element’ (Ferreira, 2016, pg. 153), for example, instead of – replacement. The occurrence of this IGM is also there in the Saraiki text, for example,

\[ \text{eendi bajaey} - \text{mutbadel} \]

\[ \text{een ghaloon, natijatan} - \text{asar} \]

instead of – alternate/replacement

for this reason, resultantly –

effect/consequence

| [Metaphorical] | کہانی وچ انسان دے روپا نے اووندی وچ اموال نے اثر دا فلسفيا نہ وی بینت گیا
(Mughal & Gillani, 2017) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kahani vich insaan dey ravayyan tey oondi hayaati dey pichvaal tey ajoaal dey asar da falsfiyaana vevra keta gey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This story has philosophically analyzed the impact of a person's past and present on his behaviours.

| [Congruent] | انسان دے روپا نے اووندی وچ اموال نے اثر دا فلسفيا نہ وی بینت گیا
Insaan dey ravayyan tey oondey pichvaal tey ajokey velay da kia asar theenday, een kahaani vich eenda falsfiyaana vevra keta gaey |

In the above example, the IGM type-3 - ajvaal (present) formed from the congruent expression ajokey velay (circumstance) along with another IGM (type -2) have created a kind of abstractness in the statement. Regarding the deployment of IGM Type-3 in the selected genres of both languages, it has been found that the extent of using this IGM is slightly lower in
Saraiki (Academic-Text) i.e., 1.4%, as compared to English (AT) i.e., 1.8 %, but slightly higher in Saraiki (Fiction) i.e., 3.4%, as compared to ENG (Fiction) i.e., 0.8 %.

**IGM Type-4 [L/C Relator – Entity]**

This type of IGM is formed when a Relator (conjunction) is replaced by its agnate form, i.e., by lexical reformulation into an Entity/ thing (noun). For example, in English, we have: 'so – result' or 'because – cause/ reason' etc. IGM type -4 has been found to be present in the Saraiki data, as well. for instance,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{je kar, mata} & \rightarrow \text{vajah} \\
\text{for, therefore, so as} & \rightarrow \text{if, because – cause}
\end{align*}
\]


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphorical/ Incongruent</th>
<th>Congruent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Na sirf pabandi haee, blkey kaeen baeex zaban dey istemaal da jurm saza da sabab vi haee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Na sirf pabandi haee, blkey jaden kaeex zaban istemaal keeti vendi haee, taan een jurm saangey saza vi mildi haee</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above example, the abstract noun *sabab* (cause/reason) is functioning as IGM-4, after the replacement of two causal relators *taan* (in that case) & *saangey* (due to) in congruent form, hence creating a complex but condensed expression.

For the deployment of IGM Type-4 (L Relator-Thing) in different genres of Saraiki and English, it has been observed that the extent of using this IGM is slightly higher in Saraiki, i.e., 2.2% in SRK (AT) as compared to 1% in ENG (AT), and 1.8% in SRK (F) as compared to 0.6% in ENG (F).

**IGM Type-5 [Process-Quality]**

This IGM is the result of the grammatical process of morphological derivation when a Process (verb) changes to a Quality (adjectivization). Such as
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‘to prevent –preventive’, ‘to begin – initial’ etc. in English. This category is also there in the Saraiki data, for example,

\[
\text{جہدز نّ (جہدزًا کریندا پینے) - جہد الز سے (وسدا پینے)}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{jheran (jera krainda pay) – jharalu} & \quad \text{vassan (vasda pay) – vasdi (haveli)} \\
\text{to quarrel - quarrelsome} & \quad \text{to live (is living) – a settled family/ an inhabited mansion}
\end{align*}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphorical</th>
<th>Congruent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ein terhaan medi ujri jhok ebaad thi vesi</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ein terhaan medi jhok jehri ujjer gai haee, o’ ebaad thi vesi</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mughal & Gillani, 2017. p. 23)

In the above example, the word *ujri* (deserted) is functioning as the IGM-5, a quality, replacing a whole process *ujjer gai haee* (settled) and, resulting in a condensed expression.

Regarding the deployment of IGM Type-5 [Process-Quality] in the Saraiki and English language genres under observation, it is clear from the stats that the English language makes greater use of this IGM in comparison to Saraiki. The percentage calculated after analyzing the texts is 7.2% in ENG (AT) and 2% in SRK (AT), while 11.4% in ENG (F) and 5.2% in SRK (F).

**IGM Type-6 [Circumstance-Quality]**

This IGM is either formed by morphological derivation or simply by using alternate agnate forms or by lexical reformulation of Circumstance (adverbial expressions or prep. p) into Quality (i.e., adjectivization). For example, ‘possibly – possible’ or ‘in a similar way – consistent’ etc. The instances of this IGM type were also found to be there in the Saraiki text, for example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ممکنۃ طور تے – امکانی} & \quad \text{اکھر تے، بالا خر – چھیکزی}
\end{align*}
\]
possibly – possible  
/likely/ probable  
in the end, lastly - last, final

[Metaphorical]

[Congruent]

---

(Rasoolpuri, 2010. p. 17)

*Indian Studies* dey professor apney haaliya mazmoon vich eendi ta’eed keeti ey

The professor of Indian Studies has endorsed it in his recent article.

In the above example, the word *haaliya* (recent) IGM-6, functioning as a quality has been derived from a prepositional phrase *inhaan deenhan* (circumstance) has created creating a condensed expression having greater abstractness.

After analyzing the targeted text for this IGM type, it has been found that the frequency of Type-6 is higher in the Saraiki Academic Register, as compared to the Saraiki Fiction, i.e., 7.2% in SRK (A) and 1.4% in SRK (F). While, its presence was higher in English Fiction, i.e., 7.8% than in Academic English, i.e., 3.4%.

**IGM Type-7 [Logical/Causal Relator-Quality]**

This IGM can be identified when the function of a logical/Causal Relator is performed by a quality (adjectivization). Such as ‘then – subsequent’ or ‘so - resultant’ etc. IGM type-7 is also present in Saraiki, for instance,

\[
\text{vляа, ват – sababi} \quad \text{tahu - hasil galh da}
\]

then, so – rationally, logically therefore – resultant/resulting

---

In the above example, the word *inhaan kamyabiyan* (success) IGM-7, functioning as a quality has been derived from a prepositional phrase *inhaan deenhan* (circumstance) has created creating a condensed expression having greater abstractness.

---

(Khan - a native speaker)

*Inhaan kamyabiyan vich Naseer da kia kamal, jo thaey*
In the above example, the function of a causal relator -tahoon (that’s why) is being performed by a quality (i.e., IGM-7) – sababbi (owing to) in the incongruent expression, hence, creating an abstract piece of text. This IGM-7 is a less commonly used type, and its extent of usage has been found very low in either of the languages. For instance, not a single instance of this IGM has been observed in the sample of English fiction, however, Saraiki fiction contained a few. The percentage of IGM Type-7 frequency in both languages is as follows: 0.8% in ENG (A) and 0.4% in SRK (A), while 0% in ENG (F), and 0.4% in SRK (F).

**IGM Type-8 [Circumstance-Process]**

When the function of a preposition is understood by a Process and a preposition or adverbial expression is substituted with an agnate verbal form the resulting expression is regarded as Type-8 IGM. For example, ‘instead of – replaces’, or ‘in accordance with – accompanies’ etc. (Ferreira, 2016, pg. 155). A few instances of this IGM type were also seen in the Saraiki data, e.g.,

| [Metaphorical] | Sarkaari tey quomi zaban Urdu maqami zubanain di jaah ghin gidhi |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------
| Rab sababbi thay | What’s the contribution of Naseer? Whatever success he has earned, is due to God's mercy on him (Idiomatic translation). |
| Rab da karam ha tahoon Naseer koon ey kamyabiyan millen; Naseer da apna kamal eendey vich keini | (Khan -a native speaker) |

The National and official language–Urdu took the place of regional languages.
In the above example, *jaah ghin gidhi* (took the place) - a process used in the place of a circumstance *di bjaey* (instead of) in the incongruent/metaphorical form is an example of IGM type-8; because a verbal phrase has replaced a Preposition (verbalization) to create an abstract condensed expression.

In Saraiki, it seems to be rarely used, and it has been observed that its frequency is higher in English Fiction as compared to the academic text of the English language, i.e., 3.6% in ENG (F) while 0.8% in ENG (AT), however, no significant difference has been observed between both genres of Saraiki, i.e., 0.6% in SRK (F) while 0.8% in SRK (AT). Secondly, English makes more use of this (Verbalized) IGM, as compared to Saraiki.

**IGM Type-9 [Logical/Causal Relator-Process]**

This IGM results when the function of a Logical/Causal Relator is performed by way of a process, by an agnate verbal form (Prepositionalization). Such as, ‘so – leads to’ ‘whereas – contrasts with, etc. This type has also been identified in the Saraiki text under consideration, for instance,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruent</th>
<th>سرکاری تے قومی زبان اردو مقامی زبانیں دی بجائے استعمال نہیں لگی</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarkaari tey quomi zanan Urdu maqami zubanain di bjaey istemaal theevan laggi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for English, every language was banned in that school, and the use of any other language resulted in the punishment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphorical</th>
<th>این سکول وچ انگرئی دی سوا بر زبان تے پانئیدی بینی تے کئن بینی زبان دا استعمال سزا دا سباب بندہ با</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>een School vich angrezi dey siwa her zubaan tey pabandi haee, tey kaeen baee zuban da istemaal saza da sabab banda ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Rasoolpuri, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruent</th>
<th>این سکول وچ انگرئی دی سوا بر زبان تے پانئیدی بینی تے جیبکر کونی</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>این سکول وچ انگرئی دی سوا بر زبان تے پانئیدی بینی تے جیبکر کونی</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The IGM type-9 is a process *sabab banda ha* (lead to / resulted in) doing the function of a causal relator *jeoker* /*taan* (in case / thus) and creating a kind of abstractness and conciseness as a result, in comparison to the congruent mode, in the example above, where the sentence takes on two relators and three clauses for its completion.

Regarding its deployment in Saraiki and English text, it is seen from the analysis, that English has more tendency to use this IGM as compared to Saraiki, i.e., 1.0% in ENG (A) while 0.6% in SRK (A), and 1.7% in ENG (F) while 0.4% in SRK (F).

**IGM Type-10 [Logical/Causal Relator-Circumstance]**

This IGM appears as an ‘information-rich adjunct’ (Ferreira, 2016, pg. 155) resulting from a single-rank downgrade shift (i.e., from sequence to figure) and as lexical reformulation, a Logical/Causal relator (Conjunction) is substituted with Circumstance (Adjunct). For example: ‘due to – under these conditions’ or ‘when – in times of’ etc. The instances of this IGM type have also been found in the data, for instance,

*tahun- een sangay, een kitay jaddan, taddan – oon vailay*

*therefore – for this reason, consequently when, then – at that time/in those times*

---

| SRK [Metaphorical] | Medi zidd sangay meku Saraiki mahole aaley school bheja gey  
(Malik, 2013) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRK [Congruent]</td>
<td>Mai zid krenda hum, heen kitey meku Saraiki mahole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the above example, *medi zidd sangay* (on account of/due to my doggedness) by adding circumstantial causal information (IGM type-10) has created a condensed expression as compared to the congruent one by replacing a causal relator *-heen kitey* (therefore) and merging two clauses into one.

This IGM’s frequency has been found higher in Saraiki text as compared to the English text, however, a difference has been observed regarding its deployment in the genres of both languages. English Fiction makes more use of IGM Type-10 as compared to Academic English, while its presence is higher in the Saraiki Academic Register as compared to the Saraiki Fiction. The percentage of IGM Type-10 deployment in both languages is 7.4% in SRK (A) and 6.0% in SRK (F), while 2.8% in ENG (A) and 5.4% in ENG (F).

**IGM Type-11 [Empty category - Entity]**

This IGM is the construal of experience, and appears in the form of an abstract Entity, “without a necessary congruent precedent”, in the words of Ferreira (2016, pg. 154); for example, the word ‘phenomenon’ (Ferreira, 2016, p. 152).

This IGM type have also been noticed in the Saraiki text, for instance,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>urdu_word</th>
<th>english_word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>تحقیق</td>
<td>Research/investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عشق</td>
<td>Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehqeeq</td>
<td>Ishq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قﯾﻘﺣﺗ</td>
<td>Tehqeeq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قﺷﻋ</td>
<td>Ishq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قﺷﻋ</td>
<td>Tehqeeq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Işh</td>
<td>Ishq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishq</td>
<td>Ishq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehq</td>
<td>Tehq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Metaphorical]

Faqeer ey ders daindey, jo jeeven kitey dhan dolet di edi lore nai hondi

The mystic gives the lesson that money and wealth are not very important for life/existence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>urdu_word</th>
<th>english_word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>فقیر آیہ درس دیندے ہے جو جیسے کبھی دھان دولت دی ایسی لوڑ نہیں</td>
<td>Faqeer ey ders daindey, jo jeeven kitey dhan dolet di edi lore nai hondi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بوندے</td>
<td>Faqeer ey ders daindey, jo jeeven kitey dhan dolet di edi lore nai hondi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mughal & Gillani, 2017, p. 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>urdu_word</th>
<th>english_word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shehenshah –e-Azam takhliy vich hunn...Aalem panah dey jalal tey tanhaii musallet hae</td>
<td>Shehenshah –e-Azam takhliy vich hunn...Aalem panah dey jalal tey tanhaii musallet hae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Dahir, 2017, p. 72)
The great emperor was in privacy, and solitude was dominating the splendour of His Majesty.

In the above examples, the words, *jeeven* (life/existence), *takhliy* (privacy), *tanhani* (solitude) - the IGMs type-11, are the existence of abstract entities, “without a necessary congruent precedent” in the Saraiki text. Regarding the deployment of Type-11 IGM in the text of both languages, it is interesting to note that Saraiki tends to use more abstract nouns in comparison with English. Secondly, this IGM has been more frequently found in the Academic Register, either English or Saraiki, than in Fiction, i.e., 5.8% in SRK (F), 4.8% in ENG (F), while, 5.6% in SRK (A) and 6% in ENG (A).

**IGM Type-12 [Empty category- Process]**

Like Type-11 IGM, this type is also a construal of experience, “without a congruent experiential precedent” (Ferreira, 2016, pg. 154), and it appears in the form of an Existential process. For instance, appears, seems, and occurs etc. These kinds of constructions also exist in the Saraiki language as in English. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Saraiki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nazarday</td>
<td>نظر دے</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honday</td>
<td>نہدے</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lagday</td>
<td>لگدے</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(it) looks like (it) happens (It) seems

**[Metaphorical]**

*Hik baey aalam Kooper di tehqeeq mutabiq ma’loom theendey, jo Sanskrit asal Munda toon ey lafz gidhen*

It seems from the research of another scholar –Cooper, that Sanskrit has acquired these words from the original Munda language.

**[Metaphorical]**

*Atey saakoon een jaapday, jivein asan pandheru dey naal naal turdey vadoon*

...and it appears to us as if we are walking alongside

52 | Sobia Malik
In the above examples, it’s clear that the verb phrases - *ma’loom theendey* (It seems) and *een jaapday* (it appears) are not emerging due to a rank-shift though, but contain a semantic abstractness and therefore, come into the category of IGM, type-12, according to theory.

The analysis of Saraiki and English text for the extent of using Type-12 IGM has revealed that Academic text makes greater use of this IGM as compared to Fiction. Secondly, the Saraiki language seems to be a more frequent user of this IGM type, in comparison to the English language, i.e., 46.6% in SRK (AT) and 37% in SRK (F), while 38.8% in ENG (AT) and 30% in ENG (F).

**IGM Type-13 [Expansion of Thing/Entity- Quality]**

This IGM formation comprises a minor shift within the same rank, involving the construal of an Entity/Thing as the Quality of that Entity (*Ferreira, 2016*, pg. 154); the process is called adjectivization. This IGM has been found to appear in 3-4 subcategories in English and Saraiki almost similarly. However, due to differences in the orthographic traditions of both languages, their structures seem quite specific to either of the languages. In English, the expansion of Entity takes place by using an apostrophe, or by using ‘of’, or by using a dash ‘-‘between the elements, or by adding a suffix (morpheme); for example, Pakistan’s destiny, moment of fulfilment, Communist-controlled, political decisions, etc. While in Saraiki, the expansion of Entity to Quality takes place by using diacritics (◌َِ،)، or the word (نا، ان، آی etc., which are specific to Saraiki and the related languages. This IGM has been frequently observed in the Saraiki text; a few examples are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saraiki</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tehzeeb da markaz - Centre of civilization</td>
<td>hathon khali - empty-handed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فنکارانہ اظہار</td>
<td>Fareed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیوان</td>
<td>Fareed’s (poetic) Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tehzeeb</td>
<td>Izhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیوان</td>
<td>Fareed’s (poetic) Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فنکارانہ اظہار</td>
<td>Fareed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دیوان</td>
<td>Fareed’s (poetic) Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See how the use of this IGM and its sub-types have been used in the sentences picked from the data:

"سماریکی دین پچکار اوازار
وى صحارن زبان کنو سرامپکی وچ آئین"

*(Rasoolpuri, 2010, p. 50)*
| [Congruent] | Saraiki diyan puchkaar awazan vi Saharen Zuban kanu Saraiki vich aacen |
| [Metaphorical] | The Implosive consonant sounds of Saraiki have come from the Language of Sahara. |
| [Congruent] | Musannaf likhdey, jo aagra da naa Maha-bharat dey |
| [Metaphorical] | Rizmiya vich vi mojood ey |
| [Metaphorical] | Similarly, the criticism in public meetings often becomes the incident of mutual praise and belittlement of others. |

(Chandio, 2011.p. 46)

"این طرحان أكثر محفلان و ج مجلسی تنقید ستانش دی گیت. دیگران دا نموند بُن و بندی بے" (Iqbal, 2019. p. 234)
From the above examples of IGM Type-13 from the Saraiki data (سپرمان ، سابقین بائیم ، صحراے راجپوتانہ ، مبہارت دے رزمیہ etc.), it's clear that these IGMs (in which Entities have been expanded to Qualities) are formed either by a morphemic addition/change to the Entity, or by using diacritics –Izaafat, or by using a preposition (یہ ، ہیں ، ایسے) creating a kind of relatedness for the expansion of Entity into Quality. Resultantly, a sense of abstraction and succinctness is created in the metaphorical expression as compared to the (un-packed) congruent one.

From the English data, examples of the four sub-categories of IGM Type-13 are given, i.e., by using an apostrophe (one's own circle), by a morphological change (Epicurean motto), by using a hyphen (Karachi-born), or using 'of' after the Noun for expansion (Moment of fulfilment). It's apparent from the given IGM examples and their 'unpacking' that these IGMs not only convey a sense of abstraction but also add brevity and conciseness to the written language.

Regarding the deployment of Type-13 IGM in the text of both languages, it has been observed that Saraiki makes greater use of this IGM with a considerable difference, compared to English. Secondly, the Academic text of Saraiki seems to have more instances of this IGM as compared to Fiction, while the English Academic text was found with comparatively fewer instances of type-13 IGM as compared to English Fiction. The stats are 25.6% in SRK (A) and 13.4% in SRK (F), while 6.6% in ENG (F) and 8.0% in ENG (A).

The manual analysis of textual data (consisting of 10 excerpts taken from the textbooks, which make 2000 clauses in total) for the IGM deployment, has resulted as summarized in the table below. The following stats show the difference between both languages and among different genres, regarding the number of IGM instances. The overall occurrence of IGMs has been found a little greater in SRK than in ENG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>SRK (A)</th>
<th>SRK (F)</th>
<th>ENG (F)</th>
<th>ENG (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IGM instances</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Bar graph: Displaying the percentage for the deployment of IGMs in Saraiki & English academic register

Bar graph: Displaying the percentage for the deployment of IGMs in Saraiki & English fiction
Table (3): The frequency of all IGM Types shown in the text types of both languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>IGM Categories (Halliday &amp; Matthiessen, 1999)</th>
<th>Academic Text</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>SRK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-1</td>
<td>Quality - Thing/Entity</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-2</td>
<td>Process - Thing/Entity</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-3</td>
<td>Circumstance – Entity</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-4</td>
<td>L Relator - Thing/Entity</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-5</td>
<td>Process - Quality</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-6</td>
<td>Circumstance – Quality</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-7</td>
<td>Logical Relator - Quality</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-8</td>
<td>Circumstance – Process</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-9</td>
<td>Logical Relator - Process</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-10</td>
<td>L Relator - Circumstance</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-11</td>
<td>Empty Category - Entity</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-12</td>
<td>Empty Category – Process</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-13</td>
<td>Thing – Expansion of Thing into Quality</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Extent of overall IGM usage in Saraiki Text

Total Saraiki IGMs: 1149
Total Saraiki Clauses: 1000 = 1.14 per Clause

The Extent of overall IGM usage in English Text

Total English IGMs: 833
Total English Clauses: 1000 = 0.83 per Clause
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The IGM frequency per clause in Saraiki has been found 1.14, and in English 0.83 per clause, which is greater in Saraiki fiction (13.4%) than in English fiction (8%), and greater in Saraiki Academic text (25.6%) than in English Academic text (6.6%).

Conclusion

The study has resulted in the identification of all IGM types in the written Saraiki language (which were previously recognized and discussed by SFL scholars in English and other languages). This result implies that Saraiki is a resourceful language, can manipulate grammatical constructions, and can create all those types of congruent and condensed expressions necessary to bring abstractness in writing.

It is also clear from the findings that Fiction contains comparatively fewer instances of most of the Ideational Grammatical Metaphor types in the data of both languages, which confirms the theory and previous studies (Halliday, 1998; Banks, 2003; Susinskienë, 2004; Hadidi & Farahani, 2008; Fatonah, 2014; Kazemian et al., 2013; Kazemian & Hashemi, 2014; Hao, 2020) that Ideational Grammatical Metaphor is predominantly a feature of Scientific and Academic discourse and not of Fiction.

It has also been observed that the Saraiki language is inclined to make greater use of IGMs where Nominalization (of either Verb, Adjective, Adverbial, or L/C relator) takes place, or where Expansion of entity/noun takes place (i.e., Types-1, 2, 4, 13) as compared to English. Secondly, the tendency of using IGM Type-10 (where the L/C relator is used as a Circumstance/Conjunctive Adjunct) is also greater in Saraiki (in either of the registers) as compared to English.

These results have implications in the field of Educational Linguistics, as they may help in bringing more depth to the second/foreign language pedagogy for the native speakers of this indigenous language and may facilitate studying this feature in other related Indo-Aryan languages of the region.

The study results can also be of interest to people from the field of Translation Studies because successful translation between any two languages is determined by the correct understanding of IGM, (as postulated by Yang, 2008); moreover, correct IGM translation is also a yardstick to evaluate the quality of translation; since, for translators, it is often difficult to find alternate functional translation equivalents for Grammatical Metaphors in the Target Language (Izquierdo & Borillo, 2000; Palumbo, 2008; Juznic, 2012; 2015; Subiyanto, 2016). The findings of this study also contribute to the repository of research conducted on indigenous languages within the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics.
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