Grammatical Metaphor Representation and Transgrammatical Semantic Domains in the Narrative Text Entitled "True Friends"

Maria Olivia Christina Sianipar
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Nommensen HKBP University, Medan, Indonesia

Abstract: *Metafunction is very useful to explain grammatical metaphor.Metaphor is not only an escape expression of vocabulary, butalso an escape means of expression for grammatical forms. Grammatical metaphor provides a new angle of view: vocabularies possess metaphorical function; grammatical forms possess metaphorical characteristic. On how to raise theoretical level for practical application, English learners and translators should adopt a more positive attitude. Grammatical metaphor commonly used in texts of science, technology and academics, The researcher choose a narrative text titled 'True Friends' which is a short interesting story that has a good lesson, that makes easy to understand about the topic of this research that is knowledge or competence of Grammatical Metaphor and Transgrammatical Semantic in Text which is written in English. This way, people will be more interesting to read the text because they can understand and translate the text into Bahasa Indonesia easier. In this case, the reader can translate this narrative text entitled 'True Friends' into Bahasa Indonesia interestingly and easier.*
Keywords: *Grammatical metaphor, metafunction, narrative, transgrammatical semantic domain,*

I. INTRODUCTION

Grammatical metaphor is studied in the viewpoint of linguistic Metafunctions in systematic-functional linguistics.The basic idea in systematic-functional linguistics is thatlanguage is a kind of instrument to maintain socialcommunication among people and lots of functions exist in thelanguage. From the view of language evolution, Hallidayconcluded that language functions can be generalized into threeMeta functions: ideational function, interpersonal function andtextual function.

The first and most obvious idea that we can transfer from metaphor to the so-called Grammatical metaphor is the variation in meaning. Indeed, the variation in grammatical form is the metaphorical extension of variations in meaning. On the other hand, the variation is produced, in the context of traditional rhetoric, from a natural meaning to an unnatural or improper meaning. Similarly, in grammatical metaphor, the variation is achieved from the natural relation between grammar and reality to an incongruent or unnatural form of expression. Something else that can be transferred from source to target domain is the mode of production of this variation. From the lexical point of view, metaphor is a word used for something resembling that which it usually refers to; then, the sort of variation in grammatical metaphor is based on resemblance of meaning between a natural grammatical form and an incongruent grammatical form.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Grammatical Metaphor.

Halliday's approach relies on the fact that there are different choices of grammatical structures, congruent and incongruent ones. *Grammatical metaphor* is conceived as an incongruent realization of a given semantic configuration in the lexico grammar (1985: 321).
The concept of *grammatical metaphor* depends on the idea that there is a direct line of form to meaning to experience (1985: xix). As far as Halliday is concerned the lexico grammar is a natural symbolic system. This means "...that both the general kinds of grammatical pattern that have evolved in language, and the specific manifestations of each kind, bear a natural relation to the meanings they have evolved to express" (Halliday 1985: xviii). There is a link between the categories of the grammar and reality. That is, grammar and reality are related in a congruent manner. This means that the direct line of form to meaning to experience is maintained intact. The different grammatical functions assigned to the participants in the clause structure express the different roles of these parts in respect to the whole and, for the selection in meaning; there will be a natural sequence of steps leading towards its realization.

But there also exists grammatical metaphor "whereby meanings may be cross-coded, phenomena represented by categories other than those that evolved to represent them" (Halliday 1985: xviii). In other words, for any semantic configuration there is one congruent expression and a set of metaphoric variants or incongruent expressions. This variation or incongruent expression is understood as a "selection of words that is different from that which is in some sense typical or unmarked" (Halliday 1985: 20).

2.2 The Category of Grammatical Metaphor.

Systematic-functional linguists divided grammatical metaphor into three types: ideational metaphor, interpersonal metaphor and textual metaphor according to the classification of metafunctions. Aiming at the phenomenon that metaphor appears mainly in the lexical level and there is a deviation to semantic rules, Halliday believed that in language expression, the grammar form can be chosen freely to express a same meaning. He called this "grammatical metaphor" and made detailed analysis with the help of Metafunctional theories in systematic-functional grammar.

A. Ideational Metaphor.

Halliday divided grammatical metaphor into two groups: ideational metaphor and interpersonal metaphor. One semantic process is presented by another process, other functional elements like participants and circumstances change correspondingly. This is called ideational metaphor. Ideational metaphor can be further divided into three levels: (1) the transition of process, which means in the transitivity system, each process can be Meta phorized mutually; (2) the transition of functional components, which means the mutual metaphorization of different elements in the process; (3) the transition of vocabulary and grammar, which means that the transferred functional components are meta phorized from established forms to other forms in the lexical and grammatical levels.

B. Interpersonal Metaphor.

Interpersonal metaphor can be divided into metaphor of modality and metaphor of mood. The former means that in the system of interpersonal function, clauses without modal elements are chosen to express certain modality instead of modal verbs and modal adverbs in the process of forming interpersonal metaphor. The latter means that the speaker employs a kind of mood which has crossing relation with the given verbal function. The consistent principle is violated, which means that declarative function is not always expressed by indicative mood; interrogative function is not always expressed by interrogative mood; injunctive function is not always expressed by imperative mood.

C. Textual Metaphor.

Halliday had discussed ideational metaphor and interpersonal metaphor in detail in his book An Introduction to Functional Grammar, but he never mentioned textual metaphor in it. The doubt of whether textual metaphor exists is raised. According to lots of researches by many linguists, there is textual metaphor in language indeed.

2.3 Narrative Text.

According to Rebecca (2003), a narrative text is a text, which relates a series of logically, and chronologically related events that are caused or experienced by factors. She, furthermore, states that a key to comprehending a narrative is a sense of plot, of theme, of characters, and of events, and of how they relate. In addition, Anderson and Anderson (2003a) explain that a narrative is a text that tells a story and, in doing so, entertains the audience. It has character, setting, and action. The characters, the setting, and the problem of the narrative are usually introduced in the beginning. The problem reaches its high point in the middle. The ending resolves the problem.

The verb to narrate means to tell, to give all account of. Writing narrative is really just putting what happen to somebody on paper (Widayati, 2003). In narrative, the incidents that make up the story are usually told in the order in which they would really happen. A narrative can tell what happens in a matter of minutes or years. A narrative text usually contains with features of characters, main character(s), setting, time, problem(s), solution, and a plot (structure). Some authors use plot, structure, or rhetorical step interchangeably.

According to Diana (2003), a narrative text usually has description of features and rhetorical steps. The generic structures of a narrative comprise three points: orientation, complication, and resolution. The other two components as proposed by Anderson and Anderson (2003b) are just variations or can even be considered as optional since the two are not differently essentially. Narrative text may take many kinds or forms. They are myths, fairytales, aboriginals, science, fiction, dreaming stories/bedtime stories, and romance novels. Among those forms, fairy tales or fairy story has lots of sub-forms: fairies, goblins, elves, trolls, giants, and talking animals.

The purpose of a narrative, other than providing entertainment, can be to make the audience think about an issue, teach them a lesson, or excite their emotions. In well-written narration, a writer uses insight, creativity, drama, suspense, humor, or fantasy to create a central theme or impression. The details all work together to develop an identifiable story line that is easy to follow and paraphrase.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This research is a form of a detailed examination of one setting a single subject, a single depository of documents or one particular even which is stated by Bogdan & Biklen (1992: 62) as a case study. However, the descriptive qualitative research as stated by Miles, Huberman & Saldana (2014) is applied in analyzing the data.

IV. DATA AND RESULT OF RESEARCH

4.1 Data

'TRUE FRIENDS'

Once upon a time, there were two close friends who were walking through the forest together. They knew that anything dangerous can happen any time in the forest. So they promised each other that they would always be together in any case of danger.

Suddenly, they saw a large bear getting closer toward them. One of them climbed a nearby tree at once. But unfortunately the other one did not know how to climb up the tree. So being led by his common sense, he lay down on the ground breathless and pretended to be a dead man.

The bear came near the one who was lying on the ground. It smelt in his ears, and slowly left the place because the bears do not want to touch the dead creatures. After that, the friend on the tree came down and asked his friend that was on the ground, "Friend, what did the bear whisper into your ears?" The other friend replied, "Just now the bear advised me not to believe a false friend.

4.2 Results of the Research

Table 1. Congruent Representation of Semantics in Grammar

NO	Meaning (Semantics)	Function and Grammar	Examples
1.	Thing	Participant/noun	**Two close friends** who were walking through the forest together. **The bear** came.
2.	Activity	Process/verb	Two close friends who **were walking** through the forest together. They **knew** that anything dangerous can happen. **They promised** each other. The bear **came.**

NO	Meaning (Semantics)	Function and Grammar	Examples
			The one who **was lying** on the ground. He **pretended** to be a dead man. It **smelt** in his ears and slowly **left** the place. The friend on the tree **came** down and **asked** his friend. What did the bear **whisper** into your ears? The other one **replied** The bear **advised** me not **to believe** a false friend.
3.	Quality	Attribute/adjective	To be a **dead** man. Not to believe a **false** friend. A **large** bear.
4.	Relation	Parataxis - hypotaxis/ conjunction	**But** unfortunately the other one did not know how to climb up the tree. **After that**, the friend on the tree came down. It slowly left the place because the bears do not want to touch the dead creatures.
5.	Location, Manner	Circumstance/adverb	One of them climbed a nearby tree **at once.** It **slowly** left the place
6.	Comment, Judgment	Modality	They knew that anything dangerous **can** happen any time in the forest.
7.	Position	Preposition	The bear came near the one who was lying **on the ground.** The friend was **on the tree.**

NO	Meaning (Semantics)	Function and Grammar	Examples
			His friend that was **on the ground.** He lay down **on the ground.**

Table 2. Metaphorical Representation

No.	Class Metaphor	Function Metaphor	Examples
1	Adjective →Noun	Quality → Thing	close → closeness dangerous → danger together → togetherness false → falseness dead → death
2a	Verb → Noun	Process → Thing	walk→ walking know → knowing promise→ promise pretend → pretence come →coming
2b	Tense/Phase Verb (adverb) → noun	Aspect of Process → Thing	Getting closer toward them → come near them. So being led by his common sense → he realizes
2c	Modality Verb (adverb) → Noun	Modality of Process → Thing	can / could → possibility will/would → possibility
2d	Verb + Adverb/Prep. phrase → noun	Process + Circumstance → Thing	They promised each other → commitment
3	Preposition → Noun	Minor Process → Thing	so → accompaniment so → effect
4	Conjunction → Noun	Realtor → Thing	so → cause
5a	Verb → Adjective	Process → Quality	a large bear **getting closer** toward them

No.	Class Metaphor	Function Metaphor	Examples
5b	Tense/Phase Verb (Adverb) → Adjective	Aspect of Process → Quality	was lying on the ground→ **being lying** on the ground
5c	Modality Verb (Adverb)→ (Adjective)	Modality of process → Quality	can → probable will → probable
6a	Adverb → Adjective	Manner Circumstance → Quality	left slowly→ slowly left
7	Conjunction → Adjective	Relator → Quality	but → in contrary and → additional
8	Conjunction → Verb	Relator → Process	and → complement, then → follow so → lead to
9	Conjunction → Prepositional phrase	Relator → Circumstance	so → as a result

Table 3. Relocation of Grammatical Class

No.	Congruent Representation	Metaphorical Representation	Relocation
1	walked	walking	Process/verb →Thing/noun
2	climbed	climbing	Process/verb →Thing/noun
3	pretended	pretence	Process/verb →Thing/noun
4	came	coming	Process/verb →Thing/noun
5	climbed	climbing	Process/verb →Thing/noun
6	touched	touching	Process/verb →Thing/noun
7	came	coming	Process/verb →Thing/noun
8	smelt	smell	Process/verb →Thing/noun
9	touched	touching	Process/verb →Thing/noun
10	advised	advisor	Process/verb →Thing/noun
11	believed	believer	Process/verb →Thing/noun

Table 4. Metaphorical and Congruent Based Translation

No	Metaphorical Text	Congruent Text	Translation Based on Metaphorical text	Translation Based on Congruent texts

No	Metaphorical Text	Congruent Text	Translation Based on Metaphorical text	Translation Based on Congruent texts
1	In their free time, two men were walking through the forest together. They realize that any bad thing could happen anytime in the forest. They swore they would be always together facing bad things until to death.	Once upon a time, there were two close friends who were walking through the forest together. They knew that anything dangerous can happen any time in the forest. So they promised each other that they would always be together in any case of danger**.**	Di waktu senggang dua lelaki memasuki hutan. Mereka sadar bahwa ada saja bahaya yang bias mengancam mereka di hutan. Mereka bersumpah akan selalu bersama menghadapi bahaya apapun sampai akhir hidup mereka.	Pada suatu hari ada dua orang teman karib berjalan ditengah hutan. Mereka tahu bahwa bahaya bias mengancam mereka kapanpun di dalam hutan itu. Lalu mereka berjanji bahwa mereka akan selalu bersama dalam menghadapi bahaya apapun**.**
2	Unexpectedly, they saw a large horrible bear was coming to them. One of them run away and climbed the tree in a short time. The other one must be lying down on the ground because he could not climb so he gave up and was pretending as if he was a dead man.	Suddenly, they saw a large bear getting closer toward them. One of them climbed a nearby tree at once. But unfortunately the other one did not know how to climb up the tree. So being led by his common sense, he lay down on the ground breathless and pretended to be a dead man.	Diluar dugaan, mereka melihat beruang yang mengerikan mendatangi mereka. Seorang dari dualelaki ini langsung lari memanjat pohon. Lelaki yang satu lagi terpaksa barbaring diatas tanah karena dia tidak bisa memanjat pohon sehingga dia menyerah dan berpura pura tak bernyawa lagi.	Tiba-tiba mereka melihat beruang besar mendekati mereka. Seorang dari mereka memanjat pohon dengan cepatnya. Sayangnya seorang lagi tidak dapat memanjat pohon. Dengan kesadarannya dia berbaring di tanah sambil menahan nafas dan berpura-pura meninggal.
3	The large horrible bear was coming to the man who was lying down on the grown. It smelt in	The bear came near the one who was lying on the ground. It smelt	Beruang besar yang mengerikan itu mendekati lelaki yang berbaring di	Beruang itu mendekati orang yang berbaring di tanah. Beruang

No	Metaphorical Text	Congruent Text	Translation Based on Metaphorical text	Translation Based on Congruent texts
	his ears and left the man because a bear does not want to touch a dead man. Then the other man came down and asked him 'Hey buddy, what did the bear say to you?' The man who was lying down on the grown replied, "the bear said do not too easy to believe anybody"	in his ears, and slowly left the place because the bears do not want to touch the dead creatures. After that, the friend on the tree came down and asked his friend that was on the ground, "Friend, what did the bear whisper into your ears?" The other friend replied, "Just now the bear advised me not to believe a false friend".	atas tanah. Beruang mencium pendengaran lelaki yang tergeletak itu, dan pergi meninggalkannya karena beruang tidak suka dengan mahluk yang sudah tak bernyawa. Lalu lelaki yang memanjat pohon itu turun dan bertanya kepada kawannya yang tergeletak di tanah tadi "kawan, apa yang dikatakan beruang tadi kepadamu?" Lelaki yang di bawah ini pun menjawab" beruang mengajariku agar aku tidak boleh terlalu mudah percaya kepada mahluk manapun".	mencium kuping lelaki itu, dan meninggalkannya dengan perlahan lahan karena beruang tidak mau menyentuh barang yang sudah mati. Sesudah itu, orang yang memanjat pohon tadi turun dan bertanya kepada orang yang berbaring di tanah tadi, "Teman, apa yang dibisikkan oleh beruang itu ketelingamu?" Lalu orang ini pun menjawab, "Barusan beruang itu menasehati aku agar tidak percaya kepada teman yang palsu".

V. CONCLUSION

From the above analysis, we can find that the theory of Metafunction is very useful to explain grammatical metaphor. Metaphor is not only an escape expression of vocabulary, but also an escape means of expression for grammatical forms. Grammatical metaphor provides a new angle of view vocabularies possess metaphorical function; grammatical forms possess metaphorical characteristic. On how to raise theoretical level for practical application, English learners and translators should adopt a more positive attitude.

Grammatical metaphor representation indicates that an experience or meaning is coded as if it were coded in another grammatical unit. The text of grammatical metaphor implies two ways of coding: congruent and incongruent or metaphorical one. In congruent coding there is a natural

relation between the meaning and the wording or between semantics and grammar whereas in metaphorical coding there is a tension between semantics and grammar. In other words, if the congruent coding is violated, metaphorical representations occur. Texts of science, technology and academics are usually coded in grammatical metaphor. Transgrammatical semantic domain extends a meaning across different grammatical units. This is to say that a meaning is potentially realized by a number of grammatical units. By its natures grammatical metaphor involves transgrammatical semantic domains. This paper has elaborated that the meaning of metaphorical text is well understood by referring to its congruent coding.

This narrative text entitled A True Friend is saying that A True Friend is the one who always supports and stands by you in any situation. Through this analysis, the reader is more interesting to read this text and is easier to understand the content of the text.

REFERENCES

[1]   Arendse Bernth and Claudia Gdaniec. (2001). "*M Translatability". In: Machine Translation 16: 175-281, 2001*.

[2]   Douglas Arnold et al. (1994). *Machine translation – An introductory guide*. Oxford University Press.

[3]   Griffiths, P. (2006). *An introduction to English semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

[4]   Halliday M. A. K. (1996). Things and Relations. In: *Reading Science: cricital and functional perspectives on discourses of science*. London: Routledge. Heather Holmback, Serena Shubert and Jan Spyridakis.

[5]   Halliday, M. A. K. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Fourth edition. London: Routledge.

[6]   Halliday, M. A. K. and Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2006). *Construing experience through meaning: A language based approach to cognition*. London: Continuum

[7]   Miles, Matthew B., A. Michael Huberman, Johnny Saldana. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A method sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

[8]   Robinson, S. K. (2011). *Out of our minds: Learning to be creative*. Chicester: Capstone

[9]   Taverniers, M. (2003). Grammatical Metaphor in SFL: A historiography of the introduction and initial study of the concept. In Vandenbergen, A.M, M. Taverniers and L. Ravelli (Eds) *Grammatical Metaphors: Views from Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

[10] Thompson, G. (2014). *Introducing functional grammar*. London: Routledge.