

Interpersonal meaning breadth variation in simultaneous interpreting English – bahasa Indonesia *dienic* texts: A contrastive-translational mood grammar analysis

Intan Christiani

Software Seni Indonesia. Jl. Magelang No.65, Kota Yogyakarta, 55242, Indonesia.

* Corresponding Author. E-mail: intanchristiani@yahoo.com

Received: 15 September 2017; Revised: 23 March 2019; Accepted: 12 April 2020

Abstract: This study presents a contrastive-translational MOOD grammar analysis of the realization of interpersonal meaning in Joyce Meyer’s English sermon text and Jose Carol’s Bahasa Indonesia interpreted text. Interpersonal meaning in the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), the model of Translational Semiotic Communication (TSC) and the model of text type and language function are the theoretical foundations of this study. This study used a descriptive qualitative-quantitative approach, involving the analysis of MOOD and Modality of the data which were translationally related semantic units grammatically expressed by MOOD clause units. The analysis reveals that the texts in this study can be classified as *dienic* texts with Declaratives and Imperatives as the prominent clauses, while Modality elements realized in T1 were generally realized in T2 in the same types. Declaratives and Imperatives respectively serve the informative and operative function of the texts, and the Modality elements which are mostly of a high degree and expressed explicitly give values to these functions.

Keywords: interpersonal meaning, MOOD, modality, *dienic* texts

How to Cite: Christiani, I. (2020). Interpersonal meaning breadth variation in simultaneous interpreting English – bahasa Indonesia *dienic* texts: A contrastive-translational mood grammar analysis. *LingTera*, 7(1), 111-121. doi:<https://doi.org/10.21831/lt.v7i1.15756>



This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



INTRODUCTION

This study aimed to describe the realization of interpersonal meaning in the systems of MOOD and Modality in Joyce Meyer’s English sermon text and Jose Carol’s Bahasa Indonesia interpreted text. These translationally related texts occurred in the process of a simultaneous interpreting (SI), in a spiritual revival event called “*Festival of Life*” held in Jakarta back in 2013 with Joyce Meyer as the preacher and Jose Carol as the Indonesian interpreter for the Indonesian audience. Here, the translational activity took part in the act of Christian preaching, and “Christian preaching is always gospel preaching” (Anderson, 2006, p.64). It is the heart of all teachings. It is good news. It is the Word of God. As emphasized by Nathan (1998, p.4), “the gospel is not simply a call for conversion, it is a call to a lifelong commitment to truth, righteousness and justice”. Strongly, Lloyd-Jones (1972, p.95) states that “true preaching, after all, is God acting. It is not just a man uttering words; it is God using him.”

In this study, the kind of translational activity which was being analyzed was *interpreting*. Traditionally, it is known as “oral translation” because the product of translation is in the form of speech. However, in *Translatics*, specifically in the model of Translational Semiotic Communication (TSC) proposed by Tou (2005), translational activity is not identified based on the “medium” of the text which has been generally used. Instead, he proposes new terms, “graphic” and “phonic”, to be used as the ways to differentiate translational activity in a concept of “channel”. As stated by Amalia and Tou (2016, p.139), “channel of communication determine how a text is organized”. Therefore, this study used the term of interpreting, which means that texts are made and perceived through phonic channels, and the product of interpreting is called as interpreted text. Specifically, the form of interpreting analyzed in this study is “simultaneous”. With the fact that the interpreter is confronted with a fast-paced, auditory and tracking task, Anderson (1994, p.101) says that the purpose of simultaneous interpreting (SI) is “not to

establish linguistic equivalent between two languages, but to communicate the meanings of a speech being heard”.

With the unique characteristics of a preacher and preaching-particularly, Christian preaching-an interpreter who helps the preacher communicate the gospel to target listeners will also be “indirectly” involved as the “tongue” of God. He will not only be demanded to have acquired background knowledge of any possible messages which he will get from the source speaker (preacher), but he also needs to understand how gospel must be delivered, so the listeners can grasp the messages as intended by the preacher who is inspired by the Spirit of God. Therefore, interpreting a sermon or preaching is crucial because the interpreter deals with spiritual values which must not be mistakenly delivered to the listeners. Ideally, the interpreter must possess positive attitude toward the God-inspired values of preaching which he will say to the listeners. With this positive attitude, the interpreter will be able to work together with the preacher in one united heart, as the agents of change, to communicate the messages of God to the listeners.

In the analyzed process of SI, it could be seen that both of Joyce Meyer and Jose Carol were close with the audience in a face-to-face situation. They were all connected in three ways: (1) the preacher tried to interact with the audience and close the gap between her and them as she delivered true, straightforward and powerful messages; (2) the interpreter spoke with the same attitude, power and authority with the preacher; and (3) the audience were never quiet listeners as they freely responded to each climax of the preacher’s powerful messages with loud cheers and applause. The interpersonal meaning was therefore chosen to be the focus of the study, because meanings related to social relationships are manifested in the interpersonal function of language.

Language has an interpersonal function which is “to encode interaction, to show how defensible we find our proportions, to encode ideas about obligation and inclination and to express our attitudes” (Butt, Fahey, Feez, Spinks, & Yallop, 2000, p.5). Furthermore, Lock (1996, p.9) states that this function of language-or metafunction, as how it is called in SFL-is responsible for the ways in which we act upon one another mediated by language such as “giving and requesting information, getting people to do things, and offering to do things ourselves”, and the ways in which we show our judgments and attitudes, such as “likelihood, necessity, and desirability”. As explained by Halliday (2002, p.175), this metafunction is responsible to establish and maintain social relations for “the expression of social roles, which include the communication roles created by language itself”.

An act of translation in general is an act of communication. Specifically, communication is a symbolic act (Porcar, 2011, p.23) and it is an act of meaning (Halliday, 1989, p.3). Regarding the act of meaning, Halliday furthermore explains that “it has to be addressed to someone-not necessarily some particular person, maybe just to the world at large; but unless there is a receiver it will not work” (1989, p.3). Texts produced by Joyce Meyer as the preacher in the spiritual revival event expressed her propositions, ideas, attitude, experiences and-most importantly-her interpretation of the Word of God, which were all intended for the Indonesian audience. Here she tried to build an interpersonal relationship with the audience, mediated by the interpreter. It was therefore a social interaction. Responsible to establish and maintain social relations is interpersonal meaning, and it is realized by and in the system of MOOD and Modality.

According to Butt, Fahey, Feez, Spinks, and Yallop (2000, p.88), the crucial relationship in interpersonal meaning is between grammatical functions. They emphasize that two grammatical features which carry the main burden of interpersonal meaning are the *Subject* and the *Finite*, which are closely linked together to establish the system of Mood (Mood Block). According to Sweet, Mood is the locus where basic speech functions of statement, question, response, command and exclamation are grammatically expressed (Halliday, 2002, p.189). While Mood or Mood Block is a system which consists of the Subject and the Finite, MOOD can be understood as “a system of the clause, not of the verbal group or of the verb” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p.114). It is “the major interpersonal system of the clause” Halliday and Matthiessen (2014, p.97) caused by the relationship of the Subject and the Finite.

At the level of a clause rank in SFL, there is a system of Freedom which makes clauses fall into two types: “Free” clauses and “Bound” Clauses. Both respectively refer to the conventional concepts of Independent and Dependent Clauses. In the system of Freedom, Free clauses hold the entry condition to the system of MOOD type, which semantically “realize either propositions or proposals, serving to develop exchanges in dialogue either by initiating new exchanges or by responding to ones that have already been initiated” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p. 170). Then, besides the Subject and the Finite,

the system of Modality also operates in the system of Mood (Mood Block) and thus takes part in the clausal expression of exchanges realized in MOOD. As stated by Halliday and Mattiessen (2013, p.120), Modality is “a rich resource for speakers to intrude their own views into the discourse: their assessments of what is likely or typical, their judgments of the rights and wrongs of the situation and of where other people stand in this regard”.

Here in this context of simultaneous interpreting, the process of delivering meanings is worth our attention because the texts involved are not only informative, but also purposeful in which sympathetic motives are involved. They are commonly identified as religious texts, or “dienic texts” as they are specifically called in the model of TSC. In this model, *dien* is at the highest position in the stratal system of contexts in society. It is related to a certain belief or a religion which empowers the making of text. It is an area which is not out of the world but here in this universe, where meanings are manifested as the results of the relationship between human as social beings with “the Self-Existent, the Absolute, the Greatest, the Sacred and so on, Being generally called God” (Tou, 1997). However, not all humans believe in the “Unseen Being” called God, such as atheists. *Dien* is therefore exclusively a system of social relations between believing humans and their perceived God(s), and from these relations there are social effects in the life of human society. With these notions, it can be said that “any human system (situational, cultural, ideological, etc.) which is based on a *dien* system is referred to as a *dienic* system, whereas one which is not based on a *dien* system is referred to as a *nondien* or *nondienic* system” (Tou, 1997). In this study, the texts were made in the dienic system, so they are called dienic texts.

Finally, the relationship between the dienic system and these texts will be related to the types of text which serve different purposes, suggested by Reiss (Hatim & Munday, 2004, pp.183-184): *informative*, *operative*, and *expressive*. Then, the interpreter, as the first receiver of the sermonic text in this case, faced the situational pressure to re-establish the interpersonal meaning intended by the preacher. By entering the systems of MOOD and Modality of the preacher’s and the interpreter’s texts, the translational phenomenon in the particular case of the realization of interpersonal meaning was analyzed. Furthermore, this study is hoped to have theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, the result of this study is expected to contribute to the discipline of Translation, especially in the study of Interpreting which focus on the simultaneous interpreting. Practically, the result of this research is expected to: (a) be a useful related literature for future researchers who pursue the same particular interests in the simultaneous interpreting and interpersonal meaning or interpersonal function of language, (b) encourage future researchers to employ any possible methods of analysis which may be different from this study in dealing with texts which are produced and perceived through phonic channels, (c) provide an additional reference on the practicality of the theory of Translativity proposed by Tou (1997) as an SFL-inspired theory of translation, and (d) broaden the scope of Interpreting studies which mostly deal with non-religious (non-dienic) texts, giving the evidence that a scientific study can also be conducted in a religious (dienic) context.

METHOD

This is a descriptive qualitative-quantitative study, given the fact that I pursued the translational and linguistic phenomena which occurred in the real setting of a simultaneous interpreting, attempting to qualitatively answer the research questions in accordance with the findings from the quantitative analysis.

In this study, the data were natural because there was neither treatment nor experiment applied. They represented the reality I could not manipulate as texts bound in certain contexts. Specifically, Pöchhacker (2011, p.14) emphasizes the point that interpreting studies can be regarded as an empirical discipline because of the nature of its object of study. As empirical elements in this study, texts are “not only the essential data on which findings are based, but also the basis of interpretations and the central medium for presenting and communicating findings” (Flick, 2002, p.29). Then, the data must be analyzed at the clause rank of interpersonal meaning, so they are translationally related semantic units grammatically expressed by MOOD clause units. The sources of the data were Joyce Meyer’s English sermon text and Jose Carol’s Bahasa Indonesia interpreted text, collected from a downloaded video which was previously shared in a private channel of Youtube intended for Christian viewers. The video recorded Joyce Meyer who preached to Indonesian audience and the interpreter who interpreted her sermon during the spiritual revival event called *Festival of Life* held in 2013 in Jakarta. The duration of

the video is 14 minutes and 34 seconds, thus actually not covering the entire session of Joyce Meyer's sermon.

Using the perspective of Sudaryanto (Kesuma, 2009, p.16), the method used in collecting the data was an "observation method" (*metode simak*). Specifically, the observation method was done "without the participation of the researcher in the process of linguistic activities" (*simak bebas libat cakap*).

Here, I only acted as an observer. I was not a participant of the audience in the *Festival of Life 2013* held in Jakarta, so the observation method was done through the already existed (available) record. This method is also called as a *non-participant observation* or *indirect observation*, because I relied on the result of occurrence which came from the recorded observation of someone else who participated in the studied event. As the continuation of the non-participant or indirect observation method, Sudaryanto (Kesuma, 2009, p.18) suggested that a "noting technique" (*teknik catat*) can be used in a linguistic research. For further analysis, the two texts were transcribed and all translational analysis units were taken from the beginning until the end of the video arranged in chronological order. According to O'Connell and Kowal (2008, p.89), the use of written transcripts was considered to be significantly appropriate, because transcription is intended for the research analysis of "spontaneous and reproductive spoken discourse". By doing so, I did not include traits of natural speech such as "phonotactic and prosodic features of speech" (Chernov, 2004, p.1) which include intonation, stress and rhythmic characteristics occurring during the production of texts. To maintain the reliability of the data, the transcriptions were crosschecked by one native speaker of English and one native speaker of Bahasa Indonesia.

Due to the naturalistic inquiry of this study, I served as the primary research instrument in this study. I was the planner, the observer, the data collector, the transcriber, the analyst and the most responsible one who integrated the results of analysis and presented the interpretation of the simultaneous interpreting phenomena. In addition, I certainly had to make use of a non-human instrument which was a video player to watch the recorded simultaneous interpreting of Joyce Meyer's sermon as a secondary source of data, then also used supportive instruments such as printed books, electronic books, computer sets, notes for transcription of the texts, a Cambridge Advances Learner's Dictionary (third edition) and assistance of the internet by which I collected information related to this study and accessed an online *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language).

The data analysis technique employed a *contrastive-translational MOOD grammar analysis method*. It is because what was being studied were MOOD grammar of interpersonal meaning clauses where the systems of MOOD and Modality are manifested, and the texts being contrasted were translationally related. The data were then analyzed using the qualitative analysis techniques progressing interactively among data collection, data reduction, data display and conclusions drawing, which were quantitatively supported by a simple statistical method.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

For general terms, English units of meaning realizations by the preacher (Joyce Meyer) as a whole were labeled as Text 1 (T1), and Bahasa Indonesia units of meaning realizations by the interpreter (Jose Carol) as a whole were labeled as Text 2 (T2). Besides that, the terms of "Text 1 (T1)" and "Text 2 (T2)" were also used as specific terms, referring to a translational analysis unit in English or Bahasa Indonesia which realized meanings at the grammatical level of a clause rank. This translational analysis unit may be a simple clause or a clause complex.

Collected from the video which was 14 minutes and 34 seconds long, the data were treated in pairs due to the contrastive nature of this study, which means that each unit of analysis consists of T1 (English text) and T2 (Bahasa Indonesia text). The procedures of the analysis were limited only at the level of Denotative Semiotic (DS). From the transcribed units of verbal realizations of meanings, I decided that there were 136 pairs of translational texts, including a few units of analysis which showed that the preacher did not make meanings while the interpreter added new meanings, or the preacher made meanings but the interpreter left the meanings unrealized. However, a few units of analysis could not be analyzed due to their insignificance to the focus of this study. Because there were 4 pairs of translational texts which did not meet the requirements to be analyzed as clause units which realized

interpersonal meaning, this study then focused only on 132 pairs of translational texts. They represent the total number of data (ND).

More importantly, because the analysis of meaning variation must be conducted at the Denotative Semiotic (DS) level of a clause rank, the total number of data reduced into 115 pairs of translational analysis units. These analysis units consists of clause complexes and simple clauses. They represented the total number of analysis units (NAU).

In the analysis of MOOD type and polarity, the significance of textual meaning realized as Textual Adjunct is not neglected as in the analysis of the degree of meaning variation. From 115 pairs of translational analysis units (total of NAU) being analyzed, it is found that T1 has 113 MOOD types and T2 has 111 MOOD types.

Table 1. MOOD Type and Polarity of the Interpersonal Meaning Clauses in T1

Total of MOOD Types found in T1	MOOD Type			
	IND			IMP
	DEC	INT	EXC	
113 (100%)	108 (95,6%)	1 (0,9%)	-	4 (3,5%)

Table 2. MOOD Type and Polarity of the Interpersonal Meaning Clauses in T2

Total of MOOD Types found in T2	MOOD Type			
	IND			IMP
	DEC	INT	EXC	
111 (100%)	106 (95,5%)	-	-	5 (4,5%)

(Note: IND = Indicative Type; IMP = Imperative Type; DEC = Declarative, INT = Interrogative; EXC = Exclamative)

Declarative

Based on the statistical findings, it can be said that both T1 and T2 have Declaratives as the most dominant type of MOOD.

T1 (NAU: 1; ND: 1)

you	already	have	the victory
S	A: M	F P	C

in Christ
CA

T2 (NAU: 1; ND: 1)

<i>saudara</i>	<i>telah</i>	<i>memiliki</i>	<i>kemenangan tersebut</i>
S	F	P	C

<i>di dalam Kristus</i>
CA

As shown in Data 1 with Number of Analysis Unit 1, the MOOD types of the two texts are identical. They are Declaratives with positive polarity.

Interrogative

T1 (NAU: 34; ND: 42)

'cause	God
A: Cj	A: Vc

You	sent	me	here
S	F P	C	CA

why	did	I	go	one time in five years	when
WH-A	F	S	P	CA	A: Cj

they	were	going to have	a flood
S	F	P	C

T2 (NAU: 34; ND: 42)

<i>bisa saja</i>	<i>saya</i>	<i>berkata</i>	<i>Bapa</i>
F	S	P	A: Vc
<i>mengapa</i>	<i>mengutus</i>		<i>persis</i>
WH-A	F	P	C CA
<i>dihari</i>	<i>dimana</i>		<i>lima tahun sekali</i>
A: Cj	CA		CA
<i>mereka</i>	<i>mengalami</i>		<i>banjir besar</i>
S	F	P	C

Data 42 with Number of Analysis Unit 34 has a pair of significantly longer utterances compared to other sets of data. Undoubtedly, T1 and T2 have a translational relationship, but an interesting phenomenon occurred as the effect of semiotic communication, in which the type of MOOD “shifted” from T1 to T2. Indeed, T1 in Data 42 is a Clause Complex which consists of one Free Clause and Bound Clauses; so is T2 in Data 42. However, they have different functions. Data 42 is closely tied to the previous data—which are Data 39, 40 and 41—where there was a situation in which the preacher honestly stated that “*coming to Indonesia from America was a long and tiring ride, and she could be confused*”. Continuing that statement, she added in the beginning part of T1 in Data 42 that “*she could be confused because God sent her to Indonesia*”, a nation which is unfamiliar to her and Jakarta flooded terribly at the time the event was held. Next, the preacher asked herself. Here, the self-questioning utterance contained Interrogative MOOD, but it was replaced by a different MOOD when the interpreter realized and restructured the meanings in Bahasa Indonesia. In T2, it seems like the interpreter “paraphrased” what the preacher had said. He started the text with “*bisa saja saya berkata*” (in English, “*I could just say*”), making it function as the Free Clause of the Clause Complex, leaving the rest of the clauses as Bound Clauses. This way, the MOOD type “shifted” from Interrogative to Declarative, realized by “*bisa saja saya berkata*”. While T1 in Data 42 contains the expressions of the preacher who asked herself, T2 gave information about what she had experienced (had said).

Imperative

T1 (NAU: 78; ND: 95)

think	about that		
P	CA		
God	lives		in you
S	F	P	CA

T2 (NAU: 78; ND: 95)

<i>coba</i>	<i>renungkan</i>	<i>sementar</i>	<i>bahwa</i>
P	P	CA	A: Cj
<i>Allah</i>	<i>hidup</i>		<i>di dalam dirimu</i>
S	F	P	CA

Data 95 with Number of Analysis Unit 78 shows that T1 and T2 are Clause Complexes, but they are not actually identical. As can be seen, T1 consists of two Free Major clauses: “*Think about that*” which is an Imperative, and “*God lives in you*” which is a Declarative. The Imperative MOOD in T2 is realized in “*coba renungkan sebentar*”. However, the interpreter bound it with “*Allah hidup di dalam dirimu*” (in English, “*God lives in you*”) through the use of a conjunction “*bahwa*” (in English, “*that*”). Therefore, “*Allah hidup di dalam dirimu*” is no longer a Free Clause, but a Bound Clause.

Modality

Modality is a part of the system of Mood Adjunct which are “closely associated with the meanings construed by the Mood system” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p.187). The Table 3 shows that there are elements of Modality in T1 which were unrealized in T2. Next, there are elements of Modality in T1 which were realized in T2. They belong to the same and different types.

Table 3. Unrealized Elements of Modality

NAU	ND	Elements of Modality	Type
17	19	<i>Ever</i>	MO; U
2	2	<i>Need to</i>	MU; O
3	3	<i>Want to talk</i>	MU; I
39	50	<i>Want to say</i>	MU; I

(Note: MO = Modalization; MU = Modulation; U = Usuality; O = Obligation; I = Inclination)

Table 4. Realized Elements of Modality with the Same Types

NAU	ND	Elements of Modality		Type
		T1	T2	
18	20	<i>I believe</i>	<i>Saya percaya</i>	MO; P
19	21			
44	55	<i>I think</i>	<i>Saya rasa</i>	
45	56			
102	121	<i>definitely</i>	<i>pasti</i>	MO; U
20	23	<i>[will] never</i>	<i>tidak [akan] pernah</i>	
49	60			
50	61			
79	96			
91	108			
53	68	<i>always</i>	<i>selalu</i>	
54	69			
63	78			
60	75	<i>a lot</i>	<i>sering</i>	
98	115	<i>often</i>	<i>sering kali</i>	
13	14	<i>has to</i>	<i>harus</i>	MU; O
72	89	<i>have to</i>	<i>harus</i>	
16	18	<i>want to make sure</i>	<i>mau pastikan</i>	MU; I
56	71	<i>wants to give</i>	<i>ingin memberikan</i>	

(Note: MO = Modalization; MU = Modulation; P = Probability; U = Usuality; O = Obligation; I = Inclination)

Table 5. Realized Elements of Modality with Different Types

NAU	ND	Elements of Modality		Type
		T1	T2	
5	5	<i>entirely</i>		INT; D
			<i>tentunya</i>	MO; P
12	13	<i>has to</i>		MU; O
			<i>hanya</i>	INT; C

(Note: MO = Modalization; MU = Modulation; P = Probability; O = Obligation; INT = Intensity; D = Degree; C = Counterexpectancy)

Finally, there are also added elements of Modality in T2. This means that they do not have any semantically corresponding representation in T1.

Table 6. Added Elements of Modality

NAU	ND	Elements of Modality	Type
22	29	<i>Tentunya</i>	MO; P
35	43	<i>Tidak [akan] pernah</i>	MO; U
113	134		

(Note: MO = Modalization; P = Probability; U = Usuality)

Discussion

In this study, the *dienic* texts were made in the context of Christianity. They were purposeful and in them communicative goals were manifested. They were unique and would never occur again, reflecting all CS levels in the *dienic* system which existed *only* at that time. Instead of emphasizing on equivalence of linguistic forms which is a popular tradition in the study of Translation, I am more interested in intertextual contexts which influenced the process of meaning-making in the analyzed SI.

Indeed, the Hallidayan concepts of metafunctions which consist of ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings are too wide, so I chose interpersonal metafunction as the focus of this study, certainly without putting aside the equal significance of the other two metafunctions because they occur simultaneously as a text is made. The main reason why I decided to concentrate on the interpersonal meaning came after I thought of the nature of the analyzed SI. The register of the texts created in the analyzed SI was that of a sermon typically delivered by a preacher as a part of a Christian church ceremony, or other events for spiritual awakening. In such a religious context of situation, the most obvious genre of the texts was a combination of informative and operative types, as categorized by Katharina Reiss in her theory of text types (functions of the text) and translation methods.

Katharina Reiss's work in the 1970s on text types and language functions has helped me identify the communicative goals of a sermon. In her model of text types and text varieties, a sermon is categorized as a host of hybrid types, which here means that sermon is informative and operative at the same time. Here in this study, the analyzed texts were informative because the preacher communicated her propositions about God's messages to the audience by choosing related verses in the Bible and interpreting them. She also communicated her opinions, feelings and intentions by stating powerful explanations about God's love for people, and even by sharing her dark past with the audience. Then, the texts were also operative, because the preacher used her explanations to motivate and urge the audience to believe in God's unfailing love and His promises for their lives. In this sense, texts were made to induce behavioral responses, or in other words, the receivers of the texts were persuaded to act in a certain way.

Being the most found type of MOOD in both of T1 and T2, Declarative clauses have an ultimate feature which is the exchange of information. Semantically, they are intended to share information. Declarative clauses also occurred as the preacher communicated other facts, such as her arguments, opinions, feelings, judgements, intentions, etc. Dienic texts are thus very informative, particularly in the context of the analyzed SI in this study. The American preacher spread the messages she received from God, explained Bible verses which were the foundations of her propositions and shared her past. Then, Imperatives functioned as the operative part of the analyzed dienic texts, through which the preacher requested, demanded and also prohibited the audience to do something. Further into the Mood system, the system of Modality is the locus where the attitude and judgment of the speaker are manifested in.

Interestingly, being the Subjects in the Mood systems of the preacher's Declarative clauses are the preacher herself, the audience, the Bible, the enemy (referring to the devil) and certainly, God. From the collected data I could see that Joyce Meyer was building a horizontal connection with the audience, and also leading the course of the audience to have a vertical connection with God. There was no social distance because all souls who attended the event were equal under the Mighty, Supernatural Being. To preserve these horizontal and vertical connections is the role of the Bible, in which the Word of God lives to give humans guidance and feed their faith. However, other than the close relationship which is shaped by God, the Bible, the preacher and the audience, there is another "unseen" force which threatens to damage the relationship. That is "the devil"; the enemy of all believers.

Then, the next element of the Mood system is the Finite. In English, the Finite Operators are classified into Temporal Finite Operators and Modal Finite Operators. Temporal Finite Operators show the Tense of the clauses. In T1, *Present Tense* and *Past Tense* occur the most. *Present Tense* was generally used as the American preacher shared the Gospel, explained Bible verses, delivered facts and motivated her audience. *Past Tense* was generally used as she talked about what she experienced to get to Indonesia, and also about her past when she was as a child abused sexually, mentally and emotionally by her father until she learned the Word of God which healed her. Then, the next type of Finite Operator is Modal Finite, or known conventionally as Modal Verb. In the category of Modal Finite Operators are auxiliary verbs and modal phrases used to express ability, possibility, permission or obligation. Judging from their functions, Modal Finite Operators are closely related to the system of Modality. The most common Modal Finite Operators found in T1 are *can*, *cannot*, *could*, *has to*, *have to*, *will*, *would*, *[is] gonna (going to)*, and *need to*. In the category of ability and lack of ability are *can*, *cannot* and *could* (for Past Tense). With these Finite Operators, the preacher generally expressed her knowledge about our ability to easily access bad news around the world from electronic and mass media, our ability to have a good finish despite a bad start, our ability to bring a change to the suffering nation, and of course about God's unrivalled capacity to do unbelievable things. The lack of ability or incapability is also reflected in some Declarative clauses with negative polarity, with which the preacher expressed the incapability

of the enemy (the devil) to defeat fully-alerted believers. Next, in the category of future references are *will*, *would* (for Past Tense) and *[is] gonna (going to)*. They were mostly found in Bound clauses. In the category of obligation are *has to*, *have to* and *need to*. By Halliday, they are identified as Modal Finite Operators with high degree of obligation. In T1, they were generally used to express a condition which must be dealt with in a certain way because there was no other way to achieve it.

Besides the Subject and the Finite, Modality also provides important elements to the Mood system. As stated by Cameron (2007, p.75), modality system is a network of resources used by the speaker to stake claims to knowledge, allowing the speaker “to formulate different kinds of claims (e.g. assertions, opinions, hypotheses, speculations)” and indicating how committed the speaker is to those claims. Two types of Modality are Modalization which consists of Probability and Usuality, and Modulation which consists of Obligation and Inclination. In T1, the elements of Probability are represented by *I believe*, *I think*, and *definitely*. By Halliday (Eggins, 2004, p.174), *I believe* and *I think* are identified as metaphors of Modality, referring to the type of Modality which is realized as a clause instead of an Adjunct. With these two expressions, the speaker made her judgment obvious in an explicit way. While *I believe* is used to express a high degree of probability of something, *I think* is intended for a median degree. Then, there is *definitely* which shows a high degree of probability, meaning that something is going to really happen. This is similar to *I believe*, while the level of assertion is lower in *I think*. The elements of Usuality are represented by *ever*, *never*, *always*, *a lot*, and *often*. *Ever*, *never* and *always* are in the category of Usuality with high degree, with *never* for negative polarity. In the same way, *a lot* and *often* also represent a high degree of Usuality as they are generally used to express something which happens many times. The elements of Obligation are represented by *need to*, *has to*, and *have to*. They function as Modal Finite Operators as previously explained, expressing a high degree of Obligation. The elements of Inclination are represented by *I want to talk*, *I want to make sure*, *I want to say*, and *He wants to give*. With the expression *want to*, the preacher showed her willingness to do something for the audience, or in other words, offered service. Interestingly, in NAU 56 (“*He wants to give*”), the preacher spoke “on behalf of” God, telling the audience that God had something to offer to them. This obviously indicates the authority of a preacher, reflecting a special relationship between her and the Transcendental Being called God, given the fact that she is His proxy to make the good news of Gospel heard by people. As can be seen in the part of the descriptions of the findings, some elements of Modality were realized in T2 while some other were left unrealized.

Based on the statistical findings, T2 almost have the similar number of MOOD types with T1. While there are 108 Declaratives, 1 Interrogative and 4 Imperatives in T1, there are 106 Declaratives and 5 Imperatives in T2. These results can be considered as the reflection of the very low level of meaning variation which occurred from translational semiotic communication between the two texts. The obvious reason for this slight difference is in the systems of wordings of the two texts, where cohesive devices play their roles in uniting semiotized meanings into texts which make sense. Despite the structural “closeness” between English and Bahasa Indonesia, textual elements can cause the logical and coherent relationship among texts to vary. Sometimes the interpreter followed different methods of bonding the expressions of meanings, and thus functionally changed the relationship. However, meaning variation occurred at the very low level, so there were no significant consequences because Declaratives in T2 represented Declaratives in T1. Imperatives in T2 also represented Imperatives in T1, except one which is an added unit of meaning expressions by the interpreter. One Interrogative in T1 is not found in T2, because the interpreter created a new relationship as he restructured meanings in the lexicogrammar system of Bahasa Indonesia.

Regarding Modality in T2, the elements of Modality in T2 reflected those in T1, as can be seen in the part of the descriptions of the statistical findings. However, there are also added elements of Modality in T2 whose meanings cannot be traced back in T1. These added elements consist of Modality of Probability and Usuality. In the category of Probability, there are two expressions of “*tentunya*” (in English, *definitely*, *certainly*). The former *tentunya* functions as an added element, while the latter *tentunya* is the result of translational semiotic communication in which a Mood Adjunct of Intensity in T1 was realized in a different type of expression in T2 as a Mood Adjunct of Modality. Similar to its English form, *tentunya* also refers to Probability at a high degree. In the category of Usuality, there are “*tidak pernah*” (in English, *never*) and “*pernah*” (in English, *ever*).

From the analysis of MOOD types and Modality, I could also find other interesting facts. Opposing one of the conclusions of the previous study by Sujatna (2012) in her *Applying Systemic*

Functional Linguistics to Bahasa Indonesia Clauses, I want to say that three strands of meanings occur simultaneously as we create texts in the system of social contexts. There is no way that one strand of meanings is left out. This is because ideational meaning give contents to our texts, interpersonal meaning gives values to the contents of our texts as the reflections of our existence as social beings, while textual meaning “packages” the contents and social values in our texts into a coherent entity as a whole. In her study, she concluded that clause as exchange does not occur in Bahasa Indonesia because it does not have the function of “Finiteness”. I disagree with this statement. I believe that all languages in the world reflect our need to communicate, because that is what languages are for. Through communication humans exchange ideas and anything they have in mind, building relationships with others due to their nature as social beings. That is the role of interpersonal meaning. Finiteness exists in Bahasa Indonesia, but it work differently compared to Finiteness in English. As stated by Butt et al. (2000, p.89), Finite refers to any form of the verbal group which encodes the speaker’s opinion and it cannot be separated from polarity.

When a clause in Bahasa Indonesia has a positive polarity, Finite is usually “ellipsed”, or “concealed” in the verb element or adjective element of the clause. However, Finite can appear in clauses with positive polarity too, represented by “*adalah*” (in English, *is/am/are/was/were/be*) and “*merupakan*” which has the similar function with “*adalah*”. Both forms are verbs in Bahasa Indonesia. I categorize them as elements of Finite because if they are realized in the clauses, they give positive affirmation to the content of the clauses. In other situations, Finites may also appear in Bahasa Indonesia clauses with positive polarity and have the same function like those of Temporal Finite Operators in English which show the time of action. They are “*telah*” or “*sudah*” (in English, *have/has/had*), “*sedang*” (in English, *is/am/are/was/were/be* followed by a verb + -ing), and “*akan*” (in English, *will/would/to be + going to*). In Bahasa Indonesia, “*telah*” or “*sudah*” have the same function like *have*, *has* and *had* in English clauses with Perfect Tense, used to express something which the speaker has done before the present time and something which has occurred or finished before the speaker says it or does a certain action. “*Telah*” or “*sudah*” may be used either in a context which is related to the present time or the past. Then, “*sedang*”, or “*lagi*” as its informal form, has the same function like *is*, *am*, *are*, *was*, *were* and *be* in English clauses with Continuous Tense, used to describe an action which is going on or in progress. Similar to “*telah*” and “*sudah*”, “*sedang*” or “*lagi*” may also be used either in a context which is related to the present time or the past. At last, “*akan*” has the same function like *will* and *would* in English clauses with Future Tense, used to refer to actions which will take place after certain actions. Interestingly, in Bahasa Indonesia, “*telah*”, “*sudah*”, “*sedang*”, “*lagi*” and “*akan*” are in the category of adverbs. In addition, Finites in Bahasa Indonesia may also be of the similar function like those as Modal Verbs in English, such as “*bisa*” (in English, *can*) and “*harus*” (in English, *must/have to/has to*). In the system of word classification in Bahasa Indonesia, “*bisa*” is a verb and “*harus*” is an adverb.

In contrast to Bahasa Indonesia clauses with positive polarity, the value of negative polarity in the clauses is given by “*tidak*” (in English, *no/not*) and “*bukan*” (in English, also *no/not*). While “*tidak*” may be followed by a Predicate, an Attributive Complement (commonly known as Adjective), and even a Circumstantial Adjunct, the meaning expressed in “*bukan*” is only followed by a Complement (either a noun or an adjective). With these explanations, I can say that, although Bahasa Indonesia does not have any concept of Tense, Bahasa Indonesia has Finiteness which is responsible for the expression of interpersonal meaning, and it may either of the group of verbs and the group of adverbs.

CONCLUSION

Texts in this study can be classified as *dienic texts*, because meanings were made in the context of Christianity. In the analysis on the realization of interpersonal meaning for MOOD, Declaratives and Imperatives are respectively the most prominent types of clauses in T1 and T2, as expected from the genres of dienic texts which are *informative* and *operative*. Declaratives serve the informative function of the texts, and Imperatives serve the operative function of the texts. Then, in the analysis on the realization of interpersonal meaning for Modality, it was found that elements of Modality realized in T1 were generally realized in T2. The elements of Probability, Usuality and Obligation are mostly of a high degree. Meanwhile, the elements of Inclination show the willingness of Joyce Meyer and God (Whom she authoritatively spoke on behalf of) to do certain actions which were expressed explicitly.

REFERENCES

- Amalia, C., & Tou, A. (2016). Textual function variations of foreign embassies' press releases and their implications for translation teaching. *LingTera*, 3(2), 130-141. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.21831/lt.v3i2.11111>
- Anderson, K. C. (2006). *Choosing to preach*. Michigan: Zondervan.
- Anderson, L. (1994). Simultaneous interpretation: Contextual and translation aspects. In S. Lambert & B. Moser-Mercer (Eds.), *Bridging the gap: Empirical research in simultaneous interpretation* (pp. 101-120). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Butt, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., Spinks, S., & Yallop, C. (2000). *Using functional grammar: An explorer's guide* (2nd ed.). Sidney: Macquarie University.
- Cameron, D. (2007). *The teacher's guide to grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eggs, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum international Publishing Group.
- Flick, U. (2002). *An introduction to qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1989). *Spoken and written language* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd Ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2013). Meaning as choice. In L. Fontaine, T. Bartlett & G. O'Grady (Eds.), *Systemic functional linguistics: Exploring choice* (pp. 15-36). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Oxon: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K.. (2002). On grammar (J. Webster, Ed.). London: Continuum.
- Hatim, B. (2013). *Teaching and researching translation* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.
- Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. New York: Routledge.
- Kesuma, T. M. J. (2009). Metode linguistik menurut perspektif Dr. Sudaryanto. In P. Ari Subagyo & S. Macaryus (Eds.), *Peneroka hakikat bahasa* (pp. 15-25). Yogyakarta: Penerbit Universitas Sanata Dharma.
- Lloyd-Jones, D. M. (1972). *Preaching and preachers*. Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Lock, G. (1996). *Functional English grammar: An introduction for second language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nathan, R (Rev.). (1998). The way forward. In Bishop Joe Aldred (Ed.), *Preaching with Power: Sermons by Black Preachers* (pp.1-7). London: Cassell.
- O'Connell, D.C., & Kowal, S. (2008). *Communicating with one another: Toward a psychology of spontaneous spoken discourse*. New York: Springer.
- Pöhhacker, F. (2011). Researching interpreting: Approaches to inquiry. In B. Nicodemus & L. Swabey (Eds.), *Advances in interpreting research: Inquiry in action* (pp. 5-25). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Porcar, C. (2011). Sign and meaning: a semiotic approach to communication. *Journal for Communication and Culture* 1, 1, 20-29. Retrieved on 15 December 2016, from <http://www.jcc.icc.org.ro/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/JCC-1-2011-20-29.pdf>
- Sujatna, E. T. S. (2012). Applying systemic functional linguistics to Bahasa Indonesia clauses. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(2), 134-146. Retrieved on 15 December 2017, doi: 10.5296/ijl.v4i2.1506.
- Tou, A. B. (1997). *Translational semiotic communication: A transdisciplinary perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Macquarie University.
- Tou, A. B. (2005). *Ihwal translation/ translating versus interpreting dalam kajian translasi*. Makalah disajikan dalam Seminar tentang Penerjemahan di Kopertis Wilayah I, NAD – Sumut.