

# Spatial Metonymy in Balinese Language: Semantic and Syntactic Perspectives

<sup>1</sup>Made Susini, <sup>2</sup>Ni Wayan Kasni, <sup>3</sup>Nyoman Sujaya

**Abstract**--This study reveals metonymy as a language phenomenon related to language manipulation in communication. By this form of language certain entity is used to replace other entity to refer to something and the two entities have a relationship of contiguity. Based on the type of entity used, metonymy is of three types among those are spatial, temporal, and abstract metonymy. Spatial metonymy uses spatial entities and these entities are related to physical entities that have spatial extensions and can be in three-dimensional space. Applying Seto's E-relation metonymy concept (1999), Halliday's grammatical metaphor (2009), and Halliday & Matthiessen's structure of transitivity (2014), semantically this research is to investigate the types of spatial metonymy found in Balinese language and syntactically to explore them from transitivity structure perspective. The data sources of this research are books of Balinese short stories. Biernacka's procedure was applied to identify metonymy and functional grammatical analysis method to analyze the transitivity structure of the clauses under study. From semantic perspective, the spatial metonymy found in Balinese has the following reference types: 1) the whole-part type, 2) the container-contents type, and 3) the adjacency type). The whole-part types include: a) object-component type, b) organization-member type, and c) object-material type. From transitivity structure view point, incongruent structure is only found in two types of spatial metonymy which include organization-member type and object-component type. A metonymic construction does not always imply that it has incongruent grammatical realization.

**Key words**--metonymy, entities, contiguity, reference, transitivity.

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

Communication involving language cannot be separated from the language styles used and each language style has a certain form that is used for certain purposes as well. To achieve the purpose, certain variation may be used and it is different between languages. Idawati (2020) has investigated the characteristics of politeness in a community language and her research finding shows that sound pressure is one of the characteristics. It is also a common phenomenon that to achieve communication purpose, language is sometimes manipulated and becomes creative (Haniah et al, 2019). How language is manipulated can also be seen in translation (Susini, et al, 2018). The research on translation studies conducted found out that a number of metaphorical constructions are used in Indonesian meditation texts and they are demetaphorized in their English translation. Another language creativity which needs to be concerned is metonymy. Traditionally metonymy is put within a figure of speech in which one linguistic expression is substituted by another. Recently, metonymy is not simply regarded as a matter of language, but as a process within

---

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Warmadewa, Bali, Denpasar. E-mail: madesusini@yahoo.com

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Warmadewa, Bali, Denpasar

<sup>3</sup>Universitas Warmadewa, Bali, Denpasar

our cognition. This view of language phenomenon is in line to what proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) that metonymy has become part of people's everyday way of thinking. This is for that reason that Radden and Kövecses in Panther and Radden (1999: 17) viewed a conceptual framework of metonymy as a cognitive process. As a cognitive process, metonymy has three properties: a) metonymy is a conceptual phenomenon, b) metonymy is a cognitive process, and c) metonymy operates within an idealized cognitive model.

Another view of metonymy is proposed by Seto in Panther and Radden (1999: 91). When metonymy is regarded as the condition that A is used to stand for B with which A and B are closely associated, Seto argued that this concept may cover other concepts among those are metaphor and synecdoche. For this controversy between metonymy and synecdoche, Seto in Panther and Radden (1999: 91) proposed a concept of metonymy and defined metonymy as a relationship related to an entity (an Entity-related transfer). This entity relation (E-relation) deals with relation of contiguity between entities, not classes. The whole-part relation is one type of metonymy. However, not all whole-part relationships are categorized as metonymy. The whole-part relationship which shows 'part of' (Entity-relation) is classified as metonymy. If the relationship indicates 'included in', this form is classified as a synecdoche. This is a kind of category relation (C-relation) (Seto in Panther and Radden, 1999: 92). Based on Seto's concept, metonymy is categorized based on the type of the entity used. One of them is spatial metonymy which is indicated by the use of spatial entities, namely entities that have spatial extensions and can be in three-dimensional space, such as humans, dogs, bicycles, and so on (Seto in Panther and Radden, 1999: 96-97). Viewing entities are different among languages and they shape our metonymic language in various ways, spatial metonymy as a language phenomenon is important to be investigated.

There have been numerous researches on metonymy conducted previously. They worked on various fields, such as metonymy in humor (Tabacaru, 2016), political debates (Amanda, 2017), parliamentary speeches (Cabrejas-Peñvelas, 2018), and in idioms (Negro, 2019; Michl, 2019). The data analysis was also viewed from different perspectives, such as discourse analysis (Fu, 2016; Amanda, 2017). These studies have shown that there has been no study that specifically addressed Balinese spatial metonymy viewed from different theory. Applying Seto's E-relation metonymy concept (1999), Halliday's grammatical metaphor (2009), and Halliday & Matthiessen's structure of transitivity (2014), this present research is to explore the types of spatial metonymy found in Balinese and to examine them from their transitivity structure view point. If the metonymic language always has incongruent grammatical structure, it will mean that metonymic language is always in line to grammatical metaphor.

## II. METHODOLOGY

The data sources of this research are Balinese story books entitled *Biur. Pupulan Cerpen Basa Bali* (Santha, 2002) and *BELOG: Pupulan Cerita Cutet* (Tudékamatra, 2014). Story books were chosen as sources of data on the basis of the consideration that they reflect the real life that the language used can be regarded as the representation of the language phenomena found in society. The stages carried out in this study are as the following.

To identify metonymy, it was by applying Biernacka's procedure (Biernacka in Littlemore and Tagg, 2018). The procedure includes:

1. reading the entire text to get the whole meaning;
2. determining the lexical units;
3. deciding on metonymicity of every lexical unit which was done by establishing the contextual meaning for every lexical unit, determining if the lexical unit has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the meaning in the given context. If this condition occurs, the next procedure is determining whether they have contiguous relation or not.
4. If the two meanings are related by contiguity, checking backward and forward was carried out to determine if any other lexical unit (s) belong (s) together from semantic point of view. The last stage is determining the extent of the metonymy vehicle and marking the lexical unit as metonymy vehicle.

To analyze the metonymic construction from transitivity structure perspective, functional grammatical analysis method was applied (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). The metonymic clauses were identified by sorting their clause components of process, participants, and circumstance. If the components are realized in incongruent way, this implies that the metonymic clauses under study belong to grammatical metaphor. To identify their incongruent structure, congruent realizations were also presented (Saddhono, 2017).

### III. RESULTS

Based on its reference type, spatial metonymy found in Balinese includes the whole-part type, the container-contents type, and other adjacency type. This is in accordance with the types of spatial metonymy proposed by Seto in Panther and Radden (1999).

#### A. The whole-part type

Whole-part type has to do with the type in which a part of entity is used to refer to the whole entity, or vice versa. This type covers object-component type, organization-member type, and object-material type.

##### 1. Object-component type

- (a) Punyan biu gedangé ento bah. *Biu gadangé* ento suba mabuah sawetara duang bulan. Tusing lebian buin abulan lakar nasak (Tudékamatra, 2014:5).

<i>Biu gedangé ento</i>	<i>suba</i>	<i>mabuah</i>	<i>sawetara</i>	<i>duang</i>	<i>bulan</i>
Banana <i>gedang</i> (DEF)	has been	bearing fruit	for about	two	months
'The banana <i>gedang</i> has been bearing fruit for about two months'					

Banana in Balinese is classified into some kinds. *Biu gedang* 'banana gedang' is one of the types. In the above context, the entity *biu gedang* is not used to refer to the banana because it is not possible for the fruit to produce fruit. What produces fruit is the banana tree. Therefore, metonymy in the above context is the use of a part of entity, i.e. the banana, which is used to refer to the whole, i.e. the banana tree.

- (b) Anak muani ento sedek ngamanesang *montorné* lakar abana majalan ka tongosné magagé di dura désa (Tudékamatra, 2014:38).

<i>Anak muani nto</i>	<i>sedek ngamanesang</i>	<i>montorné</i>
Man (DEF)	heat (PROG)	motorcycle (POS)
'The man is heating his motorcycle'		

The verb used in the example above is *ngemanesang* 'to heat'. The use of this verb shows that what is heated is not the whole motorcycle, but the engine of the motorcycle. In this context the type of spatial metonymy that exists is the whole, i.e. *montor* 'motorcycle' to refer to the part of the motorcycle, i.e. motorcycle engine. The entity *montor* 'the motor cycle' is used to refer to the entity *motorcycle engine*.

- (c) Madé Karya ngrémon padidi sambilanga macelep ka *angkul-angkulumahné* (Tudékamatra, 2014:49).

<i>Made Karya</i>	<i>ngrémon</i>	<i>padidi</i>	<i>sambilanga</i>	<i>macelep</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>angkul-angkul umahné</i>
Made Karya	grumbled	to himself	while	entered		house gate (POSS)
'Made Karya grumbled to himself while entering the gate of his house'						

*Angkul-angkul umah* is part of the overall building of the house in the front position. In Balinese context, someone who will enter the house must pass the *angkul-angkul*. That is why entering the *angkul-angkul* 'the gate' is to mean entering the house. This type of spatial metonymy is a part-whole type by using *angkul-angkul* which functions as the first to refer to the house which functions as the second entity. When the text above is worded in non-metonymic construction, the wording is: *Madé Karya ngrémon padidi sambilanga macelep ka umahné ngeliwatin angkul-angkul umahné* 'Made Karya grumbled to himself while entering the house through the gate of his house'.

## 2. Organization-member type

- (a) Limang *Sekolah Dasar* sané urukang ipun, sabilang rahina magiliran. Wiyakti pakaryan sané ngemedin (Santha, 2002:1).

<i>Limang</i>	<i>Sekolah Dasar</i>	<i>sané</i>	<i>urukang</i>	<i>ipun</i>
Five	Elementary school	which	teach (PASS)	Person III (SING)
Five Elementary Schools which are taught by him'				

Teaching is an activity that involves instructors and students in an educational institution. So, a teacher does not teach the institution, but students who study at the institution. In the datum above Elementary School is used to refer to the students in the school. If this spatial entity is used in accordance with what is referred to, the form is as the following.

<i>Murid-murid di limang Sekolah Dasar</i>	<i>sané</i>	<i>urukang</i>	<i>ipun</i>
Students in five elementary schools	who	teach (PASS)	Person III (SING)
‘Students in five elementary schools are taught by him’			

(b) *Banjaré* tedun lakar ngaénang sekancan piranti lan upakara ané lakar anggonna di upacara nanemné (Tudékamatra, 2014:25).

<i>Banjaré</i>	<i>tedun</i>	<i>lakar ngaénang</i>	<i>sekancan</i>	<i>piranti lan upakara</i>
<i>Banjar</i> (DEF)	come	make (FUT)	all	equipment and ceremonies
‘ <i>Banjar</i> will come to make all equipment and ceremonies’				

In Bali, *banjar* is a term used to refer to the building where members of community in a certain area gather. The *banjar* referred to in the sentence above is not the building but the community who are members of that *banjar*. This can be seen from the verbs that are used, i.e. the verb *tedun* ‘to come’ and *ngaenang* ‘to make’. These two verbs require animate subject. If the sentence above is arranged according to the entity referred to, the form is as follows.

<i>Krama banjaré</i>	<i>tedun</i>	<i>lakar ngaénang</i>	<i>sekancan</i>	<i>piranti lan upakara</i>
Members of banjar (DEF)	come	make (FUT)	all	equipment and ceremonies
‘The members of the <i>banjar</i> will come to make all equipment and ceremonies’.				

### 3. Object-material type

“O kéto. *Nasiné* tondén lebeng, Mé?”

“Ené jani Mémé lakar ngangkid nasiné malu ka paon, “ ... (Tudékamatra, 2014:3).

<i>Nasiné</i>	<i>tondén</i>	<i>lebeng</i>
Cooked rice (DEF)	has not	be cooked
‘The cooked rice has not been cooked yet’		

In Balinese context, the word *nasi* is used to refer to *rice which has undergone a cooking process*. That's why it is not possible if *nasi* is cooked again. What is cooked is the material of *nasi* 'cooked rice', i. e. *baas* 'the uncooked rice'. In this object-material type of metonymy, *nasi* functions as object, while *baas* functions as material.

**B. The container-contents type**

(a) Araké ané telah baana ngoyot suba telung botol lebih.

“Mbok, imbuhin buin *abotol dogén!*” kéto Wayan Nésa morahan kapining Mbok Putri. (Tudékamatra, 2014:29).

<i>imbuhin</i>	<i>buin</i>	<i>abotol</i>	<i>dogén</i>
add	more	one bottle	just
'Just add one more bottle'			

The bottle functions as a container and based on the context of the text, what the speaker asked for is a bottle of traditional Balinese fermented drink called *arak*. This metonymy structure shows that it belongs to the container-contents type because the entity *abotol* 'one bottle' which functions as container is used to refer to its contents, namely *arak*.

(b) “Bapa, lamun Yan Kardi inget, ngendusin tur nagih yéh, sampunang malu liu baanga. Cukup baang *a séndok dogén* (Santha, 2002:59).

<i>Cukup</i>	<i>baang</i>	<i>a séndok</i>	<i>dogén</i>
enough	give	one spoon	just
'It's enough if you just give him one spoon'			

The example above also shows metonymy of container-contents type. Based on the context *séndok* 'spoon' as container is used to mean the content, i.e. *water*.

**C. Adjacency type**

(a) Mara sledétina *bungut paoné*, tepukina nu ngendih lan di duur bungut paoné ento misi panci. Ungkabina panciné, tepukina misi nasi ané tondén lebeng (Tudékamatra, 2014:2).

<i>Mara</i>	<i>sledétina</i>	<i>bungut paoné</i>	<i>tebukina</i>	<i>nu</i>	<i>ngendih</i>
When	looked at	furnace hole (DEF)	saw	still	burn (PROG)
'When he looked at the furnace hole, he saw that it has been burning'					

*Bungut paon* based on Balinese context is a term used to refer to the hole in the furnace that is used as a place for the firewood during the cooking. What is burning when cooking is the wood, and it is not the hole of the furnace.

The speaker of the text above uses other entity, i.e. *bungut paone* ‘the furnace hole’ to mean other entity, i.e. the fire wood. The two entities do not show part-whole, container-content relations, but they are in contiguity and related each other.

- (b) Ia malaib ka balé daja ngalih méméné ané sedek mabalih *tipi* sambilanga majejaitan canang (Tudékamatra, 2014:50).

<i>méméné</i>	<i>ané</i>	<i>sedek mebalih</i>	<i>tipi</i>
mother (POSS))	who	watch (PROG)	TV
‘... her mother who is watching TV’			

*Tipi* ‘TV’ refers to the electronic media used to broadcast news. What people watch is the news broadcasted via TV. Therefore, the entity *TV* in the above context is used to refer to the news that is broadcasted on TV. TV and news are in contiguous relation, but one of them is not as a part/whole of another nor as the container/contents of another.

To summarize, Balinese language shows the existence of all types of spatial metonymy viewed from the semantic concept of metonymy (Seto in Panther and Radden, 1999: 99-104). Based on the data under study, the use of the entity in metonymic language can be vice versa. Metonymy of objects-component type is found to apply in two ways. The use of *montorné* in the datum ‘*ngamanesang montorné* ‘to heat the motorcycle’ shows that object *montorné* ‘his motorcycle’ refers to component *mesin montorné* ‘the machine of the motorcycle’. The opposite is found in the datum *biu gedangé ento suba mabuah* ‘the banana *gedang* is bearing fruit’ where the component *biu gedangé ento* ‘the banana *gedang*’ is used to refer to the object *punyan biu gedangé* ‘the banana tree’.

From transitivity structure point of view, it can be shown how metonymy shapes our message and how the components of the text are manipulated to become creative. When the metonymic language is compared to the non-metonymic one, mostly its transitivity structure keeps constant. The reason is that the entity used in metonymic language is still in the same unit, i.e. the part of the noun group (*montor* ‘motorcycle’ for *mesin montor* ‘the machine of the motorcycle’; *tipi* ‘TV’ for *berita di tipi* ‘the news on TV’, and so forth). The transitivity structures of the metonymic and non-metonymic language are as follows.

**Metonymic wording:**

Anak muani ento	sedek ngamanesang	<i>montorné</i>
Actor	Process: Material/ Action	Goal

**Non-metonymic wording:**

Anak muani ento	sedek ngamanesang	<i>mesin montorné</i>
Actor	Process: Material/Action	Goal

The transitivity structure of the two constructions shows that they both belong to the same clause type and have the same components. Both represent material clause of action with inanimate Goal.

In some cases some metonymic constructions result in shift of transitivity if compared with the non-metonymic one. The change of transitivity structure in Balinese metonymic language is illustrated as the following.

**Metonymic wording:**

<i>Banjaré</i>	<i>tedun lakar ngaénang</i>	<i>sekancan piranti lan upakara</i>
Actor	Process: Material/Event	Goal

**Non-metonymic wording:**

<i>Krama Banjaré</i>	<i>tedun lakar ngaénang</i>	<i>sekancan piranti lan upakara</i>
Actor	Process: Material/Action	Goal

From grammatical metaphor point of view, a shift of transitivity structure occurs in the datum above. Material clause of action turns into material clause of Event. Another datum is illustrated below.

**Metonymic wording:**

<i>Madé Karya</i>	<i>macelep</i>	<i>ka angkul-angkul umahné</i>
Actor	Process: Material/Action	Cicumstance

**Non-metonymic wording:**

<i>Madé Karya</i>	<i>macelep</i>	<i>ka umahné</i>	<i>ngeliwatin angkul-angkul umahné</i>
Actor	Process: Material/Action	Cicumstance	Cicumstance

Shift of transitivity structure also occurs in the datum above. The two structures have different components. The first is with one component of Circumstance, while the second two components of Circumstance. This research finding becomes a new approach which can be applied in investigating metonymic language from different perspective. There is no previous research on Balinese spatial metonymy which was viewed from Halliday and Matthiessen's view point. The research conducted previously explored metonymy from different approaches, such as



discourse analysis (Fu, 2016; Amanda, 2017, Widodo & Saddhono, 2012; Saddhono, 2018), cognitive linguistics (Tabacaru, 2016), conceptual metonymy theory (Cabrejas-Peñvelas, 2018; Negro, 2019).

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Numerous spatial metonymies occur in Balinese language. This becomes a proof that spatial metonymy has been a part of daily Balinese language activities and that Balinese language is a creative language.

1. Balinese uses various spatial entities to form spatial metonymy. The types include the overall types proposed by Seto in Panther and Radden (1999).
2. Not all metonymic constructions show incongruent grammatical structures. The incongruent structure is only found in organization-member type and object-component type. When a construction shows metonymy, it does not imply that it shows grammatical metaphor.

#### REFERENCES

1. Amanda, E. (2017). Metaphor, Metonymy, and Voice in Political Debates: A Discourse Analysis Study. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*. ALR Journal 2017; 1(1): 41-48. doi: 10.14744.alrj.2017.58077.
2. Cabrejas-Peñvelas, A. B. (2018). Metonymy in Spanish and American parliamentary speeches: Obama's State of the Union Address versus Rajoy's State of the Nation Address. *Cultural Studies Journal of Universitat Jaume I*. ISSN 1697-7750. Vol.XIX/2018, pp. 45-69. DOI: HTTP://DX.DOI.ORG/10.6035/CLR.2018.19.3.
3. Fu, Z. (2016). The Application of Conceptual Metonymy in Discourse Coherence. *International Journal of English Language Education*. ISSN 2325-0887, Vol. 4, No. 2. doi: 10.5296/ijele.v4i2.9485.
4. Halliday, M.A.K.. (2009). *The Essential Halliday*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
5. Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M.. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar. Fourth Edition*. New York: Routledge.
6. Haniah, Widodo, ST, Suwandi, S, Saddhono, K, and Mohamad, B. (2019). Investigating the Traditional Proverbs and their Impact on Cultural Identity and Communication: Lessons from the Madurese Community. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*. 11(5) 846-857
7. Idawati. (2020). Characteristics of Politeness in Language in Perspective, Culture in the Pendopo-Lintang Right Society. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, Vol. 24, Issue 3, pp. 1322-1335. DOI: 10.37200/IJPR/V 24I3/PR 200882.
8. Littlemore, J. and Tagg, C. (2018). Metonymy and Text Messaging: A Framework for Understanding Creative User of Metonymy. *Open Research Online*. Applied Linguistics, 39 (4) pp. 481-507. The Open University. <http://dx.doi.org/doi: 10.1093/applin/amw018>.
9. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
10. Michl, D. (2019). Metonymies are more literal than metaphors: evidence from ratings of German idioms. *Language and Cognition* 11 (2019), 98-124. doi: 10.1017/langcog.2019.7.
11. Negro, I. (2019). Metaphor and Metonymy in Food Idioms. *Languages* 2019, 4, 47; doi: 10.3390/languages4030047. [www.mdpi.com/journal/languages](http://www.mdpi.com/journal/languages).
12. Panter, K.-U. and Radden, G. (1999). *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
13. Radden, G. & Kövecses, Z. (199). *Towards a theory of metonymy*, in Panter K.-U., and Radden, G. (eds), *Matonymy in Language and Thought*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: JohnBenjamin Publishing Company pp. 17-59.
14. Saddhono, K (2018). Language and superdiversity: Indonesians knowledging at home and abroad. By Zane Goebel. *Sociolinguistic Studies*. 12(1), 113-118
15. Saddhono, K. (2017). Language of Coastal Communities in the Northern Coast of Central Java: Sociolinguistic Studies in Cultural Integration Maritime-Agrarian Perspective. *Advanced Science Letter*. vol. 23 no.10 pp 10054-10056, 2017
16. Santha, Dj. (2002). *Biur*. Pupulan Cerpen Basa Bali. Denpasar: Sanggar Buratwangi.

17. Seto, K. (1999). Distinguishing metonymy from synecdoche, in Panter K.-U., and Radden, G. (eds), *Matonymy in Language and Thought*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company, pp. 91-120.
18. Susini, M., Sudipa, I N., Suparwa, I N., Puspani, I. A. M. (2018). Demetaphorization in the Translation of Meditation Text. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, volume 166. 4<sup>th</sup> PRASASTI International Conference on Recent Linguistics Research (PRASASTI 2018)*. Atlantis Press.
19. Tabacaru, S. (2016). The Power of Metonymy in Humour: Stretching contiguous relations across different layers of meaning. *European Journal of Humor Research* 4 (2), 1-18. [www.europeanjournalofhumor.org](http://www.europeanjournalofhumor.org). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7592/EJHR2016.4.2.tabacaru>.
20. Tudékamatra. (2014). *BELOG: Pupulan Cerita Cutet*. Tabanan: Pustaka Ekspresi.
21. Widodo, ST and Saddhono, K. (2012). Petangan Tradition In Javanese Personal Naming Practice: An Ethnolinguistic Study. *GEMA Online: Journal. of Language. Studies*. 12(4), 1165-1177