INTERPERSONAL MEANING IN NETANYAHU'S SPEECH

Arif Firmansah
Department of English Education, University of Kuningan, Indonesia
E-mail: Arif.firmansah.iced@gmail.com

Abstract:
This study investigates how the interpersonal meaning is realized in the speech of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. This study aimed to uncover (1) the mood structure which realized in Netanyahu's speech of Iran and Palestine and (2) To what extent the difference in field determine the interpersonal metafunction of the speaker. This study is largely qualitative but in order to answer those research questions, this study will be assisted by some descriptive quantification to observe the trend in the interpersonal meaning of the speaker. It applies Hallidayan theory of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in analyzing the research data. The data were taken from the websites which are readily accessible to the public. Two different transcribed speeches are discovered to extract the data which are needed to investigate the interpersonal meaning. Subject, Finite and Modality are the main tools to realize the interpersonal meaning of Netanyahu in his speech. It can be realized by discovering the use of those parts in his speech in different issue and occasion. It is found that Netanyahu's interpersonal meaning is realized through the placement of Subject and the utilization of Finite, Modality and Mood Adjuncts. It is also found that the differences of the field influence the interpersonal meaning of the speaker through the comparison of subject and finite. The findings in this present study are expected to be useful for some purposes in the future.
Keywords: *Interpersonal meaning, mood, modality.*

INTRODUCTION

Interpersonal meaning is a technical term in Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) related to someone's attitude and judgments. In an utterance, there is meaning that wants to be delivered to the hearer. "Meanings are realized in wordings through what is called mood and modality" Gerot and Wignell (1994:13). Mood is most centrally influenced by the context situation named tenor. On the other hand, Halliday in Beaugrande (1991:245) explains briefly that the interpersonal metafunction concerns 'forms of interaction' and 'embodies all use of language to express social and personal relations', 'personalities, and personal feelings', as well as 'the speaker's intrusion into speech situation and speech act.

The interpersonal meaning can be achieved by analyzing the mood system and its constituents. Mood represents the organization of participants in speech situation and speakers' roles. Mood system consists of two elements. They are mood element and residue.

Mood element contains Subject and Finite. Meanwhile, residue "is a remainder of the clause "(Gerot and Wignell, 1994:25). Mood and residue are the elements which set the clause as exchange. Those can be analyzed to set

how the interpersonal meaning is constructed in such situation.

The main structure of mood is Subject and Finite. Subject is a part of nominal group and finite is a part of verbal group. Finite can be a representation of time speaking and the judgment of the speaker as stated by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:115).

Martin et al (1997:62) state that "the mood element makes the clause 'negotiable' and consists of finite, subject and sometimes modal adjunct(s). The finite makes the clause negotiable by coding as positive or negative." It means that the finite is the decisive factor which realizes the interpersonal meaning of the speaker. For detailed explanation, the following section will give brief explanation about the mood elements. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:117) define subject as something by reference to which the proposition can be affirmed or denied. It is also vested the success or failure of the proposition. Subject is also responsible for the functioning of the clause. It can realize the offer or command in a clause.

Furthermore, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p. 119) also state regarding subject, "subject has got distinct identity which can carry modal responsibility which is responsibility for the validity of what is being predicated (stated, questioned, commanded or offered) in the clause." It means that Subject can be placed as the actor of what being said in the utterance which is responsible to what is being discussed. Matthiessen et al. (2010, p. 98) define "the finite verbal operators has the function to express the arguability value of the clause as exchange by reference to either of tense or modality (probability, usuality, obligation, inclination, or ability; high, median or low value)."

In constructing meaning in a clause, finite works by using two operators. They are primary tense (temporal operators) and modality (modal operators). The primary tense is past, present or even future of the speaking time. Meanwhile, modality indicates the speakers' judgment or the obligations in what the speaker is saying (Gerot & Wignell, 1994, p. 27-28).

Finite modal operators represent the three values to set the interpersonal meaning of the speaker. They are high, median and low value. Each of them has their own function. The high value shows the obligation of the matter. The median value functions the inclination or futurity. Then, the low value functions the possibility or ability. The three value of it is represented in the modal used by the speaker. The detailed information will be provided below with the temporal finite operators as taken from Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p. 116). Based on the explanation, the researcher is interested in how Netanyahu positions himself towards current issues faced by Israel regarding Palestine and Iran.

The main issues addressed in this study are the interpersonal meaning of Netanyahu found in his speeches. The enquiry towards these issues is formulated in the following research questions:

1. How is the mood structure realized in Netanyahu speech of Iran and Palestine?
2. To what extent does the difference in field determine the interpersonal metafunction of the speaker?

METHOD

This research is conducted by considering both theoretical and practical purposes. Theoretically, this research is aimed to prove and to develop the theory about interpersonal

meaning expressed by someone in a speech. It investigates interpersonal meaning performed by Benjamin Netanyahu in his speech by means of qualitative method. In order to answer those research questions this research employs qualitative research design. Qualitative research occurs in natural setting where human behaviour and events occur. "The researcher is the primary instrument in data collection rather than some inanimate mechanism and the data emerge from a qualitative study is descriptive" (Creswell, 2003, p. 227).

The primary data of this study was taken from the selected speech transcription in two occasion, they are Netanyahu's speech of Iran and Netanyahu's speech of Palestine. These data are available in international websites which is readily accessible by the public. The object of this study is transcription of the speech taken from several websites which readily accessible by the public. As cited by Sugiyono (2011, p. 329) from Bogdan "in most tradition of qualitative research, the phrase personal document is used broadly to refer to any first person narrative produced by an individual who describes his or her own actions, experiences, and belief."

From the definition above, it can be concluded that the transcription is one of the personal documentation form. Then, the data of the study collected from the document of transcribed speech of Benjamin Netanyahu. Taking some notes was very helpful to analyze the data. In analyzing the data, literature review was the preliminary task. This activity was begun by reviewing related theories and previous studies. Then, preparing the data to be analyzed in accordance with its literature review was done before doing the main activity. In addition, the main activity in this study was analyzing the data. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p. 115), "finite is used to show the proposition to its context in the speech event. This can be done in two ways. One is by reference to the time of speaking; other is by reference to the judgment of the speaker."

The modality is a parameter of the speaker's judgment through his speech. As stated by Gerot and Wignel (1994, p. 23), "modality indicates the speaker's judgment of the probabilities or the obligations involved in what he or she is saying." Finite and modality inseparable because they are the indicators of someone judgment deliver in his or her meaning through the utterances. Furthermore, finite also combined with the polarity in constructing the meaning existing in utterances.

In analyzing the data, the researcher needs to breakdown all the phrase and sentences using the theory of SFG. After getting the data, the researcher tabulates it to get the frequency of the occurrence of the subject of this research. Finally, the researcher translates it into the result supported by further explanation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The foundation used to examine the data in this present study is the mood structure and interpersonal of the speaker is Hallidayan theory named Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). The main issue discussed in this chapter is about the speaker's judgment regarding the sensitive issue in the world; they are about Iran and Palestine.

Iran and Palestine are two countries that have a relationship with Israel. Iran becomes Israel's attention because of the developing of nuclear

program which can threaten Israel. Palestine is being a huge attention from Israel because they have a conflict since 40 years ago. Netanyahu as the Prime Minister of Israel positions himself as the representative of his nation regarding these two sensitive issues through the interpersonal meaning realised in his speech.

In this section, the influence of different field can be analysed which probably influence the interpersonal metafunction of the speaker. The interpersonal meaning of the speaker will be analyzed through the use of subject and also the use of *finite modal operator* because it refers to "the speaker's judgment of the probabilities or the obligations involved in what he or she is saying" (Gerot & Wignell, 1994).

The first focus which probably influences the interpersonal meaning of the speaker is the placement of the subject. The subjects which used by the speaker in both speeches will be compared to be interpreted. It can be an indicator of the speaker's interpersonal meaning on the issue under discussion. For detailed information, the following table will provide the comparison of the realisation of the subject in both speeches.

Table 1. *Realisation of subject in both speeches*

Entities	Realisation	about Iran		about Palestine	
		F	%	F	%
Speaker	I	9	6.48	39	16.32
	We (inclusive)	4	2.88	13	5.44
	We (exclusive)	4	2.88	36	15.06
Subtotal		17	12.23	88	36.82
Iran	Iran	17	12.23	-	-
	Iranian	1	0.72	-	-
	They	10	7.19	-	-
	It	1	0.72	-	-
	That	1	0.72	-	-
Subtotal		30	21.58	-	-
Audience	You	4	2.88	-	-
Palestine	Palestinian	-	-	18	7.53
	They	-	-	1	0.42
	Who	-	-	1	0.42
	This	-	-	1	0.42
	That	-	-	1	0.42
Subtotal		-	-	22	9.21
Israel	Israel	-	-	8	3.35
	Israeli	-	-	2	0.84
	The Jewish	-	-	5	2.09
	The government	-	-	1	0.42
	Who	-	-	1	0.42
	It	-	-	2	0.84
	This	-	-	4	1.67
Subtotal		-	-	23	9.62
Total		51	36.69	133	55.65

Based on the table above, it is found that the speaker placed himself as the subject more when he was speaking about Palestine. It is found in 88 clauses or 36.82%. The speaker placed himself as subject in speech of Iran in 17 clauses or 12.23%. It generally shows his attitude toward the problem. By using the word "we (exclusive)" 36 times or 15.06% in speech of Palestine means that he as the representative of the government wanted to show to the audiences that he and the government are able to overcome the problem with the neighbour country, Palestine. He always stated what government did in the past to bring peace between two states. It is to ensure that they are in the doing good things on this problem. He also tried to represent the audience by using the word "we (inclusive)" to equalize his position with the audiences (Israeli citizen). It is different when he was speaking of Iran. He did not place the word "we (exclusive and inclusive)" too much. He preferred to use "I" to draw his statement toward Iran. He wanted to show his neutral position toward the problem because this problem is still debatable that may trigger the worse conflict.

After that, the speaker placed Iran as the subject more than Palestine. It shows that the speaker more concern on the problem related to Iran which is developing the nuclear program which potentially threatens the security of

international community – especially Israel. The speaker directly mentioned Iran by using the word "Iran" itself to refer to the whole country. In contrast, the speaker used "Palestinian" to refer to the Palestine. The choice of Palestinian shows his judgement toward the Palestine state itself. He did not want to recognize the Palestine as a state so that he just mentioned the people of the Palestine not the country.

Finally, the use of "Israel" in the speech of Palestine also showed the judgment of the speaker as Israeli citizen. He wanted to show that Israel is the most deserved state to own the existing land which is owned by Israel and Palestine. He always states the positive things when he places Israel as the subject. It shows his attitude that he wanted to the audiences that Israel is in the correct position.

In conclusion, by looking at the use of subject, the speaker's attitude and judgment can be interpreted that when he was talking about Iran, he tried to be careful because of the sensitivity of the issue, but when he was talking about Palestine, he looked so confident and sure in delivering the statement.

The next focus is the use of modal finite operators which influence the interpersonal metafunction of the speaker. The following table will provide the comparison of the modal finite operators which used in both speeches.

Table 2. *The frequency of modality in both speeches*

Value	Realisation	about Iran		about Palestine	
		F	%	F	%
Low	Can	5	13.51	7	10.15
	May	1	2.70	1	1.44
	Might	2	5.41	1	1.44
	Could	4	10.81	0	0
Median	Will	8	21.62	30	43.48

	Would	4	10.81	5	7.25
	Should	3	8.11	0	0
	Will not	1	2.70	4	5.80
	Would not	0	0	2	2.90
High	Must	3	8.11	17	24.64
	Have to	5	13.51	0	0
	cannot	1	2.70	2	2.90
Total		37		69	

Regarding the table above, it can be generally concluded that the speaker's attitude on subject matter can be seen through the frequency of *Modal Finite Operator.* Netanyahu used more *Modal Finite Operators* when he wass talking about Palestine. He produced 17 modal which represents the obligation (must). Compared to the speech about Iran, he just used 11 modal operators which represent the obligation. Netanyahu was not overconfident in talking about Iran nuclear program. This significant differentiation, of course, has an influence to the speaker. The emergence of obligation in the speech of Palestine is to show his judgment that the recognition of the Israel as a sovereign state by the Palestinian is a must.

It also shows his judgment toward the problem that he did not place himself to respect to the Palestine even he disposed to force Palestine to do what Israel wants. His power clearly appeared in this speech. He was easily to blame even to force Palestine to recognize Israel and to overcome factions in Palestine such as Hamas and Hezbollah. On the other hand, the fewer number of the obligation in the speech of Iran seems that he did not show his power to this issue. It is probably because of the sensitivity of the case that may trigger the war.

The use of "will" which indicates the futurity also appeared more in the speech of Palestine which appeared 30 times. The use of this word is to figure out the future will be if the Palestinian recognize the Israel as a sovereign state. It is also used to ensure the audiences that the peace will be reached if the neighbour country is ready to live side by side with them. In contrast, Netanyahu was more careful when talking about Iran. He just stated 8 times to draw the futurity (will) of the Iran nuclear program. The use of "will" is used by the speaker to draw the futurity if the international community does not do real action to stop the enrichment of deadly weapon.

The use of "can" indicates the possibility. The emergence of this word is not too significant. The speaker used this word in 7 clauses in the speech of Palestine. The use of this word in speech of Palestine is to show the possibility if both countries co-operate in many sectors. It is also used to ensure the audiences of the importance of the unity of both countries. Contrary, the speaker used the word "can" in 5 clauses to describe that the Iran nuclear program is possible to be observed by the public. He also used this word to show the possibility that the international community may be too late stop Iran if they do not do clear action toward the problem because Iran already run the nuclear program.

In conclusion, the numeric results provided in this chapter uncover the baggage of the speaker concerning the subject matter. The speaker was able to position himself on the problems occur

related to his country. He was able to select the appropriate *modality* to express his judgment in different field. He placed himself in a low value while talking about the highly-strung issue because it may trigger the worse condition. Meanwhile, he placed his high value of judgment on the unfinished problem with the neighbour country, Palestine. Finally, the interpersonal meaning of the speaker can be influenced by the selecting of modality and field what or where he is saying.

CONCLUSION

This study is aimed to reveal the interpersonal metafunctions found in Benjamin Netanyahu selected speech in two different occasions. This present study aims to uncover the mood structure which influences the interpersonal metafunction of the speaker and to what extent the difference in field determine the interpersonal metafunction of the speaker. It employs Systemic Functional Grammar which is originally proposed by Halliday as the main theory to analyze the data. This study has answered the questions of the research about how the mood structure realized in Netanyahu speech of Iran and Palestine and also to what extent does the difference in field determine the interpersonal metafunction of the speaker.

It was found that there are 426 clauses from two selected speech, 150 clauses found in the first speech and 276 clauses found in the second speech. Furthermore, the speaker used some entities to be the subject in clauses. After that, Finite as the primary constituent in Mood element is becoming the main focus in this study. Verbal operator that is frequently used is *temporal finite*. *Temporal finite* in the both speech are

significantly appeared in Iran and Palestine speech (73.38% and 71.72% out of clause). In addition, there is about 26.62% or 37 out of 139 of the *finite operators* in the first speech are *modal*. Meanwhile, 28.28% or 69 out of 244 of the *finite operators* in the second speech are *modal*. In short, the numeric *modal finite operators* appeared in both speech is the expression, assessment, and judgment of the speaker to the issue under discussion. The adjunct of polarity is used 1 time, the adjunct of temporality is used 2 times and the adjuncts of mood appear 4 times in Netanyahu's speech about Iran. Meanwhile, the adjunct of polarity is used 4 times and then the adjuncts of temporality appear 5 times, the adjuncts of usuality also appeared 5 times and the last adjuncts of mood appear 5 times in Netanyahu's speech about Palestine.

Furthermore, the interpersonal meaning of the speaker is also influenced by the field what or where he delivers his speech. The subjects used by the speaker in both speeches indicate that the speaker's interpersonal meaning toward the issue. It is found that the speaker's judgment and attitude are clearly seen when he was talking about the Palestine issue than the Iran issue. The interpersonal meaning of the speaker is also influenced by the use of modal operators. The speaker stated 8 times to draw the futurity, 5 times to draw possibility and 11 times to draw the urgency or obligation regarding the speech about Iran which developing the nuclear program. The speaker holds on himself not to state offensive to prevent the worse condition. Furthermore, regarding the speech of Palestine, the speaker expresses possibility 7 times, the futurity 30 times, and obligation 17 times. It can be interpreted that the speaker has a high confidence in talking

about the conflict between the neighbour countries.

Finally, the construction of interpersonal meaning is really important to be understood. It is because the speaker is not always shows his/her judgment directly. He/she may show it through the diction of the word used in a communication. The speaker may also use indirect language to give a judgment toward something. This is really important to prevent misunderstanding between the speaker and the hearer or even it can be an indicator to know someone personality through his/her interpersonal meaning.

REFERENCES

Benjamin Netanyahu: full speech on Palestinian state. (2009) *(2009, June 19). Retrieved from: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews /middleeast/israel/5535664/Benjamin-Netanyahu-full-speech-on-Palestinian-state.html.*

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry & research design.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

De Beaugrande, R. (1991). *Linguistic theory: The discourse of fundamental works.* London: Longman.

Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics.* New York: Continuum

Feng, H. & Liu, Y. (2010). Analysis of interpersonal meaning in public speeches—A case study of Obama's

Speech. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1(6), 825-829.

Gerot, L. & Wignell, P. (1994). *Making sense of functional grammar.* Sydney: Antipoaean Educational Enterprises.

Halliday, M.A.K & Matthiessen, M.I.M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar (3rd edition).* London: Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K & Webster, Jonathan (2002). *On Grammar.* London: Continuum.

Key portions of Israeli PM Netanyahu's U.N. speech on Iran. (2012, September 27). Retrieved March 19, 2013 from: http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/27/u s-un-assembly-israel-text-idUSBRE88Q1RR20120927. September 27, 2012.

Marczyk, G. R., DeMatteo, D & Festinger, D. (2005). *Essentials of research design and methodology.* New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Martin, J. R. Christian Matthiessen, M. I. M. & Painter, C (1997). *Working with functional grammar.* London: Arnold.

Martin, J.R. (1992). *English text system and structure.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Matthiessen, C. , Lam, M., & Teruya , K. (2010). *Key terms in systemic functional linguistics.* London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Sugiyono (2011). *Metode penelitian pendidikan, pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Ye, R. (2010). The interpersonal metafunction analysis of Barack Obama's victory speech. *English Language Teaching. 3*(2), 146-152.