English and Lampungnese Relational Processes

Afrianto[1]
afrianto@teknokrat.ac.id

Abstract: This research is aimed at configuring the English and Lampungnese relational process and comparing one another. This qualitative research gathered the data from English and Lampungnese lesson books. This research reveals that English and Lampungnese relational clauses demonstrates a similar configuration. Both have relational process and participants in the forms of carrier-attribute and token-value. The English relational process is indicated with copular verbs (become, sound), possessive verbs (have, contain, and consist), auxiliary verb (is, are), and modal (will and should). Furthermore, it is found that the Lampung relational process is also realized by the copular verb (*jadi/dijadiko, iyulah, yakdo,* and *ngeghupako*). Other than a copular word, it is also realized by other relational processes, such as possessive verb (*ngedok, tekughuk*), modal (*dapok*), and other forms (*sebanding, gegoh, artini, and bumakna)*. Further, different from English, Lampung relational clause has a unique characteristic. It is found that sometimes the clause just has participants and no process. This phenomenon will not be found in English.

Keywords: *clause, carrier-attribute, Lampungnese, relational process, token-value*

Abstrak: Penelitian ini diarahkan untuk menelisik konfigurasi proses relasional Bahasa Inggris dan Lampung kemudian membandingkannya satu sama lain. Data penelitian ini dikumpulkan dari buku pelajaran bahasa Inggris dan Lampung. Penelitian ini mengungkapkan bahwa klausa relasional bahasa Inggris dan Lampung memiliki konfigurasi yang serupa. Keduanya memiliki proses relasional dan partisipan dalam bentuk *carrier-attribute* dan *token-value*. Proses relasional dalam bahasa Inggris diindikasikan oleh kata kerja kopula (*become, sound*), kata kerja kepemilikan (*have, contain*, dan *consist*), kata kerja bantu (*is, are*), dan modal (*will* dan *should*). Lebih jauh, ditemukan juga bahwa proses relasional dalam bahasa Lampung direalisasikan oleh kata kerja kopula (*jadi/dijadiko, iyulah, yakdo*, dan *ngeghupako*). Selain itu, proses relasional juga ditunjukkan oleh penggunaan kata kerja kepemilikan (*ngedok* dan *tekughuk*), modal (*dapok*), dan bentuk lain (*sebanding, gegoh, artini*, dan *bumakna*). Kemudian, berbeda dengan bahasa Inggris, klausa relasional dalam bahasa Lampung memiliki karateristik yang unik karena ditemukan bahwa terkadang klausa relasional hanya memiliki partisipan tanpa ada proses. Fenomena ini tidak akan ditemukan dalam bahasa Inggris.

Kata-kata kunci: klausa, *carrier-attribute*, Bahasa Lampung, proses relasional, *token-value*

---
[1] *Lecturers at Faculty of Arts & Education, Universitas Teknokrat Bandarlampung, Lampung, Indonesia*

Regarding Ethnologue (2019), Lampung language (henceforth Lampungnese) is categorized in trouble. It can be reported that it is not only Lampungnese but there are also other 272 indigenous languages from 701 languages in Indonesia are in trouble. Trouble means in a critical condition. Accordingly, Hinton (2011, p. 291-293) argues that conducting research and collecting data can be an optional point to anticipate and overcome the problem of language existence. Thus, this present research is aimed at exploring an indigenous language, i.e. Lampungnese. The exploration is targeted to figure out the relational process in English and Lampungnese clauses and to compare the forms of it one another.

A relational process is an element in a clause. Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) discussit under the discussion of the transitivity system in which there are six types of process, they arematerial, mental, verbal, relational, behavioural and existential processes. A process type defines the type of clause. An English relational clause is realized by a relational process which is in the form of a copular verb, an auxiliary verb, or a possessive verb. For example:

1. His proposal seems very interesting.
2. He is a great football player.
3. John has a pivotal role in his team.

The clauses (1 to 3) are classified into the relational clause. The clause (1) has a relational process in the form of a copular verb (seems) while the clause (2) employs 'to be' (is) as the process. Further, clause (3) employs a possessive verb (has). Accordingly, an English relational clause can be indicated by three forms for its process, mainly 'a copular verb,' 'to be', and 'verb construing possession.' Compared to English, a Lampungnese clause can also be figured out through the form of the process. For example:

4. *Nayuh yaddolah acakha pekhkawinan.*
   Nayuh is ceremony wedding
   'Nayuh is a wedding ceremony.'
5. *Lampung ngedok nayah tradisi.*
   Lampung has many tradition
   'Lampung has many traditions.'

To decide the type of clauses (4 and 5), identifying the process is a way. The clause (4) has two components; participants (*nayuh* and *pekhkawinan*) and a process (*yaddolah*). In this case, the process relates to both participants. Further, the clause (5) also has a pro-

cess (*ngedok*) which relates the participants (*Lampung* and *nayah tradisi*) and construes possession. Accordingly, both clauses demonstrate the relational process in Lampungnese clause and both processes define an identifying relation (*yaddolah*) and possession (*ngedok*). On the other hand, it is another fact that a Lampung relational clause is sometimes found without a process. For example

6. *Lampuni mati.*
Lamp suffix die.
'The lamp is off.'

The clause (6) only has participants; they are 'lampuni' and 'mati'. These participants are not related to a relational process. Even though it has no process, it is, in fact, a clause in Lampung grammar (Udin et al., 1992). This phenomenon will not be found in English and this study tries to find more phenomena to show the similarities and differences between English and Lampungnese relational clause by investigating the elements of them.

This research directs the analysis at clauses. It is to figure out a relational process. A clause has aspects of meaning and function which are called metafunction (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). There are three types of metafunction; they are ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunction. Thus, this research is aimed at discussingthe ideational metafunction which is realized in the transitivity system. Transitivity system explores clause to figure out all components and then to define their senses and functions. The components in the transitivity system are participants, processes, and circumstances (Thompson, 2014, p. 92). The process is classified into six types; they are material, mental, verbal, relational, behavioural, and existential (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, Gerot & Wignel, 1995, Deterding & Poedjosoedarmo, 2001, Eggins, 2004, Lock, 2004, Bloor & Bloor, 2004, Emilia, 2014, and Thompson, 2014).

In a clause, a relational process brings about a relationship between two entities (participants). In other words, an entity identifies, defines, characterizes, and modifies another. Bloor and Bloor (2004, p. 120) posit that in English 'to be' (auxiliary verb) and copular verb can take a role as a relational process (the examples 1 to 3). Further, based on its function the relational process can be categorized into two categories; they are identifying and attributive relational process. An identifying relational process relates two participants in which a participant (value)

identifies another (token). On the other hand, an attributive relational process demonstrates a relation of two participants in which a participant (attribute) modifies and characterizes another (carrier). Regarding Satun (1985), in a clause, an entity which identifies or modifies subject is called complement (subject complement) while a subject is an entity which is identified or modified.

Table 1. Types of the relational process (Halliday & Mathiessen 2014)

Participants	Process	Participants
Token, Identified	Relational Process: Identifying	Value, identifier
Carrier, modified	Relational Clause: Attributive	Attribute, modifier

Other than process and participant, a clause also has circumstances. In a clause, the circumstances modify the process by informing a particular place, time, reason, role, and manner (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014). In other words, the circumstances answer the questions of when, where, how, and why. There are seven types of circumstances; they are temporal, spatial, manner, cause, accompaniment, matter, and role (Gerot & Wignel, 1995).

Nowadays, the exploration of languages through Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is in advanced progress.There were many researchers who have conducted research on SFL toward some languages besides English to figure out the metafunction, such as French (Caffarel, 2004, pp. 77-137), German (Steiner & Teich, 2004, pp. 139-184), Japanese (Teruya, 2004, pp. 185-254), Tagalog (Martin, 2004, pp. 255-304), Chinese (Halliday & McDonald, 2004, pp. 305-396), Vietnamese (Thai, 2004, pp. 397-431), Telugu (Prakasam, 2004, pp. 433-478), Pitjantjatjara (Rose, 2004, pp. 479-536), Arabic (Bardi, 2008), Spanish (Lavid, Arus, & Mansilla, 2010). Two other Indonesian researchers discuss Bahasa Indonesia and indigenous languages (Sundanese and Javanese). They are Sujatna (2012a, pp. 134-146 and 2012b, pp. 468-476) and Wiratno (2017). Compared to those pieces of research, this current research specifically focuses on the relational process as a part of the transitivity system discussion.

METHOD

This research is projected to explore and describe the form of the relational process in English and Lampungnese clauses and then to compare one another; accordingly, this research employs a qualitative method (Croker, 2009). Thus, the interpretative analysis of clauses is conducted to see and describe the relational process and other components (Croker, 2009). On the other hand, the findings are not going to be generalized; it is only to present knowledge and insight for readers (Stake, 2010).

This research employs data in the form of clauses to figure out and compare the form of relational process. To have the equal data between English and Lampungnese, the clauses were taken from the English and Lampungnese lesson books through documentary search (Atkinson & Coffey, 2004). Taking the data from the books was intended to have a natural source since both English and Lampungnese books were made by the native speakers. Further, from the books, the clauses were extracted from the passages (Silverman, 2015).

Patterning the English relational process is the first analysis conducted. The second one is to pattern the Lampungnese relational process. And then, the last step is to compare the patterns in English and Lampungnese. The comparison highlighted the forms of the relational process so that this research can reveal the character of each.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

It can be reported that the configuration of relational clause consists of participants and relational process. This process functions to relate participants and the relation can be attributive and identifying. It is found that there are four forms of the relational process; they are a copular verb, possessive verb, to be, and modal. Further, the findings also clarify that a Lampungnese relational process brings about the attributive and identifying relation. This session presents the findings and the discussion which are divided into three parts; they are English relational process, Lampungnese relational process, and comparison.

Table 2 presents the forms of relational process found in English and Lampungnese clauses. It is noted that copular verb and possessive verb are found as the attributive relational process while to be and modal can demonstrate attributive or identifying relational process. It depends on how a participant (attribute or value) treats another participant else (carrier or token). All findings are presented below.

Table 2. Forms of the relational process in English and Lampungnese

No.	Forms	Types of relational process	E/L*
1	Copular verb	Attributive – identifying	E/L
2	Possessive verb	Attributive	E/L
3	To be	Attributive – identifying	E
4	Modal	Attributive – identifying	E/L

*E (English) – L (Lampungnese)

English Relational Process

As argued by Bloor and Bloor (2004), an English relational process is realized by a copula and to be. Accordingly, this study found them too and affirmed that there was a copula verb (become) which could function as the relational process while the auxiliary verbs were also found, such as are, is. It is not only a sense of relating, but the relational process also defines a sense of having. It is realized by the verb (have) and then this study found three other verbs which construe possession and are copular verbs too, i.e. 'include', 'consist', and 'contain'. Here are the analyses.

Copular verbs

The clauses (1 to 5) show copular verbs (become, means and sound) which function as the relational process. It relates to the participants (Token – Value and Carrier - attribute). Here, one is the identifier (value: 'better or best', 'further or further', and 'toward') and the modifier (attribute: 'so similar' and 'strong enough') while another one is the identified (token: 'good', 'far', and 'To') and the modified (carrier: 'they' and 'it').

1. 74/3/VII Good becomes better or best.
2. 76/3/VII Far becomes further or furthers.
3. 143/3/IX "To" means "towards"
4. 103/1/IX Because they sound so similar
5. 4/1/I it won't sound strong enough!

Good	becomes	better or best
Far	becomes	further or furthers
'To'	means	'toward'
Token	**Process – identifying**	**Value**

They	sound	so similar
It	won't sound	strong enough
Carrier	**Process – attributive**	**Attribute**

Regarding the type of relation, the clauses (1 to 3) are classified into identifying relational processes. It means that the value gives identity to the token. On the other hand, the clauses (4 and 5) demonstrate other forms of the relational process because the participants (so similar and strong enough) modifies other participants they and it. Thus, both processes are the attributive relational processes.

Possessive verb

6. 39/I/8 The exam has 4 parts.
7. 17/VI/2 Your study area should have a tidy workspace with no clutter or distractions and should be well-lit.

It is noted that the clause (6) employs a possessive verb (has) which relates and indicates the characteristics of a participant (The exam). This participant is characterized by another participant (4 parts). It shows that a participant attributes another and thus the process is attributive. It is also found in the clause (7). Here, the process is a verbal group which consists of a modal (should) and a possessive verb (have). Further, there is also another relational process exists in this clause; it is 'should be'. Both processes demonstrate a modified-modifier relation since the nominal group (a tidy workspace with clutter or distractions) and adjectival group (well-lit) modify the nominal group (Your study area).

The exam	Has	4 parts
Your study area	should have	a tidy workspace with no clutter or distractions
	should be	well-lit
Carrier	**Process – attributive**	**Attribute**

According to the relation between the participants, both clauses (6 and 7) are classified into the attributive relational clause. Also, there are two other processes which contextually construe possession; they are 'contain' and 'consist'.

8. 40/IV/8 Part four will contain a dialogue between two people
9. 32/I/7 It consists of two separate words i.e. "good" and

"looking" …

The clause (8) has a verbal group which consists of a modal (will) and a verb (contain). In this clause, the relational process indicates that a participant (a dialogue between two people …) characterizes another (Part four) which is the carrier. In other words, this carrier (Part four) has an entity which becomes the characteristic or in this case is the attribute. The next clause (9) also employs a verb which contextually construes possession, i.e. 'consist'. Regarding the context of the discourse, the word 'it' refers to a nominal group (a compound word) and becomes the carrier which is modified by the attribute (two separate words …). It is also shown that this attribute belongs to the carrier.

Part four	will contain	a dialogue between two people …
It (a compound word)	consists of	two separate words i.e. "good" and "looking" …
Carrier	**Process – attributive**	**Attribute**

Showing a possessive meaning and a modified-modifier relation, both clauses demonstrate the attributive relational clause. Furthermore, there is a copular verb (got) construing a possession. It is presented in the clause (10).

10. 41/I/9   It's got spots on it.

Contextually, the word 'it' refers to 'a dog' discussed in the previous clauses. The process (got) indicates an entity which is owned by the dog, i.e. 'spots' and then the 'spots' becomes the characteristic of the dog. Hence, this relation affirms that the clause (10) is an attributive relational clause.

It	's got	spots	on it
Carrier	**Process – attributive**	**Attribute**	**Circumstance**

To be

The next form of relational process found is 'to be'. It is presented in the clauses (11 to 13). Those clauses show a different relation between their participants. It is noted that the clause (11) with its process (is) show an identied – identifier relation because the participant (your thing) represents or identifies

another participant (meeting stranger). On the other hand, the clauses (12 and 13) indicate the modified-modifier relation. For example, the clause (12) has the participant (an easy place to make new friends) modifying 'London' and then the participant (important) also modifies another participant (Being polite and knowing how to apologize).

11. 15/V/2   If meeting strangers isn't your thing,
12. 22/I/4   London is not always an easy place to make new friends.
13. 10/X/1   Being polite and knowing how to apologize is important in all languages and cultures.

Regarding the relation existing in those clauses, the clause (11) is an identifying relational clause while the clauses (12 and 13) are classified into the attributive relational process. Besides, clause 13 has a circumstance, i.e. 'in all languages and cultures'. These clauses can be presented as follow.

meeting strangers	isn't	your thing	
Token	**Process – identifying**	**Value**	

London	is not	always an easy place to make new friends.	
Being polite and knowing how to apologize	are	important	in all languages and cultures
Token	**Process – attributive**	**Value**	**Circumstance**

Lampungnese Relational Clause

It is found that a Lampungnese relational process can be in various forms, such as copular verb, possessive verb, and modal. Besides, regarding the findings, it can be probed that Lampung relational clause shows a similar configuration to English. It can be proven through the clauses presented in this part. However, there is also a discussion which highlights a difference in English and Lampungnese relational clauses.

Copular verbs

The copular verb in Lampungnese plays the same function, it inks participants in a

clause and shows the relation and thus is included in the relational process. The discussion is represented in the clauses (14 to 17).

14. 26/IV/1   Mudah-mudahan kebeghanian Radin Intan II sina dapok dijadiko teladan guwai generasi muda Lampung.
15. 44/IV/2   Kibau sina jadi penettu dana di lom pelaksanaan prosesi adat Lampung Pepadun.
16. 009/I/1   … waghna bulu ni sai jadi halom unyin.
17. 95/II/4   … warga masyarakat sikak lamon si jadi korban akibat penyalahgunaan narkoba sina.

The clauses (14 to 17) demonstrate a different type of relational process even though they used the same process. It can be noted that the clauses (14 and 15) employ the copular verbs and are classified into the identifying relational process. It is worth noting that the clause (14) is structured in a passive construction and its process (*dijadiko*) indicates an identified-identifier relation because the participant (*teladan guwai generasi muda Lampung*) provides an identity for another participant (*kebeghanian Radin Intan II sina*). The next clause (15) also shows a similar relation. Other than participant and process, circumstances are also found in both clauses; they are 'mudah-mudahan', 'guwai generasi muda' and 'di lom pelaksanaan adat Lampung Pepadun'. Here are the analyses.

Mudah-mudahan	*Kebeghanian/Radin Intan II /sina*	*Dapok* **dijadiko**	*teladan*	*guwai/generasi/muda/ Lampung.*
Hopefully	Bravery/Radin Intan II/that	Can become	role model	For/generation/young/ Lampung
'Hopefully, the bravery of RadinIntan II can be a role model for Lampung young generation.'				
Circum-stance	**Token**	**Process – identifying**	**Value**	**Circumstance**

Kibau - sina	*Jadi*	*penettu/dana*	*di lom/ pelaksanaan/ prosesi/ adat/ Lampung/ Pepadun*
Buffalo - that	become	determination/ fund	in/ commemoration/ ceremony/ culture/ Lampung/ pepadun
'The buffalo becomes the standard for the fund in conducting a cultural ceremony in Lampung pepadun.'			
Token	**Process – identifying**	**Value**	**Circumstance**

Even though the next two clauses (16 and 17) have the same copular verb for their processes, both clauses show a different relation between the participants. Each of both clauses employs a participant which modifies the carrier. The modifiers are 'halom' and 'korban' while the participants modified (carrier) are 'waghna bulu ni' and 'warga masyarakat sikak lamon'. This relation affirms that both processes are the attributive relational process. Further, the circumstance is also found in both clauses; they are 'unyin' and 'akibat penyalahgunaan narkoba sina'.

Further, there are other copular verbs found; they are *iyulah, yakdo/yakdolah*, and *ngeghupako*. In Lampung, they commonly appear in a non-verbal clause. Based on the formal grammar, it becomes the predicate to link the subject and complement while in the functional grammar perspective, it links carrier and attribute or token and value. As a note, a non-verbal clause refers to a clause which process does not construe doing, sensing, saying, behaving, or existing but it indicates a structure of relating and having.

Waghna/bulu/ni	*sai/ **jadi***	*Halom*	*Unyin*
Color/feather/its	which/ become	black	Completely
'The color of its feather turned into black completely.'			
Warga masyarakat/sikak lamon	*si / **jadi***	*Korban*	*akibat/ penyalahgunaan/ narkoba/ sina*
People/many	who/ become	victim	result/ abuse/ drug/ that
'Many people become a victim of drug abuse.'			
Carrier	**Process – attributive**	**Attribute**	**Circumstance**

18. 009/II/1 *Pelajaghan sai ketelu iyulah pelajaghan bahasa Lampung.*
19. 25/IV/1 *Sai nulisni iyulah Mayor A.W.P. Weitzel.*

The clauses (18 to 20) employ 'iyulah' to be the relational process. This process indicates an identified-identifier relation because each participant after this process (such as 'pelajaghan bahasa Lampung', and 'Mayor A.W.P. Weitzel') identifies the other participants (token). Therefore, these clauses have the identifying relational process. It can be presented as follows.

It is worth noting that 'iyulah'basically has the same meaning 'yakdolah'. It is found that there is no special characteristic of usage for both. They can paradigmatically substitute each other. It can be seen in the clause (20).

20. 111/VIII/4 *Raden Intan II yakdo putra Raja Keghatuan Ghah Handak, Raden Imba Kusuma, datuk Raden Inten II yakdo Raden Inten I.*

The clause (20) is a clause complex which consists of two clauses. These clauses have a similar process, i.e. 'yakdo'. The process in-

Pelajaghan/ sai/ ketelu	***iyulah***	*Pelajaghan/bahasa/Lampung*
Lesson/ which/ third	Is	Lesson/language/Lampung
'The third lesson is Lampung language.'		
Sai/nulis/ni	***Iyulah***	*Mayor A.W.P. Weitzel*
Who/write/it	Is	Mayor A.W.P. Weitzel
'The one who wrote it was Mayor A.W.P. Weitzel.'		
Token	**Process – identifying**	**Value**

dicates an identified-identifier relation. It can be seen in the first clause; the participant (*putra Raja Keghatuan Ghah Handak, Raden Imba Kusuma*) identifies who 'RadenIntan II' is. Therefore, this clause has an identifying relational process. Furthermore, another clause also shows a similar configuration as presented below.

There is a characteristic which can be noted from the clause (20). It is found that the participants in each clause can be reversed, for instance; the first clause can be 'Putra Raja Keghatuan Ghah Handak, Raden Imba Kusuma yakdo Raden Intan II' and the second one can also be 'Raden Inten I yakdo datuk Raden Intan II'. Thus, this reverse is

Raden Intan II	***yakdo***	*putra/ Raja Keghatuan Ghah Handak, Raden Imba Kusuma*
Raden Intan II	Is	son/ The King of Keghatuan Ghah Handak, Raden Imba Kusuma
'Raden Intan II is a son of The King of Keghatuan Ghah Handak, Raden Imba Kusuma,'		
Datuk/ Raden Inten II	***yakdo***	*Raden Inten I*
Grand father/ Raden Intan II	Is	Raden Inten I
'Raden Intan II's grandfather is Raden Intan I.'		
Token	**Process – identifying**	**Value**

an alternative way to indicate an identifying relational process.

The next copular verb found is *ngeghupako*. It is found that there are two forms; 'ngeghupako' and 'ngeghupakon'. Both refer to the same meaning and function and are spoken in different dialect/area.

21. 55/V/2   *Sekura sinji ngeghupako pentas atraksi silik pencak silat...,*
22. 81/IV/3   *Sebagian kani kan hinji nge ghupako hasil karya inda ikan cagham.*

23. 90/I/4   ... *bahasa ngeghupako cermi -nan atau isi budaya daerah setempat.*
24. 102/VI/4   *Ghani hinji ngeghupakon ghani busejarah bagi hikam,*

The process (*ngeghupako*) appearing in the clauses (21 to 24) is one of the relational processes which commonly indicates the identified-identifier relation. It means that the participants taking the role as the value can be reversed into the beginning of the clause without changing their function and role.

Token	Process – identifying	Value
Sekura/ sinji sekura (mask) / this	***ngeghupako*** Is	*Pentas/ atraksi/ silik pencaksilat* Performance/ attraction/ silik pencaksilat
'This mask (sekura) is a performance of pencaksilat.'		
Sebagian - kanikan– hinji Some – food – this	***ngeghupako*** Is	*hasil - karya - indai - kanca - gham.* Result – work – friend – my
'Some of the food was made by my friends.'		
Bahasa Language	***ngeghupako*** Is	*cerminan - atau - isi - budaya - daerah – setempat* Reflection – or – content – culture – local - there
'A language is a reflection of a certain culture.'		
Ghani – hinji day – this	***ngeghupakon*** Is	*ghani - busejarah - bagi – hikam* day – history – for – me
'Today is a historic day for me.'		

It is shown that each value represents the token and then the position of the value can be exchanged with the token. Thus, it is proven that the processes (in the clauses 21 to 24) are classified into the identifying relational process. Additionally, there are two Lampungnese relational processes which are found and construe possession; they are 'ngedok' and 'kughuk'/'tekughuk'.

Possessive verb
25. 77/III/3   ...*provinsi gham ngedok bahasa daerah* ...
26. 50/V/2   *Topeng Lampung kughuk di lom tradisi sai musti dipeghta -hanko.*
27. 93/I/4   ... *bahasa Lampung sina tekughuk anugerah Tuhan ...'*

The clause (25) employs a process (ngedok) which indicates a modified-modifier relation because the participant (bahasa daer-

ah) becomes the characteristic for 'provinsi gham'. Therefore, this clause is an attributive relational clause.

Carrier	Process – attributive	Attribute
Provinsi / gham Province / we	***ngedok*** have	*bahasa/ daerah* language / local
'Our province has a local language.'		

It is worth noting that the next two clauses (26 and 27) have a modified-modifier relation. It can be seen from the participants (tradisi sai musti dipeghtahanko and anugerah Tuhan) which are the main part and the other participants (*Topeng Lampung* and *bahasa Lampung*) are a part of the main. In this case, both clauses are classified into the identifying relational process.

Carrier	Process – identifying	Attribute
Topeng/ Lampung	***kughuk*/ di lom**	*tradisi/sai/musti/dipeghtahanko*
Mask / Lampung	include / in	custom / which / must / preserve
'Lampung mask is included in a tradition which must be preserved,'		
bahasa/ Lampung/ sina	***tekughuk***	*anugerah/Tuhan*
Language / Lampung / that	included	gift / God
'Lampung language is a gift from God.'		

Other forms for the Relational Process

There are three more findings which also take a role as the relational process; they are 'dapok' (modality), 'sebanding' and 'gegoh' (equality and representation), and 'artini' and 'bumakna' (definition). The clause (28) employs a modal which links two participants in which one modifies another. It is shown that 'macom-macom' modifies 'bulu gham waghnani'; therefore, this clause is an attributive relational clause.

28. 003/I/1 '*... bulu gham waghnani dapok macom-macom*', ...

Carrier	Process – attributive	Attribute
bulu/gham/ waghnani	Dapok	macom-macom
feather/our/ color	Can	Varied
'The color of our feather can be varied.'		

The next relational process construes equality. It means that the participants in a clause are compared one another and have a similar condition/state. It can be found in the clauses (29 and 30). Due to this comparison, one participant can represent another, in other words, one participant (value) is the identity for another (token). Here is the analysis.

29. 33/II/2 *Kandungan gizi ni sebanding jama pak sihat, ...*
30. 62/VI/2 *…jukung gegoh jama biduk….*

Token	Process – identifying	Value
Kandungan/ gizi/ni	***sebanding***	*jama /pak sihat*
Content / nutrition / its	Equal	with / 'pak sihat'
'Its nutrition is equal to '*pak sihat*'.'		
Jukung	***Gegoh***	*jama/biduk*
Jukung/boat	Similar	With /'*biduk*' – boat
'A '*jukung*' is similar to a '*biduk*'.'		

Regarding this analysis, the participants in each clause can be reserved as well and thus it is true to classify both clauses into identifying relational clause. Further, there are two more relational processes found; they are 'artini' and 'bumakna'. Both words have the same meaning in both clauses (31 and 32) and they construe a definition.

31. 68/II/3 *manjaumuli sina artini ghatong mit lamban muli …*
32. 128/VIII/4 *Shidiq bumakna jujugh, ...*

The clause (31) has a process which links an identifying participant (*ghatong mit lamban muli*) and an identified participant (*manjau muli sina*). Also, the process in the clause (32) demonstrates it too. 'jujugh' is a participant which describes what 'shidiq' means or it defines 'shidiq'. Furthermore, 'jujugh' can be reversed to the beginning of the clause without changing the meaning and the function. Hence, it can be noted that both clauses engagethe identifying relational process. It can be seen as follow.

Token	Process – identifying	Value
Manjaumuli/ sina	***Artini***	*ghatong/ mit/ lamban/ muli*
Manjaumuli/ that	Mean	Come / to / home / girl
'Manjaumuli means coming to girl's home.'		
Shidiq	***Bumakna***	*Jujugh*
Shidiq	Mean	Honest
'Shidiq means honest.'		

A Comparison of English and Lampungnese Relational Clause

There are three points which will be highlighted in this part; they are pattern, form, and characteristics of the relational clause in English and Lampungnese. Regarding the findings, it is noted that both English and Lampungnese relational clause have a similar pattern. This similar pattern is seen from three conditions. The first is that English and Lampungnese relational clause is the representation of a non-verbal clause. It means that the process employed in a clause does not construe doing, sensing/perceiving, saying, behaving, and existing. It construes relating, being, and having. The second is that the participants found in the Lampungnese relational clauses can render the function and the role of English participants. The third is that both types of relational clause (identifying and attributive) can also be found in the Lampungnese relational clause. Hence, it is proven that both English and Lampungnese have a similar pattern in the relational clause.

Further, the findings also show that the forms of the relational process in English and Lampungnese are generally similar. English relational process is realized with copular verbs (become, sound), possessive verb (has, have) and 'to be' (is, am, are, was, were). Lampungnese relational process can be copular verbs (jadi/dijadiko, ngedok, kughuk/ tekughuk, iyulah, yakdo, and ngeghupako); and modal (dapok). It means that both English and Lampungnese have a similar form for the relational process. There are also other processes which construe equality (*sebanding* and *gegoh*) and representation (*artin*i and *bumakna*).

On the other hand, Lampungnese relational clause has a characteristic which makes it different from English. It is worth noting that sometimes a relational process is not found in the Lampungnese relational clause. For instance:

Seghuit sinji lebih sihat.
Salad   this more healthy.
'The salad (seghuit) is healthier.'

The Lampungnese relational clause only has its participants (*seghuit hinji* and *lebih sihat*), but it has no relational process. Even though, there are no processes; it can be classified as a clause. Furthermore, this clause is an attributive relational clause since the participant lebih sihat modifies another participant seghuit hinji. In other words, the participant (*lebih sihat*) links itself to another participant (*seghuit hinji*). Therefore, the researcher calls the participant taking the role as the attribute or the value as a relational processor. Compared to Lampungnese, English relational process will never have this configuration**.**

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it can be reported that both English and Lampungnese relational process are realized in similar forms. The forms found are:
1. Copular verbs: English (become, sound); Lampungnese (*jadi*' or '*dijadiko*)
2. Possessive verb: English (have, contain, consist); Lampung (*ngedok, kughuk, iyulah, yakdo,* and *ngeghupako*)
3. To be: English (is and are)
4. Modal: English (will and should); Lampungnese (*dapok*).
5. Other forms found in Lampungnese: *sebanding, gegoh* (equality and representation); *artini* and *bumakna* (definition).

Other than similarity, a difference is also found between English and Lampungnese relational clause. A Lampungnese relational clause is sometimes found without a process and there are only participants taking the role as carrier-attribute and token-value. In this context, both attribute and value play a role to indicate the type of the clause; identifying or attributive relational clause. Different from Lampungnese, in every English relational clause there will be a process which links the participants. In closing, the researcher posits that an attribute or a value can be a process when there is no real process and thus is called the relational processor.

REFERENCES
Atkinson, P., & Coffey, A. (2004). Analyzing

documentary realities. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method, and practice* (pp. 77-137). London, UK: Sage Publications.

Bardi, M. A. (2008). A systemic functional description of the grammar of Arabic. Unpublished Dissertation, Linguistics Department, Macquarie University.

Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2004). *The functional analysis of English (*2nded). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Inc.

Caffarel, A. (2004). Metafunctional profile of the grammar of French. In A. Caffarel, J. R. Martin, & C. M. I. M Matthiessen (Eds.), *Language typology: A functional perspective* (pp. 77-137). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Croker, R. A. (2009). An introduction to qualitative research. In J. Heigham, & R. A. Croker (Eds.), *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction* (pp. 3-41). London: Palgrave Mcmillan.

Deterding, D. H., & Poedjosoedarmo, G. R. (2001). *Grammar of English*. Singapore: Prentice Hall.

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

Emilia, E. (2014). *Introducing functional grammar*. Bandung, Indonesia: Pustaka Jaya.

Ethnologue. (2019). Retrieved fromhttps://www.ethnologue.com/country/ID/languages

Gerot, L., & Wignel, P. (1995). *Making sense of functional grammar* (2nded.). Sydney, NSW: GerdStabler.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M.I.M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). London, UK: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K., & McDonald, E. (2004). Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Chinese. In A. Caffarel, J. R. Martin, & C. M. I. M Matthiessen (Eds.), *Language typology: A functional perspective* (pp. 305-396). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Hinton, Leanne. (2011). Revitalization of endangered language. In P. K. Austin,& J. Sallabank (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of endangered languages* (pp. 25-155). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lavis, J., J. Arus, & J. R. Zamorano-Mansilla. (2010). *Systemic functional grammar of Spanish: A contrastive study with English.* New York, NY: Continuum.

Lock, G. (2005). *Functional English grammar – an introduction for second language teacher* (8th ed.). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, J. R. (2004). Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Tagalog.In A. Caffarel, J. R. Martin, &C. M.I.M Matthiessen (Eds.), *Language typology: a functional perspective* (pp. 255-304). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Prakasam, V. (2004). Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Telugu. In A. Caffarel, J. R. Martin & C. M. I. M Matthiessen (Eds.), *Language typology: A functional perspective* (pp. 433-478). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Rose, David. (2004). Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Pitjantjatjara. In A. Caffarel, J. R. Martin, & C. M. I. M Matthiessen (Eds.), *Language typology: A functional perspective* (pp. 479-536). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Saragih, A. (2007). *Fungsi tekstual dalam wacana: Panduan menulis Rema dan Tema*. Medan, Indonesia: Balai Bahasa Medan.

Satun, A. R. et al. (1985). *Struktur bahasa Lampung*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Pusat Pembinaandan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Silverman, D. (2015). *Interpreting qualitative data*. London, UK: Sage Publication Ltd.

Sneddon, J. N. (1996). *Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar.* London, UK: Routledge.

Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative research-studying how things work*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Steiner, E., &Teich, E. (2004). Metafunctional profile of the grammar of German. In A. Caffarel, J. R. Martin, & C. M.I.M Matthiessen (Eds.), *Language typology: A functional perspective* (pp. 139-184). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Sujatna, E. T. S. (2012a). Applying systemic functional linguistics to Bahasa Indonesia clause. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *4*(2), 134-146.

Sujatna, E. T. S. (2012b). Sundanese verbs in mental processes: A sytemic functional linguistics apparoach. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *4*(4), 468-476.

Teruya, K. (2004). Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Japanese. In A. Caffarel, J. R. Martin, & C. M.I.M Matthiessen

(Eds.), *Language typology: A functional perspective* (pp. 185-254). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Thai, M. D. (2004). Metafunctional profile of the grammar of Vietnamese. In A. Caffarel, J. R. Martin, & C. M. I. M Matthiessen (Eds.), *Language typology: A functional perspective* (pp. 397-431). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Thompson, G. (2014). *Introducing functional grammar*. London, UK: Routledge.

Udin, N., et al. (1992). *Tata bahasa Lampung dialek Pesisir*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Proyek Penelitian Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah Lampung.

Wiratno, T. (2017). *Pengantar ringkas linguistik sistemik fungsional*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Pustaka Pelajar.