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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. RATIONALE

Nowadays, English is the most widely used language on over the world. It plays an important part in communication together with the socialization and industrialization. By anyway, directly or indirectly, people use language to express their beneath ideas. And, metaphor is one of the most effective and intelligent ways to show the speaker’s meanings.

Metaphor is a well-known phenomenon in communication and speaker can communicate using metaphorical utterances. As Lakoff and Johnson [18] said “Metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Also, Murry said: “Metaphor is as ultimate as speech itself and speech as ultimate as thought” [28, p. 20], and John R. Searle considered “metaphorical meaning is always speaker’s utterance meaning” [p84]. It means that the metaphorical utterance is different from literal utterance. For example:

“Man is a wolf” [28, p. 20]
“A poem is a pheasant”
“Sally is a block of ice”
“Sam is a pig”
“Life is a stage”
or
“Love is a journey”

When we hear the above sentences, we are likely to assume that the speaker does not mean what he say literally but that he is speaking metaphorically.
Practically, there are plenty of similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese that can be seen through metaphorical meaning especially metaphor in stories.

Halliday also has his own viewpoint of metaphor. He pointed that metaphor is usually described as variation in the use of words: as a word said to be used with a transferred meaning. He also said that we shouldn’t ask “How is this word used?” but “How is this meaning expressed?” Halliday is the first linguist who gives the definition of interpersonal metaphor.

Interpersonal metaphor is a new concept of metaphor. According to Halliday, interpersonal metaphor is one of two main kinds of grammatical metaphor. This is an example of a very common type of interpersonal metaphor, based on the semantic relationship of projection:

“Probably that pudding never will be cooked”

Or:

“I don’t believe that pudding ever will be cooked” [6]

In addition, speakers have indefinitely many ways of expressing their opinions, for example:

*It is obvious that*......
*Everyone admits that*......
*It stands to reason that*......
*It would be foolish to deny that*....
*The conclusion can hardly be avoided that*.....
*No sane person would pretend that*....*not*....
*Commonsense determines that*.....
*All authorities on the subject are agreed that*....
*You can’t seriously doubt that*...
These kinds of expression are usually appeared in communication, especially in stories and they may cause difficulties for readers in understanding what is meant or referred to the writer.

Since what are discussed above, once again, we can say that interpersonal metaphors are associated and pervasive in our ordinary everyday language, thought, communication and actions. They are also the creative devices for language development as Brook and Warren (1961) said that language develops thanks to the expanding of metaphors. And our recognition of metaphorical statement depends essentially upon two things: our general knowledge of what it is to be a metaphorical statement and our specific judgement that a metaphorical reading of given statement is here preferable to a literal one.

Furthermore, we also easily recognize that interpersonal metaphors actually contribute to the understanding of language, that studying interpersonal metaphors is really important in order to help communicate effectively and understand deeply the meaning of any discourse. All these things have motivated us to choose interpersonal metaphors for this research. Therefore, “AN INVESTIGATION INTO INTERPERSONAL) METAPHOR IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE STORIES” is carried out.

Our study will show the syntactic and semantic features as well as analyze interpersonal metaphor as clearly as possible. The study will also draw out the similarities and differences between the language used in English and Vietnamese. It is expected that the
study will be of the practical use to the process of learning, teaching and translating as well.

1.2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

1.2.1. Aims of the Study

The thesis is aimed at:

- Investigating the metaphorical modes of expression according to Haliday’s points of view.
- Finding the ways that interpersonal modes work in English and Vietnamese.
- Investigating the similarities and differences between interpersonal metaphor in English and Vietnamese.
- Making implications to teaching and learning metaphor in literature or other related subjects effectively.

1.2.2. Objectives of the Study

To gain the aims above, the researcher tries to:

- examine the syntactic features of interpersonal metaphor in English and Vietnamese stories;
- explore and analyze the conceptual semantic features of interpersonal metaphor in English and Vietnamese stories;
- analyze and discover the similarities and the differences in the interpersonal metaphors in English and Vietnamese stories;
- make suggestions for teaching, learning, and translating the expressions of interpersonal metaphor

1.3. THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study just focuses on investigating interpersonal metaphor based on the semantic relationship of projection and a further account of modality and modulation. Due to the limited time and the ability, in this
thesis, I just investigate the expressions of interpersonal metaphor in the
two types: metaphor of Modality (include: probability, usuality, obligation and inclination) and metaphor of Mood under the light of functional grammar. The theoretical background for this study is mainly by Halliday (1976, 1985, 2004)

The data is collected from some stories in 19th, 20th and 21th century by the following writers:

In English stories:
- O. Henry
- Charles Dickens
- Lois Richer
- Lynn A. Cole Man
- Jannet Lee Baron
- William Somerset Maugham
- William Faulkner
- Karen Kingsbury

In Vietnamese stories:
- Trần Thùy Mai
- Nhât Linh- Khái Hùng
- Vũ Trọng Phụng
- Bảo Ninh

1.4. **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

To achieve the aims and objectives above, the researcher has to make every effort to answer the following questions:

1. What are metaphorical modes of expression according to Haliday’s theory?

2. How does Interpersonal Metaphor works in English and Vietnamese stories in terms of syntactic features and semantic features?
3. What are the similarities and differences in terms of syntactic features and semantic features between Interpersonal Metaphor in English and Vietnamese?

1.5. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study of interpersonal metaphor in English and Vietnamese stories brings a lot of significances:

Firstly, it provides teachers and learners of English a through point of view towards metaphor in general and interpersonal metaphor in particular based on the theory of functional grammar.

Secondly, it classifies the similarities and differences of interpersonal metaphor in the areas of syntax and semantics between English and Vietnamese stories.

Thirdly, the study will make a considerable contribution to the translation of interpersonal metaphor expression from Vietnamese stories to English stories and vice versa. This also helps the speakers as well as the writers get the effective ways to express their ideas metaphorically without “beating around the burst”.

1.6. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The research is organized into five chapters as follows:

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Literature review and Theoretical background

Chapter 3: Methods and Procedures,

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion,

Chapter 5: Conclusion, Implications and Limitations
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW
AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. AN OVERVIEW TO THE PREVIOUS STUDY RELATED TO THE RESEARCH

So far there haven’t been many researches on interpersonal metaphor by linguists, language teachers and students. Phan Văn Hòa [36] in the article “Ẩn dụ và ẩn dụ ngữ pháp” takes this concept into the consideration in Vietnamese based on Halliday’s theory. Nguyen Thi Thanh Huong [24] investigated the linguistic features of interpersonal metaphor in English and Vietnamese equivalents.

2.2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.2.1. Metaphor

a. Definition of metaphor

A metaphor is considered a comparison between two things, which are basically quite different without using like or as. It is transference of one object’s characteristics onto another. However, it is not to be confused with simile, metonymy, personification, allusion and antonomasia. Originated from Greek, meta bears the progress in complexity from simple to more advanced, and pherein means to carry, that is, metaphor, from its roots, has the notion of hidden comparison. Up to now, a lot of linguists and researchers have given out a variety of definitions on metaphor. And, here are the selected definitions on metaphor which are the closest to its nature.

“Metaphor, as a phenomenon, involves both conceptual mappings and individual linguistic expression.”[17]

“Many words have both literal and metaphorical meanings. The literal meaning of a word is the most basic sense. A
metaphorical meaning is when it is used to refer to something other than this.”[18]

“A meaning may be realized by a selection of words that is different from that which is in some sense typical or unmarked. From this end, metaphor is variation in the expression of meanings.”[6; p.320]

“Metaphor is the transference of meaning (name) from one object to another, based on similarity between the two objects.”[26]

“A figure of speech in which a word or phrase denoting one kind of object or action is used in a place of another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them.”[31]

“Án dự từ là cách cá nhân làm thời lấy tên gọi biểu thị đối tượng này dùng để biểu thị đối tượng kia dựa trên cơ sở của mỗi quan hệ liên tưởng về nét tương đồng giữa hai đối tượng.”[45]

“Án dự là phép thay thế tên gọi của sự vật, hiện tượng này bằng tên gọi của sự vật, hiện tượng khác dựa trên cơ sở liên tưởng đồng nhất hóa chúng theo đặc điểm, thuộc tính nào đó cũng có ở chúng.”[49]

“Án dự là cơ chế của lời nói thể hiện trong cách dùng từ biểu hiện một lồ sự vật, hiện tượng nào đó v.v. để định tính hoặc gọi tên những đối tượng thuộc một lồ khác, hoặc gọi tên một lồ đối tượng khác tương đồng với lồ đã cho trong một quan hệ nào đó.”[55]

b. Classification of metaphor

❖ STRUCTURAL METAPHORS
❖ ORIENTATIONAL METAPHORS
❖ ONTOLOGICAL METAPHORS
❖ CONDUIT METAPHORS
c. Metaphor versus simile and metonymy

- METAPHOR VERSUS SIMILE

Simile is the comparison between two objects of different kinds which have at least one point in common, that is, comparing two or more unlike things using *like, as, or as if*, etc.

In simile, the quality picked may be unimportant at first, but it is intensified according to the writer’s intention to turn into a telling feature, with a view to giving us a new and unexpected light about the object characterized.

- METAPHOR VERSUS METONYMY

In The American Heritage Dictionary [30] published by Houghton Mifflin, metonymy is “A figure of speech in which one word or phrase is substituted for another with which it is closely associated, as in the use of Washington for the United State government or of the sword for military power.”

2.2.2. Interpersonal metaphor

Definition

Interpersonal metaphor is a fairly undeveloped area in Systemic Functional Language, but Halliday [7] has prepared the ground for further investigation on the topic. According to the two theorists, interpersonal metaphors arise from the Mood and Modality system of language.

Halliday defined interpersonal metaphor is one kind of grammatical metaphor, in the expression of mood and modality related to the speaker’s opinions. The interpersonal type of metaphor in Halliday’s theory is especially concerned with the example: *I don’t believe that pudding ever will be cooked*, expressing the modality “*in my opinion....not likely*” in the form of a Head clause *I don’t*
believe, and the thesis “that pudding will be cooked” in the form of a dependent Modifying clause. That this is metaphorical construction can be seen from the fact that the “tagged” form would be “I don’t believe that pudding ever will be cooked, will it?” (not I don’t believe that pudding ever will be cooked, do I? as it would be if the example was to be interpreted congruently. The expression I don’t believe is functioning as an interpersonal (modal) Theme. Other examples are: I dare you say you’ll see her soon, I think I’ll go and meet her, Do you suppose that they could get it clear?- where the similarly the tags would be won’t you?, Shall I?, and could they?[7]

Halliday presents the structure of interpersonal metaphor in a way that brings out the metaphoric element in its modal structure

**a. Metaphor of modality**

This is an example of a very common type of interpersonal metaphor, based on the semantic relationship of projection. In this type the speaker's opinion regarding the probability that his observation is valid is code not as a modal element within the clause, which would be its congruent realization, but as a separate, projecting clause in a hypotactic clause complex. To the congruent form it probably is so corresponds the metaphorical variant I think it is so, with I think as the primary or 'alpha' clause. The reason for regarding this as a metaphorical variant is that the proposition is not, in fact,'I think'; the proposition is 'it is so.

**b. Metaphor of mood**

The other main type of interpersonal metaphor is that associated with Mood. Mood expresses the speech function, the underlying pattern of organization here is the exchange system-giving or demanding information or good-&-services, which
determine four basic speech functions of statement, question, offer and command.

CHAPTER 3
METHODS AND PROCEDEURES

3.1. RESEARCH DESIGN
The investigation was done through qualitative and quantitative approaches so as to response its aims and objectives. In addition, descriptive and analytical methods were chosen to be the main ones during the researching.

3.2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.3. RESEARCH PROCEDURES

3.4. DATA COLLECTION AND DATA ANALYSIS

3.4.1. Data Collection
200 samples in English stories and 200 samples in Vietnamese contain interpersonal metaphor

3.4.2. Data Analysis

3.5. SUMMARY

CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. SYNTAXTIC FEATURES OF INTERPERSONAL METAPHOR IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE STORIES

4.1.1. Syntaxtistic features of modality in English and Vietnamese stories
The syntactic features of Modality is the Projection clause. In this type, the speaker’s opinion regarding the probability that his observation is valid is coded not as a modal element within the
clause, which would be its congruent realization, but as separate, projecting clause in hypotactic clause nexus.

(1) I thought they were broken

(2) I doubt I could equal anything Wingate Manor offer

The projection clause in English stories includes a mental clause and an idea clause. It means that the clauses containing I think, I don’t think, I thought, I know, I believe, I suppose, I guess, I doubt are mental clauses (MC) and the after clauses are idea clauses (IC)

Base on the analysis of probability expression modal by Halliday [8, p.613,617] we would like to draw out some further examples present probability in English stories as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘in my opinion’</th>
<th>Mood Residue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Finite</td>
<td>Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite/Modality/</td>
<td>Polarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Finite</td>
<td>Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘present’</td>
<td>Residue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite/Modality/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mood Residue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t really think CJ’s brother is cute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Vietnamese, syntactic feature of modality is similar to that in English in the term of projection clause. The metaphorical elements of probability in Vietnamese stories are expressed in verbal
clauses such as: “Tôi thì tôi nghĩ, tôi cho rằng, tôi định, người ta biết rõ, người ta đoán rằng, hô kêu, em cam đoan...” Those are the similarities of projecting clauses in English and Vietnamese language.

(3) Tôi thì tôi cho là người ta chưa đảm tin dịch xác là con Tuyết đã hư hong” [32, p. 158]

(4) Tôi thì tôi cho người ta đã muốn hỏi hơn rồi [32, p. 158]

Modality in Vietnamese stories also include a mental clause and an idea clause

(5) Tôi dấy hử lâu, vẫn tương // sự quỷ nhất của ta là lể nghi, là ngữ luận ngữ thương, là tam tôn tử dục của đàn bà [112, p. 67]

4.1.2. Syntaxtic features of mood in English and Vietnamese stories

Syntaxtic features of mood presented as declaratives (giving information), interrogatives (demanding information), and imperatives (expressing demands or offers).

Declaratives

(6) I want to see the last one fall before it gets dark [158]

(7) I can’t live without her [174]

(8) Tôi là con nhà danh giá, tôi không muốn bị thiên hạ hả nhầm là gái nhány” [9, p.87]

Here, the Mood element of the “indicative” clause is constrained in term of the SUBJECT PERSON AND DEICTICITY. The SUBJECT PERSON is ‘addressee’ and the DEICTICITY is ‘modal’, more specifically ‘modulation. In other words, the Subject is the
same as that of a ‘jussive imperative’ clause and the modality is of the proposal kind- the imperative type

**Imperatives**

(9) *Don’t* let Nora try to run your life  
[88, p. 27]

(10) *Đừng có* lấy nẽ thầy yêu mà lòng hành.  
[192, p. 86]

**Interrogatives**

(11) Why didn’t someone tell me?  
[81]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘you’</th>
<th>shouldn’t</th>
<th>act</th>
<th>So unfeeling toward him</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Finite</td>
<td>Predicator</td>
<td>Complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Residue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how</td>
<td>could</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH-/Adjunct</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Finite</td>
<td>Predicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Residue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(12) Sao lại đi với thầy Quân?  
[150]

(13) Chúng ta đi bỏ *có hồn* không em?  
[95, p. 8]

### 4.2. SEMANTIC FEATURES OF INTERPERSONAL METAPHOR IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE STORIES

#### 4.2.1. Semantic features of modality in English and Vietnamese stories

**a. Probability**

In this type, the speaker’s opinion regarding the probability that his observation is valid is coded not as a modal element within
the clause, which would be its congruent realization, but as a separate, projecting clause in hypotactic clause nexus. [8, p. 614]

(14) They *must* be tired and half-frozen after the day they’ve had. [6]

(15) I can’t *guarantee* she won’t give you fits some days. [127]

The probability in interpersonal metaphor includes words such as: certainly, probably, possibly, perhaps, seem… The reason for regarding those as metaphorical variant is that the proposition is not, in fact, I think; the proposition is ‘it is so’

In Vietnamese, the metaphorical elements of probability are expressed in words such as: có lẽ, chắc, chưa chắc, không biết rõ, hay lẽ, có lẽ, tương như, dễ thương, đã chắc đâu, hinh như, không khéo.. For examples:

(16) Chưa chắc. Đã họ cùng phân vân như mình, vi đến chính ngay mình, cũng không biết rõ con gái mình có hư hay không. [34]

(17) Tương như kiên vũ di xa về. [53]

b. Usuality

The degree of usuality presented in English stories by the adverbs of frequency always, usually, sometimes, occasionally

(18) Rowena! You’re *always* thinking about work. [21]

In comparision with Vietnamese stories, the degree of usuality act varily. We have examined and point out some adverbs that frequently appear in Vietnamese stories such as: đếm nào, thường, thịnh thoảng, chạy máy khi, làm lúc, ít khi, luôn, chẳng lúc nào...

(19) Thưa cụ, thịnh thoảng mới được một năm lại, còn thì làng nhàng thôi. [122]

c. Obligation

(20) He *had to* talk to her, try to explain that he hadn’t known
she’s lost her baby.                  

(21) Chúng ta phải cõi dò cho ra xem thẳng kỹ H…ngoài việc tiêm thuốc cho chủ nhà này, nó còn giờ trở gì nữa không.             

**d. Inclination**

(22) He ignored the challenge, *determined* to find out what had her protective hackles up.                  

(23) Con *nhất định* phải cã chủ thuốc tây cho đến cùng.      

---

**Figure 4.2: Metaphor of modality in Vietnamese stories**

Metaphor of modality in Vietnamese appears more than in English. In both English and Vietnamese stories, Probability makes
up a large part, 49% for English stories and 58% for Vietnamese ones. The frequency of the other three kinds just occupy a half. The data shows the frequency level for usuality is higher in English stories, at 12%, than in Vietnamese stories, at 14%.

4.2.2. Semantic features of mood in English and Vietnamese stories

a. Assuring
(24) I’m sure it is, Gram.  [87]
(25) I bet that is a sight. [86]
(26) Em cam đoan sẽ tìm ra đường mà. Hay anh không tin em?  [74, p. 232]
(27) Là cái chắc.  [83, p. 251]

b. Offering
(28) Would you mind bringing her down to her playpen in the kitchen?  [129]
(29) Nếu tôi đèn on có một ngăn Bắc có nghĩ sao?  [129, p. 126]

c. Threatening
(30) Don’t mention his name again or I’ll hang up. [166]
(31) Xéo ngay, không tôi báo công an đấy  [67- p208]

c. Promising
(32) I’ll come and pick you up, take you wherever you want to go.  [29]
(33) Tôi sẽ chắc lệ các dòng chỉ ấy.  [73, p. 231]

e. Undertaking
(34) I’m determined not to let her bother me.  [98]
(35) Bằng mọi giá phải tìm được đường ra sông.  [76, p. 232]

f. Blaming
(36) I can’t believe that you are willing to bury the past.  [122]
(37) Em trở lại một cõ hàng chiều, giá Mẹ em cực đề cho em buôn bán từ trước thì đâu đến nơi. [186, p. 230]

g. Encouraging
(38) I believe you’ll do a wonderful job.

[55]
(39) Đừng hoàng. [86, p. 264]

h. Advising
(40) I think you should choose another work. [32]
(41) I hope it will be a lesson to you to make no more rash journeys on these hills. [182]
(42) Ai lại nói thế trước mặt bác gái hay cử Hồng hay cử Tổ! [7, p. 85] (we shouldn’t say that thing)

i. Warning
(43) If you get out of the room, you can get hurt. [100]
(44) Tôi chắc thế nào ra, hỡ cưng bất được ông. [138] (If you get out, you must be arrested)
Figure 4.3: Metaphor of mood in Vietnamese stories

The number of metaphor of mood in Vietnamese stories is more than that in English ones. Frequency of assuring in English stories makes up a large proportion -27% in comparison to that in Vietnamese stories-11%. In the other hand, advising in English stories just rates 18%), less than in Vietnamese ones (37%).

4.2.3. Objectives and Subjective Feature of interpersonal metaphor in English and Vietnamese stories.

Objective feature:

(45) I hope he lets his family help him now [85, p. 25]

In Vietnamese stories, the Objective feature is also used in interpersonal metaphor and makes their meaning inferred. Objectives feature in Vietnamse stories acts similarly to that in English. In the same way, we consider the following examples:

(46) Mọ nên nghĩ đến cấu ấy, trong sau năm nay không một chút nào là không nhỏ, không thường mơ [126, p. 123]

Subjective features:

(47) You’ll waste your whole life fighting make-believe
battles if you don’t turn around and see the truth [172, p. 83]

These English examples present the speaker’s opinion as well as point of view and attitude to the problems. In the same way, Vietnamese stories also contain a lot of subjective features in interpersonal metaphor like the following instances:

(48) Tôi vẫn sẳn lòng không lấy làm hay nếu tử là để không thấy mắt tôi nữa, thì tôi vẫn sẳn lòng đi kia mà. [160, p. 23]

4.2.4. The Explicit and Implicit Feature in Interpersonal Metaphor In English And Vietnamese Stories

a. The Explicit Feature

(49) I thought perhaps it had fallen into the hands of a private owner [149]

We can see from the examples that the explicit is used mainly in commands and its meaning presented by the speakers in order to make the listener understand clearly what the speaker means and what needs to be transfer.

(50) I don’t think anyone gets to live exactly the life they planned” [33, p. 115]

For this example, we can understand that there are two possibilities in each of the explicit form: the Subjective explicit is “I think no one gets to live exactly the life they planned/ I don’t think anyone gets to live exactly the life they planned” and the Objective explicit is “it’s likely that no one gets to live exactly the life they planned/ it isn’t likely that anyone gets to live exactly the life they planned”

b. The Implicit Feature
Table 4.1: Table of implicit feature in English stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subjective:</th>
<th>Subjective:</th>
<th>Objective:</th>
<th>Objective:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explicit</td>
<td>implicit</td>
<td>implicit</td>
<td>explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modalization:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>probability</strong></td>
<td>I <em>thought</em></td>
<td>it fell into the hands of a private owner [149]</td>
<td>it probably knows [in all probability]</td>
<td>it’s likely that it fell into the hands of a private owner [it is likely to]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>usuality</strong></td>
<td>You’ll be family to me [96, p. 37]</td>
<td>You’re always be family to me</td>
<td>it’s usually for you to be family to me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>obligation</strong></td>
<td>I <em>hope</em> you will come [47, p. 135]</td>
<td>You should come</td>
<td>You’re supposed to come</td>
<td>it’s expected that you come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>inclination</strong></td>
<td>I’ll <em>speak to him about it</em> [167]</td>
<td>I’m keen to talk to him about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 4
CHAPTER 5  
CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS  
5.1. CONCLUSION

The aim of this study is to investigate the interpersonal metaphor in English and Vietnamese stories in terms of syntax and semantics. By doing this, we aim to find out the similarities and differences between the two languages. After examining and analyzing 400 samples of interpersonal metaphor including 200 samples in English stories and 200 samples in Vietnamese ones, we can come to the following conclusions:

Firstly, in terms of syntax, interpersonal acts similarly in English and Vietnamese stories. The projection clause occurs as a high rate and includes two main parts: Mental clause and Ideational clause.

Secondly, in terms of semantics, there are some differences due to the lexical of two languages and their position as well as the combination in two main types of interpersonal metaphor.

Thirdly, the structures of interpersonal metaphor in English and Vietnamese stories are different. For the structures of metaphor of Mood in English stories include Subject and Finite. Meanwhile, metaphor of Mood in Vietnamese stories just depends on the lexical and the structure lexical units. For the metaphor of Modality, the positions of the words and the grammar structure present this kind are deeply different.

Fourthly, for occurrence frequency, Probability occurs with large rate in the two languages, 58% in Vietnamese stories and 49% in English stories. Usuality, Obligation and Inclination make up a similar low rate, 12%, 18% and 21% in English stories, 9%, 14% and 19% in Vietnamese stories. In the other hand, there are some
differences between the two languages. Advising has a large proportion in Vietnamese stories (37%). In contrast, it has a low ratio in English stories (just for 18%). *Assuring* occurs more frequently in English stories (27%) than that in Vietnamese ones (3%) but *Undertaking* makeup a higher rate in Vietnamese stories in comparison to that in English stories.

In generally, interpersonal metaphor occurs in both English and Vietnamese languages with all the sub-types of two main kinds: Mood and Modality. However, the structure of these two main types in different in two languages due to the specific characteristics. For the occurrence frequency, the differences are larger than the similarities.

The study results show that the interpersonal metaphor is very interesting and needs more attention from linguist, teachers and learners. We need to pay more attention into the structural and manifestation features of interpersonal metaphor in various discourses so that we can clarify the similarities and differences between the two languages in this interesting field.

Our paper is provisionally closed here. Many issues of conceptual metaphor in particular and cognitive semantics in general are our interests. We hope for other papers that can discuss more about them, also make some comparisons of language use between English and Vietnamese.

**5.2. IMPLICATIONS**

Furthermore, metaphor is also the problem argued in the transferring from a language to another. Equivalent is probably the most controversial notion in Translation Studies, whose focus has shifted markedly from linguistic towards contextual and cultural
factors which effect translation. Moreover, Lakoff and Turner (1989) say that conceptual metaphors are part of the common conceptual apparatuses shared by members of a culture. They widely conventionalized in language, that is, there are a great number of words and idiomatic expressions in our language whose meanings depend upon those conceptual metaphors. The knowledge of interpersonal metaphors and cultures is thus required to achieve an effective translation. Therefore, this research paper is carried out with the hope to contribute a little to translating process.

5.3. LIMITATION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Being aware of the significance of interpersonal metaphors in our daily communication as well as in the understanding of literary expressions, we have made every effort to investigate and compare the interpersonal metaphors with two main types: Modality and Mood in English and Vietnamese. However, the lack of time, the limitation of knowledge and references make it impossible for the researchers to do the process as expected. Certainly, the research paper remains some inevitable restrictions and shortcomings, and still leaves much to be desired.

Due to the limit time, the research just draws some syntactic models of the collected samples.

This paper has just exploited a minor part in the whole theory of interpersonal metaphors. There are still more of interpersonal metaphors and other aspects of cognitive semantics that need be investigated in further researches. We hope that our research will be a small contribution to not only theory but also to the application of using and understanding language.