'Mpama Hepe' Symbolic Metaphor Expression

Erwin[1*], Djoko Saryono[2], Imam Suyitno[2], Maryaeni[2]

[1]Postgraduate Doctoral Universitas Negeri Malang and Lecturer Universitas Muhammadiyah Mataram, Indonesia

[2]Universitas Negeri Malang

*erwindonggo@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Research by title 'Mpama Hepe' Symbolic Metaphor Expression conducted and presented to describe the use of language symbols expressed through local wisdom mpama hepe oral traditions in the social dynamics of the user community, namely the Donggo ethnic community as one of the original Mbojo tribes who reside in Donggo and Soromandi Districts, Bima Regency, Nusa Tenggara Province West. This study uses a qualitative approach to the type of ethnographic research. Ethnographers collect data using engaged observation techniques, friendly conversation techniques and accompanied by recording activities. The data collected is in the form of verbal data of mpama hepe interaction and confirmation data of friendly conversation, as well as non-verbal data obtained through observation of friendship activities. The results showed that the local wisdom of the oral mpama hepe tradition used by the Donggo ethnic group was a symbolic expression of language that is metaphorical. Specifically, the findings of this study are in the form of symbolic expressions of mpama hepe; about human behavior, about animals, about plants, and the nature of things. Applicatively, this research is useful for the wider community to be able to recognize and understand the oral tradition of mpama hepe as one of the Donggo ethnic local wisdom. The results of this study can be used as material for folklore, linguistic, stylistics, and research methods courses (for example, applications of qualitative research on oral traditions using ethnographic approaches). The novelty of this research lies in the research problem, which is 'mpama hepe'. This research reveals the uniqueness in the social interaction of one of the ethnic groups in the world, namely the Donggo ethnic group. The use of symbolic language in social expression mpama hepe becomes something important to be revealed so that it can be known and understood by the wider community.

Keywords

mpama hepe, symbolic expression, symbolic metaphor , and ethnic Donggo

Introduction

Mpama hepe is one of the local wisdom of the *Donggo* ethnic community. They use *mpama hepe* utterances to express their ideas, feelings, and thoughts in daily social interactions. The use of metaphors is an act of thinking to describe something with something else (Semino, 2008). In social interactions, the use of *mpama hepe* involves the use of metaphorical linguistic symbols (symbolic metaphors) as a symbolic play of meaning in order to decipher the interpretations of listeners or other speech participants. *Mpama hepe,* in principle, is used as a means of entertainment to fill time in between other activities. However, in speech *mpama hepe* contains messages and values of local wisdom that are quite rich. In fact, some *mpama hepe* are often used as pearls of wisdom expressed on various occasions. One of them is used to convey positive messages to children by parents.

Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) proposes that metaphor is an element of thought about language. CMT's revolutionary claim that metaphors exist everywhere in language, and linguistic metaphors are grouped as conceptual structures is known as conceptual metaphors. Metaphor is defined as cross-domain mapping, which means that elements from the source domain are transferred to the target domain. Thus, in the metaphor, "the ego is very fragile" elements of the source domain (fragile object) are mapped to the target domain (mind) (Burgers, Renardel de Lavalette, & Steen, 2018; Lakoff & Johnson, 2008).

Metaphors tend to be expressed with words and images that are visual, even multimodal (C. Forceville, 2009). The symbolic metaphor referred to in this case, is the use of symbols in the form of words expressed in speech form with the intention to convey a message. That expression is a type of speech act that states something that is felt by the speaker. Even in general, metaphors are usually constructed in communication events such as films, cartoons, advertisements, and also in everyday social interactions (Alousque, 2014;

Jeong, 2008; Landau, Nelson, & Keefer, 2015; Pérez-Sobrino, 2016). In this context, the communication event that is made the object is *mpama hepe*.

The use of symbolic metaphors often causes uncertainty in expressing meaning because there is a gap between the text and the object being referred to (Bateman John, 2014; Jay, 1998). Thus, in order to answer "hepe" in the game "mpama hepe", the speech participants must have the same knowledge about the environment and culture of the local community. If not, then the game will not be able to take place, because the speech participants are certain not to be able to function their critical reasoning to be able to 'guess' the object intended by the speaker with the maximum membership. The reality of the hepe symbolic metaphor, in line with the opinion, is that "In general the play patterns of symbolic meaning metaphors complement each other in terms of making claims about the suitability of text and objects referred to in the context of their use (Deignan, Littlemore, & Semino, 2013).

Traditionally the literal meaning is a major component in the process of interpretation of meaning (Abuarrah, 2018). Thus, the basic capital that must be possessed by the speech participants to be able to participate in the *mpama hepe* interaction is to have the same meaning (can speak *Mbojo*). The similarity of absolute meanings is needed or can understand literally, as capital to interpret the play of symbolic meaning metaphors. This is in line with the opinion that the interpretation of meaning tends to be done literally as a source of recognition of meaning (Abuarrah, 2018; Dascal, 1987; Davidson, 1979; Frege, 1966; Giora, 1999; Grice, 1975; Katz & Fodor, 1963). Meanwhile, the gap between literal meanings and non-literal meanings is always a concern of meaning theories (Abuarrah, 2018; Giora, 1999).

Thus, this research was conducted using qualitative methods with a phenomenological approach. The study was conducted in *Donggo* sub-district, Bima district, West Nusa Tenggara province, with the *Donggo* ethnic community research subject. Research data collection using observation, record, and in-depth interview techniques. The data obtained in this study were 145 *mpama hepe*. Research data are grouped into 4 (four) categories, namely; (1) about human behavior, (2) about animals, (3) about plants, and (4) about the nature of things. The following are presented 5 (five) examples of research findings and their explanations.

Mpama hepe about human behaviour

Mpama hepe about human behavior is a *mpama hepe* category whose content is about knowledge-based activities or behaviors that are generally carried out by humans. In its use, this *mpama hepe* category uses source domains related to behavior normally played by humans but is associated with very diverse target domains. For example, it is associated with the target domain in the form of plants, organs, and others.

Table 1. Mpama hepe categories of human behavior

No.	Mpama Hepe	Source Domain	Target Domain
1.	*Losa-losa ana kani kababu ndeko* 'Come out wearing cloth in a way wrapped around it'	*kababu ndeko* 'wrapped in cloth.'	*Kando* 'bamboo shoots.'
2.	*Ulu lao ulu lowa* 'Go back and forth alternately'	*Ulu* 'Go first or go ahead of each other.'	*Edi* 'the feet'
3.	*Ina na ma tunti ama na ma baca* 'The mother wrote, the child read.'	*ina* 'mother', *ama* 'father', *tunti* 'write', *baca* 'read'	*Ina janga ma keha ngaha ana na* 'The hen is looking for food for her cubs'
4.	*Na ne'e si uma ndai kani na mee, laona di uma dou na kala*	*uma* 'home', *me'e* 'black', *kala* 'red'	*Kapanto* 'shrimp'

No.	*Mpama Hepe*	Source Domain	Target Domain
	'Entering one's own house black, entering a red person's house'		
5.	*Ina ndi sarere piu, ana ndi tonda* 'Her mother stroked, his child was stepped on'	*ina* 'mother', *ana* 'child', *sarere* 'petted', *tonda* 'step on'	*a'u* 'staircase'

For example, *mpama hepe* (1) uses the 'wrapped in cloth' source domain associated with the target 'bamboo shoots' domain. The symbolic metaphor used to identify the 'bamboo shoots' is through physical characteristics described by the analogy of a baby born accompanied by a body condition wrapped around a cloth. In this case the 'baby' symbol is a metaphor used to refer to 'buds', while the 'cloth' symbol is a metaphor that draws bamboo petals that wrap 'buds'.

The source domain used on *mpama hepe* (2) is 'go first or go ahead of each other' for the domain the feet 'target domain. The source domain is a symbol used to play the meaning of the metaphor. The source domain 'first or overtake 'is a metaphor describing activities that precede each other, like people walking. The metaphor is associated with the target domain 'foot' which, when used for walking and running, precedes each other. That is, when the feet are used for walking, the two go ahead of each other alternately, sometimes the right foot first and sometimes the left foot first.

Mpama hepe (3) uses the source domain 'mother, father, writing, and reading' as metaphorical symbols to describe the target domain object 'A hen that seeks food for its children'. In the *mpama hepe* utterance, describing two different activities carried out by a mother and father. 'Mother reading' is an analogy of the metaphor associated with the hen who moves her feet and pegs the ground with her beak as a sign of finding food for her children (the act is analogous to crossing or writing activities). Meanwhile, usually at the same time the rooster will shout to call its children to eat the food that has been found, in this case using Catholic 'father reading' metaphor.

Mpama hepe (4) uses the metaphoric symbol 'house, black, and red' as the source domain to describe the target domain object 'shrimp'. In the speech of the *mpama hepe*, it gives an illustration of the activities carried out by a person (human) who ascends or enters two different houses, that is his own house and a person's house. At the time of rising or entering the house itself is black is a symbolic metaphor illustration used to describe the nature and shape of the target domain of 'shrimp' that lives in their own habitat (in river water or ponds). While the illustration of symbolic metaphor rising or entering the house of a red person is associated with the change in the color of the shrimp when it is in the container (pot) when it is cooked. That is, when shrimp live freely in their natural habitat or they are black, but will turn red if boiled or in a pot.

In *mpama hepe* (5) there is the use of the symbol 'mother, child, petted and stepped on'. These symbols are the domain of the source of metaphorical expression to describe the target domain of the 'stage ladder'. The symbol 'mother' described as being treated positively by 'being stroked' is a metaphorical expression for the two wooden steps (the stairs) which indeed when a person rises automatically has to hold it. Meanwhile, the symbol 'child' is described as being treated negatively as 'being stepped on' which is a metaphorical expression for the stairs as a footstool when people climb the stairs as they enter the house.

Mpama hepe about animals

Mpama hepe about animals is the category of *mpama hepe* whose source domain content is about animals. Content about animals is used as symbols of metaphorical expression to analogize an object that is the target domain. The following are five examples of the animal category along with an explanation and analysis.

Table 2. Mpama hepe animal category

No.	Mpama Hepe	Source Domain	Target Domain
1.	*Kamau manonto doro* 'Pythons snake across mountains'	*kamau* 'python', *doro* 'Mountain.'	*mbao/panggalari uma* 'The wood that crosses two sides of the house on stilts'
2.	*Janga bura salona peke* 'White one-bone chicken'	*janga bura* 'white chicken ', *peke* 'bone'	*Kisi* 'the loom is a thread roller'
3.	*Jara bura rante ta loki* "White horse with chain on butt"	*jara* 'horse', *rante* 'chain', *loki* 'ass'	*landau* 'needle'
4.	*Sahe ma makanca angi sanai-nai* 'Buffalo that fights with the wind every day '	*sahe* 'buffalo', *angi* 'wind'	*Wanga uma* 'House horns/ornaments on the roof of the house mounted like horns'
5.	*Dudu mboto wudu* 'Porcupine with lots of eggs'	*dudu* 'Porcupine', *wudu* 'genital egg'	*nangga* 'jackfruit'

Based on table 2. *Mpama hepe* animal category (1) uses the symbol 'python and mountain' as the source domain which is a metaphorical expression for the target domain object 'Wood that crosses the two sides of the stage house'. The symbol 'python' is associated with 'wood' whose size is along the house, considered to resemble the physical shape of the snake. Meanwhile, the symbol 'mountain' is used as a metaphorical analogy associated with the overall shape of a house of relatively large size and size. Thus, what is referred to in the analogy of this symbolic metaphor is the long wooden form that resembles (the same) as the shape of a python and the size of a relatively large and large house, which in this case is analogous to (similar to) a mountain.

In *mpama hepe* (2) it is expressed using the symbol 'white chicken and bones'. The symbols are the source domain of the symbolic metaphor *mpama hepe,* which is used to reveal the target domain 'looms in the form of yarn spools processed from cotton.' The symbol 'white chicken' is a metaphor that has an emphasis on the 'white' color associated with (yarn or cotton), while the 'bone' symbol is associated with a loom in the form of a single rod of wood 'yarn or cotton rollers.' In the game of the symbolic metaphor using an analogy with the approach to nature and shape, namely the identification of the soft nature of feathers owned by cotton, white, and the shape of wood with bones.

Mpama hepe (3) is expressed using the symbol 'white horse, chains, and buttocks'. The symbol 'horse, chain', and butt 'is the source domain of the symbolic metaphor used to reveal the target domain' needle '. The use of the symbol 'white horse' is a metaphor aimed at the shape and color of the needle. Meanwhile, the 'chain' symbol is associated with the thread attached to the needle, and the 'butt' is associated with the pinhole in the back. The symbolic metaphoric game in mpama hepe uses the analogy of the physical form possessed by animals as the source domain in order to reveal the shape or characteristics of an object as the target domain.

Mpama hepe (4) is expressed using the symbol 'buffalo and wind'. The two symbols are source domain objects that are associated with the target domain 'roof decoration or accessories'. In the metaphor, there is a symbolic game using the analogy of the shape, namely the shape of buffalo horn which is considered similar (the same) with the form of accessories or roof decoration of the house, which in local Bima or Donggo ethnic terms is known as *wanga uma* 'home horn'.

In *mpama hepe* (5) there is the use of the 'hedgehog and egg eggs' symbol. The symbol is the domain of the symbolic metaphor expression associated with the 'jackfruit' as the target domain. The use of 'hedgehog' symbol to describe the nature of jackfruit skin that resembles porcupine hair (prickly/sharp), while 'genital egg' is used to describe the shape of the contents of jackfruit

which is considered similar (same) as the genital egg. Thus, the metaphor in this hepe method uses the analogy of the nature and shape of the source domain to identify the target domain.

Mpama hepe about plants

Mpama hepe about plants is a type of hepe which is the source domain content category, for example about plants. The contents of these plants are used as symbols of metaphorical expression to analogize an object that is the target domain. As an illustration, the following are five examples of the hepe category of plants accompanied by an explanation and analysis.

Table 3. Mpama hepe category of plants

No	**Mpama Hepe**	**Source Domain**	**Target Domain**
1.	*Ro'o na kapenta, wua na wanga* 'The leaves are planks, the fruit is horns'	*ro'o* 'leaf', *wua* 'fruit'	*Kalo* 'banana tree'
2.	*Ndi mantasa wati mou, ma moro na mou* 'The ripe one doesn't fall, the raw one falls'	*ntasa* 'mature', *moro* 'raw'	*ta'i jara* 'horse dung'
3.	*Fu'u haju au ma mbunta ta elona, mbua ta awa dana* 'What trees bloom at the top, bear fruit under the ground'	*mbunta* 'flowering', *wua* 'bear fruit'	*kaca nggore* 'peanuts'
4.	*Cacoro dua mobo woko kengge doro* 'Two mushrooms grow on the edge of the mountain'	*cacoro* 'mushroom', *doro* 'mountain'	*fiko* 'ear'
5.	*Ro'o na mancanga paju, wuana biji bajo* 'The leaves are branched, the fruit is oval and hanging'	*ro'o* 'leaf', *wua* 'fruit'	*panja* 'papaya'

Mpama hepe category of plants (1) is a form of expression that uses the symbol 'leaf, board, fruit and jackfruit' as the source domain to describe the physical shape of the target domain object 'banana tree'. The use of the 'leaf and board' symbol to describe a banana tree has leaves that are physically wide like a board, while the 'fruit and horn' symbol is used to describe the physical shape of a long banana resembling a cow and buffalo horn. The analogy of symbolic metaphors used in the expression of the *mpama hepe* speech is the analogy of physical form or material form.

Mpama hepe in the category of plants (2) uses the 'mature and raw' synbol. The symbol 'mature' is not meant because it is cooked, but ripe which is characterized by changes in color and taste naturally, such as the ripening of mangoes, papayas, bananas, and other fruits. Likewise, the use of the 'raw' symbol which in this context means that it is not yet ripe is marked in green. The use of the 'mature and raw' symbol as the source domain is associated with the 'horse dung/ta' target domain. This symbolic metaphorical game analogizes the tendency of the

event of the fall of fruits from the tree which is usually caused because it is ripe, but in this case the opposite is described, because the ripe does not fall, but the raw still falls. The phenomenon of the analogous event is associated with the fall of the 'tai horse' from the buttocks in a round shape like a fruit that is still raw, because it is green. Thus, the analogy of the metaphor used is the analogy of the material form of form and color.

Mpama hepe in the category of plants (3) uses the symbol 'flowering and fruiting' as the source domain associated with the target domain 'peanuts'. The symbol of flowering and fruiting is used to describe a phenomenon of productivity of plants that has an emphasis on the unusual occurrence of most plants in general. This unusual phenomenon is meant, because in general the flowering and fruiting plants above, while the source domain narration is the opposite. Thus, the analogy used is the direct analogy category, which explains the nature and material form of 'peanuts' directly.

In the *mpama hepe* example of the plants category (4) there is the use of the 'mushroom and

mountain' metaphor symbol as the source domain, which is associated to describe the 'ear' target domain. The symbol 'mushroom' is narrated as plants which number two trees, while the symbol 'doro' is the place or medium for the growth of the fungus. Specifically described, that the fungus grows on the edge of the mountain (on two sides in the opposite direction). The metaphorical symbol used to analogize the 'ear' is 'mushroom', while the 'mountain' symbol is only an explanatory or accompanying symbol used to describe the 'ear' position. Therefore. So the analogy of the metaphor used is the analogy of the characteristics of form and place.

The *mpama hepe* in the plants category (5) uses the 'leaf and fruit' symbol which is part of the growth as the source domain, and is associated when describing the target domain 'papaya'. The leaf symbol that is described is branching, while the "fruit" is dangled, as a narrative translated into the shape of a papaya leaf and fruit. Thus, the analogy used is the analogy of the form described directly (direct analogy).

Mpama hepe about the nature of objects

Mpama hepe about the nature of objects is a variant whose source domain content (mpama) is related to the nature of objects. The nature of objects as content is expressed through metaphorical symbols to analogize a target domain object (hepe). Here follows 5 (five) examples of hepe about the nature of objects about their explanation and analysis.

Table 4. Mpama hepe categories nature of objects

No	Mpama Hepe	Source Domain	Target Domain
1.	*Maci ma moro, maci ma ntasa* 'Young sweet, mature sweet'	*maci* 'sweet', *moro* 'raw', *ntasa* 'pedas"	*saha* 'chili'
2.	*Kani si na bou, wi'i si na nci'I* 'Used to be new, not used to be used and dirty'	*kani* 'used', *wi'i* 'save it' *bou* 'new (clean)', *si'i* 'dirty'	*ncai* 'footpath'
3.	*Oi saciri tiloa eda ba sahe ra jara* 'A piece of water that is not visible to buffalo and horses'	*oi saciri* 'a little water'	*oi ni'u* 'coconut water'
4.	*lu'u na rombo, losana mboko* 'straight in, hunch out'	*lu'u* 'enter', *losa* 'Exit', *rombo* 'straight', *mbeko* 'crooked'	*koki tai ilu* 'people put a finger in the nose'
5.	*Bobo mbalu da wau di bila* 'Stars that cannot be counted'	*bombo* 'star', *bila* 'can't count'	*honggo* 'hair'

Mpama hepe about the nature of objects (1) uses the symbol 'sweet, raw, and ripe' which is a type of flavor as the source domain to express the target domain object 'chilies'. The symbol 'sweet' is used to express taste, while 'raw and ripe' is used to express form. The sweet taste is symbolized as a taste that belongs to the 'chili', both raw and ripe. Sweetness is only a metaphor that contains the 'spicy' figurative meaning which is a chili-owned identity. Thus, the analogy of the metaphor used is the analogy of taste.

Mpama hepe about the nature of objects (2) uses the symbol 'new and dirty' which is a form of nature. The symbol is the source domain that is used to describe the 'pathway' target domain. The 'new' symbol is a trait associated with the target

domain 'footpath' when used, while 'dirty' is a trait associated with set footpath 'that is not used. This inverted analogy actually explains that there are facts that contradict reality in general. Usually, something that is stored will remain new, while what is used will be used and dirty. Thus, the analogy of the metaphor used is the analogy of nature.

Mpama hepe about the nature of objects (3) uses the 'little water' symbol as the source domain to reveal the target domain 'coconut water'. The symbol of 'little water' is a form of character associated with 'coconut water' which is small in number and very closed. Thus, the analogy used is a direct analogy, which directly describes the

nature of coconut water, which is in a very closed place.

Mpama hepe about the nature of objects (4) uses the symbol 'enter, exit, straight, and crooked'. These symbols are the source domain used to give an idea, in order to reveal the target domain 'people put their fingers in their nose'. The use of 'in' and 'out' symbols is the information of actions or actions which are followed by the use of symbol straight 'and' crooked 'inclusion information symbols. Substantially these symbols are used to explain an action, that is, 'a person enters the finger in the nose'. Thus, the analogy used is the analogy of actions and deeds.

Mpama hepe about the nature of objects (5) uses the symbol 'star and count'. These two symbols are the source domain for explaining the 'hair' target domain. The star symbol is associated with hair because the hair in the *Donggo* ethnic culture is the crown that symbolizes human identity and honor, while the 'count' is a companion symbol that explains the nature of hair, which is countless. Thus, the analogy used is the analogy of the form and nature metaphors.

Methodology

This research was conducted using a qualitative approach to the type of ethnographic research. Qualitative research is an effort to build meaning about something based on the views of the participants (Creswel, 2009). Consideration of using a qualitative approach, because this research is functional. Meanwhile, this type of research is ethnographic research, an act of identifying a community, then examining how the community develops patterns of behavior (Creswel, 2009); understand the point of view of the native population, its relationship with life, to get its view of the world (Malinowski, 1926); and the work of describing a culture with the primary goal of understanding a view of life from the point of view of the native population (J. P. Spradley, 2006). Thus, ethnographic research is about learning about the world of people experiencing, see, hear, talk, think, and act in different ways. That is, the ethnographic approach in qualitative research is not only used to study the community but more than that, it is used by researchers (ethnographers) to learn from the community.

Ethnography is a culture that studies other cultures and seeks to build a systematic understanding of all aspects of community culture based on the perspectives of researchers who have studied them (J. Spradley, 1980).

This research was conducted in 6 (six) villages in Donggo sub-district, Bima Regency, West Nusa Tenggara Province. The six villages in question are Desa Manggekompo, Kala, O'o, Mpili, Mbawa, and Padende. The research was conducted in May-July 2019. In data collection activities, researchers (ethnographers) settled in the research location and managed directly with the community from one village to another. The research data was obtained by ethnographers from informants, namely the Donggo ethnic community who were socially assisted using *mpama hepe* naturally. The number of *mpama hepe* narratives that were the subjects in this study were 65 *mpama hepe* events. Research data collection uses engaging collection techniques, and friendly conversations. In data collection activities using both techniques, ethnographers also use recording devices. The data obtained in this study are 145 mp hepe. Research data are grouped into 4 (four) categories, namely; (1) understanding about human behavior, (2) understanding about animals, (3) understanding about plants, and (4) understanding about the nature of objects.

Results and Discussion

Based on the research findings as explained above, that there are four categories of *mpama hepe* which are used as expressions of symbolic metaphors in the dynamics of *Donggo* ethnic social life, namely (1) *mpama hepe* about human behavior, (2) *mpama hepe* about animals, (3) *mpama hepe* about plants, and (4) about the nature of objects. Thus, this finding is confirmed in line with the reference category metaphors submitted, (Tay, 2017) who found 2 (two) metaphor categories, namely categories by topic and categories based on delivery media. Topic categories consist of; (1) accompaniment, (2) ambiguous, (3) people, (4) circumstances, (5) emotions, (6) life, (7) past, present, and future, (8) behavior, (9) goals, and (10) success. Reference categories consist of: (a) objects, (b) movements, (c) animals, (d) forces, (e) nature, (f) actions, (g)

containers, (h) light, (i) dreams, and (j) vision. The findings of this study, also similar to those put forward, Lakoff and Turner (1989), that metaphorical games tend to symbolically compare ourselves (humans) with animals in both positive and negative terms. A comparison of animals with humans is more dominant in many cultures, so it can be assessed as an embodiment of people's wisdom in a social context (Zuñiga, 1992).

Mpama hepe is used in certain situations with certain symbolic diction. In other words, that the forms and topics of hepe are expressed using distinctive metaphorical symbols based on the situation and context of the speech event. This is relevant to what (C. Forceville & Urios-Aparisi, 2009) say, that "the construction and interpretation of metaphors are influenced by pragmatic and situational factors, where the emphasis lies on symbolic (local) metaphorical topics rather than conceptual (global) mapping.

Symbolic metaphors used in hama's speech are social expressions that are factual and real. That is, the things that are revealed in the *mpama hepe* game are not engineered by imagination, but rather facts that can be proven materially. Language construction uses an analogy that aims to stimulate speech participants to think critically. This is in line with the view that says, "The use of metaphors is usually related to specific real-world contexts that can affect, limit, or otherwise affect the production, interpretation, and function of metaphors" (Deignan et al., 2013; Sanz, 2015; Zanotto, Cameron, & Cavalcanti, 2008).

However, the metaphorical symbols used in the speech of *mpama hepe* have varying degrees of difficulty in interpretation, because some are linear and not linear. Metaphors can be categorized into equivalent reference metaphors and unequal reference metaphors. This is in line with the opinion, (C. Forceville, 2009) "Equivalent reference metaphors expressed in the same mode; like the words 'sky' and 'sky picture', the references are the same or not significantly different, the underlying concepts. While the reference metaphor is not equivalent, on the contrary. Therefore, the symbolic metaphors used in the *mpama hepe* are multi-interpreted, and even tend to mislead the logic, so that the speech participants often incorrectly guess the purpose of the *mpama* utterances that are brought up for

hepe. This is also in line with, (Glucksberg, 2003), according to him, "In the interpretation of metaphors sometimes it cannot be confirmed or connected with a real conceptual".

Mpama hepe in its use does require a wider world knowledge relating to the social environment and the natural environment. Specifically, the world knowledge is related to animals, plants, human character and behavior, and other objects. Besides that, the basic principle that must be considered, that the game *mpama* hepe is a two-way communication interaction so that it requires at least two speech participants. Both have their respective roles, as *mpama* speakers and hepe speakers. As such, the metaphors used in *mpama* speech, are intended to be understood and understood by *mpama* speakers. This is in line with what was said by (Gibbs Jr, 2015), a metaphor is used by a speaker and writer to be understood and understood because it requires others as listeners and readers. Speakers and writers sometimes explicitly hint at the intentional use of metaphors. *Mpama* speech can actually also be seen as one form of rhetorical expression that is done intentionally to trick the mind of a speech partner (*hepe* speaker), so that the *hepe* speaker cannot guess correctly and precisely according to the will and intention of the *mpama* speaker. This is in line with the view, "It is very possible for people to use conventional metaphors very intentionally, intentional use of metaphors is characterized by wordplay and rhetorical devices used" (Gibbs Jr, 2015; G. Steen, 2008; G. J. Steen, 2011). A metaphor is intentionally used with a view to changing the recipient's perspective about the reference or topic that is the target of the metaphor, thus making the recipient trapped in a different conceptual domain (Gibbs Jr, 2015).

The diction used in the speech of *mpama* contains figurative meaning. In other words, the metaphorical symbols used are figurative. .Metaphor is a matter of using words with figurative meanings, meaning that deviates from the standard or literal meaning (White, 2001). Conceptual metaphors also called primary metaphors are metaphorical patterns motivated by the close correlation between the fundamental dimensions of human experience (Grady, 1997; Yu & Huang, 2019).

In its development, research on metaphors has evolved to bring up research on multimodal metaphors that are adaptations of the natural convergence between the dynamics of development with metaphorical theories, specifically related to Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) (Lakoff, 1993), and are supported by increasingly evolving and complex contexts. contemporary studies so that multimodality becomes more prominent (Bateman John, 2014; Jewitt, 2009). The use of metaphors in verbal communication aims to find unique ways to express an ideal concept, thought, or idea, which can then be confirmed as a form of verification and proof of conformity (Cienki, 1998; C. J. Forceville, 2005; Refaie, 2003; Spitzer, 2015).

The unique way of being expressed as a concept, thought, and idea is reflected very clearly in the long-term interaction of the Donggo ethnic community. In practice, the 'mpama' speaker processes and constructs the language in such a way as to lead the speech partner to capture a concept, thought, or idea. Meanwhile, the speech partner must fight hard and really hone the power of critical thinking, in order to guess or answer 'hepe'. To abstract the reality of *mpama hepe* interaction as one of the expressions of local cultural wisdom of the Donggo ethnic community, the following 2 (two) data facts of ethnographic conversation social interaction of *mpama hepe* are presented.

(1) Pn : ***Runca-runca** losa **oi bura**?*
"But the water comes out?"

Mt : ***Dou ma maru wei labo rahi**.*
"People who have husband and wife sex"

Pn : *Turu nggahi*
"Don't be negative thinking."

Mt : *Iyo wa'u mpa ni... Au waliku?*
"It's true that right ... What else come on?"

Pn : *Laina ede... Ncara!*
"That's not it ... Wrong!"

Mt : *Au ku?*
"So what?"

Pn : *Somba ro?*
"Give up?"

Mt : *Iyo...!*
"yes …!"

Pn : ***Dou ma sika woi***
"The person who brushes his teeth"

Mt : *Be ku laona ede?*
"What is the connection?"

Pn : *Dou ma sika woi ka, runca-runca ntuwu na sika woi losa hobo bura ede*
"The person who brushes his teeth, butts and then continues to brush his teeth and will produce foam / white foam"

Mt : *Oh ndede ku? Iyo…iyo….iyo…*
"Oh, I see? Yes, Yes, Yes…"

In the conversation above, the speaker uses the diction *runca* 'buting' and the *oi bura* "white water". The diction is used to obscure intentions or in other words it is used to trick the minds of the speech partners. The answer or *hepe* spoken by the speech partner shows that his imagination and reason are influenced by the diction, so it is answered *dou ma maru wei labo rahi* "People who have husband and wife sex". *Hepe* is the result of the construction of imagination and thoughts about a social event symbolized by the words 'buting' associated with the practice of intercourse and *oi bura* 'white water' associated with 'semen'. For that matter, what do you mean, "All the water comes out?" it is associated with *hepe* "people who brush their teeth". With the rationalization of the argument, that "the person who brushes his teeth is done by rubbing his teeth (disguised with the words" copulating-copulating ") and the result of rubbing produces foam/foamy white.

(2) Pn : ***Ina na ma bedi, amana ma rongko, ana na manangi?***
"His mother shot him, his father smoked, while his son cried".

Mt : ***Dou rahi labo wei o ana na ma lao nggalo.***
"A married couple and a child hunting".

Pn : *Lain!*
"Not!"

Mt : ***Dou ma dawara dirawi?***
"Unemployed person?"

Pn : *Ncara!*
"False!"

Mt : *Dou ringu*
"Crazy people"

Pn : *Somba ro?*
"Give up?"

Mt : *Iyo…!*
"Yes…!"

Pn : **Dou ma kamori oto**.
"The person who started the car".

Mt : *Ba au loa kain ndede laona?*
"How come?"

Pn : *Tiojapu dou ma kamori oto ka, dou ma kamorina, losa obu ta kenalpot, masin na ma kanggica"*
"Try to pay attention to the person who turned on the car, the person who turned on the contact, introduced the smoke, and the engine shouted".

In the second conversation above there is the *mpama* game that reads *Ina na ma bedi, amana ma rongko, ana na manangi?* "His mother shot him, his father smoked, while his son cried". In the *mpama* there is the use of the verbs *bedi, rongko, and manangi*. Typical diction is used by the speaker to stimulate the mind and imagination of the speech partner (*hepe* speaker). Based on this example, it is answered with three *hepe*, namely 'people who go hunting', 'people who are unemployed', and Crazy people. Both of the answers (hepe) are said to be wrong by *mpama* speakers, because the correct *hepe* is *dou ma kamori oto* 'the person who started the car'.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the research described above, it can be concluded that *mpama hepe* is the local wisdom of the Donggo ethnic group which contains a universal social dimension. *Mpama hepe* is also a symbolic expression that is metaphorical. Therefore, *mpama hepe* can stimulate participants to think critically and imaginatively, and can train participants to produce innovative, critical, educative language creativity. As one of the local wisdom products, *mpama hepe* is used as an alternative communication strategy in the Donggo ethnic social reality. The speech of *mpama hepe* uses diction with a unique and unique pattern with four categories of *mpama hepe*, namely; *mpama hepe* about human behavior, *mpama hepe* about animals, *mpama hepe* about plants, and *mpama hepe* about the nature of things. As one of the local wisdoms, then of course the existence of oral traditions is the main requirement for noble values which are passed down from generation to generation.

References

Abuarrah, S. (2018). Literal meaning: A first step to meaning interpretation. *Topics in Linguistics*, *19*(2), 86–96. https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2018-0012

Alousque, I. N. (2014). Verbo-pictorial metaphor in French advertising. *Journal of French Language Studies*, *24*(2), 155–180. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959269513000045

Bateman John, A. (2014). *Text and Image: a Critical Introduction to the Visual/Verbal Divine*. London.

Burgers, C., Renardel de Lavalette, K. Y., & Steen, G. J. (2018). Metaphor, hyperbole, and irony: Uses in isolation and in combination in written discourse. *Journal of* *Pragmatics*, *127*, 71–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.01.009

Cienki, A. J. (1998). Metaphoric gestures and some of their relations to verbal metaphoric expressions. *Discourse and Cognition: Bridging the Gap*, 189–204.

Creswel, J. W. (2009). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. *Los Angeles: University of Nebraska–Lincoln*.

Dascal, M. (1987). Defending Literal Meaning. *Cognitive Science*, *11*(3), 259–281. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1103_1

Davidson, D. (1979). *What metaphors mean. In, S. Sacks (Ed.), On Metaphor. U*. Chicago Press.

Deignan, A., Littlemore, J., & Semino, E. (2013). *Figurative language, genre and register*. Cambridge University Press.

Forceville, C. (2009). Non-verbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework: Agendas for research. *Multimodal Metaphor*, *2*, 19–35.

Forceville, C. J. (2005). *Cognitive linguistics and multimodal metaphor*.

Forceville, C., & Urios-Aparisi, E. (2009). *Multimodal metaphor* (Vol. 11). Walter de Gruyter.

Frege, G. (1966). On sense and reference.(Originally published in 1892). *Translations from the Philosophical Writings of Gottlob Frege*.

Gibbs Jr, R. W. (2015). Do pragmatic signals affect conventional metaphor understanding? A failed test of deliberate metaphor theory. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *90*, 77–87.

Giora, R. (1999). On the priority of salient meanings: Studies of literal and figurative language. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*(7), 919–929.

Glucksberg, S. (2003). The psycholinguistics of metaphor. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *7*(2), 92–96.

Grady, J. (1997). Foundations of meaning: Primary metaphors and primary stress. *University of California, Berkeley*.

Grice, P. (1975). Logic of Conversation. *The Semantics-Pragmatics Boundry in Philosophy*, pp. 41–58.

Jay, L. (1998). *Multipling meaning: visual and verbal semiotics in scientific text In Martin, Jim & Veel, Robert.(eds). Reading Science: critical and functional perspectives on scientific discourse*. London: Routledge.

Jeong, S. H. (2008). Visual metaphor in advertising: Is the persuasive effect attributable to visual argumentation or metaphorical rhetoric? *Journal of Marketing Communications*, *14*(1), 59–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697010701717488

Jewitt, C. (2009). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis*. Routledge London.

Katz, J. J., & Fodor, J. A. (1963). The structure of a semantic theory. *Language*, *39*(2), 170–210.

Lakoff, G. (1993). *The contemporary theory of metaphor*.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2008). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago press.

Landau, M. J., Nelson, N. M., & Keefer, L. A. (2015). Divergent Effects of Metaphoric Company Logos: Do They Convey What the Company Does or What I Need? *Metaphor and Symbol*, *30*(4), 314–338. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2015.1074806

Malinowski, B. (1926). Argonauts of the Western Pacific (London, 1922). *Crime and Custom in Savage Society*, 1895–1896.

Pérez-Sobrino, P. (2016). Multimodal metaphor and metonymy in advertising: A corpus-based account. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *31*(2), 73–90.

Refaie, E. El. (2003). Understanding visual metaphor: The example of newspaper cartoons. *Visual Communication*, *2*(1), 75–95.

Sanz, M. J. P. (2015). *Multimodality and cognitive linguistics* (Vol. 78). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge University Press Cambridge.

Spitzer, M. (2015). *Metaphor and musical thought*. University of Chicago Press.

Spradley, J. (1980). Observación participante. *New York: Rinehart and Winston*, 7–25.

Spradley, J. P. (2006). Metode Etnografi, translated. *Misbah Zulfa Elizabeth, Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana*.

Steen, G. (2008). The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *23*(4), 213–241.

Steen, G. J. (2011). The contemporary theory of metaphor—now new and improved! *Review of Cognitive Linguistics. Published under the Auspices of the Spanish Cognitive Linguistics Association*, *9*(1), 26–64.

Tay, D. (2017). Metaphor construction in online motivational posters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *112*, 97–112.

White, R. M. (2001). Literal Meaning and "Figurative Meaning." *Theoria*, *67*(1), 24–59.

Yu, N., & Huang, J. (2019). Primary metaphors across languages: Difficulty as weight and solidity. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *34*(2), 111–126.

Zanotto, M. S., Cameron, L., & Cavalcanti, M. C. (2008). *Confronting metaphor in use: An applied linguistic approach* (Vol. 173). John Benjamins Publishing.

Zuñiga, M. E. (1992). Using metaphors in therapy: Dichos and Latino clients. *Social Work*, *37*(1), 55–60.