

**EXPERIENTIAL MEANING BREADTH AND GRAMMATICAL
COMPLEXITY REALIZATION VARIATIONS OF W. SHAKESPEARE'S
KING LEAR AND J. CROWTHER'S *KING LEAR***

A THESIS SUMMARY

**Presented as Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Attainment of
a *Sarjana Sastra* Degree in English Language and Literature**



Second Consultant

Yosa A. Alzuhdy, S.S. M.Hum

NIP: 19710801 199903 1 002

By:

Irmia Christi

05211144033

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE STUDY PROGRAM
ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND ARTS
YOGYAKARTA STATE UNIVERSITY**

2012

A. Introduction

a. Background of the Research

Language is involved in almost everything we do as human beings for communication. Every nation has a different language. To know the message of other language, people need tools to communicate each other, to deliver the message. It is why people need translation. Through translation people that do not know the point of a message in different languages can get it easier. A translation should convey the same information as the original. As an example of translation is Shakespeare's play which has been translated into late modern English in order to make a better understanding for people who read the original text of Shakespeare's play.

b. Focus of The Research

This study focused on the analysis of experiential meaning breadth and grammatical complexity realization variations of the whole clause units in the intralingual translation of W. Shakespeare's *King Lear* and J. Crowther's *King Lear*. The meaning variation is in terms of experiential meaning breadth, while the realization variation is in terms of grammatical complexity realization variations by comparing W. Shakespeare's *King Lear* and J. Crowther's *King Lear* texts.

In accordance with the focus of analysis mentioned, the researcher formulated the problems as follows:

1. How are the experiential meaning breadth and grammatical complexity realization variations represented in W. Shakespeare's *King Lear* and its translation J. Crowther's *King Lear*?
2. What are the contextual factors that motivate the occurrence of the experiential meaning breadth and grammatical complexity realization variations in question?

3. What are the contextual effects of the experiential meaning breadth and grammatical complexity realization variations in readability context?

c. Objectives of the research

1. to describe the experiential meaning breadth and grammatical complexity realization variations in W. Shakespeare's *King Lear* and J. Crowther's *King Lear*,
2. to explain the contextual factors that generate the occurrence of the experiential meaning breadth and grammatical complexity realization variations in question, and
3. to interpret the contextual effects of the experiential meaning breadth and grammatical complexity realization variations in readability context.

B. Literature Review and Research Method

This research observes intralingual TSC, which is monolingual that is early modern English texts as realizers. It uses experiential meaning and grammatical complexity to find the degrees of experiential meaning and grammatical complexity realization variation, semiotic motivating factors, and semiotic effects. In this study, experiential meaning breadth and grammatical complexity analysis is classified into seven scales of parameters, from 0 (lowest) to 6 (highest).

Referring to the research data, the researcher used qualitative method while, the data in the table are measured and valued in terms of quantitative research. The qualitative research method is used in valuing and explaining the data in words or in making the interpretations of the data from table into words. The main instrument was the researcher herself since this research is a content analysis research. The table sheets and related references were used to classify the data and as the research instruments. The data source of this study is a play taken from <http://nfs.sparknotes.com/kinglear/>. This research

use written text as the data. The unit of analysis of this research is clause. All the data in this research were taken from all clauses in W. Shakespeare's *King Lear* and J. Crowther's *King Lear*. In collecting the data, the researcher read the two texts several times. Then, all the clauses of both SE and TE were written into a data sheet. After getting the data, they were classified and analyzed using experiential meaning and grammatical complexity analysis. Parameters were used in analyzing the data in order to get a valid and constant data. After the data were collected into the data sheet and were analyzed, they were recapped in tables. In order to get a valid and reliable research, the researcher emphasized the trustworthiness of the research by the rereading activities and also asked her consultants and her colleagues' judgment to verify the research data. The general steps in analysis were:

1. rewriting the clauses in Text 1 and Text 2 into the data sheet,
2. analyzing the data in terms of experiential meaning breadth and grammatical complexity,
3. recapping the data result in the statistic table of the data,
4. describing the data in the table into words,
5. interpreting the intrinsic and extrinsic motivating factors,
6. interpreting the effects that caused by intrinsic and extrinsic motivating factors,
7. drawing the conclusion.

C. Findings

SE and TE consist of 5 acts and 26 scenes. There are 2642 clause units of analysis. After analyzing data, in experiential meaning, the research find that the "0" degree variations or zero variations is the largest number of variations. There are 1034 units of analysis or 39.14% which belong to zero variation. It implies that the majority of expressions in SE are realized almost accurately into TE while, in grammatical complexity the "0" degree or zero variation also the largest number of variation. There are 1173 or 44.40% which belong to zero variation. It shows that there is no significant difference

between SE and TE.

D. Conclusion

After discussing and comparing text 1 and text 2 in chapter 4, there are some findings and conclusions that can be drawn related to the objectives of the research as stated in Chapter I. The conclusions are as follows:

1. According to the data, the “lowest” level of variations is the greatest number in the analysis of both in experiential meaning breadth (39.14%) and grammatical complexity variations (44.40%). It indicates that many clauses in ST are realized into TT. The number of average in experiential meaning breadth which is placed in “2” level or “low” level of variations support the low variations. The number of average in grammatical complexity variations which is placed in “1” level or “very low” level of variations support the very low variations. In addition, those variations are also supported with the degree variations between ST and TT. In experiential meaning breadth variations: there are 21.92% in SE, 37.93% in TE, and 40.15% in SE=TE. While in grammatical complexity realization variations: there are 19.46% in SE, 36.18% in TE, and 44.36% in SE=TE. In brief, ST and TT have low experiential meaning breadth variations and very low grammatical complexity variations. This low and very low variations become the features of rewording between ST and TT. So, this translation has achieved the high level of equivalence in meaning and realization variations.
2. Those low and very low variations are motivated by many factors. The first, the intra-textual contexts that consist of diction, contracted and archaic words, different spelling words, omission, grammatical principles, and paraphrase. Second, there are also many inter-textual motivating factors. The inter-textual motivating factors are inter-related texts and situation value (field, tenor, and mode). The field of the play is about the story of political authority as much as it is about family dynamics between Lear as father and as a King and his three daughters. The tenor of the ST is William Shakespeare as the author of the play and the readers of Elizabethan age or the readers of early modern English era. While in TT, the author is John Crowther as the translator and the common

English readers around the world as the readers. The mode of the texts is in a form of written texts.

3. The contextual effects are actually inter-related to the target readers of the texts. First, the readability effects towards the target readers of the two texts. The ST is readable for the target readers who lived in the Elizabethan Age. While, the TT is readable and understandable for the target readers of the present era since it consists of less complex grammar and vocabularies. The second aspect is the purpose of creating the texts. The TT is made to ease the readers in comprehending the story of the play in ST which is not familiar and unreadable for the common readers of this era.

E. References

- Amstrong, N. 2005. *Translation, Linguistics, Culture: A French-English Handbook*. The Cromwell Press Ltd: Great Britain.
- Baker, M. 1992. *In Other Words: A coursebook on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bell, R.T. 1991. *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. Harlow: Longman.
- Butt, D. 2003. *Using Functional Grammar: An Explorer's Guide (Second Edition)*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Catford, J.C. 1965. *A Linguistics theory on Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crowther, J. 2003. *No Fear Shakespeare: King Lear*. New York: Spark Publishing, a Division of Barnes & Noble Publishing.
- Eggins, S. 2004. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistic, 2nd*. London: Continuum.
- Finch, G. 2000. *Linguistic Terms and Concepts*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Gleason, H.A, Jr. 1955. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston Inc.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1978. *Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation*

- of language and meaning*. London: Arnold.
- _____. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- _____. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold
- _____. 2004. *An Introduction To Functional Grammar 3rd Edition*. London: Arnold Publisher.
- Halliday, M.A.K and Hasan, R. 1985. *Language, Context and Text: Aspect of Language in Social Semiotics Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C. 1994. *Systemic Functional Grammar: A First Step into the Theory*. A Paper: Unpublished.
- Halliday, M.A.K & Matthiessen, C. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Martin, J.R. 1993. *Writing Science*. London: Falmer Press.
- Hanafi, Nuraclunan. 1986. *Teori dan Seni Menerjemahkan*, Ende-Flores: Nusa Indah.
- Hornby, A. S. 1995. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jakobson, R. 1959. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation" in Bower, R.A. (Ed) *On translation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Krippendorf, K. 1980. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication.
- Larson, M. L. 1984. *Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Lock, G. 1996. *Functional English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Machali, R. 1998. *Redefining Textual Equivalent in Translation*. Jakarta: The Translation Center of UI.
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A text Book of Translation*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Newmark, Pete. 1981. *Approaches to Translation*, London: Pergamon Press.
- Nida, E.A. and Taber, C.R. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nida, E.A., and Taber, C.R.1982. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Onions, C.T. 1958. *A Shakespeare Glossary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, D. 2001. *Becoming a Translator: An Accelerated Course*. New York: Routledge.
- Simatupang, Maurits D S. 1999. *Pengantar Teori Terjemahan*, Jakarta:Depdiknas.
- Sinar, T. S. 2008. *Teori dan Analisis Wacana: Pendekatan Sistemik-Fungsional*. Medan: Pustaka Bangsa Press.
- Sudaryanto. 1988. *Metode Linguistik; Bagian Pertama Ke Arah Memahami Metode Linguistik*, Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University press.
- Tou, A.B., 2008, "The Translatics of Translation", in *Journal of Modern Languages, Vol. 18*, Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University of Malaya, Jabatan Penerbitan Universiti Malaya, 50603, Kuala Lumpur, 2008:23.
- Wilss, Wolfram. 1982. *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods*. Stuttgart: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- No Fear Shakespeare: King Lear. Retrieved on June 29th, 2011 from <http://nfs.sparknotes.com/kinglear/>

