CLAUSE COMPLEX AND EXPERIENTIAL REALIZATION IN COURT TEXTS (BALI BOMB CASE I): A SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS STUDY

Eddy Setia[1*], I Gusti Made Sutjaja[2],

Amrin Saragih[3], Ida Bagus Putrayadnya[2]
eddy12457@yahoo.com
1 School for Graduated Study, Udayana University.
2 Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters, Udayana University
3 Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters, Medan State University

1. Introduction

Through the analysis of clause complex and experiential realization in court texts (especially Bali Bomb Case-I) by employing two approaches, namely Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the writer hopes to find out not only the grammatical constructions of both problems in the court texts but also their ideological constructions. Law text in general and court text in particular have their own language characteristics compared with others, such as journal and scientific ones. Language complication in law text is also agreed by law experts and law-text makers especially the language used in government constitutions. Danet (1980:449) explains that the study of law text is related to language characteristics, functions, and consequence used in social decency negotiation (for details see Danet, 1980:449; Remmelink 2003:51—52; Lumintaintang 1993, 1994, dan 1995; Gibbons, 2005:15; Tiersma, 1999:139—41; Halliday, 2004:3, also Eggins, 2004:10; Thompson, 2000:9).

There are some basic concepts in learning language, besides those that are related to a number of theoretical explanations, as in various technical terms used. In SFL, studying language must be linked to four basic components, i.e. (1) language as a text and system, (2) language as sound, writing and wording, (3) language as structure – configurations of its parts, and (4) language as resource – choices among alternatives. Besides, there are also five dimensions in language and their ordering principles. They are (1) structure (syntagmatic order), (2) system (paradigmatic order), (3) stratification, (4) instantiation, and (5) metafunction (see also Halliday, 2004:20—30; Eggins 1994:201—202, 2004:203; Teich 1999:19—20; Martin, 1992:4; Martin, 1992:4; Halliday, 2005:22).

2. Clause and Clause Complex in SFL

The technical term of ''clause'' in SFL is identical with 'sentence' in the formal grammar. In SFL (Halliday 2005:262) clause complex is a part of clause. The term clause itself, by Eggins (2004:255—256) is called clause simplex. Clause or clause simplex equals simple sentence in formal grammar and clause complex equals complex sentence. In SFL, parts of a clause are in accordance with the types of process, i.e. (material, mental, verbal, relational, behavioral, and existential). The criteria used in grouping the process are semantics and syntax. These criteria differentiate one kind of process from the others. Type of process determines kinds of experience in a clause and as determinant of participant that is tied up by the process. Clause in SFL is a grammatical unit that consists of three main components, i.e. (1) process, (2) participant, and (3) circumstance. *Process* equals verb in formal grammar, *Participant* equals subject or object, whilst *circumstance* equals complement.

Interdependency of clauses is technically called "taxis". The same interdependency is called parataxis (equal status) and the different one is called hypotaxis (unequal status). Hypotaxis is the relation between a dependent element and its dominant, the element on which it is dependent. Parataxis is the relation between two-like-elements of equal status, one initiating and the other continuing.

The distinction between parataxis and hypotaxis has developed as a powerful grammatical strategy for guiding the rhetorical development of text. The choice between parataxis and hypotaxis characterizes each relation between two clauses (each nexus) within a clause complex, and clause complexes are often formed out of mixture of parataxis and hypotaxis.

3. Experiential Realization

The concept of experiential realization in SFL refers to flow of events. Then, this flow of events is chunked into quanta of change by the grammar: each quantum of change is modeled as a figure – a figure of happening, doing, sensing, saying, being or having. According to Halliday (2004:170) the concept of experiential realization is called as flow of events. There are some elements needed in realizing experience in a clause, i.e. *process*, *participant*, and *circumstance.*   Process refers to activities or actions happening in the clause.

4. Ideological Concept

Fowler and Kress (1979:185) claim that text embodies ideology. The use of language is influenced by the interlocutors' ideological positions, that is, the values (consciously or unconsciously held), the perspectives acquired through particular path through the culture (see Lemke, 1990:435; Threw, 1979:94; Hodge, Kress, and Jones 1979:81; Young and Brigid, 2006:32.

5. The Research Findings

The research findings on clause complex realization involve Taxis and Logico-Semantic Relations. The analysis of clause complex in court texts (Bali bomb case I), especially that which deals with taxis and logico-semantic relations shows the number of percentage of the needs of clause interdependencies (parataxis and hypotaxis) and the system of logico-semantic relations . From the eleven texts, a number of 305 clause complex nexus, consisting of 51,47% parataxis and 48,52% hypotaxis is found. The needs of logico-semantic relations are (expansion = 95, 08% and projection = 4, 53%). In conclusion, court texts favor much more parataxis than hypotaxis. The scale of priority of the needs of taxis (expansion and projection) can be determined from T1 to T11.

Expansion clauses can be grouped into three types, i.e. (1) elaboration, (2) extension, and (3) enhancement. From the whole texts, only T4 favors complete expansion in the two taxis (paratactic and hypotactic elaboration, extension, and enhancement. T1, T2, T6, T7, and T10 variously show the degree of needs of elaboration and extension in their taxis. The variation of the needs is not too much except for paratactic elaboration and hypotactic extension, i.e. for parataxis (elaboration=22,4%, extension=30,18%, and enhancement=2,83%); for the hypotaxis: (elaboration=1,88%, extension=4,71%, and enhancement=35,23%). T1, T2, T6, T7 and T10 show the degree of needs of elaboration and extension in their taxis. The variation of the needs is also not too much except for paratactic elaboration (T10=7,69%) and hypotactic extension (T1 and T2 are equal, i.e. 11,11%, and T6 = 5,0%).T3, T5, and T11 do not need paratactic elaboration at all.

From the results of analysis of T1 to T11, there are only six texts that use projection clauses, i.e. T2, T4, T6, T7, T8, and T9. There are two types of projection clauses, namely locution and idea. They can be in the forms of paratactic projection of locutions and ideas and hypotactic projection of locutions and ideas. Only some data of projections are found in the analysis. The requirements of projections of court texts can be represented in six texts, and they are arranged based on the scale of priority as the following. (1) T9 = hypotactic projection of locution   (26, 66%), (2) T4 = hypotactic projection of locution (26, 66%); (3) T6 = hypotactic projection of locution (13, 33%), (4) T2 and (5) T8 = hypotactic projection of locution (6, 66%); T6 = paratactic projection of locution (6, 66%).

5. The Results of Experiential Realization Analysis

The results of lexicogrammatical experiential analysis are tabulated in order to clarify the degree of the difference in the needs of distribution of grammatical elements in each text. T9 does not mostly need MEN(tal) process type (6,55 %), but also highly needs VERB(al) process type(6,72 %) compared with the other texts. MEN process concerns with sense, cognition, emotion, and perception that happen in human being. VERB process is in between, MEN and REL processes. It means that, VERB process owns its characteristics, that is, to show activities which are closely related to information.

From the results of the analysis, BEH (avioral) and EX (istence) processes are likely not required in all

texts. There are also some other processes that are not required in some texts. For example, MAT (erial) process does not exist in T3 and T7, neither do MEN process in T1 and T2, REL process in T1 and T3, and VER process in T5 and T10.

Requirements of types of process in each text are different from each other. T4 prioritizes MAT and REL processes (even the portions are different) compared with the other types, i.e. 12, 61% and 8, 06% of each. In conjunction with VERB transitivity process, T9 can be seen to need the biggest VERB transitivity, namely 30,0% out of the total number of 133 processes, followed successively by T10=20,30%, T11=18,79%, T4=18,04%), T6=5,26%, T2 and T1 =2,25% each, T8 and T3=0,75% each, and T5 does not require it at all.

The results of the analysis of Participant types show that from the total number of 550 samples, the spread of each participant types (PT) (humans and nonhumans) in each text can be concluded as follows:
  T9 favors 194 PTs (humans=29,0% and nonhumans=6,18%). T4 favors 165 PTs (humans=18, 0% and the rest (12,0%) are nonhumans. T10 favors 39 PTs (humans=5, 45% and nonhumans=1,63%). T11 favors 34 PTs (humans=4, 72% and nonhumans=1, 45%). T2 favors 26 PTs (humans=3, 63% and nonhumans=1, 09%). T8 favors 18 PTs (humans=1, 27% and nonhumans=2, 0%). Both T1 and T5 favor 10 PTs (humans=1, 45% and nonhumans=0, 36%) nonhumans. T3 is the only text which does not require PT (= 0%), but it requires 2 nonhuman PTs (0, 36%).

The results of the analysis of circumstance types show that eight out of eleven texts favor ACC circumstantial type. They are T1 (1, 27%), T3 (0, 21%), T4 (9, 09%), T5 (0, 63%), T6 (2, 33%), T7 (0, 63), T8 (0, 63%), and T9 (18, 18%) respectively. T2 and T10 favor the same type of circumstance, i.e. LOC/temporal (T2=1, 90% and T10=1, 48%). T11 is the only text which favors ROL circumstantial type (3, 59%). Meanwhile the insignificant numbers are cause (CAU) =5, 50%, extent (EXT) temporal=2, 75%, circumstantial=1, 90%, ROL=1, 48%, MAT=0, 85%, and EXT distance=0, 42% respectively.

Context of situation can be grouped into three components, i.e. (1) social action, (2) role structure, and (3) symbol organization. These three components, in LFS are recognized as *field*, *tennor*, and *mode*. Environmental or social context of language is structured as "field", a certain social action; "tenor" concerning with the role relationship; whilst "mode" concerns with problem of symbol subdividing. The combination of the three components produces situation or context of a text.

Tables of Context of Situation

Text	Field	Tenor	Mode
1	Court	Prosecutor	Written
2	Court	Prosecutor	Spoken-written
3	Court	Prosecutor	Spoken-written
4	Court	Prosecutor	Spoken-written
5	Court	Defendant/the accused	Spoken-written
6	Court	Defender	Spoken-written
7	Court	Prosecutor	Spoken-written
8	Court	Defender	Spoken-written
9	Court	Court of Justice	Spoken-written
10	Court	Court of Justice	Spoken-written
11	Court	Supreme of Court	Spoken-written

6. Novelty

The ideological interpretation of each text (T1-T11) can be represented as follows: Based on the analysis in part 4 (4.1 – 4.1.3) and part 5 (5.1 – 5.5) above, it can be summarized that T1: [(α xβ)® Actor ^ Pro.MAT ^ Gol ^ Sirc.ACC: (part:human)] = can be interpreted as "written order" that needs to be replied. T2: [(1 +2)® Actor ^ Pro.MAT ^ Gol ^ Sirc.LOC dan TIME: (part:human.)] =can be interpreted as the information of material and physical events. T3: [(1 +2)® Senser ^ Pro.MEN ^ Phenomenon + Sirc.ACC: (part.nonhuman)] = can be interpreted as "rules/authorities". T4: [(α xβ) ® Actor ^ Pro.MAT ^ Gol ^ Sirc:ACC: (part:human) + (Hipotactic Locution Projection)] = can be interpreted as the information of

material and physical events. T5: [(α xβ) ® Actor ^ Pro.MAT ^ Gol ^ Sirc:MAN / ACC /ROLE: (part:human)] = can be interpreted as material acts that implicitly can be proved as facts. T6: [(α xβ) ® Senser ^ Pro.REL ^ ATT ^Sirc:MAN + ANGEL: (part:nonhuman.)] = can be interpreted as "evidence". T7: [(1 =2) ® Token ^ Pro.REL ^ VALUE ^ Pro. REL ^ VALUE: (part:nonhuman)] = can be interpreted as "definition". T8: [(α xβ) ® Token ^ Pro.REL ^ VALUE :(part:nonhuman)] can be interpreted as "definition".T9 : [(α xβ) ® Actor ^ Pro.MAT ^ Gol ^ Sirc.ACC: (part:human) + (Hipotactic Projection Locution)] = can be interpreted as the information of material and physical events. T10 : [1 + 2] ®Actor ^ Pro.MAT ^ Gol ^ Sirc./TIME: (part:human)] = can be interpreted as "statement". T11 : [1 + 2] ® Sayer ^ Pro.VERB ^Gol ^ Sirc.MAN :(part:human.)] = can be interpreted as "order".

7. Conclusion and Recommendation

7.1 Conclusion

Discussing experiential metafunction means discussing about grammatical clause as representation. Transitivity system or process system stresses on the differences in material, mental, verbal, and behavioral paradigms. Circumstantial systems stress on the differences in adverbial or prepositional phrases which exist in all processes (material, mental, verbal, and behavioral. Nevertheless, each process is followed by the role of different participants which happen in the different configuration. The choice of material process, for instance, chooses the role that must follow it, i.e. Actor, and other choice elements, such as Gol. The choice of mental process involves Senser and Phenomenon, and so on. Therefore, in describing the grammar of clause as representation, it does not only describe the difference among the process types but also the difference that arises in the role and the function of participant and the possibilities of circumstantial choices. The results of overall analysis of both grammatical elements (clause complex and experiential realization) in each text result in ideological interpretation.

7.2   Recommendations

This writing only discusses about clause complex and experiential aspects. It means that, there are many more grammatic aspects need to be observed and expanded. There are many kinds of texts that can be further studied and observed.

Hopefully, the results of the analysis in this disertation could be match with the usefulness, i.e. (1) can enrich the documentation of language research in general, (2) can be a model and at the same time as enrichment of texts analysis that combine two approaches, i.e. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), (3) can be a reference and at he same time as a contribution for those who particularly are interested in texts analysis and in language researches in general.

8. References

Halliday, M.A.K. 1961 *Categories of the theory of grammar*. Word 17, 242-292. Dicetak ulang di Bab II dalam M.A.K. Halliday (2002), *On Grammar*, vol. 1 Kumpulan Karya M.A.K. Halliday. Diedit oleh Jonathan J. Webster. London & New York: Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1963a. *The tones of English*. Archivum Linguisticum 15.1: 1-28.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1963b. *Intonation in English grammar*. Transactions of the Philological Society. p. 143-169.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1966a. *"The Concept of Rank: a reply*." Journal of Linguistics. 2 (1): 110-118.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1967. *Intonation and Grammar in British English*. The Hague: Mouton.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1973. *Exploration in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1974b. *Language and Social Man*. London: Schools Council & Longman.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1975. *Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the development of language*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1979. *Language as Social Semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*.

London: Edward Arnold Publishers.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. First Edition. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K, 1986. *Spoken and Written Language*. Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1992b. The Notion of 'context' in language education. In: Le, T., McCausland, M. editors. *Interaction and development: proceedings of the international conference,* Vietnam. 30 Maret – 1 April 1992, University of Tasmania: Language Education.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1993. *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*. London: The Falmer Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Second Edition. London: Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2002. *Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse*. London: Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2003. *On Language and Linguistics.* London: Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2004. *The Language of Early Childhood.*. London: Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2005. *On Grammar.* London: Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2006. *The Language of Science*. London: Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2006. *Computational and Quantitative Studies*. London: Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K. dan Matthiessen, C. M.I.M. 1999. *Construing Experience through Meaning: a language-based approach to cognition*. London: Cassell.

Halliday, M. A. K. dan Matthiessen, C. M.I.M. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Third Edition. London: Arnold

Halliday, M.A.K dan Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hancock, C. 2005. *Meaning Centered Grammar: An Introductory Text*. London: Equinox.

Hodge, B, G. Kress, dan Jones. 1979. The Ideology of middle management. In Fowler, et.al. *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, p.81-93.

Hodge, R. dan Gunther, K. 1988. *Social Semiotics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hoey, M. 1996. *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.