On Literary Criticism: Looking into Noer's *Moths* from the planes of light of New Critics, Russian Formalists and the Structuralists

Antonius Herujiyanto
ELESP – Sanata Dharma University
anton.herujiyanto@gmail.com

Abstract

Without denying the truth of the so-called silent enim leges inter arma [Law stands mute in the midst of arms], this paper makes use of the analytical perspectives of New Criticism, Russian Formalism and Structuralism to look into Arifin C. Noer's play named Moths. It is admitted that literary critics often define their assumptions about literary work and the better way to go about reading it (and writing about it). The New Critics, Russian Formalists and the Structuralists are only three of them. According to Ian Ousby, the three groups can be described as formalists; they share a common conception: a work is autotelic, that is, complete in itself, written for its own sake, and unified by its form – that which makes it a work of art.[1] Looking closer at the three movements, we would undoubtedly find that they are not exactly the same. The New Critics, for example, explicitly repudiated English Romanticism and its radical tradition while Russian Formalists merely attacked the utilitarian and social tradition.[2] Then, Russian Formalists were concerned with the way in which the individual work of art was perceived differently against the background of the literary system as a whole. The Structuralists, however, set themselves the task of describing the organization of the total sign-system itself by dissolving the individual unit back into the langue of which it is a partial articulation.[3] The end goal of this study is, thus, to find the possible ways to go about reading the play; to see how the playwright seems to write about his work; and to have a better understanding of the nature of the play.

Keywords**:** *New Criticism, Russian Formalism, Structuralism, literary system, playwright*

INTRODUCTION

In Arifin C. Noer's posthumous publication, *Songs of Solitude* (*Nyanyian Sepi,* 1995), we can find three poems dealing with his play *Moths* (*Kapai-Kapai,* 1970). They are entitled *Act One: Mother's Fairytales*, *Act Three: The Sun Flies Away, the Moon Whirls Around*, and *Act Four: Abu and Iyem Caught in the Rain*. As the names of the poems suggest, they obviously have something to do with Arifin's *Moths.* They have, respectively, exactly the same name as that of Act One, Act Three and Act Four of the play. The question is, however, whether or not the poems talk about the same things as those of the three acts? This is precisely what this paper is about. It looks into the play from multiple planes of light: those of the New Critics, Russian Formalists and the Structuralists.

According to Roman Ingarden, there are five elements essential to any work of literature: sounds; meaning of words and sentences; the objects presented; the schematized appearances and 'metaphysical

[1] Ian Ousby, *The Cambridge Guide to Literature in English* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 361
[2] Frederic Jameson, The Prison-House of Language (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), p. 46
[3] ibid., p. 101

qualities.'[4] The essence of the practical studies of the New Critics is, however, covering and making use of the second and the third (and occasionally the fifth) of Ingarden's layers.[5]

It is obvious that the second layer (meaning of words and sentences) will be effective to be used to explicate poems. This study delimits, thus, the border by trying to investigate the second together with the third and the fifth of Ingarden's layer in order to explicate Arifin's *Moths.* It hardly needs emphasizing, however, that the layers coexist in the play – providing that it is a good one.

The third layer is, anyway, the layer of the 'objects presented,' namely, characters, physical objects, moods and situations described explicitly, and plot.[6] The fifth one or the 'metaphysical qualities' can be described as follows:

> There are certain simple or complex qualities, such as the sublimity (of somebody's sacrifice), the baseness (of somebody's treachery), the tragedy (of someone's defeat), the frightfulness (of someone's fate); that which is profoundly shaking, incomprehensible, or mysterious; the demonic quality (of somebody's action or someone per se); the saintliness (of someone's life), or its opposite: the sinfulness, or "hellishness" (of a vengeance), the ecstatic quality of the highest admiration, the peace (of the ultimate consolation), etc. Here belong also such qualities as the grotesque quality of some phenomenon or person, the pathos of somebody's behavior, the solemnity of a ritual, the lightness and grace of a girl's movement or its opposite, the seriousness and stateliness of somebody's manner or way of life.[7]

In dealing with **t**he Russian Formalists, it can be pointed out that they believe that critics should be able to establish a 'science' of literature – a complete knowledge of the formal effects, namely devices, techniques and so forth – which together make up what we call 'literature.'[9] The literary aspects of a play, then, are those which concerned with transforming raw material like facts, emotions, stories … into the play. Reading a play is, therefore, meant for many reasons such as for comfort, for inspiration, for entertainment.

The essence of practical studies of Russian Formalists is slightly different from that of the New Critics. We may say that the Formalists are much more insistent than the New Critics in calling the reader's attention to the auditory aspect of the literary work and to the structure of properties of the objects, persons and situations presented in it. In short, they tend to make use of the first and the fourth of Ingarden's layers.[10]

The fourth layer is, anyway, the layer of the 'schematized appearances." They deal with the imaginary world of a work of literature or the imaginary looks based on the properties of no less imaginary objects and characters appearing in the third layer of the work (vide & cf. p. 3).[11] Thompson's conclusion about this is enlightening:

> This concept of Ingarden refers to the innumerable 'looks, or 'appearance', of things and characters as they emerge from a particular manner of describing these things and characters. We would not come into contact with the objects presented were it not for these appearances. We 'hear' the characters speaking (i.e. we get the auditory appearances) or have their inner life

[4] R. Ingarden, *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (Halle, 1931) in Ewa M. Thompson, *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism* (The Hague: Mouton & Co. N.V., 1971), p. 111-112
[5] Ewa M. Thompson, Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism (The Hague: Mouton & Co.N.V.), p. 126
[6] Ewa M. Thompson, Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism (The Hague: Mouton & Co.N.V.), p. 112
[7] ibid., p. 113
[9] Raman Selden, *Practising Theory and Reading Literature* (Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989), p. 37-38.
[10] Ewa M. Thompson, *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism* (The Hague: Mouton & Co.N.V.), p. 145
[11] ibid., p. 112

desribed (i.e., get their psychic appearances).[12]

As for the Structuralists who might to a certain extend be included in those of what the so called the Formalists in the sense that they are also concerned with the way in which the individual work of art (or *parole*) was perceived differently against the background of the literary system as a whole (or *langue*). However, they set themselves the task of describing the organization of the total sign-system itself by dissolving the individual unit back into the *langue* of which it is a partial articulation. In short, a study of superstructures or rather of ideology is what they undertake. The object is, thus, seen as the unconscious value system or system of representations which orders social life at any of its levels.[14] One of the structuralist thoughts that is going to be used in this study is the BO ('Binary Oppositions').

DISCUSSION

The following analysis is respectively conducted in the flights of New Criticism, the Russian Formalists, and those of the Structuralists.

To begin with, the New Critics would conduct the explication of Arifin's *Moths* in the light of the elements of the second, third and fifth Ingarden's layer:

(1). In I.2 we can see a kind of soliloquy where *Darkness* says "It is now 1930 and no longer 1919. You must put on your janitor's uniform at once." And then II.5, he says, "It is now 1960. It is no longer 1919. He [*Abu*] will die in 1980. It is time to add a few wrinkles to his forehead." Then, again, in III.9 he states, "It is too late for you to find out. It is now 1974 and no longer 1919. It is time for you to experience one of the wonders of the world. You will witness a great work of the Artist." After that, in IV.3 we can see: first, *Darkness* says, "Six more revolutions, Mother"; secondly, Arifin writes "*(The Moon enters with a hangman's rope)*"; then, right before the words "(*The Bell enters with a large sword*)," *Darkness* says, "Wait" and then, "Not yet! Curtain!" In the last Act or to be precise in V.8, *Darkness* announces, "It is now 1980. It is no longer 1919. It is time you were dead."

It is clear that the setting of the play is between 1930 and 1980: Act One takes place in 1980, Act Two is in 1960 and Act Three is in 1974. We can conclude that Act Four also takes place in 1974 from the words, "Six more revolutions, Mother" meaning six more years before the end of the story (Act Five) in 1980. The play, by the way, consists of five Acts and 46 scenes. There are more than sixteen characters in the play: *Abu, Iyem, Mother, Darkness* (*and his squad*)*, Moon* (*and Thousand Moons*)*, Boss*(*es*)*, Old Ma*(*e*)*n, King of the Evil Spirit, Princess, Prince, Bell*(*s*)*, Tramps, A, B*, G and so on.

The setting of the play is in Indonesia, somewhere in Jakarta. in I.10 Arifin writes:

Darkness. It is now 1941. It is no longer 1919. He [*Abu*] was born in Salam six miles from Solo. He was raised in Semarang. Then he moved to Cirebon. Then he moved to Jakarta. He will die in 1980.

(2). In I.5 we find how *Mother* comments upon herself (and *Moon* and *Darkness*) and *Abu* when she talks to her assistant *Moon*:

Good. Now Mother can get down to finishing her final book. Strangely enough, in this novel of mine Abu begins to find the key to our riddle. He becomes increasingly aware of the power we have over him. But – nevertheless – I am still hopeful he will remain faithful to us. He will always need cheering up and only we can do that.

[12] Ewa M. Thompson, *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism* (The Hague: Mouton & Co.N.V.), p. 112

[14] Frederick Jameson, The Prison-House of Language (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974), p. 101-102

From the words above we can establish a relationship between *Mother* and *Abu* or between *Moon* and *Abu.* We can also see that *Mother* is writing a nove about a person called *Abu*. As a writer, she can do anything she likes with *Abu*: making him happy or miserable; making him a happy goodlooking prince or having him tortured and hung; making him a janitor or … it is entirely up to her. After all she is the writer of the novel. she is plotting *Abu*'s life.

In writing her novel, *Mother* has two assistants to help her: *Moon* (female) and *Darkness* (male). In I.5, the relationship between *Mother* and *Moon* is really clear:

Mother. We can protract that a great deal. When you are 70 we'll tell him [*Abu*]. Remember not to use the stale old ways. We have to be more creative. We must work out the timing very carefully. Fulfill everything right at the moment when he's at the end of everything, right at the moment when the festivity is at its height.

Moon. Let's just tell him now.

Mother. You always feel sorry for them, Moon. You're a real softy.

Moon. But he's so poor.

Mother. We'll make him [*Abu*] rich. Oh, come on. You can help by consoling him. *Mother*'s time is finished. I must go back to my writing.

Actually, before the dialogue above, there is a dialogue between *Mother* and *Darkness*, establishing their relationship with *Abu:*

Mother. ….. where is Darkness?

Darkness. Here I am, Mother.

Mother. Did you hear what I was just saying?

Darkness. I didn't miss a single word, Mother.

Mother. One other thing: we must be systematic. As long as we each keep to our appointed tasks I am sure that not one thing will go astray.

Darkness. Is he [*Abu*] asleep?

Mother. Asleeo, no. Not asleep, no. As before, with the others, he is dead but he doesn't know yet.

Darkness. Shall I tell him?

Mother. Not yet. …

We can see, once again, how *Mother* and her two assistants can do anything with *Abu*: making him happy or miserable. In I.4, *Mother* makes *Abu* really happy:

Abu. Will I be happy, Mother?

Mother. Happy for sure. Forever. Now pretend you are the Handsome Prince. You'll see what it feels like to be really tired then. Now close your eyes tight. Sleep. The birds are asleep. Sleep.

The sun is asleep. Sleep. Even the trees are asleep. Sleep. The whole world is asleep. Sleep.

When everything is gone, you can put on the Prince's shining clothes. Now you can't see a thing except the brightness of your clothes. You can't hear anything except the chinking of the gold. Now you're taking up the Magic Mirror. Now you're going into the perfumed room of the Beautiful Princess; the bed is turned right down, ready to receive you.

Mother, however, can also be cruel with *Abu*. We can see, for example, the event at the end of the play. In fact, Arifin as the playwright makes up the play the easiest way: making *Mother* kill the protagonist of her novel.

(3). Looking into the whole play, we can see that Arifin is trying to dramatize the story about *Mother* (together with her two assistants, *Darkness* and *Moon*) who is writing a novel. Arifin is, actually, at the same time putting – or rather dramatizing – the story of the novel on the stage. The result is a real "Binggo!" He has the advantages of applying a "mixed point of view" – meaning that he has the possibility of performing more than one 'world' on stage: in the case of *Moths,* there are at least two worlds, namely, *"Mother*'s world or *Abu*'s world. The question is, however, whether Arifin has made good use of it or not?

We are, obviously, able to find out about it by both looking at the name of each Act and looking into each of them. Act One is, for example, entitled "Mother's Fairytales": Here, both *Mother*'s world and *Abu*'s world are presented by Arifin. When *Mother* was talking to *Abu* (*Mother*'s world), for instance, suddenly *Boss* interrupted, calling *Abu* out loud, "Abu! Abu! Abu! Abu! Abu! Abu! Abu! Abu! Swine! Are you deaf?" This, certainly, makes the spectators realize that they are watching two worlds on the stage.

(4). The 'metaphysical qualities' of a literary work reveal themselves in human actions, in complex life situations, in historical events.[8] From the two worlds presented in Arifin C. Noer's *Moths*, we can picture the principal characters of the play: first, *Abu* (including *Ijem*, *Boss*(*es*)*, Old Ma*(*e*)*n, King of the Evil Spirit, Princess, Prince, Bell*(*s*)*, Tramps, A, B*, G and so on) cannot really do what he wants to do. In his both worlds – in his world of fantasies as a Prince, for example, or in his world of reality as a janitor – he is always dependent. All the conflicts he has are settled largely by the simple decision of *Mother* (or *Darkness* or *Moon*) or by a word or two of *Boss*, *Ijem*, *Old Man*, etc. But then, even in his real world – *Abu* the janitor – he is ruled by *Mother* the novel writer.

Secondly, *Mother* as a novel writer is, in fact, not free either. Her power over *Abu*, for example, is also limited: *Darkness* has already drawn the border of *Abu*'s life. Arifin's *Moths* can, then, be said as evoking the frightfulness of the characters' fate, particularly *Abu*'s fate.

As for Russian formalists, the following is their one possible explication on Arifin's *Moths*:

(1). Arifin's *Moths* is indeed 'baring' its own devices. In giving us a good look of the characters, for example, we can see their appearances through the changing of time (setting of time) presented in the five acts of the play. In Act One, we can see how Abu is introduced as a character of a play within a play: *Mother,* in the play, is writing a novel. Abu is the protagonist of the novel. Both the process of writing the novel (a) – such as how the protagonist is supposed to lead his life, etc. – and the "actual life" of *Abu* which has been decided upon him by *Mother* (b) are enacted or performed on the play stage.

The (a) can, for example, be followed in I..5:

Good. Now Mother can get down to finishing her final book. Strangely enough, in this novel of mine Abu begins to find the key to our riddle. He becomes increasingly aware of the power we have over him. But – nevertheless – I am still hopeful he will remain faithful to us. He will always need cheering up and only we can do that.

As for (b) we can see in I.8 about how *Abu* who has been "created" by *Mother* to have a wife called *Ijem*:

Ijem. You ape! What sort of a man are you? An ox? A pig?

Abu. What time is it, Jem?

Ijem. What time is it? The town-hall clock strike until its hands fell off and you'd still be snoring. Don't you want to go to work?

Abu. It's not that.

Ijem. All right, if you'd rather stay snoring. I'll go out and earn money. I could you know. I'm still well-built enough to tuck a thousand men's heads between my legs.

Abu. Don't be so vulgar.

(2). Arifin through *Mother*'s assistant, *Darkness*, sets the play according to time: Act One is in 1930. In I.2 *Darkness* says "It is now 1930 and no longer 1919. You must put on your janitor's uniform at once." Act Two is in 1960. In II.5, *Darkness* says, "It is now 1960. It is no longer 1919. He [*Abu*] will die in 1980. It is time to add a few wrinkles to his forehead." Then, Act III is in

[8] Ewa M. Thomson, *Russian Formalism and Anglo-Ameican New Criticism* (The Hague: Mouton & Co. , 1971), p. 113

1974. This same *Mother*'s assistant says in III.9, "It is too late for you to find out. It is now 1974 and no longer 1919. It is time for you to experience one of the wonders of the world. You will witness a great work of the Artist." Act IV is still in 1974. In IV.3 we can see: first, *Darkness* says, "Six more revolutions, Mother"; secondly, Arifin writes "*(The Moon enters with a hangman's rope)*"; then, right before "(*The Bell enters with a large sword*)," *Darkness* says, "Wait" and then, "Not yet! Curtain!" The last Act takes place in 1980. In V.8, *Darkness* announces, "It is now 1980. It is no longer 1919. It is time you were dead."

Such a device is really helpful: not only is it useful for the playwright, but it is also to the benefit of the spectators. The spectators can follow the stages, progress and development of the play.

(3). The name of each Act in the play is also a wonderful device. This, in fact, reminds me of Bertold's *Verfremdungseffekt* (especially that Arifin makes use of such a device throughout this play). After all, Bertold once got acquainted with Russian Formalists.[13] Arifin, anyway, calls the first Act "Mother's FairyTales." In this Act, Arifin begins with *Abu*'s fantasies: he is listening to a fairytale told by *Mother*. A happy *Abu* can be felt here: It is not such a bad idea to have a beautiful daydream. In I.4 we see:

Abu. Will I be happy, Mother?

Mother. Happy for sure. Forever. Now pretend you are the Handsome Prince. You'll see what it feels like to be really tired then. Now close your eyes tight. Sleep. The birds are asleep. Sleep.

The sun is asleep. Sleep. Even the trees are asleep. Sleep. The whole world is asleep. Sleep.

When everything is gone, you can put on the Prince's shining clothes. Now you can't see a thing except the brightness of your clothes. You can't hear anything except the chinking of the gold. Now you're taking up the Magic Mirror. Now you're going into the perfumed room of the Beautiful Princess; the bed is turned right down, ready to receive you.

Act Two is "Bird, Where Is the Edge of the World?" Here we can see an unhappy *Abu*: It is a dream that makes people unhappy. In II.4 we can see:

Ijem. Oh God. What have we done? Another hour and the flood will be in the house. God. What was it? Where do you want this rotten old couch? You keep this nasty little chair bobbing about. Saints and ancestors, where are you? And the cupboards. Our old clothes. This shabby mattress. Which part of it would You like to have a rip at next?

Abu. …….

Ijem. You're a real old worn-out sand-shoe. But Mamat's [their son] got to go to work. He's old enough. He mustn't be a sandshoe like his father. Oh God. Flood. Flood. Flood.

Abu becomes very unhappy realizing the real life he has to face and lead to. In II.9 we can also see another example of how *Boss* has treated him.

"The Sun Flies Away. The Moon Whirls Around" is the name of Act Three: by

reading and reading this very Act, we can see how both, reality and dream are beyond the man's [*Abu*'s] control. The title of Act IV is "Abu and Ijem Caught in the Rain." Here *Abu*'s struggle for life is described in such a way that we may end up with the theme of this act, namely, the way to reach what we are dreaming of is often unexpected due to our undeniable reality. The last Act is "The Door." As the word suggests, it can mean anything: what door? where does it lead to? *Abu* in this act, amazingly, in one hand, manages to get to the door – possessing the Magic Mirror – but on the other hand, he has also to die. It is indeed in line with the saying that there is also a limit to a daydream.

When dealing with the Structuralists, we know that to them the so-called forms of binarism have been there in human thought. In

[13] as can be seen in my paper entitled "Arifin C. Noer's *Moths* and the Theater of Bertold Brecht A Study from *Verfremdungseffekt* Aspect" (March 3, 1997)

philosophy and religion, for example, we recognize subject and object, God and man, temporal and eternal and so forth. It is understandably when Raman Selden exposed the concept of 'privatives' in analyzing Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman*.[15] He writes that the world in terms of *absence* of certain qualities: darkness is an absence of light, an object is still when it lacks movement. The concept can, indeed, cover certain substantive 'Binary Oppositions' (BOs): 'woman'–as feminists have pointed out–is defined as lacking certain male features. Deconstructive critics talk about the pervasive presence of binary logic in Western discourse and, needless to say, Structuralists have argued the importance of BOs in human language.

Arguing that there is possibility of discovering binary structures in texts, Jonathan Culler proposes what he calls "the reader's use of BOs as a means of attributing significance to literary texts."[16] Appearance and reality, country and city, body and soul, reason and feeling, are a few of many BOs which readers have employed as interpretive strategies. The danger of BOs, he further explains, is that they permit one to classify anything beside the fact that we can always find some difference between any two items. There is a good example of how we might go through this unexpected thing: being tempted to align two BOs and to regard them as possessing the same structure ('homologous') just because they are both present in a text. On the other hand, certain BOs are capable of generating a whole series of associated oppositions within a text: the biological nature and Divine Nature, the organic and mechanical, and fancy and judgment.

Arifin C. Noer's *Moths* (1974) is a play concerning *Mother* who is writing a novel and *Abu,* the protagonist of the novel. *Mother* has two assistants *Darknes* and *Moon.* They both help her in deciding how *Abu* would be like in the novel. *Abu* is a janitor who leads in poverty. He has beautiful fantasies and believes that by having the Magic Mirror he will be happy: free from the cruel and unhappy everyday life. The play concludes with *Mother*'s (and *Darkness*' and *Moon*'s) decision: killing *Abu,* the protagonist of the novel.

Abu's happinness is linked to his fantasies as we can see in I.4:

Abu. Will I be happy, Mother?

Mother. Happy for sure. Forever. Now pretend you are the Handsome Prince. You'll see what it feels like to be really tired then. Now close your eyes tight. Sleep. The birds are asleep. Sleep.

The sun is asleep. Sleep. Even the trees are asleep. Sleep. The whole world is asleep. Sleep.

When everything is gone, you can put on the Prince's shining clothes. Now you can't see a thing except the brightness of your clothes. You can't hear anything except the chinking of the gold. Now you're taking up the Magic Mirror. Now you're going into the perfumed room of the Beautiful Princess; the bed is turned right down, ready to receive you.

The concept of happiness is that of Prince's life, and Abu is satisfied with that. The happiness can mean many things. As for Mother whose goal is to finish her novel, she would be happy if Abu did not know her riddle:

Good. Now Mother can get down to finishing her final book. Strangely enough, in this novel of mine Abu begins to find the key to our riddle. He becomes increasingly aware of the power we have over him. But – nevertheless – I am still hopeful he will remain faithful to us. He will always need cheering up and only we can do that.

The happiness for *Moon* is when she can make *Abu* happy:

Mother's Voice. Cll him 'Prince', Moon.

Moon. Prince – I hate telling lies, but it doesn't matter as long as he's happy. My Prince, behold ….

[15] Raman Selden, *Practising Theory and Reading Literature* (Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989), p. 55

[16] ibid., 56-57

In I.7 we can also see:

Abu. Where's the Princess?

Moon. Where is she? The Princess…

Darkness. She's still bathing in the palace pool, my lord.

Abu. Goodness, it must be the morning.

Darkness. It is, my lord the Handsome Prince. The roosters have answered each other thre times. And the sun has begun to light its stove. In a moment the warm water will wash my lord's body.

Abu. How bright it is. My jewels. How bright they are. My sword. How bright it is. My palace…..

Moon. How dare you tell those lies?

Darkness. Shut up, cry-baby.

Abu. Where's my Magic Mirror?

Moon. He stole it.

Darkness. Shut up, fool. The time isn't right yet. Idiot.

Anyway, the above dialogues together with all of the dialogues quoted in dealing with New Criticism and Russian Formalism, we can see the patterns of contrast and similarity between the characters. The patterns turn upon certain qualitatively significant binary oppositions. The BOs are apparent in key correlations between (1) illusion and reality, (2) happiness and reality. We can express the BOs as they relate to particular characters as follows:

A. Mother	Darkness
illusive	realistic
Abu	Moon
illusive	illusive
B. Mother	Darkness
Happy	Happy
Abu	Moon
miserable	miserable

There are, indeed, many other possible BOs which produce significnces from the play's textual signifiers. The demonstration above merely shows that this study is trying to discover meaning based upon binary patterns.

CONCLUSION

After looking into Arifin C. Noer's *Moths* with analytical perspectives of formalism, we can see several important things: first, we know some possible ways to go about reading it; secondly, we can see how the playwright seems to write about his play

and thirdly, we come to have a better understanding of the the play – thus appreciating it better.

It is also possible to regard that the New Critics tend to repudiate English Romanticism and its radical tradition as pictured in Noer's *Moth*, while Russian Formalists merely attacked the utilitarian and social tradition aspects.[2] The Russian Formalists were, thus, concerned with the way in which the individual work of art [in the *Month*] was perceived differently against the background of the literary system as a whole. The Structuralists, however, set themselves the task of describing the organization of the total sign-system itself [as revealed by the characters in Noer's *Moth*] by dissolving the individual unit back into the *langue* of which it is a partial articulation.

[2] Frederic Jameson, The Prison-House of Language (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), p. 46

REFERENCES

Brecht, Bertold. (1964). *Brecht on Theatre*, ed. & trans. John Willet. New York: Hill and Wang.

Brooks, Cleanth and Robert B. Heilman. (1953). *Understanding Drama*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc.

Carlson, Marvin. (1986). *Theories of the Theatre*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Jameson, Frederic. (1974). *The Prison-House of Language.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lentricchia, Frank and Thomas McLaughlin. (1990). *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Chicago: The University of Cicago Press.

Mobley, Jonnie Patricia. (1992). *NTC's Dictionary of Theatre and Drama Terms.* Chicago: National Textbook Company.

Noer, Arifin C. (1974). *Moths*, trans. Harry Aveling. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

_____ . (1992). *The Bottomless Well*, trans. Karin Johnson & Bernard Sellato. Jakarta: The Lontar Foundation.

Ousby, Ian, ed. (1992). *The Cambridge Guide to Literature in English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selden, Roman. (1989). *Practising Theory and Reading Literature.* Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Thompson, Ewa M. (1971). *Russian Formalism and Anglo-American New Criticism.* The Hague: Mouton & Co. N.V.