

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### A. Theoretical Framework

Poetry is meaningful sign structure (Pradopo 120-121). It means poetry contains the elements which structured. Every element only has meaning in its correlation with other element in the structure and the whole (Hawkes 17-18). Hence, structural analysis is analysis of poetry in the structure and function. In structural analysis, the literary work is analyzed just in the intrinsic structure.

Literary work, included poetry is not born in a void of culture or the reality of society (Teeuw 11 in Pradopo 280). It means poetry is written by a poet who has bounded to the ideologies, paradigms of society at that time or the previous. The poet is not getting loose from situation of the own social- culture. The poetry is not born in a void poetry, and it is not getting loose from previous works. All the relationships determine the meaning and comprehension of poetry. So that, it should be analyzed in semiotics to comprehend the meaning of poetry as a study of sign. Thus, the writer focuses on structuralism and semiotics theory.

#### 1. Structuralism-Semiotics theory

Structuralism-semiotics is structuralism that uses semiology study in analyzing the significance of literary work (Muhadjir 165-166). It means that semiotics is frequently used in close association with the theory of structuralism. It

has been argued that literary structuralists are really engaging in semiotics, so some distinctions should be made clear (Carter 43). Structuralism is, strictly speaking, a method of investigation, whereas semiotics can be described as a field of study. Its field is that of sign systems (43).

Structuralism is a primarily French movement in contemporary literary criticism utilizing the methods of structural linguistics and structural anthropology (Holman 430). Where linguists, such as Ferdinand de Saussure, study the underlying system of language rather than concrete speech events and where anthropologists, such as Claude Levi-Strauss, try to explain cultural phenomena in terms of the underlying formal systems of which they are manifestations, structuralist literary critics, such as Roland Barthes and Jacques Derrida, seek not explication of unique texts but an account of the modes of literary discourse and their operation. The line separating such study of the structures and conventions of literature from semiotics, the study of signs, is thin and frequently crossed. Based on the idea of structuralism, Language is arbitrary. It is a mark, either written or spoken, called a 'signifier', and a concept (what is 'thought' when the mark is made), called a 'signified.'

There are two basic types of structuralism. One concentrates its study on the patterns formed by linguistic elements in the work and examines these patterns to find which ones unify the text and throw certain elements in relief. The other and more common type, one with very close affinities to semiotics, sees literary conventions and forms as constituting a system of codes that contribute to and convey meaning. The special interest here is on the organization and function





on logic and meaning and has become central in linguistics linked to philosophy (Martin and Ringham 3). Much of Peirce's work is devoted to the development of sign categories such as making a distinction between icon, index and symbol. This approach differs considerably from European semiotics, represented by the Paris School (*Ecole de Paris*) founded by A.J. Greimas. The Paris School is concerned primarily with the relationship between signs, and with the manner in which they produce meaning within a given text or discourse. Importance is attached not only to the elaboration of theories but also to their application as methodological tools for textual analysis.

Compared to Peirce, the Paris School thus takes a more wide-reaching approach and, in the final analysis, is of greater practical use. Semiotics according to the Paris School posits the existence of universal structures that underlie and give rise to meaning. These structures are susceptible to representation in the shape of models which - conversely - can also be applied to any signifying object to decode and interpret its effects of meaning. Being concerned with structures, however, does not mean that semiotics is synonymous with structuralism, a theory concerned solely with the perception and description of structures. Neither is it simply a sign system; it should not be confused with semiology. Nor is it confined to the theories of Roland Barthes.

Semiotics, in fact, has a much wider aim: the theory purports to explore the generation of signification, any signification, not only that of the written word, meaning in all its guises and to its full extent (2). Semiotics thus covers all

disciplines and signifying systems as well as social practices and signifying procedures.

As a literary theory, semiotics has increasingly gained ground in the last two or three decades of the twentieth century. It is now usually included in secondary education literature programmes and in surveys of critical theory. In 1985, when speaking about the development of semiotic theory, Greimas said: 'My theoretical genius, if I can so call it, was a form of "bricolage". I took a little Levi-Strauss and added some Propp ...' He also said that as a linguist, he was more inspired by Dumezil and LeviStrauss than by other linguists, 'with the exception of Saussure and Hjelmslev of course'. It all started at the beginning of the twentieth century with the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, who was the first to apply scientific theory to the study of language and to relate this science to social psychology. It was he who introduced the term *semiologie*, which he defined as forming a link between linguistics and psychology. Saussure viewed language as a social phenomenon. His great contribution to its study was the discovery that meaning does not reside in individual words but in a complex system of relationships or structures. His motto was: 'Il n'y a de sens que dans la difference.' He pointed out that language structures could be explored by describing them in their current form (synchronically) or historically (diachronically). Saussure is perhaps best known for having divided the phenomenon of language into *langue* (abstract language system, language as structured system of signs) and *parole* (the individual utterances, or speech, making use of the abstract system). In his study of language, however, Saussure

went even further. He applied the structure principle to the individual sign or word. The linguistic sign, according to him, is characterized by the relationship of its two components: the 'sound-image' or material substance which he named signifiant (signifier) and its 'concept' or sign/ie (signified) (2).

If Saussure and his revolutionary findings paved the way for structuralism and semiotics, the same can be said for the Dane Louis Hjelmslev and the Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen. Even without any immediate link to the Swiss linguist, Hjelmslev's theoretical approach was very close to that of Saussure, whose work he can be said to have continued. In his *Prolegomena to a Theory of language* (1943) he formalized language, dividing the phenomenon into 'system' and 'process'. Hjelmslev also refined the Saussurian definition of the two aspects of the language-sign by recognizing two fundamental levels or planes of language, one of 'expression' and one of 'content'. Each one of these, he believed, was possessed of a 'substance' and a 'fom'. Hjelmslev's contribution to linguistics included his theory of the semiotic function which he defined as existing between the twin aspects of the signifying act- between signifier and signified (according to Saussure) or between expression and content (according to Hjelmslev). Finally, Hjelmslev extended his semiological studies to incorporate non-verbal language systems such as traffic lights or the chimes of BigBen (3).

There are four basic principles on which the semiotic analysis of texts is based :

1. Meaning is not inherent in objects, objects do not signify by themselves. Meaning, rather, is constructed by what is known as a competent observer, i.e. by a subject capable of 'giving form' to objects. To give an example: confronted with an implement from a different culture, say African or Asian, we would probably be incapable of grasping its significance. However, left alone with it, we will give it a meaning that is based on what knowledge we have and what will suit our purpose.
2. Semiotics views the text, any text, as an autonomous unit, that is, one that is internally coherent. Rather than starting with ideas/ meanings external to the text and showing how they are reflected within it, an approach that is still widely adopted in the academic world, semiotic analysis begins with a study of the actual language and structures of the text, showing how meanings are constructed and, of course, at the same time what these meanings are. Semiotic analysis becomes, then, a discovery method and is clearly an invaluable tool for all those engaged in original research.
3. Semiotics posits that story structure or narrativity underlies all discourse, not just what is commonly known as a story. For instance, it underlies political, sociological and legal discourse. One can even go as far as to say that narrativity underlies our very concept of truth: recent studies in the field of legal discourse, for example, have shown that those witnesses in a law court whose account conforms most closely to archetypal story patterns are those whose version is most likely to be believed.



involved in getting at the meaning of all written texts, including legal, historical, and literary, as well as biblical texts (Abrams 127).

Hermeneutics is the study of interpretation, thought of both as reading and as dialogue: the conversation that occurs between readers and texts. It has been of crucial importance not just in literary study, but also in theology (where it originated) and in law. The discipline began around 1819 with the writings of Friedrich Schleiermacher, and was further developed by Wilhelm Dilthey (1833–1911). Hermeneutics, Schleiermacher and Dilthey explained, sees human experience, which appears most permanently and significantly in written texts, as an object of interpretation. Their goal was to establish a proper foundation for the discipline, or science, of such interpretation. For Schleiermacher, this effort meant trying to recover the original intention of an author by investigating the author's psychology and historical circumstances (Mikics 141).

The philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer in *Truth and Method* (1960) departed from Schleiermacher's attempt to recover an original meaning by suggesting that the early text and the later reader's expectations interpenetrate. Gadamerian hermeneutics requires that we make an effort to grasp our position in relation to the subject matter we are trying to understand: such positioning precedes, and forms the basis for, understanding. Interpreting the human world differs from interpreting the natural world because in the former case the interpreter's prejudices and preconceptions interact with the attitudes displayed in the text. Such conversation between interpreter and text contrasts with the natural scientist's effort to explain an inert, natural object, which cannot respond.



Andri Hermawan analyzed a poetry uses semiotics theory based on C.S.Peirce. He analyzed *Verities, First Poem For You, And What Do Woman Want* three kinds of Kim Addonizio's poems which constructed by the symbol as one kind of intrinsic element of poetry. He utilize triadic-theory of semiotic process which are proposed by Charles Sanders Peirce to know the meaning of each symbol, they are; representament, interpretant, and object. The representament is the form which the sign takes. An interpretant is not an interpreter but rather the sense made of the sign. And an object is to which the sign refers.

According to Andri Hermawan, based on that triangle theory of C.S.Peirce we can possibly analyze from every side of term, if we analyze from the representament, then the representament will explain the object and the interpretant, and so on. Finally, he found that the use of symbol in *Verities* describes as sad perspective of the world. The use symbol in *First Poem For You* describes as to compare between the tatoos and poetry to love in a relationship. The use of symbol in *What Do Women Want* describes as the power of her sexuality, freedom, and equality.

In other reference, Jabrohim, ed. *Teori penelitian sastra*. Yogyakarta: pustaka pelajar, 2014 Prof.Dr.Rachmat Djoko Pradopo investigates Subagio Sastrowardoyo's poetry *Dewa Telah Mati* in structuralism-semiotics theory as like as the writer study.

According to Pradopo's investigation, it is explained that in analysis of poetry is needed theory and method to be clear the poetical elements with the result is the significance units. The theory and method are used to analyze the complexity of poetry. They are structuralism and semiotics.

To comprehend the meaning of poetry is needed the semiotics perusal, such as heuristic and hermeneutic. Heuristic perusal is to be certain the interrelation between figurative language element and the linguistic meaning. It does not give significance yet to poetry, so that continued to hermeneutic perusal to give the meaning to poetry. It is caused that poetry as a sign system in second level has own convention which different from language convention as a sign system in first level.

Poetry is not understandable well when it is not comprehended in the whole. It is caused by the coherent elements. The meaning of every element is known by interrelation between the elements and the whole.

Otherwise, to know more about the meaning of poetry is needed the analysis although every element must be seen as a unit to other element and the whole. In literary comprehension, especially to poetry, the structuralism-semiotic theory could not be separated. The relevance between sign structure and the meaning is not separated. Structural analysis is to know interrelation among the elements, meanwhile semiotics analysis is to know the meaning of the elements as meaningful sign.

About *Bond and Free*, the writer found the critic in the book of Deirdre J. Fagan entitled *Critical Companion To Robert Frost: A Literary Reference To His Life And Work*. In this book, is explained that there is a clear distinction is drawn between love and thought, heart and mind. At the start, love appears to be the weaker of the two. Love is described as clinging and having walls: “wall within wall to shut fear out.” It is vulnerable and self-protective. Thought, however, is strong and does not have to protect itself; its substance is its own protection. While love is a bond, “with hills and circling arms about, “thought is free and can soar on its “pair of dauntless wings.” The poem suggests a dichotomy between love and thought in which love holds the inferior position at the start of the poem but the end gains the upper hand.

According to Fagan’s book, the writer found that her study is different to Fagan’s critic. Fagan criticizes only the dichotomy between love and thought, meanwhile the writer criticizes the intrinsic structure and meaning of *Bond and Free* based on structuralism-semiotic study.