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ABSTRACT

The discipline of Literary Studies accommodates various sub-disciplines, and in the future, because of the dynamics of the times, some of them might either survive or do not play important roles any longer. Because the reader’s role tends to be stronger than the author’s role, Reader-Response Theory, covering among other things New Historicism and Intertextuality will survive, and the roles of those that cannot catch with the dynamics of the times, such as Historicism and Comparative Literature, might be weaker. Historicism considers literary text as a finished product, and thus the reader has to accept literary text as an absolute truth, while New Historicism gives ample opportunities to the reader to evaluate literary text not as a finished product, but as a process of power relations. Intertextuality does not only involve the relationships of literary texts, but also the relationships of Literary Theories which leads to the birth of Meta-Theory whose nature is philosophical. Literary texts, in the meantime, are never void of conflicts of characters, and significant conflicts always involve psychological problems, and thus theories of psychology in literature and psychological criticisms will be always absolutely needed in all literary studies in all parts of the world.

KEYWORDS: Reader-Response Theory, Historicism, Intertextuality,

There are four core pillars in Literary Studies, (a). Literary Text, functioning as the object of analysis, (b). Literary Criticism, a tool for analyzing Literary Text, and (c). Literary Theory, empowering Literary Criticism in sharpening its function in analyzing Literary Text, and the reader, because without the reader, the literary texts would be “dead.” The reader can be a common reader, can be literary critic, and theorist of Literary Theory. On paper, Literary Text is prerequisite for Literary Criticism and Literary Theory, so that without Literary Text, on paper, there is no
Literary Criticism, and there is also no Literary Theory. But, again, in practice, Literary Criticism and Literary Theory can come into existence “without” Literary Texts.

Literary Text is the object of Literary Criticism, because Literary Text actually is not simply a story, but also, and more importantly, the ideology of the author expressed in the form of literary texts, such as poems, novels, plays, short stories, and even essays. Because Literary Text is inseparable from the author’s ideology, there are two components that, according to New Criticism, cannot be neglected: form and content. Form is the way the author employs in expressing the content, and the content is the ideology to be conveyed to the target reader. Form and content should be in an equal balance, symbolized by Cleanth Brooks as “The Well-Wrought Urn” in his critical book *The Well-Wrought Urn: Studies in the Structure of Poetry*. The title of this book is an allusion taken from John Donne’s poem, “Canonization,” whose ideology concerns with an equal balance between love in the present life and love in after-death for those who believe in the Almighty of God.

Because Literary Text is never void of ideology, there are several approaches that can be employed in analyzing Literary Text, such as philosophical approach if the ideology is philosophical, psychological approach if the ideology is psychological, biographical approach if the literary text is the extension of the author’s biography, and historical approach if the literary text is colored by historical events. A great literary text, In the meantime, like an invaluable precious stone, is diaphanous: please look at it from all angles, and from each angle you will see that it sends beautiful sparks. Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, for instance, is colored with philosophy, psychology and history, Charles Dickens’ *David Copperfield* is inseparable from Dickens’ own biography, his psychology, and the history of the excesses of The Industrial Revolution, and Emily Bronte’s is full of psychological and legal aspects.
Philosophical, psychological, and historical approach can be applied in analyzing *Hamlet*, biographical and historical approach is suitable to be employed in analyzing *David Copperfield*, and psychological and legal approach is also appropriate to be used in analyzing *Wuthering Heights*.

In the past, in analyzing a literary text, one generally stated what approach he/she chose prior to his/her analysis. If one was interested in the psychological problems in *Wuthering Heights*, for instance, he/she stated that he/she chose psychological approach, and consequently, he/she will apply theory of psychology in literature, such as Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalysis, or the theory of psychological individuation of Carl Gustav Jung. Today, and especially in the future, the so-called “approach” disappears from the vocabulary of literary criticism. In analyzing *Hamlet*, for instance, one can go straight to Freud’s psychoanalysis, due to the fact that this tragedy is strongly laden with abnormal psychology. The so called “approaches” disappears, because the central theme of *Hamlet* is clear, the problems of psychology.

**Abram’s Theory of Criticism**

The fact that a literary critic can go directly to the central theme has “killed” M. H. Abrams theory of criticism in *The Mirror and the Lamp*. H.H. Abrams offers four types of criticisms, id est (a). Mimetic Criticism, (b). Pragmatic Criticism, (c). Expressive Criticism, and (d). Objective Criticism. Mimetic Criticism reflects how far a literary text succeeds in copying reality, Pragmatic Criticism concerns with the effects that the author can give the reader, such as moral instruction and esthetic pleasure, Expressive Criticism deals with the expressiveness of the author in developing his/her imagination, and Objective Criticism is a purely intrinsic criticism without involving extrinsic elements such as the author’s biography, the historical setting in the literary text, the political problems in the literary texts, and so on. The
four types of criticism are now no longer needed, as one can see, for instance in analyzing *David Copperfield*. In *David Copperfield*, for instance, mimetic criticism can be replaced by, say, psychological theory of the characters in reacting towards the bleak excesses of the Industrial Revolution, while pragmatic criticism and expressive criticism can also be accommodated in psychological theory, in how far Charles Dickens succeeds in exposing the psychology of the characters so that the reader is convinced that the characters and events are real characters and real events.

The new paradigm in literary studies, in the meantime, rejects the belief that the literary text is a monolithic world, because, willy-nilly, the ideology of the writer is, however, the product of a given period in the history of human beings. Armyn Pane’s novel, *Belenggu* (the 1930-s), for instance, has the power to predict that one day in the future, when men and women are equally educated and equally modern-minded, rotten marriages would flourish, and today one can see that the divorce rate tends to increase drastically. The drastic increase is, in fact, parallel with the rate of adultery. The fact that *Belenggu* cannot be separated from the spirit of the age or *Zeitgeist* proves that the literary text cannot be monolithic, or, in other words, cannot stand alone.

Unlike in the past, when people still used http://www if they wanted to open a website, today people can go directly to, say, Freud’s psychology. The theory of Freud’s psychology can be either mimetic, pragmatic, expressive, or objective, and so are other theories. It is mimetic because the literary text basically cannot be separated from reality, it is pragmatic because the author of the literary text automatically has the strategy in attracting the reader’s attention, and it is expressive because the literary text, willy-nilly, expresses the author’s imagination. Even if the analysis is intrinsic without “inviting” other factors outside of the literary work, such as the author’s
biography and the historical background of the setting, objective criticism can also be applied, and academically acceptable.

Please pay attention, for instance, the feasibility of applying objective criticism in analyzing Gabriel Gracia Marquez’s novel, *Chronicle of a Death Foretold*. This novel is based on a true story, on the real reality that happened many years before Marquez was determined to write this literary text. When this literary text was published, Marquez was sued because the characters and their complicated problems in the literary text are the real characters in reality. The novel, according to law, can be considered as a bitter insult to the real people in the real reality. Even though this novel literary text is originally the reflection of a real reality, Marquez won this legal case, because this novel is a literary text, not a journalistic report. To analyze this literary text intrinsically as required by Abrams’ objective criticism is no doubt feasible, because the analysis does not go to the real reality experienced by the characters in the literary text. In analyzing this literary text one can go directly to Jacques Lacan’s theory of psychology without paying attention to the fact that this analysis is actually an intrinsic analysis, the core principle of objective criticism.

Even though any analysis is basically a criticism, say, mimetic, pragmatic, expressive, or even objective criticism, in analyzing the literary text one can go directly to the literary theory, such as psychological theory, feminism theory, Marxism theory, and so on. Psychological theory can be narrowed down into Freudian theory, Jungian theory, Lacanian theory. Feminism theory can be narrowed down into liberal feminism, Helene Cixous’s theory, Elaine Showalter’s theory, and Emma Watson’s theory. Marxism theory can also be narrowed down into Georg Lucacs’s theory, Habermas’s theory, and Adorno’s theory.
Liauw Yock Fang and H.B. Jassin confirm, that Literary Criticism is a means to analyze the literary text, consisting of, among other things, to find fault, to praise, to judge, to evaluate, to compare, and to appreciate. In order to accommodate these points, it can be concluded that the literary criticism is nothing else “judicial criticism.” It is called “judicial criticism” because in order to judge the literary text, one is supposed to, besides judging, find fault, praise, evaluate, compare, and appreciate. To compare is needed, because in order to judge one particular literary text, one should also consider other literary text. In order to judge the alienation elements in Gabriel Garcia Marquez’s *Chronicle of a Death Untold* “objectively,” for instance, the findings will be more insightful if one takes Kafka’s *Metamorphosis* as a comparison. In another discipline, say, modernization, one can conclude that a certain country is either modern or not modern by comparing a certain country and another country.

The object of Literary Criticism and Literary Theory is the same, Literary Text and in order to be applied in analyzing Literary Text, Literary Theory needs a bridge, and the bridge is Literary Criticism. There are, therefore, Psychological Criticism, Marxist criticism, and Feminist Criticism. Because in order to apply Literary Theory it depends on Literary Criticism, then the term “Critical Theory” came into existence.

**Titter totter**

On paper, again, without Literary Text there would be no Literary Criticism and also there will be no Literary Theory, but in practice, Literary Criticism and Literary Theory can come into existence without any Literary Text. In the history of literature there are some instances when the balance of Literary Text on the one hand and Literary Criticism and Literary Theory on the other is like the balance in teeter totter. At the time when Literary Text flourished well, Literary Criticism and Literary Theory sank, and vice versa. In commenting the balance between Literary Text on the
one hand and Literary Criticism and Literary Theory on the other, Liaw Yock Fang and H.B. Jassin confirm, “It is clear that the dawn of Literary Criticism [and Literary Theory] means the dusk of Literary Text. Literary Text is not the prerequisite Literary Criticism and Literary Theory, and thus both Literary Criticism and Literary Theory can “live” by themselves without the presence of Literary Text.

This paradigm might be in a way right. Plato’s ideas on mimesis, for instance, “do not talk about poetry and tragedy.” None, according to Plato, can imitate any reality in its real sense. What one can do is imitating reality based on one’s perception, interest and ideology. A carpenter, who can create chairs and is more useful than a poet. Because poet tends to manipulate reality and convinces people that what he is saying is nothing else but the truce, poet is considered dangerous and therefore should be banished from the country.

In 1599, in the meantime, William Shakespeare wrote a tragedy, Julius Caesar, and this tragedy shows that Plato, who lived for centuries ago, is right in his idea concerning mimesis. In this tragedy Brutus and Anthony are good orators, and therefore, like good poets or rhapsodists, they create chaotic world. Brutus and the other generals of Julius Caesar know for sure, that Julius Caesar is actually a sick man. He suffers from epilepsy, and in the battles to defeat enemies, Julius Caesar, proved to be very weak. He does not deserve, therefore, to be inaugurated as emperor, because an emperor should be as perfect as a god, and if he is forced to be emperor, he will ruin his country. The only way to save the country, according to Brutus and his friends, is to kill Julius Caesar.

In his capacity as a good orator, Brutus is able to convince the people of the Republic the justification for killing Julius Caesar. But then, Anthony, also a good
orator, in his good speeches is able to convince them that the killing of Julius Caesar is a crime that cannot be forgiven, and thus Brutus and his friends should be killed.

Shakespeare does not apply Plato’s critical theory, but elaborates the fact that, to a certain extent, a poet, orator, or rhapsodist often times manipulate reality in order to achieve his own interest. The fact that Shakespeare does not apply Plato’s critical theory, but elaborating it, might happen because Plato’s critical theory, unlike Lacan’s critical theory, is too much prescriptive and moralizing. In propounding his critical theory on the Three Orders (mirror stage, subjective order, and the real), on the other hand, Lacan conducted intensive research and experiments.

What Shakespeare has done is in a way the same as Sartre and Camus in elaborating their own paradigm of Existentialism. Two key concepts of Sartre, “existence proceeds essence” and “man is thrust into life” are not applied in his literary texts, but elaborated in his literary texts, novels and plays. Camus also does not apply his critical theory on Existentialism and Absurdity, but elaborates the paradigm via his literary texts, novels, plays, and short stories.

Again, there has been a strong tendency today, in the meantime, for Critical Theory to escape from Literary Text. Derrida, Deleuze, Adorno, Zizek, and other critical theorists are busy with their own interests in critical theory itself, as if Literary Text does not exist. This tendency creates Meta-Theory, and Meta-Critical Criticism, elevating Literary Theory and Critical Theory to the realm of philosophy. Meta-theory comes into existence mainly from philosophy, not from Literary Text. Derrida’s *Writing and Difference*, for example, is not, so to speak, related to Literary Texts, but, among other things, to Rousseau’s philosophy of “Force and Signification.” In *The Parallax View* Slavoj Zizek talks about Bertold Brect, but not Bertolt Brecht as an author of Literary Text, but as a philosopher.
The tendency to escape from Literary Text comes from the fact that the emphasis of Critical Theory is no longer on the form of the literary text, but on the content, idea, theme, or ideology. New Criticism, whose emphasis is more on the form, has been left behind. Modern critical theory is concerned more with content, theme, and ideology, and thus Feminism, Post-colonialism, New Historicism, and other critical theories flourish.

It does not mean, however, that the emphasis on form automatically has vanished. Postmodernism pays attention to form a lot, among other things because postmodernists are “defeated” by their being rootlessness, and also by the fact they have no solid ideas to be expressed. Concerning their being rootlessness, Artaud, an outstanding poet confirms that:

All communications are cut
In front
Behind
All around
And the last ties which still cling to man must be cut
We are without roots

Besides being rootless, again, postmodernists in general have no solid ideas, and thus, in their literary texts, they have to present the unpresentable to be presentable, as one can see in an example given by David Lodge in *Consciousness and the Novel*:

“…if only there was a thing, but there it is, there is not, they took away things when the departed, they took away nature, there was never anyone, anyone but me, anything but me, talking of me, impossible to stop, impossible to go on, but I must go on, I’ll go on, without anything, but me, but my voice…..”
Feminism

In order that one can “foresee” what will happen in the future, there are two points that should be considered. The first point is related to the four types of feminism, and point two is related to Elaine Showalter’s paradigm of the development of feminism.

The four types of feminisms are (a). Liberal Feminism. (b). Radical Feminism, (c). Marxist Feminism, and (d). Socialist Feminism. The emphasis in Liberal Feminism is the fact all genders, males and males, can do liberally what they want to do and to get. Education is open to all genders, and so is job market. Males and females have the same chances in all fields, and yet in reality females are "defeated,” because reality reveals that males are still superior. Radical Feminism admits that males consider women’s bodies as the objects of males’ enjoyment, and it is in a way an “insult,” but ironically, in order to be recognized as accomplished females, females voluntarily let themselves to be half-naked as one can see in female famous models and actresses. Marxist Feminism, in the meantime, like in the relation between the bourgeois and the proletarian, considers females as the properties of males, and the proletarians are the properties of the bourgeois. Socialist Feminism, as one can see in North Korea and Cuba, females have given a lot of contributions to the countries, and yet males anyhow are still superior, as if females’ contributions are not recognized.

All four types of feminisms have proved that their struggles to achieve equal status are fruitless.

Elaine Showalter in A Literature of Their Own expounds her paradigm concerning the stages in feminism movement, i.e. (a). Feminine Stage, (b). Feminist Stage, and (c). Female Stage. In Feminine Stage females admit that they are inferior to males, and thus males can do what they want to females, because anyway females
will not protest. *Sitti Nurbaya* in Indonesian literature exposes the fact that Sitti Nurbaya does not protest against her father when all her male friends in Padang are assigned by their fathers to study in Jakarta, a faraway place from Padang, to study. Sitti Nurbaya, being a girl, has to stay home instead of going to study in Jakarta, and she does not protest against her father. In feminist stage, females would protest if they are considered inferior to males and treated differently. “Man,” or humans should be changed into “men and women,” and because not only males who have the ability to chair, if the chair is a female it is not “chairman,” but “chairwoman.” Wives and husbands have the same status, and thus, it is not necessary for wives to adopt their husbands’ names. Marriage is a private choice, and therefore “Ms” is more appropriate than “Mrs.” In the third stage, Female Stage, females and males have the same status, and thus, one is judged based on his/her gender, but based on one’s ability, integrity, and reputation. Instead of using the term either “chairman” or “chairwoman,” females and males in female stage should use the term “chairperson,” implying that personality is more important than gender.

Whether or not feminism today has reached “Female Stage,” of course, opens to debates, and yet, this discourse is closely related to Queer Theory, a theory that recognizes the rights of LGBT. Because in the past women were marginalized, today, when they have reached equality in Female Stage, they are concerned with LGBT, a marginalized class in sexual problems. In Indonesia, therefore, the authors of literary texts who pioneered in writing LGBT are women, such as Naning Pranoto in *Miss Lu*, Djenar Maesa Ayu in *Nayla*, Stefany Hid in *Bukan Saya, Tapi Mereka Yang Gila*, Ayu Utami’s *Saman*, Dewi deLestari’s *Supernova*.
Comparative Literature

Inspite of the fact that many universities have Departments of Comparative literature, probably the progress and development of this study is very slow, not as progressive as, say, Marxism, Psychology, and Feminism. Since its birth in the nineteenth century up to the present day, the number of books of Comparative Literature is indeed very skimpy. After the publication of Francois Jost, *Introduction to Comparative Literature* in 1974, practically speaking there has been no publication of Comparative Literature besides Susan Bassnett’s *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction* (1993). Steven Totosy de Zepetnek’s *Comparative Literature: Theory, Method, Application* in 1998, and Sunqing Cao’s *The Variation Theory of Comparative Literature* (2013) also does not bring new perspectives in the study of Comparative Literature. Recent books mostly talk about two schools, French or European School and American School, as if “there nothing new” in Comparative Literature. In *Journal of Comparative Literature*. University of Oregon, Eugene, Winter 1988, Vol. 40, number 1, for instance, there is no discussion of Comparative Literature. The articles are all about literary criticisms that have no relationship with Comparative Literature.

French School or European School, in the meantime, deals with problems of influences, and American School deals with the significance behind the similarities and differences between two or more than two different authors of two different countries and cultures. In East Java, for instance, there was a Cerita Panji, and scholars could also find similar Cerita Panji in Malaysia, and also in Thailand. All of these ceritas have the same motifs, such as Panji, his cock, and his adventures to find his lover. French or European School tries to identify which cerita is the “original” one, which cerita is influenced by another cerita, and the esthetic values of the three ceritas.
French School has been “neglected,” because scholars tend to consider stories like Cerita Panji not primarily as literary works, but as folklore products, and folklore is closer to anthropology and mythology rather than to literature. As Claude Levi-Strauss’ study of two similar American Indian folklores, the emphasis is not the problem of influences, not which one has influenced another one, but on the similarities of the themes. Two American Indians, according to Claude Levi-Strauss, are bound by collective consciousness that they are threatened by old age, diseases, and death, and the similar two folktales stems from the similar collective unconsciousness. In other words, both ethnics are unconsciously frightened by the same threats.

Two similar objects with similar functions in Literary Studies, in the meantime, belong to Structuralism. All doors in the world have the same structures because all those doors have the same functions. Take, for example, doors, blackboards, and spectacles. All doors in the world have same structures because those doors have the same functions, all blackboards in the world have the same structures because their functions are the same, and all spectacles in the world have same functions and therefore the structures of all spectacles are also the same. All literary products, especially those that have mythical elements, have the same structures because all of them also have the same functions, representing either collective unconsciousness or collective consciousness. Structuralists, in fact, refused to confine to Literary Studies only, because according to them, Structuralism is an integral part of other disciplines. Doors, blackboards, and spectacles, for instance, do not belong to literature only, but also to other aspects of life.

When Henry HH Remak, Horst Frenz, and Stallknecht propounded American School as a reaction against French School, communication and transportation was
still difficult, and therefore, when communication and transportation is no longer
difficult, the function of American School creates problems. Today there are many
traveler and migrant authors who write about other countries. Take, for example, the
case of I am Malala by Christina Lamb and My Name is Parvana by Deborah Ellis.
Christina Lamb is a British journalist and novelist who has been living in Pakistan and
Afganistan, and Deborah Ellis is a Canadian who has been living also in both countries.
I am Malala is about a girl, a victim of the Taliban in Pakistan, and My Name is
Parvana is about a girl, also the victim of the Taliban, in Afganistan. Instead of
applying American School in Comparative Literature, one actually can use
Comparative Study (minus “Literature”) because the findings will anyhow the same:
this is the cruelty to children committed by the Taliban in Pakistan from the point of
view of a British author, and this is the cruelty to children by the Taliban in Afganistan
from the point of view of a Canadian Author. Each country has similar problems, and
each protagonist have also similar personalities. Apart from the weakness of American
School, the comparatists of this school have given a significant contribution to Literary
Studies: unlike the comparatists of French or European Schools who confined
themselves to literature only, the comparatists of American School believed that
literature as a discipline could not be separated from other disciplines. American
School is therefore an interdisciplinary discipline.

Both Comparative Literature and Comparative Study (minus “Literature”) have similar problems: they do not have Literary Theories of their own, and consequently they have to borrow other Literary Theories, such as Postcolonialism, Feminism, or New Historicism.
Power Relations

As long as human beings are enslaved by lust to dominate and to oppress, Marxism and all its roots and leaves, such as Theories of Power Relations, Theories of Hegemony, Postcolonialism, Racism and the like will never vanish from Literary Studies. The story of The Golden Ball in Ancient Greek myth proves to be right: wars, representing the will to dominate and the will to resist, will never end. The world is never void of wars and violence: If some parts of the world are peaceful, in some other parts of the world there must be wars. Because of Zeus’ cardinal sins, raping Leda that caused her to bear Helen, the most beautiful and yet the most destructive woman in the world of mythology, human beings should suffer forever from never ending threats of wars, revenges and violences. Samuel Huntington’s theory of The Clash of Civilizations also proves to be right: the world will never be able to free itself from conflicts, wars, ethnic cleansing and the like. Today the world is facing clashes of ideologies of fundamentalism and secularism, and these kinds of conflicts today actually also happened in the past.

Michel Foucault’s paradigm in Power Relations Theory also proves to be right: if there is an oppression, there must be resistance, and in fact, from the past to the present, and presumably to the future, the world has been dominated and will be dominated by a series of oppressions and resistences. The marginalized, or the “they,” and the non-marginalized, or the “we,” has also dominated the world, and, as Rudyard Kipling implied in his poem “We and They,” “They Look Upon We/ As only a sort of They.” The struggles between “They” and “We,” the fact that “They” want to be “We,” and “We” tends to look down and even suppress “They” will last forever.

In order to abolish sharp differences between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, according to Marxism, revolution must be implemented. Revolution, not
evolution, because evolution takes long processes that make the bourgeoisie more powerful, and the proletariat more helpless. In Russia, for instance, there was a revolution in 1917 to overthrow the Emperor, the Cuban Revolution in 1953 to overthrow Batista, and in 1948 there was a communist coup d’etat in Madiun, Indonesia, and another effort to change the ideology of Pancasila to Communism in October 1965 in Jakarta, Indonesia. The successful revolutions did not give the birth of equality of all people, but the birth to totalitarian governments, such as in The Sovyet Union under Stalin and in Cuba under Fidel Castro. Instead of implementing meritocracy system, in communist and socialist countries implanted feudality: Fidel Castro in Cuba has been succeeded by his own brother, Roul, and in North Korea the country has been ruled by Kim Dynasty. The one who replaced Fidel Castro as the President is Raoul Castro, Fidel’s brother, and North Korean has created Kim Dynasty. The feudality stems from the efforts of the authority to keep status quo, so that “We” remains “We,” and “They” remains “They.”

Colonialism and Postcolonialism is also unseparable from power relations between the stronger side, colonial peoples and the weaker side, colonized peoples. One of the weaknesses lies in the mental attitudes of the colonized peoples. One of the examples can be seen, a.o., in Robinson Crusoe, a novel of Daniel Defoe, published for the first time in 1719. In his expedition to an unknown place, Robinson Crudoe’s ship was struct by a terrible hurricane; all of the crew perished, and he was the only survivor. In order to life with no other human being in an unknown land, he had to cultivate the land accompanied by his pets. One day, on Friday, when he was taking a walk, he was wondering why there was something moving beyond the bush. It turned out that it was a human being, a colored one. Right at this moment of this encounter, Robinson Crusoe spontaneously said to himself, that the colored man was his slave
and had to follow whatever he ordered him. At the same time, the colored man spontaneously said to himself, that this white man was his master, and he was a loyal slave of Robinson Crusoe. In order to show that he was a loyal slave, he knelt down, and set Robinson Crusoe’s foot upon his head. Because this encounter was on Friday, Robinson Crusoe named him Friday, and Friday accepted this name gratefully.

This encounter reflects the superiority complex of the whites, and the inferiority complex of colored peoples. These complexes imply mental attitudes: the whites feel the right to enslave the colored peoples, and the colored people let themselves to be enslaved, and even proud of being enslaved. Colonialism happened not simply because colored peoples did not have modern weapons and lack experiences in wars, but consciously or unconsciously were happy to be colonized. Conrad’s *Lord Jim* is another example of the colored peoples’ mental attitudes. Jim is a criminal fugitive, and therefore should be driven away when he came at a colored people’s land. Instead of being driven away, the local people welcome him warmly, and consider him as a “Lord.”

Territorial colonialism has been over, and yet, in postcolonialism period similar mental attitudes still exist, as one can see in Homi Bhabha’s concept of mimicry and Frantz Fanon’s opinion in his book, *Black Skin White Masks*. Dying hair into blond and whitening skin by white cleansing shows that colored ladies, consciously or unconsciously feel that they are respected if physically the look like white ladies. Most actors and actresses of cinema electronic (sinetron) are whites, otherwise people tend not to watch the sinetrons. In Africa similar problems also happen: the Africans are aware that they are blacks, and in order to have better status they behave like whites. These attitudes of mimicking the West and behaving like The
West are, in fact, the echoes of Friday’s attitudes towards Robinson Crusoe in the early eighteenth century.

**Deconstruction**

Binary opposition, in the meantime, is in line with natural law: day and night, big and small, far and near, high and low, men and women, etc. Each pair shows contradictories of powers. Day is considered better than night, big is more valuable than small, high is more prestigious than low, man is stronger than woman. The same as in “We” and “They,” equality practically speaking does not exist, as thus, binary opposition in literary studies will never disappear.

Deconstruction is inseparable from binary opposition: while deconstructing an object, the deconstructionist willy-nilly meets binary opposition. In deconstructing a human body, for instance, the deconstructionist will find right eye, left eye, upper lip, lower lip, right hand, left hand, head above and feet below, and so on. Binary opposition, again, is in line with natural law.

Analyzing action of reading and understanding the reading also involves binary oppositions because there is a gap between the action of the reading and the understanding of what one’s is reading. The slower the reader is, the wider the gap. There is also a gap between the mind and the speech, and thus, in English, people say “you see” which is actually redundant, and in Indonesian people say “apa namanya” which is actually also redundant in order to bridge the gap. There is a binary opposition, therefore, between the act of reading and the understanding of reading, and between the mind and the speech.

As long as human beings are unable to skip the gap, Deconstruction will never disappear from Literary Studies.
Historicism and New Historicism

Historicism considers a literary text as a finished product, reflecting the reality of a certain period of time. *Sitti Nurbaya*, a novel by Marah Rusli, for instance, is considered as the reflection of the reality in Indonesia in the 1920s, the period when people still believed that the best marriage was arranged marriage, or even forced arranged marriage. New Historicism, on the contrary, believes that a literary text is not a finished product, and thus the process of the writing of a literary text should be considered seriously.

If one tries to understand *Sitti Nurbaya* based on Historicism perspective, he/she will consider Samsulbahri as a hero, and Datuk Maringgih is a devil figure. In order to convince the reader that Samsulbakhri is a hero, the narrator describes him as a sympathetic character whose physical appearance to a certain extent is like the physical appearance as a Dutch. On the contrary, in order to convince the reader that Datuk Maringgih is a devil figure, the narrator describes him as an antipathetic character whose physical appearance is very disgusting. On the other hand, according to New Historicism, Samsulbakhri is a wishy-washy character who does not deserve respect, while Datuk Maringgih is actually the hero.

When Marah Rusli was writing *Sitti Nurbaya*, Indonesia was under Dutch colonial power, so that it was impossible to write against the Dutch openly. Samsulbakhri’s behavior to some extent is like the behavior of the Dutch, and in his disappointment of having lost Sitti Nurbaya, he joined KNIL, the instrumental army of the Dutch in oppressing Indonesian dissidents. Datuk Maringgih, in the meantime, is the only character who had the courage to rebel against the injustices of the Dutch. *Siti Nurbaya*, according to New Historicism, is a disguised process of writing in criticizing the Dutch. Literary authors, willy-nilly, are bound by the situations of his
time, so that what he writes does not necessarily tell the truth, and the one that functions in telling the truth is New Historicism.

In evaluating the past, today’s perspective should be considered, and therefore New Historicism will survive.

In New Historicism, a literary text functions as a series processes of writing to be interpreted and judged by the reader, and thus the role of the reader is more important than the role of the literary text itself. Since the subject is the reader, and the object is the literary text, New Historicism can be categorized as an application of Reader Response Theory. In Reader-Response Theory, all interpretations and judgments are in the hand of the reader, so that any reader can analyze a literary text based on his/her interest, objective, and ideology. Since the authority lies in the hand of the reader, Reader Response Theory will survive in Literary Studies.

**Reader-response Theory**

Because Literary Text “incites” critics and the reader to give response, there are then interactions among critics, interactions among literary theorists, and also interactions among readers. A critic can give comments on other critics’ criticism, a literary theorist can give comments on other critics’ theories, and a reader can also give comments on other readers’ opinion. A reader, in the meantime, can also give response to a critics’ criticism, and also to literary theorist’s theory, and a critic can also give response to a reader’s opinion. In giving response to another reader, the literary critic acts as the reader, and the literary theorist also act as the reader. Reader-response theory, therefore, stems from the interactions of readers.

According to Wolfgang Iser, in the meantime, there are two types of readers, the implied reader and the actual reader. The implied reader, being dominated by reading as esthetic enjoyment, tends to follow what is happening in the text, while the
actual reader, being dominated by his/her concept of how the literary text should be, tends to be “suspicions” that there must be “things wrong” in the literary text. A Marxist reader, for instance, is an actual reader, and therefore, in reading a literary text whose nature is not in line with Marxism will automatically draw a conclusion that this literary text is a poor text.

Even though the implied reader is different from the actual reader, in reading a literary text both of them have “the horizon of expectation.” While reading a text, both types of the readers hope that they can find what they want in the literary text. In the process of reading Suzanne Collins’ The Hunger Games, for instance, both types of the readers have an expectation that Katnis will be able to overthrow President Snow. The implied reader expects that Katnis will be able to overthrow President Snow because the literary texts meets the requirements of poetic justice (the wicked should be punished, and the good should be rewarded). A Marxist reader also expects that Katnis will be able to overthrow President Snow because, in line with his/her ideology, in order to erase injustice, a revolution should be conducted.

In the Romantic Age in the 19th century, an outstanding poet, Percy Bysshe Shelley, claimed that “poet is prophet,” “and “poet is the legislator of the world,” implying that in Literary Studies the orientation should be the author, not the reader, as if the reader is simply the object of the author. Judging from the fact that without the reader the literary text would be dead, the orientation has changed into the reader.

Intertextuality

In order to understand the practice of Intertextuality one can pay attention to these three literary texts, “Crock,” a short story by Bakdi Soemanto, an Indonesian author, in the early 1990s, “Para Priyayi,” a novel by Umar Kayam, an Indonesian author in 1992, and All My Sons, a play by an American playwright Arthur Miller in
1947. These literary texts expose similar revelations: “Crock” is a revelation of the downfall of a high class aristocrat family, *Para Priyayi* deals with the revelation of the downfall of a middle-class aristocrat family, and *All My Sons* about the downfall of an industrialist family. In “Crock” the crock all of a sudden fell and its parts scattered on the floor, in *Para Priyayi* the jackfruit tree all of a sudden fell even though there was no strong wind, and in *All My Sons* the cherry tree also all of a sudden fell when the wind was also silent.

Three objects fell with no particular reasons, and all of them signifies the same downfalls of three respectable families. This is an example of intertextuality. The reader does not know whether Umar Kayam had read Bakdi Soemanto, and the reader also does not know whether or not they had read Arthur Miller.

Parts of J.K. Rowling’s *Harry Potter* can be traced back to the Bible, ancient myths from European countries, and the language can also be traced back to Latin and Greek. Whether or not J.K. Rowling was thinking of the Bible, ancient myths, the reader does not know, but the reader knows for sure that *Harry Potter* is not a text that stands alone. In intertextuality the Bible is called “Hypotext,” and *Harry Potter* is called “Hypertext,” and thus the existence of hypertexts depends on the existence of hypotext. A hypotext, in the meantime, can “give birth” to numerous hypertexts, such as Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*. Based on this hypotext *Pride and Prejudice* (1813) Elizabeth Eulberg wrote *Prom and Prejudice* (2011), Seth Grahame-Smith wrote *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies* (2009), Mandy Hubbard wrote *Prada and Prejudice* (2009), and Grace Dent in *Posh and Prejudice* (2009).

Intertextuality is not only limited literary texts, but also can be done in Literary Theory. Julia Kristeva’s theory of psychoanalysis, for instance, cannot be separated from theories of psychoanalysis of other theories of psychoanalysis, such as the
theories of Sigmund Freud and of Jacques Lacan. The theory of the conscious and the unconscious is taken from Sigmund Freud’s theory, and “mirror stage” is taken from Jacques Lacan’s theory of Three Orders. Like intertextuality in literary text, a hypotext can also “give birth” to numerous hypertexts. The status of a hypotexts, in fact, is considered as “higher” than the status of hypertexts, and thus ancient European myths is higher than *Harry Potter*, and the status of Rendra’s poem “Nyanyian Angsa” is lower than the Bible. Even though the status of hypotext is higher, a hypertext can be richer than hypotext. The many hypertexts of Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*, for instance, like Eulberg’s *Prom and Prejudice*, Grace Dent’s *Posh and Prejudice*, Mandy Hubbard’s *Prada and Prejudice*, and Seth Grahame-Smith’s *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies* because, according to Jonathan Culler in *The Pursuit of Signs*, the one who writes a hypertext should be able to perform “heroic deeds.”

Intertextuality comes into existence because no text is monolythic, and because all texts are actually related to other texts. Based on the fact that no text can free itself from other texts also indicates that Intertextuality will never vanish from Literary Studies. As Jonathan Culler confirms in the same book, Hypertext can take up, cite, parody, refute, or transform things from the Hypotext. The hypertext authors can do these things unconsciously, like in the intertextuality of *All My Sons, Para Priyayi*, and “The Crock, or consciously, like the hypertexts authors of the hypotext of Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*. The process of taking up, citing, parodying, refuting, or transforming, done either consciously or unconsciously will never end in Literary Studies.

**Cultural Studies**

Because all studies stem from cultures belong to Cultural Studies, the area of this discipline is broad, indeed. Patriarchy, Feminism, Culinary, Media, Pop Literature,
Postcolonialism, clothes, and other sub-disciplines belong to Cultural Studies. Culture, in the meantime, is inseparable from identity, and thus Cultural Studies is at the time also a study of identity. Indonesian culinary, for instance, is different from culinary in India, because Indonesians have their own identity and Indians have also their own identity. Because of globalization, a nation’s identity can change, and therefore identity can also change. Indian culinary, for instance, due to the immigrations of Indians Britain, has dominated the taste of British people, and therefore, in a way, the identity of the British people has also changed.

One of the cores of Cultural Studies is Pop Culture, consisting of, among other things Pop Literature, Pop Music, Pop Movies, and no one can neglect the importance of pop culture in shaping identity. Richard Hoggart, one of the pioneers of Cultural Studies of Birmingham School, emphasizes that pop culture has a significant contribution to the dynamic progress of a culture rather than high culture. Because of the fast growing industrialization of Pop Culture, Cultural Studies will not vanish from literary studies.

**Simulacra & Hyper-reality**

Human beings are homo symbolicum, the creator and interpreter of simulacra. The statue of a god is not the god himself, but the representation of a god which is treated like the real god. Human beings feel closer to the statue, the simulacra, rather than the god himself. Human beings can see the statue, touch it, caress it, kiss it, but human beings cannot do it to the real god. Which is actually real, the god, or the statue? The real one of course is the god, because the statue is only the representation of the god. But because human beings cannot see, touch, caress, and kiss the real god, the simulacra is more real than the real one, and thus the simulacra is considered as “hyper-reality.”
Life in a movie is more impressive than the real life, and thus the movie is more real than the reality, or, in other words, the movie is the “hyper reality” of the real reality. In watching football games, for instance, especially when the camera crew is good, watching via TV is more comfortable than watching the real games. The dynamic progress of I.T., in the meantime, has made the role of hyper reality more important than the past. In solving legal issues in court, for instance, CCTV plays important roles.

Human beings cannot free themselves from being homo symbolicum, and therefore Baudrillard theory of hyper-reality will survive in the future of literary studies.

Psychological Theories in Literary Studies

Horace confirms that a good literary text must meet two criteria, dulce et utile ((enjoyable and usefulness), so that if one reads it he/she will enjoy it, and he/she will get the benefit from reading it. Utile involves moral values, esthetic values, insights into life, and anything valuable. In Wellek and Warren’s term, utile is identical as “cognitive value,” and in order that the reader can get cognitive value, the dramatist and novelist should master psychology. Wellek and Warren even claim that “the novelist can teach you more about human nature than the psychologists.” Wellek and Warren’s statement confirms that even though a good dramatist or novelist is not a psychologist by training and by profession, a good dramatist or novelist has good insights to human psychology. In propounding their theories, in fact, great psychiatrists like Sigmund Freud and Carl Gustav Jung, to a certain extent are dependent of great literary texts, such as Shakespeare and Dostoeysky and ancient myths. Sigmund Freud and Carl Gustave Jung are actually not psychologists but psychiatrists, and their theories have been “transported” to theories of psychology in literary studies.
The “cooperation” between Jung in his capacity as a psychiatrist and Herman Hesse in his capacity as Jung’s patient and novelist, for instance, had given birth to Jung’s theory of individuation. Herman Hesse suffered from psychological disintegration, and Jung acted as his psychiatrist. In the process of therapy, Jung found the ways how to make Hesse aware of his identity which was different from other people’s identity.

In the 1970s an Indonesian scholar was invited to teach Indonesian literature in America, and in the 1990s another Indonesian scholar was invited to teach Indonesian literature in Australia. The questions of the students of the two countries and two different decades were the same, concerning the fact that Indonesian authors fail in creating psychological conflicts. The lack of significant conflict might stem from numerous problems, but the most essential problem is the fact that Indonesian fiction writers in general do not have good insights into psychology.

The best conflicts of characters in literature probably can be found in Sophocles’s tragedy, Antigone, whose central character, Antigone, faces a dilemmatic choice, the first choice is death, and the second choice is also death. The raw material of this tragedy is ancient Greek myth, and yet, because Sophocles had profound insights into psychology.

M. Forster, a novelist and theorist of novel writing, believes that good novels help people to socialize with other people. From E.M. Forster’s novel A Passage to India, for instance, the reader learn the psychology of Indian people in general, and English people in India. Karen Horney, a psychoanalyst, also believes that by reading good novels and plays the reader can learn human psychology. She therefore confirms, that Dostoevsky, Shakespeare, Ibsen and Balsac as inexhaustible source of understanding human psychology.
Philosophy of Literature

Please pay attention to Jean Jacques Sartre’s literary texts, such as *Nausea*, a novel, and *The Wall*, a collection of short stories, and Albert Camus’s literary texts, such as *The Stranger*, a novel, and a short story “The Guest,” one can conclude that those literary texts represent Sartre’s philosophy of Existentialism, and Camus’s philosophy of existentialism and absurdism. The conclusion is right, because Sartre and Camus are philosophers and they actualize their philosophical credos in their literary texts.

Great authors, in the meantime, like Shakespeare and Dostoevsky, never talk about their ideological philosophy, but because their literary texts are diaphanous and contain philosophical ideas, their texts can be appropriately analyzed by philosophical perspectives. Franz Kafka’s *Metamorphosis* and Gabriel Garcia Marquez’s *Chronicles of a Death Foretold*, for instance contain sophisticated philosophy of alienation. Karl Marx’s alienation, Kierkegaard’s alienation, Sartre’s Existentialism, Camus’s existentialism and absurdism are heavily and sophisticatedly presented in these two literary texts.

A philosophical literary text do not necessarily represent one’s philosophical ideas explicitly, it is, anyhow, a philosophical literary text, as long as the ideological philosophy is expressed in highly esthetic and sophisticated form. The philosophical ideology must be related to the core ideas of philosophy, epistemological and ontological. As long as philosophical literary texts are available, philosophy of literature in Literary Studies must also be available.

Conclusion

Horatius’ adagium, dulce et utile, suggests that esthetic values and morality are one and therefore are inseparable. Literary Text gives pleasure and at the same time
gives also usefulness, and the emphasis of usefulness is good morality. Esthetic values and usefulness, therefore, should be in an equal balance. There has been a strong tendency, however, that esthetic values are no longer considered too much, and utile is no longer a matter of morality, but ideology. Sir Walter Scott’s literary texts, for instance, from the point of view of esthetic values today are considered as minor works, and yet, according to Georg Lukacs Scott’s literary texts, as historical references, are very useful. Rudyard Kipling’s poem “We and They” is also esthetically considered poor, but It is a very important poem because it expresses imperialistic ideology. Due to the fact that the majority of Pearl S. Buck literary texts voice the domination of patriarchal values, there has also been a tendency for feminists not to consider her as a canon author. To a certain extent Postmodernists also believe that the formation of Canon Literature should be reconsidered.

The shifts from morality-oriented to ideology oriented show that the reader has much more freedom in interpreting Literary Text, or, in other words, reader-oriented has been much stronger than in the past. Because readers come from several disciplines, interdisciplinary points of views also dominate Literary Studies. Even more than fifty years ago, when the pioneers of American School in Comparative Literature came from the disciplines Literary Studies, they refused to confine themselves to the realm of Literary Studies only, because they were sure, that Literary Studies could not free themselves from other disciplines, such as politics and other Social Sciences. Structuralism is also the same: Literary Studies are not limited to literature only, but stands together with other disciplines.

One cannot deny the fact that there has been a strong tendency that film studies also play important roles in Literary Studies. The adagium “from text to screen” willy-nilly will give stronger effects on how scholar evaluate Literary Text. Because it is
impossible for all scholars to be polyglot, translations also interferes Literary Studies and this fact will also give effects on how one should react against Literary Studies.

Because of IT, games have also come into existence. From games authors can adopt the games into novels, and from novels/texts, the texts can be adopted into films/screens, such as George R. R. Martin’s *The Games of Thrones* and Suzanne Collins’ *The Hunger Games*. The mixture novels and comics have also come into existence, such as Khaled Hosseini’s novel *The Kite Runner*, adapted into a film, and from film it was adapted into Graphic Novel. The mixture of comics, games, and novels has also been developed into Light Novel, as one can see in Reki Kawahara’s works. Light Novel has around one hundred pages and at the most five illustrations, and the contents are games of wars of heroes. All these phenomena will no doubt influence people’s thoughts about Literary Studies.
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