Translation or Intertextuality: A Literature Comparative Analysis of "The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak" by Archibald MacLeish and "Krawang Bekasi" by Chairil Anwar

Fathu Rahman and Fakhriawan Fathu Rahman
Universitas Hasanuddin, Makassar, Indonesia
fathu.rahman@unhas.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to pinpoint the relevant relation between two literary works which have a relationship with one another in the perspective of comparative literature studies. Data were gathered through the text deconstruction theory method by means of an intertextuality approach. The method is applied to juxtapose two well-known poems, *Krawang Bekasi* (Indonesia) and *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak* (America), which are suspected of having the same content and theme, but their relations were never revealed. This thematic-based study uses a multicultural perspective and is naturally suitable for comparative literature study. The objective of this study was to reveal the existence of *Krawang Bekasi* as one of the Indonesian poems written by Chairil Anwar and to demonstrate the cultural translation methods, known as cultural intertexts relation, for finding the intertextuality of two literary works. In fact, by tabling line through line, the intertextuality was found to be workable in comparative literature. As a result, the study shows that *Krawang Bekasi* by Chairil Anwar is an adaptation which borrows from and transforms *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak* by Archibald MacLeish. Thus, the intertextual relationship of these two works is revealed.

1. Introduction

Comparative Literature (CL) is one of the studies that is closely related to cross-cultural study. During its development, it also involves several other scientific approaches such as intertextuality, translation, stylistics, semiotics, cross cultural studies, and so on. The study of CL was firstly introduced in Europe at the beginning of the 19th century. It was proposed by Sante-Beuve in an article published in 1868. It was then exposed in one article that at the beginning of the 19th century as a science since was published in the journal Revue Litterature Comparee in 1921 (Remak, 1961).

Pragmatically, the study of CL is more applied in such as 1) to examine the intertextual relationship between one work with other works, 2) to compare aspects and cultural characteristics of one work to another, 3) to see the effect either hypogram or intertext, and 4) no less important is to look at the elements of plagiarism and similarity of the work. Translation and adaptation belong to this concept (Surya et al., 2017)

The problems of similarity of the same author, especially the author of literary work, it should not happen. Similarity of different authors can also occur due to two things: 1) the author of the article (work) has ideas that are salami, and 2) the author failed to paraphrase after reading the works of others. Or after paraphrasing the writer ignores mentioning the source, unlike the case with intertextuality.

Consequently, in cases like this, the difference between paraphrase and plagiarism are very thin. Except in scientific papers, paraphrase it is justified by citing its sources. Paraphrasing with unacknowledged source can be categorized as plagiarism.

Before the similarity and plagiarism checker software was invented, a literary work was easy to be plagiarized. In plagiarism, something was freely adapted for granted without citing sources, whether the translation, adaptation, reconstruction and so forth. Plagiarism in the academic writing is a violation of ethics and plagiarism in scientific articles is a violation. They are a sensitive case and serious problem.

In contrast to plagiarism and similarity, there are now varieties of software such as iThenticate for plagiarism checker and Turnitin for similarity detector. It is also a problem in the salami publication of scientific papers. According to von Elm et al. (2004), there is no software application or algorithm for detection of salami publication. Identifying this type of publication misconduct is complex because salami publications do not often include text plagiarism so that manuscripts can easily evade strict software checking.

The scope of this study is to analyse the two works of the poem that are allegedly the result of translation or intertext. In this way, elements of the differences and similarities will automatically be revealed. Either the

translation or intertext, in this study, is still called the work of transformers. Although a work has been deconstructed the nature of the translation and its intertext remains traceable.

In CL, the differences and similarities that exist in a literary work might be an object to be compared. It can also be more specific, such as plot, themes, characters, and so on. For the translation of literary works analysis, it can be stylistic, an aspect of semiotics, a method of translation and so on. Remak (1961) explained that in CL open to compare historical events, literary affinities, similarities and differences, theme, genre, style, a device of cultural evolution, and so on.

This discussion would not be complete without a mention of how the Krawang Bekasi (the object of this research) is touted as the best work of Anwar and also becomes one of his popular works. No one knows for sure that this work is a work of transformation from the work of Archibald MacLeish, an American poet. From the time of writing, Anwar's work was published on time when Indonesia was defending the independence of freedom, its theme and nuance were very much in keeping with the situation at the time.

This research is a scientific effort to explain the position of Krawang Bekasi as an adaptation from The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak, although until now there has never been any party who complain about the existence of Krawang Bekasi as an adaptation work.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Intertextuality in Comparative Literature

Intertextuality is the forming of a text's meaning by another text. Intertextual figures include allusion, quotation, calque, plagiarism, translation, pastiche, and parody (Hallo, 2010). It is a kind of literary device that creates an 'interrelationship between texts' and generates related point in separate works. It is the interrelationship between texts, especially the works of literature; where there are similarities or related texts influence, reflect, or differ from each other (Cancogni, 1985).

The term intertextuality has been widely borrowed and transformed many times since it was coined by poststructuralist Julia Kristeva in 1966 (Kristeva, 1980). As philosopher William Irwin wrote, the term has come to have almost as many meanings as users, from those faithful to Kristeva's original vision to those who simply use it as a stylish way of talking about allusion and influence (Irwin, 2004).

In relation to this study, the relationship between intertextuality and intertextual relationship can be divided into three types of categories. They are optional, accidental and obligatory (Fitzsimmons, 2013). These causes depend on at least two key factors: the intention of the writer, and the significance of the reference. The distinctions of these types and those differences between categories are not really absolute and exclusive (Miola, 2004). But they are instead manipulated in a way that allows them to co-exist within the same text.

Linguist Norman Fairclough (2003, p.51) states that "intertextuality is a matter of recontextualisation." According to Linell (1998, p.154), recontextualisation can be defined as the "dynamic transfer-and-transformation of something from one discourse/text-in-context … to another." The recontextualisation can be relatively explicit—for example, when one text directly quotes another—or relatively implicit—as when the "same" generic meaning is rearticulated across different texts (Oddo, 2014).

2.2 Literary Translation: Literary Work Transformation

Literature is a reflection of life. It is a form of a creative art and its object is a human and the life using language as a medium (Rahman & Weda, 2019). One of the literary genres is literary translation – that is a genre of literary creativity in which a literary work was written in one language and is recreated in another. Since literature is verbal in nature, it is the one and the only art that is subject to linguistic barriers. It is unlike another kind of art; music, painting, sculptures, or dance, the literary work is merely accessible to those who know the language in which the literary works are written. The specific characteristics of literary translation are, in this case, defined by its place among other types of translation and by its relationship to original literary creativity. As a result, the literary works and their translations might be an object of CL.

Literary translation is often known as trans-expression. For the case of literary translation, language has more than a medium of communication, way of interaction or social relation and connective purpose. The word or expression functions as the basic and primary element of literature—that is, it has an aesthetic function. It has its own style. Between the inception and the completion of a creative proses work of translation, a complex effort process takes place—the trans-expression (Pushkin's term) of the life captured in the creation of imagery of the work being tranformed. Therefore, the problems of literary translation are within the sphere of art and are subject to its specific laws.

Literary translation, in many cases, differs from literary creativity where its position depends on the existence of the object of translation, a work to be translated. However, in the actual literary process, it is not always possible to draw a distinct boundary between translation and all creative literature. In quite a few instances, a work may not be a translation in the usual sense, but it may not be possible to describe it unreservedly as a work of literary creativity. This is the difference between the translation of literary works and the translation of non-literary works.

Theoretically, a literary texts translation is a separate literary text that is different from the literary text of the original language. A literary text of literature is no longer part of the literary treasury of translated texts, but it has become part of the literature in the target language.

With such an argument, the center of the problem is the language. Consciously or not, language becomes one of the important factors that determine the existence and identity of literary texts. There is a reason for that, Wellek & Werren (1956) called the language is a medium of literary work.

When a work is translated, it is transferred in principle, not just the meaning from one language to another, but a series of cultural, historical, political and social content, and so forth. That is why it is said that basically a text is always in its own context and intertext (Kristeva, 1980). For Derrida (1997) emphatically stated that there is never any meaning out of context (linguistic).

Both paradigms certainly have their own implications. Both have advantages and difficulties. The first paradigm assumes all translators have an adequate knowledge of everything related to the translated object. Is the translator able to explore the meaning contained from the source language into the target language? This is always a problem.

The second paradigm opens the widest opportunity to the translator to adjust the cultural, political, the social context of the translated language. In this aspect, the translator can make a more contextual adaptation to facilitate not only the translator but also the reader. The disadvantage is that the degree of accuracy of the transformation to the load contained in the original text may not be as it should be. Such translations should be ethically coded over copyright and mention the source.

One interesting case is the transformation of one particular work (call it a poem) of a particular language into another language. It is a transformation since it does not acknowledge the source, but it proved to be loaded with intertextual. Knowing had been intertextualised since the native poem has been deconstructed in such a way. Then, there are addition and subtraction in here and there. The case happened in *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak* (America Poem) into Krawang Bekasi (Indonesia Poem). This happened around 1946, and until now has never been revealed scientifically.

Referring to the case mentioned above, the role of comparative literature studies becomes very important to keep track of the works of transformation, adaptation, plagiarism and even similarity.

2.3 Interdisciplinary study of literature and culture

CL is closely related to the interdisciplinary study of literature and culture. It opens to demonstrate some theories and approach from outside the studies. To analyze the transformation work for example. The researcher must relate the object to the cultural setting of the works, stylistic language, and genetic of the works.

All literary works including poems have a characteristic style and different, influenced by cultural settings as is the case for these two poems. Thus, there a compelling reason for comparing the two works of poetry in order to compare the cultural elements they contain. It is widely understood that CL is closely related to cross-cultural study. Observing two different literary works will generally mean that the researchers involved are also observing two different cultural settings.

Using the method of intertextuality, instances where a text is related to one or more of other texts can be revealed. The observed connectedness between the works could have many sources, perhaps a mutual influence, happenstance, or because one or more of the works have been adapted from the other works involved.

The role of cultural studies is to look at the relationship between the cultural aspects of the sources of two different works. A literary work is a text. Text, as an object of cultural study, cannot be viewed narrowly in isolation, but it needs to be seen through touching the element of subjectivity and taking into account the social backgrounds that lie behind a text (Storey, 1996).

3. Method

This research applied the principles of comparative cultural studies. Comparative cultural studies as proposed by de Zepetnek (1999) is conceived as an approach with three areas of theoretical content: 1) to study literature (text and/or literary systems) in the context of culture and the discipline of cultural studies; 2) within the field of cultural studies itself, to study literature with borrowed elements (theories and methods) from comparable literature; and 3) to study culture and its composite parts and aspects in the mode of the proposed "comparative cultural studies" approach instead of the currently reigning single-language paradigm, dealing with a topic with regard to its nature and problem in one culture a time.

The text and literary system studied here consists of two poems. The theory and method applied are the text deconstruction theory and the intertextuality approach. The poems are written in two different languages namely *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak* in English and *Krawang Bekasi* in Indonesian. Both of the authors are considered poets of their time and generation.

The data were gathered through the text deconstruction method by means of an intertextuality approach. In practice, this method is applied to juxtapose two well-known poems which are suspected of having the same content and theme, but their relations were never revealed so far.

The best way to find the intertext relation or suspected plagiarism is to parse the equivalence of two works. The procedure applied to determine the process of transformation of the work (especially poetry) is a) to deconstruct the text of poem, b) the results of deconstruction is then placed line by line of the poem in the table (juxtaposition for the sake of comparison), c) to decontextualize these lines from the theme (focused on the linguistic aspect), and d) to describe the character of the translation (transformation) according to its nature.

There were four steps in this research. The first step was to identify the thematic aspect of the two poems to see the suspected intertext. To determine which one is original, the genesis the works needed to be investigated. The second step was to deconstruct both works by pairing the target poems line by line (see Tables 1 and 2). The third step was to parallelize the lines or phrases (part of lines) to revel the potential adaptation. The fourth and final step was to underline the words, phrases and or sentences (see Table 3) to highlight their cultural translation and transformation (Rahman, 2017).

Table 1. The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak (MacLeish, 2009)

1	The young dead soldiers do not speak
2	Nevertheless they are heard in the still houses.
3	(who has not heard them?)
4	They have a silence that speaks for them at night
5	And when the clock counts
6	They say,
7	We were young, we have died, remember us.
8	They say,
9	We have done what we could
10	But until it is finished it is not done
11	They say,
12	We have give our lives
13	But until it is finished no one know what our lives gave.
14	They say
15	Our death are not ours
16	They are yours,
17	They will mean what you make them
18	They say
19	Whether our lives and our deaths were for peace and new hope
20	Or for nothing.
21	we cannot say, it is you who must say this.
22	They say,
23	We leave your our deaths.
24	Give them their meaning.
25	Give them an end to the war and a true peace.
26	Give them a victory that ends the war and a peace after words.
27	Give their meaning.
28	We were young, they say,
29	We have died
30	Remember us.

Line to line detection in order to find its intertextuality relationship between the poems is aldo done. This was done carefully using the numbers assigned to each line of *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak*. From this process, the deconstruction can be depicted. In *Krawang Bekasi* some straighforward were found.

The young dead soldiers do not speak
Nevertheless they are heard in the still houses.
…..
They say,
We have give our lives
But until it is finished no one know what our lives gave.
…..
Our deaths are not ours
…..
We leave your our deaths.
Give them their meaning.
….
We were young, they say,
We have died

However, *Krawang Bekasi* also contains additional material not found in *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak*, as follows:

Kami yang kini terbaring antara Krawang-Bekasi
tidak bisa teriak "Merdeka" dan angkat senjata lagi.
…..
Kami cuma tulang-tulang berserakan
…..
Teruskan, teruskan jiwa kami
Menjaga Bung Karno
menjaga Bung Hatta
menjaga Bung Sjahrir
…..
yang tinggal tulang-tulang diliputi debu
Beribu kami terbaring antara Krawang-Bekasi

Table 2 is the result of the intertextual detection in *Krawang Bekasi* based on *The Young Dead Soldier Do No Speak*. The reference numbers shown refer to the line numbers in Table 1, indicating paired line by line relationships. The process was done accurately to ensure its validity. Based on the reference numbers, the deconstruction and reconstruction is now clearly visible.

Table 2. Krawang-Bekasi (Anwar, 2007)

	Kami yang kini terbaring antara Krawang-Bekasi
	tidak bisa teriak "Merdeka" dan angkat senjata lagi.
3	Tapi siapakah yang tidak lagi mendengar deru kami,
	terbayang kami maju dan mendegap hati?
4	Kami bicara padamu dalam hening di malam sepi
5	Jika dada rasa hampa dan jam dinding yang berdetak
7	Kami mati muda. Yang tinggal tulang diliputi debu.
30	Kenang, kenanglah kami.
9	Kami sudah coba apa yang kami bisa
10	Tapi kerja belum selesai, belum bisa memperhitungkan arti 4-5 ribu nyawa
	Kami cuma tulang-tulang berserakan
16	Tapi adalah kepunyaanmu
17	Kaulah lagi yang tentukan nilai tulang-tulang berserakan
19	Atau jiwa kami melayang untuk kemerdekaan kemenangan dan harapan
20	atau tidak untuk apa-apa,
21	Kami tidak tahu, kami tidak lagi bisa berkata
6	Kaulah sekarang yang berkata
4	Kami bicara padamu dalam hening di malam sepi
5	Jika ada rasa hampa dan jam dinding yang berdetak

30	Kenang, kenanglah kami
	Teruskan, teruskan jiwa kami
	Menjaga Bung Karno
	menjaga Bung Hatta
	menjaga Bung Sjahrir
7	Kami sekarang mayat
27	Berikan kami arti
19	Berjagalah terus di garis batas pernyataan dan impian
30	Kenang, kenanglah kami
	yang tinggal tulang-tulang diliputi debu
	Beribu kami terbaring antara Krawang-Bekasi

To demonstrate intertextuality, Table 3 shows line by line pairing. By underlining words, phrases or sentences, we can see how *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak* was adapted into *Krawang Bekasi* (English translation in Appendix 1). The Underlining is done with a cultural translation approach.

Table 3. Lines by Lines Pairing of the Two Poem

The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak	Lines	Krawang-Bekasi
(who has not heard them?)	3	Tapi siapakah yang tidak lagi mendengar deru kami?,
They have a silence that speaks for them at night	4	Kami bicara padamu dalam hening di malam sepi
And when the clock counts	5	Jika dada rasa hampa dan jam dinding yang berdetak
They say,	6	Kaulah sekarang yang berkata
We were young, we have died, remember us.	7 30	Kami mati muda. Yang tinggal tulang diliputi debu.
Remember us.	30	Kenang, kenanglah kami
We have done what we could	9	Kami sudah coba apa yang kami bisa
But until it is finished it is not done	10	Tapi kerja belum selesai, belum bisa memperhitungkan arti 4-5 ribu nyawa
They are yours,	16	Tapi adalah kepunyaanmu
They will mean what you make them	17	Kaulah lagi yang tentukan nilai tulang-tulang berserakan
Whether our lives and our deaths were for peace and new hope	19	Atau jiwa kami melayang untuk kemerdekaan kemenangan dan harapan
Or for nothing.	20	atau tidak untuk apa-apa,
we cannot say, it is you who must say this.	21	Kami tidak tahu, kami tidak lagi bisa berkata
Give their meaning.	27	Berikan kami arti

Based on these facts, the researcher believes that the poem *Krawang Bekasi* is a transformed work which draws heavily on *The Young Died Soldiers Do Not Speak* of MacLeish.

Anwar can considered to have made a big mistake in not mentioning that the *Krawang Bekasi* was deconstructed adaptation of an English work into Indonesian. Such a blunder is difficult to tolerate in this age of intellectual Property Right.

4. Results and Discussion

One of the best-known forms of comparative literature studies is to sees the relationship between one literary work and another (Astiantih et al., 2017). This study presents two outstanding poems which were written in different languages, different poets within different cultural backgrounds. They are *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak written by* Archibald MacLeish and *Krawang Bekasi* by Chairil Anwar.

Archibald MacLeish, author of *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak* was an American poet and writer associated with the modernists school of poetry. He was born on May 7, 1892 and died on April 20, 1982. MacLeish read English at Yale University and law at Harvard University. He enlisted in the Army and saw action during World War One. After the war, he lived in Paris during the 1920s. On returning to the USA, he contributed to Henry Luce's magazine Fortune for nine years (1929 to 1938). MacLeish was Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard University, and was awarded three Pulitzer Prizes for his work. *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak* is one of his most popular poems.

Chairil Anwar is a poet of the Indonesian "Angkatan 45". He was born in Medan, North Sumatera, Indonesia on July 26, 1922 and died in Jakarta on April 28, 1949. He is considered one of the leading and most influential Indonesian poets. During his life he wrote around 70 major poems on various themes such as rebellion, struggle, death, individualism and existentialism. He was hailed as pioneer and is widely considered as an originator, playing a key role in the birth of Indonesian modern poetry. His most two famous works are *Aku* and *Krawang Bekasi*.

There are several similarities between these two poets, in particular, they both wrote on the theme of war and struggle. MacLeish wrote within the setting of World War II while Anwar wrote within the setting the struggle for Indonesian independence. MacLeish talked about the sacrifice of American soldiers on the field of war, while Anwar spoke about the persistence of Indonesian freedom fighters.

Krawang Bekasi was written in 1949, just a year after *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak* created. Recently some literary critics have suggested that *Krawang Bekasi* is not an original work of Anwar but rather a translation from *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak* written by MacLeish in 1948.

One of the findings of this research is affirmed that the work of *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak* strongly has been indicated a transforming work into *Krawang Bekasi*. It is seen in a number of intertext redirects in a transformation by way of translation. Although the translation is not whole as a whole but as a result has been deconstructed in such a way.

Based on Table 3, it seems that the process of deconstruction, transformation and translation (it is a cultural translation). The process is closely related to the process of adaptation and transformation. Conversely, the adaptation itself is a part of the transformation. The transformation of *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak* into *Krawang Bekasi* can be divided into six categories, as follows:

1) changing of the subject pronoun 'they' to 'kami' (we) / 'kau' (you). These occur at line 4, 6, 8, and 18. Similarly, the object pronoun 'them' to 'kami' (us) at line 3, and 30, possessive pronoun 'their' to be 'kami' (our) at line 27.
2) elimination of punctuation, line 3 (bracket)
3) combining two sentences into one (7 and 30). They became line 7
4) partial use lines occuring at 5, 7, 10, 17, and 21.
5) changing the context, line 19
6) dynamic (straighforward) translation, occurs at 9, 20, and 30.

Based on this transformation, it can be deduced that Anwar had a good mastery of English. In his poem, he deconstructs and diverts MacLeish's work into an Indonesian context very successfully. His work *Krawang Bekasi* is now famous throughout Indonesia. As a part of adaptation, the title has been changed by Anwar to suit the post-independence context in Indonesia. Based on evidence of literary genesis *The Young Dead Soldier Do Not Speak* was published earlier than *Krawang Bekasi*. In short, there is very strong evidence that the poem was adapted from *The Young Dead Soldier Do Not Speak* and not vice versa.

5. Conclusion

The study of comparative literature with the theory and method of deconstruction by means of intertextuality approach may be less frequently used than many other methods. But this theory and method have the advantage that they are able to show the relationship between two works whic are being compared. One purpose of comparative literature studies is to tease out the similarities and the relevance of the works alleged or suspect to have relationship.

This study found evidence that the work of Anwar is very likely to be an adaptation of *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak* in terms of both form and meaning despite some differing aspects of the poems which were written in two different languages. Despite the fact that MacLeish talked about the sacrifice of American soldiers in Worl War II, while Anwar spoke about the persistence of Indonesian fighting for independence. Using the comparative literature approach, it is clearly visible how deconstruction may have occured.

References

Anwar, C. (2007, October 7). *Karawang-Bekasi ~ Chairil Anwar.* Dunia Penyair. https://penyair.wordpress.com/2007/10/07/karawang-bekasi-chairil-anwar/

Astiantih, S., Rahman, F., & Makka, M. (2017). From Narrative Slave to Movie: Adaptation Theory. Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research (IJIR). Vol-3(6), 2017 pp. 659-663.

Cancogni, A. (1985). The Mirage in the Mirror: Nabokov's Ada and Its French Pre-Texts pp. 203-213.

de Zepetnek, S. T. (1991). In 1991: A Manifesto of Gender Responsibility. *Men's Studies Review*, *8*(2), 16-18.

Derrida, J. (1997) Of Grammatology. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fairclough, N. (2003). Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research. New York: Routledge.

Fitzsimmons, J. (2013) Romantic and contemporary poetry: readings. Retrieved from CQUniversity e-courses, LITR19049 - Romantic and Contemporary Poetry, http://moodle.cqu.edu.au

Hallo, W. W. (2010). *The world's oldest literature: studies in Sumerian belles-lettres* (Vol. 35). Brill.

Irwin, W. (2004) "Against Intertextuality". Philosophy and Literature, Vol.28, Number 2, October 2004, pp. 227–242.

Kristeva, J. (1980) Desire in Language A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art. (ed. Leon S. Roudiez).Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Linell, P. (1998) "Discourse across boundaries: On recontextualisations and the blending of voices in professional discourse," Text, 18, 1998, p. 154.

Macleish, A. (2009, July 10). *The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak*. Military Salute Project. http://militarysalute.proboards.com/thread/871

Miola, R.S. (2004) Seven types of intertextuality. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Oddo, J. (2014) Intertextuality and the 24-Hour News Cycle: A Day in the Rhetorical Life of Colin Powell's U.N. Address. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2014, p. 132-133.

Rahman, F. (2017) Literary Translation and Cultural Transformation. Conference: The 2nd Annual Seminar on English Language Studies at: Aula Mattulada FIB UNHAS, Makassar-IndonesiaVolume: 1, December 2017

Rahman, F., & Weda, S. (2019). Linguistic Deviation and The Rhetoric Figures in Shakepeare's Selected Plays. XLinguae, 12(1), 37-52.

Remak, H. H. (1961). Comparative Literature, Its Definition and Function. *Comparative Literature: Method and Perspective. Southern Illinois University Press.* Storey, J. (Ed). (1996) What is Cultural Studies? (Cultural Studies: an introduction). London: Arnold.

Surya, W., Rahman, F., & Makka, M. (2017). Folktale from England to Toraja. Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research (IJIR), 3, 2454-1362.

von Elm, E., Poglia, G., Walder, B., & Tramer, M. R. (2004). Different patterns of duplicate publication: an analysis of articles used in systematic reviews. *Jama*, *291*(8), 974-980. http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.291.8.974.

Wellek, R. & Warren, A. (1956) Theory of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Ltd.