2.1 Structural Theory

In analyzing this thesis, the writer gets some theories of the book *An Introduction Structuralism in Literature* by Robert Scholes. Structuralism literary theory is a theory of approaching literary texts that emphasize the overall relationship between the various elements of the text. Text elements independently is not important. Structuralism analysis is an approach that aims to see something cultural phenomenon as readable text. According to the model of textual approach, cultural phenomena of any nature can be understood as an event that can be read and interpreted through existence of structural analysis system. The existence of the text will be seen from the elements are interlinked. The unity of the relationship between the elements will only be meaningful in relation to other elements.

In general, text structuralism approach is seen as a structure consisting of the elements are intertwined and then build the text as a whole. Thus, it can be understood that the structural analysis aims to uncover and expose as carefully, as accurately as, in as much detail, with the deepest possible linkages and entanglement of all aspects of the cultural phenomenon that is ultimately jointly produce a comprehensive meaning.
Ahimsa Putra in his book *Strukturalisme Levi Strauss MitosdanKaryaSastra* describes the Lévi-Strauss's structuralism,

*Gejala*kebudayaansa*malnyadengangejala-*
*gejalaseperti*bahasa, yang mengekspresikan struktur berpikir manusia. Dengan kata lain, struktur adalah relations of relations atau system of relations. (Cultural symptoms similar with symptoms such as language, which expresses the structure of human thought. In other words, the structure is the relations of relations or system of relations).

The relationship between language and culture is a reciprocal relationship that affects each other or one-way relationship, culture affects language or vice versa. Folklore or legend is part of the spoken language and it is a description of a culture. The language is used by a society as a reflection of the overall culture of that society. In short, according to Lévi-Strauss, language and culture is a product or result of the activity of the human’s mind.

Although there are a few figure’s name of structuralism, which were introduced by the structural linguistics, Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913. In his theory found three distinctions that eventually became the basic principles were used by the structuralists, including Lévi-Strauss.

Ahimsa Putra also explained that there are two aspects on which the theory Lévi-Strauss drawn from structural linguistics, namely:

1) aspect of language and speech of individuals (parole),

2) the difference between the aspects of the paradigmatic and syntagmatic aspects of language.
In the structural analysis, Lévi-Strauss distinguishes the structure into two kinds; surface structure and deep structure. The deep structure is relations between elements that can be made or wake up based on external features or characteristics of empirical of these relations, while the inner structure is a specific arrangement which is built based on the structure of birth that has been successfully made, but it does not always appear on the empirical side of phenomenon are learned. In the analysis, the writer uses the outer structure, which is part of the plot. Analysis of the structural theory to literature can be done by identifying, assessing, and describing the meaning and functions between elements that is intrinsically interconnected as Teeuw stated in above quotation. The intrinsic elements will be identified, in this study, the plot is the most important element to devide into episodes that the whole episodes can give a clear explanation of the three selected legends.

Levi Strauss structuralism assumes that a variety of social activities and the results such as fairy tales, ceremonies, kinship and marriage systems, patterns of shelter, clothing, and so forth can all be said to be the language (Lane in Ahimsa-Putra, 2001: 67)

Levi Strauss (in Endraswara, 2005: 215) menyatakan bahwadalampandanganstruktural, akanmampumelihatfenomenenasialbudaya yang mengekspresikanseni, ritual, danpola-polakehidupan. (states that in view of the structural, will be able to look at the socio-cultural phenomenon that expresses the art, rituals, and patterns of life. This is a representation of the outer structure that will describe the human mind).
Levi Strauss (in Endraswara, 2005: 232) explains that in myth correlation units (which is a structure) that is not isolated, but the unity of relations that relationship can be combined and used to uncover the meaning behind the myth.

Myth for Lévi-Strauss as well as a fairy tale for us. In it there is a story or a story that was born from the reason and the human imagination, and of the human imagination. However, one thing that appeals to Lévi-Strauss is the fact that if ever a fantasy or human reasoning that got the expression of the most free in the fairy tale, why often found tales that are similar or somewhat similar to one another, either on some elements, in several parts or in several episodes. In such cases, the three legends that would be the writer analyzed has the same case, the similarity or likeness stories with each other, this is what will be discussed using structural theory.

As noted earlier, Lévi-Strauss's thinking was much influenced by other scientists. As well he looked myth. Myth or legend for Lévi-Strauss has the same characteristics as the language. It also distinguishes it with other anthropologists—such as Malinowski or Radcliffe Brown in the structural-functionalist perspective that does not mention at all about contiguity between languages with myth.

For Lévi-Strauss, first, the language is a medium, a tool, or means of communication, to convey messages from one individual to another, from one group to another group. Similarly, with legend.Legends conveyed through language and contains messages through the process of storytelling, as well as the messages conveyed through language known to find its pronunciation.

Lévi-Strauss's structural analysis looked at the legend is no longer just a bedtime fairy tale, but a story that contains a number of messages. Thus, in an effort
to disclose it, Lévi-Strauss emphasizes two main things that need to be considered, namely with regard to methods and procedures. Which is arranged in syntagmatic and paradigmatic.

2.2 Folklore

Folklore can be described as a traditional art, literature, knowledge, and practices that are passed on in large part through oral communication and example. Wellek&Waren (1982:84) said that “literature is a social institution, using as it’s medium language, a social creation”. Since literature is a social creation, literature is also expression of society that contains social reality, and express through the language. As well as folklore is an oral literature conveyed through language.

American folklore, Dundes(1965: 3) defines folklore etymologically. According to him, folklore derived from the folk and lore. From the both of word it means there is a dependency with each other, thus forming the meaning of folklore. Folk collective meaning. The term lore, by Dundes not explain further. on the other part. Source of folklore was actually an oral culture. Oral and written traditions will support each other to realize a more effective folklore (Endraswara, 2009:17). William R Bascom found folklore also contains elements of legend, myths, beliefs, and as an expression of culture. In folklore using metrics and prose word means.

Dundes (1965:277) explain in Endraswara’s book MetodologiPenelitianFolklorKonsep, Teori, danAplikasithat there is some function of folklore in general, that is:

1) Aiding in education of young

2) Promoting a group’s feeling of solidarity
3) Providing socially sanctioned way is for individuals to act superior or to censure other individuals

4) Serving as a vehicle for social protest

5) Offering an enjoyable escape from reality

6) Converting dull work into play

Genres of folklore include Material culture such as folk art, Music such as folk songs, Narratives such as legends, Sayings such as proverbs, Beliefs as in folk religion, and Food as in traditional cooking. Among the most common types of narrative folklore are folktale. A folktale is a story that forms part of an oral tradition, and does not have a single, identifiable author. The stories are passed down from one generation to the next, and over time become expanded and reshaped with each retelling. Folktale often reflect the values and customs of the culture from which they come. They have been used to teach character traits. Folktale are often not connected to a specific time, place, or historical persons. The characters are usually ordinary people. Similar folktale are found in different cultures around the world. Vladimir Propp found a uniform structure in Russian fairy tales. A folk narrative can have both a moral and psychological aspect, as well as entertainment value, depending upon the nature of the teller, the style of the telling, the ages of the audience members, and the overall context of the performance. A skilled storyteller will adapt the narrative to his particular audience.
2.3 Legend

Legend is one of genres of folklore that is the narrative type. According of Danandjaja (2007:50) *legend is prose folk that have characteristics similar to myths, which are considered never actually happen, but it is not considered to be sacred*. Legend is traditional story or group of stories told about a particular person or place. Formerly the term legend meant a tale about a saint. Legends resemble folktales in content; they may include supernatural beings, elements of mythology, or explanations of natural phenomena, but they are associated with a particular locality or person and are told as a matter of history. Legend is stories that reflect the life and culture of local communities. Character of legend is secular, occur in the past period, and is hosed in the world as it is known. Thus, it can be said that the legend is indeed tied to the life history of the past although it is true often are not pure.

A legend is a narrative of human actions that are perceived both by teller and listeners to take place within human history and to possess certain qualities that give the tale verisimilitude. Legend, for its active and passive participants includes no happenings that are outside the realm of "possibility" but which may include miracles. Legends may be transformed over time, in order to keep it fresh and vital, and realistic (Wikipedia). The Brothers Grimm defined legend as folktale historically grounded.

A modern folklorist's professional definition of legend was proposed by Timothy R. Tangherlini in 1990:

*Legend, typically, is a short (mono-) episodic, traditional, highly ecotypified historicized narrative performed in a conversational mode, reflecting on a psychological level a symbolic representation of folk belief*
and collective experiences and serving as a reaffirmation of commonly held values of the group to whose tradition it belongs.

Legends are used as a source of folklore, providing historical information regarding the culture and views of a specific legend's native civilization.

2.4 Theories of Violence

Gregg Barak’s (2003; 2004; 2005a; 2005b) reciprocal theory of violence and nonviolence is derived from an extension of the same logic used by the more traditional integrative, pathway, and multidimensional life-course theories. At its core, my approach to violence maintains that the key to understanding the dialectics of violence and nonviolence can be discovered, on the one hand, in the adversarial and mutualistic tendencies of social intercourse and, on the other hand, in the reciprocal relations of violent and nonviolent properties and pathways. More specifically, the reciprocal theory argues that the struggle between violence and nonviolence is a struggle about the contradictory relations or tensions between adversarialism and mutualism, that universally intersects virtually all individuals, groups, and nation-states alike, as these express themselves as competing properties. In addition, my theory contends that there are also pathways for culturally organizing personal and societal identities that, ultimately, navigate and guide individual, institutional, and structural behavior with respect to non/violent outcomes.

Found throughout families, neighborhoods, classrooms, boardrooms, workplaces, country clubs, or in a variety of settings involving other groups of people or institutions such as the military, law enforcement, judiciary, mass media, and the church, there are a diversity of violence and nonviolent expressions. There
are also common or established “properties” and “pathways” that operate across a two-sided continuum of interpersonal, institutional, and structural relations of social and cultural organization that simultaneous promote violence (adversarialism) and nonviolence (mutualism). The interconnections between the interpersonal, institutional, and structural spheres constitute a reciprocal playing field where the constellations of pathways to non/violence are mutually reinforced, resisted, or negotiated.

Properties of violence refers to the essential attributes, characteristics, elements, factors, situations, routines, hot spots, conditions, and so on identified by any of the ad hoc, life-course/developmental, and integrative theories of antisocial behavior. These properties of violence, unsanctioned and sanctioned, may include negative emotional states involving feelings of alienation, shame, humiliation, mortification, rejection, abandonment, denial, depression, anger, hostility, projection, and displacement. They may also include a lack of emotional states associated with the properties of nonviolence such as empathy and compassion stemming from positive experiences of love, security, attachment, bonding, identification, altruism, mutualism, and so on.

When the properties of violence or “emotional pathogens” as James Gilligan (1997) refers to them, form in the familiar, subcultural, and cultural interactions between individuals and their social environments, and these states of being are not checked or countered by the states of being associated with the properties of nonviolence, then the potential for violent interactions involving the battered psyches of persons, groups, and nation-states alike, persists. That is to say, feelings of shame and humiliation, or of self-esteem and well-being, may be experienced by
individuals, families, communities, tribes, nations, and other social groupings or subcultural stratifications based on age, gender, class, religion, ethnicity, sexuality, and so on. In short, to the extent that individuals and groups feel abandoned by or bonded with their parents, peers, schools, communities, and nation-states, or to the extent that people experience connection or disconnection, they will be prone to relate or not relate, to identify or not identify, to empathize or not to empathize, to take or not take responsibility, to project or not project hostility and aggression, to make war or love, to make violence or nonviolence, to be anxious and uptight, or to be contented and calm.

As for the production of violence, over time and space, the transitions or trajectories toward or away from non/violence accumulate, forming an array of divergent pathways that may facilitate or impede one state of being over the other. It makes sense, therefore, to view adversarialism, violence, and abuse, or mutualism, nonviolence, and empathy, as occurring along a two-sided continuum where the actions of individuals, groups, and nation-states are capable of stimulating, accommodating, or resisting pathways to one or the other. In terms of time and place, these pathways refer to the spatial webs of violence and nonviolence expressed at the familiar, subcultural, and cultural levels of social, political, and economic organization.

All combined, there are nine possible pathways to violence and nine possible pathways to nonviolence. In the structural spheres of violence and nonviolence alone, for example, there are the same informational, financial, and media networks that form an underside of global capitalism, global terrorism, and global peacemaking. Whether operating for prosocial, antisocial, or no particular purposes, these
expanding infrastructures have created virtual realities in which once-secure societies now find themselves becoming “permeable webs that both allow and require new communication systems, circulation patterns and organizational structures” (Taylor 2001: B14). As societies and people adapt, as we find ourselves moving from industrial to network organization, and as the new technologies interact with both isolated individuals and collective villages of globalized culture, pathways to violence and nonviolence are reproduced.