

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

II. 1. Related Theory

As mentioned slightly before, the literary work that has been chosen by the writer to be examined is a drama. Principally it is a work written, a dramatized story designed to be performed on a stage by actors. In drama, the words are mainly dialogue: people talking is the basic dramatic action.

A Drama is a work of literature or a composition which delineates life and human activity by means of presenting various actions of – and dialogues between – a group of characters. Drama is furthermore designed for theatrical presentation; that is, although we speak of a drama as a literary work or a composition, we must never forget that drama is designed to be acted on the stage. (Christopher Russell Reaske; 1966, p. 5)

In the comedy of manners,, the eighteenth century presented us with some of the best works in dramatic literature. These works presented lightly the follies of upper-class society. . . . Among the later works of this kind are some of the best: Congreve's *Love for Love* and *The Way of the World*, Sheridan's *The Rivals*, *The School for Scandal* (Graham Little; 1966, p. 127)

Dramatic works actually are classified as tragedy, comedy, etc. One of those works the writer pleases to ana-

lyze, entitled The School for Scandal, is categorized as comedy of manners in which such plays focus on the attitudes, manners, and morals of the upper class. The play being analyzed behind concerns itself with the manners and customs of an artificial highbrow society, provides amusement by making the behaviour and fashions of a particular group look foolish. It is meant for such what those people do and how they behave that in a part they sound silly and witless. Sort of that companionship is seen in the play, some appear ridiculous and senseless in their conduits.

II. 1. 1. Intrinsic Study within Objective Theory

Since the writer is going to explain the work by considering it in isolation, as an autonomous whole, whose significance and value are determined without any reference beyond itself, the theory used in this thesis is from Abrams, namely objective theory :

....the 'objective orientation', which on principle regards the work of art in isolation from all these external points of reference, analyzes it as a self-sufficient entity constituted by its parts in their internal relations, and sets out to judge it solely by criteria intrinsic to its own mode of being.

Seeing the study, first and foremost, concentrates on its actual work itself, thus, the analysis is being

explanative from its text. It proposes not to interpret literature in the viewpoint of economic, social, political conditions; to determine the work, those aforesaid factors are above contemplation. Thus, The School for Scandal is going through intrinsic study, which tends to analyze the elements of the work of art that build it, such as rhyme, image, setting, plot, character and characterization, etc (Ahmad Badrun; 1983).

II. 1. 2. Structural Approach

Behold how the various elements in a work function together. the study of this thesis mainly uses structural approach. It is principally clear that structural analysis intends to expose and explain in detail the interrelationships of all the elements and aspects of literary works which together reveal the wholeness of meaning. Such approach tends to find the meaning of an art work through the concept and form concocting the totality. This conforms with Rene Wellek and Austin Warren in their book entitled Theory of Literature (1978, p. 141), which is

'Structure' is a concept including both content and form so far as they are organized for aesthetic purposes. The work of art is, then, considered as a whole system of signs, or

structure of signs, serving a specific aesthetic purpose.

In studying the concept of Joseph Surface's hypocrisy within Sheridan's The School for Scandal through its form, it demands the elements of dramatic literature essentially, for content is what is said in a literary work while form is the way in which it is said (John Peck, 1988). It comes to have the basic elements of drama that cover the analysis later on. Those consist of plot, character, point of view, setting, language, tone, symbolism, and theme or meaning. However, according to Scholes and Klaus (1978), character, dialogue, plot are too important or useful to be without.

Character, dialogue, plot. These are the indispensable elements of drama.

On the subject of the analysis, instead of studying all the dramatic elements, the writer determines to examine the play through the characters only, which is constricted on the characterization of Joseph Surface. Since she presumes the most important of all in evaluating any play as a work of art is characterization, — it is the life of comedy for it gives a power to the story. As Edward Sheldon once said, quoted by Busfield (1958), "the idea demands certain types of characters", which in turn

require, "a certain kind of story". It appears perspicacious that the natures of the characters motorizes the plot with all of its small episodes and incidents, its complications and simplifications. Above all, it is representative enough to convey Joseph Surface's hypocrisy shown plainly through his character delineation, of which conjecture and base of its analysis lies on the evidence of the text.

II. 1. 3. Character and Characterization

As a way to understand Sheridan's play, The School for Scandal, especially in studying hypocrisy through Joseph Surface's character delineation, first of all one has to know about character and what characterization is.

Character has two meanings. Those are someone who appears in a play and second, the intellectual, emotional and moral qualities that add up to a personality (Barnet, Berman, Burto, 1993). Thus, referring to the role in the play, character can be defined to be passive for an unchanging, usually called *static*. While another is active since they perform acts, they have large parts in the play, usually undergo certain changes as a result of the action of the play. Instead of being static they are considered *dynamic*. According to William Kenney (1966),

the character may be *major (main)* or *minor*. The main character is usually *complex (round)*, also dynamic. They bring the most important role of the story. While minor character must necessarily remains *flat*, having less in presentation, just supporting the existence of major character.

All plays are composed of characters who generate dramatic whole. They are people created by playwright to carry the action, language, ideas and emotions. Although they are not real ones they are endowed with human capacities. They talk, feel and act on their feelings, believe and act due to their beliefs, and interact with one another. They experience pleasure and pain. As the play moves on, they are deepened with the increase of the complexity of their decision, conflict, motives and relationships with one another.

To reveal the concerns and values of characters, to describe their nature, the concept of characterization is the one thing that characters deal with. It is all the ways in which characters are defined.

Character: A person in a novel, play, etc.
(Dictionary of Literary Terms; 1992, p.39)

Characterization: The portrayal, in writing, of a person - his actions, manner of thought, personality, distinctive qualities and traits.

The ability to create and depict fictional characters so that the reader perceives them as living beings is essential to the novelist or dramatist. (Ibid., p.39)

It is seen that character is chiefly a particular person in literary work by which characterization considers some qualities that make him different from others.

Distinctively people in a play are characterized through their own spoken words, through their actions, and through the comments which other characters in the play make about them – they are established through dialogue spoken about the characters and the personality and interpretation of the actor playing the role. Whereas based on Christopher Russel Reaske's How to Analyze Drama (1966), there are six certain devices of characterization given below one by one, on which analysis perspective is going to be bent later.

∞ *The Appearance of the Character*

It is the description of the character in the physical sense. It can be found often in the prologue or in the stage directions. The character can be learnt through how he looks like, how he dresses, which indicate a meticulous or sloppy person, fat or skinny, young or old, rich or poor, and so on. Thus, the appearance of

character may be used to locate our first understanding of him. (Christopher Russel Reaske, 1966; p. 46)

∞ *Asides and Soliloquies*

All of the further characterization is of course established through dialogue. The character can be understood as they speak, best specifically when they speak in short asides or longer soliloquies. On these occasions the character is, in effect, telling the audience of his specific characteristic, for example, if he is a villain, he usually explains his evil intentions or at least his malicious hopes. (Ibid., p.46)

Aside

A remark made by a character in a play and intended to be heard by the audience but not by the other characters on stage. (Dictionary of Literary Terms, 1992; p.21)

Soliloquy

A speech of a character in a play or other composition delivered while the speaker is alone. The purpose of a soliloquy is to make the audience or reader aware of the character's thoughts or to give information concerning other participants in the action. (Ibid., p.190)

∞ *Dialogue between Characters*

Beside asides and soliloquies, the information of the characters' personality can be attained through the conversation between the character with others. For example, if a man speaks one way to his master and another to his underling, there'll be various conclusions that can be drawn. If there is a large disparity between the kind of language used in soliloquies and the kind of language when talking to others, a host of implications are usually presented with. (Christopher Russel Reaske, 1966; p.47)

∞ *Hidden Narration*

If there is no direct description about a character from the playwright, it will be provided through the descriptions of the character. One of the ways is by having one character in a play narrate something about another character. The narration is hidden in the sense that it is not the playwright's comment. Sometimes, one character's estimation of another is completely wrong. For example, the playwright thus establishes in our mind that a certain character is either foolish or wise before allowing that character to describe other

characters. (Ibid., p. 47)

∞ *Language*

The language of any given character is extremely central to his personality attributes. The close attention must be given to the kind of words which the character uses and also how the character speaks; whether he is impassioned, he speaks in a quiet, timorous way, rapidly or in a long drawn-out sighs, he uses flowery language or literal statements of fact. In short, the way a character speaks and the expressions he uses should always be our first concern. This aspect of characterization is the most important device. (Ibid., p. 47)

∞ *Character in Action*

As the characters become more involved in the action of the play, quite naturally they are able to be learnt more. As in the real world, in the real world of characters on stage motivation translates into action, there, continually, comes to understand why a certain character behaves in a particular way. (Ibid., p. 48)

II. 2. Related Study about The School for Scandal

So far, the only study of The School for Scandal the

writer knows is delivered by A. M. I. Fiskin, Ph. D. His book is even divided into two interested parts concerning the same playwright, id est Richard Brinsley Sheridan's The Rivals and The School for Scandal.

Actually it comes up just as a note like Fiskin said, precisely a short discussion, to help reader to understand those works in a brief way before getting involved deeply to them. It talks about the author himself, his works and his life, in general discussion. The things estimating The School for Scandal, written in this book gives the reader a glimpse account. For it comments upon the plot summary, characters and characterization, though not so elaborate.

Chapter III

Hypocrisy of Joseph Surface in Sheridan's The School for Scandal