

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Concerning the controversy surrounds the lyricist, Marshall Mathers III, and his works, the writer should like to conclude by returning to the reader. Being completed in 1999, The Slim Shady LP is a contemporary work in the era which people hold what so-called the postmodernism morality, as the belief that there is no single truth in judging things. Despite the fact that we cannot just apply this view in every matter, it is a difficult task to distinguish subjectivity in literary criticism: "There is no single 'right' method of handling literary problems, no single approach to works of literary art that will yield all the significant truths about them" (Daiches 396).

However, by using several materials of proofs, the writer has tried to demonstrate her analysis. It has been mostly a structuralist interpretation, except that she also adds semiotics in order to make clear some of the unique literary interpretation, which most people would be likely to take them for granted. We found out that, in fact, even though the lyrics are mostly inspired by the lyricist's own life, they exaggerate the actualities with some distortion as well. It is somehow not enough to call this work merely as the reflection of the lyricist's personal life. The writer herself would rather see it as a blurred combination of tale and reality which is the result of the lyricist's feelings and thoughts as stated previously. Thus, it must have some consequences. Those who cannot see the blurred limitation would criticize them merely as a means to exploit the lyricist's misery. The others who do not even care to look into the lyricist's background would see the lyrics as collection of profanities, which, could ruin the younger generations, and

therefore, should be banned. On the contrary, some critics admire him as a genius and compare him to the poets of previous eras, while the younger listeners simply love what they heard. It is, needless to say, a complex matter to circumscribe people's response toward the lyricist's works. No work can please most people. However, if – with some justice – we think that the lyricist's work here is nothing than a “catastrophe” (Mathers “Without Me” n.pag) for younger generations, we shall remember that the vast majority of his young listeners can catch his messages and do not take his words as seriously as their parents do.

The writer herself appreciates the lyricist's creativity in mixing his life with his thoughts. One may go on to argue that the lyricist is not the first to use both in his works. Indeed, and further, if one can appreciate other works for that, then why Marshall Mathers III could not accept the same courtesy?

Undoubtedly, violent content in literary works has always been arising debate. It is happened to previous artists also, such as Robert Browning and Edgar Allan Poe, and it is obviously happened to the lyricist. Of course, we still have to consider the binary opposition between “high culture” and “popular culture” in literary works. Although the limit tends to be more obscured nowadays, we cannot apply the same value judgement in appreciating them both. We also have to consider the society, culture, norms, and many more matters. Thus, even when the writer admires the lyricist's work, it is too much to compare his intellectual works to previous artists, because the conditions are different. In due course, if we are to be given freedom in appreciating literary works, we shall appreciate the freedom of the authors in creating their works.

WORKS CITED