

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The novel entitled Down and Out in Paris and London talks about conflicts of its major character who is represented by "I". He lives in misery and experiences starvation every day. His life is dominated by pressures, injustices and oppressions resulting from his superiors, government and its intervention, and from upper class, namely capitalist. All of these condition are subject to his eternal sufferings, leading to his mental and physical strains. As the poor, he is so ill-fated to improve his destiny and self-esteem. In this study, the writer wants to describe on how the major character faces and experiences all mentioned complicated problems in his great efforts to survive and to endeavor his dignity and his good fortune that are despised and humiliated by domination of the rich or upper class. Besides, the writer wants to give some his own views and conceptions in account of characterization of his life as a *plongeur*, *cafetier* and tramp in Paris and London.

First of all, it should be noted that those happenings occur purely within the work itself, not in real society. By virtue of this reality, the writer will use objective

theory and supported by structural approach. Second, since in analysing this study, the writer is demanded to read, understand and then interpret it on the basis of realities present in the work of novel, he uses hermenutics theory that heavily rests on interpretation. Third, this theory will be supported by two approaches, that is, psychoanalytic and marxism approaches to reveal complicated problems mentioned above, that heavily deals with mental and physical strains. Finally, to achieve this purpose, the writer is going to characterize the character, namely the major character to support this analysis. All of these will be discussed systematically.

II.1 Objective Theory

As the study concerns about intrinsic elements, the writer uses the objective theory as the basic theory. It focuses on the study of the intrinsic elements of a literay work, disregarding any extrinsic aspects of the story. M.H.Abram in his book *Mirror and The Lamp* stated that "the objective orientation which on principle regards the work of art in isolation from all external points of preferences, analyzes it as self sufficient entity constituted by its

parts in their internal relations set out to judge it solely by criteria intrinsic to its own mode of being" (6).

II.2 Structural Approach

To analyze this study, the writer employs structural approach since the study based on the work itself. This is in line with what Welleck and Warren say in *Theory of Literature* that a study of literary work should have been based on the interpretation and analysis of literary work itself." The first and the most prominent concentration of this study should be directed toward the work itself"(157-158).

Applying this structural approach means that a process of analysing and interpreting a literary work should be based on the internal elements of the work itself. In this context, the elements that will be analyzed are characters, plot, theme, setting. In regard to this purposed study, the writer will choose one of intrinsic elements, namely character only.

II.2.1 Character

According to Harry Shaw in his *Dictionary of Literary Terms*, "character is aggregate of traits and features that

form the nature of some person or animal" (70). Character also refers to moral qualities, ethical standards and principles. In literature, it has several meanings, notably that of a person represented in a story, novel, play etc. Character in a literature generally, and in fiction specifically, is extended verbal representation of human being, the inner self that determines thought, speech, and behaviour (Robert, 1989:143). A character is presumably an imagined person who inhabits a story (Kennedy, 1983:45). Characters of literary works are, hence, fictitious, not real people.

Characters in novels have been specifically created by authors. When the authors create characters, they select some aspects of ordinary people, develop some of those aspects whilst playing down others and put them together as they please. The result is not ordinary person but a fictional character who only exists in the words of the novels (Guches, 1985:90).

II.2.1.1 Types of Character : Round and Flat

According to E.M. Foster in *Aspects of the Novel*, there are two types of characters, round and flat. The basic requirement of a round character, usually one of the major

figures in the work, is he or she profits from experience and undergoes a change of some sorts. Round characters have many realistic traits (a typical or habitual mode of behaviour such as acting first and thinking afterward, looking directly into one's eyes or avoiding eye contact completely) (Robert :144) and relatively fully developed then so called hero or heroine. This kind of character is also called protagonist which implies that a character is a center of attention, not a moral or physical giant (Roberts, 1989:145). In addition, it is also called major character. In Down and Out in Paris and London, this character is represented by "I".

The flat character is undistinguishable from other persons in a particular group or class. Therefore, the flat character is not individual, but representative. They are usually minor characters. They may be the parent, brother, sister or friend of the major character, and may be contrasted in some way with a major character, and perform the other important tasks in the development of a story. We learn little of their traits and lives. Because they do not change or grow, they are static, not dynamic like the round characters. In this novel, minor characters are represented

by Bozo, Peddy, Charlie, Boris, but all these character ere excluded in this analysis.

Of the characters in the novel, the writer will only pick out the major one as the central object of the analysis considering its dominating appearance in the novel and its leading role in making the work meaningful.

II.3 Hermeneutics Theory

Hans-George Gadamer and Paul Ricoeur in *Twentieth Century Literary Theory* said that hermeneutics, a science of interpretation, had its origin in the work of sixteenth-century German theologians. The major contributor to modern hermeneutics theory is Friedrich Schleiermacher. The basic problem that hermeneutics confronts is that while words of a text written in the past, such as Bible, remain constant, the context that produced those words no longer exist. Schleiermacher argued that the purpose of hermeneutics was to reconstruct the original context so that the words of the text could be properly understood. Hermeneutics would focus on understanding (Verstehen) rather than on explanation (Erklaren), which operated in the natural sciences, since in natural sciences interpretation was directed at non-human

world. In the human science, in contrast, interpretation was directed at what had been produced by human beings, so that understanding had to operate in order to bring humanly produced objects to life (K.M. Newton, 1988: 103).

Stated bluntly, the nature of interpretation is to construe a sign-system (for short "text") somethings more than its physical presence. That is, the nature of a text is to mean whatever we construe to mean. The nature of a text is to have no meanings except that which an interpreter wills into existence. We, not our text, are the makers of meaning we understand, whilst a text being only occasion for meaning, in itself an ambiguous form devoid of the consciousness where meaning abide. One meaning of a text can have no higher claim than another on the ground that it derives from "nature of interpretation", for all interpreted meanings are ontologically equal; they are all equally read. Interpreters make best of our historicity not only by reconstructing an alien world from our text but also by interpreting them with our own world and making them speak to us (109).

In actual fact, writing is central to the hermeneutical phenomenon. It involves self-alienation. Its overcoming of

the text, is thus the highest task of understanding. The writing is, as we have said, a kind of alienated speech, and its signs need to be transformed back into speech and meaning. Because the meaning has undergone a kind of self-alienation through being written down, this transformation back is the real hermeneutical task. The meaning of what has been said is to be stated anew, simply on the basis of the words passed on by means of the written signs. In respect with an understanding of a literature, it does not mean primarily to reason one's way back to the past, but to have a present involvement in what is said. The meaning of what is said is, when we understand it, quite independent of whether we can gain from the tradition a picture of the author and of whether or not historical interpretation of the tradition as literary source is our concern. What is stated in the text must be detached from all contingent factors and grasped in its full ideality, in which alone it has validity, although we can not escape the fact that our historical world is a pre-given of our experience and is therefore constitutive of any contextual interpretation (K.M. Newton, 105-110).

In respect with this study, hermeneutics is referred to

negative hermeneutics. This means that analysis of the work should be based on the work itself exclude all external constituents, such as socio-cultural backgrounds, the life of its author, social condition when the work is created, and other external factors. Paul Ricoeur said that "the hermeneutic field, whose outer contour we have traced, is internally at variance with itself" (K.M. Newton, 193-94).

II.3.1 Psychoanalytic Approach

There is a close relationship between developments in modern literary theory and the political and ideological turmoil of the twentieth century. But such turmoil is never only a matter of the wars, economic slumps and revolutions : it is also experienced by those caught in it in the most intimately personal ways. It is a crisis of human relationship, and of the human personality, as well as a social convulsion. Indeed, anxiety, fear of persecution and fragmentation of the self are experiences throughout recorded history, not in a certain period only. What is perhaps significant is that in this period such experience become constituted in a new way as a systematic field of knowledge. That field of knowledge is known as psychoanalysis,

developed by Sigmund Freud in late nineteenth century Vienna (T.Eagleton, 1983:150-153).

In his *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* cited by Terry Eagleton in his book *Literary Theory*, Freud stated that the motive of human society in the recent decade is economic one. What has dominated human history to date is the need to labour; and for Freud that harsh necessity means that we must repress some of our tendencies to pleasure and gratification. If we were not called upon to work in order to survive, we might simply lie around all days doing nothing. Every human being has to undergo this repression of what Freud named the *pleasure principle* by reality principle, but for some of us, and arguably for whole societies, the repression may become excessive and make us ill. We are some time willing to forego gratification to heroic extent, but usually in the canny trust that by deferring an immediate pleasure we will recoup it in the end, perhaps in richer form (151).

We are prepared to put up with repression as long as we see that there is something in it for us; if too much is demanded of, however, we are likely to fall sick. This form of sickness is known as neurosis and note that all human

beings must be repressed to some degrees, it is possible to speak of the human race, in the words of one of Freud's commentators, as *sick animal*. It is necessary to see that such neurosis is involved with what is creative about us as race, as well as with the causes of our happiness. One way in which we cope with desires we can not fulfil by sublimating them, by which Freud means directing them toward a more socially valued end. This is related to his theory about *id, ego and superego* (T.Eagleton, 1983:150-152).

Besides that, in the book of Richard A. Sequel Guches entitled *A Handbook of Critical Analysis of Literature*, Freud stated that psyche is organized into three zones: *id, ego and superego*. The *id* is totally submerged in the unconscious, and its function is to fulfill what is called primordial life principle- or as Freud referred to it, the *pleasure principle*. Contained in this *id* is the *libido* from which comes the individual's psyche energy. He describes *id* as totally lacking in the laws of logic since mutually contradictory impuls may exist simultaneously without cancelling each other. Consequently, the *id* knows ethics or values; it knows no good or evil; it encompasses no morality. Then, the *id* is the source of human aggression and all

desires. For the id is both amoral and lawless, it demands gratification without regard for any religious or legal ethics, social conventions, or moral constraints. Concerned solely with instinctual, pleasurable gratification the id would drive the individual to any lengths for pleasure, even to self-destruction for self-preservation is not an id impulse (Guches, 1980:115).

The ego is usually thought of as the conscious mind; however, a portion of it resides in the unconscious. Referred to as *the reality principle*, the ego's function is to govern the id and channel the id's drives into socially acceptable outlets. Since the id's pleasure demands are often not immediately obtainable, the ego postpones or even alters the demands into drives that are realistically obtainable. The ego's function is, then, to determine when, where, and how the id's demands might be best gratified in ways that are acceptable for the well-being of the individual. In a normal, well-balanced person the ego and the id work harmoniously together, when the two are in conflicts, repression and neurosis results (Guches, 1980:115-116).

While the id is the source of drive for pleasure and ego is reality, superego is the source of ethics. As a moral,

censoring agency, the superego is the home of the conscience and of pride. If a society regards a particular id impuls toward pleasure as socially unacceptable and the ego can not divert the impuls, then the superego blocks its fulfilment by forcing it back into unconscious, that is repressing it (Guches, 1980:116).

If Marx looked at the consequences of our need to labour in terms of social relations, social classes and forms of politics which it entailed, Freud looks at its implication for the transcendental life. The paradox or contradiction on which his work rest is that we come to be what we are only by a massive repression of the elements which have gone into our making. Of course, we are not conscious of this, anymore that for Marx men and women are generally conscious of the social process which determine their lives (Terry Eagleton, 1983 : 153).

II.3.2 Marxism Approach

In *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory*, George Lukacs stated that marxism literary approach starts from the assumption that literature must be understood in relation to historical and social reality as interpreted from a marxism

standpoint. The fundamental marxism approach postulate is that economic base of a society determines the nature and structure of the ideology, institutions, and practices (such as literature) that form superstructure of that society. The most direct form of Marxist criticism, what has been called *vulgar* Marxism, takes the view that there is straightforward deterministic relation between base and superstructure, so that literary texts are seen as casually determined by economic base.

Within marxism model, the economic base is composed of the means of productions, technics and productive linkages. The means of production can be equated with the available materials for productive process; productive technics with the available technics used; the productive linkages with types of the ownership equally together with social division among the owner of means of production and the labours within a class society.

Owing to the productive process is not static, but dynamic one, a structure of the social relationships above could develop into conflicts each other, resulting in tensions that are so difficult to be overcome. For Marx, human being history is result of such condition above: primitive commu-

nal of a society permits a way to slavery society, in return, develop into feudalisms that lead to capitalism.

Each age of human being is characterized and structured by types of production and ownerships dealing with them. Social division becomes the lord and the slave, the noble and the poor, the entrepreneur and employee do not end to production patterns, but go on to another side of life. Fundamentally society is divided into productive relationships and, then, subdivided into other social relationships. Therefore, social relationships, institutions, laws, religions, philosophy, and literature-- as superstructure of a society--reflect and mainly determined by infrastructure of a society, constituting mentioned productive relationships. The lords do not only govern/organize production, but throughout society as whole under his influences. They, differ from slaves, are the makers and the executives of the laws. The laws they have made represent their status and position; and conscious or not the laws are framed to protect their interests and their properties (T. Eagleton, 1983:85).

CHAPTER III
ANALYSIS