

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In analyzing a novel as a literary work, the writer needs a means as a way to approach the problem studied: According to Eagleton in *Literary Theory: An Introduction* that there is in fact no 'literary theory', in the sense of a body of theory which springs from, or is applicable to, literature alone (vii). It means that using a specific theory in analyzing a literary work is not a must. There are approaches from phenomenology and semiotics to structuralism and psychoanalysis which 'roots' are emerged from other area of the humanities, and have implications well beyond literature itself, that can be used to analyze a work of literature. These approaches are used so that the analysis will not go too far from the topic the writer wants to write on, because they also serve as a limitation for her problems.

Until relatively recently, in the English-speaking world at least, ordinary readers of literature and even professional literary critics had no reason to trouble themselves about developments in literary theory. Theory seemed a rather rarefied specialism which concerned a few individuals in literature departments who were, in effect, philosophers pretending to be literary critics.

A. Phenomenological Approach

A modern philosophical tendency which stresses the perceiver's central role in determining meaning is known as 'phenomenology'. In Raman Selden's *A*

Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory, according to Edmund Husserl, the proper object philosophical investigation is the contents of our consciousness and not objects in the world. Consciousness is always of something, and it is the 'something' which appears to our consciousness which is truly real to us. In addition, argued Husserl, we discover in the things which appear in consciousness ('phenomena' in Greek, meaning 'things appearing') their universal or essential qualities. Phenomenology claims to show us the underlying nature both of human consciousness and of 'phenomena'. This was an attempt to revive the idea (eclipsed since the Romantics) that the individual mind is the centre and origin of all meaning. Selden says that in literary theory, this approach did not encourage a purely subjective concern for the critic's mental structure but a type of criticism which tries to enter into the world of a writer's work and to arrive at an understanding of the underlying nature or essence of the writings as they appear to the critic's consciousness (51).

As stated by Eagleton that to establish certainty, then, we must first of all ignore, or 'put in brackets', anything which is beyond our immediate experience; we must reduce the external world to the contents of our consciousness alone (48). This, the so called 'phenomenological reduction' is Husserl's first important move. Everything not 'immanent' to consciousness must be rigorously excluded; all realities must be treated as pure 'phenomena', in terms of their appearances in our mind, and this is the only absolute data from which we can begin. The name Husserl gave to his philosophical method—phenomenology—stems from this insistence. Phenomenology is a science of pure phenomena. For Husserl,

knowledge of phenomena is absolutely certain, or as he says 'apoditic', because it is intuitive: I can doubt such things no more than I can doubt a sharp tap on the skull (49).

Further, Eagleton explains that as with Husserl's 'bracketing' of the real object, the actual historical context of literary work, its author, conditions of production and readership are ignored; phenomenological criticism aims instead at a wholly 'immanent' reading of the text, totally unaffected by anything outside it. The text itself is reduced to a pure embodiment of the author's consciousness: all of its stylistic and semantic aspects are grasped as organic parts of a complex totality, of which the unifying essence is the author's mind. Phenomenological criticism will typically focus upon the way an author experiences time or space, on the relation between self and others or his perception of material objects (51).

The methods of Edmund Husserl, the father of modern phenomenological philosophy, were vigorously applied to the analysis of human existence itself by one of his students, Martin Heidegger. Since human existence is what is bracketed by Heidegger (and others) as the phenomenon to be investigated, his approach has been termed existential phenomenology, or, more simply, existentialism (Tageson 55). The essence of the phenomenological method, as developed by Husserl and Heidegger, can be boiled down to three consecutive operations:

1. A careful descriptive analysis of some state of consciousness, remaining as close as possible to the immediate "givens" of that experience.

2. A reductive analysis, based upon this description, to the essential structure of that experience, or to the discovery of those elements without which the experience could not exist.
3. A categorical analysis, which involves the further description of connected categories of such structures: broader unities that characterize a range of such experiences (56).

For Papillon, being imprisoned in a solitary confinement brings him a certain depression—an unforgettable experience—that influence his mind's consciousness. Moreover, he has to go through it for a crime he should not have deserved. Being alone in a cell with total silence puts Papillon in a certain condition of mind. Even a strong ceiling light in the cell can make him dazzled so that he lays a folded handkerchief over his eyes to lessen its hurt. He sees with his mind's eye everything that come into his mind at that condition. He is going to set about things once he has escaped; and those are horrible things he has in his mind (Charriere 24-25).

The writer finds out that such condition experienced by Papillon is a conscious phenomena. It follows the three consecutive operations stated by Husserl and Heidegger above. Papillon is in some state of consciousness to describe his immediate "givens" of the experience:

Those long hours during which I worked out my future revenge were so vivid that I could see myself carrying it out exactly as though the thing was actually being done. All through those nights and even during part of every day, there I was moving

about Paris, as though my escape was something that had already happened. I was dead certain that I should escape and that I should get back to Paris. (Charriere 26)

In other parts of the novel is also described how intensely total silence and complete solitariness can stimulate an imaginary life, when it is inflicted upon a young man (Papillon) shut up in a cell—how it can stimulate the imagination before the whole thing turns to madness. So intense and vivid a life that a man literally divides himself into two people. He takes wing and he quite genuinely wanders wherever he feels inclined to go. His home, his father, mother, family, his childhood—all the various stages of his life (Charriere 26).

B. Psychological Approach

Papillon's struggle to be a free person is part of his attempt to find his true existence in the world. The constructing of his personality during his punishment period is much influenced by his environment—in this case is the prison environment in the penal colony in French Guiana. As Tageson says in his book *Humanistic Psychology*, that this condition is in conformity with Nuttin's idea of personality. Nuttin calls for a *constructive ideal of a personality* to be worked out by each individual in the conscious attempt to integrate the various levels of his or her existence in a harmonious and realistic way. Nuttin points out that in this case all living systems are aided by a dual characteristic. First, that all living organisms possess an *actualizing tendency*, a pervasive impulse toward their own survival and growth within the possibilities and limitations provided by their environments. Second, living systems are open systems, a characteristic that

implies a *constant exchange* with the environment at all levels of functioning. No living system is sufficient unto itself. Tateson notes that humanistic authors are almost unanimous in their insistence that true self-realization can only come about from the ongoing conscious attempt to resolve and harmonize the constructive tensions that inevitably arise among the rich variety of qualitatively different human aims that we simultaneously seek to realize (26).

Papillon tries to survive from the condition in prison or penal colony because it is not easy to keep yourself alive in such place. Although his main goal is to escape, Papillon cannot avoid his existence in new environment—which is full of dangerous convicts with their unpredictable characteristics—is first of all, to keep yourself alive:

... it seemed to me that once you got to the penal settlement you must almost forget what you have been, how or why you had landed up there, and concentrate upon one thing alone—escape. I was wrong, because the most engrossing thing is above all to keep yourself alive. (Charriere 55)

The biggest challenge for Papillon is actually to find his true freedom neither in penal settlement nor in outside world, but within himself. In the penal settlement, of course, he is a convict whose physical and mental freedom is obviously “blocked” by regulations. But if he finally escape from the penal and live as a free man, will it guarantee that he will discover his goals and meaning of his own existence? The answer can be found out within Papillon’s own reality—during his punishment period and escape efforts.

Humanistic psychology concerns with man's conscious awareness of the laws that underlie and determine the course of natural events. As Tageron says that among all living organisms, humankind alone is meaningfully aware of its own existence. Our capacity of self-consciousness is what distinguishes us from other human beings on the planet. It is the source of our personhood, our dignity, and our freedom, our unique ability to understand and to adjust to our environment, and, potentially at least, to fashion ourselves or to discover within our own reality the goals and meaning of our own existence (51).

Joseph Rychlak, an experimental psychologist, terms the antecedent choice (conscious or unconscious) of a set of premises which will serve to guide future activity, as a telosponse. *Telos* in Greek means end, goal, purpose, reason why. A telosponse is therefore an adopted or chosen meaningful premise for the sake of which subsequent behavior is engaged in. With this analysis we return once more to the humanistic view that men and women are telic organisms whose behavior under normal circumstances, guided by conscious purposes or goals. Papillon's motivations to escape can be analyzed through this telosponse, because he can consciously has purposes or goals once he gets out from French Guiana. The writer will describe that these motivations are greatly influenced by events and environment around Papillon. According to Rychlak:

... free will, or psychological freedom becomes the capacity which an individual has to transcend and thereby alter the grounds (meaningful premise, affirmation, etc.) for the sake of which he or she is determined. If human beings reason

dialectically, then they will never be totally under the control of unidirectional (demonstrative) inputs from the environment. They will be capable of transcending the meanings of such inputs, in self-reflexive fashion. (Rychlak 29)

The humanistic approach therefore implies that psychological freedom or the power of self-determination is inextricably bound up with the degree and extent of self-awareness and is thereby closely correlated with psychological health or authenticity. A person is victimized and unfree to the extent that his or her motivations and action tendencies lie outside the sphere of conscious awareness and control. Even here, Tournier and Frankl would maintain, a significant vestige of freedom may exist in that the person remains free to search for personal meaning in his or her "illness" and to adopt an attitudinal stance or posture toward it :

Attitudinal values, are actualized wherever the individual is faced with something unalterable, something imposed by destiny. From the manner in which a person takes these things upon himself, assimilates these difficulties into his own psyche, there flows an incalculable multitude of value-potentialities. This means that human life can be fulfilled not only in creating and enjoying, but also in suffering ! (Frankl 105-106)

During his punishment period, Papillon constantly attempt to escape . It shows that he is a career criminal whose mental has shaped him into a person who is desperate to escape, because he simply cannot accept his fate to be oppressed and

“tortured” physically and mentally as a convict in the penal settlement. But all of those escaping experiences have given Papillon real values of life and freedom.

C. Sociological Approach

Our behavior is shaped through interaction with others, especially those to whom we have formed strong attachments. These attachments to others cause us to live up to their expectations about how we should act. But when we violate the rules or norms in the society where we live, there must be some lawful action to handle it. As in Papillon’s case, he is an underworld man who is wrongly accused for a murder so that he must be imprisoned. It is hard for Papillon to prove himself innocent in this case since he is a member of the underworld in Paris. However, he cannot accept his fate just like that; as a social man he desires to return to his society and regain his freedom. The novel “Papillon” is a work of literature which describes the life of a character—that is Papillon—who mostly for social reasons struggle to find his true identity through regaining his freedom. In *Theory of Literature* is said that literature represents ‘life’; and ‘life’ in large measure, a social reality, even though the natural world and the inner or subjective world of the individual have also been objects of literary ‘imitation’. The poet himself is a member of society, possessed of a specific social status: he receives some degree of social recognition (Wellek and Warren 94).

When psychologists say behavior is repeated because it has been reinforced, they are saying that people select their actions on the basis of past experience—we repeat actions that produce the results we desire (Stark 65). Micro sociological theories rest on the chance proposition. Humans seek what they

perceive to be rewards and avoid what they perceive to be costs. It is the same with Papillon's efforts to escape; he believes that by escaping from the penal he will reward something fundamental in his life: freedom. Moreover, Starks explains that micro theories become truly sociological by the incorporation of two very important insights. First, sociologists greatly expand the concepts of rewards and costs. For example, while economists tend to restrict these concepts to material commodities, sociologists realize that we do not live by bread alone. There are things we value immensely besides what we can put in our mouths or in our pockets. Chief among these are affection and self-esteem. We want to be loved, liked, respected, and admired. Second, sociologists recognize that much of what we want can only be gotten from other people. Thus, for micro sociologists, interaction among human beings is the fundamental social process. Interaction is the process by which we influence one another. We are endlessly tangled up in interactions, in influencing and being influenced by people around us (Stark 65-66).

Desire to live within a society is a humane thing since man is a social being. As D.S. Halacy, Jr says in *Social Man* that like a cell, man will usually form groups rather than live alone and apart (11). Actually, once when Papillon has escaped and stranded in an island that is inhabited by Indian tribe, he has been well accepted as its member. He gets all the pleasures and facilities he has never imagined before. In short, he gets everything that he never had in his previous community in Paris. But, as the days go by, Papillon felt a lack of something that made him did not belong to the tribe :

... I'd not escaped just so as to increase the Indian population of South America. Dear Lord, You must understand that I just have to live in an ordinary civilized society once more and prove that I can be a harmless member of it. That's my real destiny—with Your help or without it. (Charriere 200)

It is obvious that he has a will to prove that he can be an ordinary human being, if indeed not a better one than the other members of some given community or some given country.

In *The Humanity of Man*, Ralph Barton Perry says that man is a social animal, and we cannot have a full picture of man unless we examine him in his social context. The humanist ideal is that of freedom as the social creed determining the relationship of men to each other and to their total environment—the ideal of the free individual in the free society (101). In order to clarify the humanistic concept of freedom as a social ideal, Perry proposes that we begin with a basic definition: to the effect, namely, that freedom in relation to the social and physical environment means effective choice. Man is free, in other words, in proportion as he does or thinks what he chooses.

It is this capacity for effective choice that gives man that dignity of which we are accustomed to speak. Nature or the Creator has arranged this world so that many things are left to choice; and it is here that man enters. It is this which raises him above the brute to perilous heights from which he can fall below the brute. It is choice which gives to human life its tragic sublimity. It is choice that imposes on human life what is perhaps its greatest burden: for it is very hard to choose. It

is because he has the capacity for choice that man is a moral being. And when freedom is defined as relative to choice it becomes a central idea not only in personal life, but in public affairs, in man's higher culture, and in his progress and destiny (Perry 105). Papillon chooses to leave his Indian tribe and then try to return to his previous community in Paris which is more suitable for him as a man of civilization; though later on he found that civilization does not guarantee a community or a country to have "civilized" people. He contemplates the true value of civilization through his acquaintance with the fishermen of Irapa in Venezuela during his escaping periods :

... the greater human civilization and the greater understanding is to be found in each member of this community, living simply and naturally; even if it is a community that lacks all the advantages of an industrial civilization. But though they may not have the benefits of progress, they have a much higher notion of Christian charity than all the other so-called civilized nations in the world. (Charriere 536)

Papillon's struggle to be accepted in an ordinary society may be considered as a man's effort to fulfill the potentialities of his life. Like Perry says that humanism in its social creed proclaims the freedom of all men to fulfill the potentialities of human life and it maintains that man's natural intellect is the primary faculty by which he can achieve this end (127). This including Papillon's contemplations of religion which he found during his escaping period. Religion is fruit of knowledge and imagination and requires the freedoms of both. Its visions

and its faith derive their higher quality from the opportunity which is given to men both to see and feel for themselves and to express what they say and feel in words or in those forms of outward expression known as “worship” (135). Further, Perry says that science, general enlightenment, liberal arts, religion, are dependent, then, on freedom of thought and communication. These in their aggregate constitute what is called “civilization”, which raises human life above the level of bare survival—justifies survival and makes life worth to be living (136).

CHAPTER III
ANALYSIS