

CHAPTER 2

FRAMEWORK OF THE THEORIES

This chapter contains of the explained approach that is used as a base to support the analysis of the novel. In previous chapter, I have mentioned the concepts and theories of intrinsic and extrinsic approaches that are going to be used to analyze the novel. To analyze the character, I use the analysis of telling method: characterization through appearances and characterization by the author; showing method, characterization of dialog and vocabularies of characters. After that, I will analyze the novel through plot which consists of exposition, complication, crisis, falling action and resolution. Then, I will analyze the novel through the setting. It is divided into three parts; as background of action, and as antagonist, and as means of creating appropriate atmosphere. For the extrinsic approach, I will be using philosophical concept; natural rights theory by John Locke and some supports from points of natural rights.

A. Intrinsic Approaches

To support and analyze the data to prove the assumption of the research, I will be using intrinsic concepts through telling method; characterization through appearances and characterization by the author; showing method, characterization through dialogue and characterization through action. After that, I will analyze the novel through plot which consists of exposition, complication, crisis, falling action and resolution, and setting.

1. Characterization

The term character applies to any individual in a literary work. Without character there would be no plot and hence. Fiction presents us with an almost endless variety of memorable human beings, some who delight and amuse us, others who puzzle, intrigue, or terrify us. By characterization, we can sympathize, or even empathize, with some of these characters in their open enjoyment of life, in their doubts and sorrows, in their loneliness and endless search for value and meaning. Others characters only appall us with their greed, their burning hatred and desire for revenge, or their ability to manipulate others coldly for selfish ends. (Pickering and Hooper, 1981: 23). To analyze characters

in a literary work, there are certain methods that can be used. I decided to use telling and showing methods:

a. Telling Method

Telling method is explanation that is done directly by the author. The author explains the characters by explaining and describing the characters by herself (Minderop Albertine, 2005: 8). According to Pickering and Hoper, analyzing characterization by telling method is divided into two methods:

- Characterization through appearance

By putting attention on the appearance of the character will give us details of dress may offer clues to background, occupation, economic and social status, and perhaps even a clue to the character's degree of self-respect. Details of physical appearance can help to identify a character's age and the general state of his physical and emotional health and well-being: whether the character is strong or weak, happy or sad, calm or agitated. Appearance can be used in other ways as well, particularly with minor characters who are flat and static. By common agreement, certain physical attributes have become identified over a period of time with certain kinds of inner psychological states. For example, characters who are tall and thin are often associated with intellectual or aesthetic types who are withdrawn and introspective (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 30)

- Characterization by the author

In the most customary form of telling the author interrupts the narrative and reveals directly, through a series of editorial comments, the nature and personality of the characters, including the thoughts and feelings that enter and pass through the characters' minds. By doing so the author asserts and retains full control over characterization. The author not only directs our attention to a given character, but tells us exactly what our attention toward the character ought to be. Nothing is left to the reader's imagination. Unless the author is being ironic – and there is always that possibility – we can do little more than assent and allow

our conception of character to be formed on the basis of what the author has told us. (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 30-31)

b. Showing method

By contrast, there are essentially two methods of indirect characterization by showing: characterization through dialogue (what characters say) and characterization through action (what characters do). (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 31)

- Characterization through dialogue

We pay attention to such talk because it is interesting and, if we are attempting to understand the speaker, because it may consciously or unconsciously serve to reveal his innermost character and personality. The task of establishing character through dialogue is not as a simple one. Some characters are careful and guarded in what they say: they speak only by indirection, and we must infer from their words what they actually mean. Others are open and candid; they tell us, or appear to tell us exactly what is on their minds. Some characters are given to chronic exaggeration and overstatement; others to understatement and subtlety. It is a rare work of fiction, whose author does not employ dialogue in some way to reveal, establish, and reinforce character. (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 32)

For this reason the reader must be prepared to analyze dialogue in a number of different ways: for what is being said, the identity of the speaker, the occasion, the identity of the person or persons the speaker is addressing, the quality of the exchange, and the speaker's tone of voice, stress, dialect, and vocabulary. (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 32)

- *What is being said.* To begin with, the reader must pay close attention to the substance of the dialogue itself. Is it small talk, or is it the subject of an important one in the developing action of the plot? (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 31)
- *The identity of the speaker.* Obviously, on balance, what the protagonist says must be considered to be potentially more

important (and hence revealing) than what minor characters say, although the conversation of a minor character often provides crucial information and sheds important light on the personalities of the other characters (and on his or her own) as well. (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 31-32)

- *The occasion.* In real life conversations that take place in private at night are usually more serious and, hence, more revealing than conversations that take place in public during the day. (Pickering and Hoper 1981: 33)
- *The identity of the person or persons the speaker is addressing.* Dialogue between friends is usually more candid and open, and thus more significant, than dialogue between strangers. . (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 33)
- *The quality of the exchange.* The way a conversation ebbs and flows are important, too. When the real give and take to a discussion, the characters can be presumed to be open-minded. . (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 33)
- *The speaker's tone of voice, stress, dialect, vocabulary.* The speaker's tone of voice (either stated or implied) may reveal his attitude toward himself (whether, for example, he is confident and at ease or self-conscious and shy) and his attitude toward those with whom he is speaking. (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 33)

- Characterization through action

To establish character on the basis of action, it is necessary to scrutinize the several events of the plot for what they seem to reveal about the characters, about their unconscious emotional and psychological states as well as about their conscious attitudes and values. A gesture or facial expression usually carries with it less significance than some larger and overt act. But this is not always the case. Very often it is the small and involuntary action, by very virtue of its spontaneous and unconscious quality that tells us more about

a character's inner life than a larger, premediated act reflecting decision and choice. (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 34-35)

2. Plot

A plot is a narrative of events, the emphasis falling on causality. The time-sequence is preserved, but the sense of causality overshadows it. It suspends the time-sequence, it moves as far away from the story as its limitations will allow. A plot cannot be told to a gaping audience of cavemen or to a tyrannical sultan or to their modern descendant the movie-public. They can only be kept awake by “And then-and-then” they can only supply curiosity. But a plot demands intelligence and memory also. (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 13). The plot of the traditional short story is often conceived of as moving through five distinct sections or stages, which can be diagrammed roughly as follows:

Elements of Plot



In some novel this five-stage structure is repeated in many of the individual chapters while the novel as whole builds on a series of increasing conflicts and crises.

- a. *Exposition.* The exposition is the beginning section in which the author provides the necessary background information, sets the scene, establishes the situation and dates the action. (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 16-17)
- b. *Complication.* The complication, which is sometimes referred to as the rising action, breaks the existing equilibrium and introduces the characters and the underlying or inciting conflict (if they have not

already been introduced by the exposition) (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 16-17)

- c. *Crisis*. The crisis is that moment at which the plot reaches its point of greatest emotional intensity; it is the turning point of the plot, directly precipitating its resolution.
- d. *Falling action*. Once the crisis, or turning point, has been reached, the tension subsides and the plot moves toward its appointed conclusion. (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 16-17)
- e. *Resolution*. The final section of the plot, it records the outcome of the conflict and establishes some new equilibrium or stability. (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 16-17)

3. Setting

Setting a term that in its broadest sense, encompasses both the physical locale that frames the action and the time of day or year, the climactic conditions, and the historical period during which the action takes place. Setting helps the reader visualize the action of the work, and thus adds credibility and an air of authenticity to the characters. These are the functions;

- a. Setting as antagonist. Setting in the form of nature can function as a kind agent or antagonist, helping to establish plot conflict and determine the outcome or events. (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 39)
- b. Setting as a means of creating appropriate atmosphere. Many authors manipulate their settings as a means of arousing the reader's expectations and establishing an appropriate state of mind for events to come. (Pickering and Hoper, 1981: 40)
- c. Setting as a background of action. When we talk of setting as background, then, we have in mind a kind of setting that exists by and large for its own sake, without any clear relationship to action or characters, or at best relationship that is only tangential and slight. To see whether setting acts as an essential element in the fiction, or whether it exists merely as decorative and functionless background, we need ask ourselves this: Could the work in question be set in another time and another place without doing it essential damage? If

the answer is yes, then the setting can be said to exist as decorative background whose function is largely irrelevant to the purpose of the work as whole. (Pickering and Hooper, 1981: 38)

B. Extrinsic Approach

Sometimes, the extrinsic study only connects the literature to the social context and the previous growth. In most cases, it becomes a 'causal' explanation, professing to account for literature, to explain it, and finally to reduce it to its origins. Extrinsic approach is the approach that is out of the text, such as history, environment, economy, social and political. (Wellek & Warren, 1977:73, *Theories in Literature* [online]: <https://literarystudies.wordpress.com/2007/07/29/the-extrinsic-approach-to-the-study-of-literature/>). I will be using psychological approach that includes natural rights theory by John Locke and some supports from human rights points.

1. Philosophy in Literature

Although quarrelsome and in many ways complex, the relations between philosophy and literature have been close since the two fields became distinct practices. For example, philosophers have used various literary forms in expressing their points: Parmenides and Lucretius wrote poems, Heraclitus aphorisms, Plato, Augustine, Boëthius, Malebranche, Berkeley, and Hume dialogues. Montaigne and Emerson used the essay. Further, philosophers such as Voltaire, Diderot, Nietzsche, Santayana, Sartre, de Beauvoir, and Murdoch, to mention some, made philosophical points in their novels. Some philosophers, Nietzsche, for example, preferred literary expression outright, whereas some philosophers, such as Sartre and de Beauvoir, gave their philosophical views a parallel, literary treatment in their novels and plays. Likewise, literary authors have always made excursions into philosophy. There is a considerable amount of works in the western literary canon in which philosophical views are put forward, suggested, entertained, or otherwise play a central role. John Locke was one of the most influential philosophers in England. His thoughts about humans and law influenced the government system in England. He came with his natural rights theory in 1690. His background for writing *Two Treatises* was because the slavery and discrimination were so popular in England. He assumed

that every human had to live in peace and respect one another. His first point of human rights is “Life.” He believed that every human deserves a decent life and no one can bother her life. (Mark Francis, 1952:8, *Philosophy of Human Rights According to John Locke*, Loyola University Chicago, [ebook]: https://ecommons.luc.edu/cgi/cgi?referer=https://www.google.co.id/&httpsredir=1&article=2056&context=luc_theses)

2. Natural Rights by John Locke

Philosophers have used the idea of a state of nature to argue that the state is based on an agreement between people to live together under laws. So the idea of a state of nature helps answer another question – it tells us a story about how a group of individuals who are free become obligated to obey the laws of a state. (Michael Lacey, 2002:1, *The State of Nature*, Taylor and Francis Group [pdf]: <http://cw.routledge.com/textbooks/alevelphilosophy/data/AS/WhyShouldIBeGoverned/Stateofnature.pdf>). Human rights are one of the most talked about in philosophy. John Locke is one of the philosophers who was very concerned with the harmony between fellow human beings, seen from his dedication in one of the influential theories that he has, natural rights. John Locke defended that men are free and equal by nature. Locke argued that people have rights, such as the right to life, liberty, and property that we have brought since we were born. No one can take one of those right away from us:

- a. Life, because the preservation of mankind requires individuals not to take the their own or other’s lives;
- b. liberty, because “all men are equal,” and hence possess the “equal right... to [their] natural freedom, without being subjected to the will or authority of any other man;”
- c. and property, because “every man has a property in his own person” that entitles him to “the labour of his body, and the work of his hands” such that whatever “he removes out of the state that nature hath provided, and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property.”

Locke was very supportive in developing welfare and harmonic life for all humans. That's why respecting and appreciating one another are needed in creating the welfare life. When Locke supported human life, Hobbes was the opposite. Hobbes argues that in a state of nature, we have the right to use our power however we choose in order to stay alive. Respecting someone is not enough unless we use our power to make them respect us. For example, if I have the right to life, everyone has the duty not to kill me; if I have the right to what I own, everyone has the duty not to steal from me. (Michael Lacewing, 2002:2, *The State of Nature*, Taylor and Francis Group [pdf]: <http://cw.routledge.com/textbooks/alevelphilosophy/data/AS/WhyShouldIBeGoverned/Stateofnature.pdf>). So, Hobbes's theory based on death instinct that it is human's nature that they compete to stay alive even when they have to kill others to stay alive. But because in the state of nature, no one has the authority to say how or how not to exercise the right to stay alive, if someone judges that in order to stay alive, they will kill someone else or steal from them, then they have a 'right' to do this, and each person judges individually how best to do this. They have no duty not to kill or steal. So, each person's right to self-preservation conflicts with everyone else's. Each person must eventually rely just on themselves, on their strength and intelligence. So that everyone will be disposed or ready to fight if they need to, and will live in a state of 'continual fear and danger of violent death'. It is clear that Hobbes disagree with Locke that to be a live, someone has to be ready to fight with others when they need to for the sake of being alive. So even people who are not violent have reason to become violent if they fear losing what they want. We will fight for gain, to get what we need; we will fight for security, to get what we need in the future; and, says Hobbes, we will fight for 'glory' – the reputation of being powerful, either because we simply enjoy it or because it is a kind of power in its own right (people tend to be compliant towards people who are known to be powerful). Hobbes's theory is more like eye to eye. When someone does something to us, we have a right to do the exact thing to him. (Michael Lacewing, 2002:2-3, *The State of Nature*, Taylor and FrancisGroup[pdf]:<http://cw.routledge.com/textbooks/alevelphilosophy/data/A>

S/WhyShouldIBeGoverned/Stateofnature.pdf). Locke through his natural rights theory says that humans deserve to live his life and no one can take a way that right. It is suitable on disagreeing the death penalty. But it seems like Hobbes has another point of view about it. Hobbes said that men had a *fear of death* and that this fear would cause them to be peaceful. A person is not going to what to die so therefore they will not participate in things that can kill them. The death penalty could serve as a tool to keep the peace because of this. Hobbes believed that the government is there to protect you and you should only disobey the government if they fail to protect you. A citizen's duty is to keep the peace and those who fail to do that needs to be punished. Most commonly the death penalty is given to harsh murders and homicides. (David Heyd, 2012: 1, *Capital Punishment in The Eye of Hobbes*, [online]: https://www.jstor.org/stable/27743969?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents)

Hobbes believed people have a fear of death and believe that death penalty is suitable for murders, homicides for taking someone's life because every single human has power and they use their power to get equality, when someone murders someone, the murderer deserves to be executed. (David Heyd, 2012: 1, *Capital Punishment in The Eye of Hobbes*, [online]: https://www.jstor.org/stable/27743969?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents).

Equality means no one has the right to hold power over anyone else. While we have the right to self-preservation, there are limitations on what we may do, given by what Locke calls the Law of Nature. The Law of Nature says that no person may subordinate another, harm his life, health, liberty or possessions (except in self-defense), and furthermore, that we should help each other when this does not harm ourselves. And so, Locke says, the state of nature is a state of liberty but not a state of 'license', because it still falls under a law, viz. the Law of Nature. Locke, however, disagrees with Hobbes about scarcity, one of the conditions that leads to war. In the state of nature, there is plenty of land for each person to have some for themselves, which they can cultivate and so provide themselves with food and shelter. And most people will prefer to do this than try to attack someone else to steal what they have grown, so it is possible that we live together peacefully. We should respect one another's rights

(Michael Lacewing, 2002:3, *The State of Nature*, Taylor and Francis --- Group[pdf]:<http://cw.routledge.com/textbooks/alevelphilosophy/data/AS/WhyShouldIBeGoverned/Stateofnature.pdf>). According to John Locke theories of human rights, these are the few possible points that he disagreed with death sentence:

- a. It violates someone's right to live. No one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty or possessions, Life is always being the first focus of natural rights.
- b. Natural rights arguments for limited government have a powerful but limited appeal. The limitations come from the foundations of human rights that no one deserves a cruel punishment.
- c. John Locke says that every man has a right to enforce the law of nature and punish offenders:

(i) The right that everyone has, to punish the criminal so as to restrain him and prevent such offences in future;

It is clear that John Locke defines punishing someone as an expectation that the crime someone has done won't be repeated again in the future. Creating established, harmonic and welfare life between humans is contradicted by taking someone's life again. It will not solve the problem because there would be another murderer and taking someone's life after all just increases the number of other violations, rehabilitation could be the perfect option to prevent such a thing, because every murderer has their own stories, backgrounds, and reasons why they decide to murder someone. There are always possibilities that someone would change to be a better person. I will analyze the novel by using those extrinsic theories above to prove the reflection of natural rights through Rusty Quinn character that as a lawyer, he keeps defending guilty people, especially murderers not to be executed.