

CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter will discuss the elaboration of theoretical framework which will be used to analyze the novel based on research questions. This chapter consists of the explanation about intrinsic and extrinsic elements. The elaboration of intrinsic element will cover theme, character, plot, and conflict. Meanwhile, the elaboration of extrinsic element will cover queer theory, identity, and performativity.

3.1 Intrinsic Elements

Intrinsic elements are some specific elements that build a certain literary work from the work itself. There are several elements in intrinsic aspects. However, the writer will only point out certain aspects which are theme, character and characterization, plot, setting, and conflict as the supporting data for further analyses.

3.1.1 Theme

Theme, according to Holman, is the core idea which dominates a literary work, he asserts that, "it is the abstract concept which is made concrete through its representation in person, action, and image in the work" (1980: 443). Meyer defines a theme as "the central idea or meaning of a story" (1990: 196). Meanwhile Kennedy explains a theme as any general idea or insight that is revealed in the entire story (1983: 90). Apparently, the theme of a story is not explicitly mentioned in a literary

work since it is merged with the other elements of a story. However, determining the theme of a story is valuable because it needs a close analysis of every element of a work (Meyer, 1990: 196).

3.1.2 Character

Kennedy defines a character as “an imagined person who inhabits a story” (1983: 43). However, a character is not always imagined person (Meyer, 1990: 61). There are several types of characters, namely dynamic and static character, flat and round character, and stock character (Meyer, 1990: 65-66). A dynamic character is a character that undergoes some changes in a story whereas the opposite is called static character. A flat character is a character that only has one kind of personality, while a round character has more complex personality. Flat character is usually known by “outstanding trait or feature, or at most a few distinguishing marks” (Kennedy and Gioia, 2007: 75). Flat character is also known as typified character that commonly represents “general traits of a group of persons or abstract ideas” (Klarer, 1999: 17). Another type of character is round character. Round character shows us more complex aspects. It indicates that the author wants to give the readers more descriptions of the character in greater depth and a lot of details (Kennedy and Gioia, 2007: 75). Round character usually refers to “a persona with more complex and differentiated features” (Klarer, 1999: 17).

Other types of character are protagonist and antagonist. According to Holman, protagonist is a leading character in a story who plays important role in terms of the

story itself and in terms of his or her ability to attract the reader's interest and sympathy (1980: 355). Meanwhile, antagonist is a character who becomes the opponent or rival of the protagonist (Holman, 1980: 25).

3.1.3 Plot

Plot is the author's arrangement of events in a story. There might be similarity between story and plot. Both story and plot can be defined as a narrative of events. What makes them different is that story is merely a series of events and arouses only curiosity whereas plot emphasizes causality and demands intelligence and memory (Holman, 1980: 335). Therefore, the main idea of plot is the existence of related causes and effects amongst events within a story. Holman defines plot as, "intellectual formation about the relationships existing among the incidents of a drama or a narrative" (1980: 336). According to Meyer, plot is "the organizing principle that controls the order of events" (1990: 38). On the other hand, Klarer defines plot as, "the logical interaction of the various thematic elements of a text which lead to a change of the original situation as presented at the outset of the narrative" (1999: 14). The traditional sequence of plot, according to Klarer, starts from exposition which presents the initial situation. The exposition is then disturbed by complication or conflict which results in suspense and finally leads to a climax that is also known as crisis or turning point (Klarer, 1999: 15). There are several ways in presenting the order of events in a story which are chronological arrangement that begins from first event to latter events (progressive), begins at the end and then lead

up to why or how events happened as they did, begins in the middle of things, and flashback (Meyer, 1990: 38-39).

3.1.4 Conflict

A conflict is a crucial element of a story. It often occurs between the protagonist and the antagonist, but conflict also happens between the characters and other characters in the novel. Conflict is, writes Holman, “the struggle which grows out of the interplay of the two opposing forces in a plot” (1980: 98). Conflict presents any aspects of interest and suspense in a story. According to Holman, one of the opposing forces is not always a person, but it can be animal or inanimate object that is treated as if it were a person (1980: 98).

Holman classifies conflict into four kinds; (1) conflict against the forces of nature, (2) conflict against another person, (3) conflict against society as a force, (4) conflict to win one of two or more elements within a person (1980: 98). A story seems rarely to have only one conflict. It usually provides several different kinds of conflict which makes the story more interesting to read. Holman also asserts that, “the term conflict not only implies the struggle of a protagonist against someone or something, it also implies the existence of some motivation for the conflict or some goal to be achieved by it” (1980: 98).

3.2 Queer Theory

In 1960s, gay and lesbian theories originate in the radical movements. According to Selden, Gay Liberation in 1970s had two main goals, which are “to resist persecution

and discrimination against a sexual minority” and “to encourage gay people themselves to develop a pride in their sexual identities” (2005: 243). On the other hand, Selden says that the focus of lesbian theory is on “the interlocking structures of gender and sexual oppression” (2005: 248). Several features that are problematized by lesbian theory are compulsory heterosexuality, emphasis on women identification, and the creation of an alternative women’s community (Selden, 2005: 248). At the beginning, gay liberation and lesbian feminism suggest a sexual revolution. Eventually, however, they increasingly strengthen themselves as civil right movements to struggle for human equality particularly for marginalized minority groups (Jagose, 1996: 58).

Jagose asserts that the purpose of liberation politics is to fight for individual’s freedom from “the constraints of a sex/gender system that locked them into mutually exclusive homo/hetero and feminine/masculine roles (1996: 59). By mid 1970s, both gay and lesbian movements preferred an ethnic model in which it committed to establish gay identity as a legitimate group, whose official recognition would secure citizenship rights for lesbian and gay subjects, which emphasized community identity and cultural difference. Jagose says, “the suspicion that normative models of identity will never suffice for the representational work demanded of them is strengthened by influential postmodern understandings of identity, gender, sexuality, power and resistance” (1996: 71). By all these reasons, they provide the context in which queer becomes an intelligible phenomenon. However, homosexual, lesbian or gay, and

queer altogether describe the terms of self-identification commonly addressed to cover same sex desire in twentieth century (1996: 74).

Once, the term queer was known as homosexual or a term of homophobic abuse, yet queer term has increasingly developed into broader meaning. According to Jagose, queer is a term for “a coalition of culturally marginal sexual self-identification” and “a nascent theoretical model which has developed out of more traditional lesbian and gay studies” (1996: 1). Queer is a category in the process of formation that the characteristics of queer can be seen from its definitional indeterminacy and its elasticity (Jagose, 1996:1). According to Bennett and Royle, queer becomes a “term of pride and celebratory self-assertion, of difference affirmed and affirmative difference” (1995: 188). The term queer is also regarded inclusive that gains prestige and power as it, somehow, recreates our perspective of male and female, or masculinity and femininity, or bi-, hetero, and homo- (Bennet and Royle, 1995: 188).

Queer theory has broadened several meanings, from a merely useful term to talk about gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered experiences to a “theoretical sensibility that pivots on transgression or permanent rebellion” (Seidman, 1997: 92). Queer theory aims to challenge sexuality regime. Queer theorists view that heterosexuality and homosexuality are not only as identities or social statuses but also as categories of knowledge. Seidman declares,

“queer perspectives suggest that the study of homosexuality should not be a study of minority—the making of the lesbian/gay/bisexual/subject—but a study of those knowledges and social practices that organize “society” as a

whole by sexualizing – heterosexualizing or homosexualizing – bodies, desires, acts, identities, social relations, knowledges, culture, and social institutions” (1997: 93).

3.2.1 Identity

The rise of homosexual, lesbian, and lately queer movements is to challenge psychoanalysts’ suggestion regarding human’s sexuality. Freud’s Oedipal complex privileges masculine phallic sexuality and disregard female sexuality as it constructs homosexual as abnormal and pathological (Campbell, 2000: 134). Guy Hocquenghem, a radical French poststructuralist, sarcastically criticized Freud’s Oedipal concept that is seemingly discrediting non-male sexual identity as he compares male as the phallus and non-male as the anus. Hocquenghem in Campbell (2000: 136) declares, “Only the phallus dispenses identity; any social use of the anus, apart from its sublimated use, creates the risk of a loss identity. Seen from behind we are all women; the anus does not practise discrimination”.

There are two conceptions regarding identity which are suggested by so-called essentialist and constructionist. “Whereas essentialists regard identity as natural, fixed, innate, constructionists assume identity is fluid, the effect of social conditioning and available cultural models for understanding oneself” (Jagose, 1996: 8). Edward Stein in Jagose writes that essentialists suggest that one’s sexual preference is a “culture-independent, objective, and intrinsic property”, while social constructionists suggest that it is “culture-dependent, relational, and, perhaps, not objective” (1996: 8). Foucault believes that sexuality derives from historical

construction which enables power relations to control society (Campbell, 2000: 139). Therefore, sexuality is a product produced through power.

Butler rejects the notion of gender's concept that it is divided only into man and woman. She suggests that we cannot assume that genders must remain as two (1990: 6). Butler asserts that gender must become a free-floating artifice which means that femininity can signify a male body as well as masculinity signifies a female body since gender cannot be said to follow from a particular sex (1990: 6). Butler believes that gender is not stable yet it is fluid. She argues that:

“Gender is a complexity whose totality is permanently deferred, never fully what it is at any given juncture time. An open coalition, then, will affirm identities that are alternately instituted and relinquished according to the purpose at hand; it will be an open assemblage that permits of multiple convergences and divergences without obedience to a normative telos of definitional closure” (1990: 16).

Beauvoir in Butler (1986: 35) declares, “One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman”. This statement implies that Beauvoir distinguishes sex from gender. The verb “becomes” implies that to be a woman is not about to be born without penis, but rather to establish processes of being a woman. In line with Beauvoir, Butler differentiates sex and gender, whereas sex is anatomically obvious, gender is “the cultural meaning and form that that body acquires, the variable modes of that body's acculturation” (1986: 35).

To borrow Beauvoir and Butler's ideas, therefore, the identity of someone cannot be said fixed. Instead, it is acquired through some cultural and social acts.

3.2.2 Performativity

Unlike sex, gender is not exact. When one was born, one was sexed and not gendered. Beauvoir in Butler (1990: 111) suggests that nobody is born with a gender since gender is always acquired. Butler elaborates Beauvoir's statement by explaining that,

“Beauvoir was willing to affirm that one is born with a sex, as a sex, sexed, and that being sexed and being human are coextensive and simultaneous; sex is an analytic attribute of the human; there is no human who is not sexed; sex qualifies the human as a necessary attribute. But sex does not cause gender... gender is the variable cultural construction of sex, the myriad and open possibilities of cultural meaning occasioned by a sexed body” (1990: 111).

Beauvoir's argument motivates Butler to suggest that woman does not have to be the “cultural construction of the female body” and man does not have to represent male body. This leads to a deduction that gender must not be restricted in two kinds. Considering that gender is something that one becomes, asserts Butler (1990: 111), then that gender is “a kind of becoming or activity, and that gender ought not to be conceived as a noun ... or a static cultural marker, but rather as an incessant and repeated action of some sort” (1990: 112). Butler affirms that “gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being” (1990: 33). Butler does not acknowledge that gender is stable identity, yet it is rather changeable in time¹. In this matter, Butler would like to formulate her conception concerning gender, whereas it is constructed and hence possible to be reconstructed or constituted in different way. Butler writes that “constituting acts not

¹ Judith Butler. ‘Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory’ in *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (John Hopkins University Press: 1988) p 519.

only as constituting the identity of the actor, but also constituting that identity as a compelling illusion, an object of *belief*². She proposes that gender identity is a performative accomplishment forced by social sanction and taboo.

Certain kinds of acts are often understood as expressive of gender core or identity instead of performative. It implies that gender is usually interpreted as something prior to either biological sex or series of acts. However, Butler consciously refuses this idea. According to Butler, gender reality is performative which means that it is continually performed (1988: 527). She proposes that there is significant distinction between expression and performativeness, whereas expression shows that gender identity is prior to sex and acts, performativeness suggests that there is no preexisting identity.

As gender is a set of free-floating attributes, Butler suggests that “the substantive effect of gender is performatively produced and compelled by the regulatory practices of gender coherence” (1990: 24). According to Jagose, there is nothing authentic about gender (1996: 84). Gender is performative that is constituting the identity that it is purposed to be. Therefore, as Butler argues that there is no gender identity behind the expressions of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very “expressions” that are said to be its results (1990: 25).

Butler in Jagose also asserts the notion of iterability, which is the process of:

“a regularized and constrained repetition of norms. And this repetition is not performed *by* a subject; this repetition is what enables a subject and constitute the temporal condition for the subject. This iterability implies that

² *Ibid.* p 520

‘performance’ is not a singular ‘act’ or event, but a ritualized production, a ritual reiterated under and through constraint, under and through the force of prohibition and taboo, with the threat of ostracism and even death controlling and compelling the shape of production, but not, I will insist, determining it fully in advance” (1996: 87).

Acts and body are two essential aspects related to performativity. According to Butler, body is not merely a stagnant entity that is sexed right away when one was born. Instead, she asserts that, “the body is not a self-identical or merely factic materiality; it is a materiality that bears meaning”³. She believes that body is a matter which continually creates possibilities. This, therefore, leads to an understanding that one’s body creates more than a person. Yet it may become the reason of the emerge of, for instance, a woman. Butler states,

“To be female is, according to that distinction, a facticity which has no meaning, but to be a woman is to *become* a woman, to compel the body to conform to an historical idea of ‘woman,’ to induce the body to become a cultural sign, to materialize oneself in obedience to an historically delimited possibility, and to do this as a sustained and repeated corporeal project.”⁴

She also suggests that the body will shape its gender by some series of behaviours which are reacted, revised, and reconfirmed continually through time. Thus, one’s identity is determined by one’s performativity. Meanwhile, to make it easier to understand, the key of performativity is the repetition of acts.

The discussion of intrinsic elements that have been elaborated earlier will be supported by the application of queer theory to explain the issue of gender. The problem of gender will be explained in discussion part in chapter four.

³ *Ibid.* p 521

⁴ *Ibid.* p 522

