CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL REVIEW

2.1. Drama

In responding a play, we need to observe the elements of drama in action together. In a play, the elements of drama such as characters, plots, themes are combined together and none of them stands alone. In other words, the elements of drama are closely related to one another. Therefore, in analyzing an element of drama we need to relate it to others elements.

Kennedy (1991: 955) says that analysis of structure is important to grasp literature. He further states:

   To analyze the structure of a play is one way to understand and appreciate a playwright’s art. Analysis is complicated, however, because in an excellent play the elements (including plot, theme, and characters) do not stand in isolation. Often, deeds clearly follow from the kinds of people the characters are, and from those deeds it is left to the reader to infer the theme of the play—the general point truth about human beings that may be drawn from it. Perhaps the most meaningful way to study the elements of a play is to consider a play in its entirety.

A character is a person created by the playwright to carry the action, language, ideas, and emotions of the play (Roberts, 1993: 1021). This quotation cites that the idea represented by the play can be understood through the analysis of character as its carrier. In addition, Robert (1993:366) states that characters and their action may often be equated with certain ideas and values. This quotation emphasizes that characters and ideas often have the same position in a play and to talk about characters is a shorthand way of talking about the ideas.
In order to understand the idea through the description of characters we need to know the devices of characterization, which the playwright has used. Every dramatist has at his fingertips a relatively large galaxy of differing devices of characterization. Some of the devices are the appearance of the character, asides and soliloquies, dialogue between characters, hidden narration, language, and character in action (Reaske, 1966: 46-48).

The character can be analyzed by their appearance. In the prologue or in the stage directions the playwright often describes the character in the physical sense. We learn from these stage directions what the character looks like and probably how he dresses; when a character walks onto the stage, it is obvious from his appearance whether he is a meticulous or sloppy person, attractive or unattractive, old or young, small or large, etc. In other words, in the mere appearance of character we locate our first understanding of him (Reaske, 1966: 46). It means that the appearance of the characters leads us to understand them and to draw a conclusion about their attitude.

All of further characterization is of course established through dialogue. We learn about the characters as they speak. And specifically, we are apt to understand the characters best when they speak in short asides or in longer soliloquies. On these occasions the character is, in effect, telling the audience of his specific characteristics (Reaske, 1966:46). This quotation cites that the characters inform the readers their specific characteristics when they speak alone.

Not only does the language of the character speaking alone characterize him, but his language when speaking to others also sheds a great deal of light on his personality. If a man speaks one way to his master and another to his
underling, we can draw various conclusions (Reaske, 1966: 47). This quotation emphasizes that we can learn about the character’s personality through his words when he speaks to other characters.

While character in a play is never directly described by the playwright himself, there are nevertheless descriptions of characters. One of the devices of characterization frequently employed is having one character in a play narrate something about another character. The narration is hidden in the sense that it is not the playwright’s direct comment. Of course, sometimes one character’s estimation of another is completely wrong; the playwright thus establishes in our mind that a certain character is either foolish or wise before allowing that character to describe other characters. If the character doing the describing is a fool and generally not very perspective, then we simply reverse everything he says about another character in order to arrive at the truth. If a fool thinks someone wise, we generally can assume that the someone is stupid (Reaske, 1966:47).

The above quotation describes that eventhough the playwright does not give a direct comment on his characters, we can learn about a characters through the comment of other characters of the play. However, to draw a conclusion about a character based on other characters’ statements, we have to pay attention to the certain characteristics of commenting characters.

It cannot be emphasized too many times, that the language of any given character is extremely central to his personality attributes. Not only must we pay close attention to the kind of words which the character uses, but also we must be careful to remember how the character speaks. The way a character speaks and
the expressions he uses should always be our first concern (Reaske, 1966: 47-48). This quotation shows us that the personality of a character can be learnt through his words, the way he speaks, and the expressions he uses.

As the character become more involved in the action of the play we quite naturally learn more about them. For once a playwright chooses to have a character act in one way rather than another, we immediately understand that character much better (Reaske, 1966: 48). This quotation conveys that the way a character acts, defines his characteristic.

2.2. Literature and Ideas

Ideas are vital to understanding and appreciation, for writers have ideas and want to communicate them (Roberts, 1993: 363). This quotation cites that the writers communicate their ideas through literature. He (1993: 1025) also states that although most playwrights do not seek primarily to persuade or propagandize their audience, they do write their plays to dramatize ideas about the human condition. This quotation emphasizes that the playwrights use play, as a branch of literature, as a media to convey the ideas about human’s life.

Furthermore, Unger, in Rene Wellek’s *Theory of Literature*, classifies ideas in literature such as: the problem of fate, by which he means the relation of freedom and necessity, spirit and nature; the religious problem, including the interpretation of Christ, the attitude towards sin and salvation; the problem of nature, which would include such questions as the feeling for nature, but also questions of myth and magic; the problem of man, which concerns questions of
The concept of man, but also of man’s relation to death, man’s concept of love; and finally there is a group of problems of society, family, and state (1976: 115).

The above quotation conveys that literature expresses the ideas about life. It may convey the idea of love, belief, nature, death, man with all of his problems in life such as social problems and economic problems, and also the idea about social life and family life.

2.3. Escapism

Escapism is an action of turning away from reality. A dictionary definition (Agnes, 2002: 485) defines escapism as a tendency to escape from reality, the responsibilities and routine of real life, etc. especially by unrealistic imaginative activity. This quotation cites the emphasis of escapism is the turning away from reality of life. It denies responsibilities that man should have in facing the reality of life.

In addition, Chaplin (2000: 173) in his dictionary says that escape from reality is the attitude including the effort to avoid or isolate and retreat oneself from the problems and conflicts of life (own translation). This quotation also states that escapism is the tendency to escape from the problems in real life. It avoids finding the solution of problems and conflicts, which exist, in real life.

Apter (1982: 6), in his book’s Fantasy Literature, states that fantasy offers escape from reality, but the purpose and effect of the escape ranges from wish-fulfilment, excitement or sheer entertainment, to release from habitual assumptions, thus providing a vantage point from which new possibilities can be realized. This quotation emphasizes that the purpose of escapism or the escape
from reality is to fulfill one’s expectations, to gain pleasure or entertainment, to free somebody from routine of real life. He also states that fantasy also serves as a means of escaping from habitual assumptions and expectations, but the purpose of this escape is to show how awful, how limiting and imprisoning, the human world is. This quotation cites the unpleasant life is the cause of human’s escape.