CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter comprises conclusions and suggestions based on the findings and the discussions.

5.1 Conclusions

As a whole, it can be concluded that having the knowledge of stylistics is essential if someone wants to know deeper about the meaning of a literary work. Since stylistics analysis has a broader sense than the literary analysis, it would be able to help a reader understand the implied meaning conveyed in the literary work.

In spite of fact that Animal Farm is a political satire on communism (especially the Russian variety), yet the most striking impression I get after reading it is: Animal Farm is a profound and moving comment on the circumstances of man's life which is forced to combine with others "to get things done". Pragmatically Animal Farm is a literary story about humans' life in a country which is connotated as animals. Animal Farm contains not only literary styles but also non-literary styles as politic and social, but compromising with truth and honesty in every combination that he makes, to allude about bad political condition which matches closely with the main idea of the story that "Power tends to corrupt and that absolute power corrupts absolutely." It is the philosophical theme of Animal Farm which means that the power of a king or a

leader which is done cruelly and unlimited without control will lose the country and torture his/ her people.

The novel was so named, because the whole story took place in a farm, the Manor Farm, owned by Mr. Jones. It is not without any reason why George Orwell named his book such. In writing this book, Orwell had in mind the Russian Revolution of 1917. Indeed, Orwell's <u>Animal Farm</u> is a modern example of a literary form known as political satire, that is a work which blends a critical attitude with humour and wit for the purpose of ridiculing the follies of man's political behaviour and institutions. Many events in the story are allusions to the recent history of Russia in which <u>Animal Farm</u> represents Sovyet Union whereas the <u>Manor Farm</u> symbolizes Tsarist Russia.

Orwell uses animals as humans and Animal Farm as the country to show that people in the country are only passive as farm animals and become objects of the government as an owner of a farm which is a human. They do not have voices to give some opinions or roles in the government like animals which cannot talk as humans. They do not get any education or equal rights, they are let to be uneducated, illiterate, and senseless like animals. They only obey their governor's commands absolutely like humans rule their farm animals or pets. They are only as a second/ lower class people like animals which have the lower degree than humans.

So, Orwell uses animals as characters of humans because the people in the country represent the people's attitudes as animals which are mostly negative.

Only one human as the first leader which shows human characters which are

noble, elegant, powerful as a leader but numskull. He does not care his country and people well, he only gets pleasure to himself without taking care of his people. Therefore, his people rebel and fall down him bravely and proudly as animals which are angry and mad. Finally, there is one of the people who changes the government; he is Napoleon who has bad characters as pigs.

Orwell describes the second leader as a pig because he has a greedy, lazy, and pig-headed but very ambitious to be a leader, so that he can enjoy what he wants freely and unlimitedly for his own interests. It is a political greed. He shows his ambitious personality to be a leader to show to other people that he is the most intelligent, reputable, self-confident, and powerful so that they respect him everywhere. He is mad of honour. He represents his bad characters as a pig in the government which always wants other people's possession to benefit himself. He also waits for other people serve him and give what he wants. He always does something for his own interest without considering other people's needs. He does not understand other people' feelings, except himself. He also does not want to hear his friend's opinion to build a country, but he does as he thinks it must be true. He even drives everyone out who protests and rebels against him. So, he is crueller than the first leader.

Orwell describes many animals (such as: dogs, horses, cats, hens, etc) as people in <u>Animal Farm</u> as a country to reveal the different animal characters in every person. However, they are only senseless and less educated people who must obey Napoleon absolutely and Napoleon freely does what he wants to his people. He dehumanizes his people by full of hard work without enough rest and

salary, and he also does not pay attention to their rights. So, they still suffer as the lower class people, because Napoleon and his friends who have characters as pigs are more intelligent and powerful than others. Therefore, Orwell concludes that humans tend to imitate bad attitudes than good ones from others, includes in the government.

Orwell narrates <u>Animal Farm</u> in figurative languages to to show there are many connotated words, utterances, and sentences which are used to tell about the allusive political events in the country. The aim is to hints the bad political condition symbolically, so that his work is not protested or rejected but acceptable to every reader as an amusing political fable.

The novel is suitable to be analyzed from stylistics views, because stylistics covers broadly over literature, linguistics, and also sciences such as politics, social, and religion. The figurative novel which contains many implied meanings will be understood clearly by the readers after discussed from the meaning of connotated words, sentences, and utterances include metaphor, diction, allusio, symbol, personification, etc. From literature the readers will know the characters of Napoleon which is cruel explicitly through the theories of characters also the meanings of connotated words, sentences, and utterances through the theories of figurative languages. From linguistics the readers will know about the aspects of pragmatics and discourse analysis in the words, sentences, and utterances. From sciences the readers will know about the aspects of politics and religion which are discussed explicitly in the novel.

Viewed from literature as discourse, literature is a kind of discourse, a language activity within social structure like other forms of discourse. It is as amendable to linguistic study as are all other discourses such as conversations, sentences, and words in the novel. Linguistic analysis of literary discourse aims first of all to specify the formal patterns of texts, a novel with a degree of precision which is unachievable in conventional literary criticism; avoiding impressionism and permitting clearly articulated debate. From this perspective, literature is, like all languages, interaction between people and between institutions and people.

5.2 Suggestions

The writer gives the suggestions that stylistics can be related to the field of teaching. The approach that has been outlined is meant to improve a useful pedagogic purpose: to develop in learners an awareness of how literature functions as discourse and so to give them some access to the means of interpretation (Widdowson, 1975: 116). It should be noted that the claim is not that stylistic analysis can replace literary criticism but it can prepare the way for it to operate more effectively. The value of stylistic analysis is that it can provide the means whereby the learner can relate a piece of literary writing with his own experience of language and so extend that experince. The establishment of such a relationship can then serve as a base from which literary criticism, or rather a teaching approach deriving from it, can conduct its operations.

The meanings which literature conveys are of their nature elusive of precise description. It would seem reasonable to suggest that there is also a point in the learner's progress when allowance should be made for the exercise of intuition and for the the appreciation of the artistic value of the message which the literary work conveys. And the literary critic as teacher can point out that it would be undesirable to suppress the imaginative response of learners in the interest of linguistics. It would also be undesirable to allow the learner license to indulge in interpretation without consideration of supporting linguistic evidence. The problem in the teaching of literature is to know when to what extent the learner can be allowed to proceed to the appreciation and evaluation of the broader aesthetic significance of literary works without confusion. So literary works should achieve into the readers' notion feelings to get intuitive judgement.

Stylistics occupies the middle ground between linguistics and literary criticism and its function is to mediate between the two. In this role, its concerns overlap with the two disciplines. It is for the reason that stylistic analysis shades imperceptibly into literary appreciation: if it did not it would not fulfil the pedagogic purpose.

If the teacher of literature can see little or no value in the particular approach to literary study, I hope him/ her to re-assess the role of literature in the teaching of language. There are many people who question the relevance of literature to the practical concerns of language teaching. It seems to me that we urgently need an attitude to literature and a teaching approach based upon it. That literature is strange and mysterious and also recognises that it is a use of language

and so comparable with other uses of language; and that is only one of the strange and mysterious ways in human beings manage to communicate with each other.

Stylistics can be taught for usually university students who take (English) Literature/ Language Teaching as a subject. Thay can know deeply about the knowledge of literature, linguistics, and other sciences which are related to stylistics fields. They are useful in teaching literature, linguistics, the practice of interpretation/ translation from many books of literary works, and making poems, novels, plays, or drama which need the role of stylistics. Whereas for high school students, literature and linguistics are only given as a basic knowledge in a language teaching.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, M.H. 1979. The Mirror and the Lamp. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Anggraini, Indrani Dewi and Lestari, Gatut. 1995. An Introduction to Poetry: A Handbook for the Students. Surabaya: University of 17 Agustus 1945, Faculty of Letters, English Department.
- Beard, Adrian. 2000. The Language of Politics. London: Routledge.
- Bogdan, Robert C & Biklen, Sari Knopp. 1982. <u>Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods</u>. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bradford, Richard. 1997. Stylistics. London and New York: Routledge.
- Burger, Jerry. 1986. <u>Personality, Theory, and Research</u>. California: A Division of Wadsworth, Inc.
- Butt, David et al. 1995. <u>Using Functional Grammar</u>: An Explorer's Guide. Sidney: Macquarie University.
- Carter and Simpson. 1995. <u>Language</u>, <u>Discourse and Literature</u>. New York: Hyman Ltd.
- Callow, Robert J. Reilly. 1977. <u>Guide to American Literature from Emily Dickinson to the Present</u>. New York: Harper & Row.
- Chapman, Raymond. 1973. <u>Linguistics and Literature</u>. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Ching, Marvin K.L., Haley Michael C., Lunsford Ronald F. 1980. <u>Linguistic Perspective on Literature</u>. London: Routledge & Keagan Paul Ltd.
- Drever, James. 1986. Kamus Psikologi. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.
- Freud, Philip. 1965. The Art of Reading the Novel. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1964. Linguistic and Style. London: Oxford University Press.
- Forster, E.M. 1927. Aspects of the Novel. New York: One of the classic studies.

- Fowler, Roger. 1981. <u>Literature as Social Discourse: The Practice of Linguistic criticism</u>. London: Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd.
- Hickey, Leo. 1990. <u>The Pragmatics of Style</u>. Great Britain: Scarborough Typesetting Services.
- Holman, C.Hugh and Harmon, William. 1986. A Handbook to Literature. 5th ed. New York: Macmillian.
- Hornby, A.S. 1989. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current Language. Oxford University Press.
- Kennedy, X.J. 1983. An Introduction to Fiction. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Leech, N. Geoffrey. 1983. Principles of Pragmatics. New York: Longman Inc.
- Leech, N. Geoffrey and Short, Michael H. 1981. <u>Style in Fiction</u>. New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Lester, James. 1986. Writing Research Papers: MLA Style Manual. London: Scott, Foresmand and Co.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. <u>Pragmatics</u>. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayhead, Robin. 1965. <u>Understanding Literature</u>. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, Mathew B & Huberman, A. Michael. 1986. Qualitative Data Analysis. London, England: SAGE Publication Ltd.
- Noth, Winfried. 1995. Handbook of Semiotics. USA: Indiana University Press.
- Orwell, George. 1965. Animal Farm: A Fairy Story. London: Secker and Warburg Ltd.
- Perrine, Laurence. 1973. Sound and Sense. New York: Harcout Brane Jovanich.
- Pickering, James H.T. & Hoeper, Jeffrey D., 1980. Concise Companion to Literature. USA: Mac Millan Publishing Co. Inc.
- Ranald, Ralph. 1965. George Orwell's Animal Farm. New York: Monarch Press.
- Rankema, Jan. 1993. <u>Discourse Studies: An Introductory Textbook</u>. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Rees, R.J. 1973. English Literature. Basingstoke and London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Roberts, Edgar. 1977. Writing Themes about Literature. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Sandell, Rolf. 1977. <u>Linguistic Style and Persuasion</u>. London: Academic Press Inc.
- Senduk, H.L. Buah Rohulkudus. Jakarta: Seksi Penerbitan Yayasan Bethel.
- Short, Mick. 1996. Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose. London: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Turner, G.W. 1973. Stylistics. England: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1975. <u>Stylistics and the Teaching of Literature</u>. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Yewangoe, A.A. 2002. <u>Iman, Agama, dan Masyarakat dalam Negara Pancasila</u>. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia.

http://www.essaymill.com/free-essays/inmers/m2598.htm.

http://www.k-1.com/Orwell/animf.htm.