

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter deals with the data analysis as well as interpretation. It covers the discussion of the correlation analysis aimed at figuring out the existentialism of the main characters which opposes to positivism and rationalism and their purpose of doing so.

#### **4.1 The Existentialism of the Main Characters**

In order to answer the first statement of the problem, the writer attempts to elaborate the data analysis one by one. In this sub chapter, the writer will clarify the main characters' existentialism in each play in opposing to positivism and rationalism.

##### **4.1.1 Smirnov's Existentialism toward Popova in "The Bear"**

"The Bear" by Anton Chekhov consists of three characters, they are Smirnov, Popova and Luka. At first, Smirnov as a landowner asks politely to Popova about her deceased husband's debt. Instead of giving the money, without feeling sorry, Popova tells Smirnov to come back tomorrow because she does not have any money that day. Smirnov gets annoyed and heats up. His dignity as a landowner is trampled. People who borrow money from him should be scared and pay the debt directly, but Popova. At this moment, Smirnov shows off his existence by opposing positivism and rationalism. As explained in the previous chapter, positivism and rationalism here are an individual's behavior affected by others

while existentialism is independent. There are the lines of Smirnov which are obviously flaunting his existence toward Popova:

Excerpt 1:

POPOVA. You'll have your money the day after tomorrow.

SMIRNOV. I don't want the money the day after tomorrow, I want it today.

POPOVA. You must excuse me, I can't pay you.

SMIRNOV. And I can't wait till after tomorrow.

POPOVA. Well, what can I do, if I haven't the money now!

SMIRNOV. You mean to say, you can't pay me?

POPOVA. I can't. (Medellin, 2007: 87-88)

From the three Smirnov's lines above, he clearly denies Popova's reason that she cannot pay the debt that day. Smirnov denies it without getting affected by Popova's reason such in "You must excuse me, I can't pay you". Instead, he insists to get his money that day by saying "And I can't wait till after tomorrow". In quotation above, Smirnov shows his existence towards Popova as a powerful landowner. The writer finds it is an existence as Catalano and Kaufmann's statement that an individual is independent and not affected by others but himself. This fact is opposing positivism whereas a behavior is affected by an object. The fact will be supported by next quotation:

Excerpt 2:

POPOVA. I thought I distinctly said my steward will pay you when he returns from town.

SMIRNOV. I didn't come to your steward, but to you! What the devil, excuse my saying so, have I to do with your steward!  
(Medellin, 2007: 88)

The quotation above supports that Smirnov clearly rejects Popova's reason. Bacon in Vanzo (2012) mentioned that rationalism proceeds something upon

reason, but here Smirnov clearly denies Popova's reason means he opposes rationalism.

Popova's reason here, from first and second quotations are as the fact that she cannot pay the debt since she does not have money that day. Based on Priya (2015), one the characteristics of positivism is fact is the object of knowledge. So Popova's reason is known as object since it is fact. The writer assumes that positivism is objective since there is fact as object.

As Catalano (1974: 9) said that existence is a fundamental act that caused a thing to be independent and Kaufmann (1968: 12) that individual's behavior is not affected by others but himself, in this state, Smirnov does it.

Besides being independent, Smirnov also does some actions that indicate an existence such as self-description, freedom, and subjective. Those conditions will be discussed deeper below.

Excerpt 3:

SMIRNOV. ...What a way to reason! *A man is in desperate need of his money*, and she won't pay it because, you see, she is not disposed to attend to money matters! . . . That's real silly feminine logic. That's why I never did like, and don't like now, to have to talk to women. *I'd rather sit on a barrel of gunpowder than talk to a woman. Brr! . . . I feel quite chilly...* (Medellin, 2007: 89 *my italic*)

In the sentence "A man is in desperate need of this money" means Smirnov does not care at all about Popova's condition even though she told him clearly that she does not have cash that time. In the sentence, Smirnov only focuses on what happened to him, it is supported by the next sentence "I'd rather sit on a barrel of gunpowder than talk to a woman" this condition can be called as self-description.

The rest italics indicate that he only focuses on what happened to himself. There are more quotations as evidences that Smirnov is doing self-description as follows,

Excerpt 4:

SMIRNOV. ... You can be ill for a week, if you like, and I'll stay here for a week. . . . If you're ill for a year — I'll stay for a year. I'm going to get my own, my dear!... ..I sleep badly... ..My head's aching...

...  
SMIRNOV. ...It's rather impolite to come into a drawing-room in this state, but it can't be helped. . . . I am not here as a visitor, but as a creditor...

...  
SMIRNOV. Oh, how angry I am! So angry that I think I could grind the whole world to dust. . . . I even feel sick...

...  
SMIRNOV. ... I stay here and shall wait until I get it. [Sits down] You're going to pay me the day after tomorrow? Very well! I'll stay here until the day after tomorrow. I'll sit here all the time...

...  
SMIRNOV. No, I do know how to behave before women! (Medellin, 2007: 90-92)

From the quotation above, Smirnov is so strict when it comes to his aim such in “I’m going to get my own”, Smirnov even states that he will stay a year if he has to get what he want to. “I sleep badly”, “my head’s aching”, “how angry I am!”, “I even feel sick”, and “I do know how to behave before woman”, those sentences indicate that Smirnov is doing self-description. He states many times that he will stay there no matter what happened to Popova at least he gets his aim. He even explains that he is a creditor not a visitor, it means he wants to be respected. His self-description will be supported by quotation below:

Excerpt 5:

SMIRNOV. ...Just because *I'm too gentle* with them, because *I'm a rag*, just weak wax in their hands! *I'm much too gentle*

with them! Well, just you wait! You'll find out what *I'm* like! I shan't let you play about with me, confound it! I shall jolly well stay here until she pays! Brr!. . . How angry I am today, *how angry I am!* All my inside is quivering with anger, and I can't even breathe. . . . Foo, my word, *I even feel sick!* (Medellin, 2007: 89 *my italic*)

The quotation above clearly shows about how Smirnov feels that time. The writer picks sentences with “I” and “my” from Smirnov’s lines which indicate that he is full of himself. The sentences “I’m much too gentle”, “how angry I am”, and “I even feel sick” are clearly seen that he only cares about himself. In “I’m much too gentle” Smirnov believes that everything happened to him is because of him himself. Then in “how angry I am” and “I even feel sick” Smirnov only concerns about what happened to himself, he does not care about what happened to others, in this case is Popova that has a rational reason why she does not pay the debt. In existentialism those kind of statements are called authenticity. Kaufmann (1968) stated that authenticity governed existentialism. Further, Crowell (2004) stated that authenticity is a condition on self-making. Self-making or self-description is a condition where a person is being subjective. His behavior is made by himself without any interferences from others’.

Next, the writer will discuss about Smirnov being subjective as seen in the quotation below:

Excerpt 6:

POPOVA. Then, according to you, who is faithful and constant in love? Is it the man?

SMIRNOV. Yes, the man! (Medellin, 2007: 94)

“Yes, the man!” is obviously indicated that Smirnov is subjective since he is a man so he choose his own gender. He even answers it without give it a thought.

Other quotations that support Smirnov’s subjective side are as follows,

Excerpt 7:

SMIRNOV. *I have not the pleasure of being either your husband or your fiancé*, so please don’t make scenes. [Sits] I don’t like it.

...  
SMIRNOV. We’ll fight it out! *I’m not going to be insulted by anybody, and I don’t care if you are a woman*, one of the “softer sex,” indeed!

...  
SMIRNOV. *I’ll bring her down like a chicken! I’m not a little boy or a sentimental puppy; I don’t care about this “softer sex.”*  
(Medellin, 2007: 96-98 *my italic*)

For the quotation above, the writer applies Kierkegaard’s statement in Cochrane (1956) that the subjective thinker is infinitely involved in the problem of his own eternal happiness. As in “I have not the pleasure of being either your husband or your fiancé” Smirnov decides himself whether it brings happiness for him or not, it clearly tells that Smirnov is a subjective thinker. Then in second sentence “...I’m not going to be insulted by anybody, and I don’t care if you are a woman...” as Mastin (2008) states that existentialism is a movement to describe whose who refuse to belong to any circle of thought, reject the state of anybody’s beliefs or systems, so from the sentence Smirnov uttered indicates that he is existentialist. Smirnov obviously does not care even if his opponent is a woman, he does not care about the gender as long as he is happy. It is supported by Smirnov’s next lines “I’ll bring her down like a chicken! I’m not a little boy or a sentimental puppy; I don’t care about this...”

#### 4.1.2 Lomov's Existentialism toward Natalya in "The Proposal"

"The Proposal" is a one-act play written by Anton Chekhov covered with his sense of humor. This play is about a man who wants to propose a girl. This man named Lomov. Lomov wants to propose Natalya who is a daughter of his neighbor, Chubukov. In order to get Natalya's heart, Lomov is supposed to tell his wealth and property he has.

Unfortunately, instead of getting Natalya's heart, they are involved in an argument because of misunderstanding between them. The hypochondriac Lomov is getting panic so he shows his existence toward Natalya, he forgets that he shall get Natalya's heart instead of quarreling with her. Lomov keeps opposing to positivism and rationalism by being subjective to show Natalya that he is right, he is better than her and capable to be her husband. There are lines of Lomov which state his existence toward Natalya:

Excerpt 1:

LOMOV. ... *I'm trembling all over*, just as if I'd got an examination before me. The great thing is, *I must have my mind made up*. *If I give myself time to think*, to hesitate, to talk a lot, to look for an ideal, or for real love, then *I'll never get married*. ...

But *I'm getting a noise in my ears* from excitement. [Drinks] And it's *impossible for me not to marry*. ... In the first place, *I'm already 35*—a critical age, so to speak. In the second place, I ought to lead a quiet and regular life. ... *I suffer from palpitations*, *I'm excitable* and always getting awfully upset. ... At this very moment *my lips are trembling*, and there's a twitch in my right eyebrow. ... But the very worst of all is *the way I sleep*. *I no sooner get into bed* and begin to go off when suddenly *something in my left side*—gives a pull, and I can feel it in my shoulder and head. ... *I jump up like a lunatic*, walk about a bit, and lie down again,

but as soon as *I begin to get off to sleep* there's another pull!  
And this may happen twenty times. ... (Medellin, 2007: 42-  
43 *my italic*)

From the Lomov's lines above, the writer picks some statements that indicate Lomov is subjective. Some of the statements are Lomov being full of himself whereas he only concerns about what happened to himself such in "I'm trembling all over", "I'm getting a noise in my ears", "impossible for me not to marry", "I'm already 35", and "my lips are trembling". He describes well about what happened to himself. Besides, he also mentions how shall he does so everything happens as his wish such in "I must have my mind made up" and "If I give myself to think". He concerns about what he shall do to himself so the things will happen his way. Further he talks about how he does not get a proper sleep because he is too worry about himself. This matter is called authenticity in existentialism. Crowell (2004) states that authenticity defines a condition on self-making. Self-making happens when an individual creates his personality without intervention by others so this individual can be an authentic human being.

It is not only those quotations above, there are many of Lomov's lines which indicate how subjective he is. They are as follows,

Excerpt 2:

LOMOV. ... I inherited my land, always had the greatest respect for  
your father and your late mother....

...

LOMOV. Natalya Ivanovna, I don't want the Meadows, but I am  
acting on principle. If you like, I'll make you a present of  
them.

...

LOMOV. Then you make out that I'm a land-grabber? Madam, never  
in my life have I grabbed anybody else's land, and I shan't



allow anybody to accuse me of having done so. ...  
(Medellin, 2007: 44-47)

The quotation above clearly shows that Lomov is describing himself well like in “I inherited my land” means that he is wealthy so he is capable as Natalya’s husband. Lomov even states that “always had the greatest respect for your father and your late mother”, from the sentence he shows his good side by describing himself toward Natalya. As Kierkegaard stressed that individuals must be in their own way without the aid of universal or objective standards. Sartre was the first prominent existentialist who adopts Kierkegaard’s existentialism term as a self-description. Being subjective can be classified as self-description.

From the next sentences, “Natalya Ivanovna, I don’t want the Meadows, but I am acting on principle.” Once again he describes himself, then he adds “If you like, I’ll make you a present of them.” to be good in front of Natalya. He wants Natalya sees him as a wealthy and nice man towards Natalya so she wants to marry him. He tells every good thing about himself to get Natalya’s heart. His pride is not about being nice and wealthy, but also the ability of a dog he has as the quotation below:

Excerpt 3:

LOMOV. I did it on principle. ... My land is worth little to me, but the principle...

...

LOMOV. The more so as I have evidence. My aunt’s grandmother gave the land to your father’s grandfather’s peasants...  
(Medellin, 2007: 54)

Lomov keeps doing self-description toward Natalya as shown in “My land is worth little to me”, it means he is wealthy enough so the cost of the land is not a big deal for him. While in “I have evidence” Lomov tends to show Natalya that he

is the one who is right. He has evidence, and only his evidence which is right and truthful. The two sentences above, Lomov is being subjective.

Besides being subjective by self-description, the writer finds out that Lomov also denies of being objective as seen in the next quotation.

Excerpt 4:

LOMOV. ...*My very best dog*, to say nothing of the expense. I gave Mironov 125 roubles for him.

NATALYA STEPANOVNA. It was too much, Ivan Vassilevitch.

LOMOV. *I think it was very cheap. He's a first-rate dog.*

NATALYA STEPANOVNA. Papa gave 85 roubles for his Squeezer, and Squeezer is heaps better than Guess!

LOMOV. Squeezer better than. Guess? *What an idea!* [Laughs] Squeezer better than Guess!

NATALYA STEPANOVNA. Of course he's better! Of course, Squeezer is young, he may develop a bit, but on points and pedigree he's better than anything that even Volchanetsky has got.

LOMOV. Excuse me, Natalya Stepanovna, but you forget that he is overshot, and an overshot always means the dog is a bad hunter! (Medellin, 2007: 54-55 *my italic*)

In the quotation above, Smirnov denies all Natalya's reason, he only believes what he wants to believe. Lomov starts with bragging his dog to Natalya by saying "My very best dog" and "I think it was very cheap. He's a first-rate dog." He says the second sentence to look wealthy. Then the argument between Lomov and Natalya begins when Natalya says that her dog is better than Lomov's even though hers is cheaper. Lomov cannot accept it so he starts being subjective even more such in "What an idea!" and "Excuse me, Natalya Stepanovna, but you forget that he is overshot, and an overshot always means the dog is a bad hunter!" he underestimates Natalya's dog. He believes that his dog is the best and others are

worse, so finds an unreliable excuse. Next, Lomov keeps being subjective in judging which dog is the best as in quotation below:

Excerpt 5:

LOMOV. *I assure you* that his lower jaw is shorter than the upper.

NATALYA STEPANOVNA. Have you measured?

LOMOV. Yes. He's all right at following, of course, but if you want him to get hold of anything...

NATALYA STEPANOVNA. In the first place, our Squeezer is a thoroughbred animal, the son of Harness and Chisels, while there's no getting at the pedigree of your dog at all. ... He's old and as ugly as a worn-out cab-horse.

LOMOV. He is old, but *I wouldn't take five Squeezers for him.* ... (Medellin, 2007: 55 *my italic*)

From previous quotation, Lomov subjectively says “I assure you...”, then Natalya argues and said “... He's old and as ugly as a worn-out cab-horse.” Natalya's statements is not totally denied by Lomov when he says “He is old” but Lomov adds “but, I wouldn't take five Squeezers for him.” It means he keeps looking down on Natalya's dog and does not listen to her explanation. Bacon in Vanzo (2012) stated that rationalism proceeds something upon reason, but Lomov clearly denies Natalya's reason which means he opposes rationalism.

#### **4.1.3. Ivan's Existentialism toward Murashkin in “A Tragedian in Spite of Himself”**

Ivan Ivanovitch Tolkachov is a husband, a father of a family. He is the main character of Chekhov's one act play entitled “A Tragedian in Spite of Himself” written in 1889. This play is about a husband who is tired of his own life. He comes to his friend, Murashkin, to borrow a revolver to kill himself. Ivan comes to

Murashkin's house with hands full of things he bought. Ivan tells his friend about his tiring and monotonous life. Ivan opposes positivism and rationalism when nagging because his proud as a man is hurt.

In this play, Ivan does not oppose to someone like the two main characters previously mentioned, but to his own life instead. So it will be a little bit different from the previous discussion. The exact explanation will be discussing below:

Excerpt 1:

TOLKACHOV. ... *I am dog-tired. I've got a feeling all over me, and in my head as well, as if I've been roasted on a spit. I can't stand it any longer. Be a friend, and don't ask me any questions or insist on details; just give me the revolver! I beseech you!* (Medellin, 2007: 105 *my italic*)

In his nagging above, Ivan starts with self-description as in "I am dog-tired." He describes his tiring life as tired as worker dog. Then he adds "if I've been roasted on a spit. I can't stand it any longer." To tell that he is already on his limit as a human being and he cannot stand it any longer. The writer assumes that this kind of self-description is an existentialism based on how Webber (2009) portrays Sartre's idea about existentialism which is adopted from Kierkegaard that existentialism is a self-description term.

For Sartre in Yale University Press (2012), individuals are responsible for their own choices. As Ivan states in the next sentence, "...and don't ask me any questions or insist on details; just give me the revolver!" in this state Ivan chooses his own path and takes responsible for it so he does not want others to interrupt him.

In the next discussion, the writer will talk about when Ivan declines reason or opposes rationalism as in the quotation below:

Excerpt 2:

MURASHKIN. Well, really! Ivan Ivanovitch, what cowardice is this? The father of a family and a Civil Servant holding a responsible post! For shame!

TOLKACHOV. *What sort of a father of a family am I! I am a martyr. I am a beast of burden, a nigger, a slave, a rascal who keeps on waiting here for something to happen instead of starting off for the next world. I am a rag, a fool, an idiot. Why am I alive? What's the use? [Jumps up] Well now, tell me why am I alive? What's the purpose of this uninterrupted series of mental and physical sufferings? I understand being a martyr to an idea, yes! But to be a martyr to the devil knows what, skirts and lamp-globes, no! I humbly decline! No, no, no! I've had enough! Enough!*

MURASHKIN. Don't shout, the neighbours will hear you!

TOLKACHOV. *Let your neighbours hear; it's all the same to me! If you don't give me a revolver somebody else will, and there will be an end of me anyway! I've made up my mind!* (Medellin, 2007: 105 *my italic*)

Murashkin, Ivan's friend, in the quotation above tells him about who he is actually, but Ivan declines it and says the opposition instead like in "What sort of a father of a family am I! I am a martyr. I am a beast of burden, a nigger, a slave, a rascal...". Ivan describes himself as his belief who he is. It is exactly rejecting the fact that Murashkin tells about him. It related to Mastin (2008) that existentialism is a movement to describe those who refuse to belong to any circle of thought, reject the state of anybody's beliefs or system. From the theory, the writer comes with an idea that existentialism asserts people to make decisions based on subjective meaning rather than pure rationality. In this case, Ivan is being subjective and opposing rationalism. He keeps describing himself subjectively such in "I am a rag, a fool, an idiot." He sees himself as an idiot and do not deserve to live anymore. Furthermore Murashkin tells him to not shouting but he declines it and says "Let

your neighbours hear; it's all the same to me!" The sentence indicates that Ivan will do what he wants to do and nobody can interrupt his decision such as in the end of his sentence "I've made up my mind!" it clearly tells he will decide it himself.

After all this play is about the nagging Ivan. The writer writes so because almost the whole story contents of Ivan describing himself subjectively. Ivan tells the daily story about himself, but sometimes he uses Murashkin as the subject with pronoun "you" so Murashkin can feel what he does. The writer gathers some quotations as follows:

Excerpt 3:

TOLKACHOV. ...*you* spend the time between *your* office and *your* train, running about the town like a dog with *your* tongue hanging out, running and running and cursing life...

...In one place you stumble, in a second *you* lose your money, in a third you forget to pay and they raise a hue and cry after *you*, in a fourth you tread on the train of a lady's dress. ...

... *You* get so shaken up from all this that *your* bones ache all night and *you* dream of crocodiles. Well, *you've* made all *your* purchases, but how are *you* to pack all these things? For instance, how are *you* to put a heavy copper jar together with the lamp-globe or the carbolic acid with the tea? How are *you* to make a combination of beer-bottles and this bicycle? It's the labours of Hercules, a puzzle, a rebus! Whatever tricks you think of, in the long run *you're* bound to smash or scatter something, and at the station and in the train *you* have to stand with *your* arms apart, holding up some parcel or other under *your* chin, with parcels, cardboard boxes, and such-like rubbish all over *you*.

...

*You* can't protest. *You* are a husband, and the word husband when translated into the language of summer residents in the country means a dumb beast...

...

If *you* go to a dance *you* have to find partners for *your* wife,...

...

*You* smoke, and go for them, and cover *yourself* from head to foot, but it is no good! At last *you* have to sacrifice *yourself* and let the cursed things devour *you*. (Medellin, 2007: 107-109 *my italic*)

The quotation above is taken when Ivan starts telling Murashkin about his life from his point of view. In the plays, this part takes almost five pages. He tells in detail what he has been suffered so far. Ivan uses pronoun “you” when he tells Murashkin his story as in “...you spend the time between your office and your train, running about the town like a dog with your tongue hanging out...” Ivan positioning Murashkin as he by using pronoun “you” in his story.

For Kierkegaard in Cochrane (1956) the subjective thinker is infinitely involved in the problem of his own eternal happiness. In this case, Ivan positioning Murashkin to have a support from Murashkin so he agrees about what Ivan feels. When Ivan says “you spend the time” exactly means that “I spend the time” so as in “you lose your money” means that “I lose my money”. Ivan even says clearly what he feels when he becomes a husband in “You can’t protest. You are a husband, and the word husband when translated into the language of summer residents in the country means a dumb beast...” Ivan describes himself as a dumb beast. The sentence represents Ivan’s feeling as a husband and he wants Murashkin feel it as well that is why Ivan uses pronoun “you”.

## 4.2 The Purposes of the Main Characters in Showing Existentialism

Sartre's existence precedes essence once explained by Webber (2009) that individuals do not have natures or essences, they determine their behavior. In shorts they define their own self. In the plays, Chekhov makes the main characters define their own self to achieve their purposes. Every main character has his own purpose to achieve in each play. From Kierkegaard's point of view as written in Cochrane (1956: 24) that the subjective thinker is infinitely involved in the problem of his own eternal happiness. The Kierkegaard's point of view above will be the reference to find out the purposes of the main characters. The writer assumes that the main characters proposes are their own eternal happiness. In this sub chapter, the writer will elaborate what and how the main characters do to achieve their eternal happiness to answer the second statement of the problem.

### 4.2.1 Smirnov's Purpose in Showing Existentialism toward Popova in "The Bear"

The Bear is about a landowner named Smirnov who wants to collect the debt from Nikolai. Unfortunately, Nikolai dead. When Smirnov comes to his house, he meet his wife, Popova, who does not have cash that day so she cannot pay the debt right away. Smirnov gets annoyed by hearing Popova's answer as in the question below:

Excerpt 1:

POPOVA. You'll have your money the day after tomorrow.

SMIRNOV. I don't want the money the day after tomorrow, I want it today.

POPOVA. You must excuse me, I can't pay you.



SMIRNOV. And I can't wait till after tomorrow.  
 POPOVA. Well, what can I do, if I haven't the money now!  
 SMIRNOV. You mean to say, you can't pay me?  
 POPOVA. I can't. (Medellin, 2007: 87-88)

In the quotation above, Popova clearly tells that she will pay tomorrow such in "You'll have your money the day after tomorrow." But Smirnov does not want to by saying "I don't want the money the day after tomorrow, I want it today." then adds "And I can't wait till after tomorrow." The rejection of Smirnov is indicated by previous experience when he asked his debtors who did not pay him. Smirnov nags about how the debtors look down on him in the quotation below:

Excerpt 2:

SMIRNOV. ... I meet a man on the road, and he asks me "Why are you always so angry, Grigory Stepanovitch?" But how on earth am I not to get angry? *I want the money desperately. I rode out yesterday, early in the morning, and called on all my debtors, and not a single one of them paid up!* I was just about dead-beat after it all, slept, goodness knows where, in some inn, kept by a Jew, with a vodka-barrel by my head. At last I get here, seventy versts from home, and hope to get something, and I am received by you with a "state of mind"! How shouldn't I get angry. (Medellin, 2007: 88 *my italic*)

As seen in the italic above, Smirnov is angry just like he said on "I want the money desperately. I rode out yesterday, early in the morning, and called on all my debtors, and not a single one of them paid up!". Smirnov tells how he gets frustrated because of the debtors. He tired of being nice to his debtors so they do not want to pay. This case hurts Smirnov's pride as a landowner. To get his pride back, he wants to change his method to collect his money from his debtors. The quotation below will show how Smirnov comes with new method in collect debt.

Excerpt 3:

SMIRNOV. ... I go to Grusdev and he isn't at home, Yaroshevitch has hidden himself, I had a violent row with Kuritsin and nearly threw him out of the window, Mazugo has something the matter with his bowels, and this woman has "a state of mind." Not one of the swine wants to pay me! *Just because I'm too gentle with them, because I'm a rag, just weak wax in their hands! I'm much too gentle with them! Well, just you wait! You'll find out what I'm like! I shan't let you play about with me, confound it!* I shall jolly well stay here until she pays! Brr! ... How angry I am to-day, how angry I am! All my inside is quivering with anger, and I can't even breathe. ... Foo, my word, I even feel sick! [Yells] Waiter! (Medellin, 2007: 89, *my italic*)

From the italic above, the writer applied Kaufmann's authenticity, a term that individual's behavior is not affected by other but himself, governed existentialism (1968). In the sentence above, "Just because I'm too gentle with them, because I'm a rag, just weak wax in their hands! I'm much too gentle with them! Well, just you wait! You'll find out what I'm like! I shan't let you play about with me, confound it!" Smirnov believes that the cause of his debtors do not want to pay him because he is a gentle debt collector, he is a rag, a weak wax. He blames himself then he states that he shall not let Popova plays with him because he wants to get his money this time. If he keeps being gentle toward his debtors, he will not be paid and his reputation as a landowner will be looked down by his debtors.

In the next discussion, the writer attempts to show how Smirnov change himself into a powerful landowner who is strict and strong. In this time he has determine to collect his money from Popova. In the quotation below will be seen how Smirnov strictly asks Popova to pay the debt that day.

Excerpt 4:

SMIRNOV. *Please don't shout, I'm not your steward! You must allow me to call things by their real names. I'm not a woman, and I'm used to saying what I think straight out! Don't you shout, either!*

POPOVA. I'm not shouting, it's you! Please leave me alone!

SMIRNOV. *Pay me my money and I'll go.*

POPOVA. I shan't give you any money!

SMIRNOV. *Oh, no, you will.* (Medellin, 2007: 95, *my italic*)

From the italic above, clearly seen that Smirnov starts showing up his power as a landowner as in “Please don’t shout, I’m not your steward! You must allow me to call things by their real names.” To Kierkegaard in Panza and Gale (2008: 135), passionate people are inward because they strive to be and to exist as subjects not as objects. Further, a subject is active in its existence due to its capacity to choose how to exist or face the future. Smirnov’s statement above who starts showing up his power can be included as passionate people. Smirnov is being passionate to show his existence by saying “I’m not your steward!” on the other hands means “I’m a landowner!” so in his next line he says “Pay me my money and I’ll go.” Then adds “Oh, no, you will.” His short sentences are showing how serious he is. In the next quotation, the writer will show Smirnov seriousness about his landowner dignity so he even does not care about anybody.

Excerpt 5:

SMIRNOV. We'll fight it out! I'm not going to be insulted by anybody, and I don't care if you are a woman, one of the “softer sex,” indeed!

...

SMIRNOV. I'll bring her down like a chicken! I'm not a little boy or a sentimental puppy; I don't care about this “softer sex.” (Medellin, 2007: 98)

The two Smirnov’s lines above indicates that he is serious with his coming to get his debt paid. Panza and Gale (2008) states that passionate people take their

very existence seriously. In cultivating their passion, they seek to develop their subjectivity, or existence as a subject (p.135). From the line "...I'm not going to be insulted by anybody, and I don't care if you are a woman..." clearly shows that Smirnov is subjective. He develops his existence as a landowner by saying "I'm not a little boy or a sentimental puppy; I don't care about this "softer sex."" The sentence has meaning that he is a big man and strong landowner who can get his debt paid anytime he wants even gender is not a matter for him.

Kierkegaard in Cochrane (1956) stated the subjective thinker is infinitely involved in the problem of his own eternal happiness. Along with Panza and Gale (2008: 135) that passionate people are purposeful, just like in "I shall jolly well stay here until she pays!" by Smirnov (Medellin, 2007: 89) in order to achieve his purpose which is his own happiness, Smirnov is being passionate in showing his power is landowner to get the debt paid. So in this case, Smirnov is being subjective and opposing positivism and rationalism for his pride as a landowner and get the debt paid.

#### **4.2.2 Lomov's Purpose in Showing Existentialism toward Natalya in "The Proposal"**

As the title of the play, "The Proposal", Lomov is willing to marry Natalya, his neighbor's daughter. His neighbor is Chubukov, a rich landowner. So Lomov needs to be looked worth to marry his daughter as can be seen in the quotation below:

Excerpt 1:

CHUBUKOV. ...My dear fellow, why are you so formal in your get-up? Evening dress, gloves, and so on....

...  
CHUBUKOV. Then why are you in evening dress, my precious? As if you're paying a New Year's Eve visit! (Medellin, 2007: 41)

Chubukov's lines above describe how Lomov appearance is when he comes to Chubukov's house. From the lines "... why are you so formal in your get-up? Evening dress, gloves, and so on...." and "...As if you're paying a New Year's Eve visit!" obviously known that Lomov is well-prepared by wearing formal dress when comes to visit his neighbor. Not only appearance to impress Natalya and family, Lomov also flaunts his belongings such in the quotation below:

Excerpt 2:

LOMOV. Natalya Ivanovna, I don't want the Meadows, but I am acting on principle. *If you like, I'll make you a present of them.* (Medellin, 2007: 46 *my italic*)

In the quotation above, Lomov flaunts his belongings because he wants to be looked as a capable fiancé, as seen in "If you like, I'll make you a present of them." Lomov asserts that he is rich and able to give Natalya a big present. In order to achieve his purpose Lomov starts by doing self-description and talks subjectively about himself towards Natalya. Lomov describes how rich he is by words. As Sartre's phrase, existence precedes essence, Panza and Gale explains that a human being is essentially a creature that creates his own essence. You must define yourself through your choices and action (2008: 165). In this case, Lomov defines himself and chooses to be looked as a rich man who is capable to be Natalya's husband by dressing luxurious and flaunting his wealth. So Lomov can be called subjective since he makes his own decision without interfered by others, in shorts

as self-description. Further, Smirnov does not only self-describing himself but also humiliate the other so he looked higher, as seen in the next quotation below:

Excerpt 3:

LOMOV. And with good reason. The dogs are running after a fox,  
when Squeezer goes and starts worrying a sheep!  
(Medellin, 2007: 58)

From the quotation above, Lomov is comparing his dog with Nataya's. He says "And with good reason. The dogs are running after a fox, when Squeezer goes and starts worrying a sheep!" It means that he has a better quality dog compare to Natalya's. He said so in case to make a good impression towards Natalya that a good dog is owned by a good man. Next, the writer will show how straightforward Lomov is in humiliate his opponent just for his own sake.

Excerpt 4:

LOMOV. And are you a hunter? *You only go hunting to get in with the Count and to intrigue. ... Oh, my heart! ... You're an intriguer!*  
CHUBUKOV. What? I an intriguer? [Shouts] Shut up!  
LOMOV. *Intriguer!*  
CHUBUKOV. Boy! Pup!  
LOMOV. *Old rat! Jesuit!* (Medellin, 2007: 59, *my italic*)

From the previous quotation, Lomov bravely mocking Chubukov by saying "...You only go hunting to get in with the Count and to intrigue... You're an intriguer!", "Intriguer!", and even dare to call Smirnov "Old rat!". The writer applies Kierkegaard's idea as written in Cochrane (1956: 24) that the subjective thinker is infinitely involved in the problem of his own eternal happiness, that Lomov is mocking his opponent in case to make his class looked higher. Normally,

Lomov will get into trouble if he mocks Chubukov like that, but his purpose makes him safe. What is his purpose? His purpose can be seen in the quotation as follows:

Excerpt 5:

LOMOV. One moment ... this very minute. The fact is, *I've come to ask the hand of your daughter, Natalya Stepanovna, in marriage.* (Medellin, 2007; 41-42 *my italic*)

Absolutely Lomov comes there with a willing. What is his willing? The answer can be found from Lomov's line in italic above that he comes to ask the hand of Chubukov's daughter, Natalya Stepanovna, in marriage. Lomov wants to propose Natalya, his neighbor's daughter, which is why he wears such in evening dress and do such things only to be looked stunning in front of Natalya and her family. This subjective side of Lomov is an existentialism. In this rate Lomov is being subjective and opposing positivism and rationalism to be able to marry Natalya.

#### **4.2.3 Ivan's Purposes in Showing Existentialism toward Murashkin in "A Tragedian in Spite of Himself"**

Ivan is an ordinary father and husband that tired with his monotonous life. He comes to his friend's house with bunch of things on both his hands to borrow a revolver. His words when asking is suspicious so Murashkin, his friend, does not give him the revolver. Instead, Murashkin asks his reason for being frustrated as seen in the quotation below:

Excerpt 1:

TOLKACHOV. ... *I implore you lend me a revolver till to-morrow.*  
Be a friend!

MURASHKIN. What do you want a revolver for?

TOLKACHOV. I must have it. ... Oh, little fathers! ... give me some water ... *water quickly!* ... *I must have it ... I've got to go through a dark wood to-night, so in case of accidents ... do, please, lend it to me.*

MURASHKIN. Oh, you liar, Ivan Ivanovitch! What the devil have you got to do in a dark wood? *I expect you are up to something. I can see by your face that you are up to something.* What's the matter with you? Are you ill?

TOLKACHOV. ... I can't stand it any longer. Be a friend, and don't ask me any questions or insist on details; just give me the revolver! *I beseech you!*

...

MURASHKIN. Hold on, you've pulled off a button. Speak calmly. I still don't understand what's wrong with your life. (Medellin, 2007: 104-106 *my italic*)

From the quotation above, Ivan urgently ask to borrow a revolver from Murashkin as seen in “I implore you lend me a revolver...” and “I must have it” the way he says them are suspicious. Ivan even says “...I've got to go through a dark wood to-night, so in case of accidents...” which makes thing becomes more suspicious. For Sartre and the existentialists as written in Panza and Gale (2008) that facing the reality of your own morality is an awakening experience. If you respond to it properly, if you don't run from it, it heightens your awareness of your own inevitable engagement in life: the degree to which your life is a choice and the degree to which that choice is yours (p.163). As Sartre's, the writer assumes that Ivan who is tired of his life will choose something risky with the revolver, whether to kill people or himself or to get something from Murahskin based on “your life is a choice and the choice is yours”. The writer look at the subjective side of Ivan. This presumption also felt by Murashkin. He smells something fishy from Ivan's words, so he says “...I expect you are up to something. I can see by your face that



you are up to something...” as a friend, normally he asks what the matter is. At this state, Ivan finally gets Murashkin attention.

Ivan gets his first intention that is attention from Murashkin. Then Ivan subjectively tells Murashkin the story his frustrating life. He even uses pronoun “you” in order to make Murashkin feels what Ivan has been suffered in life as in the quotation below:

Excerpt 2:

TOLKACHOV. ...*you* spend the time between *your* office and *your* train, running about the town like a dog with *your* tongue hanging out, running and running and cursing life...

...

*You* can't protest. You are a husband, and the word husband when translated into the language of summer residents in the country means a dumb beast which you can load to any extent without fear of the interference of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. (Medellin, 2007: 107-108 *my italic*)

From the quotation above, Ivan actually tells story about himself. He uses the pronoun “you” in order to Murashkin can feel how Ivan's feel these days. Ivan nags about five pages in this plays and he changes almost all the pronoun that supposed to be “I” into “you”. In Panza and Gale (2008: 136) stated that existentialists are concerned with how people pursue it. So it is important to remember that people are free to figure out what path to take and pursue it with passion and engagement, with a fire of lived intensity. In this case, Ivan has choose his path, so he pursues it with his passion by using that kind of technique, changes pronoun “I” into “you” in order to achieve his purpose. His purpose is can be seen in the quotation below:

Excerpt 3:

TOLKACHOV. ... And nobody has any sympathy for me, and everybody seems to think it's all as it should be. People even laugh. But understand, I am a living being and I want to live! This isn't farce, it's tragedy. I say, if you don't give me your revolver, you might at any rate sympathize.

MURASHKIN. I do sympathize.

TOLKACHOV. I see how much you sympathize. ... Good-bye. ...  
(Medellin, 2007: 110)

The quotation above shows the anti-climax of Ivan. After telling a long story about his life, he finally confesses that there is nobody who feels his pain such in "...And nobody has any sympathy for me, and everybody seems to think it's all as it should be. People even laugh..." However he adds his desperate willing that he wants to live. From the quotation, clearly says that he needs a sympathy at least. Ivan is absolutely looking for sympathy toward Murashkin by being subjective. As Kierkegaard in Cochrane (1956) stated the subjective thinker is infinitely involved in the problem of his own eternal happiness. Ivan's eternal happiness in his tiring life is at least lets people know his struggle in life. Ivan opposes positivism and rationalism in the story and being subjective with propose to get other people sympathy.