

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Existentialism

Existentialism is a philosophical movement which concerns on the problem of what it means to be human. This philosophical movement gives strong emphasis on the individuality, personal freedom, and passionate commitment. Existentialism was considered firstly established by a Danish philosopher, namely Kierkegaard. However the establishment of Existentialism as a movement itself is somewhat fabricated as the matter of fact none of the existentialist figures would recognize themselves as the part of a movement (except Sartre) (Solomon, 2000). As the first existentialist, Kierkegaard proposes a work which heavily concerns on the individual's subjectivity, passion and commitment as the very aspects which determine the quality of human's existence. To truly exist, as he insists, one must really engage and consciously participate in their activities of will and choice. Kierkegaard's philosophy attempts to criticize collective rationalism and modernity that, according to him, is potentially creating a mass culture with a mass mentality which in turn bring the shallowness and rendering people to be less conscious about their responsibilities by reducing it to fraction (Hasan, 1992:30).

Furthermore Nietzsche (1967) suggests that to really exist is to actualize one's ultimate talent and virtue. He attempts two different types of morality

namely Master and Slave, which he clearly favours the former. Master morality is characterized by independency and powerfulness. In contrast Slave morality is signified by the resentfulness, servility and powerlessness (Solomon, 2000:42). Thus he suggests that everyone must live his life to the fullest by really working hard and relying on his true power to accomplish his highest hope in life. The idea of the "will to power" is predominant in Nietzsche's philosophy. This "power" does not necessarily mean the power over others to control or dominate but power of creativity and imagination (ibid. p. 48). Moreover Nietzsche (1967) recommends people not to '*will something beyond his capacity*'. It shows that similar to Kierkegaard, how self-understanding is above all, central in his philosophy. For Nietzsche (1967) people are for the most part not so reflective, thus he suggests that "becoming the person who you truly are" as the most important thing that one needs to do in the first place. Later Heidegger (1996) articulates the term '*Eigentlich*' (*Authentic*) to denote the state when one chooses his "ownmost" potentiality-for-Being (Inwood, 1999:22). For Heidegger (1996) to really exist as human being is to have possibilities and capacity to choose among them. Similarly Sartre (1992) suggests that to really exist, one must be free to choose what one wants to be and responsible once the choice is made. He believes that human are absolutely free and insists that "existence precedes essence". Thus no matter the circumstances are, Sartre (1992) suggests that one always has choices and free to choose whether something is really an obstacle or not. Moreover, in choosing for himself, one is always at the same time, choosing for all mankind. As a matter of fact, in becoming the way he wants to be, man is

always at the same time creating certain image that he thinks is ideal for man to be. Thus everyone is actually responsible not just for the way he is but ultimately for the way the world is as well.

2.1.1 Existential authenticity

At the heart of existentialism philosophy is the concept of authenticity. In a broad sense, authenticity refers to the genuineness or originality of events or things. But in the context of existential philosophy it refers to the state when one is being true to oneself existentially. This notion become central and ultimately gained its particular references especially in the work of Heidegger, *Being and Time*. Stated in general being authentic means to act upon one's own authority, that is not letting oneself being influenced more by the environment than by oneself in determining how one wants to live. This is done, according to some existential philosophers, by being subjective and involving one's inner self in making a decision or commitment (Kierkegaard, 1985); having a highest hope in life and a will to power (Nietzsche, 1969); being attuned to one's own experiences rather than interpreting the world through institutionalized concepts or abstractions (Heidegger, 1996); and being free and responsible in making oneself as one wants to be (Sartre, 1992). Latter Jacob Golomb (1995), in '*In Search of Authenticity: From Kierkegaard and Camus*', suggests that authenticity is an incessant movement of becoming, self-transcendence and self-creation and a protest against the blind mechanical acceptance of an externally imposed code of values.

2.2 Heidegger's concept of authenticity

Heidegger uses the term authenticity to define a condition in which one resolves to choose one 'own-most' possibility for being oneself or the possibility in which one feels belong at one given situation (Heidegger, 1996:40). It is distinguished from the inauthentic mode of being in which one is being more influenced by the environment or 'publicness' rather than by oneself in determining one's way. The self of everyday Dasein or as Heidegger calls *They-self* is inauthentic for it is something that is not from individuals own making; it is rather impersonal, anonymous yet it is simply taken for granted in order to be linked to one another (Heidegger, 1996: 121). In spite of this Heidegger suggests that both inauthenticity and authenticity are seen as positive phenomenon. The two kinds of mode of being are used to describe the dynamics of the existence of human being in the world. However the authenticity is in turn become normative if the case is one becomes estranged from oneself and constrained to see himself and the others as well as indistinct self or merely a carrier of social role (Golomb, 1995).

This can be happened as the 'average everydayness' where one is plunged tends to obscure the unique possibilities of one's own being because in the everydayness things are seemed to be closed off and has been publicly interpreted. However this does not necessarily means that to be authentic therefore demands one to detach himself from the everydayness. Instead to be authentic demands one to make meaning out of meaninglessness of indifference everydayness. As Heidegger (1996:40) insists that authenticity must be understood in term of

existentiality. It is something that gained through a continual process of becoming and anticipating the way one truly engaged. Simply put the authenticity is not merely about the 'what' but 'how' one perceives himself, his everydayness and ultimately his life.

To explore Heidegger's concept of authenticity, it is necessary to begin with his view about human existence. Traditionally scholars define human being in terms of rationality, speech or will in order to distinguish it from other entities. However Heidegger argues that such definition of human being only tends to resemble the definition of things (Stumpf & Fieser, 2008). Thus Heidegger avoids of defining people in terms of objectively present properties or attributes that divide them from world. Instead he emphasizes the fact that human being is the only being who questioning its own being as a more fundamental characteristic that makes human being is distinguished from other entities (Hardiman,2016). Indeed sometimes, we wonder about why do we exist in this world?; How are we supposed to be? And why the world or reality appears to us as what it is?

Heidegger (1996:40) uses the term *Dasein* to refer an individual human being (the term human being is considered to bring a too general sense thus *Dasein* is used to give a very personal sense of a distinct individual; everyone is *Dasein* and there is no *Dasein* in general). The term is designated not to express its what, but to emphasize its way of existence in the world. The term *Dasein* is derived from German words mean 'being-there'. Precisely the 'there' refers to the world where human being is simply 'thrown'. *Dasein* as 'Being-in-the-world' cannot help but always find itself already 'thrown' into the world where its own

being becomes such an issue for it (Hadirman, 2016). Hence I was never being asked to be born neither discussed about what I would be but nonetheless here I am, 'thrown' into myself. The notion of 'throwness' (*Geworfenheit*) gives us such a recalling that sometimes we are not always the author of our life, there are something that beyond our control nor plan but they simply exist in our life and shape our roots. Heidegger gives the term 'facticity' to denote our roots or historicity wherein we are simply being 'thrown' (Steiner & Reisinger, 2006).

Furthermore the quality of 'being-in' in the notion of 'being-in-the-world' does not merely indicate the location of *Dasein* in the world as in the case of one thing being in another thing. Instead *Dasein* as 'being-in-the world' indicates a sense of a type of being wherein one is capable of thinking meaningfully about the world (Stumpf & Fieser, 2008). It has the same implication as the expression of 'being in love' for instance. Thus 'the world' in the phrase 'being-in-the-world' is not merely refer to nature or a global container but it is rather a context or circumstances which *Dasein* presupposes and dwells on (Taminiaux, 1991).

Inspired by Husserl's phenomenology, Heidegger suggests to approach 'human being' as *phenomena*, that is 'something that reveals itself in itself'. It is our individual human existence that reveals itself to us through our everyday encounters with the world (Stumpf & Fieser, 2008). In the other words, *Dasein's* 'throwness' into the world is essentially a disclosing processor 'understanding' to reveal its own meaning of being (Heidegger, 1996:134). Consequently the essence of human being or *Dasein* is essentially not fixed and therefore needs to be discovered through and through. In this regard, Heidegger gives an idea of

truth as *alethia*, a Greek term means ‘un-concealment’ or ‘un-forgetfulness’ (Guignon,2006:xxii). Therefore the process of revealing the self, or understand the meaning of one’s being, is a process of becoming. It is such an on-going task that needs continuity of self-creation and self-reflective since no truth can be gained completely in immediate way. For Heidegger the true self-knowledge is neither transparent nor immediate, but it is something that needs to be continually discovered and in order to revealed it one needs to pay head to his ‘attunement’ (*Befindlichkeit*) or moods. So that thinking about Heidegger’s philosophy is not just about how our consciousness receives the reality but how the reality let our consciousness receives it as what it appeared to us individually and how a given situation ‘attune’ our emotions. For Heidegger the truth is a matter of perspectival and thus the essence of individual human being lies in its existence or in its possible ways to be and only this.

“The essence of Da-sein lies in its existence. The characteristics to be found in this being are thus not objectively present attributes of an objectively present being which has such and such “outward appearance”, but rather possible ways it to be and only this.” (Heidegger,1996:40).

Since the essence of human being or *Dasein* lies in its existence, it is rather a possibility, and as possibility, according to Heidegger, *Dasein* can potentially lose and win itself or even “*can never and only “apparently” win itself*” (Heidegger,1996:40). When *Dasein* wins itself in which it is capable of taking hold of itself and choosing its ‘ownmost’ possibility for being oneself, it is the state when *Dasein* is being authentic. Conversely, *Dasein* is being inauthentic when it loses itself or has not yet gained itself and gets lost in the public world of

the they (*Das-Man*). Nevertheless, being inauthentic is something that is inescapable for *Dasein* as 'being-in-the-world' because it essentially always and already find itself 'plunged' into a narrow social milieu along with its shared normativity which inevitably constructs the everyday way of being a self of *Dasein* or as Heidegger calls *They-self* (ibid., 127). Heidegger (1996:314) points out that "for the most part, I myself am not the "who" of *Dasein*; the *They-Self* is its "who". Nonetheless Heidegger (1996:40) insists that being inauthentic itself is what defines *Dasein*'s totality as "being-in-the-world" and it is in fact necessary for *Dasein*'s process of revealing its-self because only after initially being lost in the the they, *Dasein* can realize its potentiality to be authentic (Heidegger, 1996:156).

2.3 The Turn from inauthenticity to authenticity

As *Dasein* as being-in-the-world is rather an 'understanding' or a process of revealing, thus the quest for authenticity is moved in a dynamic turn from inauthenticity to authenticity. *Dasein* is 'thrown' into itself where its own being becomes such an issue for it and it is entangled in the world as it plunges into the average everydayness in which things are made to be closed off and have been publicly interpreted (ibid.,167). As they-self, *Dasein* is still dispersed in 'the they', and thus must first find itself. *Angst* is the basic mood in which *Dasein* can realize its 'lostness' in the they. In *Angst* *Dasein* reveals its feature as 'being-possible'. As the following action of *Angst* is resoluteness. In resoluteness which defined the authentic mode of being (ibid., 334) one resolves to grasp one ownmost possibility for being oneself, making meaning out of meaninglessness of the

indifference ‘average everydayness’ and reappropriating one’s way of relating to the others, including oneself, to become more considerably liberating and encouraging.

2.3.1 The they (*Das Man*)

One thing that must be kept in mind is ‘the they’ does not necessarily refer to a group of people or society. It is rather a common normativity or impersonal understanding of what one’s possibilities are, an understanding that comes through shared social norms and is experienced via the general public, the media, friends and family, one’s upbringing, and so on. This common understanding of each Dasein’s possibilities, called ‘publicness’ by Heidegger (1996:165). Since we become familiar with the world, we internalize this ‘publicness’ as the common understanding which prescribes us about how we usually need to act or behave in our everydayness. The they is after all can be seen as something necessary in order to support people to have a kind of shared understanding which makes it possible for people to link to one another. As Dreyfus (1992:153) states *“das Man preserves averageness, which in turn is necessary for the functioning of the referential whole, and it is thanks to the one that there is a single shared public world rather than a plurality of individual worlds.”*

Despite the fact that the they is something that is inescapable and not even necessary to get rid of nonetheless what supposed to be underlined is Dasein does not necessarily and constantly have to be carried out all along by the they and lose a unique sense of its own Being (Heidegger, 1996:165). As the they (Das Man) is

basically just a set of common understanding, that prescribes only general or common possibilities applicable to everyone and thus tend to obscure the unique possibilities that individuals have in the first place. Following the ways of the they all along, Dasein tend to become forgetful about its fact as a distinct self with a unique possibilities and therefore estranged to itself. Thus Dasein needs to modify the they in accordance of Dasein's own projection to the future. Heidegger emphasizes that this modification must be done in term of existentiality.

'Authentic Being-one's-self takes the definition from an existentiell modification of the 'They''; and this modification must be defined existentially.'(Heidegger, 1996:312)

Hence it is not merely about the modification of one's outward appearance or behaviour so that it is distinguished from the others, but it precisely involves a continual process of re-appropriation. What supposed to be re-appropriated is one's attitude toward life to be more responsible for oneself and for the other. This is happened because inauthenticity basically signifies Dasein's tendency to flee from its responsibility when facing its freedom. *Angst* is the immediate response of this responsibility. However sometimes indeed we are tempted to flee from this responsibility and thus prefer to tranquilize ourselves in a 'publicness', we do conform and ignore what we really need to do in the first place as ourself. We flee in the face of our self by 'levelling down' ourselves into 'averageness' and become closed off for new possibilities in life (Golomb, 1995:70). According to Heidegger (1996), in averageness (*Durchschnittlichkeit*), the self or Dasein is not concerned with its own Being, its own self; it flees in the face of itself and

does not think of himself as a distinct self but merely as a part of a network or a carrier of a social role (for instance as a student, a woman, a lady etc).

Beside the 'averageness', another thing which characterized the inauthentic mode of being or they-self (in which Dasein is still dominated by the they) is 'distantiality'. As one falls to become closed-off in the mode of being 'averageness' where everything is seemed to be closed off and has been interpreted publicly, it is potentially creating boredom and increasing the urge to seek for a distraction or novelty. Thus Dasein tends to de-distancing for itself, that is, 'it tends to leave the things nearest at hand for a distant and strange world' (Heidegger, 1996:161). Dasein becomes curiosity driven and intrigued just by the outward appearance of the world. Curiosity for Heidegger (1996:161) is different with understanding, "*Curiosity has nothing to do with the contemplation that wonders at being, thaumazein, it has no interest in wondering to the point of not understanding. Rather, it makes sure of knowing, but just in order to have known*". Thus the curiosity driven Dasein, instead of dwelling in its everydayness and trying to make meaning out of meaninglessness, it tends to escape from it and seeks novelty only to leap from it again to another novelty.

Nevertheless, Heidegger suggests that after all, the inauthentic mode of being is what makes it possible for Dasein to disclose itself only in so far it continually moves in such dynamic movement from inauthenticity to authenticity as he states: "*But inauthenticity is based on the possibility of authenticity.*

Inauthenticity characterizes a kind of Being into which Dasein can divert itself and has for the most part always diverted itself; but Dasein does not necessarily and constantly have to divert itself into this kind of Being. Because Dasein exists, it determines its own character as the kind of entity it is.” (Heidegger, 1996:303).

In brief, the quest to authenticity does not merely about being different but it tells us about the true challenge that is being different for the better. This modification has to be made in the level of state of mind instead of merely in the superficial level that has such and such outward appearance. Because above all, the turn to authenticity is not just about self-creation but more importantly it is revolved around self-reflective, so that one can realize one's blind mechanical acceptance to the shared understanding and transform that anonymous way to become one's ownmost by keeping one's orientation to the future and anticipating future possibilities in resoluteness. This is of which Heidegger (1996:40) suggests as the main characteristic of authentic *Dasein*, 'Jemeinigkeit' that means 'in each case mine'. Surrendering in the they or the publicness might give us a peace of mind, a *tranquillity* as in the they everything is made to be seemed already understood and in the best order (Heidegger, 1996:119) but it never gives us a real cure for *Angst*. For the they never really tells us about what we need to do in the first place as a distinct and unique individual. They-self might very useful to suggest what I normally should do as a college student, as a friend, as a daughter, as a human being, but it never really tells about what I suppose to do in the first place as me, myself. Thus to reconsider about authenticity is to mind about being

creative and grasping one ownmost potentiality-for-being in which one does feels engage to himself or simply as being at home. However one must keep in mind that that ownmost potentiality-for-being is therefore must be something 'alien' or free from any influences of the they. The they is in fact something that inevitably for everyone because it prescribes what one has to do as a part of network. But none the less, as Golomb (1995) suggests that one does not necessarily to become a 'public property' by letting this impersonal understanding dominates one's mind.

2.3.2 Being-with-other

Heidegger suggests that being authentic involves "being-with-other" (*Mitdasein*) in the first place however not in a manner that one might be tempted to suppose. Accordingly He points out that there are two different manners of "being-with-other": First is "leaping in" for another and second is "leaping ahead" for him (O'Brien, 2011). The former tend to be mastering and dominating which render other to be dependant whereas the latter is more liberating by means one helps the other to become more transparent to himself about his care and to become free for it (Heidegger, 1996:122). Heidegger gives the term solicitude (*Fürsorge*) to define the authentic manner of being-with-other in which people are mutually and genuinely caring for one another (Hadirman,2016).

It is necessary for Dasein to re-appropriate its way of relating to each other because, as Heidegger insists, that the fundamental feature of Dasein is 'Care' (*Sorge*). As Care or caring being, Dasein basically orients its actions to something

that matter to it. It cannot help but consumes by the things that it encounters everyday (Stumpf&Fieser, 2008). So Dasein in relating to each other for instance is inevitably growing a personal concern to other people around and thus burdened by a deep sense of responsibility for others. Moreover, because the world where Dasein is being 'thrown' is always and already the world of Other, the self is cannot be independent from the other. Being-with-Other is Dasein's fundamental feature. Thus it is inescapably for Dasein of being shaped by the world, growing the same concern with other people or community. In turn the world becomes the undivided part of the self. Here the boundaries between the self and the Other or the world become fused together. Therefore in term of fulfil one's self at the same time it also means to take the responsibility for others. As Heidegger (1996: 116) states that

“according to the analysis which we have now completed, being-with-others belongs to the being of Da-sein, with which it is concerned in its very being. As being-with, Da-sein "is" essentially for the sake of others.” In consequence being authentic self essentially involves authentic being-with-other in the first place because it is only through the engagement with other people *Dasein* can find itself.

However as mentioned earlier, that such engagement with other people sometimes can be deceptive and superficial rather than enlightening in which one tends to be mastering or dominating the other and thus obscuring other's 'ownmost' potentiality. This is happened because Dasein usually tend to be more focus to its feature as "being-in-the-world" and become forgetful about its more

fundamental character as Being-with. In this case one become more fascinated by the mundane things and become forgetful about the aspect that actually motivated all those things which appeared on the surface. One forgets about the true motivation that based all the actual deeds that is essentially for the sake of other a. Consequently one tends to fall into the superficial social mode of being or inauthentic being-with Other. One fails to genuinely orient his deeds for the sake of the other and rather tempted to see the other as mere ready-to-hand objects to be used and manipulated (Golomb, 1995:70). As being-in-the-world, encountering the entities as something *in-order-to* or utensils is its immediate access to the everyday world (Stumpf&Fieser, 2008). However in term of confronting other people,it is not relevant to deal with the same manner. Heidegger (1996:161)) suggests that in term of confronting other people, one has to place the other people neither as an object nor attribute but as another Dasein, which means that rather than mastering others one must liberating them to choose their ownmost possibilities by helping them to be more transparent in seeing their care.

Having a clear sense of one's care is the primary task of one and which one is obliged to make it accessible for another. Only by having a genuine understanding of care one can be authentic self and as well as authentic being-with-one-another for this awakens Dasein for its first and foremost characteristic as Being-with. As mentioned earier, Dasein as Care (*Sorge*) orients its action to something that matter to it, it basically does something *for-the-sake-of-others*. But it is often being forgetful. Thus a clear sight of what we truly care about or as Heidegger (1996:300) suggests as *authentic care* is often being obscured. This

clear understanding of authentic care, according to Heidegger (1996:300) can be grasped when one considers the unity of the threefold structure of Dasein as Care (*Sorge*): thrownness, fallness and existentiality. “thrownness” signifies our facticity or roots that belongs to the past; “fallness” signifies our present condition while “existentiality” signifies our projection to the future. In the other words, a clear sense of care can be gained as one truly pay attention to the relation of his past, present and future. This is done by being true to one’s roots in contemplating one’s present condition and anticipating the future. Conversely the understanding of care can be inauthentic if one breaks the unity of the past, present and future by forgetting his roots, seeking for distraction in order to flee from his present situation, and not anticipating his future as though his time is infinite thus taking action is something of no importance (Heidegger, 1996: 330).

2.3.3 Call of conscience and *Angst*

Call of conscience is the appeal which summons Dasein to its “ownmost potentiality-for-Being-its-self” (Heidegger, 1996:314). This call is not necessarily about utterances articulated by words however it gives something to understand. It essentially calls us in *silence* however it moves us in some ways (Heidegger, 1996, 255). The content of this calling is neither expected, nor prepared, nor does it come from what other people suggest it has to be. Sometimes the call can even against one’s will or expectation nonetheless this is not something that come from another but oneself (Heidegger, 1996:276). Somehow it calls away Dasein back to itself from its “lost-ness” in the “they” (Heidegger, 1996:253). In a way, this calls brings a feeling of uncanny or simply as if not being at home. Such feeling

belongs to *Angst* (Heidegger, 1996:255). In *Angst* one cannot find concrete object that caused him to be anxious. It is different from fear as in fear one can acknowledge the concrete object that caused him to be fearful. Heidegger (1996: 175) explains that *Angst* is different from fear as what *Angst* is about is not an *innerwordly* being. What *Angst* is anxious for is individual's freedom as being which is essentially *thrown* into the world.

'Angst discloses Da-sein as being-possible, and indeed as what can be individualized in individuation of its own accord. Angst reveals in Da-sein its being toward its ownmost potentiality of being, that is, being free for the freedom of choosing and grasping itself.' (Heidegger, 1996:176)

Angst reveals to inauthentic Dasein that not all is well in the everyday way of being a self. In *Angst* Dasein realizes its "thrownness" or its groundless self. Dasein is being awakened that the everyday norms or shared understandings are just something that is given and being taken for granted. They are ultimately groundless and it is grounded only in shared practice and nothing more. Thus in *Angst* Dasein is called to grasp its freedom and it makes apparent to Dasein that its life cannot ever be meaningful if it is lived through the impersonal way of being or They-self all along.

'The caller is unfamiliar to the everyday they-self, it is something like an alien voice. What could be more alien to the they, lost in the manifold "world" of its heedfulness, than the self individualized to itself in uncanniness thrown into nothingness? "It" calls, and yet gives the heedfully curious ears nothing to hear that could be passed along and publicly spoken about.' (Heidegger, 1996:255)

It is possibly that the call echoes from the moment when Dasein is not being lost in the They and primordially authentic. It appeals Dasein to be guilty for “fleeing” from oneself and succumb in the impersonal way of being or They-Self (Heidegger, 1996:273). This conscience call is essentially the call of Care for it essentially pushes Dasein to realize its authentic care. It recalls Dasein back to take hold of itself and take its own responsibility of what it truly cares about in the first place. Listen to this conscience call opens Dasein to be guilty from neglecting its ownmost potentiality for being its self. Nevertheless still Dasein can choose to listen or ignore this call. If Dasein chooses to listen so it means that the next thing that should be done is taking action in resoluteness. However, if Dasein chooses to not pay heed so it will simply flee back into the inauthentic mode of being and running from its responsibility to take hold of itself.

2.3.4 Resoluteness

As the implementation of the conscience’s call is resoluteness. This is the state when one firms his choice in regard to his call. Here the term resoluteness must be understood beyond its ordinary sense. As the characteristics which differentiate inauthentic and authentic Dasein, the notion of resoluteness gained its special references. When Dasein is resolute it means that it acts upon its conscience’s call or authority rather than merely based on what others expect it ought to be. However, not to mention that this resoluteness is done in such a stubborn or egoistic way but as mentioned earlier that it is the following up action of conscience’s call, of the guilty appeal, of readiness to take the responsibility to oneself and others in terms of attaining Dasein’s “ownmost” potentiality-for-

Being and helping others as well to be transparent to themselves about their “ownmost” possibility and to be free for it. Thus basically resoluteness helps to summon oneself and others from their lost-ness in They, as Heidegger points out:

“Resoluteness, as authentic Being-one’s-Self, , does not detach Dasein from the world, nor does it isolate it so that it becomes a free floating ‘I’...Dasein’s resoluteness toward itself is what first makes it possible to let the Others who are with it “be” in their ownmost potentiality-for-Being, and co-disclose this potentiality in the solicitude which leaps forth and liberates. When Dasein is resolute, it can become the ‘conscience’ of Others. Only by authentically Being-their-Selves in resoluteness can people authentically be with one another.” (Heidegger, 1996:334)

In the contrary, Inauthentic Dasein might only take its action based on what others expect to or what public consider as good or ideal without being truly engaged in the action. For inauthentic Dasein or They-Self, the situation is rather closed off and common, thus one has to response in ordered ways.

“Das Man has always kept Dasein from taking hold of these possibilities of Being. Das Man even hides the manner in which it has tacitly relieved Dasein of the burden of explicitly choosing these possibilities” (Heidegger, 1996:312)

Furthermore, resolute Dasein, though has been resolved to stand firm once the choice is made, still it must always remain open for introspection and readiness to let everything be. This means that in order to reveal itself, Dasein must follows up his resoluteness with confession and another resolution to fix its previous lack of choice once it discovers another layer of truth that has not been revealed. Still Dasein must listen to the conscience’s call when it emerges and summons Dasein back from its lostness in the They. This is happened because

after all authentic Being-one's-self is essentially a process of becoming and in this process Dasein cannot help but always constantly at risk of slipping back into They-Self. Still Dasein has to "plung" into the everydayness whereby it for the most part tempted to divert itself in curiosity, novelty, idle talk, ambiguity, averageness, irresoluteness which basically characterized Dasein's lostness in the they. So in all resoluteness is that which holds Dasein in its on-going task to be authentic while it must remain 'plunges' into the everyday way of being a self (they-self).

2.4 Paulo Coelho' *By The River Piedra I Sat Down and Wept*

The story tells about a woman named Pilar and her journey to find herself. Pilar was born and raised in a small town in Spain called Soria. Almost all of her life time was spent in that small town. She never expected to leave her hometown though deep inside her, she was dreaming out loud about having an adventure to travel around the world and find new things and excitements. The failure in the past has turned her to be negative, bitter and upset with life. Once she had worked hard to get a scholarship but she failed and forced to work as waitress to pay her study in college. Pilar obsessed about planning and having a stable life. She was afraid of changes and rejection, all that she wanted were just marrying a good man, having children, living in a nice house and having a clear financial. Pilar also has strayed from the conservative Catholic life a few times by sleeping with other men before marriage, and has been hurt by them all. Because of this, she became seeing love as meaningless and thinking that all relationships will end up the same. This made her fears of changes and rejection even worse and made her

to be a timid and very closed-off person until she finally reunited with her childhood friend that has spent the last ten years travelling around the world, learning about different cultures, religions and the representation of the feminine side of God in those different cultures. He taught Pilar about what he has learned and attempted to get her to open her mind about new possibilities in life by involving her to his short trip to Paris.

Throughout the novel, Pilar eased up and opened her mind and her heart to God and the Virgin, or the feminine side of God. She has become a transformed woman who was finally able to love and live the way she hopes to. However, she was confronted by another problem that was the fact that her old friend who has professed his love to her and that she loves too, was still a seminarian and was a direct disciple of the Virgin. He must give up his ability to communicate directly with the Virgin and work a miracle of healing, a special gift that many people wished they had, in order to get a chance to spend his life with Pilar. Pilar did not want him to give up that gift because it also means that her dream to live an extraordinary life would never come true. At first she felt so doomed by her friend's fate of losing his gift but above all she could not deny her desire to be with him. At the end, they found a way to be together and convinced each other to start again and work hard together to find happiness.

The rest of the story explains just how important it is to believe in love and let everything be in order to find a true happiness in life. It is not enough to simply follow societal and religious rules, a person has to believe and consciously participate in doing those things, or else they will never find a spiritual happiness.

Throughout the story, Pilar's friend has helped Pilar to discover who she is and accept what she wants in the first place and how to get it. To dream means to work hard is the main message that the story alludes and explicitly express in the closing sentence delivered by Pilar's friend.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

This study focuses on analysing the quest for authenticity of the main character in Paulo Coelho's *By the River Piedra I Sat Down and Wept* by using the concept of existential authenticity proposed by Heidegger in his work *Being and Time* to elaborate the dialogues and narrations showing the main character's turn from inauthenticity to authenticity. The dynamics from inauthenticity to authenticity of the main character in the novel is analysed using three features that based on Heidegger's concept: lost in the they (Das Man), Angst and call conscience, and resoluteness. Here the 'lostness' in the they what characterized the inauthentic mode of being in which the self becomes estranged to itself as it still dispersed in the they or the 'publicness' while the resoluteness is indicating the authentic mode of being in which the self has grasped itself. This study used the qualitative research design and descriptive analytical as a method.