The Cherry Orchard

The Setting

The action takes place between May and October at a rural estate in Russia three to four decades after Csar Alexander II freed the serfs in 1861. It is a time of revolutionary change, when nineteenth-century values and traditions are yielding to a new way of life in which the upper classes are losing their power and prestige and the lower classes are taking advantaging of opportunities previously denied to them.

What Was a Serf?

In nineteenth-century Russia, a serf was a peasant laborer attached to a landowner. In effect, a serf was a slave.

Themes

Effects of Change

......The main theme of the play is how changes in Russian social, economic, and cultural life affect Madame Ranevsky and her daughters as well as her friends, her acquaintances, and the servants on her estate. Madame Ranevsky refuses to accept change, preferring instead to hold onto the past—or at least the remnants and memories of it. She even spends as she did when she had money, driving herself deeper and deeper into debt.

......Gaev shares his sister's fondness for the aristocratic past, but in the end he yields to the reality of the present and takes a job at a bank. His decision to accept a position that he believes is below his social station no doubt resonates with elite modern workers forced by economic hard times to accept menial labor.

......Lopakhin embraces change, for it has allowed him to rise from poverty to wealth and the social power that goes with it. But he tends to focus so much on material gain that he ignores Varya. She loves him, and he is fond of her. In Act 5, Varya tells Ranevsky,

I can't propose to him myself, little mother. People have been talking about him to me for two years now, but he either says nothing, or jokes about it. I understand. He's getting rich, he's busy, he can't bother about me. If I had some money, even a little, even only a hundred
roubles, I'd throw up everything and go away. I'd go into a convent.

Others do not know how to respond to change. Epikhodov, for example, says to Yasha, "I'm an educated man, I read various remarkable books, but I cannot understand the direction I myself want to go—whether to live or to shoot myself, as it were. So, in case, I always carry a revolver about with me." Charlotta exists in a vacuum: "I don't know who I am or why I live." Old Fiers freezes time, choosing to live and work exactly as he did when he was a serf bound to the land. Trofimov condemns the oppressive days of serfdom and welcomes what lies ahead of him. He tells Anya,

All Russia is our orchard. The land is great and beautiful, there are many marvellous places in it. [Pause] Think, Anya, your grandfather, your great-grandfather, and all your ancestors were serf-owners, they owned living souls; and now, doesn't something human look at you from every cherry in the orchard, every leaf and every stalk? . . . We've left those two hundred years behind us. So far we've gained nothing at all—we don't yet know what the past is to be to us—we only philosophize, we complain that we are dull, or we drink vodka. For it's so clear that in order to begin to live in the present we must first redeem the past, and that can only be done by suffering, by strenuous, uninterrupted labour. Understand that, Anya. (Act 3)

Anya responds positively to his viewpoint. Then he says,

I'm not thirty yet, I'm young, I'm still a student, but I have undergone a great deal! I'm as hungry as the winter, I'm ill, I'm shaken. I'm as poor as a beggar, and where haven't I been—fate has tossed me everywhere! But my soul is always my own; every minute of the day and the night it is filled with unspeakable presentiments. I know that happiness is coming, Anya, I see it already. . . . (Act 3)

Dunyasha's response to change is to try to look and act like a lady. Lopakhin, noticing this behavior in her, reminds her that she is maidservant, saying, "You dress just like a lady, and you do your hair like one too. You oughtn't. You should know your place" (Act 1). Then she tries to latch onto Yasha, viewing him as superior to the bumbling Epikhodov. But Yasha is a bad choice, for he is self-seeking and insensitive—perhaps not unlike the man waiting for Madame Ranevsky in Paris. When Ranevsky decides to return to Paris, Yasha chooses to go with her. Here is the parting conversation between Dunyasha and Yasha.

DUNYASHA. If you only looked at me once, Yasha. You're going away, leaving me behind. [Weeps and hugs him round the neck.]

YASHA. What's the use of crying? [Drinks champagne] In six days I'll be again in Paris. To-
morrow we get into the express and off we go. I can hardly believe it. Vive la France! It doesn't suit me here, I can't live here . . . it's no good. Well, I've seen the uncivilized world; I have had enough of it. [Drinks champagne] What do you want to cry for? You behave yourself properly, and then you won't cry. 

DUNYASHA. [Looks in a small mirror and powders her face] Send me a letter from Paris. You know I loved you, Yasha, so much! I'm a sensitive creature, Yasha. (Act 4)

One may say that Dunyasha has achieved her goal of becoming like a lady—namely, Madame Ranevsky, who allows a scoundrel to misuse her.

Class Distinctions

.......The social gap between the upper and lower classes is beginning to close in the new Russia, as Fiers points. Once upon a time, he says, "The peasants kept their distance from the masters and the masters kept their distance from the peasants, but now everything's all anyhow and you can't understand anything" (Act 3).

.......However, the gap is still wide enough to create tension. For example, when Lopakhin broaches the idea of cutting down the cherry orchard to make room for money-making villas, Ranevsky calls the plan a vulgar, bourgeois concept. Class differences surface again when a discussion is under way about how to save the estate and Gaev says, "My aunt's very rich, but she doesn't like us. My sister, in the first place, married an advocate, not a noble. She not only married a man who was not a noble, but she behaved herself in a way which cannot be described as proper" (Act 1).

.......From time to time in the play, Lopakhin—though a wealthy businessman—acknowledges his humble origins, with regret. For example, he says, "My father was a peasant, an idiot, he understood nothing, he didn't teach me, he was always drunk, and always used a stick on me. In point of fact, I'm a fool and an idiot too. I've never learned anything, my handwriting is bad, I write so that I'm quite ashamed before people, like a pig!" (Act 3).

Failure to Grasp Reality

.......Madame Ranevsky fails to grasp the seriousness of her financial straits and the fact that the age of nobility and privilege is dying. It is as if she thinks a god will appear, deus ex machina, to lead her to a pot of gold and restore her to the happy days of her youth. When she imagines that she sees her mother in the cherry orchard, she reveals her tendency to dwell in the idyllic past and ignore the unsettling reality of the present.

Self-Destruction
.....Madame Ranevsky makes choices that sabotage her well-being—emotional, financial, and otherwise. For example, she marries a man who turns out to be a good-for-nothing drunk. Then, after her husband dies and her seven-year-old son drowns, she takes up with a scoundrel, a man whom she nurses during an illness. After he depletes her finances in Paris, he leaves her for another woman. Later, he begs her to return. Meanwhile, she and her brother have an opportunity to liquidate their debts by signing on to Lopakhin's scheme to build and rent villas. But both she and Gaev refuse to take part in it because it will mean the destruction of the beloved cherry orchard. However, she does nothing to save her property. In the end, after Lopakhin buys the property, she returns to the man who ruined her. Anya goes with her. ......Other characters—Charlotta, for example—also sabotage their welfare by doing nothing to improve their lot. Trofimov attends a university, but one wonders whether he will ever graduate. Epikhodov does not know whether to go on living or commit suicide.

......

Generosity

.....Despite all her failings, Ranevsky has a redeeming quality: generosity. She gives freely of her love—perhaps too freely at times—and of what little money she has left, as the incident involving the tramp demonstrates. Lopakhin also exhibits generosity when he offers Trofimov money (Trofimov does not accept it) and hires Epikhodov to watch over the estate after Madame Ranevsky returns to Paris.

.

.

Climax

......The climax occurs in Act 4 when Lopakhin announces that he has purchased Ranevsky's property. He says,

The cherry orchard is mine now, mine! [Roars with laughter] My God, my God, the cherry orchard's mine! Tell me I'm drunk, or mad, or dreaming. . . . [Stamps his feet] Don't laugh at me! If my father and grandfather rose from their graves and looked at the whole affair, and saw how their Ermolai, their beaten and uneducated Ermolai, who used to run barefoot in the winter, how that very Ermolai has bought an estate, which is the most beautiful thing in the world! I've bought the estate where my grandfather and my father were slaves, where they weren't even allowed into the kitchen. I'm asleep, it's only a dream, an illusion. . . . It's the
fruit of imagination, wrapped in the fog of the unknown.

Conflict

The central conflict of the play is the battle between the values of the old Russia and the values of the new Russia.

Satire

In depicting Ranevsky's prodigality, Chekhov is satirizing the extravagance of aristocrats with inherited wealth who never held a job and never learned the value of a single kopeck. In depicting Trofimov's idealism, Chekhov appears to be satirizing visionaries who are all talk but no action. Instead of acting to further his ideals, Trofimov—who is nearly thirty—continues to attend the university as a "perpetual student."

Symbols

Cherry orchard: To Madame Ranevsky, the cherry orchard represents the flowering of gentility and refinement in the good old days at her estate. To Trofimov, the orchard represents the serfdom and oppression of the people who tended the property in bygone days. To Lopakhin, it represents commercialism and money. Lopakhin views other plant life in the same way.

In the spring I sowed three thousand acres of poppies, and now I've made forty thousand roubles net profit. And when my poppies were in flower, what a picture it was! So I, as I was saying, made forty thousand roubles. . . . . (Act 4)

Dropped purse: In Act 2, while Ranevsky is outside with Gaev and Lopakhin, she drops her purse. Gold coins scatter about. This incident symbolizes Ranevksy's spendthrift ways.

Fiers' death: Fiers' death at the end of the play symbolizes the death of the old Russia.

Nursery: This room in the Ranevsky estate symbolizes the comfortable and secure past of Ranevsky and Gaev. Moreover, it suggests that Ranevsky and Gaev still act like children in many ways.

Telegraph poles: The line of telegraph poles symbolizes the modern world that Ranevsky and Gaev reject.

Varya's keys: The keys symbolize the control and order typifying her management of the
estate, qualities lacking in Ranevsky and Gaev.

**Ironic Ending**

.......The play concludes with a supreme irony. Ranevsky, who once had power and money, ends up with next to nothing. Lopakhin, who once had nothing as the son of a serf, ends up as a man of power and wealth who owns the Ranevsky estate.

**Foreshadowing**

**The Frost**

.......Whether the frost (stage directions, beginning of the play) damages the cherry blossoms is unknown. (Cherry orchards are especially vulnerable to a killing frost.) But the frost nonetheless seems to foreshadow the loss of the cherry orchard and the rest of the Ranevsky estate. In Act 4, Lopakhin acquires the estate and begins felling the cherry trees to make way for the construction of villas.
Abstract: Chekhov’s heroes criticize the situation, mock at themselves and at the others. Chekhov describes the past, present and the future of humans. His heroes have difficulties connected to save their estate. They cannot plan their life and even in the end of the play we hear the noise of tree cutting, which is the witness of destruction of estate. Chekhov put a mirror in front of humans for them to see their problems and solve them. His heroes are ordinary, credulous people.

1. Introduction

Heroes of Chekhov are from different classes of society: ordinary people, aristocrats and generally representatives of upper class. The main idea is coming from ordinary people’s life but the purpose is to show the painful events which have occurred from life changing results. The play “The cherry orchard” by Chekhov is not just a comedy which makes you laugh. The scene and actors are in a kind of position that the audience appears between controversial situation of laugh and pain.

Chekhov with his sharp satire makes audience to be awake and attract their attentiveness. This is coming from the inner requirements of satire and people's conditions which are coming from the political and social situations are simply visible in Chekhov’s works. Chekhov shows the life using the easiest language.

In Mikhalkov's opinion “audience has never felt the distance between themselves and Chekhov's works, because his works are true to life.”[1]

The most important factors in this piece are eating, drinking and gossiping. In Chekhov's view, life becomes more perfect by means of these factors. In his works there aren’t any signs of murdering, suiciding (in an exception is Treplyov's son of Irina Nikolayevna in the play “The seagull”) and marriage etc.. Chekhov always tends to present the usual events, behavior and morality, which can happen in every human life. According to this, Chekhov says “I want the actor to be attractive as in real life, because not every minute they are being shot or hanged out, never promise eternal love or do not express gorgeous thoughts. These people are eating, drinking, walking and gossiping so much that these ones should be presented on the stage. We should write that kind of piece where people are going and coming, having dinner, talking about the weather, playing cards. These are not the author's ideas; actually life itself is such kind. Life should be like this, people should be like this, because in fact life and humans are like that, but of course not with their awful sight. [2] Chekhov didn’t write about ideal personalities. Heroes of his pieces and short stories have generally positive characters: neither angels nor evils.

2. Materials and Methods

For analyzing “The cherry orchard” piece we have chosen the following heroes: Lyubov AndreievnaRanevskaya, Anya, Yermolai Alexeievitch Lopakhin, and Peter Sergeievich Trofimov. We have presented the heroes according to the list written under the line. Separation of era (previous, new, future) used in dissertation are not just automatic separations of acting heroes’ age qualifications but also folk method of author used by fictional time. Heroes acting in new era and regard to their motives of psychological feelings correspond to time impersonating and making it subjective. In Chekhov's play “The cherry orchard” some of the acting heroes live with the previous memory and change the process of life back, but some of them live with the hope to reach happy future and change the time before. There are heroes who live and create in present and work in present effectively implementing their decisions. By means of these folk tricks Chekhov is a unique wrighter in Russian history of dramaturgy.

3. Results and Discussions

A-Previous era

Lyubov Andreievna, Gayev and of course Firs are the representatives of last generation. Even though if Lyubov Andreievna in the beginning of the play is a positive hero in the last parts her real character is becoming to be revealed plus numerous
negative aspects. Lopakhin in the beginning describes her positive aspects in this way;

**Lopakhin:** ... Lyubov Andreievna has been living abroad for five years; I don't know what she'll be like now...She is a good person. An uncomplicated and easy going kind of person. I remember when I was just a lad, fifteen or so, my late father-he kept a little shop here in town-he hit me in the face with a fist, and the blood just gushed from my nose... We had come here for some reason, my father was drunk. Lyubov Andreievna, I remember it as clear as if it were yesterday, still so young, slender. She let me over to the washtub right here, right in this room, in the nursery. "Don't cry, little man, it will be all right in time for your wedding...". (Act one)

Lyubov Andreievna is an extremely generous person and this character always has been concerning her family. She sells her apartment in Paris and returns to estate, while without any income in the restaurant she gives each of the waiters a whole ruble as a tip, she borrows money from Lopakhin in Moscow, but at the same time she gives gold piece the beggars. Varya, her adoptee, said with frightened voice;

**Varya:** I'm leaving... I'm leaving...Oh, Mummy-dear, the servants at home have nothing to eat, and you just gave the beggar a gold piece. (Act two)

Lyubov Andreievna loves people around her, she hugs them, kisses them, talks with them tenderly, she doesn't deny any request from them, she is an innumerable spending kind of woman which is the main reason of bankruptcy. Gayev is a feckless kind of person, being fifty years old he is leaving relying on attendant Firs. He is just playing billiard and nothing else. it is just wasting time. Anya, Darya and Andreievna always reproach him as the way that they think as less he talks; as a consequence their difficulties will become less. Andreievna to her brother Gayev;

**Lyubov Andreievna:** ...Why drink so much, Lyona? Why eat so much? Why speak so much? Today, at the restaurant you went on and on again and all of it was inappropriate, about the seventies...And how many people are there in Russia, and nobody knows why those people are existing. Whatever, but the circulation of job has been found a suitable job for her brother Gayev; Lopakhin

**Lyubov Andreievna:** Yes. My nerves are better it's true. (Act four)

"Actually there is a double metonymic shift here, for not just Gaev’s speech but Gaev’s very figure is a device. The speech is not a marginal poking of fun at the nincompoop Gaev. It is the key to the figure of Gaev which, in turn, is a key to the equivocal language of the text. The very functional justification of the figure of Gaev in the economy of Chekhovian dramatic dialogue lies in his giving cues, in his "incidental" references to literature, which can alert the spectator to the undercurrents, to the travesty of the literary context and Chekhov’s own place in it surreptitiously put forward." [3]

In fact this dialogue reveals that they are not serious. Both of them are lazy and dumb. Even thought they find it hard to make decision for saving their life. Both of them are sensitive and vulnerable. In their life they have moral bankruptcy and material bankruptcy. Andreievna lives in present, but she is still fascinated with memory of her childhood and youth. They are admired with their “full life of the past”; in fact they don’t have a future. Here is Lopakhin’s idea.

**Lopakhin:** Forgive me, but such irresponsible people, as you, sir, as you madam, such unbusinesslike, such strange people, are new to my experience. I have never come across this type before. I am telling you, in plain Russian: your estate is being sold. And you act as if you don’t understand in the least. (Act two)

**Lopakhin:** ...And how many people are there in Russia, and nobody knows why those people are existing. Whatever, but the circulation of job is not that? They say that Leonid Andreievitch have accepted the case, it will be in the bank, six thousand per year... But that is not the remainder, he is very lazy...(Act four)

Andreievna and Gayev became the imitation of their ancestors. Aristocrats who are tired of themselves and cannot change their situation, their financial ability is exhausted, but Andreievna still talks about her aristocratic class and status. When there have been found a suitable job for her brother Gayev she says "It is nonsense, your honor is higher than this". Gayev knows his sister character and that is why he even doesn’t ask an advice, as he knows her position. The feckless and the relation to the old tradition of Andreievna and Gayev keeps them away from new initiatives. One of the Chekhov’s skills is in different types of satire to discover personages like

---


Gayev, who is lazy and phlegmatic. These personages instead of paying heed to the real life’s issues are just talking idly. Their feelings and counteraction about the life phenomena doesn’t meet the requirements of reality. Their silence is also the symbol of impatience and despair. They are alienated from reality, but even knowing it they continue their feeble life with the same way. They appear in their personal problems and feel sorry for their loss. The sister and brother just because of this mentality they seem ridiculous and because of escaping from reality they received compassion from people’s side. Considerably when realism and social psychology are combined with each other they will be moving together along and gently. The reality and imagination as brilliant contradictions are successfully represented in Chekhov’s pieces.

B- Present era

Coming back to Lopakhin’s personage we can assume that he is a representative of a new generation, he is an enthusiastic, busy person and fulled with eagerness to work. He says about himself in this way;

**Lopakhin:** You know, I’m up at five in the morning, I work from morning until late at night, and I am constantly putting my own and other people’s money to use, and, well, I see what kind of people there are out there. All it takes is for you to start doing something productive, and it immediately becomes clear, how few honest, decent people there actually are. Sometimes, when I can’t sleep, I think: “Lord, You have given us these vast forests, these endless fields, these vanishing horizons, and, living here, we ourselves ought by rights to be giant…”(Act two).

Lopakhin as the other personages in the play has positive and negative character. According to this Trofimov’s idea is essential:

**Trofimov:** What I think, Yermolai Alekseyich, is this the: you are wealthy man. You will soon be a millionaire. As with natural metabolism there is a need for the beast of pray to exist, who gorge everything that comes his way, so that’s you. (Act two). Then he continues.

**Trofimov:** Whatever, I love you in spite of everything. You have the slender, delicate fingers of an artist, an artist’s slender, delicate soul...(Act four) Chekhov in his letter to Russian actor and producer Konstantin Sergeyevich Stanislavsky explained about Lopakhin’s character: “When I was writing the role for Lopakhin I was thinking about that this concerned exactly to you... It is true that, Lopakhin is trader, but he is conscientious and ambitious kind of person, and he should have positive behavior... He is not a simple one, he is intellectual and he is not a liar that is why he is the main hero of the play.” [4]

Sometimes “The cherry orchard” is considered to be the clash of collapsing class of aristocrats and development of bourgeoisie in the same way as Lopakhin shows. On the other hand commentators think that Chekhov’s dramas are far from of this collapses and event they are penetrating to psychological inner world. In fact the play “The cherry orchard” after the entrance of actors becomes a comedy and the interesting act is Lopakhin’s personage, who tries to save Andreieva’s and Gayev’s estate, but they reject whole is proposals. The thinking way of Lopakhin’s is clear: to divide the garden into small pieces and sell them twenty-five thousand ruble per piece, but no Gayev and Adrei evna reject it.

After these whole Lopakhin was despaired, he tries to describe his plan with enthusiasm and even he is ready to congratulate them to have such kind success and the expected brilliant future. But Andreieva’s answer and Gayev’s evaluation about the cherry garden, he told that the name of this garden is even mentioned in “Knowledge base”, so this is the main reason of their rejection, and Lopakhin’s all efforts are in vain.

“The play as a whole demonstrates shifts in class identities and social relationships (Lopakhin is the first main character from the merchant class in Chekhov’s plays) and the increasing redundancy of a social order where the upper classes do not work and are served by a vast, impoverished peasantry”[5] Lopakhin tries to solve the problems of this family using his methods, but there is a deadlock and in the end he gets the estate. This is remarkable symbol of absurdity which is characteristic to Chekhov’s works. Lopakhin is successful in earning money, but in love and expressing his feelings he is weak. He felled in love with Varya, but his mind is in another region.

G-Future era

Anya and Trofimov belong to the future. Trofimov is an eternal student, thinker and lives in world which promises him a good future. His dream is to have freedom and a better future, but like the other hero he also has positive and negative characters, so he fails in some cases and that is why he gets some grid from surrounding him people.

**Lopakhin:** He’ll be fifty years old tomorrow, but he’s still studying away. (Act two) Chekhov greatly respects the ideas of young people and explains his opinions through Trofimov’s language.

**Trofimov:** Mankind matches forward, perfecting its strengths. Everything that is unattainable today shall someday become accessible, familiar, intimately known... All that is necessary is to toil away, to help those who are searching for the truth with all the
strength we can master. Here in Russia, very few actually toil at this time. The overwhelming preponderance of that intelligentsia, of the educated upper and middle classes that I know, is not searching for anything at all, and are incapable of any kind of productive work as of yet. They call themselves educated and enlightened, but they still address their servants using the informal you, they treat the peasants as if they were animals, they fail in school, they read nothing serious, they do nothing of any value whatsoever, they only speak of the sciences, they understand very little about art. They are all serious; everyone wears a stern expression on their talks only of important matters, philosophizes, and at the same time, the overwhelming preponderance of us, ninety-nine out of every hundred, lives like savages. The least little thing sets them off, they're at each other's throats, knocking out teeth, cursing, eating revolting meals, sleeping in filth, in stifling houses, with bedbugs everywhere, and foul smells, and dampness, immorality, impurity…And, evidently, all our heart conversations are just a device to draw attention away from ourselves, and to distract others. Show me, where are our child care institutions for the people, the reading rooms we keep talking about? These are only details in fashionable novels; they don't exist at all in real life. All that does exist is filth, vulgarity, an Asiatic mentality and customs… I fear and I feel an antipathy towards very serious faces. So let's don't talk! (Act two)

“Trofimov's 'mangy' appearance, his premature loss of hair and beard that refuses to grow are comical odds with his heroic utterances, and his priggish assertion that he is 'above love' is deservedly ridiculed by Ranevskaya; yet his assessment of Lopakhin is both affectionate and shrewd, so that we are inclined to agree with him that Lopakhin's grandiose plans for the estate's transformation are little more than 'arm-waving.'[6]

Trofimov is very kind personage and he cannot withstand in difficult situations. He classifies himself beyond love.

Trofimov: Varya is afraid we will fall in love, and so she spends all her time, every day, keeping us company. She can't get it through her narrow head that we are beyond love. The goal and purpose of our life together is circumventing any fleeting, picayune illusions that interfere with personal liberty and personal happiness. We go forward! We march on, relentlessly, towards that bright star that burns up head in the distance! Nothing and no one can keep up from going further and further! We cannot be controlled! We keep on going! Keep up with us, friends! (Act two)
society from that period of time in Russia. In this piece Lopakhin represent a category who want to replace another disappearing from society class which is lead by Andreievna, and the actions going on outside the piece have their own deep effects on events.

“In 1903, two years before revolution (1905) Anton Pavlovich Chekhov wrote the play “The cherry orchard”. In that period of time he used to feel the necessity to write it. This play is a symbol of previous and new era: nowadays, which is the collision moment of yesterday and today for human being. The base of the play is taken from the flow of time, which is moving forward permanently, apart from, the author of the pending case tries to open space for his heroes to enact also in a future, because the future belongs to new generation. Playwright’s aim is to show the movement of historical background of heroes and events’ relations using that relations and time category. He has chosen his heroes according to his own experience and necessity of life. Chekhov has collected them in an exhibition to show them in a future one by one.” [7]

According to history the play “The cherry orchard” is more close to Russian revolution and has powerful prevision of internal force. There is not any other work where Chekhov’s feelings about the fall of capitalistic world could be expressed in such way. In this drama time is passing so slowly and just the pauses between the dialogs of personages fulfill it. Pauses which represent different periods and the author don’t let their completion to be in pretended way. Here also the differences between “The cherry orchard” and “Three sisters” are obvious. In “The cherry orchard” the idea of to be depending from materialism doesn’t spread all over whole personages, meanwhile in piece “Three sisters” is not so. Andreievna and Gayev are two bankrupted aristocrats who defend their estate badly, and businessman Lopakhin is not so hurry to uproot the trees. He seeks to convince Andreievna and Gayev, helps them to defend their rights and even he doesn’t rapidly remind them about the commitment fifteen thousand rubles.

Is Chekhov optimistic or pessimistic is an old argument, but in fact Chekhov is pessimistic against past but optimistic against future. In reality he is considered to be optimistic. Chekhov doesn’t find a remedial prescription for old Russia, because even the sad situations for him became an optimistic comedy. He sees himself in the future and that is so even the clash of brutal interests loses its sadness. Thus Chekhov’s sad pieces become happy and satiric and this is “The cherry orchard” act three. An important day the cherry estate is going to be sold or it is already sold. The orchestra is playing, guests are dancing, and Charlotta was busy with buffoonery. Certainly for showing these whole there is a significant reason as well, and this is the irregular and disorganized conditions at Andreievskaia’s house. The important thing is to reach the goal, and if we will look further so why we shouldn’t be happy for cherry orchard’s sale?

In the piece “The cherry orchard” the heroes demonstrate some contradictory dialogue and behavior.Lyubov Andreievna feels sorry to have nothing, but she still gives presents. Gayev is working for Lopakhin pretending to be responsible person, but he doesn’t give up the billiards for starting to think about another things. Trofimov thinks that he demonstrates the young generation of society, but his behavior during the piece gives an opportunity for the others to make fun of him and even they told him sarcastically.-

Varya: (Angry) Miserable sir. (Act three)
And Trofimov to Varya again sarcastically.-

Trofimov: (speak ironically) Misses Lopakhin Misses Lopakhin... (Act three)

Chekhov consciously creates contradictory situation in the play “The cherry orchard”. These situations are not just external contradictions but also internal and these are the results of heroes’ characters. Chekhov created its specific comedy. Even if he thought that “The cherry orchard” is a comedy, but Stanislavsky had different idea; he wrote: “in my idea “The cherry orchard” is your best piece, I like it even more than “The seagull”, and it is neither comedy nor tragedy it is dram.” [8]

Well-known dramaturge doesn’t peache an ideology he shows the simple events, feeling and satire of life: personages who are weak-willed and ask a compassion from us. What is the main target of Chekhov in this play? To make noise about the upcoming revolution, hundreds of “Hamlets” embarrassment and morbid suspicions, or to respond to “Prometheus’s suffering which tries to rescue the others by bearing their pains? It is beyond the doubts, that Chekhov doesn’t like the characters of his piece; he doesn’t consider them to be heroes and has doubts that after the social changes they will survive. With rude irony He explained his personages that they “don’t know how to live.

Chekhov’s definition about the comedy genre, is the same as definition of Russian famous writer Alexander Sergeiyevich Pushkin: “The base of good comedy is not just laugh, but also it is somehow a tragedy which is based on the heroes characters.” [9]

The percept itself is clear, simple and has satire and deep meaning. This is for those who don’t know the secret of living happy, when they meet funny situations in their life but they cannot find the right path of their life. This is also the main reason of
Chekhov’s satire and sympathy and the reason of lack positive personages as well.

In Chekhov’s opinion this is the mission of theatre and this was the main reason that Chekhov is famous as a talented writer, writer who haven’t thought to create personages but created the piece through internal contradictions and attracting the audience. Chekhov’s pieces such as “The cherry orchard”, “The seagull”, “Three sisters” found their places in audience life who need reality. This has happened when Chekhov was alive and saw interlocutor response.
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In Anton Chekhov’s “The Cherry Orchard,” the cherry orchard estate is the significant locale of this play. Chekhov uses the cherry orchard—the property of Ranevskaya’s family—as a symbol to dramatize the different perceptions towards the cherry orchard among the major characters: Ranevskaya, Lopakhin, and Trofimov.

First of all, Ranevskaya, the representative of the old Russia clinging to the decaying aristocratic values, perceives the cherry orchard as her past childhood and beauty. It represents her heart-warming childhood as she mentions that “O my childhood, my innocence! I slept in this nursery, gazed out at the orchard, happiness awoke with me every morning. Staring at it, she sees her “mama is walking through the orchard.” The cherry orchard is all of her life, for it is full of memories of her mother and her old life. Moreover, she finds that beauty of the cherry orchard is the certain benefit; she refuses to sell it and pay debt because she doesn’t want to disrupt its beauty. But, her idea isn’t practical in the new capitalist world; beauty is a non-utilitarian value. Undoubtedly, she loses her beloved cherry orchard since she can’t adapt herself to new social values.

Lopakhin, on the contrary, is the businessman which is the representative of capitalist Russia. He regards the cherry orchard as a utility producing a lot of money. He advises Ranevskaya to “divide the cherry orchard into the building lots and then lease out for summer cottages, you’d be making at the very least twenty-five thousand a year.” He definitely focuses on the numbers of profit of the estate; and his advice is a practical way to maintain the cherry orchard. Furthermore, he suggests to “chop down the old cherry orchard which is absolutely worthless”; it is implied that he ignores the beauty because beauty is useless in the present day and can gain no profit.

Besides Ranevskaya and Lopakhin, Trofimov is the representative of pro-Marxist man in Russia. Because he trusts in socialism, he sees the cherry orchard as a corrupt and oppressive place; he mentions to Anya, “All Russia is our orchard” “Before we start living in the present, we must first atone for our past, finish with it, and we can atone for it only through suffering, only through extraordinary, incessant labor.” He realizes the serfs are exploited in the world of aristocracy; therefore, this corrupt system must be revolted and eradicated for
the equality of people. After the cherry orchard is bought and he moves out of the estate, he pleasingly calls it “new life”.

To me, the cherry orchard symbolizes the old values which don’t fit the modern social system. Likewise, Ranevskaya can’t preserve the whole cherry orchard, but Lopakhin is able to maintain it by adapting and dividing it to earn the profit. Chekhov intelligently chooses the cherry orchard as the major symbol of the play because the estate is in a transition period which moves from aristocracy to capitalism. Therefore, the cherry orchard allows each character to freely identify themselves with the estate.

In conclusion, Anton Chekhov doesn’t endorse any characters; he is neutral and only depicts the story objectively. Presumably, he suggests that no matter how much people want to postpone things, everything always goes on. What people can do is accept it, adapt themselves, and conform to it.