

The Echoes of Ibsenism In Strindberg's Drama

Assist.Lecturer. Mithal Madlool Chilab
College of Education / University of Al-Qadisiya

Abstract

Henrik Ibsen (1828-1906) and August Strindberg (1849-1912) are two modern dramatists who belong to different nationalities (the first is Norwegian and the later is Swedish), but they are almost alike in tackling social subjects. Both playwrights' drama have been characterized by a powerful style and coloured by didactic and psychological impulses that make Ibsen's theatre as well as Strindberg's a mirror that reflects the reality of modern life in general and modern woman in particular.

Actually, Ibsen, the father of modern drama, and Strindberg, the highly controversial figure in modern dramatic literature, are two Scandinavian dramatists who join their hands in many aspects and reflect their hostility in others. It is true that each one has his uniqueness and significance in the development of modern drama in particular and modern literature in general and it is equally true that the interpretation of one's work is done with a reference to the other's. In brief, Ibsenism is the modern dramatic school whose initiator is Ibsen and Strindberg is one of its talented students.

This study aims at following up the echoes of Ibsenism in Strindberg's drama. Here-upon it is divided into three sections and a conclusion. Section one is a brief commentary about Ibsen's and Strindberg's beliefs, concepts, styles and dramatic techniques that reflect their affinity at certain points and their hostility at others. So this section enables the reader to formulate a preliminary idea about Strindberg's Ibsenism.

Section two is devoted to the study of the characteristics of Ibsen's drama and his Ibsenist qualities with special reference to his major realistic play, *The Doll's House* (1879) and then it states the meaning of "Ibsenism".

Section three attempts an insight into the fields where Strindberg really relies on Ibsen for the treatment of the same subjects. i.e. this section is meant to be a detailed study of Strindberg's Ibsenism and anti-Ibsenism by drawing a comparison between Ibsen's *A Doll's House* (1879) and Strindberg's *The Father* (1887) and *Miss Julie* (1888).

The study eventually ends with the conclusion where the major findings are introduced.

Section One

Introduction

*One of the most exciting decades in the history of the drama,
the decade that saw the birth of the modern theatre in
the controversial works of Ibsen and Strindberg.1*

Ibsen and Strindberg have indeed become a topic for a variety of academic studies that have proved them significant enough to change the direction of modern drama in particular and modern literature in general. The two artists' spirits, Ibsen and Strindberg, injured by witnessing the miseries and sufferings of a modern man in addition to the wound of their own life. Both take the side of the common whose life and social, psychological, sexual... problems had become the central subjects of their works and a fertile source for their images along their literary careers. As a matter of fact, those two Scandinavian dramatists in

their views and arts , sometimes appear as two facets of the same coin and sometimes the distance that separates their views be much wider than that between the boundaries of their countries.²

Strindberg establishes an alternative “anti-realistic” theatre in opposition to Ibsenist “realism”. He becomes convinced that Ibsen was the fervent champion of his hated enemy, the emancipated woman. Actually, looking to Ibsen as merely the champion of bourgeois realism and the emancipated woman widens the gap between them and leads to the description of Strindberg as “Ibsen’s anti-mask”.³ Strindberg’s objection to Ibsen’s subject matter and characterization is the real reason that initiates the hostility and creates a gap between the two artists.

The wide gap can be enclosed a little by illustrating the aspects or the points which Ibsen and Strindberg join hands at. Both are members in the theatre of revolt. They rebel against God. Ibsen’s rebellion is based on his conviction that God is dead. While according to Strindberg's convention god is the father of evil, as he writes in *Inferno* “I have sought for God and found the devil”.⁴ In reality, both started as unbeliever and initiate the war against God but later one they change their attitudes and find new meaning for the belief

As they joining hands in the matter of belief they also meet together in the professional field that they pass through their long career in the theatre as stage managers, directors, and playwrights.⁵ Both of them begin at the same point of departure of the old dramatic conventions and tendencies that deny the fulfillment of the individual. Moreover, both initiate the “independent theatre” movement which is more devoted to artistic innovation than to commercial success.⁶

The Independent Theatre movement focuses on the questioning about the identity of the human personality and man’s faith, passion and thought. Actually, being members of this same movement make both, Ibsen and Strindberg, focus in their works on the problem of self-realization. In addition, they introduce of new views and interpretation of man-woman relation, life, marriage, love, sexuality, the notion of womanliness and the idea of modern realism.⁷

Modern realism whose pioneer is Ibsen and skilful adopter is Strindberg is well reflected in their drama which is built on the assimilation of the new play-formula that suits their own purposes. In their modern realism, they attacked contemporary social ills and adopt new technicalities which serve their concentration on contemporary man as a social-intellectual- spiritual being. They abandoned the machinery of the older drama and the pattern of well-made play, though Ibsen at the beginning of his literary career followed it. Actually, they introduced the newness in all of the dramatic aspects, in order to concentrate on the dramatic substance of human experience rather than with the manipulation of a successful play- formula.⁸

The successful play-formula, the machinery of old drama, is not the only thing that is abandoned by Ibsen and Strindberg, rather they also seek freedom in the matter of theme. They introduced “the hidden theme” as Denis de Rougemont has pointed.⁹ While J. Stayn calls them “the forbidden topics” such as syphilis, adultery, free love, incest, euthanasia and lesbianism. These topics in way or in another are revealed according to their connection with the conception of new woman and the problem of will.¹⁰ Though they are attacked severely at the beginning and accused for introducing immoral tendencies in their plays, they succeeded in the manipulation of these topics not only in the field of drama but literature generally.

In brief, Strindberg from his early beginning followed Ibsen's steps till his voluntarily exile from his native land as Ibsen. This information has been reflected in Robert Brustein's studies of the entire career of August Strindberg. Actually, Brustein tries to explain how Strindberg joins Ibsen to be a revolutionary spirit in the theatre of revolt as in the following lines:

Strindberg joins Ibsen in his compromising revolt against life. Finding common roots in Rousseau and the Romantics. Each hopes to redeem mankind from spiritual emptiness- through desperate remedies: Strindberg by clearing away rotten buildings, Ibsen by torpedoing the Ark-both by unremitting warfare on all existing social, political, and religious institution. The negative, individualistic and essentially anti-social quality at these attacks exposes their metaphysical sources. Both playwrights begin as Messianic rebels, animated by strong religious needs, and determined to war on the God of the old while advancing towards something new.¹¹

Interestingly, Ibsen established the basis of modern drama and he participated in its development more than any other dramatist. As a supposition, Raymond Williams says: "Ibsen creates the consciousness of modern European drama"¹² While Bjornson states that "Ibsen is not a man, but a pen"¹³ As a matter of fact, Ibsen has a great influence on many artists whose one of them is Strindberg who uses Ibsen's pen, but surely not blindly. Hereupon, Ibsenism is a movement that reflects Ibsen's uniqueness and Strindberg's greatness and the mutual impact between them despite the hatred.

Notes

1. Edward.R.Mergenthal "The Modern Drama" www.geocities.com accessed on 2-9-2007.
2. Robert Brustein "Male and Female in August Strindberg" in Modern Drama: Essays in Criticism by Travis Borgard and William I Oliver eds.(New York: Oxford Univ.Press.1965), p.314.
3. Ibid, p.317.
4. Michael Meyer, Ibsen, (London: Michael Meyer, 1971), p.586.
5. J.L.Stayn, Modern Drama in Theory and Practice: realism and Naturalism, Vol.1(New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981), p.44.
6. Brustein, p.318.
7. Bernard Shaw, The Quintessence of Ibsenism: Now Completed to the Death of Ibsen, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1913), chapter two passim.
8. Meyer, p.586.
9. Brustein, p.352.
10. Styan, Modern Drama In Theory and Practice: Realism and Naturalism, p.25.
11. Brustein, p.316.
12. Raymond Williams, Drama From Ibsen to Eliot, (London: Hazell Watson & Winery Ltd, Ayleste Back, 1964), p.110.
13. Ibid, p.111.

Section Two

The Quintessence Of Ibsenism

No amount of criticism, biased or sound, can dislodge Henrik (Johan) Ibsen from his place as the father of modern drama. Despite the marked provincial quality which permeates his plays, he, as no one else, wrecked outmoded conventions of life and theatre. In short, he brought life to the stage and set the tone for the modern era.¹

Ibsen, the dramatist who is described as the realist as well as the idealist, has faith in himself, willfulness, conscientious, unscrupulousness, and could always make himself heard.² Ibsen focuses on the realities of modern life and establishes realism as the essential principle of modern drama. Actually, in his social drama, Ibsen discusses the status of modern man whose life is poisoned and distracted by old conventions and unjust social laws and aims at reconstructing rather than destructing the morals of his society.³

As a response to his interest in morality, Ibsen always tries to make the theatre as a common place where people from different classes meet at and render his stage as a forum for the discussion of social issues. So his drama is characterized by the display of the fundamental theme: the relation between the individual and society. Actually, Ibsen always tries to represent the daily life by revealing a connection between the problems of the private person and social, political and economic conditions. He reflects different kinds of situations which show the communication in marriage, professions, friendship and others, since his major concern is to show the struggle among the individuals to achieve social and economic success as well as the inner struggle within the individual to realize his/her own ambition, personality and man's own being. This is the principle of his realistic social drama as in his *A Doll's House* whose protagonist is the second-class citizen of his Victorian society, Nora Helmer.⁴

Actually, *A Doll's House* and in his other plays, Ibsen's characters are real: flesh and blood. They are introduced in personal disasters and conflicts out of their social relationships. In fact, his characters are "thinkers and feelers" constantly examining their personal inclinations and conflicts. Ibsen introduces complex relationships among his characters and reinforces their weaknesses or strengths by using a foil character, as in *A Doll's House*, Mrs. Linda appears as a foil character for Nora.

Ibsen's characters themselves explain their conflicts out of their necessity. They suffer because their private lives are weakened by social roles. They try to change conditions but cannot, as if they are "crushed by a blind fate" which can be the social background or the dead hand of the past events. Here-upon, the major problem that the characters reveal on the stage is related to male – female relation in its private and social frame. Male – female relation is the major theme in Ibsen's plays and it's tackled from different dimensions: love, family, friendship, parental relation or any other social ones. i.e. the male and female are the principle figures in Ibsen's plays as they are in real life.⁵

In male – female (or man – woman) relation, Ibsen sometimes tries to reflect the war between the sexes, but he always stands with female character. That is why he is described as a champion of woman's rights. He concentrates on the feminine personality, so he is called "a feminist writer". Ibsen looks to the status and to the image of woman in the time of working life, of economic and industrial progress. He explains how the women are treated badly and suffer from the pressure of society. In reality, women are helpless in modern society which is a society of males and not of human beings.⁶ Ibsen comments on this notion saying:

*A woman cannot be herself in the society of the present day, which is an exclusively masculine society, with laws framed by men and a judicial system that judges feminine conduct from a masculine point of view.*⁷

Ibsen's women always try to achieve their desires for personal happiness. They love to the degree of self-sacrifice. Women such as Ellida, Hedda, Irene, Nora represent love and humanity which are in clash with by the self-seeking world of men. Actually, women, in Ibsen's plays, are not judged according to their good or bad action, but according to their faith in their responsibilities, duties and rights in their families as well as the society.⁸

Our modern society is built on the difference of attitudes between man and woman to their life and particularly towards the sex and the sensual pleasure and this is what leads to the creation of the major problem in man's life as well as Ibsen's drama. Men, generally, declare only the sensual pleasure which women themselves admit, but they neglect other women's needs which help them, women, to achieve their own personalities. As in *A Doll's House*, for example, Torvald considers Nora merely "an ornamented sex object". He always encourages her to dress like a corseted girl and dance to achieve his own desires of getting pleasure.⁹

Nora: Now play for me! I am going to dance!

Helmer: (as he plays) Slower, slower!

Nora: I can't do it any other way.

Helmer: Not so violently, Nora!

Nora: This is the way.

Helmer: No, no – this is not a bit right.

Nora: Didn't I tell you so?

Bank: Let me play for her.

Helmer: Yes, do. I can correct her better than.

Mrs. Linde: Oh! –

Nora: (as she dances) Such fun, Christine!

Helmer: My dear darling Nora, you are dancing as if your life depended on it.

Nora: So it does.¹⁰ (Act II, p.47)

As a fact, Nora Helmer reflects the image of modern woman who finds herself bound within a male-dominated society where moribund social conventions and personal masquerades derogate the most vital of human gestures; that is the freedom to realize the self.¹¹

Nora, the innocent child-like woman who lives in desperate life with insensitive husband moves to a new reality and appears as a new strong character that tries to assure her own being through her conversation with her husband.

Nora: I am not speaking about business matters. I say that we have never sat down in earnest together to try and get at the bottom of anything.

Helmer: But, dearest Nora, would it have been any good to you?

Nora: That is just it; you have never understood me. I have been greatly wronged, Torvald – first by papa and then by you. (Act III, p.63)

Michael Meyer comments on these lines saying that Ibsen in *A Doll's House* discusses the issue of female emancipation and the female's rights. Meyer adds that Ibsen shows "the concept of a woman's duty to herself rather than herself-sacrifice in marriage".¹² While some critics accuse Ibsen by introducing rebellious woman, but according to Ibsen, Nora represents the concept of new woman who lays in the recognition of her intellectual and independence and even in new way of her action and performance.¹³

The image of new woman that is reflected in the above lines is not the only thing that attracted the attention of the critics rather the way by which Ibsen conveys the liberated thoughts of his new woman. i.e. the critics comment on Ibsen's mechanism which is called by Shaw "a discussion".¹⁴

'Discussion' is not the only new mechanism that was used by Ibsen to reveal the characters of Nora and Torvald, rather he used other theatrical devices. One of them is the

tarantella which does not add to the essence of the play, but it presents and heightens the situation in which Nora has been put and make the audience aware of the personality of Nora and Torvald in a direct way. Ibsen uses dance, mime and symbol as satisfactory means of communication that can achieve emotional effect beside their expressive meaning.¹⁵

Helmer: Well, let me look. (turns to go the letter-box. Nora, at the piano , plays the first bars of the tarantella. Helmer stops in the doorway.) Aha!

Nora: I can't dance tomorrow I don't practice with you.

Helmer: Are you really so afraid of it, dear?

Nora: Yes, so dreadfully afraid of it. Let me practice at once; there is time now, before we go to dinner. Sit down and play for me, Torvald dear; criticize me, and correct me as you play.

Helmer: With great pleasure, if you wish me to.(sits down at the piano).

Nora: Now play for me! I am going to dance! (Act.II,p.46)

Though Ibsen uses different kinds of theatrical devices and means to convey his message, yet he believes that "the use of prose [is] essential to realistic drama".¹⁶ John Gassner discusses verse-prose polarity in relation to Ibsen's play. Ibsen abandoned verse dialogue after having written two great plays: *Brand*(1866) and *Peer Gyat*(1867) and began to write in prose to compose his drama of ideas or drama of critical realism. Certainly, if Ibsen makes Nora speaks in verse, she will be away from our reality and will not be able to convey her own messages to audience. In addition, the nineteenth century is described as an age of prose: prose of journalism, epic, novel and of drama. i.e. Gassner by a discussion of verse-prose polarity reflects the old-new polarity in the development of drama generally and of Ibsen's drama particularly, since Ibsen started writing in verse, then introduces great plays in prose and at last, he put an end to his dramatic career by introducing his last play, *When We Dead Awaken*(1899) in verse.¹⁷

By discussing Ibsen's plays and looking at his Ibsenties, one can look to him not merely as a dramatist but also as a psychologist, philosopher, reformer and as a man who has a feminine sensitivity. As a matter of fact, Ibsen has been praised by many critics and scholars as in the following words of Una Ellis-fermor.

Ibsen's work represents on the English stage all that the potency and authority of his name conveyed, had the curious effect of setting the serious English drama, when it did emerge in the early twentieth century, in the prose form and the social-problem tradition. Ibsen , the greatest imaginative dramatist, since the seventeenth century which most needed his spirit in its full complexity, by a succession of dramatized Blue Books.¹⁸

After the detailed discussion of Ibsen's dramatic style and his Ibsenties, the reader becomes very close to the meaning of Ibsenism and can easily understand what is meant by this term.

Ibsenism is the greatest single force in the making of the twentieth-century drama and in setting the tone for modern era. It has no formula rather a quintessence which can be summarized by the following dramatic factors which lie at the basis of modern dramatic production of modern stage. The adoption of the sense of realism in different aspects such as action, characterization and in dialogue that reflects the use of prose as an apposed to verse. The emphasis on the individual creation of dramatic situations with the recognition of psychological motivation. Moreover, the departure from character romanticization towards the portrayal of the drama inherent in the lives of the middle class, with the portrayal of the common in order to create the drama of pure character analysis with the treatment of social

problems and ideas. In addition, the meaning of Ibsenism is reflected also in the revolution of women and the union of many forces into an integrated whole.¹⁹

Ibsenism has been defined by different critics according to their points of view. In his reference to the Norwegian master's social consciousness, Edward R. Mergenthal states that the term 'Ibsenism' refers to modern dramatic school of Henrik Ibsen that blends the realistic with the visionary and symbolic. The school which introduces pleasant, witty and erudite dramatic discussions aimed at satirizing and altering the ways of the world.²⁰

In brief, Ibsenism is a dramatic school whose literary productions or plays are characterized by technical excellence, power of characterization, and universal concentration on contemporary man as a social-intellectual-spiritual being. Throughout the principles of this school, Ibsen dramatized "the plight" of the individual within a restrictive society.

Notes

1. "Ibsen's Dramatic Works" www.Ibsen_Dram.com accessed on 6-10-2007.
2. Bernard Shaw The Quintessence of Ibsenism: Now Completed to the Death of Ibsen (New York: Hill and Wang, 1913), p.47.
3. John Gassner. An Introduction to Four Great Plays by Henrik Ibsen trans. R.Farquharson Sharp(U.S.A.:Bantam Books Inc., 1959)p.xi.
4. Leo Lowenthal "Henrik Ibsen: Motifs in Realistic Plays" in Ibsen: A Collection of Critical Essays by Rolf Fjelde ed. (U.S.A.: Prentice Hall.Inc.1965), pp.141-2.
5. Michael Meyer, Ibsen(London: Michael Meyer, 1971), p.546.
6. Lowenthal, pp.152-3.
7. Ibid, p.153.
8. Ibid, p. 155.
9. Ibid, p.156.
10. R. Farquharson Sharp trans. Four Great Plays by Henrik Ibsen.(U.S.A.: Bantom Books.Inc.1959), Act , p. .All the textual references of A Doll's House are related to this source.
11. "Ibsen's Dramatic Works" www.Ibsen_Dram.com accessed on 6-10-2007.
12. J.L.Stayn Modern Drama in Theory and Practice: Realism and Naturalism vol.1(New York:Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981) p.20.
13. Raymond Williams Drama from Ibsen to Eliot (London: Hazell Watson &Uinery Ltd.Aylester Back, 1964), p.76.
14. Ibid, p.76.
15. Ibid,pp.84-5.
16. John Gassner Direction in Modern Theatre and Practice(U.S.A.:Holt Runchart and Winston.Inc. 1965), pp.70-1.
17. Ibid, p.71.
18. Una Ellis Fermor The Irish Dramatic Movement (London, 1953), p.6.
19. "Ibsen's Dramatic Works" www.Ibsen_Dram.com accessed on 6-10-2007.
20. Edward R.Mergenthal "The Modern Drama" www.geocities.com accessed on 2-9-2007.

Section Three

The Echoes of Ibsenism In Strindberg's Drama

For over thirty years he has dissected us from every point of view; during that time his name has always been conspicuous in every book-shop window and his books gradually push out the others from our shelves; every night his plays are produced at the theaters; every conversation turns on him, and his is the name the pigmies quarrel over daily; the cry is heard that he has become hysterical, sentimental, out of his mind, but the next one knows, he is robustness itself, and enduring beyond belief, despite great need, enmity, sorrow. One hour one is angry over some extravagance which he has allowed

himself, the next captivated by one of his plays, stirred, melted, strengthened and uplifted by his sublime genius.1

Johan August Strindberg(1849-1912) is a Swedish playwright known for his contributions to the naturalist, symbolist and expressionist theatre. Strindberg, the playwright, novelist, essayist and poet whose literary work was characterized by special tone of his stormy life. Beside the influence of his personal life, he has directly been influenced by the works of different dramatists like O'Neil, Miller, O'Casey, Shaw , but mainly by the works of the Norwegian dramatist, Henrik Ibsen.

Strindberg, the artist who dominates the western theatre of twentieth century, wrote sixty-two plays whose various dramatic modes and techniques reflect Ibsenties and anti-Ibsenties. Strindberg struggles to build his plays on the concept of truth like Ibsen. He states that his plays deal with the fundamental truth, "like those of the sexual relationship, the psychological conflict of wills and the bearing of the past on the present" 2 as in Miss Julie. Miss Julie blames her unusual behaviour, her strong attitudes towards sex due to her inner conflict that has been created by her parents.

Miss Julie: You don't mean what you say—and besides; everybody knows my secrets. You see, my mother was not an aristocrat by birth. She came of quite simple stock. She was brought up in conformity with the ideas of her generation: equality of the sexes – the emancipation of women – and all that sort of thing. She looked upon marriage with downright aversion. Therefore, when my father proposed marriage to her, she relied that she would never be his wife- but –she married him just the same. I came into the world – against my mother's wishes, as I have learned; and now I was to be reared by my mother as a child of nature.3

While Ibsen's 'truth' is defined in opposite to "life's lie". He looks to the truth as a self-realization or a consciousness derived from reason as well as emotion. He believed that untruthfulness is the essential point that underlies all the crimes. This has been shown in A Doll's House when Nora's untruthfulness about her father's money and Torvald's untruthfulness about his love to Nora lead to the distraction of the family.4

Helmer: I would gladly work night and day for you, Nora-bear sorrow and want for your sake. But no man would sacrifice his honour for the one loves.

Nora: It is a thing hundreds of thousands of women have done.

Helmer: Oh, you think and talk like a heedless child.

Nora: Maybe. But you neither think nor talk like the man I could bind myself to. As soon as your fear was over-and it was not fear for what threatened me, but for what might happen to you-when the whole thing was past, as far as you were concerned it was exactly as if nothing at all had happened. (Act III, pp.66-7)

The conversation above between Helmer and Nora conveys to man-woman relation. Actually, Strindberg like Ibsen, writes about man-woman relation and the war between sexes as a fundamental law for life and marriage. Both wrote naturalistic plays about(with or against) woman's liberation. Strindberg wrote Miss Julie as a criticism of Ibsen's A Doll's House which calls for woman's emancipation. While Miss Julie is a result of Strindberg's own anti-feminism and misogyny and it has been created to destroy Ibsen's liberated heroine, Nora.5 i.e. Strindberg made Julie face her complete distraction at the end of the play in contrast with Ibsen's Nora who achieves her self realization at the end of the play.

Nora: I have other duties just as sacred.

Helmer: That you have not. What duties could those be?

Nora: Duties to myself.

Helmer: Before all else, you are a wife and a mother.

Nora: I don't believe that any longer. I believe that before all else I am a reasonable human being, just as you are-or at all events, that I must try and become one. I know quite well. Torvald, that most people would think you right, and that views of that kind are to be found in books. (Act III, p.65)

As these lines are based on woman's liberation both playwrights build their plays on the same notion of woman's liberation, but this does not mean that whatever has been reflected in Strindberg's Miss Julie is Ibsen's in origin. For example, Ibsen's A Doll's House does not have a frank discussion of sex while Miss Julie does, but also this does not mean that Miss Julie is about the mystery of Julie's sex drives or about Jean's seduction to Julie rather it is about the relation between class and sex and the effect of the past events on the psychological aspects of man's action and behaviour. In brief, the core of Ibsen's drama is reflected in Strindberg's plays either by using Ibsen's dramatic techniques or anti-Ibsenist or by new ones. Here-upon, the notion of Strindberg's Ibsenism can be clarified by drawing a comparison between Ibsen's A Doll's House and Strindberg's Miss Julie and The Father which are written as a reply to Ibsen's play.⁶

Strindberg thinks that Miss Julie is an important step in creating "a truly naturalistic drama" that reflects his misogyny and be as a response to Ibsen's A Doll's House. Miss Julie is an aristocratic lady who spends Midsummer Eve in the kitchen with the servant. She behaves like her parents who gave a birth to Julie and they had not been married yet. They do not look to pre marital sex as so scandalous and their Julie has been brought up unconventionally. This is the reason behind the reflection of Julie's weakness in her unconventional behaviour in Midsummer Eve.

Actually, Julie's parents have left great impression on her mind, in particular her mother who teaches her to be strong against man and hate him and be the superior gender. While her father creates within her even the hatred for her own sex.⁷

Miss Julie: I took my mother's part because I didn't know the true circumstances. She had taught me to mistrust and hate men, for she herself hated men, as I told you before – and she made me swear never to become the slave of any man... (p.76.)

Jean: Did you ever love your father, Miss Julie? Did you?

Miss Julie: Yes, I did – immensely – but, at the same time, I think I must hate him.... I must have done so without being conscious of it! It was he who brought me up to look with contempt upon my own sex – to be part woman and part man! Who is to be blamed for the consequences? My father, my mother, or myself? Myself? Am I then really myself? There is nothing I can call my own. (p.90.)

In previous lines one can get that Strindberg introduce Julie, who symbolizes modern woman, as victim of her unmerciful parents, but in reality Strindberg believes that "woman already by nature is instinctively villainous".⁸ He believes that woman has no truth in her love, and just like a vampire who tries to suck the blood of man. Strindberg had been inspired to write Miss Julie when he looked at the portrait of Munch, an expressionist painter, this portrait depicts the 'kisses' of women as vampires sucking the blood of men. One can draw the contrast between the image of Julie who has been inspired from such occasion and that of

Nora who had been inspired when Ibsen was talking with his wife and a friend, Camilla Collet at home.⁹

Strindberg looks to woman as evil and inferior to man, even if she is an aristocratic lady. He is always against woman's freedom, that's why his woman is the opposite, contrastive image of Ibsen's heroine who is the real reason behind their hostility.

Miss Julie: *Do you think I'll remain under this roof as your mistress? Do you think I will allow the people here to point a finger at me? Do you think I could face my father after this? Never! Take me away from here – from this humiliation and disgrace! Oh, my God, what have I done? My God!... (she breaks into tears.) ... and now you despise me! I'm falling – falling –*

Jean: *Fall low enough – fall down to my level then I'll raise you up again!*

Miss Julie: *What dreadful power could have drawn me to you? The attraction of the weak to the strong, the ones on the decline to the one rising? Or could it have been love? Is this what you call love? (p.70.)*

These lines show the nature of the relation between Jean and Julie and they are indirect reflection of Strindberg's concentration on the sexual war between man and woman and the social conflict between a servant and an aristocrat. In reality Strindberg is against woman's strength, and freedom and he wanted her to be weak and passive unlike Ibsen's woman. He thinks that no woman can feel superiority or regards herself above man even if she is an aristocratic lady since this feeling which as soon as been killed and prove her frailty, inferiority and weakness in "the arms of great democratizer and equalizer, sex".¹⁰

In brief, Miss Julie shows social-sexual image and makes the opposite directions; Julie, the aristocratic and Jean, the servant meet on equal ground at the scene of seduction. Strindberg comments on this image saying, "Julie is the sexual slave and the social aristocrat".¹¹ This image is reflected clearly in Jean's words:

Jean: *You – a menial's strumpet – whore to a lackey – keep your mouth shut and get out of here! Is it for you to rake me over the coals for being coarse and uncouth? Never have I seen any of our kind behave so vulgarly as you behaved tonight! Do you think a servant girl would accost a man in the way you did? Did you ever see a girl of my class throw herself at a man as you did? That's something I have only seen done by animals and prostitutes! (p.72.)*

In other words, Miss Julie is built on 'social-sexual image' unlike Ibsen's A Doll's House which has this image as a subsidiary one to 'social – psychological image' that is reflected obviously in the following lines:

Helmer. *I would gladly work night and day for you, Nora – bear sorrow and want for your sake. But no man would sacrifice his honour for the one he loves.*

Nora: *It is a thing hundreds of thousands of women have done.*

Helmer: *Oh, you think and talk like a heedless child.*

Nora: *May be. But you nether think nor talk like a man I could bind myself to. As soon as your fear was over – and it was not fear for what threatened me,*

but for what might happen to you – when the whole thing was past, as far as you were concerned it was exactly as if nothing at all had happened. Exactly as before, I was your little skylark, your doll, which you would in future treat with doubly gentle care, because it was so brittle and fragile.(getting up.) (Act III; p.67.)

Interestingly, the discussion of social-sexual image in Strindberg's Miss Julie attracts the attention to the fact that Strindberg finds in Miss Julie an echo of himself, since he is a son of an aristocratic father and a common woman. His life is also embroidered by misery and suffering like Julie who can be regarded the other face of Strindberg's coin. Julie suffers from her father's weakness who has taught her to despise man and woman and her mother, an emancipated woman, who encourage her to dominate man. Being tortured between two opposite forces, being not in total sex-hatred, nor in her class arrogance leads her to dirt and death. While Jean reflects his cleverness in his successful seduction of Julie and be above his low position as a servant and reaches to aristocracy.¹² i.e., the contrast that Strindberg witnesses in his own life is cooperated with flavor of Ibsen to be experienced by his characters later on.

As a matter of fact, Strindberg is fond of creating contrastive things in characters, attitudes and in other aspects due to his contrastive background. In his drama, one can find body versus spirit, winter and summer, beauty and ugliness, fortune and misfortune, love and hate, love and lust and dirt and flowers. It is true that, Julie and Jean are not only contrastive in their social status, but also in their attitudes towards love, sexual act and honour. Julie believes in romantic ideals, while Jean looks at love as "an honorific term for a purely animal act".¹³ And it is equally true that, the contrastive aspect in Miss Julie is greater than that in A Doll's House.

Jean: Miss Julie – you are a glorious woman – far too good for one like me! You are under the spell of some intoxication, and now you want to cover up your mistake by deluding yourself that you love me! But you don't! you may be attracted to me physically- and in that case your love is no better than mine! But I am not content with being just an animal, to you; and I can never kindle any love in you for me – (p. 73.)

Nora: that is just it; you have never understood me. I have been greatly wronged, Torvald – first by papa and then by you.

Helmer: what! By us two – by us two, who have loved you better than anyone else in the world? (Act III; p.63)

Both Nora and Julie are treated as a child, but the difference in the result of being treated as child, as Nora is concerned this treatment stimulates her to realize the reality of her own being, i.e., leads her to real maturity unlike Julie who faces her distraction and is deceived as easy as possible out of the effect of her childhood. In reality, Nora realizes everything at the end and explains to Torvald her decision of departure. She appears as rational self-possessed woman when she leaves her house and fulfills her responsibility towards herself.

Nora: I have other duties just as sacred.

Helmer: That you have not. What duties could those be?

Nora: Duties to myself.

Helmer: Before all else, you are a wife and a mother.

Nora: I don't believe that any longer. I believe that before all else I am a reasonable human being, just as you are-or at all events, that I must try and become one. I know quite well. Torvald, that most people would think you right, and that views of that kind are to be found in books. (Act III, p.)

These lines echo psychological aspects in Strindberg's drama. As a matter of fact, Strindberg's psychological development was hindered by his sense of social inferiority and the conflict between his intellectual and emotional patterns and some critics described his psychological experience of his childhood as a nightmare. For example, what has been reflected in *The Father* as a practice of Oedipal pattern is rotted in Strindberg's ambivalence towards his mother affection and love and in Ibsen's drama that is the vehicle that conveys Freud's theories. Interestingly, Strindberg employs psychological aspects and the principles of Freudian theories in his plays partly due to his own background and mainly as an imitation of Ibsen's dramatic style.¹⁴

Being within the scope of psychological interoperation, Ibsen in *A Doll's House* shows what Freud and Jung later assert. He shows that the liberation can only come from within and it is built on the revolution of the spirit of man. Actually, Nora achieves this liberation at the end and leaves her husband when she liberates her inner world, mind, and achieves self-realization.¹⁵

Nora: I believe that before all else I am a reasonable human being, just as you are-or, at all events, that I must try and become one. ... I can no longer content myself with what most people say, or with what is found in books. I must think over things for myself and get to understand them. (Act. III, p.65)

The self- realization, which is employed as an action of liberation that is built on certain psychological impulses, finds an echo in Strindberg's *Miss Julie* , but not as a realization rather as a self-expression.

Miss Julie: Oh, help me-help me! Tell me what to do-and where to go! I have behaved like a madwoman ... but is there is way out of this? ... I can't go-and I can't stay here! Can't you help me! I am so tired, so dreadfully tired!-Order me to go! Make me move! I am no longer able to think- I can't bring myself to do anything! (pp.78-79)

Going on in the diagnosis of the Freudian aspects that have been captured by Strindberg from Ibsen's drama, one can not neglect the adaptation of 'magnetism'. Strindberg's *Creditors*, for example, reflects what Ibsen manifests in his other plays like *The Wild Duck*: "the ability of one human being to gain a supernatural power over the mind of another".¹⁶ Strindberg in *Miss Julie* and *The Father* which have been written after two months of Ibsen's *Rosmersholm*, reflect Strindberg's interest in 'magnetism' and 'hypnosis' which were firstly used by Ibsen and later theorized by Freud.¹⁷

As a comment on previous psychological aspects in Strindberg's drama, Eric Bentley states that Strindberg shows 'self-analysis' and a unique frankness which was called later by Freud as "daring frankness". This frankness is either modified by modesty or immodesty and

it is considered as a proof of his own psychological genius.¹⁸ Actually, Bentley expresses this aspect fully in the following lines:

Yet Strindberg is not the flat explicitness of extrovert. The completeness with which he reveals himself implies not only love of confession and mastery of realistic technique but ruthless introspection and psychological genius. Nietzsche and Freud, if no one else, should have convinced us that psychological genius means ruthless introspection and is more an heroic human daring than a preternatural gift of knowing. This genius Strindberg has.¹⁹

The genius that Strindberg has enabled him to meet Ibsen again at the introducing of an excellent naturalist drama. Both want by this naturalistic movement to bring the theatre into audience and modernize it to meet the demands of the age.²⁰ naturalist drama as it is pointed by R. Furst and N. Skrine deals with 'contemporary man in his cultural and social environment' and creates the awareness of the central problem in a complete objectivity. Interestingly, Ibsen says "my intention [is] to give the reader an impression of experience a piece of reality"²¹ and Strindberg on Julie's tongue says "No, I am not complaining about social customs".

In addition, Strindberg in Miss Julie reflects the Ibsenities of introducing ordinary people in simple setting that indicates their reality. He builds his events round the Midsummer Night's Eve like Ibsen who builds his A Doll's House on Christmas occasion. As those two great figures join hands in many technical and thematic aspects in addition to the occasions of their plays, their ways meet together also at the station of language. In the matter of language, Strindberg does not follow Ibsen only in the use of prose language, but also in all other devices. He uses the mechanism of 'discussion' in Miss Julie like Ibsen's A Doll's House.

Miss Julie: (with an expression of pain) *Do you think all children have the same thoughts that you have?*

Jean: (at first hesitatingly, then with conviction) *That all poor children... Yes, of course- of course...*

Miss Julie: *It must be terrible to be poor!*

Jean: *Oh. Miss Julie--- Oh! (p.64)*

Moreover, he uses, like Ibsen, the "contrapuntal dialogue" which means "the phrases that have been used earlier are repeated, but only as a means of argument the casting the other's words back in a reversal of a previous situation".²² Compare the following lines from Miss Julie which echoing words from A Doll's House's ones.

Julie: *and now you've seen the hawk's back.*

Jean: *Not exactly its back.*

Julie: *And I was to be the first branch ...*

Jean: *But the branch was rotten.*

Julie: *I was to be the signboard at the hotel ...*

Jean: *And I the hotel. (pp.71-72)*

Helmer: *what! By us two-by us two, who have loved you better than anyone else in the world?*

Nora: (shaking her head) You have never loved me. You only thought it pleasant to be in love with me. (Act III, p.63)

Diving more in the discussion of Strindberg's Ibsenities, one cannot forget the monologue, the mime and the dance. Strindberg feels that by these theatrical and formal devices, he can convey more meaning to his audience and his play appear more natural; though Kristin's mime is less successful than the ballet (dance) of Julie and Jean. Such adaptation does not mean that Strindberg is a blind imitator of Ibsen distinctive way that differentiates it from Nora's tarantella.²³

Jean: (enter alone) She is mad, really! Dancing the way she does! The way she does! The people are standing behind the doors, grinning at her ... what do you think has got into her, Kristin?

Kristin: Oh, she's having her period-and then she is always so peculiar-well, do you want to dance with me now?

Jean: I hope you are not cross with me because I let you down a moment ago, are you?

Kristin: Certainly not! Not for a little thing like that you ought to know that! And I know my place....

Jean: (puts his arm round her waist) you show good sense, Kristin. You'll make a good wife (p.56)

The other theatrical device that is added to the adaptation of monologue, mime and dance is the use of tempo, but this aspect was not initiated by Ibsen. Rather it is related to Shakespearean drama, but now it is used with prose instead of verse. Tempo is "an intrinsic element in the play by which the writer tries to control the speed of language and the use of irony to evoke meaning with great powerful feelings"²⁴ By the tempo in the orchestrated rhythmical scene the dramatist introduces highly dramatic effect by blending different kinds of modes.

Laura: Now I am sleepy, so if you have any more fancies, keep them till tomorrow.

Captain: A word more first about realities. Do you hate me?

Laura: Yes, sometimes, when you are a man.

Captain: This is race-hatred. If it is true that we are descended from two separate species. We are not like one another, are we?

Laura: What do you mean by all this?

Captain: I realize that one of us must go under in this struggle?

Laura: Which?

Captain: the weaker, of course.

Laura: And the stronger will be in the right.

Captain: Certainly, since he has the power.

Laura: Then I am right.

Captain: Have you the power already then?

Laura: Yes, the power of the law, by means of which I shall put you under control tomorrow.²⁵ (Act II)

The tempo in the above lines is used as a device to reflect the struggle between Captain, the husband and his wife, Laura. The later tries to little Captain's manhood and

agitate his nervous system and make him realize the despair and failure in his battle. Laura speaks slowly with cold tone while Captain as soon as ask quickly and in anger tone "Do you hate me?" Laura answers with great powerful effective statement, "Yes, sometimes, when you are a man", which reflects the core of the play and Strindberg's skill of controlling the use of tempo. In short, tempo is the tool that reflect the theme of the play, the struggle between the weak and the strong and shows the image of "the third sex" in relation to the notion of "womanliness". This scene from *The Father* asserts S. L. Styan words in describing tempo; "like rhythm in poetry, tempo in itself is an index of a play's quality".²⁶

The tempo that make an in direct comparison between Captain and Laura, attracts the attention to make another comparison between Strindberg's *The Father* and Ibsen's *A Doll's House* to get more about Strindberg's Ibsenism. Both of these plays are built on the notion of 'womanliness' and the struggle between the two sexes, but by using different mechanism. Strindberg creates *The Father* as a reply to Ibsen's *A Doll's House* and introduces Laura as "a diabolical" contrast to Nora. Actually, these plays go through different directions, but they meet each other in certain points.²⁷

The two plays stand against conventional sexual attitudes and the unsuccessful marriage. "Ibsen dramatizing the woman revolt against the tyrannizing male, and Strindberg the male's revolt against the tyrannical woman".²⁸ As a comment on this idea, some critics say this is not a struggle of individual characters, since Nora's real antagonist is not Torvald, but society and even in *The Father*, the reason behind captain suffering is not his wife rather his "misunderstanding of the venomous female nature".²⁹

Interestingly, *A Doll's House* and *The Father* built on the conflict of ideas. Ibsen builds his play on his new concepts of "womanly woman" and "manly man". Womanly woman is defined as "a natural woman with a heart to love, and a soul to find its supreme satisfaction in sacrifice for lover or for child". While manly man is defined as:

*The man who ever feels helpless by the side of the self-helper; whilst the self-sacrificer is always a drag, a responsibility, reproach, an everlasting and unnatural trouble with whom no really strong soul can live. Only that who has helped himself know how to help others, and to respect their right to help themselves.*³⁰

Actually, Nora fails in her marriage and appears as unwomanly woman because of being lived under the merciless law of society and merciless treatment of un manly man.

The same notion appears again in Strindberg's *The Father* which is built on the same principle that Ibsen follows in his *A Doll's House*, the lack of the sense of "womanliness" but it is described by using different terminology. *The Father* is a tragedy of Captain who losses his mind and integrity, because of his selfish wife, Laura tortures him with the doubt about the legitimacy of his child. The character of Laura, the mother who is interested mainly in the possession of the child, is built on Ibsen's emancipated woman, but described as "a third sex".

Captain: *I saw it, but I did not understand . I believed you despised me for my unmanliness, and I wanted to win you as a woman by being a man.*

Laura: *Yes, but there was the mistake the mother was your friend, you see, but the woman was your enemy, and love between the sexes is strife. Do not think that I gave myself; I did not give, but I took---what I wanted. But you had one advantage. I felt that, and I wanted you to feel it.*

Captain: You always had the advantage. You could hypnotize me when I was wide awake, so that I neither saw nor heard, but merely obeyed; you could give me a raw potato and make me imagine it was a peach; you could force me to admire your foolish caprices as though they were strokes of genius. You could have influenced me to crime, yes, even to mean, paltry deeds. Because you lacked intelligence, instead of carrying out my ideas you acted on your own judgment. But when at last I awoke, I realized that my honor had been corrupted. (Act II)

As an explanation for the idea of 'the third sex', Robert Brustain clarifies that: As a member of the "third sex", the typical strindberg heroine. (Laura, Berta, Tekla) has a strong masculine streak in her nature too sometimes even stronger than the man's, for awhile he occasionally expresses a child like desire for tenderness, she remains adamant until she feels herself invulnerable.³¹

As a matter of fact, The Father is not exception or unique since Strindberg in most of his plays creates men as weak characters and concentrates on their passivity which is created out of the behaviour of the emancipated women who try to deprive men from their 'manliness'. Actually, Strindberg is aware of the ambiguous manliness of his male character and how the hero, Captain appears as unmanly in front of his wife as if his manliness is transformed to her, third sex.³² at last, Laura who is described as a third sex tell her husband that:

Laura: You have fulfilled your function as unfortunately necessary father and bread-winner. You are not needed any longer, and you must go. (Act.II)

The quotation above attracts the attention to the employment of childhood in Strindberg's The Father. In this play one can get another Ibsenit that is the destiny of innocent child who has to pay the penalty and be a victim for wife-husband conflict. In other words, Ibsen and Strindberg try to reflect the suffering of the children because of being one of the parents be as a child. According to Strindberg the emphasis always been on child-mother relation and in oedipal-pattern due to his own real childhood experience, but in The Father he introduces a new dimension for this relation. He shows the husband, Captain as a child(in A Doll's House the wife, Nora be as a child)who is in need of the love of his mother and he has to be under her control, power and will, and this is the real cause behind his fall.³³

Laura: Do you remember when I first came into your life, I was like a second mother? ... I loved you as my child. But ... when the nature of your feelings changed and you appeared as my lover, I blushed, and your embraces were joy that was followed by remorseful conscience as if my blood were a shamed. (Act.II)

Interestingly, The Father contains two basic truth, motherhood and fatherhood, but Strindberg concentrates on the motherhood. This emphasis has its significance in explaining the real cause behind man-woman conflict. Laura tries to let her daughter grow up away from her father, though he is as vital factor as the mother in the child's life. She does so in order to let her be a way from the other sex from her early moments of life, and she will face the same future of her mother. She thinks the realization of the daughter to father role 'will help very much to minimize the conflict between the sexes'.³⁴

It can be concluded that neither Nora nor Laura is womanly woman, since their 'womanliness' is burnt in unwomanly conditions. Strindberg and Ibsen in these two plays join hands in the theatre of revolt by introducing a new woman and a new kind of battle that is not a military. Ibsen in *A Doll's House* reflects the battle of brains and *The Father* is also a curious play that reflects the battle of brains and not a dagger fight.³⁵ Moreover, both plays show the psychological conflict within the character which is later described by Freud as "a soul-complex".³⁶

Actually, as one tackles the affinities between *A Doll's House* and *The Father* and the aspects that they meet at together one can not neglect the differences between them. They differ in the use of props. In *The Father* the lamp is used as purely an instrumental of aggression when the Captain throws it at his wife, while in *A Doll's House* as instrument of enlightenment. In addition, there is a difference in the type of setting. "The Helmer's house is as tangible and solid as the real world, but the walls of the Captain's house seem flimsy and penetrable, as if incapable of containing the explosive forces within."³⁷

It is true that those great dramatist, Ibsen and Strindberg use some of each other notions, themes, techniques and aspects in their plays and it is equally true that each one hangs the picture of the other in his house, but surely not out of affection. Micheal Meyer comments on Ibsen-Strindberg relation saying:

*Strindberg and Chekhov are Ibsen's two great successor in the realm of tragedy explored fields that he did not. Strindberg, like no writer before him, mapped that no-man's-land where reality and fantasy, sanity and insanity abut; and he wrote of sex a frankness which Ibsen, being Ibsen, could not match, especially of sex divorced from love and riding hand-in-hand with contempt and hatred.*³⁸

Notes

1. "Strindberg's *The Father*" www.strindberg_drama.com accessed on 2-10-2007
2. J. L. Styan *Modern Drama in Theory and Practice: Realism and Naturalism* vol. 1 (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press), p.38.
3. Arvid Paulson trans. *Strindberg's One-Act plays* (New York: Washington Square press, 1969),p. . All other textual references from *Miss Julie* is related to this source.
4. F.W.Kaufmann "Ibsen's Conception of Truth" in *Ibsen: A Collection of Critical Essays* by Rolf Fjeld ed. (U.S.A: Prentice Hall. Inc. 1965), pp.19-25.
5. Katrya L. Layton "Ibsen's *A Doll's House* and Strindberg's *Miss Julie* as part of an Emerging Naturalistic Movement in Theatre" www.Scandivian_studies.com accessed on 2-11-2007.
6. Styan, *Modern Drama in Theory and Practice*, p.41.
7. Layton.
8. Dirk Hillyer "Woman and Myth in Strindberg's *The Father*" www.Strindberg_studies..com accessed on 2-11-2007.
9. Ibid.
10. Robert Brustein "Male and Female in August Strindberg" in *Modern Drama: Essays in Criticism* by Travis Bogard and William I Oliver eds.(New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965), p.335.
11. Ibid, p.335.
12. Evan Goodwin www.A.Strindberg_drama.com accessed on 17-11-2007.
13. Brustein, p.337.
14. Ibid, p.320.
15. Michael Meyer *Ibsen*(London: Michael Meyer, 1971), 478.
16. Ibid, p.554.
17. Ibid, p.585.

18. Eric Bentley. *The Playwright as Thinker: A Study of Drama in Modern Times* (U.S.A.: Eric Bentley, 1946), pp.162-3.
19. *Ibid*, p.163.
20. Layten.
21. Styan, *Modern Drama in Theory and Practice*, pp.60-1.
22. Raymond William *Drama from Ibsen to Eliot* (London: Hazell Watson & Uinery Ltd. Aylester Back, 1964), p.120.
23. Styan, *Modern Drama in Theory and Practice*, p.40.
24. J.I.Styan *The Elements of Drama* (London: Cambridge Univ. Press,1960), p.142.
25. J.Edith and Warner Oland eds. *The Father by A.Strindberg*, www.Strindberg_plays.com accessed on 1-10-2007.
26. Styan, *The Elements of Drama*, pp160-2.
27. Brustein, p.327.
28. *Ibid*, p.327.
29. *Ibid*, p.327.
30. Bernard Shaw *The Quintessence of Ibsenism: Now Completed to the Death of Ibsen* (New York :Hill and Wang, 1913), p.48.
31. Brustein, p.326.
32. *Ibid*, p.327.
33. Emma Goldman "The Scandinavian Drama: August Strindberg The Father" www.A.Strindberg_drama.com accessed on 17-11-2007.
34. *Ibid*.
35. Bentley, p.167.
36. Styan *Modern Drama in Theory and Practice*, p.41.
37. Brustein, p.328
38. Meyer, p.855

Conclusion

Several figures of modern drama use the label "Ibsenism" as a mark vaguely progressive respectability to their experimental techniques in general, but according to Strindberg the matter is different since he adopts Ibsen technical skill in a unique manner that leads to creating a distinguished identity for Strindberg's theatre.

Strindberg is the brilliant dramatist who captures from Ibsen's style which enables him to be another pole in the world of drama. His intelligence serves him to behave like Ibsen, build his plays on causes and effects that reflect the reality of society with an honest treatment. He understands Ibsen's self-awareness and his new concept of tragedy as being a battle of brains and souls with no dagger fight. Moreover, he also captures Ibsen's notion of womanliness and makes the woman occupies the central position in his plays, but he appears as her enemy and not as a champion.

Actually, the analogy of Ibsen's and Strindberg's views is introduced in their plays that reflect their understanding of the social, sexual and cultural context of modern man. In addition, they dramatize the forces and frictions of modern life and widens the territories of modern drama themes by using their psychological insight and skilful manipulation for the tools of scientific explores then both playwrights become members of 'the theatre of thought' by their introducing 'drama of ideas'.

In short, the echoes of Ibsenism are clearly reflected in Strindberg's drama whether in the matter of themes or of techniques. Both dramatists introduce naturalistic drama and fix their names to be as landmarks not only as great writers in the dramatic world, but also as great explores of the unconscious world.

Bibliography

1. Bentley, Eric The Playwright as Thinker: A Study of Drama in modern Times. U.S.A.: Eric Bentley.1946.
2. Borgard, Travis& William I Oliver eds. Modern Drama: Essays in Criticism. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.1965.
3. Edith,J. and Oland,Warner eds. The Father by A.Strindberg, www.Strindberg_plays.com accessed on1-10-2007.
4. Fermor, Una Ellis. The Irish Dramatic movement.London.1953.
5. Fjelde, Rolf ed. Ibsen: A Collection of Critical Essays U.S.A.: Prentice Hall.Inc.1965.
6. Gassner, John Direction in Modern Theatre and Drama.U.S.A.:Hall.Runchart and Winstan.Inc.1965.
7. Goldman, Emma "The Scandinavian Drama:August Strindberg The Father" www.A.Strindberg_drama.com accessed on 17-11-2007.
8. GoodWin, Evan www.A.Strindberg_drama.com accessed on 17-11-2007.
9. Hillyer, Dirk. "Woman and Myth in Strindberg's The Father" www.Strindberg_studies..com accessed on 2-11-2007.
10. Layton, Katrya. "Ibsen's A Doll's House and Strindberg's Miss Julie as part of an Emerging Naturalistic Movement in Theatre" www.Scandivian_studies.com accessed on 2-11-2007.
11. Mergenthal, Edward R. "The Modern Drama"www.geocities.com accessed on2-9-2007.
12. Meyer, Michael. Ibsen London: Michael Meyer.1971.
13. Paulson, Arvid trans.Strindberg's One-Act Plays New York: Washington Square Press.1969.
14. Sharp, R.Farqharson trans. Four Great Plays By Henrik Ibsen. U.S.A. Bantom books.Inc.1959.
15. Shaw, Bernard The Quintessence of Ibsenism: Now completed to the Death of Ibsen. New York: Hill and Wang.1913.
16. Styan, J.L. Modern Drama in Theory and Practice: Realism and Naturalism.vol.1 New York: Cambridge Univ.Press.1960.
17. -----The Elements of Drama. London: Cambridge Univ. Press.1960.
18. William, Raymond. Drama from Ibsen to Eliot. London: Hazell Watson&Uinery Ltd.Aylester Back.1964.
19. Strindberg's The Father" www.strindberg_drama.com accessed on 2-10- 2007.
20. "Ibsen's Dramatic Works" www.Ibsen_Dram.com accessed on 6-10-2007.

الخلاصة:

يعد كل من ايسن(١٨٢٨-١٩٠٦) و اوگست سترندبيرك(١٨٤٩-١٩١٢) كاتبين مسرحيين محدثين، يعودان إلى قوميتين مختلفتين(النرويجية و السويدية)، و لكنهما متشابهان في معالجتها لموضوعات اجتماعية. لقد تميزت مسرحيات كلا الكاتبين بالأسلوب الرصين و قد لونت بدوافع تعليمية و نفسية مما جعل كل من مسرح ايسن و سترندبيرك مرآة تعكس حقيقة الحياة الحديثة عموماً و المرأة العصرية على وجه الخصوص.

في الواقع، أن ايسن، مؤسس المسرح الحديث، و سترندبيرك، الشخصية الذي أثار الجدل بشدة في الأدب المسرحي الحديث، هما كاتبين مسرحيين اسكندنافيين تصافحت أيديهم في سمات عديدة و اظهروا عدائيتهم في غيرها. في الحقيقة أن لكل منهم تفرد و أهميته في تطور المسرحية الحديثة بصورة خاصة و الدب الحديث على وجه العموم. و بنفس الصحة أيضاً هو تفسير عمل أحدهما يتم بالإشارة إلى الآخر. باختصار، ألا بسنية هي مدرسة درامية حديثة أسسها ايسن و كان سترندبيرك أحد طلبتها الموهوبين.

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تتبع أصداء ألا بسنية في مسرحيات سترندبيرك لذا كانت في ثلاث فصول و خاتمة.

يعطي الفصل الأول إجازا عن معتقدات و مفاهيم و الأساليب و التقنيات المسرحية لكلا الكاتبين،ابسن و سترندبيرك، عاكسا لتشابهم في نقاط معينة و اختلافهم في غيرها. كذلك أن الفصل يمكن القارئ من تكوين فكرة مبدئية عن ابسنية سترندبيرك.

أما الفصل الثاني فقد كرس لمسرح ابسن و خواص الابسنية بالإشارة لأهم مسرحياته الواقعية،(دمية المنزل)و من ثم يعرض معنى "الابسنية".

أما الفصل الثالث فقد حاول أن يعرض المجالات التي اعتمد فيها سترندبيرك على ابسن في معالجتها لنفس المواضيع. بعبارة أخرى، أن هذا الفصل يسعى إلى عقد دراسة تفصيلية لعرض ما قدمه سترندبيرك من ابسنيات أو ما هو مضاد للابسنيات من خلال مقارنة بين(دمية المنزل)(١٨٧٩) لأبسن و كل من (الأب)(١٨٨٧) و (الأنسة جوليا)(١٨٨٨) لسترندبيرك.

وأما الخاتمة فكانت عرضا لأهم النتائج التي توصلت إليها الدراسة.

