

The Lark's Lonely Twittering

An Analysis of the Monologues in *A Doll's House*

When I read Ibsen, I always hear noises, not the noises of the words, but the noises behind and between the words, noises that risk reducing those words to mere noises, to birdsong. (Simon Critchley 2007, 132)

In this article we examine Ibsen's use of monologues in A Doll's House. The use of monologues in this play has been criticized, and by some characterized as old and conventional, while others have considered this a futile device. However, previous scholars and critics have neither agreed on the number of monologues, nor about where in the play these monologues appear. Our close reading shows that there are as many as nineteen monologues in the play, several in each act, and that three of the characters express themselves in monologues. We find surprising dramaturgic patterns in the use of this device, and this indicates that Ibsen's use of monologues in A Doll's House has a more important function than the literature about A Doll's House until now has found. Our intention in this article is not to give a new interpretation of A Doll's House, but to examine Ibsen's use of monologues in the play, to reflect on the questions of why Ibsen made use of this device, and to consider what aesthetic functions this device might have.

Keywords: monologue, pantomime, peripeteia, soliloquy, teichoscopy, temporality

INTRODUCTION

Ibsen's use and rejection of the monologue in his modern, realistic dramas is an old and bewildering narrative. Maybe Ibsen himself is partly responsible for this bewildering. Already in 1869, he wrote to Georg Brandes that he had finished a play (*De unges forbund/League of Youth*) in which he had worked hard with the form, and proudly proclaimed that he had “gjort det Kunststykke at hjælpe mig *uden en eneste Monolog*, ja, *uden en eneste 'afsides' Replik*/done that piece of an art to make it *without a single monologue*, yes, *without a single aside*” (Fulsås 2005, 352; our italics). This statement has later been quoted and commented on, and several scholars see this removal of the monologues as an important part of Ibsen's modernizing of the drama genre (Northam 1953, 15; Geis 1993, 18). R. Farquharson Sharp claims that *A Doll's House* marks a turning point in the history of European drama: “Naturalness of dialogue and situation [...] and *the disappearance of such artificialities as the soliloquy*” (Sharp 1949, x; our italics). Alisa Solomon draws this somewhat ironic picture of this topic:

Indeed, if students learn anything about Ibsen, it's that his plays follow a clear progressive trajectory from overwrought verse dramas to realistic paragons, the prose plays themselves evolving like an ever more fit species, *shedding soliloquies, asides, and all the integuments of the well-made play as they creep*, then crouch, then culminate in the upright masterpiece, *Hedda Gabler*. (Solomon 1997, 48; our italics)

In a translation of *A Doll's House* into English in 2012, most of the monologues have been removed (Stephens 2012). This is also the case in a number of Scandinavian stage and screen performances (Törnqvist 1999, 29, 63, 189).

Ever since Rudolf Franz published a book about how Ibsen actually used monologues in almost all his plays, even in his realistic/naturalistic dramas (Franz 1908, 99 – 129), scholars have addressed this topic. But as we shall see, scholars have failed to identify the

comprehensive use of monologues in *A Doll's House* and to recognize the complex aesthetic function of this device. In this article, we will first define and discuss our main concepts, and then briefly present some other studies that discuss Ibsen's use of monologues in *A Doll's House*. We will analyse and discuss *A Doll's House* as a literary text, which concerns the readers, and only comment the play as a performing art when this is relevant for the argumentation and reasoning. The main part of the study will have a quantitative approach highlighting the extension and placement of monologues, with analysis and comments. In our study we have identified nineteen monologues in the play, which we identify as monologues M1 through M19. In the following part, we discuss what aesthetic functions the monologues have according to style, discourse and dramaturgy.

Monologues in the Drama Genre

In theatre, we meet actors performing and communicating on stage, and the dialogues and direct speech constitute the dramatic genre (Gullestad et al. 2018, 23). The monologue plays a far more peripheral (not mentioned by Aristotle in his *Poetics*) and remarkable role in the drama genre. Still, monologue as a dramatic device has its roots in ancient drama and accompanies the history of drama until modernism and contemporary postmodernism (Geis 1993, 15 – 27). Drama theory operates with different types of monologue in the classical drama (Helland and Wærp 2005, 165 – 166):

- A long speech line: a speech that has such an extensive range that the dialogue/conversation is temporarily suspended
- A speech addressed to the reader/audience
- Aside: a brief remark that a person makes directly to the audience, traditionally delivered to the side of a raised hand

- Soliloquy: the person is alone on stage and is speaking aloud

Soliloquies are the most commented-upon type of monologues, and they can be addressed to the audience or to the speaking actor her- or himself (Hirsh 1997, 1-2).¹ According to Deborah Geis, soliloquy generally suggests introspection. Teichoscopy, “viewing from the wall,” is a classical type where one of the actors tells the audience/reader about something s/he observes outside the stage. Teichoscopic information would often concern a phenomenon that the audience would not appreciate to see or have on stage (Geis 1993, 16). A very famous example of teichoscopy in Ibsen’s realistic dramas is the last scene in *Rosmersholm* where Madame Helseth is referring to Rosmer and Rebecca jumping into the millrace.² Patrice Pavis mentions a special form of monologue (dialogue solitaire) relevant for our study, *an absurd dialogue*, where one of the dialogue partners turns to the other who does not answer, or the readers/audience are unsure if s/he listens (Pavis 2013, 217).³

The monologue is therefore a technical device that has many different forms and functions. It might report things from outside the stage or the inner thoughts and emotions of a character. The most striking quality of the monologue, according to Geis, is its ability to “affect the narrative of the play”, for instance by manipulating time and space (Geis 1993, 10 – 11).

In modern realistic and naturalistic drama of the nineteenth century, monologues were rejected or considered quite outdated (Geis 1993, 17 – 23; Aarseth 1999, 71; Helland and Wærp 2005, 169 – 170). The opinion was that monologues disturbed the illusion of reality on stage. Several scholars claim that there are many monologues in Ibsen’s early (pre-realistic) plays, and that they are almost absent in the realistic contemporary dramas; they reappear again in Ibsen’s later symbolic dramas, where the monologues are more or less embedded in the dialogue or psychologically motivated (Geis 1993, 17 – 19; Helland and

Wærp 2005, 169 – 170). We have not found any later comments from Ibsen on monologues than the one from 1869, but we think it is worth noting what he wrote to his publisher, Frederik Hegel, in September 1879 upon finishing *A Doll's House* that no other work had given him “større tilfredsstillelse under udarbejdelsen af enkelthederne /greater satisfaction in the development of the details” (Fulsås 2008, 505). The monologues have had a renaissance in modernistic drama in the twentieth century and play, for instance, a central role in the dramas of Samuel Beckett, Bertolt Brecht, and in postmodernism (Richardson 1988, 199 – 202, 213; Geis 1993, 23 – 27).

In this article, we use *monologue* as a common term for all of the different types of speech outside the dialogic domain, and where the speaking character is either alone on stage and/or the utterance is not meant for any other characters in the play. In the analysis, we will identify, describe and analyse the different types we find in *A Doll's House* and discuss their aesthetic functions. In *A Doll's House*, most of the monologues are framed by stage directions, and a certain type of these play an important role in this drama, namely those describing silent movements and behaviour of the character. As Rudolf Franz and Egil Törnqvist do, we refer to these directions as pantomimes and will include them in our study of the monologues.

Other Studies Referring to the Monologues in *A Doll's House*

Here we will shortly present some central Ibsen scholars who have commented on the use of monologues in *A Doll's House*, in a 100-year perspective.

Rudolf Franz was one of the first literary scholars to examine Ibsen's use of monologues. He analysed their use in all three acts of *A Doll's House* and found that the monologues had different functions through the play; he appreciates the more psychological

motivated (naturalistic) monologues at the end of first act and some in the second act.

However, Franz evaluated Ibsen's use of the monologues in *A Doll's House* as a technically significant step backwards in relation to the other realistic dramas of Ibsen and claimed that Ibsen stopped using monologues in his ten last plays, *Ibsens Meisterwerke* (Franz 1908, 123, 129). He compared several of the monologues in *A Doll's House* to earlier, historical dramas by Ibsen, and he found no lyrical elements in the monologues in *A Doll's House*. In addition, Franz evaluated the use of dashes, question and exclamation marks as old-fashioned. Franz had a more positive evaluation of the stage directions surrounding the monologues; they create a silent play (*stumme Spiel*), a sort of *pantomime*. Franz evaluated these pantomimes as more aesthetically important and modern than the monologues and claimed that several of these pantomimes made the monologues redundant and thereby technically and aesthetically weak.

John Northam had a rather original approach as he began his study of *A Doll's House* by identifying and commenting on the monologues. Northam identified seven monologues for Nora (he does not say whether Ibsen had any other person in the play use monologues): two in act I, four in act II, and one in act III (see appendix, M5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13 and 17). Northam compared the monologues in *A Doll's House* with monologues in poetic drama (for instance Shakespeare's), and his aesthetic judgement is rather discouraging concerning Ibsen:

These broken, repetitive, incoherent utterances lack the illustrative power of comparable passages in poetic drama, where they would be the chief illuminators of the heroine's soul. Here they tell us that Nora is suffering, and they tell us vaguely the source and intensity of her torment; they may be, in themselves, a sign of childishness; but by themselves they do not re-create in us the sort of rich emotional attitude that we obtain from such a speech as "Ay, but to die, and go we know not where".
(Northam 1953, 16)

Nora's monologues give us limited opportunities to enter into the soul of Ibsen's characters, Northam concluded, and he found this device to be a failure – an involuntary violation of the

realistic illusion – and Ibsen to be a bit clumsy as a play writer. Several later critics have quoted Northam’s findings and agreed with his (incorrect) tally.

Toril Moi initiated her comments on the monologues by claiming that *A Doll’s House* has “seven brief soliloquies”, but she only identified two (M10 and M17) (Moi 2006, 241). Most of her comments relate to other studies. Moi disagreed with the assessments of Northam and other scholars that Ibsen was formally clumsy in his use of monologues in *A Doll’s House* and argued that in 1869 Ibsen had already demonstrated that he was able to write a play without monologues. Moi found the use of monologues to be a conscious and meta-theatrical device from Ibsen:

Nora’s moments alone on stage, is a conscious device from Ibsen; to show us how Nora is when she is not under the sight of the man she constantly is playing for; - and to remind us that we are located at a theatre. (Moi 2006, 241)

Nora’s fear and horror are only expressed when she is alone on stage, Moi observed, and her main point was that Nora’s monologues show us Nora’s uncensored thoughts when she is not under the control of Torvald. By letting Nora only behave authentically in what Moi characterized as the most theatrical scenes, Ibsen signals “the power of theatre to convey the plight of a human being” (Moi 2006, 242). According to Geis, soliloquies are inherently metatheatrical because they call for “the vocalization of thoughts for an audience” (Geis 1993, 9).

Egil Törnqvist offered special attention to the monologues in *A Doll’s House*, and he quoted and commented on almost every single one he found. Törnqvist was more interested in *A Doll’s House* as a performance text than a written text for readers, and started his examination of monologues by identifying the solo sequences (scenes or configurations) where only one person is on stage. He found 16 solo sequences: 13 for Nora, two for Helmer and one for Mrs. Linde. In the monologues, Törnqvist claims, Ibsen shows us glimpses of

Nora's true self, a self she has to hide from the other characters, and by these small glimpses Ibsen could prepare the reader for the disclosure of her real nature in the last part of act III (Törnqvist 1995, 27). However, Törnqvist did not find these monologues realistically satisfying. The monologues are only included to indicate Nora's inner development, he wrote, and "thus to prepare for her final transformation, and Ibsen thereby is sacrificing realistic plausibility (Törnqvist 1995, 27). In a book some years later, Törnqvist claimed that modern technical and media development makes it easier for us to accept this "defeat" he found in 1995, and claimed that these monologues therefore are more suited for the screen than for the stage (Törnqvist 1999, 28).

Some of the monologues in *A Doll's House* are among the most famous lines in the play, for instance M14 and M17, and they are usually commented on in studies on *A Doll's House*, but few critics thematise this point. It would have disrupted the frames for this article to mention all these comments, but some will be referred to in the discussion.

RESULTS

The monologues in *A Doll's House*

We will now present, analyze and comment on some of the monologues in each of the three acts, chronologically and in a contextualized manner, in order to prepare for the discussion of the aesthetic functions of the monologues.

Act I

Table 1 shows an overview of the monologues we have found in act I of *A Doll's House*. Here we find seven monologues, all uttered by Nora; one in the opening scene, four in the middle, and two monologues at the end of the act. The one in the beginning stands rather isolated,

concerning both its placement and content. There are several pages and a number of scenes between M1 and M2, but M2 is followed by a series of four monologues coming close together, with only a few lines between them: six lines between M2 and M3, one line before the next, and then four lines between M4 and M5. Then there is a long scene and several pages between these four and the last two monologues at the end of the act. The speeches consist of short sentences with an average length of four words per sentence.

Table 1 inserted here

It is tempting to believe that something has triggered this appearance of monologues in the middle and at the end of the act, given that we are dealing with a great writer who is extremely engaged in “developing the details.” But before we disclose this, we will comment on some of the monologues.

A Doll's House starts with a long pantomime and a very short scene with three people. Then two of the people leave, and the third person is alone in the scene, moving to a door to the left to listen (M1): **Nora.** Jo, han er hjemme./Ah yes, he's home.

Since there is no other person in this scene, this statement has no addressee and is not part of a dialogue, this qualifies as a monologue. Still, M1 is formulated like a response with its initial *jo/yes* – but without any preceding question, of course, because there is no other person in the scene to communicate with. M1 is embedded in a context of surrounding sounds (bag crackles, macaroon eating, tiptoeing, humming) and sights (pantomime) creating a bright, merry, playful and cheerful atmosphere full of expectation.

M2 forms both a parallel and a contrast to M1. As with M1, it starts with a word that seems to be a response to a line, but there is no preceding line nor any person in this scene to respond to. The atmosphere has totally changed from M1. The joyful *jo/yes* has turned into a negative *aldrig/never* followed by denials (*ikke/not, nei/no*) and negative emotions and

characteristics (*bange/frighten, enfolding/gullible, umuligt/impossible*). There is no obvious grammatical or immediate textual reference for the “he” who wants to frighten Nora and is the reason for all these negatives. M3 consists of only one word (*nei/no*), while M4 repeats the negation from M3 and partially repeats M2 (*det er umuligt/it’s impossible*). M5 is longer than the previous ones. This monologue has six sentences and starts with a sort of teichoscopy where Nora is telling the audience what they themselves can observe (*Her skal lys – og her skal blomster/Candles here – and flowers here*). This opening sentence is followed by five topic changes (Christmas preparation, abuse, self-comforting, Christmas hope, promises to Torvald), and the speech has several incomplete sentences and dashes.

In these four monologues, M2–M5, it is obvious that something dramatic has happened to Nora to turn the bright and merry atmosphere from M1 into something dark and threatening. No reader will have any problem in identifying the highly dramatic scene preceding M2 which triggers this series of monologues. To understand and make sense of this monologue and the three that follow, we have to relate them to the preceding scene where Nora had the first dialogue with the antagonist Krogstad; he is the hidden reference for the pronoun. He has made Nora aware of an unlawful transaction that she made several years ago, when she falsely signed a promissory note with Krogstad in the name of her father. The money was needed to cover the expenses for a necessary journey for medical convalescence for her husband Torvald. Krogstad threatens to disclose this to her husband and the public, and this will ruin her husband’s career and the family’s status. It is reasonable to interpret the initial “*aldrig/never*” in M2 as Nora’s response to Krogstad and a rejection of his accusations. Further, the last sentence in M2 repeats an argument Nora used in prior dialogue with Krogstad (*Jeg gjorde det jo af kærlighed/I did it out of love after all*). The four monologues in the middle of act I, M2–M5, function as an echo in Nora of what she has just experienced; they represent an inner replay of the controversy.

At the end of act I, there are two more monologues repeating the denials from M2–M5, but there are several pages and an important dramatic scene with Nora and Torvald between these two, M6–M7, and the previous ones. Torvald has given Nora a lesson about the moral consequences of forging a signature, and Nora has gradually become aware of the gravity of her mistake. M7, the last monologue in act I, starts with Nora’s repetition of two utterances from Torvald’s moral teaching. This indicates that Nora’s denials now have turned against Torvald as well as against Krogstad. The short pause and the denying gesture between the citation of Torvald, and the double statement that “this” is not true, invite us to relate this to both characters and to the accusations Nora has experienced in act I.

The monologues in act I are rhetorically formulated as lines in a social conversation and seem clearly addressed at someone else’s speech: as answers (*jo/yes, nei/no*), questions (*Forgifte hjemmet?/Poison our home?*), exclamations (*Å, hvad/What*), opinions (*Så enfolding er jeg da ikke/I’m not that gullible*), promises (*Jeg skal synge for deg/I’ll sing for you*), judgements (*Dette er ikke sant/It isn’t true*), excuses (*Jeg gjorde det jo av kjærlighed/I did it out of love after all*), and abuses (*Snak, snak, snak!/Oh, nonsense, nonsense*). They seem a bit absurd when we read them in isolation like this. The utterances look like lines in dialogues where Nora communicates with people who are absent, and like lines borrowed from other scenes as if they were in the here-and-now. The pronouns lack identifying references in the context. Our point is that it is impossible to determine any meaning from the monologues if we read them as autonomous speech; the linguistic form of the monologues demands a broader context to make sense, and because of this lack, the reader has to create it. The effect of the lack of context is not absurdism, because we, the readers, immediately and perhaps unconsciously identify and relate Nora’s monologues to the appropriate broader context, and thereby create meaning in the apparently meaningless.

Act II

In Table 2 we present an overview of the monologues we found in act II. There are two in the beginning, three in the middle and two at the end of the act, all identified as soliloquies and all performed by Nora; M8, M9, M10 and M13 alternate between soliloquy and teichoscopy. The average length of the sentences is the same as in act I, four words per sentence.

Table 2 inserted here

Act II opens with a monologue (M8) with a series of short utterances embedded in pantomimes of Nora walking around restlessly, fearing the arrival of someone or something (a letter or a card), switching between speech and pantomime seven times (see appendix). M8 has another discursive form than the monologues in act I: Nora is reporting what she observes while guarding the front door. Technically this is a teichoscopy, with elements of fear, doubt, self-reproving and despair. Another difference from the monologues in act I is that there is a thematic connection between all the sentences in M8. The only deviant linguistic phenomenon is two pronouns without clear references (*han/he* and *det/it*), but that problem was “solved” in act I. Nora does not identify the frightening phenomenon.

In the next monologue, M9, we find a “traditional soliloquy”: Nora performing an introspection, thinking aloud, letting us explicitly know what is on her mind. Linguistically, this appears through the personal pronoun in the anxious opening of the monologue, *Å, hvis jeg turde gå ud/Oh, if I dared go out*. This is clear speech; the pronoun has an evident reference in the immediate context, and Nora denotes herself as a subject. M9 ends with Nora screaming out “from the wall” a relatively innocent announcement of an arrival: *Ah, der kommer de/Ah, they’re coming*.

M10, M12 and M13 continue Nora’s anxious guarding of and reporting “from the front door” about the letterbox and end with (M13) Krogstad dropping his fatal letter to Helmer, where he provides information about Nora’s false signature. Like act I, act II ends

with a monologue (M14); Nora is figuring out how many hours she has left to live (see Appendix M14).

Both acts I and II have seven monologues, all uttered by Nora. While the monologues in act I are gathered in the middle and the end of the act, except for M1, all seven monologues in act II are evenly distributed throughout the act. They all appear in connection with crucial and dramatic events in the conflict with Krogstad, and they report Nora's immediate reactions to these.

All seven monologues in act II vary between pantomime and speech, two of them up to seven or eight times. Teichoscopies play a more central role in act II than in act I, indicating that the dreadful, frightening things have become more external; they are no longer just recurring inner fantasies spun around previous utterances, but have turned out to be *observable* phenomena "from beyond the wall." This dramaturgical change is reflected in the discursive change of the monologues, from pseudo-dialogues with an absent character to reporting narratives. While the pseudo-dialogues in act I are focused on how Nora experiences Krogstad's accusation as a threat against her own personality, the reporting narratives in act II focus more on the threat against her home and family by showing us how Nora anxiously monitors the front door.

Act III

Table 3 shows an overview of the monologues in act III, and here we find quite another picture than in the two previous acts. The number of monologues has decreased from seven to five, and in this act the monologues are divided between three characters: two by Mrs. Linde, two by Torvald, and only one monologue by Nora. We also find a new type of monologue, a long speech containing more words than all the others together, and the sentences in this monologue are on average five times longer than in the monologues in acts I and II.

Table 3 inserted here

Act III, like acts I and II, opens with a monologue that is an example of teichoscopy. We find the same alternating between pantomime and speech (five times). Now, for the first time in this drama, primary attention shifts from Nora to Mrs. Linde. Like Nora, she is listening for the arrival of Krogstad (M15): *Endnu ikke. Og nu er det dog på den højeste tid. Hvis han bare ikke – /Still not here. And time really is running out. I just hope he hasn't –*. This monologue, then, forms both a parallel and a contrast to other monologues in act II: someone is waiting for Krogstad, but not in fear as in act II – but with hope. Mrs. Linde's meeting with Krogstad is framed by two monologues, M15 and M16. In M16, Mrs. Linde is summing up and evaluating what she has experienced: *Hvilken vending! Ja, hvilken vending! Mennesker at arbejde for/What a turnaround! Yes, what a turnaround! People to work for*. Even if Mrs. Linde's two monologues are related to Nora's monologues through parallels and contrasts, they play a more metatheatrical role than the monologues in acts I and II. That *Time really is running out* (M15) can be read contextually (Krogstad has to hurry up before Nora and Torvald return from the masquerade), but also as a statement about the whole play, as we are in the last act. This metatheatrical element is followed up in M16. Here Ibsen has Mrs. Linde use the Norwegian name for the dramaturgical concept "peripeteia"⁴ to characterize her new prospects, a marriage with her lover from adolescence, Krogstad. The concept is emphasized by the repetition, probably signaling that there will be more reversals in this play.

The next monologue, M17, appears in the middle of the act, at the time when Torvald believes he and Nora will be going to bed. The audience/reader learned at the end of act II that Nora will commit suicide after the masquerade. Torvald says he will read his letters before bedtime, and among these letters is the one from Krogstad. In M17, Nora's last monologue, she prepares for her final goodbye:

NORA med forvildede øjne, famler omkring, griber Helmers domino, slår den omkring sig og hvisker hurtigt, hæst og afbrudt. Aldrig se ham mere. Aldrig. Aldrig. Aldrig. (*kaster sit schavl over hovedet*) Aldrig se børnene mere heller. Ikke dem heller. Aldrig; aldrig. – Å, det iskolde sorte vand. Å, det bundløse –; dette –. Å, når det bare var over. – Nu har han det; nu læser han det. Å nej, nej; ikke endnu. Torvald, farvel du og børnene – *Hun vil styrte ud igennem forstuen*;

This monologue has the same form as the others: pantomime and speech alternating (five times). The most striking aspect of the content is the overwhelming numbers of negations: “never” eight times, “no” twice. In the middle of the speech, Nora quotes the image Krogstad conjured up when she threatened to commit suicide (*black, icy water*) in act II. The speech contains 54 words distributed between fifteen sentences, seven of which consist of only one word, and five incomplete sentences with five topic shifts (leaving her husband, leaving her children, suicide image, Torvald reading Krogstad’s letter, farewell). This rambling, incoherent speech, together with the ten negations, makes this monologue the great existential “no” in *A Doll’s House* (see Moi 2006, 241 – 242).

Torvald has the ambiguous honour of delivering the last two monologues, M18 and M19. M18 is typologically the most atypical monologue in the whole play, and it is performed while one of the most famous symbolic actions is taking place in another room where the reader or viewer has no access. It does not look like any of the other monologues in *A Doll’s House*, except for the fact that the speaking actor is alone on stage. Torvald (in M18) believes Nora is listening to what he says, but the reader is not sure if Nora is actually listening. We are, however, sure that the *terrified little songbird* Torvald is talking about does not exist anymore. It is a sobering point that this speech is delivered when Nora is undressing, shifting from fancy masquerade to everyday dress, as this shift has been read as a sign for Nora’s transformation into her new identity (Durbach 1991, 121;⁵ Rekdal 2004, 89).

Nevertheless, whether or not Nora is listening to or noticing what Torvald says does not matter concerning its status as a monologue. This is a monologue, for several reasons. It might be classified as an *absurd dialogue* where one of the dialogue partners (Torvald) turns to the other (Nora) and we are unsure if s/he is listening (Pavis 2013, 217). Furthermore, due to its length, this monologue might also be categorized as a speech that has such an extensive range that the conversation is temporarily suspended. We read this scene in this way: Torvald imagines being in a dialogue, while he actually, through dramatic irony, is degraded to a monologue. Torvald's words and speech have lost their meaning because the reality that these words describe no longer exists. Torvald is addressing a person (*lille forskræmte sangfugl/terrified little songbird*) who now only exists in his fantasy. Nora has removed these metaphorical disguises, and such a sentimental version of patriarchal discourse no longer has any effect on her, neither to comfort nor to control. This lack of correlation between the intention of the speaker, the addressee, and the context creates dramatic irony, and Torvald falls from his position of power and becomes a victim of irony. He presents himself as a huge bird with *brede vinger/broad wings*, who will *redde den lille sangfuglen ud af høgens klør/save the little songbird from a hawk's claw*. But there is no bird to save. The lark does not twitter any more. The play with the doll's house and the toys has come to an end. We read M18 as a carnivalesque dethroning of a patriarch. This is both comic and tragic: A cowardly man pretending to be heroic is comic. A man who does not know himself nor his wife is both tragic and comic.

Like acts I and II, act III ends with a monologue (M19):

HELMER *synker ned på en stol ved døren og slår hænderne for ansigtet. Nora! Nora! (ser sig om og rejser sig) Tomt. Hun er her ikke mere. (et håb skyder op i ham) Det vidunderligste –?! Nedefra høres drønnet af en port, som slås ilås.*

In M19, we find a number of echoes, parallels and contrasts with monologues and scenes from all three acts. The most obvious is that Torvald has replaced Nora as the speaking character on an empty stage, saying things without an addressee. We have the same alternation between pantomime and speech (seven times), frequent topic shifts, desperate outbursts, short statements, single-word sentences and incoherent utterances. Now it is Torvald who is guarding the front door with desperate movements (*slår hænderne for ansigtet/throws his hands up to his face*) like Nora did in act II. Torvald's first utterance (*Tomt. Hun er her ikke mere/Empty. She is gone.*) makes a contrast to Nora's first monologue in the opening scene in act I (*Jo, han er hjemme/Yes, he's home*). As Errol Durbach points out, Torvald's last utterance repeats Nora's last idea (*Det vidunderligste/The most miraculous*) from act III, an expression Torvald did not understand some lines earlier in this act, but now gives him hope (Durbach 1991, 130). Nora does not believe in this "miraculous" any more. At last, Torvald is ironically captured by his own patronizing words about Nora with Nora's loud door-slamming serving as a goodbye. It is reasonable to read this loud door-slamming, as Tone Selboe does, as a cruel ironic response to Torvald's line from the masquerade conversation (Selboe 1997, 96): *En afslutning bør altid være virkningsfuld, fru Linde, men det er det mig umuligt at få gjort Nora begripeligt/A finale ought always to be effective, Mrs. Linde; but that is, it seems, quite impossible for me to get Nora to grasp.*

Discussion of the Aesthetic Functions of the Monologues

Style and Linguistics

In Table 4, we present a complete overview of the monologues in the entire play, with a focus on the style.

Table 4 inserted here

Nora's 15 monologues contain 414 words that make up about 80 sentences; on average there are five words per sentence. Most of the sentences are incomplete: 8 (of 24) in act I, 31 (of 56) in act II, 11 (of 15) (by Nora) in act III, and there is weak or no coherence between the sentences (*A candle here — and flowers there. — That horrible man!*). There are many negations like *no/not* (28 times), *never* (10 times) and *impossible* (5 times) – altogether 52 negations. We find it significant that most of the sentences in the monologues are without a subject, and we think that this syntactic deficiency is a highly relevant expression of the deconstructive process Nora is going through. We find nine exclamation marks and eight dashes, which indicate the speaking of a confused and anxious mind. Furthermore, the monologues in act II contain incomplete sentences, missing subjects, dashes and exclamation marks. Two of the monologues contain just one word, *Nei/No* in M3 and *Ah* in M11. Several phrases are reminiscences and fragments echoing more eloquent utterances in the dialogues.

The language we highlight here is more similar to a language that not yet has found its form, and that is not yet communicable to other characters. The utterances in the monologues have to be related to other and larger parts of the text to give meaning. One can question whether these monologues are conventional or communicative speech at all. In a profound way, these utterances are more like a sign or symptom of something (the character's state of mind) than they are expressing something (a specific content). In these monologues Ibsen has portrayed a language that is falling apart. Even the physical, nonverbal language in the monologues emphasizes this deterioration of verbal language, including movements that initiate action, but are interrupted or not finished. These pantomimes (M2–4 and M8–10) indicate Nora's attempts to create an acceptable atmosphere, but as her verbal language no longer communicates, her physical actions (folding laundry, stitching embroidery, etc.) become a language that could possibly maintain her status in society. However, she does not

manage to complete these actions, and the pantomimes combined with the verbal utterances show her state of mind.

Looking in an isolated way at the linguistic and stylistic form of the monologues, especially Nora's 15 monologues, we think Northam gave a precise description, calling them "broken, repetitive, incoherent"; they may in themselves, as Northam wrote, be "a sign of (Nora's) childishness" (Northam 1953, 16). This language is neither poetic nor well-articulated. It is obvious that Ibsen did not use the monologues in *A Doll's House* for great speeches. Further on, we also think that Northam was right in claiming that the monologues do not "recreate in us a sort of rich emotional attitude" (Northam 1953, 16) as Shakespearean monologues do because Ibsen used the monologues in totally different ways than Shakespeare. We agree with Moi that the use of monologues must have been a conscious device for Ibsen. However, we find it harder to follow Moi when she writes that this was a device for showing us Nora's uncensored and liberating thoughts (Moi 2006, 241 – 242). Erik Østerud focused on M14 and described the linguistic form in this particular monologue as "naked, objective level-headedness, a calmly observant form" and characterized this speech as "linguistic sobriety" (Østerud 2004, 163). Østerud's characterization seems more convincing, but this speech (M14) is an exception to all the other monologues in *A Doll's House*.

Our perspective is that the overall meaning of the monologues does not lie in the content of what is uttered, but in the form and functions of the monologues. And as we have shown, the form and function changes throughout the play. Ken Frieden claims that monologue "signals an active break from norms of ordinary language and is thus allied with innovation, deviant discourse, and creativity" (Frieden 1985, 19). We will therefore examine the discursive levels in the monologues more closely.

Style and Discourses

Deborah Geis wrote that some monologues may be used to address another character (being communicative) while other monologues, for instance soliloquies, generally suggest introspection (Geis 1993, 8). We have argued that most of the monologues in *A Doll's House* are soliloquies (seventeen out of nineteen), and it is not unreasonable to say that the monologues in this play serve as a vehicle for introspection; the monologues give the reader access to the speaker's inner thoughts and emotions. At the same time, on the linguistic surface, the utterances in the monologues have an obvious resemblance to utterances in interactive communication and dialogues; they are addressed to another character's utterances, especially in act I. But the dialogue partner is absent. The reader has to identify to which person and to what situation(s) the utterances in the monologues relate. One might therefore say that the monologues demand a more active reader who has to create a context for the utterances in the monologues. If the reader does not respond to this demand, the monologues will give no meaning.

The same is true concerning monologues consisting of fragments (words and formulas) from lines in dialogues from preceding scenes. These fragments, too, appear to echo other characters' speech; and again, because the addressee is absent from the scene's here-and-now, the drama text challenges the reader to identify, relate and create meaning actively. Thus, even if the monologues function like introspection, they have the linguistic surface and form of communicative language. In *A Doll's House* Ibsen therefore portrays the character's inner life as truly dialogic.

Ibsen changed the use and the purposes of monologues in relation to his earlier dramatic works. Since Northam and Moi failed to identify all the monologues in *A Doll's House*, they also failed to see the complete aesthetic significance of Ibsen's new way of using monologues. Törnqvist was closer to identifying all the monologues, but he overlooked their aesthetic functions. Northam, Moi and Törnqvist listened more to what the monologues say

and paid too little attention to the way they say it. The significance of the monologues in *A Doll's House* does not lie in the meaning of the words, their eloquence, or their expression of inner psychological secrets. The significance lies in their form and function. The dramatic characters in the monologues are not merely telling about their thoughts and emotions; instead Ibsen shows their inner life to be a battlefield of combatants, and the weapons are linguistic fragments and reminiscences from the struggles they are fighting. The monologues are almost impossible to read and comprehend as autonomous utterances because they are so deeply dependent on the larger surrounding context. Therefore, they also to a larger degree reflect the dramatic changes in the play; in the monologues, we can listen to how the characters react to these changes. The monologues should therefore be read in light of time and dramaturgy.

Monologues and Temporality

In Ibsen's retrospective technique, the three main aspects of time – present, past and future – play an important role. Erik Østerud has made us aware of that temporality itself is actually thematised in one of the monologues, M14, and says that this monologue is “one of the absolute most important (speech) in the play” (Østerud 2004, 163). This temporal thematization is, as we have seen, followed up in M15 (*time really is running out*). In Table 5 we can see that the main aspects of time have a dynamic shift during all the three acts: the monologues in act I (M2–M7) relate to the *past* (what has been said in earlier scenes), except for M1, which relates to the present time. In act II the monologues relate to *present time* (Nora is reporting what she hears and sees at the front door), except for Nora's last monologue (M14), which relates to *future time*; she calculates how many hours she has left to live.

All the monologues in act III have a clear temporal theme, and these temporal aspects are related to change, or opportunities for radical change. The first three monologues make up a remarkably temporal relation to future time: Starting with Mrs. Linde's expectations (M15) (*Endnu ikke/Still not... på den højeste tid/time running out ... Hvis han bare ikke –/I hope*),

and then followed by the happy change (*Hvilken vending/What a turnaround*), and ending with the dialogue with Krogstad that promises well for the future (*Mennesker at arbejde for ... der skal riktignok tages fat/People to work for ... there's a task to be done*). This optimism regarding the future is turned to the diametric opposite in M17. Nora's last monologue, M17, takes up the thread from her previous monologue, M14, where she let us know that she had decided to commit suicide in the near future, and here she makes her farewell to her children and husband and imagines how her imminent death will be.

The temporal aspect of M18 is a bit more implicit and metaphoric than the temporal aspects of the earlier monologues in act III. There is a discrepancy between the person Torvald is speaking about and the person he is addressing. The character Torvald is talking about, the *terrified songbird*, no longer exists. Time has escaped him, Torvald is living with the ghosts of the past, and the real Nora is about to leave him. In the play's last monologue, M19, we are back to the monologue type of act I (relating to the past): a lonely character in despair, speaking on an empty stage with an absent person, echoing speech fragments from earlier scenes. The single but significant new aspect of this monologue is that the speaking character has been replaced; whereas earlier it was the protagonist, it is now the antagonist.

Geis claims that the monologue has a "capacity for manipulating time".⁶ According to Geis, even the past and future can ultimately only be evoked through "the 'present' of the stage action in front of us" (Geis, 1993, 10). As we have seen, Ibsen manipulates the three main aspects of time in the monologues in each of the three acts of *A Doll's House* in a very significant way: from present to past in act I, back to present in act II but with quite another purpose than in act I (from happy to anxious observing); then from present to future time at the end of act II as a temporal bridge to the future aspect in act III. The future prospects alternate between happy expectations and total hopelessness, depending on who is speaking; the happy expectations of Mrs. Linde are framed by Nora's suicidal fantasies. The temporal

narrative of the monologues turns back to the past in Helmer's two monologues, in his conversation with a Nora-figure who no longer exists, and with speech fragments from an absent person in the end.

Dramaturgy and Transformation

Northam and Moi found seven monologues in *A Doll's House*, and Törnqvist found sixteen. We have proven that the correct number is nineteen. In Table 5 we give a complete overview of the monologues in the entire play.

Table 5 inserted here

According to our close reading and Table 5, both the number and the distribution of the monologues make a clear and surprising compositional pattern in *A Doll's House*: seven monologues in act I and in act II, all uttered by Nora; then 2 + 1 + 2 monologues in act III, by the main character in the middle, a parallel figure in front and an antagonist in the end.

Together with the placement of the monologues in the acts and the shifting time aspects from acts I to II to III, this makes a remarkable compositional pattern. It is hard to believe that Ibsen, who had such a "great satisfaction in the development of the details" in making *A Doll's House*, was not aware of this (Fulsås 2008, 505).

Soliloquy is the dominant type of monologue in *A Doll's House*. In acts II and III Ibsen alternates between soliloquy and teichoscopy in the same monologues. The increasing number of teichoscopies in act II reflects the fact that the threatening things have changed from inner fantasies in act I to outer phenomena in act II. In addition to this traditional use of "reporting from the wall," the teichoscopies also disclose the reporter's state of mind. The most atypical monologue in the whole play is M18, both in linguistic form, content and

extent. But the aesthetic function and effect of the use of monologues in *A Doll's House* depends on several other factors than merely the type of monologue.

Every act starts and ends with a monologue, and thus the entire drama is framed by monologues. It is the entrance of the main antagonist, Krogstad, that is the starting point for the stream of monologues in the middle and last part of act I and further on in act II. This entrance marks the turning point in Nora's life, and by extension one of the great peripeteias in this drama. The two main turning points in the action of the play, the arrival of Krogstad in act I and Nora's uprising against Torvald in the last part of act III, mark the starting point and the end of Nora's frequent use of monologue.

As we have seen, there is an allusion to the concept of peripeteia in the play itself (M16). Referring to peripeteia in the beginning of the last act might be a form of irony from Ibsen, preparing – and promising – the audience/reader for the great change to come. The play is coming to an end, and one might read this irony as a metatheatrical comment encouraging the characters to perform in a more honest manner, after this little comic interlude of Mrs. Linde and Krogstad. Several monologues are connected to peripeteias in *A Doll's House*, for instance: M2 (the information about the great mistake), M13 (the point of no return; Krogstad has put the letter in the letterbox), M14 (Nora has decided to commit suicide), M16 (Mrs. Linde and Krogstad's reconciliation), and M19 (Nora is breaking up the marriage and Torvald is about to realize the tragedy). The monologues are thereby related to a series of *peripeteia*, one of the most “powerful elements of emotional interest” in a play, according to Aristotle's *Poetics* (Butcher 2011, 27).

In act I and act II the monologue becomes a locus where Nora can unfold her despair. To a large extent the monologues reflect Nora's reactions and responses to the actions and utterances of the other characters, and illustrate the increasing tension in the play. This dialogic conflict shows us Nora's mind represented as a battlefield of extreme emotions,

crossing interests and conflicts, attitudes and ideologies from the surrounding social context represented by Krogstad and Torvald, and all the other striving forces in the play. This battlefield does not emanate beautiful and profound speech, but the monologues give us a unique “view from the wall” of the conflicts in the play, and how these conflicts are tearing Nora apart, occupying and deconstructing her doll-like mind, love and life.

Moi claimed that Ibsen’s use of the monologue is a metatheatrical device; her point is that this is the case in the seven monologues where Ibsen shows us Nora’s uncensored thoughts, and that Ibsen want to remind us that we are located in a theatre (Moi 2006, 242). We do not share this perception, but assert that it is possible to characterize Mrs. Linde’s two monologues as metatheatrical, since M15 draws the readers’ attention to the fact that the (play’s) time is about to run out (since we have now entered the last act), and that M16 both signals and creates the expectation of a major reversal.

Durbach claimed that transformation is the governing idea of *A Doll’s House*; and not only the existential transformation of Nora from a doll into a self-conscious being, but also transformation as a principle of dramatic composition. Durbach ties this transformation to the role of the tarantella (Durbach 1991, 134). One might say that the monologues represent an introverted counterpoint to this extremely extroverted device of the dance. The monologues form an exciting compositional pattern where the most central characters express feelings that are impossible to communicate to others. The three characters who enter into a monologue – Nora, Mrs. Linde and Torvald – experience a transformation, either from happiness to unhappiness or vice versa. Several scholars have argued that the tarantella is connected to temporality and transformation (Durbach 1991, 134; Selboe 1997, 94; Rekdal 2004, 86). Østerud makes a thematic connection between the tarantella and the monologue at the end of act II (M14), arguing that it is in this monologue that the transformation of Nora happens: “Nora is on the point of entering into another mode of being [...] The total presence that

manifests itself here partly in the new experience of time, partly in the new world, partly in the new subjectivity, is the basis of the transformation that takes place in Nora in the final part of the drama” (Østerud 2004, 163). While Østerud interprets the tarantella as an expressive figure connected to dance, feast and transforming rituals (148 – 150), we have argued that the monologue can be associated with exclusion, solitude and despair.

Our study discloses that most of the monologues appear in connection with turning points in the drama, and that an allusion to the concept of peripeteia appears in one of the monologues. Characters have to retreat to monologue when the surrounding pressure is unbearable. Torvald’s final monologue, closing the play, reflects the changing roles of Nora and Torvald, inside and outside the dialogic domain. The fact that *A Doll’s House* opens with a monologue by Nora and ends with a monologue by Torvald is therefore of great aesthetic significance because it signalizes the transformation of the characters, both socially and existentially. As Selboe formulated it, in the final monologue Torvald is banished to the position Nora has left (Selboe 1997, 96).

CONCLUSION

In *A Doll’s House* we have seen that the monologue is the medium for the powerless and defeated. As previous scholars such as Durbach, Selboe and Rekdal have indicated, Nora’s act of throwing off the masquerade costume in the middle of act III, illustrates her new maturity and identity, moving from dollish helplessness to power and expressiveness. Nora is no longer in need of monologues. From now on, she is capable of expressing her thoughts and feelings in real, social dialogue. As Kwok-kan Tam expressed it: “The change in Nora is also a psychological process from being monologic to being dialogic” (Tam 2010, 86).⁷ Torvald is developing the opposite direction in the last part of act III; we see an ironic and degrading

dethroning in M18, and he becomes more tragic in M19. The most important transformations, by both the protagonist and the antagonist, take place in or around monologues.

Ibsen changed the use and function of monologue in modern drama, and in each of the three acts of *A Doll's House* he explores the stylistic and dramaturgical potential of the monologue. The meaning of the monologue is a matter of aesthetic form and function, and the number of monologues in the different acts of *A Doll's House* makes a surprising and remarkable pattern. The monologue in *A Doll's House* is a medium for thoughts and emotions that have not yet found appropriate linguistic form, and Ibsen seems to investigate a more rough, unpolished, broken, incoherently fragmented language that partially anticipates or points forward to the modernistic language of twentieth-century prose and stream of consciousness.

REFERENCES

- Aarseth, Asbjørn. 1999. *Ibsens samtidsskuespill. En studie i glasskapets dramaturgi* [Ibsen's contemporary plays. A study in the dramaturgy of the glass cabinet]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Bakhtin, Michael M. 1981. "Epic and Novel. Toward a Methodology for the Study of the Novel." In *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, edited by M. Holquist, 3–40. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Butcher, Samule H. 2011. *The Poetics of Aristotle*. Edited with critical notes and a translation by S.H. Butcher. Mansfield: Martino Publishing.
- Critchley, Simon. 2007. "Noises off – on Ibsen." *Ibsen Studies* 7 (2): 132–149. doi: 10.1080/15021860701692774.

- Durbach, Errol. 1991. *A Doll's House. Ibsen's Myth of Transformation*. Boston: Twaine Publishers.
- Franz, Rudolf. 1908. *Der Monolog und Ibsen*. Halle: Niermeyer AS.
- Frieden, Ken. 1985. *Genius and Monologue*. NY: Cornell University Press.
- Fulsås, Narve (ed.). 2005. *Henrik Ibsens skrifter. Brev 1844 – 1871* [Henrik Ibsen's Writings. Letters 1844 – 1871]. Vol. 12. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Fulsås, Narve (ed.). 2008. *Henrik Ibsens skrifter. Brev 1871 – 1879* [Henrik Ibsen's Writings. Letters 1871 – 1879]. Vol. 13. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Geis, Deborah R. 1993. *Postmodern Theatric[k]s. Monologue in contemporary American drama*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Gullestad, Anders M., Christine Hamm, Jørgen M. Sejersted, Eivind Tjønneland, and Eirik Vassenden. 2018. *Dei litterære sjangrane* [The literary genres]. Oslo: Samlaget.
- Helland, Frode, and Lisbeth P. Wærp. 2005. *Å lese drama. Innføring i teori og analyse* [To read drama. Introduction to theory and analysis]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Hirsh, James. 1997. "Shakespeare and the History of Soliloquies." *Modern Language Quarterly* 58 (1): 1–26. [doi:10.1215/00267929-58-1-1](https://doi.org/10.1215/00267929-58-1-1).
- Ibsen, Henrik. [1879a] 2008. *Et dukkehjem*. Henrik Ibsens skrifter, no. 7 2008. Tekstgrunnlag 1. utgave 1879 [A Doll's House. Henrik Ibsen's Writings 2008. First edition 1879]. https://www.ibsen.uio.no/DRVIT_Du%7CDuht.xhtml
- Ibsen, Henrik. [1879b] 2016. *A Doll's House and other plays*. Translated by Deborah Dawkin and Erik Skuggevik. London: Penguin Classics.
- Langer, Susanne. 1953. *Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art*. NY: C. Scribner's Sons.

- Moi, Toril. 2006. *Henrik Ibsen and the Birth of Modernism: Art, Theatre, Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Northam, John. 1953. *Ibsen's Dramatic Method: A Study of the Prose Dramas*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd.
- Pavis, Patrice. 2013. *Dictionnaire du théâtre*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Rekdal, Anne Marie. 2004. *Skolens gjenganger. Et pedagogisk blikk på Ibsen* [The school's ghosts. A pedagogical view on Ibsen]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Richardson, Brian. 1988. "Point of View in Drama: Diegetic Monologue, Unreliable Narrators, and the Author's Voice on Stage." *Comparative Drama* 22 (3): 193–214.
- Selboe, Tone. 1997. "Maskerade, kvinnelighet, frihet: perspektiver på Henrik Ibsens *Et dukkehjem*." [Masquerade, womanhood, freedom: perspectives on Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House*]. *Edda. Nordisk tidsskrift for litteraturforskning* (1): 88 – 98.
- Sharp, R. Farquharson. 1949. "Introduction to *A Doll's House* and two other plays." In *A Doll's House and two other plays*, edited by R.F. Sharp and E. Marx-Aveling. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co. Inc.
- Solomon, Alisa. 1997. "The New Drama and the New Woman: Reconstructing Ibsen's realism." In *Re-Dressing the Canon: Essays on Theatre and Gender*, edited by A. Solomon, 46–69. London and New York: Routledge.
- Stephens, Simon. 2012. *Translation of A Doll's House* from 2012, by Simon Stephens, for Young Vic theatre in London (online). <https://www.dramaonlinelibrary.com/plays/a-dolls-house-trans-stephens-iid-131687/do-9781408173343-div-00000005>.

Tam, Kwok-kan. 2010. "The Dialogic Self in *A Doll's House* and *The Wild Duck*." In *Ibsen and the Modern Self*, edited by K. Tam, T.S. Yip and F. Helland. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Open University Press.

Törnqvist, Egil. 1995. *Ibsen: A Doll's House*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Törnqvist, Egil. 1999. *Ibsen, Strindberg and the Intimate Theatre: Studies in TV Presentation*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Østerud, Erik 2004. "Nora's watch." *Ibsen studies* 4 (2): 147–175.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15021860410011965>

¹ We are aware that some will distinguish between monologue (speech given to the audience or even to other characters on stage) and soliloquy (speech given to oneself), but for our purpose it is more appropriate to use monologue as a common term for different types of speeches that are not part of a dialogue with other characters (Helland and Wærp 2005, 166; Preminger 1974: 529 and 779); this is in accordance with the definition by Geis (1993: 8).

² "Ja, så min sjæl står de begge to på kloppen!... Slår de ikke armene om hinanden! (*skriger højt*) Åh, – udover – begge to! Ud i fossen. Hjælp!"

³ Asbjørn Aarseth operates with an opposite form of monologue, where the speaker (Torvald) mentions the dialogue partner (Nora) in third person and does not care what she says (Aarseth 1999, 73). We will not include this type, as we consider it to be more a philosophical than technical device. On a deeper level, one might ask whether Torvald ever cares about what Nora actually thinks. It is still interesting to note that four of Aarseth's seven quotes from *A Doll's House* are monologues (M8, 9, 17, and 18), without making any points out of it.

⁴ Aristotle defines peripeteia (Greek = falling round) as "a change by which the action veers round to its opposite, subject always to our rule of probability or necessity" (Butcher 2011, 41).

⁵ Durbach writes that "[...] Nora's change of clothes becomes the external sign of the doll's extraordinary metamorphosis into the self-reliant and ethically responsible heroine she has always been beneath the Scribean fancy dress" (Durbach 1991, 121).

⁶ Geis is here referring to Susan Langer who says that theatre "takes place in a kind of 'perpetual present'" (Langer 1953, 307).

⁷ Tam perceives this transformation as an inner, psychological process, that can also be expressed in monologues (Tam is evaluating M10 as an example of dialogic language [Tam 2010, 83]), while we perceive this transformation more "superficially" (and dramaturgically); when Nora has reached a more true and realistic insight into her (life and) marriage with Torvald, she has become a character (in *A Doll's House*) who doesn't need to speak alone on stage any more. That the language in the monologues are extremely dynamic, dialogic and modernistic, and might be related to Bakhtin's concept of dialogic imagination (Bakhtin 1981), is a question that is beyond the scope of this article. In his essay, "Epic and Novel",

Bakhtin mentions Ibsen's drama as examples of "novelized" drama, and by this he means a drama form that has been strongly influenced by the novel genre, characterized by parodic stylizations and where the "conventional languages" begin to sound in new ways, become "dialogized", permeated with irony, creating a "semantic openendedness", and get in contact with "unfinished, still-evolving reality" (Bahktin 1981, 5-7).

APPENDIX to the article «The Lark's lonely twittering»

The monologues in *A Doll's House* in Norwegian and English.

The Norwegian monologues are taken from *Et dukkehjem*. Henrik Ibsens skrifter 2008. Tekstgrunnlag 1. utgave 1879.

The English monologues are taken from *A Doll's House and other plays*. Translated by Deborah Dawkin and Erik Skuggevik 2016. London: Penguin Classics.

Monologer/Monologues

	NORWEGIAN	ENGLISH
M1	NORA tar en pose med makroner op af lommen og spiser et par; derpå går hun forsigtigt hen og lytter ved sin mands dør Jo, han er hjemme. (nynner igen, idet hun går hen til bordet tilhøjre) (Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 214)	NORA (takes a bag of macaroons from her pocket and eats a couple; then she goes cautiously over to listen at her husband's door): Ah yes, he's home. (hums again as she goes over to the table on the right.) (Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 109)
M2	NORA en stund eftertænksom; kaster med nakken Å hvad! – At ville gøre mig bange! Så enfoldig er jeg da ikke. (giver sig ifærd med at lægge børnenes tøj sammen; holder snart op) Men –? – Nej, men det er jo umuligt! Jeg gjorde det jo af kærlighed. (Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 267)	NORA (thoughtful for a moment; then tosses her head): What nonsense! – Trying to frighten me! I'm not that gullible. (Busies herself with gathering up the children's clothes; soon stops.) But - ? – No, but it's impossible! I did it out of love after all. (Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 136)
M3	NORA sætter sig på sofaen, tager et broderi og gør nogle sting, men går snart istå Nej! (kaster broderiet, rejser sig, går til forstuedøren og råber ud) (Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 268)	NORA (sits on the sofa, picks up some embroidery and does a few stiches but soon stops): No! (throws the embroidery aside, gets up, goes to the hall door and shouts) (Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 136)
M4	Nora (går til bordet tilvenstre og åbner bordskuffen; standser atter) Nej, men det er jo aldeles umuligt! (Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 268)	NORA (goes to table on the left and opens the drawer; stops again.) No, but it's utterly impossible, surely! (Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 136)
M5	NORA ifærd med at pynte juletræet	NORA (busy dressing the tree):

- Her skal lys – og her skal blomster. – Det afskyelige menneske! Snak, snak, snak! Der er ingen ting ivejen. Juletræet skal blive dejligt. Jeg vil gøre alt, hvad du har lyst til, Torvald; – jeg skal synge for dig, danse for dig –
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 269)
- M6 **NORA** *sagte, efter en stilhed*
Å hvad! Det er ikke så. Det er umuligt. Det *må* være umuligt.
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 275)
- M7 **NORA** *bleg af rædsel*
Fordærve mine små børn –! Forgifte hjemmet? (*kort ophold; hun hæver nakken*) Dette er ikke sandt. Dette er aldrig i evighed sandt.
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 276)
- AKT II**
- M8 *Nora, alene i stuen, går urolig omkring; tilsidst standser hun ved sofaen og tager sin kåbe.*

NORA *slipper kåben igjen*
Nu kom der nogen! (*mod døren; lytter*)
Nej, – der er ingen. Naturligvis – der kommer ingen idag, første juledag; – og ikke imorgen heller. – Men måske – (*åbner døren og ser ud*)
Nej; ingenting i brevkassen; ganske tom. (*går fremover gulvet*) Å tosseri! Han gør naturligvis ikke alvor af det. Der *kan* jo ikke ske noget slikt. Det er umuligt. Jeg har jo tre små børn.
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 277)
- M9 **NORA** *begynder at pakke ud af æsken, men kaster snart det hele fra sig*
Å, hvis jeg turde gå ud. Hvis bare ingen kom. Hvis her bare ikke hændte noget herhjemme imens. Dum snak; der kommer ingen. Bare ikke tænke. Børste af muffen. Dejlige handsker, dejlige handsker. Slå det hen; slå det hen! En, to, tre, fire, fem, sex – (*skriger*) Ah, der kommer de – (*vil imod døren, men står ubeslutsom*)
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 280)
- M10 **NORA** *forvildet af angst, står som fastnaglet, hvisker*
Han var istand til at gøre det. Han gør det. Han gør det, trods alt i verden. – Nej, aldrig i evighed dette! Før alt andet! Redning –! En udvej – (*det ringer i forstuen*) Doktor
- Candles here — and flowers here. — That despicable person! Oh, nonsense, nonsense! There's nothing the matter. The Christmas-tree is going to be lovely. I'll do what ever you want, Torvald; - I'll sing for you, dance for you -
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 136)
- NORA** (*softly, after a pause*).
What! - It can't be. It's impossible. It must be impossible!
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 140)
- NORA** (*pale with terror*).
Corrupt my little children —! Poison our home? (*Brief pause; She lifts her head high.*) It isn't true! It can't ever possible be true.
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 140)
- ACT II**
- NORA**, *alone in the room, walks about anxiously; finally she stops at the sofa and picks up her coat.*

NORA *dropping her coat again*
Someone's coming! (*Goes to the door, listens.*)
No – nobody's there. Of course – nobody will come today, Christmas day; - and not tomorrow either. – But perhaps – (*opens the door and looks out*)
No; nothing in the letterbox; quite empty. (*Moves forward across the room.*) Oh, it's ludicrous! Of course he won't actually do it. Something like that can't happen. It's impossible. I've got three young children, after all.
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 141)
- NORA** (*starts to unpack the box but soon throws it all aside*):
Oh, if I dared to go out. If Only I knew nobody would come. That nothing would happen here at home in the meantime. Stuff and nonsense; nobody's coming. Just don't think. Brush my muff. Lovely gloves, lovely gloves. Push it away; push it away! One, two, three, four five six – (*screams.*) Ah, they're coming – (*starts for the door, but stands irresolute*)
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 143)
- NORA** (*in bewildered fear, stands as if rooted to the spot, whispers*):
He was prepared to do it, He'll do it. He'll do it, in the face of everything. – No, never that, never! Before all else! Rescue –! A way out – (*The doorbell rings in the hall.*) Dr Rank - !

- Rank –! Før alt andet! Før *alt*, hvad det så skal være!
Hun stryger sig over ansigtet, griber sig sammen og går hen og åbner døren til forstuen.
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 295)
- M11 **NORA** *kaster et øje på kortet*
Ah! (*stikker det i lommen*)
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 307)
- M12 **NORA**
Det forfærdelige sker. Det kommer alligevel. Nej, nej, nej, det kan ikke ske; det skal ikke ske.
Hun går hen og skyder skodden for Helmers dør.
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 309)
- M13 **NORA** *mod forstuedøren, åbner den på klem og lytter*
Går. Gi'er ikke brevet af. Å nej, nej, det vilde jo også være umuligt! (*åbner døren mere og mere*) Hvad er det? Han står udenfor. Går ikke nedover trapperne. Betænker han sig? Skulde han –?
Et brev falder i brevkassen; derpå hører man Krogstads skridt, som taber sig nedenfor i trappetrinnene.
NORA *med et dæmpet skrig, løber fremover gulvet og henimod sofabordet; kort ophold*
I brevkassen. (*lister sig sky hen til forstuedøren*) Der ligger det. – Torvald, Torvald, – nu er vi redningsløse!
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 317)
- M14 **NORA** *står en stund ligesom for at samle sig; derpå ser hun på sit uhr.*
Fem. Syv timer til midnat. Så fireogtyve timer til næste midnat. Da er Tarantellaen ude. Fireogtyve og syv? Enogtredive timer at leve i.
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 329)
- AKT III**
- M15 **FRU LINDE** *ser på sit uhr*
Endnu ikke. Og nu er det dog på den højeste tid. Hvis han bare ikke – (*lytter igen*) Ah, der er han. (*hun går ud i forstuen og åbner forsigtigt den ydre dør; der høres sagte skridt på trappen;*
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 331)
- M16 **FRU LINDE** *rydder lidt op og lægger sit ydertøj tilrette*
Hvilken vending! Ja, hvilken vending! Mennesker at arbejde for, – at leve for; et hjem at bringe hygge ind i. Nå, der skal rigtignok tages fat –. Gid de snart vilde
- Before all else! Before anything, whatever it takes!
She runs her hands over her face, pulls herself together and goes over to open the door to the hall.
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 150)
- NORA** (*glances at the card*):
Ah! (*stuffs it in her pocket*)
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 155)
- NORA**:
It's happening – the most terrible thing. It's coming after all. No, no, no, it can't be happening; it shan't happen.
(*She goes over and bolts Helmer's door.*)
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 156)
- NORA** (*going to the door leading to the hall, opens it a crack and listens*): Going. Isn't dropping the letter off. Oh, no, no, of course, that would be impossible surely. (*Opens the door wider and wider.*) What's happening? He's standing outside. Isn't going down the stairs. Is he changing his mind? Might he –?
A letter falls into the letterbox; then Krogstad's steps are heard as they fade down the stairwell.
NORA (*with a stifled cry, runs across the room and towards the sofa table; brief pause*):
In the letterbox. (*Sneaks nervously over to the hall door.*) There it is. – Torvald, Torvald – we're beyond rescue now!
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 159)
- NORA** (*stands for a moment as if to collect herself; then looks at her watch*):
Five. Seven hours until midnight. Then twenty-four hours until the next midnight. Then the tarantella's over. Twenty-four plus seven? Thirty-one hours left to live.
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 164)
- ACT III**
- MRS LINDE** (*looks at her watch*):
Still not here. And time really is running out. I just hope he hasn't – (*Listens again.*) Ah, there he is. (*Goes out into the hall and carefully opens the front door; quiet footsteps can be heard on the stairs;*)
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 165)
- MRS LINDE** (*tides up a little and prepares her outdoor clothes*):
What a turnaround! Yes, what a turnaround! People to work for – to live for; a home to bring comfort into. Right, there's a task to be done –. I wished they'd come soon –

- komme – (*lytter*) Aha, der er de nok. Tøjet på. (*tager hat og kåbe*)
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 342)
- M17 **NORA** *med forvildede øjne, famler omkring, griber Helmers domino, slår den omkring sig og hvisker hurtigt, hæst og afbrudt*
Aldrig se ham mere. Aldrig. Aldrig. Aldrig. (*kaster sit schavl over hovedet*) Aldrig se børnene mere heller. Ikke dem heller.
Aldrig; aldrig. – Å, det iskolde sorte vand. Å, det bundløse –; dette –. Å, når det bare var over. – Nu har han det; nu læser han det. Å nej, nej; ikke endnu. Torvald, farvel du og børnene –
Hun vil styrte ud igennem forstuen;
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 356 – 357)
- M18 **HELMER** *ved den åbne dør*
Ja, gør det; se at komme til ro og få samlet dit sind til ligevægt igen, du min lille forskræmte sangfugl. Hvil du dig trygt ud; jeg har brede vinger til at dække dig med. (*går omkring i nærheden af døren*) Å, hvor vort hjem er lunt og smukt, Nora. Her er ly for dig; her skal jeg holde dig som en jaget due, jeg har fået reddet uskadt ud af høgens klør; jeg skal nok bringe dit stakkers klappende hjerte til ro. Lidt efter lidt vil det ske, Nora; tro du mig. Imorgen vil alt dette se ganske anderledes ud for dig; snart vil alting være ligesom før; jeg skal ikke længe behøve at gentage for dig, at jeg har tilgivet dig; du vil selv usvigelig føle, at jeg har gjort det. Hvor kan du tænke, det skulde kunne falde mig ind at ville forstøde dig, eller blot bebrejde dig noget? Å, du kender ikke en virkelig mands hjertelag, Nora. Det er for en mand noget så ubeskriveligt sødt og tilfredsstillende i dette, at vide med sig selv, at han har tilgivet sin hustru, – at han har tilgivet hende af fuldt og oprigtigt hjerte. Hun er jo derved ligesom i dobbelt forstand blevet hans ejendom; han har ligesom sat hende ind i verden påny; hun er på en måde bleven både hans hustru og hans barn tillige. Således skal du være for mig herefterdags, du lille rådvilde, hjælpeløse væsen. Ængst dig ikke for nogenting, Nora; bare åbenhjertig imod mig, så skal jeg være både din vilje og din samvittighed. –
(Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 363)
- M19 **HELMER** *synker ned på en stol ved døren og slår hænderne for ansigtet*
- (*Listens.*) Aha, there they are. Coat on. (*Takes her hat and coat.*)
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 169)
- NORA** (*wild-eyed, fumbling around, grabs Helmer's cloak, throws it around herself and speaks rapidly and jerkily in a hoarse whisper*):
Never see him again. Never. Never. Never. (*Throws her shawl over her head.*) Never see the children again. Not them either. Never. Never. – Oh, the ice-cold black water. Oh, the bottomless – this –. Oh, if only this were over. – He's got it now; he's reading it. Oh, no, no, not yet. Torvald, goodbye to you and the children –
She is about to rush out through the hall;
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 177)
- HELMER** [*by the open door*]:
Yes, you do that; be calm now, gather your mind once more into balance, my terrified little songbird. Rest safe now; I have broad wings to cover you with. [*Walks about near to the door.*] Oh, our home is so cosy and perfect, Nora. There's shelter for you here; I will hold you here like a hunted dove that I've rescued unscathed out of the hawk's claws; I'll calm the clapping of your heart. Little by little it'll happen, Nora; believe me. Tomorrow this will all look entirely different to you; soon everything will be just as it was; before long I won't need to repeat how I've forgiven you; you will feel unshakeably that I have done so. How can you think it would cross my mind to reject you, or even to reproach you for anything? Oh, you don't know the stuff of a real man's heart, Nora. For a man there's something so indescribably sweet and gratifying in knowing that he's forgiven his wife – that he has forgiven her with a full and honest heart. Yes, in a way, she has become his property in a double sense, in a way he has brought her into the world afresh; she is, in a sense, not only his wife but also his child. That's how you'll be for me from today, you helpless, confused little creature. Don't worry about anything, Nora; just be honest of heart with me, and I will be both your will and your conscience. –
(Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 180 – 181)
- HELMER** (*sinks down on a chair by the door and throws his hands up to his face*):

Nora! Nora! (*ser sig om og rejser sig*)
 Tomt. Hun er her ikke mere. (*et håb skyder
 op i ham*) Det vidunderligste –?!
*Nedefra høres drønnet af en port, som slås
 ilås.*
 (Ibsen [1879a] 2008, 379)

Nora! Nora! (*looks around the room and gets
 up.*) Empty! She's not here any more. (*A
 flash of hope rises in him.*) The most
 miraculous –?!
*The sound of the street door being slammed
 is heard from below.*
 (Ibsen [1879b] 2016, 188)

Tables to the article «The lark's lonely twittering»

Table 1: Monologues in act I

ACT	NO.	TYPE	CHAR.	PLACEM.	WORDS/SENT.	PANTOM
I	1	Teichoscopy	Nora	Beginning	4/1 = 4	2
	2	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	26/6 = 4	2
	3	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	1/1 = 1	2
	4	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	7/1 = 7	1
	5	Soliloquy/Teicho.	Nora	Middle	40/7 = 6	1
	6	Soliloquy	Nora	End	13/4 = 3	1
	7	Soliloquy	Nora	End	16/4 = 4	1 (10)

We have numbered the monologues, marked the type of monologue, the speaking character, placement in the act, number of words and sentences in each monologue and the average number of words in each sentence, and the number of pantomime directions in each monologue (and the sum in each act).

Table 2: Monologues in act II

ACT	NO.	TYPE	CHAR.	PLACE	WORDS/SENT.	PANTOM
II	8	Teichoscopy/Sol	Nora	Beginning	52/12 = 4	5
	9	Teichoscopy/Sol	Nora	Beginning	49/12 = 4	2
	10	Teichoscopy/Sol	Nora	Middle	46/10 = 4,6	2
	11	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	1/1 = 1	1
	12	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	17/4 = 4	1
	13	Teichoscopy/Sol	Nora	End	41/11 = 4	5
	14	Soliloquy	Nora	End	23/6 = 4	1 (17)

Table 3: Monologues in act III

ACT	NO.	TYPE	CHAR.	PLACE	WORDS/SENT.	PANTOM
III	15	Teichoscopy/Sol	Linde	Beginning	19/4 = 5	3
	16	Teichoscopy/Sol	Linde	Beginning	38/8 = 5	3
	17	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	52/15 = 3,5	3
	18	Long speech/ AD	Torvald	Middle	254/12 = 21	1
	19	Teichoscopy/Sol	Torvald	End	10/5 = 2	4 (14)

Table 4: Monologues in *A Doll's House*

ACT	NO.	TYPE	CHAR.	PLACE	WORD/SENT	INC. SENT.	NEG. (N)
I	1	Teichoscopy	Nora	Beginning	4/1 = 4	0	0
	2	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	26/6 = 4	2	3
	3	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	1/1 = 1	0	1
	4	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	7/1 = 7	0	2
	5	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	40/7 = 6	3	1

	6	Soliloquy	Nora	End	13/4 = 3	1	3
	7	Soliloquy	Nora	End	16/4 = 4	2	2
II	8	Teichoscopy/Sol	Nora	Beginning	52/12 = 4	5	9
	9	Teichoscopy/Sol	Nora	Beginning	49/12 = 4	9	4
	10	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	46/10 = 4,6	7	2
	11	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	1/1 = 1	0	0
	12	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	17/4 = 4	0	5
	13	Teichoscopy/Sol	Nora	End	41/11 = 4	5	5
	14	Soliloquy	Nora	End	23/6 = 4	5	0
III	15	Teichoscopy/Sol	Mrs. Linde	Beginning	19/4 = 5	2	2
	16	Teichoscopy/Sol	Mrs. Linde	Beginning	38/8 = 5	4	0
	17	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	52/15 = 3,5	11	11
	18	Long speech/AD	Torvald	Middle	254/12 = 21	2	1
	19	Teichoscopy/Sol	Torvald	End	10/5 = 2	2	1

Inc. sent = incomplete sentences

Table 5: Monologues and dramaturgy

ACT	NO.	TYPE	CHAR.	PLACE	TIME	PANTOM
I	1	Teichoscopy/Aside	Nora	Beginning	Present	2
	2	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	Past	2
	3	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	Past	2
	4	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	Past	1
	5	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	Past	1
	6	Soliloquy	Nora	End	Past	1
	7	Soliloquy	Nora	End	Past	1 (10)
II	8	Teichoscopy/Sol	Nora	Beginning	Present	5
	9	Teichoscopy/Sol	Nora	Beginning	Present	2
	10	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	Present	2
	11	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	Present	1
	12	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	Present	1
	13	Teichoscopy/Sol	Nora	End	Present	5
	14	Soliloquy	Nora	End	Future	1 (17)
III	15	Teichoscopy/Sol	Mrs. Linde	Beginning	Future	3
	16	Teichoscopy/Sol	Mrs. Linde	Beginning	Future	3
	17	Soliloquy	Nora	Middle	Future	3
	18	Long speech/ absurd dialogue	Torvald	Middle	???	1
	19	Teichoscopy/Sol	Torvald	End	???	4 (14)