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Abstract

Lucas Hnath’s A Doll’s House part 2 is an intertextual text with Henrick Ibsen’s A Doll’s House. It started where Ibsen’s play astonishingly ends to answer the questions that come across each reader or viewer’s mind, like where did Nora go and what happened to her when she abandoned her responsibilities as a wife and a mother. That door, which was shut 15 years ago, is again open to herald Nora’s return as a feminist writer seeking her divorce in order to be free of the shackles of maternity, marriage, and social norms that have forbidden her from fulfilling self-autonomy. Hnath as a reader considering the ending of the original text follows the traces of Ibsen to comprise a new plot that reveals his feminist points of view to keep pace with that of Ibsen. This research aims at identifying the representation of Ibsen's Nora in Hnath’s play and her role in constructing the new Nora, consequently demonstrating her individuality. Moreover, the research aims at presenting another reading to be added to know how intertextuality helps to analyze women's conditions and create new forms of women that go on with the contemporary age. Intertextuality with Ibsen’s play has concluded that he is in fact an early deconstructionist himself who calls for liberation and self-identity through tackling social issues like marriage and love and how people should be free from the restrictions of norms and law.
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1. Introduction
Ibsen, the father of modern drama, is one of the most influential characters in contemporary theatre history. His call for the 'revolution of the human spirit' and seeking to support the struggles of women towards emancipation, breaking the shackles which imprison the veritable woman in the image of ‘the angel of the house’ or ‘a second-class individual required to be controlled by a male figure’, reveals Ibsen’s disagreement regarding women’s predetermined state in society (Mcfarlane, 2005). Through the character of Nora, He introduces a new behavior of female identity who refuses the worn-out boundaries and repressions and rises up against the negative representation and proves their equality. The kind of 'issues' he was thinking about are marriage, religion, ownership, gender interactions, and individuation. Ibsen's plays have been dubbed "realistic problem plays" or 'critical realism' as his scholars prefer, while some others choose 'modern contemporary drama' to describe his whole works since 1877 (Kennedy, 2014).

Intertextuality is a postmodern critical theory that alters the concept of the text. It refers to the interrelationships between a particular text and other texts. Intertextual relations include rearranging, insinuation, or allusion related to the subject, structure, transformation, and simulation influences of one text on another that show reverberating consequences. It confirms that meaning is inspired by reading. Thus, the authority is transferred from the author and the text to the reader, and the interpretation of the meaning becomes the reader’s property (Allen, 2002). Ibsen has inspired many male writers; Lucas Hnath is one of them. A Doll’s House Part 2 is a play about a play, and the intertextual interactions between the two texts in setting, plot, themes, characters, and dramatic techniques have made Hnath succeed in drawing an analogy in form and content between his play and that of Ibsen’s. He empowers Nora to elude from the awful inevitable destiny of that patriarchal world, devastate the boundaries, and set up her identity.
The study hypothesizes that Lucas Hnath's *A Doll's House part 2* is a postmodernist intertext with Ibsen’s play. It takes from Ibsen’s play as a platform to reveal certain feminist issues. It aims at identifying the representation of Ibsen's Nora in Hnath’s play and her role, through intertextuality, helps in constructing the new Nora, consequently demonstrating her individuality. It also aims at showing the role of intertextuality as a postmodern theory in producing a new text out of the old ones. His thinking is radical in making Nora comes back as a successful feminist writer. According to Almaaroof and A'amir (2017) literature has portrayed four types of women throughout history “the good-weak woman, the villain-weak woman, the strong –good woman and strong- villain woman. The writer is deemed to be feminist when he presents a women with good and strong character.” (as cited in Abdulla and Zaid, 2022) In his prediction, Hnath supports feminism at one hand and confirms Ibsen’s feminist attitude on the other hand. He presents Nora as strong and financially independent to show that this aspect is important in achieving the individuality of women. Hnath adheres to the discussions between characters to reveal his feminist vision, putting on the table the issue of marriage of two people avoiding their problems while this is their big problem.

2. Literary Review

Since its success, many attempts to adapt Ibsen’s *A Doll’s House* have been made. Lu Xun’s work *What Happens After Nora Leaves Home?* deals with the social and economic questions that will face Nora. According to Lu, Ibsen has written this play to emancipate her but he should have taken into consideration the economic issue. He adds that Nora has only two ways to exhibit, either return to her family and play the doll’s role once more or throw her chastity away. *A Doll’s life* (1981) is one of the adaptations of Ibsen’s play, a musical play imagining what happened to Nora. However, it has not made much success. The researcher finds no study that tackles the intertextual relation between Ibsen’s
play and Hnath’s. However, Wu Le in his article *Intertextuality of Characters in Pygmalion* (2012) studies the effect of Ibsen’s A Doll’s House on Bernard’s *Pygmalion* and how the intertextuality of the characters and their relations as well as their behavior demonstrate Bernard’s understanding of Ibsen’s play on a hand and support women’s rights at his era on the other hand. Noorbakhsh Hooti and Pouria Torkamaneh (2011) present a postmodernist study to highlights the postmodernist attributes of Ibsen’s *A Doll’s House* like irony, conflicts, the fall of the grand narratives, and insupportable feminism. Few studies have dealt with different issues related to both plays. Tara Dabbaggh (2021) starts her research with Barthes’s argument in *(The Death of the Author)* believing that the open end of Ibsen’s play authorizes one of the readers (Lucas Hnath) to write a second part to envisage the way Nora has traced in her life to achieve her financial and occupational independence.

3. *Intertextuality as a Methodology*

Intertextuality as a concept means that each literary work is either affected by or descended from a previous literary work, so fourth the former text shares in the production of a new one, and it is regarded as an intertextual text. Texts aren't designed to be viewed in isolation; they're linked together in a complicated network known as "intertextuality." This is what philosophers like Jacques Derrida and Roland Barthes uncovered in their most significant works *From Work to Text* and *The Death of the Author*, respectively. The study of intertextuality is the search for relationships between texts. In an intertextual vision, a text is created from other texts, so it must be viewed in relation to its position in the textual scope (Fairclough,1992). According to Kristeva (1986), the process by which speakers and listeners repurpose language generates what she coins as 'intertextuality,' in which each text is "a mosaic of quotes; every writing is the absorption and transformation of another." The reader will be able to recognize other text elements in the new text based on their literary experience.
Derrida (1977) claims in Living On that a text is not a finished corpus of writing, some content enclosed in a book or its margins, but a differential network, a fabric of traces referring endlessly to something other than itself, to other differential traces. Thus, the text overruns all the limits assigned to it. The meaning of presence and absence has been realized in the aesthetic process of receiving and the act of reading when writing took its law into literary work. This transformation in reading and related to the understanding of the literary phenomenon in light of postmodern approaches which leads to the decline of the author’s voice and the emergence of writing as a moving alternative that revives with each reading, considering that the second process represents the other side of the first process in a conversational movement between them without mediation, and this confirms that reading does not take place in a vacuum, but rather is motivated to start from a previous text. Accordingly, it oscillates between subjectivity and objectivity, and the writer can only simulate a literary work that is ahead of it. In another sense, a literary work cannot be a pure and unique creativity, but rather is the descendant of the writings that preceded it in one of the two ways, implicit or explicit, because the type of texts and traditions of reading are all factors that unconsciously contribute to providing the reader with initial perceptions of the content and form of the artwork. The writer absorbs the meaning of the absent text and re-extracts it again without a clear formal emergence of the absent text in the present one (Allen, 2000).

According to Kristeva, literary signification refers to other discursive significations to the extent that we can read in one poetic text multiple discourses, which creates around the poetic signification a double textual space. Although the reader assimilates the meaning that is absent in the text, this meaning should not be a pure product of his imagination, but rather remains (that is, the signified) in a permanent connection with what the text leads to (the general atmosphere of the text), and yet it is difficult for us to take control of this meaning unless we involve our imagination. The reader has his history and the text has his experience, and the effective presence of the reader is only confirmed through the
dialectic of deconstruction and construction, as confirmed by Jacques Derrida (Raj, 2015).

The possibility of achieving objective reading is a form of illusion, reading is a personal experience. We differ in reading because of our difference in taste, and because of our differences in levels of cultural inventory. Real and creative reading is the one that does not stop at the borders of the text as an explanation and interpretation, but ushers to produce a new literary text. It is well acknowledged that any writing does not emerge into existence if it does not enter into an interactive and dialogic relationship with the previous texts. Memory, awareness, and cultural inventory are basic conditions for re-creation, which pass through this magical thread that we call intertextuality. It is a productive work based on camouflaging the meaning and transforming the text to be indicative according to the intervention of readers with all their ideological backgrounds (Allen, 2000).

4. Intertextuality in A Doll’s House part 2

A Doll’s House part 2 is a postmodern play and one of the most eminent features of postmodernism is the use of intertextuality. the open-end of the text of the play always invites the audience and readers to interpret it in a new way. It is worth mentioning that Ibsen built his play on the real story of his friend Laura Kieler, but she comes back home after two years (Dabbagh, 2012). In spite of being a sequel, A Doll’s House part 2 is an autonomous play. Hnath weaves that famous controversial end with his new plot, which is considered by many to be the best adaptation of Ibsen’s play. It would need trust in one’s imagination to write about Nora’s life. Hnath does not only delineate her prior life during those 15 years but also, presents a justification for her coming back. The opening scene of Hnath’s play is intertextual with the final scene of Ibsen’s play, to show that it is a sequel, though this time it begins with the return of Nora and not her leaving off. This part demonstrates the transformation of Nora into a full grownup woman.
and her individuation has come to light. The text as a whole is a feminist turnabout of the character of Nora.

Ibsen’s *A Doll's House* consists of three acts, which take place in a lawyer's house. The setting represents the general framework of the text. Its figurative feature is important to reconcile the detailed components of the place and the movements of the characters. In addition to the importance of the place in Ibsen's plays and its use in the title of the play, namely, “House”, which confirms the vital role of the place in the theatrical text and between the narrow space that is associated with warmth, love, and protection (Kennedy, 2014). Happiness and contentment flutter over this small family, which is confirmed by “the appearance of the husband “Helmer” and his caressing of his wife “Nora”. It is noticeable that "Nora" is always present inside the house as if it is the cornerstone that represents its stability and poise. The arranged living room and its different pieces of furniture, and their harmony with each other, indicate a wife who has the ability to maintain this family. Ibsen deliberately collects most of the furniture in one place that does not be changed throughout the events of the play, and in this, he tries to draw attention to the value of the house and the value of the family that both parties, wife, and husband, try to preserve them along with the bonds of relations between them. At the same time, he creates a number of doors on the right and on the left was not purely a coincidence or a complement, rather, it is with the intent of suggesting and emphasizing that there is something behind these closed doors, which may completely contradict the beauty and elegance of this apparent room for the public (Mcfarlane, 2005).

Li Yuping (2006) believes that what makes intertextuality valuable is not the similar aspects between texts, but rather the different ones. Hnath’s play consists of one act divided into scenes named after the three characters who involve in long discussions with the main character (Nora). He sticks to the setting and costumes of an 1890 play. He adopts the same title for his play to be the second part of Ibsen’s play. The close relationship between the title and the
place, as the title consists of two words: the first is “doll” and the second is “house” makes the reader/viewer sure that Nora is still connected to it and she is still the doll in Helmer’s house. Because the place gives special connotations to the theatrical text, the writer chooses the place that corresponds with the events of the text, and increases the dramatic effect in the recipients, including the wide, empty, and silent room that may be associated with emptiness and coldness after Nora’s departure. Nora’s private things, like her piano and her mother’s picture, are removed, “anything that was yours got thrown out after you left” (p.11). Hnath reduces the places in which the events of the play take place to one room only, and he manages to run most of the events inside the house with the exit and entry of the characters to and from that famous room.

The intertextuality of the characters’ relationship is obvious in Hnath’s play to show his support for women’s issues. Hnath stays faithful to the characters of Ibsen’s play. He chooses Nora as the main character whose relationship with all the characters constructs the plot of this play and their discussions contribute to revealing the main ideas of the writer. Nora’s sudden return allows her to listen to those she has abandoned and to know about their feelings about her departure. In fact, there are three versions of Nora according to the way she behaves within the role set for her. In Ibsen’s play, Nora's character develops through the play dramatically. Acts 1 and 2 present the first Nora; the doll-like, dependent and obedient, initially appearing as a childish and naive character, then soon begins to clarify her personality during her conversation with Mrs. Linden, and how she has arranged the money to travel to Italy to treat her ill husband, and that she has got the money because of her intelligence and resourcefulness, and she is proud that she still keeps this secret inside her without disclosing it to her husband, and this elevates her status as a woman. The character then develops further at the end when she leaves the doll's house. In act 3 the rebellious Nora is awakened to start her looking for self-autonomy. In part 2, Nora is fatter, older, quieter, and more confident, and finds herself in writing to defend women’s rights. The new Nora
has managed to free herself from the social pressures of her past life through writing in a society that resists changes and the new freedom is forbidden. She tells Ann Marie ‘I'm not the same person who left through that door. I'm a very different person’ (p.15). Her ability to achieve her identity is done through her difference.

After all, it seems that Ibsen is really concerned with the natural humanity which the social shackles permanently try to suppress or hold back. Nora needs to escape from a doll-like life into a natural life where people are viewed as naturally existing, not socially constructed beings. For Ibsen, freedom is elevated to be the first requirement of life, and it appears to be his writing attitude. In some of his notes on A Doll’s House, he states that in this male dominant society where the law and the judge are men, women can’t be themselves since they are viewed from a male perspective. Self-creation and the pulse of dominance and severity are masculine rather than feminine. A feminist reading should take into account not only women’s actions and society’s reactions, but rather what are the repercussions of those actions and the way they are explicated concerning gender.

“Until I no longer heard a voice in my head other than my voice or what I was certain had to be my voice” (p.105).

Nora's understanding of the meaning of freedom is developed over the course of the play. In the first chapter, she believes that she will be "free" once her debts are paid, because she will then have the opportunity to devote herself fully to her responsibilities towards her husband and children. But after Krogstad blackmails her, she reconsiders her conception of freedom and wonders if she is happy in Helmer's house, a mere puppet subject to his orders and decisions. At the end of the play, Nora seeks a new kind of freedom. She wishes to be relieved of her family obligations in order to pursue her ambitions and search for her identity. What is really controversial in Ibsen’s play is his overlooking of the economic issue. He makes Nora face the world without financial sources. In fact, Ibsen indirectly presents a woman model for Nora to follow, Mrs. Linden, a woman of
mental and economic independence (Als, 2017). Moreover, Nora is a decisive and strong-minded woman, able to obtain money earlier (though illegally) and almost pay them back. So, what really helps women to fulfill their individualization is their feeling that they are financially supported. Hnath’s thinking is radical in making Nora comes back as a successful feminist writer. In his prediction, Hnath supports feminism at the one hand and confirms Ibsen’s feminist supportive attitude on the other hand.

In part 2, Nora comes back asking for divorce since she rejects not only her marriage but marriage as an institution in general, but she can’t get it without proof of abuse by the husband, therefore she needs Torvald to file it. Hnath highlights the issue of divorce as full of contradiction since men can get divorced easier than women. Another bias towards men on behalf of women’s rights is “…man and a woman in the eyes of the law do not have equal rights to a divorce” (p.39).

Intertextuality is apparent thematically. Sacrifice is a main theme in Ibsen’s play and stressed in Hnath’s to express the human will that takes the path of risky experiences to express itself. Nora sacrifices for her husband's sake by borrowing money illegally so that they can travel and get him healed, but she is subsequently blackmailed by Krogstad. Mrs. Linden, on the other hand also finds it necessary to abandon her lover Krogstad in order to support her mother and two younger brothers by getting married to a richer man. Also, Nora's nanny, Ann Marie, has to give up her own child to support herself financially by working as Nora's caregiver since her childhood. Emmy is breaking the law to get married to Jorgen and avoid the scandal. Nora is ready to face the law to defend her disciplines which she fights really hard for and she is ready to fight even harder. Torvald on the other hand is a victimizer rather than a victim on Hnath’s part. He has sacrificed his job and social status to be a better version of that in Nora’s book “You can even go and write a new book where I'm a better man” (p.96).
Ibsen, throughout his plays, has tried to show that the mother’s role, for some women, is imposed on them or they may simply be unsuitable to be mothers. He introduced maternity in a new frame, in terms of free choice. In *A Doll’s House*, Nora exchanges her maternity for self-emancipation which proves that Ibsen is a feminist supporter then and at present. Ibsen is much aware of the conflict inside each woman between the hardships of maternity and its mythical authority as a normal response for a woman to react. In other words, maternity is women’s only determined duty. Ibsen paints a bleak picture of the marginalized role of women in all social classes of his society, and that they were created to be sacrificed in all ways. Although men refuse to sacrifice their integrity, hundreds of thousands of women do (Mcfarlane, 2005).

Helmer: It’s shocking. This is how you would neglect your most sacred duties.
Nora. What do you consider my most sacred duties?
Helmer: Do I need to tell you that? Are they not your duties to your husband and your children?
Nora: I have other duties just as sacred.
Nora: Duties to myself (Ibsen, p. 76)

In fact, Ann Marry is another face of maternity which reflects an important theme discussed in the two plays, the consequences of freedom versus responsibility. She agreed on raising Nora and Torvald’s children at the cost of raising her own child (Als, 2017). Her responsibility comes with a sacrifice, which makes us question her decision, “It was my job, Nora, and if I didn't do what I did, three very young children were going to be left alone” (p.57). We owe ourselves and at the same time, we owe others. These ideas are conflicted with each other; thus, good choices are hard to make.

The two plays embrace the theme of humanity versus reputation and the assumed social respect. “Helmer: To desert your home, your husband and your children! And you don’t consider what people will say!” (p.116). In Ibsen’s play, Helmer has concerned only with appearances irrespective of the emotional cost. He declares outright that women are irresponsible and incapable, while men are ingenious and powerful, paying much attention to their social states. He retains
his soft tone and loving attitude with Nora once Krogstad gives up his blackmail and thus the scandal is avoided. Nora rebels when she realizes that this deluded life becomes uncomfortable for her. She stands against those social forces that intend to draw her back to the marginalized and submissive role. “A man’s presence suggests what he is capable of doing to you or for you. His presence may be fabricated, in the sense that he pretends to be capable of what he is not”. (Tolson, 2019)

In part 2, Nora asks for divorce just to save her reputation as a feminist writer and not to retreat from her beliefs and opinions, but she restores her true self in the end because she doesn’t wish to be trapped in lies again:

If that judge wants me to publish a letter, then I'll do it and I'll tell everyone
"Yes, yes, I'm a criminal, and I am not sorry;' doesn’t want to be trapped again in lies (p.88)

As Ibsen adopts the device of discussion in his social plays, Hnath supplies each character with the ability to have long conversations to express his/her point of view. “The device of the discussion is not restricted to the very end, but actually forms the whole make-up of his play, thus enabling him to provide a panoramic picture of the characters’ viewpoints regarding Nora’s choices and the consequences therein” (Dabbagh,2021). During Hnath’s play, three parallel discussions are taking place. The viewpoints of both Nora and Ann Marie concerning marriage and human rights are revealed through their discussions which have inaugurated the play. Ann Marie speaks for all who have watched or read the play and imagine what has happened to Nora ‘I thought maybe you might have had a difficult time, being a woman and being the way women are sometimes often treated these days’ (p.17). The undermined view of a woman that she is unable to survive alone even if she is ‘clever’ or ‘resourceful’ but only ‘lucky’ is clear in the two plays. The material circumstances that Nora has faced and the interaction with other people get her to develop her self-identity. Griffiths in her book Feminisms and the Self: The web of Identity (1996), argues that the self is constructed through experience, basically through knowledge and that
social transformation needs collective action. Nora argues that we believe that marriage brings happiness because we’ve been brought up with these beliefs. Nora believes that “our parents, our churches, our leaders everyone tells us that we need it, so we believe it, and the idea gets etched inside our skulls” (p.24). Generally, this attitude towards religion and authority is intertextual with Ibsen’s revolutionary plays which have been discredited by religious men for being initiators of family and eventually moral deterioration. As a response to this attack, he has written Ghosts (1881) to show the disastrous consequences of keeping in an unhappy marriage just to adhere to a clergy’s advice (McFarlane, 2005).

The second and the last discussions are with Torvald which cover two acts. He behaves differently in each. They have a serious conversation at the end, a very important thing they desperately miss in Ibsen’s play. Throughout their debate, Nora explains the oppressive position married women have to deal with in the nineteenth century. They are fully dominated by their husbands’ authority, they can’t do business or make contracts without their husbands’ permission, otherwise, they will be prosecuted. Torvald speaks frankly about his feelings towards Nora, thinking that she employs his love towards her only to get money from him or help one of her friends to get a job or residence. What comes out of their discussion is that they speak for men and women in general, how they think of each other as the second partner in this contract. They misunderstand one another, for both have different attitudes about how the other should behave and what makes them live in harmony. The relationship is ill-matched, it fluctuates between a selfish husband and a dependent, slave-like wife. Nevertheless, Nora is under societal pressure, which is why she had to turn to 'deceitful means.' She lived in constant terror of the charade being discovered.

The fourth discussion is between Nora and Emmy. Emmy is the most interested character in this play and Hnath has invented her to take the place of Kristina. In spite of the generation gap between her and Anne Marie, Emmy’s
perspective about marriage is very close to Anne Marie’s, the woman who brought her up. However, the character of Emmy is much like her mother’s. She is manipulative and persuasive “I have a feeling you're a lot like me” (p.83). Emmy pretends that her mother’s absence made her a better person, but she needs to be possessed and held by someone to fill the space left by her mother:

because you left, I know nothing about
what a marriage is and what it looks like.
But I do know what the absence of it looks like,
and what I want is the opposite of that.
I want to be held. I want to be possessed.
I want to be somebody's something-(p.82-83)

Nora told her to persuade Torvald to file the divorce for his benefit and “get him in a bad spot with his reputation” (p.74). Emmy finds herself in a situation similar to that of her mother. She is ready to fake her mother’s death and forges public records “You'd be committing forgery” p.79, just to avoid the scandal which will prevent their marriage. Emmy is ready to break the law just to be with the man she loves. This situation is intertextual with her mother’s action when she forged her father’s signature to get a loan behind Torvald’s back only to save his life. For them, breaking the law is not sinful as long as it is used for noble intentions.

This extreme thinking assures that Nora doesn’t have trust in religion, social norms, or natural law. Denying those grand narratives is one of the main fundamentals upon which postmodernism is based. Nora acknowledges that she is quite aware that her thinking is “against nature” and unacceptable to all people, therefore; the heroine dies at the end of her book, or else the book will never find its way to publication. However, “it's not so much a literal death as it is a symbolic one” (p.28) as if she dismisses an old chapter in her life and opens a new one. That reminds us of the end of A Doll’s House when some publishers change the original end and replace it with another one to be more suitable for Norwegian society.
Intertextuality is much more vivid in dramatic technique. Ibsen expands on the "retrospective strategy" in this play. He gives the action a start just as the two women's efforts (Nora and Christina) appear to be completely satisfied. The family's image has been protected, and happiness appears to be inevitable. However, situations beyond their control intrude to disrupt their lives. The past comes to light bringing their formerly well-ordered life into chaos. Both the slamming and knocking at that door bring huge chaos to that family (Engelstad, 2008). Ibsen focuses on a point in the current situation where a hidden crisis gets visible throughout the context of his plays. With such style, he was capable of retaining current societal issues through the lens of a human's destiny. Hnath adopts this strategy to start his play with. As Helmer’s household seems to be satisfied with their life after being accustomed to Nora’s absence; Torvald is still working successfully; the daughter, Emmy, has grown up and engaged to a respectful man, and the sons are doing their own businesses. The ideal tableau of a happy family has been threatened to be shaken and the old secrets are about to be exposed by Nora’s sudden showing up.

The text in Ibsen’s play has a special character and a specific dramatic goal that is commensurate with the nature of the place that is fixed throughout the events of the play. The dramatic conflict in arises in the light of the apparent conflict between the wife and the husband. Bernard Shaw said that everything that has happened in this play, has already taken place in every suburb of Europe (McFarlane, 2005). It demonstrates in her numerous attempts to persuade him not to fire Krogstad and his return to work in the bank, and another hidden conflict - fiercer than the apparent conflict - which Nora suffered in order to preserve her home and family, and her desperate attempts to persuade Krogstad to not tell Helmer. The forgery incident and this conflict did not concern Nora only but extended to include Krogstad and its struggle for survival as well. Dr. Rank's struggle with life and his attempts to enjoy what is left of him by telling Nora of his love and admiration for her. Kristen, Nora's friend, comes to struggle through her relationship with Nora and Krogstad.
In Hnath’s play, the conflicts are all revealed through the discussions, and the reader/viewer either agrees or disagrees with them. The apparent conflict is everlasting between Nora and Torvald since their views are totally different. Nora accuses him of being bumptious and ostentatious of his education and well-mannered behavior, while Torvald justifies this by pretending that it is a sort of confidence and this is what really attracts women towards men, women need to be led and straighten. Torvald accuses her of being defeatist who as soon as she realizes the problem of their untruthful marriage, she turns her back and left without making any effort to repair the damage and save their marriage. Because finding the problem is easy but it needs two of them to get involved to figure it out. Ann Marie lives a conflict between her maternal duty towards her child and her loyalty towards the Helmers. Emmy is living a conflict in her attempt to keep her marriage attained through faking her mother’s death. Each of Nora and Torvald are struggling in the traditions of their society because they realize that any deviance from the norm will be punished as soon as it becomes publicly known.

Nora in part 2 refers to the issue of honesty, an issue Ibsen has struggled for so long. Nora assumes that she is now much honest with herself, she knows what she wants and seeks to achieve it, unlike most people who are dishonest with themselves, thus, they are trapped in a miserable marriage just to satisfy their society, they are merely hypocrite and this includes the law too. The woman as well as the men are depicted as hopelessly subjugated inside a repressive bourgeois society, where the family is seen as the core of society. However, this core seems to be solid just on the surface. Nora felt obligated to do the forgery for the sake of the man she cared about. The issue of blackmail in part 1 and then time repeats itself in part 2. The anti-marriage feminist writer was exposed by a judge as a married woman because Torvald “has never filed for the divorce” (p.30), still more, her true name has been exposed as well. For the second time, Nora is lawfully a fraud and she needs Torvald to divorce her to avoid prison “I've
signed contracts, done business, had lovers-all sorts of things that a married woman isn't allowed to do, that are illegal, that amount to fraud-This judge could make a lot of trouble for me” (p.30).

The final scene in Ibsen’s plays is overflowed with 'sophisticated irony' as Northrop Frye likes to call it. This irony just presents the situation and leaves it up to the reader to apply the sarcastic tone (Engelstad, 2008). Nora's character is not satisfied with half-solutions and does not know the language of bargaining, and the conflict in Nora's character reaches a climax when she has slammed the door and leaves the house. Once again in part 2, the end is left open to the reader to imagine if Nora will come back again or if she is going to move on with her journey in a world where a woman’s identity is personified only through its relation to a man. Every playwright must draw the material and dramatic content of his plays from the social reality that he/ she lives in and is affected by all its conditions and circumstances. “Basically, the end of the play is not a conflict between Nora or Torvald or even the society, but it is definitely the struggle of choosing between modern belief or a postmodern solution” (Hooti and Torkamaneh, 2011).

**Conclusion**

In Hnath’s text, we can find traces of Ibsen’s texts. Intertextuality demonstrates that the dramatic conflict in Ibsen and Hnath’s theater is a social conflict, imposed by society on the characters. Hnath recreates his characters with the aim of highlighting lively social dramatic features, characters who represent the dimensions of contemporary society, and spread life on stage, and the audience sympathizes with them, especially the feminist element. Hnath follows Ibsen in his deep belief in the value of the human soul, which prompted him/her to make an intellectual effort to elevate the freedom of the individual, and the second is the idea of his adherence to the value of true love that is pure from the impurities of hypocrisy. What really proves from Ibsen’s play is that he is an early deconstructionist, who refuses to endorse the long-established morality as
absolute truth, therefore; he asks everyone to find his authentic identity far from social influences. Hnath also deconstructs the idea of love and marriage when he associates love with ownership. Love is a sort of restriction, to love someone means to be stuck to him till death. In both plays, Nora’s liberation is connected to her secret more than to her work. Ibsen and Hnath’s Nora come to the conclusion that law and social norms make her slave without free will and that the path she has chosen is one of fundamental truth. In fact, the supposed time of both Ibsen and Hnath’s plays is the nineteenth century, but they tackle postmodern predicaments concerning self-identity and othering women through presenting social issues like marriage and divorce.
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