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**ARTICLE INFORMATION**

**ABSTRACT**

This study aimed at investigating the concept of absurdity in *A Doll’s House* by Henrik Ibsen. Henrik Ibsen’s play *A Doll’s House* is the primary source in the present study. The data that is applied in this paper belongs to library studies and research since the focus is on or literary works and materials. The results showed that miscommunication is one of the themes of absurdity, which was identified in the present play. There is a master-slave relationship, one of the themes of absurdism, between Nora and Helmer, which can be traced in the play. Materialism is also portrayed in the play as one of the themes of absurdism. The relationships between characters are based on profit. Telling lies, which can be a sign of absurdism, is shown in the play.

1. Introduction

According to Abrams and Harpham (2009), “Literature has been commonly used since the eighteenth century, equivalently with the French belles lettres (“fine letters”), to designate fictional and imaginative writings-poetry, prose fiction, and drama. In an expanded use, it also designates any other writings (including philosophy, history, and even scientific works addressed to a general audience) that are especially distinguished in form, expression, and emotional power” (Abrams and Harpham 177). Henrik Ibsen has been regarded as the founder of modern drama. Based on Daniel S. Burt, “It’s a critical commonplace to assert that modern drama originates with Henrik Ibsen, even to mark the exact moment when the modern theatre began: December 4, 1879, with the publication of Ibsen’s A Doll’s House …. It is incontestable that Ibsen set in motion a revolution on the stage as distinctive in the history of the theatre as that in the fifth-century b.c. Athens or Elizabethan London” (Burt 133). Henrik Ibsen is famous for his propensity for shocking his audience by what could be named a disillusionment predisposition. The Norwegian playwright wrote plays that were known as realistic problem plays. Ibsen did not tend to lend support to the 19th-century Norwegian stage old traditions by creating unrealistic works that often covered the reality that generally, the society was coping with, and in lieu, Ibsen depicted the reality as it really was (Askarzadeh Torghabeh 91). The works written by Henrik Ibsen are Catiline (1850), The Burial Mound (1850), Norma (1851), St. John’s Eve (1853), Lady Inger of Ostrat (1854), The Feast at Solhaug (1855), Olaf Liljekrans (1856), The Vikings at Helgeland (1857), Love’s Comedy (1862), The Pretenders (1864), Brand (1865), Peer Gynt (1867), The League of Youth (1869), Poems (1871), Emperor and Galilean (1873), Pillars of Society (1877), A Doll’s House (1879), Ghosts (1881), An Enemy of the People (1882), The Wild Duck (1884), Rosmersholm (1886), The Lady from the Sea (1888), Hedda Gabler (1890), The Master Builder (1892), John Gabriel Borkman (1896), When We Dead Awaken (1899).

The present paper aimed at studying absurdism in *A Doll’s House*. First, a summary of *A Doll’s House* is written. Second, the definition of absurdism is presented. At last, absurdism in *A Doll’s House* is investigated. Most socialists and feminists “have always praised *A Doll’s House* as a breakthrough for women-rights” (Moi 279). They have considered this play as a feminist play, and Callens (1998) mentions that feminists have voiced their concerns regarding how women are portrayed. He believes historical changes of the time concerning male dominance (Askarzadeh Torghabeh 92). Pebruantaria (2015) stated that *A doll’s house* is a drama written by Henrik Ibsen, which expresses the theme of a woman’s rights and an individual woman asking for her rights.
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A Doll's House that was written by Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen is regarded as a three-act play. It was performed for the first time at the Royal Theatre in Copenhagen, Denmark, in 1879 that was published earlier that year (Meyer 1967). The play is set in a Norwegian town circa 1879. The play is important for the way it copes with the married woman’s fate, who in Norway did not have logical chances for self-accomplishment in a male dominant world, although Ibsen denied he intended to create a feminist play. It made a remarkable sensation at the time (Krutch 1953) and created a “storm of outraged controversy” that had gone beyond the theatre stage to the world of society and media (Walter 1998). In 2006, the hundredth anniversary of Ibsen’s death, A Doll’s House became the world’s most performed play that year, and Ibsen's autographed manuscripts of A Doll's House has been inscribed by UNESCO on the Memory of the World Register in 2001, recognizing their historical value (Pravda 2017). The translation of its title is most commonly A Doll's House, although some figures and intellectuals in the field apply A Doll House. John Simon notes that A Doll’s House is the British word for what Americans name a ‘dollhouse’ (Island 1991). Törnqvist mentions that rather than being superior to the traditional translation, it clearly is more idiomatic to Americans (Törnqvist 2017). A Doll’s House was on the basis of the Laura Kieler life (maiden name Laura Smith Petersen), Ibsen’s intimate friend. Much that took place between Nora and Torvald occurred to Laura and her husband, Victor. Like the play’s events, Laura got an illegal loan to rescue her husband’s life, in this case, to find a remedy for his tuberculosis (Byatt 2009). She wrote to Ibsen and asked for his suggestion of her work to his publisher in order to sell her book to refund her debt. As a result of his refusal, for the money, she forged a check. At this point, she was investigated. In real life, when Victor explored Laura’s secret loan, he divorced her and had committed her to an asylum.

After two years, she came back to her husband and children at his forcing, and she did her best to be a famous Danish author and brothers, she married a rich man. She became too old because of her hard life. She wanted Nora to find her a job, and Nora promised to ask Helmer to find a job in his bank. Helmer was a rigid manager and wanted to fire Krogstad because of forging some signatures. At that time, Krogstad threatened Nora to tell the secret to Helmer, and Nora tried to change Krogstad’s mind. Krogstad was the man who Kristine Linde loved, but because of money, she didn’t marry him. When Krogstad understood that Kristine was the woman he loved, he gave up telling the truth, but Kristine wanted him to tell everything he knew to Helmer. Krogstad wrote everything in a letter and sent it to Helmer’s mailbox. When Helmer read the letter and knew the truth, he behaved Nora very bad. He said that you are a liar, and you can’t train the children. But because of not knowing the people from this fact, you can stay at home. Nora felt that she was a toy, and he treated her like a toy. Then Krogstad wrote another letter and said that he gave up everything because of finding his love. Helmer began to treat Nora well, but Nora decided to leave her husband to understand herself and be independent. According to Abrams and Harpham (2009), “Literature of the absurd is applied to a number of works in drama and prose fiction which have in common the view that the human condition is essentially absurd and that this condition can be adequately represented only in works of literature that are themselves absurd” (178). The 19th-century Danish philosopher Soren Kierkegaard wrote extensively on the absurdity of the world. In The Myth of Sisyphus, Camus reviewed Kierkegaard Writing about absurdity. The man who writes: “The surest of stubborn silences is not to hold’s one tongue but to talk” makes it sure in the beginning that no truth is absolute or can render satisfactory an existence that is impossible in itself. Don Juan multiplies pseudonyms and contradiction and writes his Discourse of Edification at the same time as the manual of cynical spiritualism, Diary of a Seducer. He refuses consolations, ethics, and reliable principles (Camus 19). In absurd theatre, man is isolated both from the ordinary events and the hassles of life, and his action is manifested in motionlessness (Bradby 59). Plots in Absurd dramas are usually quite static (Hinchliffe 31), and the language, which is embodied through clichés and meaningless conversations, reflects the lack of communication. In the reality of absurdity, all characters are unable to communicate. Usage of long silences demonstrates the lack of communication in absurd theatre (Saba Akim 55). Absurd is devoid of purpose because man has already cut off from his religious, metaphysical, and transcendental roots. Man is lost; all his actions become senseless, absurd, and useless (Esslin 5).

2. Literature Review

A Doll’s House that was written by Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen is regarded as a three-act play. It was performed for the first time at the Royal Theatre in Copenhagen, Denmark, in 1879 that was published earlier that year (Meyer 1967). The play is set in a Norwegian town circa 1879. The play is important for the way it copes with the married woman’s fate, who in Norway did not have logical chances for self-accomplishment in a male dominant world, although Ibsen denied he intended to create a feminist play. It made a remarkable sensation at the time (Krutch 1953) and created a “storm of outraged controversy” that had gone beyond the theatre stage to the world of society and media (Walter 1998). In 2006, the hundredth anniversary of Ibsen’s death, A Doll’s House became the world’s most performed play that year, and Ibsen’s autographed manuscripts of A Doll’s House has been inscribed by UNESCO on the Memory of the World Register in 2001, recognizing their historical value (Pravda 2017). The translation of its title is most commonly A Doll’s House, although some figures and intellectuals in the field apply A Doll House. John Simon notes that A Doll’s House is the British word for what Americans name a ‘dollhouse’ (Island 1991). Törnqvist mentions that rather than being superior to the traditional translation, it clearly is more idiomatic to Americans (Törnqvist 2017). A Doll’s House was on the basis of the Laura Kieler life (maiden name Laura Smith Petersen), Ibsen’s intimate friend. Much that took place between Nora and Torvald occurred to Laura and her husband, Victor. Like the play’s events, Laura got an illegal loan to rescue her husband’s life, in this case, to find a remedy for his tuberculosis (Byatt 2009). She wrote to Ibsen and asked for his suggestion of her work to his publisher in order to sell her book to refund her debt. As a result of his refusal, for the money, she forged a check. At this point, she was investigated. In real life, when Victor explored Laura’s secret loan, he divorced her and had committed her to an asylum.

After two years, she came back to her husband and children at his forcing, and she did her best to be a famous Danish author who lived to the age of 83. Ibsen wrote A Doll’s House while Laura Kieler had been in the asylum. He was shook deeply due to the fate of this friend of the family, maybe since Laura asked him to suggest her work to his publisher at a critical time in the scandal, which he did not do anything for her at that time. In lieu, he turned this life context into an aesthetically formed, successful drama. In the play, Nora left Torvald with head held high, though coming across an uncertain future regarding the restrictions single women encountered in that society. Kieler finally recovered from the scandal’s shame and had her own successful writing profession as remaining discontented with sole recognition as “Ibsen’s Nora” years afterward (Worthen 2011).
A Doll’s House criticized the men’s and women’s traditional roles in 19th-century marriage (Fisher 2003). This was slanderous to many 19th-century Europeans. The marriage covenant was regarded holy, and to depict it as Ibsen did was challenging (James 1994). Notwithstanding, the Irish playwright George Bernard Shaw found Ibsen’s inclination to assess society without preconception exhilarating (Griffith 1995). August Strindberg, the Swedish playwright, questioned the play in his essays and short stories (Meyer 1967). Strindberg criticized Nora since she left her kids behind with a man that she herself disagreed with so much that she could not live with him. Strindberg also notes that Nora’s engagement with an illegal financial act that engaged Nora to forge a signature, all performed behind her husband’s back, and then Nora’s lying to him considering Krogstad’s blackmail, are tough crimes in which should pose issues at the end of the play, while Nora is moralistically judging the behaviors of her husband. Strindberg mentions that Nora’s complaint that she and Torvald “have never exchanged one serious word about serious things,” is contrary to the arguments that take place in act one and two (Sandbach 1972). The reasons that Nora left her husband could be complicated, and different details are implied all over the play. In the last scene, she tells her husband she has been “greatly wronged” by his disparaging and condescending behavior of her, and his view to her in their marriage - as though she were his "doll wife" - and the children, in turn, have become her “dolls,” causing her to be doubtful towards her own abilities to grow her children up. She suffered from her husband’s manner regarding the loaned money scandal. She does not love her husband, she feels they are strangers, she feels completely bewildered, and recommends that her problems are common among many women. Shaw notes that she left to start “a journey in search of self-respect and apprenticeship to life,” and that her revolt is “the end of a chapter of human history” (Shaw 1907).

Ibsen was inspired by the belief that “a woman cannot be herself in modern society,” because it is “an exclusively male society, with laws made by men and with prosecutors and judges who assess feminine conduct from a masculine standpoint”(Ibsen 1967). His ideas could also be regarded as having a wider implementation: Meyer maintained that the play’s theme is not women-rights, but rather “the need of every individual to find out the kind of person he or she really is and to strive to become that person” (Christiana 2006). In 1898, in an interview by the Norwegian Association for Women’s Rights, Ibsen emphasized that he “must disclaim the honor of having consciously worked for the women’s rights movement,” as he mentioned, “without any conscious thought of making propaganda,” his task having been “the description of humanity” (Schneir 1972). Howsoever, the play is related to feminism since Miriam Schneir considers it in her anthology Feminism: The Essential Historical Writings, naming it as one of the integral feminist works (Schneir 192). Based on Hornby (1995), due to the departure from traditional manner and theatrical convention included in Nora’s leaving home, her door slamming as she leaves has come to show the play itself. In Iconoclasts (1905), James Huneker noted “That slammed door reverberated across the roof of the world” (Cunningham 2009).

3. Methodology
The data that is applied in this paper belongs to library studies and research since the focus is on or literary works and materials. The main source of the data is A Doll’s House play written by Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen. The researchers of the present study investigated the traces and manifestations of absurdity in A Doll’s House through the comprehensive examination of this play.

4. Results and Discussion
Henrik Ibsen’s play A Doll’s House is the main source of data analysis of absurdity in this paper. The title of the play itself A Doll’s House has shown a sense of absurdity. The word ‘doll’ represents Nora, Torvald Helmer’s wife, whose position as a wife is the same as a doll ready to be played at home and implies a sense of degradation. In Henrik Ibsen’s A Doll’s House, absurdity is shown in the character of Nora as one of the main characters who feel disappointed in herself because she fails to find out her existence as a wife and lonely for being treated like a doll in her own house by her husband (Hartaty Putrih 30). From the expression below, it was understood that Helmer’s relationship seems to be more like a father and a daughter than a husband and wife. But finally, Nora thinks that she was become a doll in her house (Pebruantari11). Nora:

“No, only merry. And you have always been so kind to me. But our home has been nothing but a playroom. I have been your doll-wife, just as at home I was papa’s doll-child; and here the children have been my dolls. I thought it was great fun when you played with me, just as they thought it great fun when I played with them. That is what our marriage has been Torvald” (A Doll’s House 69).

Such symbolical meaning shows a nonsense meaning. G.K. Chesterton in Cuddon (98) asserts the sense of nonsense as follows: “This simple sense of wonder at the shapes of things, and their exuberant independence of our intellectual standards and our trivial definitions, is the basis of faith are the two supreme symbolic assertions of the truth that to draw out the soul of things with a syllogism is as impossible to draw.”
From the quotation above, it can be pointed that the position of a husband is more potent than a wife sounds nonsense in family life perception. Nonsense conception leads to hopelessness. Sense of hopelessness appears in the following dialogues:

Helmer: “Still, you know, we can’t spend money recklessly”.
Nora: “Yes, Torvald, we may be a wee bit more reckless now, mayn’t we? Just a tiny wee bit. You are going to have a big salary and earn lots and lots of money”.
Helmer: “Yes, after the New Year, but it then will be a whole Quarter before the salary is due.
Nora: Pooh! We can borrow till then”.
Helmer: “Nora! The same little featherhead! Suppose, now, that I borrowed fifty pounds today, and you spent it all ... and killed me’.
Nora: “Oh! Don’t say such horrid things” (A Doll’s House 4).

Sense of hopelessness can also be revealed when Nora wanted to commit suicide, which can be understood from the following expressions:

Nora: “Never to see him again. Never! Never! (Puts her shawl over her head.) Never to see my children again either—never again. Never! Never!--Ah! (A Doll’s House 10).”
Nora: “No, I have never been happy. I thought I was, but it has never really been so (A Doll’s House 15).”

She wants to be meaningful as a living creature and cannot tolerate behaviors that make her down or senseless. She needs more money, but Helmer intends to protect the family life in a strictly tied-money policy. The contradictory situation has resulted in a sense of hopelessness and confusion for both of them. A very hopeless expression which Nora says, “it’s something I should dearly love to say, if Helmer could hear me (A Doll’s House 17), reveals that Helmer is quite selfish on himself. The sense of selfishness shows hopelessness (Hartaty Putrih32).

Another expression that shows the senseless position of Nora appeared when Helmer calls Nora ‘little song bird’ in the following dialogue:

Helmer: “Didn’t you tell me no one had been here? My little song-bird must never do that again. A songbird must have a clean back to chirp with no false notes. That is so, isn’t it?’
Nora: “It was very silly of me to want to do that”. (A Doll’s House 26).

An absurd element can be traced when Nora wants to sign her husband’s signature to borrow some money. The high wall between husband and wife hinders communication, and the result will be hopelessness. The conflict situation becomes absurd because there is no trust anymore between Nora and Helmer (Hartaty Putrih35).

The dialogues in absurdism are ridiculous and nonsensical. In this drama, all the things Torvald said were like jokes, and he was not serious. This element of absurdism can be revealed when Nora says:

"We have been married now eight years. Does it not occur to you that this is the first time we two, you and I, husband and wife, have had a serious conversation? (A Doll’s House 14 ).”

Absurdity can also be traced to when Nora cannot stand living anymore with Helmer. She feels a sense of degradation in her life, which makes her so frustrated and despair or hopeless. She wants to ask for divorce to run from this absurd situation (Hartaty Putrih37). The element of absurdity can be revealed in the following dialogue:

“That our life together would be a real wedlock. Good-bye (A Doll’s House 68).”

Sense of degradation and frustration can also be revealed when Nora expressed:

“But you neither think nor talk like the man I could bind myself to. As soon as your fear was over—and it was not fear for what threatened me, but for what might happen to you—when the whole thing was past, as far as you were concerned it was exactly as if nothing at all had happened. Exactly as before, I was your little skylark, your doll, which you would in the future treat with doubly gentle care because it was
so brittle and fragile. (Getting up) Torvald--it was then it dawned upon me that for eight years I had been living here with a strange man, and had borne him three children--. Oh, I can't bear to think of it! I could tear myself into little bits! (\textit{A Doll's House} 18)."

In absurdist works, the effort to find meaning in life is futile. Life is hopeless, meaningless, and purposeless. Any action to alter the meaningless and purposeless of life is impossible or futile (Skinner Dace 9). This theme of absurdism, which refers to the futility of any action to make life meaningful and hopeful can be traced when Nora wants to borrow money from Krogstad. Borrowing money was not change the situation, and at the end of the play, Nora decided to leave Helmer. Her attempt to hide the secret of borrowing money was futile.

Nora’s agreement on what her husband judges her can be a remark of absurdity. Nora’s answer by accepting the situation ‘yes, it is’ is supposed to be absurd (Hartaty Putrih 39). This agreement can be shown in the following dialogue:

\begin{quote}
Helmer: "Is that my little lark twittering out there? Nora: Yes, it is".
Helmer: "Is it my little squirrel bustling about? "
Nora: "Yes!(\textit{A Doll's House} 3-4)".
\end{quote}

In the following dialogue, there is a miscommunication between Nora and Helmer. Helmer always treats Nora as one of his employees. The phrase ‘mine is different’ indicates his arrogance towards his wife, which leads to a feeling of disappointment in Nora (Hartaty Putrih 42).

\begin{quote}
Helmer: "My little Nora, there is an important difference between your father and me. Your father's reputation as a public official was not above suspicion. Mine is, and I hope it will continue to be so, as long as I hold my office."
Nora: "You never can tell what mischief these men may contrive. We ought to be so well off, so snug and happy here in our peaceful home, and have cares, you and I and the children. That is why I beg you so earnestly (\textit{A Doll's House} 34)."
\end{quote}

There is a lack of understanding between characters of an absurdist work. The characters do not understand each other. Nora and Torvald do not understand each other. Torvald does not know what Nora wants, and he behaves like a doll that must please him. They are not aware of each other. The lack of awareness can be shown when Helmer said: "When did my squirrel come home? (\textit{A Doll's House} 1)."

Another lack of understanding between Nora and Helmer appears when Nora introduces Christine Linde to Dr. Rank. Dr. Rank immediately recognized her and said: “I have often heard Mrs. Linde’s name mention (\textit{A Doll's House} 13).” But when Nora introduced Christine Linde to Helmer, he didn’t know her. Nora’s remarks ‘I can be of no use’ and ‘what is going on to become of me’ in the following dialogue is a voice of deep disappointment (Hartaty Putrih 42).

\begin{quote}
Nora: "You know very well that would not last long. Good-bye."
Helmer: "I won’t see the little ones. I know they are in better hands than mine. As I am now, I can be of no use to them.”
Helmer: "But someday, Nora, someday?"
Nora: "How can I tell? I have no idea what is going on to become of me (\textit{A Doll's House} 67)."
\end{quote}

In the following dialogue, Nora feels alienated in her own home as a wife and a mother of three children only because of being independent over her husband. She cannot tolerate living under the shadow of her husband. In other words, there is a master-slave relationship between Nora and Helmer, which results in the feeling of alienation (Hartaty Putrih 45).

\begin{quote}
Helmer: "Let me help you if you are in want.’
Nora: "No, I can receive nothing from a stranger.”
Helmer: "Nor can I never be anything more than a stranger to you?(\textit{A Doll's House} 68)."
\end{quote}
One of the characteristics of absurdity is domination, as expressed by Camus (80). According to Camus (80), "absurdity is the improper, the unforgivable, the incomprehensible, emerging through domination, rule, subjugation, constraint, threat, power, manipulation, infantilizing, deceit and blinding."

According to Hohl (86), three manifestations of the absurd have existed when life is considered: the ontological absurd (death), the socio-cultural absurd (doctrines of salvation and their heralds, exerting domination and demanding obedience), and the individual absurd (for instance vanity or narcissism). Domination can be shown in A Doll's House when Linde says: “a wife cannot borrow without her husband’s consent (A Doll’s House 10).”

Linde is one of the characters in the play, which shows the independency of men and the dependency of women, and the domination of men. This domination can be traced when Linde says: “have you never told your secret to your husband? (A Doll’s House 11).” A sign of Torval’s domination and Nora’s complete obedience in the play can be shown in the following expression: Nora: “I should not think of going against your wishes (A Doll’s House 4 ).”

Esslin (1960) stated that the features of absurdist drama are lack of specific setting, uncomfortability of characters in themselves, and suffering from loneliness. Characters cannot or will not make any connection with each other. Esslin’s view about the human condition is that it is always overpowered by separateness and loneliness (Esslin 4). In A Doll’s House, Nora and Torval are lonely, and they cannot understand each other. Isolation and loneliness can be traced when Nora says:

“...A Doll’s House 16."

Another important theme of absurdism is materialism. In absurdist works, the relationships, even the relations between family members, are based on profit and money. Materialism is demonstrated by the characters of the play. Although Linde loved a man, she married another man who was rich. So this marriage was based on money, not love. Nora loves Torvald because of her profit. The love between Nora and Torvald was not a spiritual love because Nora tried to please Torvald to get money from him. Money was important for Torvald as he paid attention to his position at the bank rather than his wife. The importance of money in the play, which is one of the elements of absurdism, can be revealed in the following expression: Torvald: “we can’t spend money recklessly (A Doll’s House 2).”

Telling lies is one of the themes of the play, which shows absurdity. Nora’s married life was built on lies. The relations are based on a lie. In the play, absurdity can be traced when Nora told a lie to her husband that she borrowed money from her father. All this drama is based on this lie that Nora wanted to hide. Even Nora hid the Christmas tree, which shows her interest to hide something. She even hid what in her parcel are, and she refused to show them to Helmer. Another trace of absurdism can be seen in the following expression: Helmer: “Hasn’t Miss Sweet Tooth been breaking rules in town today? (A Doll’s House 4).” This sentence shows that there is no trust between family members. Another expression that can be a sign of absurdism is: Helmer: “If it is a caller, remember I am not at home (A Doll’s House 5).”

The characters tell lies for their profit. Another lie is when Nora told Helmer that there was nobody at home, but in reality, Krogstad was in their home speaking to her. All the characters had masks on their faces and did not show their real nature.

Suleman (2016) states that “the situations that create meaninglessness and nothingness due to the lack of communicating ideas and loss of interest in the activities happening around in one’s life, because of which man is only left with doing nothing important and purposeless activities, we can say, can be said as absurdism” (Suleman2). The expression which can be traceable of absurdism in the play and shows meaningless and unimportant action is:

Nora: “someday, perhaps, after many years, when I am no longer as nice-looking as I am now. Don’t laugh at me! I mean, of course, when Torvald is no longer as devoted to me as he is now; when my dancing and dressing-up and reciting have palled on him, then it may be a good thing to have something in reserve (A Doll’s House 11).”

There is a lack of connection between characters. Nora and Linde didn’t see each other for many years ago. As in Waiting for Godot, there is nothing to be done; in A Doll’s House also there is nothing to be done as Nora says:

“I mean that I was simply transferred from papa’s hands into yours. You arranged everything according to your own taste, and so I got the same tastes as you else I pretended to, I am really not quite sure which--I think sometimes the one and sometimes the other. When I look back on it, it seems to me as if I had been living here like a poor woman--just from hand to
mouh. I have existed merely to perform tricks for you, Torvald. But you would have it so. You and papa have committed a great sin against me. It is your fault that I have made nothing of my life (A Doll’s House 15)."

So Nora didn’t do anything, and she only did what her father and her husband liked and wanted her to do. She did what they liked to please them.

5. Conclusion
The play *A Doll’s House* by Henrik Ibsen is an absurdist play. Torvald Helmer as a husband treats his wife, Nora, like a doll which shows the sense of absurdity. The play describes the elements of the absurdity of disappointment, hopelessness, and feelings of isolation. The hopeless feeling happens when Nora cannot accept her Husband’s ill-treatment and wants to commit suicide. The dialogues in absurdism are farcical and nonsensical. Miscommunication is another theme of absurdity that can be shown in the play. There is a master-slave relationship, one of the themes of absurdism, between Nora and Helmer, which can be traced in the play. Materialism is also portrayed in the play as one of the themes of absurdism. The relationships between characters are based on profit. Telling lies, which can be a sign of absurdism, is shown in the play, too. The picture of alienation as portrayed in the play comes up when Nora and Helmer are not able to bridge the differences between the two. As a wife, Nora needs more respect as a human, whereas Helmer thinks as a husband, he is the king who arranges everything. So, Nora feels like a stranger in her own home that has placed her in alienation to meet her destiny. As a result, divorce is made up in the way resolution exists from being alienated.
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