

THE DRAMATIC EFFECT OF THE ANTAGONIST IN HENRIK IBSEN'S A DOLL'S HOUSE: AN ANALYTICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

Ayham Aref Abu Oruq and Nadia Tariq

Middle East University/Jordan

ABSTRACT: *This study aims at probing into Nils Krogstad's characterization in Henrik Ibsen's A Doll's House. Mainly, it tries to prove that Krogstad is the actual antagonist in Ibsen's masterpiece by analyzing the antagonistic attributes in his characterization, his motivational impulses towards villainy, as well as his dramatic effect on the protagonist and on the plot. After the analytical discussion, the study found that the motives of Krogstad refer to social, emotional and financial variables. In the case of Krogstad's dramatic effect, the study asserted that his dramatic effect is strong on Nora by bringing her close to the reality of her life with Torvald as a doll. As well as, he is the character who incites the play's events and the one who causes the main conflicts in the plot. Moreover, the results of the study indicated that Krogstad's happy end is not a proof that he is not antagonistic to the protagonist, Nora, but also it is to show a sample, victimized in an unforgiving society. Finally, the study did prove that Krogstad is the most qualified character to be the play's antagonist for his antagonistic features including the conflicts with Nora, the strong dramatic effect on her and the dramatic effect on the play's events.*

KEYWORDS: Krogstad, A Doll's House, antagonist, dramatic effect

INTRODUCTION

In drama, the character that is evil is known as the antagonist. The English word antagonist, meaning opponent, competitor, enemy or rival, is derived from the prefix anti- (against); thus, the antagonist is a character developed by the playwright to represent an opposition against the protagonist. The antagonist is a central character in literary products since his presence is essential to represent the main conflict against his rival, the protagonist or the hero. The presentation of the antagonist in a literary work is different, depending on the writer's culture, trend, historical era, and purpose of his written work. Therefore, The development of the antagonist is supposedly built by the playwright according to his own views to serve his literary product. For instance, the antagonist in a realistic drama is almost realistic, sampled from a real society, or developed to be a representative of a real society. Accordingly, a realistic drama can be defined as a kind of drama that depicts everyday life in both presentation and content to preserve the illusion of actual life.

Henrik Ibsen is modeled as the leader of realism. He is the playwright who, by his famous realistic dramas including *The Pillars of Society* (1875), *A Doll's House* (1879), *An Enemy of the People* (1882), *Hedda Gabler* (1890) and *The Master Builder* (1892), significantly contributes to bringing realism to popularity in Europe in the mid-nineteenth century. Ibsen's masterpiece, *A Doll's House* (1879), has been deemed the most important melodrama written by him since it has been performed in various European stages. The play centers around individualism, appearances, the role of

women, parental and filial obligations and family state among the middle class people in its time. It was intended by Ibsen to criticize certain norms and issues in society.

In this study, the researcher tries to determine the real antagonist in the play. This matter has been a debatable subject to many scholars who haven't yet agreed on one real antagonist for the play. The reason actually is that no character has completely clear antagonistic features that would qualify him to be the play's antagonist. According to some views, on one hand, Nora herself is seen as antagonistic to herself due to the inner conflict she has. On the other hand, other views go with a claim that Torvald is the antagonist, as he confronts Nora at the end of the play. In this memorable scene, the couple, Nora and Torvald, uncover the truth that they are opposite to each other, and that they together represent an unseen conflict in the plot. Torvald treats his wife as a doll whom he admires to possess as his own property, while Nora attempts to find her identity, to be independent and to live like any woman who has the rights and freedom any human should have. The crucial debate about the antagonist has not yet stopped, some scholars analyze the elements of play, considering the whole society in which Nora, Torvald and Krogstad are victimized as the antagonist. Wiseman (2010) is one of the scholars who strongly support this idea, considering Nora, Torvald, Rank, Linde and Krogstad as representatives of the middle class people in the mid-nineteenth century. They are all seemingly realistic characters who suffered from certain unfair societal norms that were common in their time. As this study attempts to prove, Nils Krogstad is the most qualified character to be the antagonist. He seems to be a despicable villain in the play; he is considered to be the main antagonist as a result of his wicked deeds regarding blackmailing, threatening and forging; and his dramatic effect on the other characters and on the plot of the play. However, the turning change in his personality at the end of play, which exposes his reality as a good man victimized in an unfair society, might contradict the previous claim that he is the play's antagonist. In this respect, Brockett and others (2015) justify why Krogstad is not sometimes seen as the antagonist of the play, demonstrating that Krogstad is not presented in a stable state during the play's three acts, that is why Rank, Nora and Torvald look at Krogstad as a morally corrupted man, whereas Mrs. Linde looks at him as something else; she is the only character who has a full understanding of Krogstad's good nature.

In light of the above, the current study will analytically investigate the character of Nils Krogstad, paying special concentration on his impact in the play in which he appears, the motives that lead him to be the heinous villain in the play, and also the way he ends up in the play from the writer's outlook. Thus, the fact that he is the actual antagonist in Ibsen's play would be ultimately determined.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

In order to understand why any antagonist does what he does, one should study the motives that make him become an antagonist, and thereby, measuring the dramatic effect he has on the literary work. In the case of Nils Krogstad, many scholars have theoretically discussed his motives, dramatic effect and wicked actions. To pinpoint the significance of this character in *A Doll's House*, Henry (1997) discusses Krogstad's motivation, taking the view that Krogstad was obligated into crime in order to look after his ill wife and children. After that, he describes the relationship with Kristine as a subplot that asserts the central theme in the play, that is, the struggle against the cruel society.

Siddall (2008) explains Krogstad's blackmailing and he describes the presence of Krogstad as sinister as it would be in any thriller. A detached language has become a habitual shell for him as a defense against ill-fortune and emotional misery that he can follow. In addition, he defines Krogstad as a villain in conventional nineteenth century melodrama. He is not looking for a new job, but he wants to keep the one he has: the chief motive is to recover some of his reputation. Larsen (1932) studied three plays written by Ibsen from a psychological perspective. In the analysis of the characters in *A Doll's House*, Krogstad is described as an unhappily married and desperate man who actually realizes what it means to suffer social ostracism and financial need. He is anxious about his position at the bank for the reason that he is a father. He uses his knowledge to save himself and he thinks that to endanger Nora is the easy and profitable way for that. He realizes that Nora's influence on her husband is the only hope not to be fired. In this respect, Zmijewska-Emerson (1996) asserts that the actions of Krogstad are motivated by noble incentives: his love for his children, his feeling of responsibility toward his family and his need to preserve his dignity by restoring his good reputation. Brockett and others (2015) discuss the roles of Krogstad and Mrs. Linde who serve as a contrast to Nora and Torvald. They try to justify why Krogstad is shunned by society as morally corrupt, although he made the same mistake Nora did, that is, the forgery. Besides, they argue that the characters including Krogstad and the actions of the play, are determined by environmental forces, so all of the characters are products of their environments.

In the case of Krogstad's dramatic effect, the first critic to be reviewed is Sharma (2012). He describes the character of Krogstad and his actions in the play, claiming that Krogstad can be accepted as a negative character in the first and second acts. However, he redeems himself in the third act exactly when he gets his past love, Mrs. Linde, back. According to Grene (2014), Krogstad is the sinister moneylender who appears as the strange intruder on the family scene. He turns out to have known Helmer since their college days and has a better sense of Torvald's character than Nora has. There is the plotted intrigue of Krogstad's hold over Nora. From another point of view, Zmijewska-Emerson (1996) describes the dramatic effect of Krogstad in *A Doll's House* that Krogstad serves as a reference to the past by providing further details about Nora's past. Consequently, the audience becomes familiar with all the facts surrounding Nora's forgery. Also, Krogstad creates Nora's fear which motivates her further actions in the play when he threatens to reveal Nora's secret, he initiates a chain of events that lead to the ultimate tragedy in the Helmer's household. In his study of Western Drama, Ungar (2008) interprets the characterization of Ibsen's *A Doll's House*. Krogstad is described as seemingly morally corrupt. He is a crucial character; that is why he throws a reflection back to the protagonist Nora of the persecuted criminal in an unforgiving society. He serves the play by revealing Torvald as a cruel moralist within the Helmer's home, and demonstrating the redemptive power of disclosure. Krogstad is represented as a model for how society treats morally corrupt ones. Because Nora initially takes a hostile attitude toward him as morally and socially inferior, he becomes motivated to blackmailing her. He is afraid of losing the dignity he has gained if he loses his position at the bank.

DISCUSSION

As the study inspects the motives, dramatic effect and presentation of Nils Krogstad, it is important to note that the motives of any character are only variables that urge his actions. His actions which come as a reflection to his motivation specify the extent to which his dramatic effect is strong. His effect and actions would drive him to his end which serves the writer's purposes whether the end is happy or not.

Krogstad's Motivation

The first presence of Krogstad which is delayed to the end of the first act in the play is to meet with Torvald; a meeting which happens concurrently with Mrs. Linde's visit to Nora. Although Nora and Linde are not happy to see Krogstad, it seems that he does not have any intention toward any despicable action. He is not yet motivated to do any wicked deed; this is clear from his answer to Nora's question about the reason behind his visit as his visit is for nothing but for dry "business matters". The turning point in Krogstad's character is the dismissal from the bank in which he has a subordinate position to Torvald Helmer, his school colleague. This is the first motivation that drives Krogstad into any evasive action he would do. At the end of act one, Krogstad comes again to Helmer's house; Nora tells him that Torvald is not at home, but Krogstad explains that the reason behind his visit is to meet Nora herself. In the conversation between the two, Krogstad reveals that his position at the bank is in jeopardy, and that he might be dismissed as a result of hiring Mrs. Linde to a position at the bank. Krogstad first requests that Nora uses her influence on her husband to convince him secure Krogstad's job. When Nora denies his request, Krogstad reminds her of the signature Nora left in the bank's promissory note. Krogstad threatens Nora that he will reveal her past crime of forgery unless she helps him. He remarks that he is prepared to fight for his small position at the bank as if he is fighting for his life. He does not want to lose his reputation, his dignity and his position in society. Hence, Krogstad's despicable blackmail starts against Nora.

It is not only for the sake of the money; indeed, that weighs least with me in the matter. There is another reason--well, I may as well tell you. My position is this. I daresay you know, like everybody else, that once, many years ago, I was guilty of an indiscretion (Act 1, p53)

In this quotation, it is absolute that what motivated Krogstad to blackmail Nora is the need to save his position in society rather than for the sake of money. Krogstad seems worried about his position, because he is worried about losing his dignity. In this respect, Sharma (2012) demonstrates that Krogstad's motivation is to regain his position at the bank in hard times. Sharma believes that losing a job is not an ordinary matter because of the hard times in which Krogstad lives. The second motive that can be discussed about Krogstad is that he is struggling to secure his children. Krogstad makes a confession to Nora that he is obligated to do the business Nora has already known, he means the forgery, because his children are growing up and, in order to be able to secure them, he must try to get back his position and his respect in the town at any cost. According to Sharma (2012), Krogstad commits some illegal actions as a

consequence of being a father for motherless children. What he wants is only to save these children who are growing without a mother.

Dr. Rank refers to Krogstad as a morally sick man in the first act of the play when Krogstad comes to meet with Torvald at the Helmer's house. Meanwhile, Nora tells Mrs. Linde that Krogstad made a very unhappy marriage in the past. This fact, associated with the fact that Krogstad is a father of motherless children, constitute two sides of the same coin. The unhappy family life of Krogstad did motivate him to some illegal actions which contribute to Dr. Rank's and others' seeing Krogstad as morally sick. Blackmail is not the first despicable action Krogstad is motivated to do, but also if one looks at Krogstad's past, he will find that Krogstad helped Nora to forge her father's signature, so that she could take the loan from the bank. This action causes Krogstad to lose his reputation in society being a partner in the forgery crime. Krogstad's defense is that his motivation for such action was to save his wife's life. In one of his memorable quotations, he criticizes the society and the law which, as he thinks, does not care about motives.

The need to commit such a crime is the same as Nora's need to take Torvald to Italy in order to cure him of his illness. From another perspective, Grene (2014) sees that the reason which makes Krogstad participate with Nora in her crime is because Nora wants to save Torvald's life, rather than because he is elusive by nature. In other words, his reason or motivation is only humanitarian. At the beginning of the third act in the play, another motive is exposed. In the meeting between Krogstad and Mrs. Linde, it becomes obvious that there was a romantic relationship between the two in the past. However, Mrs. Linde left Krogstad and married another man for financial reasons. Krogstad himself talks about Mrs. Linde's abandonment as one of his motives. He states that he was emotionally distracted, and describes Mrs. Linde as a heartless woman. As he describes the psychological condition he was under after the rejection of his love, Krogstad describes himself as a shipwrecked man who clings to a bit of wreckage.

Krogstad's Dramatic Effect

Before discussing the dramatic effect Krogstad has on the other characters and the plot in *A Doll's House*, it is worth explaining the nature of his relationship with the protagonist Nora whom the main conflict of the play centers around. The nature of the relationship between them is described by Brockett and others (2015) as "Ibsen could have made his play melodramatic by depicting Krogstad as a villain and Nora as a heroine". Therefore, it is an indubitable fact that Nora and Krogstad have the strongest dramatic effect in the play. Now, the question that would be raised is: "Does Krogstad have a dramatic effect on Nora and the other characters in the play?" The answer can absolutely be determined by referring to the development of the actions Krogstad brings by his arrival from the first appearance until the end of the play. Siddall (2008) describes the presence of Krogstad in the three acts of the play: In the first act, Krogstad's visit shocks Nora into understanding the realities about the public and social worlds outside the doll's house where she lives. In the second act, his visit establishes some sort of weird affinity with Nora, especially through the prospect of suicide. In the third act, Krogstad appears not to visit or meet Nora, but to reveal the truth to Torvald by his letter. Nora seems shocked into understanding the false basis of her marriage and family.

The dramatic effect Krogstad has on Nora was not so clear before the announcement that his position at the bank is jeopardized. In other words, Krogstad's act of blackmail exhibits the dramatic effect he has on Nora. First of all, the audience gets informed about the forgery of Nora's signature which has not been revealed until the blackmail starts. In the first act of the play, Nora tells Mrs. Linde about the hard condition she and Torvald lived in when Torvald was ill. She explains that she obtained the money from her father to take Torvald to Italy for treatment. Though, by the arrival of Krogstad at the end of the first act, the source of Nora's loan is disclosed to the audience; she committed the crime of forging her father's signature to receive a loan from the bank. Furthermore, Krogstad's act of blackmail and threats drive Nora to her dilemma. She seems frightened, worried and tentative; she tries to persuade Torvald to keep the position of Krogstad to overcome her trouble, but Torvald does not accept. According to Siddall (2008) much of the play's tension relies on Nora's persuasion to let Torvald save Krogstad's position.

After the official announcement of Krogstad's dismissal from the bank, he appears again to meet Nora in the second act of the play. As a result of his blackmail, Nora reveals that she is ready to commit suicide if it might be the solution for her. She wants to save her reputation in the eyes of her husband and children, so she finds her death the only way of keeping her reputation intact. Krogstad still imposes his effect on Nora in persuading her not to kill herself. Krogstad tells Nora that even if she kills herself, her reputation will be ruined. He means that her body will be dead, but her reputation will not, her crime will be exposed and Torvald will be accused of his wife's crime. After that, Krogstad leaves Nora and on his way out of the Helmer's house, he puts a letter in the letterbox to inform Torvald of his wife's forgery. Leaving the letter has been influential, too. It makes Nora confess to Mrs. Linde her secret about the loan.

In the final act of the play, Krogstad's dramatic effect turns to touch the Helmer family. Torvald reads the letter of Krogstad and becomes outraged. He starts accusing Nora of being a liar and hypocrite. He describes her as his joy and pride in the past which has become the worst criminal in the present. What makes Torvald outraged is not only the crime itself, but also because it leads him to be under the power of the unscrupulous Krogstad. This is actually the only effect Krogstad has on Torvald in the play. That Torvald seems extremely outraged is because his wife's crime was with Krogstad, not any other person. Otherwise, Torvald is the one who has an effect on Krogstad's character; the dismissal from the bank is the most important motive that pushes Krogstad to blackmail.

Now that the truth is already uncovered, Krogstad contributes to Nora's understanding of the reality of her marriage. She realized that she is like a doll having no independence in her life; she is admired and played with like a puppet by her husband. Furthermore, Krogstad makes it clear that Torvald's fear of losing his position in society is more important than his family. Unlike Nora, who was seriously affected by Krogstad, Mrs. Linde is the one who manages to change Krogstad. When she tells him that his children need a mother; and she needs to be a mother; they thus all need each other, the changes in Krogstad's personality become apparent. Most likely, she restores him to his good nature which was abused by society. Another evidence to prove the effect of Mrs. Line on Krogstad is that he decides to take the letter back from the Helmer's letterbox in order not to ruin this family as soon as he gets his past love again.

Not only does Krogstad have a special effect at the level of the development of the characters in the play, but also he raises the actions and affects the events of the plot from the first time he appears until the end. Krogstad can be seen as the character who drives the plot and affects the moral changes of the characters in the play. In fact, the development of the actions in the play relies on the presence of Krogstad who causes the climax of the plot when he puts the letter in the letterbox; the actions become more complex and the fate of Nora becomes more ambiguous. Krogstad's conflict with Nora provides much suspense and thrill for the play. Rush (2005) considers that the rising action in the play begins in act one when Krogstad comes to Nora and informs her about her husband's firing him from the bank; he threatens her that he has the proof of her past crime.

Krogstad's End in A Doll's House

The last appearance of Krogstad in the play is his meeting with Mrs. Linde who informs him of her decision that she wants him again. Although Krogstad intends not to ruin the Helmer family by taking his letter again from the letterbox, Mrs. Linde tells him that he must not recall the letter because she enters the Helmer's house and becomes more aware that Nora and Torvald must have a complete understanding of their relationship; and this would not be possible unless the unhappy secret of forgery is disclosed. After that, Krogstad leaves the play expressing the big change in his personality. Krogstad says that he has never had such an amazing piece of good fortune in his life.

In Ibsen's play, Krogstad's role ends with regaining his love and revealing the truth of Nora's secret. The revelation of the secret is of great influence on the play. It provides Nora with a real understanding of her life in a house where she is treated like a doll. She realized that what she looks like in the eyes of her husband is only a beautiful possession; she is loved by her husband in order for him to feel he is needed. Nora finally manages to reach the truth of her being a human before being a wife and a mother, and she as a human must have independence, personality and beliefs. Ibsen does not design for his antagonist to be punished for his illegal actions, because what he wants from the representation of Krogstad as appears in the play is to introduce a victimized sample in an unfair society. Therefore, Ibsen lets his antagonist end up in a happy marriage to contradict the end of his protagonist. The relationship between Krogstad and Mrs. Linde represents a subplot contradictory to the main plot that is represented in the relationship between Nora and Torvald. This contradiction is intended by Ibsen to emphasize the message he wants to convey from his play that is the criticism of the way women were seen in that period of time.

Krogstad as the Antagonist in A Doll's House

This study mainly supposes that Nils Krogstad is the real antagonist in Ibsen's *A Doll's House*, by discussing the antagonistic attributes in his characterization, which qualify him to be considered as the antagonist. To reach a clear conclusion whether Krogstad is the antagonist or not, he would be compared to other characters who are probably classified as antagonistic in Ibsen's controversial play. The first character to be compared is Nora, the undoubted protagonist of the play. Although it has been believed by many critics that she is the antagonist as well as the protagonist in the play, she hasn't appeared in an inner conflict during the whole events of the play. At the

beginning, she is presented as a childlike, a puppet and dutiful character who accepts her wifely and motherly roles without any inner rejection. Nora's realization that she is trapped in her house starts by the arrival of Krogstad. The inner conflict then becomes obvious at the time when Krogstad threatens and blackmails her. Therefore, by comparing the inner conflict Nora has to the conflict between Nora and Krogstad, the main conflict is of course the one between Nora and Krogstad; that is simply because Nora's inner conflict comes as subsequent to the former. Wiseman (2010) asserts that the central conflict of the story is driven by Nora's crime of forgery to get the bank's loan; Krogstad, who has proceeded the loan, blackmails Nora over this fact.

The second probable antagonist in the play is Nora's husband, Torvald. This claim would be built on Torvald's confrontation with Nora at the end of the play. This confrontation does not necessarily mean that Torvald is antagonistic to Nora, as his worries are always about his dignity and standing in society. Thus, Torvald's conflict is not against Nora, but against the appearances he believes in. In a book entitled *Henrik Ibsen's A Doll's House* by Edge Hill University Arts Centre (2014), Torvald is described as a typical middle class husband of the times who almost looks like a father instructing his little daughter. His relationship with Nora is the same as a father-daughter relationship in the sense that he treats her like a pet, rewarded by gifts of money as indication of his controlling power over her. Another significant issue about Torvald to be highlighted is that he is Nora's husband whose beliefs deprive her from being independent in society. He is the one who draws the doll-house where he imprisons his puppet. However, if his conflict is compared to Krogstad's conflict with Nora, it will be seen that Torvald's actions are not wicked because he practices what other men do in the same society where they all live. In contrast, Krogstad's actions of blackmailing and threatening against Nora cannot be excused since Nora is not the one who wants to dismiss him from the bank. At the end of Torvald's and Nora's relationship, everything changes and Nora turns from being a girl to being a woman who realizes the path to her true identity outside the doll's house. This realization does not come as a consequence of her conflict with Torvald, but as a consequence of Krogstad's revelation of her past crime.

After analyzing all of the probable antagonists in *A Doll's House*, as well as comparing them to Nils Krogstad, it becomes clear that Krogstad is the most qualified character to be deemed as the antagonist in the play. To prove this assumption, it would be associated with the main questions of the study. First, he, like any antagonist in literature, has certain motives which play a big role in pushing him to do despicable actions such as blackmailing, threatening and forging. Regardless of the fact that Krogstad is a victim of circumstances and the unforgiving society where he suffers, he actually appears as a villain who causes Nora many troubles, and the main reason for destroying the Helmer's family. These despicable actions cannot be taken without reasons; the reasons are the motives that provoke Krogstad to do what he does. Second, his dramatic effect which is very strong on the protagonist and the plot of the play can be a strong proof that Krogstad is antagonistic to Nora and he makes the changes in her life. To conclude, Because Krogstad is the one who incites the events of the play, and the one who sparks the flames of conflicts in the plot, he can ultimately be classified as the actual antagonist in the play.

CONCLUSION

In terms of the variables that motivated Krogstad to take certain illegal and despicable actions, they can be divided into social, financial and emotional variables. The social variable can be seen in the dismissal from his job which means for Krogstad losing his dignity and position in society. In his time, a man is no longer respected in society without having a good job from which he can earn money. Once he feels that his job is in jeopardy, Krogstad finds no choice except blackmailing Nora. The financial variable that pushes Krogstad to commit an illegal crime is the need to save his motherless children. Before blackmailing Nora, Krogstad takes part in Nora's crime of forgery, and demonstrates that his reason is to save the life of his sick wife who dies later leaving behind her the children under Krogstad's care. Without a job, he would not be able to cover the requirements of those children. The last variable that motivated Krogstad is emotional. The fact that Krogstad's emotional state turns from misery to a high degree of happiness after regaining his old love, Mrs. Linde, leads to another possible change that is if he had not lost his love to Christine, he would not be of course motivated to do any bad deed. For that reason, the loss of whom he loved is a main motive for Krogstad's behavior.

Krogstad's dramatic effect is also very important in *A Doll's House*. His presence in the play provides the suspense in the events. His effect on the protagonist Nora is important as well. Without Krogstad, Nora would not realize the reality of her life with her husband. She would continue her life as a doll who does not have any active role in society except her duties as a wife and as a mother. She would forget that she is a human before she understands how life is out of her home by the arrival of Krogstad in the play. Krogstad introduces the audience to two different couples in the society of his time. On one hand, his relationship with Christine that insists on the sacrificial role a man and a woman should have. On the other hand, he uncovers the reality of the Helmer's relationship in which Nora and Torvald live in an artificial love relationship. Nora's role of sacrifice is clear, while Torvald is a man who only thinks of his position as the man who should prevail on his wife. Generally speaking, Krogstad's dramatic effect on Nora and on Nora's family cannot be doubted, since the fact that Krogstad is the character who achieves what Ibsen wanted from his play, that is the criticism of certain hypocritical aspects in society.

One of the main concerns the study seeks to discover is the different depiction of Krogstad's end in the play. Krogstad's end with a happy marriage somehow seems unfair because of the despicable actions he did throughout the play. This end which reveals the good nature of Krogstad may be the reason behind not considering him as the play's antagonist by many critics. Nevertheless, Krogstad is, at least, the actual antagonist in most of its parts except the end which is drawn by Ibsen to serve one of his intentions from the play; that is the depiction of a sample, victimized by the circumstances and the unforgiving society.

The last significant issue in this study is the determination whether Krogstad is the actual antagonist in the play or not. After the investigation of Krogstad's motives, the dramatic effect on the protagonist and on the plot, and the antagonistic features of his characterization, it can be concluded that Krogstad is the major antagonist in Ibsen's *A Doll's House*. If any, he can be, at least, considered as the antagonist in the play before regaining his old love with Mrs. Linde.

REFERENCES

- Brocket, O G and others. (2015). *The Essential Theatre*. 11th edition. Canada.
- Edge Hill University Arts Centre. *Henrik Ibsen's A Doll's House*. Available at:https://www.edgehill.ac.uk/events/files/2014/05/A_Dolls_House_Education_Pack.pdf
- Greene, N. (2014). *Home on Stage: Domestic spaces in modern drama*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Henry, J E. (2011). A Doll's House. *Masterplots II: Juvenile & Young Adult Literature Series, Supplement*, p 1-2, p339
- Ibsen, H. (2009). *A Doll's House*. The Floating Press
- Larsen, C. (1932). *Psychological Analysis of Certain Dramas Written by Henrik Ibsen*. (Unpublished MA Thesis). University of Southern California
- Rush, D. (2005). *A Student Guide to Play Analysis*. United States of America: Southern Illinois University press/Carbondale.
- Sharma, R. (2012). *Ready Reference Treatise: A Doll's House*, ISBN: 978-1- 300-36960-9
- Siddall, S H. (2008). *Humanities Insights: Henrik Ibsen: A doll's house humanities-ebooks*, LLP
- Ungar, G W. (2008). *Ancient, Vicious, Luscious: Secrecy and confession in Western Drama*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Irvine: University of California.
- Wiseman, M. (2010). Nora as a doll in Henrik Ibsen's A Doll's House. *Inquiries Journal/Student Pulse*, 2(03). Retrieved from <http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/220/nora-as-a-doll-in-henrik-ibsen-s-a-dolls-house>
- Zmijewska-Emerson, H K. (1996). *The Construction of Social Imagery in Pillars of Society, A Doll House and Ghosts: A study of the roots of Ibsen's modernity*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Minnesota