Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Signature:

Leesa Haspel April 14, 2010

Becoming *Miss Julie:* A Study in Practical Dramaturgy

by

Leesa Haspel

Adviser

Donald McManus

Department of Theater Studies

Donald McManus
Adviser

Lisa Paulsen
Committee Member

Joseph Skibell
Committee Member

April 14, 2010

Becoming *Miss Julie:* A Study in Practical Dramaturgy

By

Leesa Haspel

Adviser
Donald McManus

An abstract of
A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of Theater Studies

2010

Abstract

Becoming *Miss Julie:* A Study in Practical Dramaturgy
By Leesa Haspel

This paper serves to document and reflect upon an actor's experience using research to inform and develop a role. Theater Emory's 2009 production of *Miss Julie* serves as the case study, describing the process of creating the titular role. An overview of the history of dramaturgy, a dramaturgical protocol, exploration of relevant acting styles, analysis of the Theater Emory production, and personal reflection on the experience of developing *Miss Julie* cohere to create a guide advocating the use of practical dramaturgy in contemporary acting.

Becoming *Miss Julie:* A Study in Practical Dramaturgy

By

Leesa Haspel

Adviser
Donald McManus

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of Theater Studies

2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In October 2009, Theater Emory began its 2009-2010 season with *Miss Julie x 3*, three simultaneous productions of August Strindberg's drama. *Miss Julie x 3* used different translations, directors, casts, aesthetic approaches, and venues to explore *Miss Julie* through three unique lenses. *Miss Julie A* presented a postmodern interpretation, incorporating puppetry, mime, film, and dance to comment on the disjunction between the play's text and Strindberg's preface, written after the play's publication. *Miss Julie B* focused on Strindberg's work as autobiography, juxtaposing elements of classic fairytales against the harsh realities of the playwright's life. The final production, *Miss Julie C*, explored naturalism, staging the play as closely to the original as possible.

My involvement in this process was as an actress and to some extent, dramaturg, for *Miss Julie A.* Although I originally intended to serve as a dramaturg for the production, after being cast as Julie, the scope of my research narrowed to my own character development and personal understanding of the text. This project is the reflection of my efforts to develop the role of Miss Julie through dramaturgical efforts. Its purpose is to draw connections between research and performance, using *Miss Julie x 3,* and *Miss Julie A* in particular, as a case study for practical dramaturgy.

While it is partially a chronicle of my own experience, it may also serve as a resource for actors planning to produce *Miss Julie.* By recording my own experience, I hope to offer insight into how these efforts helped or hindered the rehearsal process and overall production. I do not intend to provide a step-by-step guide to becoming Julie or insinuate that there is one "right" way to perform the role. Instead, my goal is to share my struggles, triumphs, research, and analysis to better inform future productions of *Miss Julie.*

WHAT IS DRAMATURGY?

Since its beginnings in Germany in the late 1760s, dramaturgy's role in theater has been varied and ever changing. Dramaturgs have contributed to the writing, selection, and production of plays in theaters throughout the world and perform a variety of duties from reading scripts to taking rehearsal notes to writing criticism. As a result of the multifaceted role of the dramaturg, it has been difficult to define the term explicitly and comprehensively. The responsibilities and inclinations of one dramaturg may be vastly different from those of another at a different theater. I will attempt to remedy this problem by offering a basic definition of dramaturgy derived from a study of its origins, evolution, and role in modern theater. By exploring dramaturgical history and first-hand accounts of contemporary dramaturgs and literary managers, I hope to craft a thorough overview of dramaturgy, past and present, and determine its importance to the world of theater.

Currently, one of the best attempts to define dramaturgy stems from scholar Bert Cardullo, whose book of critical essays, *What is Dramaturgy?*[1], explores this question in depth. In his introduction, Cardullo outlines the main responsibilities of dramaturgs and their role in producing a play. The process begins as dramaturgs read new plays, often offering comments to the playwright on elements that should be cut or developed, or suggesting changes and clarifications to improve the work. A dramaturg's focus is not strictly limited to new plays, however, and they may also translate or adapt older works, reshaping a familiar or worn-out text to feel more contemporary for a given production. Often referred to as a literary manager, the role of the dramaturg in a theater is frequently to peruse scripts and search for material that is interesting for both audiences and the

[1] Bert Cardullo, ed., *What is Dramaturgy*? (New York: P. Lang, 1995).

theater's creative team. He may work closely with the artistic director and make recommendations about what plays form an ideal season. After selecting a play, the dramaturg must begin work with directors, actors, and potentially even designers, offering guidance and support throughout the production's development. To assist the director and actors, a dramaturg frequently assembles a protocol or casebook, outlining production history, bibliographic information about the playwright, social, economic, and historical influences, trends at the time that the play was written, a critical evaluation of the text, as well as thoughts on why it remains relevant today. Not only must he act as a historian, but the dramaturg is also a critic. He may be included in casting decisions and will often sit in on rehearsals, observing and taking notes for the director, ensuring not only that acting and design support the aesthetic vision of the theater, but also that they will engage the audience.

Just as a newspaper reviewer critiques performances, the dramaturg offers this same sort of reflection and commentary throughout the creative process. His role is to act as a sounding board for the director, serving as another set of eyes and ears to offer suggestions about how to best bring the play to life. Although the dramaturg can certainly take notes and offer suggestions to the director, ultimately, he does not have the authority to make any major changes or decisions for a production. Instead, he merely offers his own opinions based on research, extensive knowledge of the text, and familiarity with the theater and audience's preferred aesthetics. It is the director's prerogative to accept or reject these opinions. Ultimately, the dramaturg attempts to communicate the text and concept for a production as effectively as possible, and each of his suggestions or questions is meant to help achieve this goal.

Offering notes during the rehearsal process is not the only way that the dramaturg attempts to enhance the audience's experience, however. He is also responsible for drafting program notes and selecting other research, essays, or visual aides that may be distributed to the audience before the play begins. Although in the United States, it is not as common to distribute dramaturgical materials in the theater, European theaters frequently offer audiences literature or images to reflect upon as part of its theatrical experience. Essentially, it is the distribution of research materials to the audience, actors, and director, along with selection and preparation of text that comprise the main duties of the dramaturg. Cardullo points out that not every dramaturg performs all of these duties, but suggests that when the dramaturg is granted this much control and involvement in the theatrical process, the result is a very cohesive and clear communication of meaningful text in an interesting and engaging way.

Communication and education of the audience was the primary goal of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing when he began writing the *Hamburg Dramaturgy*, a journal of essays and theater criticism, in 1767. Commissioned by the Hamburg National Theater, Lessing reviewed productions in Hamburg and provided information about specific plays and their authors in order to improve the taste and theatrical knowledge of audiences.[2] A well-respected and prominent scholar, Lessing was inspired in part by the Enlightenment movement of the time, believing that his criticism and discourses could educate the German public and direct them toward a higher quality of theater. He was hired by the National Theater as an in-house critic and encouraged to write about its productions, as

[2] Joel Schechter, "Lessing, Jugglers, and Dramaturgs," *What is Dramaturgy?*, ed. Bert Cardullo (New York: P. Lang, 1995) 27-36.

well as dramatic theory.[3] Despite the National Theater's enthusiastic support, Lessing did not always commend its work, preferring to speak honestly in an attempt to provide his readers with an unbiased reaction to the play, in order to educate them about good art. In fact, Lessing was so committed to truth that he was not afraid to openly criticize the taste of German audiences in an attempt to encourage them to think more critically about theater. Both the public and members of the National Theater were offended by Lessing's criticism and consequently, his theories exerted much less influence on German aesthetics than anticipated.[4]

Regardless of its effect on the preferences of the German audience, the *Hamburg Dramaturgy* profoundly shaped theater criticism by boldly speaking against certain conventions. More importantly, Lessing's journal acted as the first dramaturgical model in which information about an author or subject was understood to be useful in understanding and enjoying a play. Although he only wrote *Dramaturgy* for two brief years, Lessing inspired a new tradition in German theater, and subsequently, many notable scholars issued their own dramaturgies. Despite their fear of criticism, theaters were eager to hire these early dramaturgs because it was a mark of distinction and prestige to boast an in-house critic and theorist. Funded by state subsidies, theaters became interested in exploring new material and the dramaturg was the ideal person to suggest a playwright to experiment with. The dramaturg began to have influence over season selection and became an

---

[3] Mary Luckhurst, *Dramaturgy A Revolution in Theatre: Cambridge Studies in Modern Theatre* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2006) 30-31.
[4] Klaus L. Berghahn, "German Literary Theory from Gottsched to Goethe," *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Vol. 4 The Eighteenth Century* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1997) 528-529.

advocate for the spectator, searching for plays and playwrights that would provide audiences with something new and engaging.[5]

The prominence of the dramaturg only continued to grow stronger in Germany over time, as over one hundred permanent state, national, and local theaters were established. It became commonplace to hire not only one dramaturg, but several per theater. Many theaters housed an entire department, or *Dramaturgie*, headed by a chief dramaturg who oversaw the work of several assistants. The duties of the *Dramaturgie* were vast, for they were responsible for soliciting and securing plays to perform, as well as arranging rehearsal and production schedules, and providing dramaturgical protocols, research, and general production-related knowledge to the director, cast, and designers of every production. Members of the *Dramaturgie* also compiled images, historical evidence, and other relevant information to be included in the program for every performance so that the audience could easily learn about the material it was watching. This model, developed over the past two hundred years, is still in place today in many German theaters.[6]

One major contributor to the German dramaturgical model was Bertolt Brecht, a famous playwright and director of the twentieth century. Brecht began his career as a dramaturg in Munich and was quickly promoted because of his innovative ideas and intelligence. He loved to experiment with mediums besides theater, including opera, and worked closely with Erwin Piscator and Kurt Weill before moving to the United States. Upon returning to Germany, Brecht formed his own company, the Berliner Ensemble, in

---

[5] Schechter 37-39.
[6] Martin Esslin, "The Role of the Dramaturg in European Theater," *What is Dramaturgy?*, ed. Bert Cardullo (New York: P. Lang, 1995) 43-46.

1949 and developed Epic Theater. This style dismissed many modern conventions and attempted to make theater "strange," distancing the audience from the play and creating a more critical and conscious spectator. Brecht granted the dramaturg more power than ever, encouraging the adaptation, translation, and transformation of texts to mimic the dramatic social and political changes of the time.[7] His dramaturgs conducted research, selected repertoire, worked with actors and designers, and even directed plays. The extensive dominance of the dramaturg in the Berliner Ensemble influenced German dramaturgy heavily, placing even more responsibility in the hands of *Dramaturgie* throughout the country. One reason it became possible for even tiny theaters in Germany to employ large dramaturgy departments was the government funding that Germany bestowed upon its arts programs. In the United States, and elsewhere in Europe, many theaters simply do not have the budget to support a *Dramaturgie* of three to four dramaturgs.[8]

This was certainly the case in nineteenth century England, where theatrical funding was completely private and the idea of a dramaturg was unheard of. Instead, the actor-manager dominated English theater, carrying out dramaturgical duties such as acquiring new plays to perform, as well as administration, directing, acting, financing, and organizing production schedules and tours. The pressure of managing almost every aspect of an entire theater was often too much for managers to handle, and by the end of the century, the actor-manager was virtually obsolete because no one could sustain the intense workload. The need for readers and literary advisers, which had existed at large theaters in the early

---

[7] Cathy Turner and Synne Behrndt, *Dramaturgy and Performance: Theatre and Performance Practices* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008) 42-56.
[8] Russell E. Brown, "Bertolt Brecht as Dramaturg," *What is Dramaturgy?*, ed. Bert Cardullo (New York: P. Lang, 1995) 57-62.

nineteenth century but faded in popularity by the 1850s, emerged once again. These advisers read, analyzed and critiqued plays, offering their thoughts to managers to help select the repertoire for each season. When managers could not afford a reader, they often relied on their wives or female relatives for input.

Eventually, by the late nineteenth century, actor-managers were exhausted and audiences were bored and unhappy with English theater. They longed for a new approach to material, and the avant-garde developed as a response to this urgent need. A new literary and performance style of theater coincided with a new management style as well, as the influence of Andre Antoine's Théâtre Libre inspired theater clubs like the Independent Theatre Society, which focused primarily on the playwright and text.[9] At the close of the nineteenth century, the dramaturg as defined by the German model still had no place in England, but in the incarnation of a literary manager, it had found its niche.

However, with the development of the Royal National Theater in 1963 and the appointment of Kenneth Tynan as literary manager, British dramaturgy began to flourish. Government funding allowed for the development of an entire department devoted to reading scripts, commissioning new works, and selecting repertoire.[10] The Royal Shakespeare Company, another government funded theater, also saw an increase in the hiring of literary managers, suggesting that British theater's limited dramaturgical presence was not an issue of choice, but of financial necessity. For the countless local and regional theaters that did not receive subsidies from the Arts Council England, it was not financially

---

[9] Luckhurst 45-60.

[10] "The Critic Comes Full Circle: An Interview with Kenneth Tynan." Interviewed by the Editors of *Theater Quarterly. What is Dramaturgy?*, ed. Bert Cardullo (New York: P. Lang, 1995) 199-202.

feasible to hire dramaturgs to research. Even today, the majority of British theaters operate without dramaturgs simply because they lack the funding to sustain them. While some may employ literary managers, their roles are limited to reading and reviewing plays and rarely involve research or involvement in any actual production. In this way, the British and German models differ greatly.[11]

Dramaturgs in the United States operate in yet another way, and the inclusion of dramaturgs in American theater occurred much later than in Europe. It was not until the 1960s and 70s, when the nation was in social and political upheaval, that theater also underwent an overhaul. New government funding encouraged theaters to explore and craft a unique, American drama, so the dramaturg developed as a partner for directors and literary managers, bridging the gap between those who select plays and those who bring them to life. The American dramaturg, much like those in Brecht's Berliner Ensemble, focused on creating something new and relevant for audiences to relate to, and his interests and projects extended outside the confines of reading and producing plays. Today, the modern American dramaturg concerns himself with creating a culture that embraces and needs theater.[12] He may organize educational events in the community and is interested in collaborating with as many directors, designers, actors, playwrights, and other dramaturgs as possible. There is a great deal of flexibility within this new type of theatrical community, so a dramaturg can also be an actor or director. He may write dramatic criticism or theories, provide research for a production, or workshop with playwrights to develop a new work.

---

[11] "Literary Management at the National Theatre, London: An Interview with John Russell Brown," Interviewed by Richard Beacham, *What is Dramaturgy?*, ed. Bert Cardullo (New York: P. Lang, 1995) 213-216.

[12] Judith D. Rudakoff and Lynn M. Thomson, *Between the Lines the Process of Dramaturgy* (Toronto: Playwrights Canada, 2002) 165-169.

He has many of the responsibilities of the early German dramaturg with the power, influence, and support of a Brechtian. Government funding through the National Endowment for the Arts and other grants has given public theaters across the country the opportunity to employ dramaturgs as the quest for an American theatrical identity continues. The dramaturg, who reads, researches, advises, and educates is essential in this pursuit and as American theater changes, so will his role.[13]

This constant flexibility and the ever-changing responsibilities of the dramaturg are precisely what make dramaturgy so hard to define. Through my analysis of its history in Europe and the United States, as well as the role of the dramaturg today, I have attempted to trace the evolution and growth of dramaturgy, noting its key components. Although it is nearly impossible to define something that constantly changes, I suggest that the dramaturg's purpose is to communicate the playwright's vision as clearly and effectively as possible by providing the director, actors, designers, and audience with useful and pertinent information about the play. His goal is always to provide the audience with a stimulating and thought-provoking experience, and he may select or commission plays for performance that will achieve this end. Consequently, I propose that dramaturgy be defined as the act of making theater a meaningful experience through research, textual analysis, education, criticism, and collaboration. From my exploration of its origins and evolution, this seems to capture dramaturgy's basic functions, encompassing attitudes and traditions from around the world over the past 200 years. When the dramaturg is given the freedom and resources to achieve his goal, theater may thrive.

---

[13] Peter Hay, "American Dramaturgy: A Critical Re-Appraisal," *What is Dramaturgy?*, ed. Bert Cardullo (New York: P. Lang, 1995) 67-87.

Dramaturgical Protocol for *Miss Julie A*

BIOGRAPHY OF JOHAN AUGUST STRINDBERG

Born January 22, 1849 in Stockholm, Sweden, Johan August Strindberg was the third child of Carl Strindberg and his wife, Nora Norling. Although Carl came from an aristocratic lineage, the family had little money and Strindberg looked back on his childhood as a time of stress, poverty, and neglect. Although he was intelligent, he was also highly sensitive, perhaps an early indication of the mental instability that would plague him throughout his life. His mother, to whom Strindberg was very attached, died of tuberculosis when Strindberg was thirteen and almost immediately, Carl Strindberg married his children's governess, Emilia Pettersson, much to Strindberg's dismay.

Despite a difficult childhood, Strindberg had a strong desire to succeed and in 1867, he journeyed to the University of Uppsala to study aesthetics and modern languages. He soon took a job in a chemist's shop as an assistant, which led to a passion for chemistry and science. In 1868, he returned to Stockholm to study chemistry at the Institute of Technology, but after failing an important qualifying chemistry exam a year later, he lost interest in pursuing a medical career. Nevertheless, his interest in science continued to grow, and in later years, he researched alchemy and the occult. Although he no longer had ambitions of becoming a doctor, he continued to identify himself as a scientist.

While pursuing his chemistry degree in Stockholm, Strindberg first became involved in theater as an extra at the Royal Dramatic Theater. In 1870, he began writing plays and developed an interest in journalism. He worked at the Royal Dramatic Theater for two years and produced his first play, *In Rome*, in late 1870. His plays enjoyed moderate success, but he continued to work as a journalist, making just enough money to survive. Eventually, his work led to a career as an assistant librarian in the National Library,

where he worked from 1874 until 1882. During Strindberg's time at the library, he met Baroness Siri von Essen, the wife of Baron Carl Gustav Wrangel, a Swedish aristocrat living in Finland. Von Essen and Wrangel divorced in 1876 and the baroness immediately began an affair with Strindberg, which resulted in pregnancy. In 1877, Strindberg and von Essen married. Shortly thereafter, their child was born, only to die a few days later. Filled with dreams of a career on stage, von Essen took a job as an actress, while Strindberg continued to write plays and political pamphlets.

His book *The Red Room*, which offered criticism of Stockholm society, gained Strindberg fame and notoriety in 1879, despite controversy due to its satirical nature. This success led to a production at the Royal Dramatic Theater of Strindberg's play *Master Olaf*, which it had previously refused to produce. *Master Olaf* received positive reviews and filled with self-confidence, Strindberg entered a period of productivity. He indulged in passions for art, specifically painting, as well as philosophy and science. Although much of his work was literary and dramatic, he established himself as a painter and theorist as well.

In 1881, he wrote *The Swedish People*, a chronicle of Swedish cultural traditions, which offended scholars and critics for its casual and dismissive attitude towards the nation's history. Rather than glorify Sweden, Strindberg tried to take a more truthful and realistic approach, and his book was not well received. This tendency to write about "reality" and his own perceptions of society continued to gain Strindberg criticism, and as quickly as he had gained success, the controversy that surrounded him began to grow. To retaliate against the harsh criticism for *The Swedish People*, Strindberg published *The New Kingdom* in 1882. This collection of satirical stories attacked important people and places in Stockholm with more vigor than *The Red Room*, and Strindberg was met with

vicious criticism. Sensing the overwhelming hostility of Stockholm as a result of his attacks, Strindberg and von Essen left Sweden in 1883, journeying to France. They remained for only a year before venturing on to Switzerland, eventually returning to Paris in 1885. Despite his constant traveling, Strindberg still found time to write. Following the release of Henrik Ibsen's play *A Doll's House* in 1879, Strindberg also became interested in gender and relationship issues. He looked down on Ibsen and criticized the play, which fueled his desire to create something more dynamic and realistic.

In 1884, he wrote *Married*, which explored women's rights and attempted to consider both men and women's roles in relationships. The backlash Strindberg received for *Married* greatly upset him, and he was tried in Swedish court for blasphemy. Nothing came of the trial and Strindberg was ultimately acquitted, but his anger and disgust at the accusations left a permanent resentment. He separated from the Lutheran church and renounced any type of god, which came as a shock to the highly religious von Essen. Although Strindberg had tried to take a neutral approach towards the gender issues in the play, he had been met with such criticism that any consideration he had for women or their portrayal in his works was eliminated. After *Married*, Strindberg's work began to reflect a deeply misogynistic attitude, fueled, no doubt, by his rocky relationship with von Essen and the abandonment and neglect he had felt after the death of his mother. It was at this time that he became familiar with Émile Zola's treaties on naturalism, a trend which Strindberg supported due to his interest in science. Zola's writing, in addition to his frustration with women, greatly influenced the next phase of Strindberg's work.

Not only had the trial and criticism of *Marriage* hurt Strindberg's opinion of women, but his own personal unhappiness greatly contributed to his misogyny. The

relationship between von Essen and Strindberg was tumultuous at best, as her religious fanaticism and feminist attitudes contradicted his atheist, anti-feminist tendencies. Strindberg's schizophrenia and constant paranoia, as well as the hypersensitivity he had cultivated since childhood, led to many disagreements and unhappiness within the marriage. Although Strindberg wished to see himself as a sexual being, their romantic relationship was lackluster, and both conducted affairs outside of the marriage to seek the sexual satisfaction they craved. Perhaps the only positive products of the relationship were the children von Essen bore, as Strindberg was a devoted and loving father. The psychological trauma of the marriage also proved helpful to Strindberg in a way, as many of the upsetting events influenced his work in the late 1880s. 1887's *The Father* was inspired by Strindberg's own fears about the paternity of his children and his mental instability. In *Miss Julie*, written in 1888, von Essen served as a model for the title character.

Strindberg began a correspondence with German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche in May of 1888. The two men shared many common theories about class hierarchy and the unreliability of women, and in Nietzsche, Strindberg found a friend and mentor. He was captivated by the Nietzschean Superman, and Nietzsche's own mental illness continued to fuel Strindberg's paranoia and schizophrenic delusions. Nietzsche suffered from a complete psychotic breakdown in 1889, but his influence on Strindberg after only one year of friendship was immense. Encouraged by Nietzsche to produce *The Father* at André Antoine's Théâtre Libre in Paris, Strindberg and von Essen began their own avant garde theater in Denmark. Named the Scandinavian Experimental Theater, Strindberg planned to debut *Miss Julie* in 1889, but shortly before opening, the play was banned by the Copenhagen censor for its highly realistic portrayal of insanity and its controversial

approach to sex and relationships. Undisturbed, Strindberg premiered *Miss Julie* at the Copenhagen Student's Union in 1889 with von Essen in the title role. The Experimental Theater was unable to recover and quickly closed.

The common goal of founding and funding the theater proved to be too much for Strindberg's marriage. He divorced von Essen, returned to Stockholm, and tried to distance himself from his wife and former life. He began to write about science and other academic subjects, re-examining his love of chemistry and medicine. He also became interested in Symbolism, as opposed to Naturalism, although much of his work was halted in 1892, when he suffered from major writer's block. Irritated by the failure of his theater and marriage, and left in a dire financial situation, Strindberg became depressed. He traveled to Berlin, where he met journalist Frida Uhl in 1892, and they married in 1893. This marriage was as unsuccessful as his first, and after a year, they separated, divorcing in 1897. Strindberg became obsessed with alchemy and the occult, and his paranoia overwhelmed him.

Several psychotic breakdowns from 1894 until 1896 are characterized as his "Inferno Crisis," and Strindberg moved to Paris, spending a great deal of time on introspection and self-evaluation. He believed that spirits called "the powers" were trying to kill him and was convinced that he had become the Nietzschean Superman. In late 1896 he emerged from his Inferno Period, reinvigorated by the mystical writings of Swedenborg and a renewed faith in the Church. This began a new period in Strindberg's professional life, as well, as he began to write smaller chamber plays with the support of Max Reinhardt. He re-married for the third and final time, to a young actress named Harriet Bosse, in 1901, although the marriage lasted only three years. The next decade was prosperous for

Strindberg, as he achieved critical and financial success. With director August Falck, he founded the Intimate Theater, and wrote numerous plays to be produced there. He experimented with Expressionism and his work was often religious or mystical, inspired by his recovery from schizophrenia several years earlier. After a turbulent career, Strindberg had finally found success. He was proud that he could provide for his children, unlike his own father, and relished time he was able to spend with them. Despite his divorces and negative feelings towards their mothers, Strindberg's children always remained an important focus in his life.

In 1911, Strindberg contracted stomach cancer, which left him in poor health. December of that year brought on a bout of pneumonia and he recovered only partially, ultimately dying at age 63 on May 14, 1912. He was survived by five children and three ex-wives, as well as a legacy as an important and influential, albeit controversial, playwright, author, critic, philosopher, political theorist, and painter.

Throughout his career, Strindberg's work was characterized most strongly by his own highly developed psychological instincts and emotions. As he openly admitted, much of his work was autobiographical or inspired by true events. The shifts in style throughout his oeuvre reflect shifts in his personal mental health and ideology. *Miss Julie*, considered by many to be Strindberg's greatest contribution to theater, chronicles the unhappiness and fear of a man who spent a lifetime struggling to find his own identity and place in the world. His unsuccessful desire to form lasting relationships and his raging mental illness are apparent in *Miss Julie*, and although his misogynist attitude might never allow him to admit it, Strindberg is very much a part of his title character.

BRIEF CHRONOLOGY OF STRINDBERG'S LIFE

1849 Johan August Strindberg is born in Stockholm, Sweden on January 22 to Carl Oscar Strindberg, a shipping agent, and his wife Nora Norling, a former servant girl. He is their third surviving child.

1853 Carl Strindberg goes bankrupt, leaving his family with no money.

1862 Nora Strindberg dies.

1863 Carl Strindberg marries his housekeeper, who becomes Strindberg's stepmother.

1867 Leaves Stockholm to study humanities at Uppsala University in Sweden, but departs after one term to teach at an elementary school and tutor privately.

1869 Joins the Royal Theater of Stockholm as an actor, but fails, and writes his first three plays, *The Freethinker*, *A Nameday Gift,* and *Hermione.*

1870 Returns to Uppsala to study modern languages and political science, while staging his fourth play, *In Rome*, at the Royal Theater.

1872 Leaves Uppsala again to settle in Stockholm and writes his first major play, *Master Olaf*, which is perceived as a failure and is not produced for nine years.

1872-1874 Works as a journalist in Stockholm and tries once again to be an actor, but fails.

1874-1882 Becomes employed as a librarian at the National Library in Stockholm.

1877 Marries Finnish actress Siri von Essen.

1879 Establishes himself as an author with the autobiographical novel, *The Red Room.*

1880-1882 Writes historical and pseudo-historical prose works, as well as *The New Kingdom*, a volume of stories attacking the establishment, which garners criticism and disapproval.

1883 Leaves Sweden to spend the next six years abroad in France, Switzerland, Germany, and Denmark, and achieves some theatrical success with his ninth play, *Lucky Peter's Journey.*

1884 Publishes a volume of short stories called *Married* and is prosecuted for blasphemy, so he returns to Sweden for the trial, during which he is acquitted.

1886 Writes a partially fictionalized account of his childhood and youth in *The Son of a Servant*, as well as his first modern play, *The Comrades.*

1887 Writes *The Father* in Bavaria, and it achieves small success in Denmark but fails in Sweden. He also works on a rustic novel, *The People of Hemsö*, and in French, *A Madman's Defence*, a malicious account of his marriage.

1888 Begins correspondence with Nietzsche and writes *Miss Julie* and *Creditors* in Denmark, receiving criticism for *Miss Julie's* immorality.

1889 Begins his own experimental theater in Denmark, where *Miss Julie* and *Creditors* are staged. Both fail before the theater goes bankrupt and Strindberg returns to Sweden.

1890 *The Father* is staged at Freire Bühne in Berlin, Germany, and this is the first production of one of Strindberg's plays outside of Scandanavia.

1892 Divorces Siri von Essen, leaves Sweden for Berlin, and writes *Playing with Fire* and *The Bond*, his last play for six years.

1893 Devotes himself for four years to science and painting while visiting England. Marries Frida Uhl, an Austrian journalist.

1894 Separates from Frida and settles in Paris, where *Creditors* and *The Father* are staged and well received, despite a lack of major financial success.

1894-1896 Continues scientific experiments and theorizing in Paris while dabbling in the occult and alchemy, trying to make gold. Befriends Gauguin, Munch, and Delius, while hovering on the brink of insanity and beginning his *Inferno* crisis.

1896 Recovers from mental breakdown and returns to Sweden.

1897 Writes *Inferno* in French, chronicling his years of near-madness.

1898 Writes Parts I and II of his dramatic trilogy, *To Damascus*, and continues a trend of productivity, writing 35 plays over the next 11 years.

1899 Writes *Gustav Vasa, There Are Crimes and Crimes*, and *Erik the Fourteenth*, considered to be his best historical play.

1900 Meets Norwegian actress Harriet Bosse, 29 years his junior, and writes *Easter* and *The Dance of Death,* Parts I and II.

1901 Marries Harriet Bosse, who leaves him, returns, and leaves permanently. Writes *The Virgin Bride, To Damascus,* Part III, and *A Dream Play.*

1904-1906 Writes no plays, while most of his recent works remain unperformed and his reputation in Sweden declines, despite praise from his peers, including Ibsen, Chekhov, Gorki, and Shaw.

1907 Founds his own Intimate Theater in Stockholm and writes four chamber plays in ten weeks to perform there: *Storm, A Burned House, The Ghost Sonata,* and *The Pelican*, which are poorly received.

1909 Writes his last play, *The Great Highway.*

1909-1912 Devotes the last three years of his life to writing articles and pamphlets on politics, linguistics, and religion.

1912 Dies at age 63 on May 14 in Stockholm as a result of stomach cancer.

COMPLETE LIST OF STRINDBERG'S DRAMATIC WORKS

1870 *In Rome*
Hermione
1871 *The Outlaw*
1878 *Master Olaf*
1880 *Secret of the Guild*
1881 *Anno Forty-Eight*
1882 *Lucky Peter's Travels*
Sir Bengt's Wife
1886 *Comrades*
1887 *The Father*
1888 *Miss Julie*
1889 *The Natives of Hemsö*
1890 *Pariah*
The Stronger
The Creditors
Simoon
1892 *The Bond*
Playing with Fire
Debt and Credit
Motherlove
The First Warning
Facing Death
1898 *Advent*
1899 *The Saga of the Fulkungs*
Gustavus Vasa
Erik XIV
There Are Crimes and Crimes

1900 *To Damascus Parts I and II*

Easter

Gustav Adolf

1901 *Swanwhite*

Charles XII

The Dance of Death

Engelbrekt

Modsommar

1902 *The Virgin Bride*

Gustav III

The Dream Play

1903 *The Nightingale of Wittenberg*

The Keys of Heaven

1904 *Queen Christina*

To Damascus Part III

1907 *The Ghost Sonata*

The Storm

After the Fire

The Pelican

1908 *Abu Casem's Slippers*

The Last of the Knights

The Regent

Earl Birger of Bjälbo

1909 *The Black Glove*

1910 *The Great Highway*

1918 *Through Deserts to Ancestral Lands*

Isle of the Dead

Hellas

The Lamb and the Beast

PRODUCTION HISTORY

1888 *Miss Julie* is written over the course of two weeks in Lyngby, Denmark.

March 14, 1889 The first production is staged at the Copenhagen University Students' Union in Copenhagen, Denmark. The original first production was intended to premiere at the Dagmars Theater in Copenhagen, but was banned by censors.

1892 The Freie Bühne stages *Miss Julie* in Berlin, Germany.

1893 *Miss Julie* is staged by André Antoine at the Théâtre Libre in Paris, France.

1904 Max Reinhardt directs the first fully successful production at the Kleines Theater in Berlin, Germany.

Spring 1905 A semi=private performance is staged at the Guildhall in Uppsala, Sweden.

September 18, 1906 The first public production in Sweden is staged at the Academic Society in Lund, Sweden.

April 28, 1912 The first production in London is staged at the Little Theater.

February 13, 1933 *Miss Julie* is revived in French at the Arts Theater in England, directed by Georges Pitoëff.

January 27, 1935 *Miss Julie* is revived again at the Arts Theater in England, directed by Esmé Percy and Geoffrey Dunlop.

September 15, 1948 The play receives its radio premiere directed by Peter Watts.

1950 A Swedish film of *Miss Julie* is made, directed by Alf Sjöberg, which goes on to win the 1951 Cannes Film Festival's Grand Prix.

December 23, 1956 *Miss Julie* is filmed for television and premieres on BBC.

1955 – 1956 George Tabori stages *Miss Julie* and Strindberg's *The Stronger* at the Phoenix Theater in New York City, United States.

1981 The play is revived in New York City, United States by the Roundabout Theater Company, Inc. and by Ingmar Bergman at the Residenztheater in Munich, Germany.

1991 Ingmar Bergman stages *Miss Julie* in Swedish in New York City, United States with support from the Royal Dramatic Theater of Sweden.

1997 Anne Bogart directs a modern Brechtian-Beckett fused *Miss Julie* at the Actors Theater of Louisville in Kentucky, United States.

2009 Patrick Marber's updated version of *Miss Julie*, *After Miss Julie*, premieres in New York City, United States.

THE NIETZSCHE/STRINDBERG CONNECTION

German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche profoundly impacted Strindberg's life personally and professionally, through both his scholarly works like *Zarathustra*, and his private correspondence with Strindberg. Although both men developed their careers throughout the middle of the nineteenth century, it was not until 1888 that they began a friendship. The Danish literary critic George Brandes knew both Nietzsche and Strindberg personally and saw similar ideals and backgrounds between his friends. Both came from religious families whose beliefs they had abandoned in favor of atheism. As evidenced by these rifts with their families, Strindberg and Nietzsche had difficulty relating to most people, considering their own intellect superior to others. Most notably, both were misogynistic, probably as a result of unhappy and unfulfilling relationships with their female relatives, specifically Strindberg's mother and his wife, Siri von Essen, and Nietzsche's sister and his lover Lou Salome. Neither man was able to remain part of a committed, functional relationship, and both developed a hatred of women, perhaps as a defense mechanism to hide his own inadequacy in dealing with the other sex. Believing the two men would get along well, Brandes initiated a relationship by recommending that Strindberg read some of Nietzsche's early works.

Almost immediately, Strindberg was filled with admiration for the philosopher. He considered him "the most independent and strongest mind who lives today" and "the most modern and liberating mind of us all,"[14] urging his friends to read Nietzsche's theories.

---

[14] Franklin S. Klaf, *Strindberg: The Origin of Psychology in Modern Drama* (New York: Citadel, 1963) 78.

Strindberg was delighted when Nietzsche wrote to him in May 1888 requesting Strindberg to translate his most recent work, *Ecce Homo*. Monetary restrictions prohibited Strindberg from accepting Nietzsche's offer, but the correspondence and friendship continued regardless. Strindberg sent Nietzsche a copy of *The Father* in French, and Nietzsche was impressed by Strindberg's adept skill at understanding and relating a psychological illness. He felt that the subtle depiction of a man slowly losing touch with reality and allowing his paranoid delusions to overcome his rational sensibilities showed immense psychological understanding, and Nietzsche admired Strindberg's ability to craft the naturalistic drama. Familiar with the naturalist movement promoted by Émile Zola and the avant garde theater produced in Paris at the Théâtre Libre by André Antoine, Nietzsche urged his friend to send *The Father* to Zola and Antoine. Strindberg, already acquainted with Zola and his treaties on naturalism, was discouraged by Zola's critique of *The Father* as "too abstract," but Nietzsche continued to offer encouragement.

This type of support was one of the most important contributions Nietzsche made to Strindberg's career, as the young playwright often felt isolated and misunderstood as a result of his intellect and mental instability. Nietzsche's encouragement came in the form of his philosophy, which shared Strindberg's ideology and channeled his frustration with society, as well as his personal correspondence from 1888 until 1889. Nietzsche gave Strindberg the support he needed to continue producing psychologically charged drama. By serving as a reminder that he was not alone in his unconventional attitude towards social issues, Nietzsche provided a nurturing environment in which Strindberg was free to create. The years during and just after their correspondence were the most productive of Strindberg's life, probably because he felt as though his ideas were relevant and would be

accepted, despite their often-radical nature. Although he had faced vicious criticism for his work in the past, he was empowered by Nietzsche's support and set forth with renewed vigor on naturalist plays exploring his own issues and fears.

Despite his deep appreciation for Nietzsche, Strindberg was not ignorant of the philosopher's illness. He recognized Nietzsche as a genius, but also a psychologically disturbed man, not unlike himself. Shortly after beginning their correspondence, Strindberg wrote, "I believe he makes me blind, for my brain from overexertion is like a wound, but he certainly makes me crazy, for the unheard of egotism in his books has conveyed itself to me – We will undoubtedly meet in Gheel [a Belgian mental institution]."[15] Aware of his own mental disturbance, Strindberg could not help but observe the psychotic nature of Nietzsche's writing and behavior. While he recognized Nietzsche's illness, he failed to give serious consideration to its impact on the validity of Nietzsche's work. Because Nietzsche had become a friend, Strindberg overlooked his megalomania and inflated sense of self-importance, finding humor in the madness, as opposed to concern. It was not until Nietzsche suffered his final psychotic breakdown and was institutionalized in Switzerland in 1889, that Strindberg was finally forced to confront the true insanity of his friend and mentor.

As a result of Nietzsche's hospitalization, as well as the dissolution of his marriage and the censorship of *Miss Julie*, all occurring in 1889, Strindberg entered a period of deep depression. Although his relationship with von Essen had been troubled prior to his friendship with Nietzsche, the philosopher's influence only exacerbated the problems. The more encouragement Nietzsche offered Strindberg, the more self-obsessed and radical he

---

[15] Klaf 74.

became. Although von Essen was devoutly religious and an advocate for women's rights, Strindberg grew increasingly less tolerant of her beliefs, and tension between the couple reached an all-time high. Strindberg was so consumed by his infatuation with Nietzsche that he ignored all those who had previously been important in his life.

Of Nietzsche's influence upon his life and work, he wrote, "My spirit life has received in its uterus a tremendous outpouring of seed from Friedrich Nietzsche, so that I feel as full as a pregnant bitch. He was my husband."[16] Strindberg's admiration and reverence for Nietzsche is so powerful that he compares himself to the wife in their "marriage," certainly an important concession given his attitude towards women as inferior. Perhaps he saw his relationship to Nietzsche as he thought the relationship between man and woman *should* exist. The more powerful, intelligent, and important party, in this case Nietzsche, the husband, is dominant and influential over the weaker female, identified as Strindberg in this metaphor. The direct reference to Nietzsche as Strindberg's husband shows Strindberg's devotion to his mentor, since he envisions the two in a marriage of sorts, a permanent union fused by mutual respect, attraction, and beliefs. The notion of Strindberg as a "pregnant bitch" also references Strindberg's work in *Miss Julie*, in which Julie's dog Diana is impregnated by the gatekeeper's mutt. Strindberg seems to say that he is submissive and greatly influenced by Nietzsche's friendship and philosophy.

This influence is evident in Strindberg's preface to *Miss Julie*, written after the play itself. Although Strindberg and Nietzsche's correspondence did not begin until after the play was written, in his preface, Strindberg expresses the idea of the uncertainty of life, declaring that there are no absolutes. He stresses that every person can be both good and

---

[16] Klaf 80.

bad and offers a variety of motives to justify the behavior of his characters. Much of his attitude towards society and human action was influenced by Nietzsche's texts, and it is probable that the reason that the preface and the text of the play itself do not seem completely in sync is because of his familiarity with Nietzschean ideals while writing the preface.

After the preface was written, Strindberg's mental health began to deteriorate dramatically. In the early to mid-1890s, he suffered from paranoid delusions that spirits, known only as "the powers," wanted to control him. He saw himself as the Nietzschean Superman and suffered from several psychotic episodes. Only in 1896, after he began reading Swedenborg's mystical texts and rediscovered the teachings of the Church, did he recover. He spent the remainder of his life filled with guilt and remorse for harboring Nietzsche's anti-Christian ideals. Although their association was brief, confined only to correspondence over the course of one year before Nietzsche's mental breakdown, Nietzsche's impact on Strindberg lasted for the remainder of his life. Whether he was promoting or repenting Nietzsche's theories, the philosopher was influential in Strindberg's development personally and professionally.

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE PREFACE TO *MISS JULIE*

Although *Miss Julie* was written in 1888, the preface to the play was not included in the original publication, and Strindberg did not actually write the preface until later in 1888, after the play's completion. Considered by many to be one of the leading manifestos on naturalism in theater, Strindberg included his preface in literature disseminated to audiences at the 1893 production of *Miss Julie* at the Théâtre Libre in Paris. Intended to support the naturalist movement and promote realism on stage, the preface acts as an explanation for why Strindberg structured the play as he did, and gives insight into his motivation behind creating the characters and story. While many of Strindberg's arguments and assertions are evidenced in the text of *Miss Julie*, the preface also presents some problematic theories and ideas that do not seem to be in line with the play itself. It is possible, and in fact likely, that in the time between writing the play and the preface, Strindberg's influences and ideology experienced a shift, particularly as a result of his correspondence with philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche.

Strindberg's preface begins with the observation that theater was previously meant to provide entertainment for the uneducated and uninformed, offering women, the lower classes, and youth an opportunity to lose themselves in another reality that was neither particularly complicated nor complex. However, as naturalism rises to popularity in science and art, and society grows more analytical and self-reflective, theater must also make adjustments in order to satisfy its audiences. *Miss Julie* is Strindberg's attempt to modernize theater and provide viewers with a world that is both engaging and entertaining, allowing them to think and observe art in the new, critical way that is prevalent in the late 1880s. He asserts, "In the following play, instead of trying to do anything new – which is impossible – I

have simply modernized the form in accordance with demands I think contemporary audiences make upon this art."[17] He maintains that it is not his intention to create a new type of theater or revolutionize art, but merely to provide a story that audiences can consider in a new, analytical way. As a result, Strindberg wants to ensure that audiences can in fact build this relationship with the characters and their plights. He intentionally selects themes and conflicts that are neither controversial nor polarizing. It seems as though the problems in *Miss Julie*, specifically issues of class hierarchy and gender conflict, are timeless because as long as humans have existed in any type of society, there has been tension caused by social stratification and the relationship between man and woman. In analyzing the preface, it becomes clear that because it is not possible to form a society without these conflicts, by choosing such enduring subjects, Strindberg can guarantee that his play will remain relevant for years to come. Furthermore, he is assured that every audience member will be able to connect with *Miss Julie* in some way, since any potential viewer has witnessed or been part of some sort of gender or social inequality during their lifetime. Whether oppressed or oppressor, it is impossible for a human being to escape these tensions, especially during the turbulent and radically changing times of the late nineteenth century.

Strindberg goes on to comment that the typical reaction to tension and the feelings that class and gender struggles arouse are based in sentimental human weakness. He hopes that people will eventually overcome their sentimental natures, but for the time being, the tendency to be sensitive and emotional is part of what makes *Miss Julie* a tragedy.

---

[17] August Strindberg, *Preface to Miss Julie*, Trans. Harry G. Carlson, *Theatre/Theory/Theatre: The Major Critical Texts from Aristotle and Zeami to Soyinka and Havel*, Ed. Daniel Gerould (New York: Applause Theatre & Cinema, 2000) 371.

Audiences feel sympathy and compassion for Julie as she loses her mind, and ultimately her life, because they fear that they too could suffer from this terrible fate. This is yet another reason why it is so important that audiences makes connections to the characters and storyline. Had Strindberg written about a character that was unidentifiable to his audience, they might not feel the same heartbreak at her downfall.

This is not to say that Strindberg intends for his audience to wallow in Julie's misery. In fact, he has little sympathy for those who find the story depressing. Although many events he chooses to include in *Miss Julie* may seem distressing or emotional, Strindberg selects them because he is fascinated by the conflict found in everyday life. He writes, "I find the joy of life in its cruel and powerful struggles, and my enjoyment comes from being able to know something, being able to learn something."[18] For Strindberg, theater is a tool used to teach, and a single play can provide countless opportunities to learn, since its actions are motivated by a number of factors and characters. Julie and Jean are both motivated by a variety of emotions, personal histories, and social constraints, woven together to create a rich and complex story. Throughout the play, it is unclear what will happen next and the action unfolds so rapidly that the audience is unsure of exactly how everything suddenly came to be. Strindberg stresses that "every event in life – and this a rather new discovery! – is ordinarily the result of a whole series of more or less deeplying [sic] motives."[19] He delights in presenting multiple points of view and providing his characters with various motives and external influences that shape the arc of the story.

In terms of character, Strindberg prefers to call Julie, Jean and Kristine "souls," since he dislikes the tradition of static, stock characters that remain constant throughout a

---

[18] *Preface* 372.
[19] *Preface* 372.

play. Typically, these stock characters are made recognizable by specific features or dialogue that are emphasized and repeated from beginning to end in a play. Strindberg's characters, instead, are naturalistic: they resemble real people who are both good and bad, complex, and constantly changing. They represent both the future and the past and are torn between a fate they cannot escape and a desire to overcome the obstacles put in front of them. He asserts, "My souls (characters) are conglomerates of past and present cultural phases, bits from books and newspapers, scraps of humanity, pieces torn from fine clothes and become rags, patched together as is the human soul."[20] The creation of Julie and Jean is a complex act, and Strindberg wants both characters to seem as real as any member of the audience. Julie and Jean vacillate between good and bad, and at any given moment, it is not necessarily clear what they are thinking or why they behave in a certain way. The audience has no choice but to constantly analyze and observe their actions, accomplishing one of Strindberg's main goals for naturalistic theater as the spectator becomes the scientist.

Beyond simply generalizing his motivation for making Jean and Julie so complex, Strindberg goes on to analyze both characters in greater detail, describing the internal conflicts and external factors that exert pressure upon them, ultimately causing Julie to crumble and Jean to survive relatively unscathed. This is where Nietzsche's influence can be seen most strongly, as Strindberg's deep-seated misogyny is expressed through his discussion of Julie. Although the actual text of the play treats Julie relatively objectively, allowing the audience to assess her strengths and weaknesses and form its own opinion of her, the preface condemns Julie, and many women like her, simply because they are women. Strindberg explains:

---

[20] *Preface* 374.

> Not that the man-hating half woman has not existed in all ages but because now that she has been discovered, she has come out in the open to make herself heard. The half-woman is a type who pushes her way ahead, selling herself nowadays for power, decorations, honors, diplomas, as formerly she used to do for money. The type implies a retrogressive step in evolution, an inferior species who cannot endure.[21]

Here, Strindberg's attacks on the female generalize the entire gender, articulating his own frustrations with the women in his life, particularly his wife. Although this subjective analysis of women initially presents Strindberg's misogynist agenda, he attempts to tie his claims back to naturalism by relating them to Darwinism and the theory of evolution. Although there are actually references to evolution in the text of *Miss Julie*, particularly in Julie and Jean's metaphorical dreams of rising and falling, the play does not explicitly state that Julie falls simply because she is a woman.

In fact, Strindberg makes great attempts to present her as a complex character whose downfall is caused not by her own choices, but the circumstances that surround her. His choice to include Julie's long monologues towards the end of the play, chronicling the pressure to exemplify and defy traditional feminine roles and her ambivalence towards her father, serve to provide historical and hereditary background about her character that make her death understandable and tragic. Although the audience may not agree with her decision to die, Strindberg has provided enough external obstacles for Julie to make it clear that the outside world has pushed her toward this desperate act, not the fact, as a woman, that she is intrinsically weak.

---

[21] *Preface* 374.

Strindberg's treatment of Jean in the preface offers even more blatant evidence of his misogyny, as he attributes Jean's perseverance largely to his sex. He asserts, "Apart from the fact that Jean is rising in the world, he is superior to Miss Julie because he is a man. Sexually, he is an aristocrat because of his masculine strength, his more keenly developed senses, and his capacity for taking the initiative."[22] Strindberg does not attempt to mask his sexual politics here, and his ideas are a departure from the scientific attitude with which he claims to be writing *Miss Julie.* Rather than study Jean as an individual, Strindberg assumes that because Jean is a man, he must be "better." There is no justification for these assertions, and although he tries to include strength, developed senses, and initiative as evidence for Jean's superiority, he attributes them not to Jean because of his personality, but simply because he is male. He ignores the possibility that a woman may also share these qualities, and any sense of scientific objectivity is lost to Strindberg's own notions of male superiority.

The text does not seem to support these claims, either, as Jean is presented as suffering from numerous flaws throughout the play. Strindberg suggests that Jean "comes through the struggle relatively unscathed and will probably end up an innkeeper,"[23] yet Jean's final lines indicate that he is suffering almost as much as Julie. He tells her, "You're taking all my strength away. I'm getting weak. . . . he'll [the Count] just ring louder! He'll just keep ringing until someone answers. – And then it's too late! And then the police come – and then –"[24] Jean's description of himself as weak and losing his strength do not suggest that he is in fact "relatively unscathed." His paranoia about the Count's arrival and

---

[22] *Preface* 376.
[23] *Preface* 376.
[24] August Strindberg, *Miss Julie,* trans. Truda Stockenström (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996) 62.

discovery of his affair with Julie intensifies throughout the course of his monologue, and his fears are justified. Because the play ends almost immediately following these lines, Jean's future is unclear. Perhaps he escapes from the estate and opens his own hotel in Switzerland, but he could just as easily be arrested and tried for rape. The ambiguity with which Strindberg ends the play presents the audience with many unsolved questions about Jean's future, and his final moments do not suggest a powerful man in control, as Strindberg claims in his preface, but a frightened, weak servant terrified of his own master and his punishment. Although the preface may attempt to clarify Jean's future by proposing that he may become an innkeeper, this is not communicated in the text itself.

As for Kristine, Strindberg openly admits that she is merely a sketch of a character, meant to serve her purpose in the dramatic action without being a fully-fledged "soul." He claims that, "As they [minor characters] carry out their duties, they lose their individuality, showing only one side of themselves,"[25] but once again, this description does not align with the play's text. While her time on stage is limited, Kristine is actually a much more complex character than Strindberg suggests. The stage directions in the opening scene present Kristine as constantly busy and hardworking. Over the course of the first two pages, these directions include, "Kristine is standing at the stove, frying something in a pan,"[26] "Serving him from the pan,"[27] "Kristine opens a bottle of beer,"[28] "Returns to the stove and puts on a small saucepan."[29] Her competency at her job and ability to manage both the affairs of her employers and her personal life suggest that Kristine is efficient and

---

[25] *Preface* 376.
[26] *Miss Julie* 11.
[27] *Miss Julie* 13.
[28] *Miss Julie* 13.
[29] *Miss Julie* 13.

organized. Strindberg also explores her playful feminine side, as she teases Jean by telling him, "When you're in the mood you can be more finicky than the Count. (*she pulls his hair affectionately).*"[30] When Jean protests, she goes on to assure him, "Now, now. It's just because I love you."[31] This loving and affectionate Kristine is not the same brisk, work-oriented kitchen drudge that the stage directions indicate. Although he tries to deny it, Strindberg actually offers Kristine much more to play than merely one side of a character. She is complex and individualized in her own right, and the preface unjustly disregards her, shifting focus to Jean and Julie instead.

After the analysis of his characters, Strindberg touches briefly on the dialogue, plot, and structure of *Miss Julie*. He advocates for naturalism by expressing his own interest in psychology, offering the fact, "Our inquisitive souls are not satisfied just to see something happen; we want to know how it happened"[32] as rationale for his creation of such a psychologically focused drama. In terms of structure, Strindberg's condensation of the action to just one uninterrupted act serves not only to heighten the emotional tension of the play, as all of the action occurs swiftly without any distractions, but also as a practical measure. He explains, "I believe our dwindling capacity for accepting illusions is possibly further disturbed by intermissions, during which the spectator has time to reflect and thereby escape the suggestive influence of the author-hypnotist."[33] In order to make *Miss Julie* as emotionally powerful as possible, he limits the time that the audience can think, and instead forces them to feel and observe.

---

[30] *Miss Julie* 13.
[31] *Miss Julie* 13.
[32] *Preface* 377.
[33] *Preface* 377.

This is not to say that he intends *Miss Julie* to unleash a relentless siege of tension upon the audience. The inclusion of monologues, mime, and the peasant dance scene act as brief respites for both the audience and the actors to rest between the play's major events. This structural adjustment to traditional naturalist style works well, as these minor interludes give spectators and cast the opportunity to refocus their attention, preparing for the next skirmish between Julie and Jean without completely disengaging from the material.

Beyond these technical adjustments, Strindberg offers further advice on the aesthetics of staging *Miss Julie.* His penchant for naturalism extends even to design, and he justifies his decision to include only one location for the play by asserting, "With only one setting we should be able to demand that it be realistic, but nothing is more difficult than to get a room on stage to look like a room."[34] He seeks a set that is both realistic and interesting to look at, providing the actors with space to move freely. In addition to their ability to travel about the stage, Strindberg is also concerned with the way that traditional theatrical lighting obscures an actor's facial expressions from the audience. He criticizes footlights by asking, "Does not this lighting obliterate many subtleties in the lower part of the face, especially the jaws, distort the shape of the nose, and cast shadows up over the eyes?"[35] Because his text is so driven by the emotional and psychological processes of the characters, Strindberg emphasizes the importance of being able to read emotion on the actor's face. He offers sidelight as an alternative to footlights, noting that this would allow the actor's eyes to be especially visible.

Although he presents suggestions, Strindberg realizes that aesthetic naturalism is not yet well developed on the stage. He writes, "I call for no revolution, just small

---

[34] *Preface* 378-379.
[35] *Preface* 379.

modifications, for to really transform the stage into a room where the fourth wall is removed, and consequently a portion of the furniture faces away from the audience, would probably, for the present time, produce a disturbing effect."[36] While he hopes that naturalist conventions will eventually become accepted on stage, he recognizes that *Miss Julie* is only an attempt to create naturalism, and acknowledges that despite any success or failure he experiences, he will still attempt again.

Written to offer insight into the creation of *Miss Julie,* Strindberg's preface also describes many of his own personal beliefs and philosophies, particularly his misogynist bias. While what Strindberg writes may be true about his perceptions of the play after it was completed, discrepancies between the ideas expressed in the preface and those actually found in the text of *Miss Julie* certainly exist. Nevertheless, the *Preface to Miss Julie* captures major ideas about the rise of naturalism in late nineteenth century theater and provides an intriguing lens through which to explore the play's text.

---

[36] *Preface* 379.

IS *MISS JULIE* A NATURALIST PLAY?

During the late nineteenth century, the naturalist movement evolved as a reaction to earlier theatrical traditions, such as the highly unrealistic, stylized melodrama. As science began to advance and Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* became popular, Europeans used their analytical and interpretive skills to approach not just science, but art as well. Although it initially inspired a reform of the nineteenth century novel, naturalism began to appear on stage, largely due to the efforts of French novelist, playwright, and theorist Émile Zola. In the preface to his 1873 play, *Thérèse Raquin,* as well as his critical essay, *Naturalism in the Theatre*, Zola advocates a movement toward using theater to depict reality as honestly as possible.

Zola recognizes that naturalism is a trend that will take time to develop. But he argues that the survival of theater depends on drama that provides audiences with what they want: a glimpse at human life that they may analyze and study. As he states in his preface to *Thérèse Raquin,* "In the endless progression of new ideas to which mankind has given birth there is now revealed the newborn babe of truth. And that alone is the driving force of the century. Everything progresses and he who wants to go backwards or escape will be smothered under the dust of all those who are marching forward."[37] The influence of Darwin's Theory of Evolution is evident, and Zola asserts that theater must embrace naturalism in order to survive in European culture. This also reflects the interests of naturalistic theater, as new, realistic plays explore human relationships and conflicts. Their goal is often to capture the rise of one person or class, and the simultaneous fall of another.

---

[37] Émile Zola, *Preface to Thérèse Raquin*, trans. Kathleen Boutall, *Theatre/Theory/Theatre: The Major Critical Texts from Aristotle and Zeami to Soyinka and Havel*, Ed. Daniel Gerould (New York: Applause Theatre & Cinema, 2000) 354.

Naturalism also attempts to provide insight into every day life, presenting audiences with a "slice of life" or a glimpse at reality. Characters are recognizable and familiar because they are created to be real. All emphasis is placed on creating the impression of actual human interactions occurring on stage.

Miss Julie is often considered a prime example of naturalist theater, and Strindberg's preface can be seen as a manifesto on the importance of the naturalist movement. The play itself features major naturalist elements, including an objective portrayal of daily life on a modern Swedish estate, complex and highly developed characters, insight into the hereditary and environmental factors that affect their thoughts and behaviors, and realistic dialogue that reflects contemporary Swedish speech.

The play begins with action, as Kristine works in the kitchen and Jean returns from the Midsummer Eve festivities. The audience is immediately immersed in the relationship between the two servants, and although they provide exposition about Julie by discussing her wild behavior, it occurs as natural dialogue between a couple who frequently discusses the instability of their mistress. As the action unfolds, the characters engage in typical, everyday behavior. Kristine cooks and manages the kitchen while Jean polishes the Count's boots. Through simple actions like these, the audience is exposed to daily life on the estate. Although many of the events that occur in the play are dramatic, such as the servants' destruction of the kitchen and the affair between Jean and Julie, they are conveyed in a truthful way and it is very possible that these events could, and did, occur in real life.

Strindberg's objectivity in portraying his characters and their actions is also important to naturalism, as he leaves interpretation and analysis to the audience without offering his own commentary on their behavior. As Strindberg expert Børge Madsen

describes, "Julie is drawn more objectively than most of his [Strindberg's] other women characters, who are almost invariably defenseless targets of his vindictive misogyny."[38] Although Strindberg's preface does critique Julie's flaws, the actual play depicts her as an unhappy, confused young woman who has lost control of her own life. Strindberg has purposely shown Julie's strengths and weaknesses, but he does not offer judgment or attempt to evaluate them. His objectivity in presenting Julie exactly as she is without commenting on her behavior grants the audience the freedom to observe and analyze her.

The complexity of Julie and Jean is also integral to this analysis, as Strindberg crafts his characters with great depth. Personally interested in psychology, Strindberg pays special attention to exploring Jean and Julie's thoughts and emotions, expressed through monologues and fast-paced dialogue. Both characters reveal the environmental and hereditary causes for their behavior throughout the course of the play. Julie discusses how her parents' unhappy marriage led to a distrust of men, while also admitting that her childhood education as both a boy and a girl has left her confused about her own gender identity. One of her final monologues expresses this confused sense of self, as Julie asks, "Who's to blame for what happened? My father, my mother, myself? Myself? I don't have a self! I don't have a thought I didn't get from my father, an emotion I didn't get from my mother."[39] The conflicting influences of her mother and father create a schism within Julie that she cannot reconcile.

---

[38] BØrge G. Madsen, *Strindberg's Naturalistic Theater: Its Relation to French Naturalism* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington, 1962) 82.
[39] August Strindberg, *Miss Julie,* trans. Truda Stockenström (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996) 60.

Jean's unhappiness with his life as a servant stems from his envy of the upper class. His motivations to improve his social status are inspired by his simultaneous reverence and resentment toward the Count, and he reflects on these feelings, admitting:

> There's the past and there's the Count. I've never met anyone I feel so much respect for – I just have to see his gloves lying on a chair and I feel small – I just have to hear that bell ring and I jump like a skittish horse – when I see his boots standing there so straight and proud, my back starts to bow. *(kicking the boots)* Superstitions and prejudices we learned as children! But they can be forgotten.[40]

These conflicting emotions fuel Jean's desire to escape the slave mentality that has been ingrained in him since childhood. By exposing Julie and Jean's fears and the factors that cause them, Strindberg objectively presents the audience with complex characters grappling with the environmental and hereditary causes that affect their everyday behavior, a major goal in naturalism.

Julie and Jean's dialogue is yet another naturalist element, as Strindberg makes a concerted effort to use both words and expressions that reflect nineteenth century Swedish vocabulary. While much of the dialogue reflects contemporary speech patterns and phrasing, Strindberg also chose to include certain shocking elements of dialogue that are truthful to the intensity of play, but defy conventional ideas of what was "appropriate" to present in the theater. In fact, Strindberg included such vulgar language and themes at times that certain critics cited *Miss Julie* as being "too real." The discussion of Julie's

---

[40] *Miss Julie* 33.

menstruation is a particularly shocking addition, and although Strindberg offers this as further cause for her volatile emotions and tendency toward sexual freedom, the subject of a woman's "feminine problems" was not traditionally considered appropriate for the stage. Specific word choice, as well, was seen as problematic during the late nineteenth century. Strindberg's intention was to allow his characters to speak as real people would speak if they were put in these situations. Throughout the course of the play, Jean refers to Julie as shit, a lackey's harlot, a menial's whore, and an animal.[41] He is overcome by rage and speaks offensively without considering the implications of his outbursts, as humans sometimes do when provoked. Strindberg does not idealize Jean and Julie's relationship, instead portraying the abuse and sexism that was prevalent in nineteenth century Sweden. Although it defied contemporary conventions, Strindberg's decision to include these words and ideas, expressing the emotionally intense truth of the conflict between Julie and Jean, remains true to the naturalist agenda of presenting reality on stage. Jean and Julie feel real because they speak and argue like real people.

While these elements of *Miss Julie* embody the spirit of naturalism, the play is not, however, exclusively naturalist. As the play progresses and emotions become heightened, Julie and Jean's manner of expressing their feelings begins to shift out of naturalism and towards a new movement, expressionism. According to theater historian Neil Fraser, "Expressionism can be defined as a reaction to and against the naturalistic movement, and as such it clearly abhors the naturalistic obsession with a strict observation of the real and the literal. It looks for a greater truth, and strives to reveal the inner feelings of mankind,

---

[41] *Miss Julie* 37.

alongside external realities."[42] While naturalism focuses on providing the audience with an objective reflection of reality, expressionism approaches truth as interpretative and encompasses a wide range of styles. Much of Strindberg's later work tends to be expressionist, and in *Miss Julie*, the audience begins to see this shift in the playwright's attention.

The expressionist elements of *Miss Julie* seem to emerge at the end of the play, as both Julie and Jean waver between sanity and insanity. Because the characters can no longer distinguish reality from hallucination, the audience is exposed to their unnatural impressions of the world around them. Julie's final speech is a clear example of expressionism, and Strindberg indicates in the stage directions that she is "*as if in a trance.*"[43] After begging Jean to hypnotize her so that she can find the strength to kill herself, Julie seems to have hypnotized herself. Her complete break with reality becomes evident as she tells him, "I'm already asleep . . . the whole room is like smoke around me . . . and you look like a cast-iron stove . . . like a man dressed in black with a stovepipe hat . . . your eyes glowing like fading coals in a dying fire . . . your face like a patch of light. It's so nice and warm. And so bright . . . and so peaceful."[44]

The expressionist aspect of this monologue lies in its treatment of the truth. Jean has not physically become a cast-iron stove, nor have his eyes become coals. Although her words are not meant literally, the emotional meaning behind Julie's observations is her own impression of reality and truth: she sees Jean as a piece of machinery, a modern innovation that will revolutionize Swedish life and make older technology, much like her own

---

[42] Neil Fraser, *Theatre History Explained* (Ramsbury: England, 2004) 165.
[43] *Miss Julie 61.*
[44] *Miss Julie* 61.

aristocratic class in the hierarchy of Swedish society, obsolete. Julie fears Jean's ascent from working to upper class, as reflected in her perception of him as an unnatural object, rather than human being. Strindberg uses the metaphor of Jean as a stove to express an impression of Julie's true feelings. This is a distinct departure from naturalism, which seeks to represent reality in more literal terms.

Jean also uses expressionism to convey his emotions, particularly in his final monologue, as he imagines the arrival of the Count and his paranoia overwhelms him. He tells Julie:

> Don't think, don't think! You're taking all my strength away, I'm getting weak. What? I thought the bell moved . . . No! I should stuff some paper in it – afraid of a bell! But it isn't just a bell. There's somebody behind it. A hand sets it in motion. And something else sets that hand in motion. Cover your ears – cover your ears! But he'll just ring louder! He'll just keep ringing until someone answers. – and then it's too late! And then the police come – and then --[45]

This idea of losing strength is another non-literal expression of Jean's feelings. Julie is not actually physically weakening him, but her descent into madness and desire to end her own life frightens Jean into his own hallucination. Although no stage directions indicate that the bell actually rings, Jean imagines that he hears the Count summoning him and his concern escalates. His fear of being caught sleeping with the Count's daughter and the realization that his ambitions may be too lofty manifest themselves in his obsession with the bell. Jean refers to the cyclical nature of authority and acknowledges that he will never

---

[45] *Miss Julie* 62.

escape the working class he was born into. These epiphanies and fears are expressed through the bell metaphor, and once again, the truth of emotion, rather than the truth of reality, is expressed.

Although *Miss Julie* is by and large a naturalistic play, the expressionist elements should not be denied. The final monologues of *Miss Julie* anticipate Strindberg's experiments with expressionism and present the audience with yet another way to examine life. This further challenges the notions set forth by Strindberg in his preface, as he claims that *Miss Julie* is an exclusively naturalistic tragedy.

COMPARISON TO *THE FATHER*

The Father, written in 1887, and *Miss Julie* use many of the same themes and images to depict two troubled couples, one at the end of a relationship and one just beginning. In both plays, a great deal of attention is paid to class and gender conflicts. Laura and the Captain come from similar social backgrounds and their marriage is legitimate and free from scandal, yet they constantly argue about who is stronger or has more power. A major issue between the couple is the concept of slave versus master, and each tries to cast the other in the role of the slave as they fight for control of the relationship, not unlike Julie and Jean. In *Miss Julie*, however, the class distinctions are actually a valid issue in the relationship, as Julie is an aristocrat and Jean her servant. What is most interesting about *The Father* is that although it was written shortly before *Miss Julie*, neither Laura nor the Captain are simply direct precursors to Strindberg's later characters. In many ways, the Captain is more similar to Julie than to Jean. Both Laura and the Captain complain that the other manipulates people to get what he or she wants, only to change her mind. This is very much like Julie, who forces herself upon Jean, only to realize that she does not want to be his lover.

Julie and the Captain both come from families where they were unwanted by their parents, surrounded by conflict and unhappiness from an early age. Much like Julie's father, the Captain has raised his own child, Bertha, to simultaneously love and hate him and he wants nothing more than to gain her trust and affection. Shortly before his death, he tells her, "You have two souls. You love me with one and hate me with the other. You must love only me, and me alone . . . You must have only one will – mine!" When Bertha

responds that she wants to possess her own will, the Captain tells her, "You can't."[46] This closely parallels the relationship between Julie and her father. Near the end of *Miss Julie*, Jean asks whether she ever truly loved her father. Julie replies:

> Oh yes, deeply, but I must have hated him too. I must have, without even realizing it! But he's the one who brought me up to despise my own sex, to be half woman and half man. Who's to blame for what happened? My father, my mother, myself? Myself? I don't have a self! I don't have a thought I didn't get from my father.[47]

Julie, like Bertha, is not allowed to form her own identity or live her own life. The product of a controlling father like the Captain, and a manipulative mother, Julie is confused about her own feelings and actions and it has limited her ability to live a healthy, productive life.

In terms of the plays' structures, the Captain and Julie each have long monologues near the end of each play, alternating between hysterical, wild ramblings, and lucidity. Both characters have been manipulated and harassed by their partners to the point that they can no longer distinguish reality from fantasy and have descended into madness. They accuse their lovers of hypnotizing them and cite their own loss of control as their downfall. Of course, neither Julie nor the Captain is completely innocent either – the Captain tries to assert his dominance as a male just as Julie asserts hers as Jean's mistress.

The basic structure of the final scenes leading up to the death of Julie and the Captain is the same. First, a discussion of who is to blame for the downfall of the doomed character. When Laura asks the Captain for his forgiveness, he says:

---

[46] August Strindberg, *The Father*, trans. Robert Brustein (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1992) 69.
[47] *The Father* 60.

> That sounds plausible enough, but what good does it do? And who is at fault? Perhaps our spiritual marriage is to blame. In the past you married a wife. Now you go into partnership with a business woman, or set up house with a friend, and end up betraying the partner or raping the friend. And what becomes of love, healthy, sensual love? It fades away and dies. And what happens to the issue of those love shares, payable to the bearer, without joint liability? Who is the holder when the crash comes? Who is the physical father of the spiritual child?[48]

This series of questions and answers shows the Captain in a contemplative and rational state. He wrestles with the notion of love and wonders how relationships work. Physically, he is constrained by a strait jacket and reclines upon the sofa while he philosophizes to both Laura and himself about the major issues that have plagued him throughout the play – what is real love and can a man truly be responsible for a child? Julie, like the Captain, also asks difficult questions about love and identity, which are the major problems she contends with. She asks:

> Who's to blame for what happened? My father, my mother, myself? Myself? I don't have a self! I don't have a thought I didn't get from my father, an emotion I didn't get from my mother, and the last – that all people are equal – I got from my fiancé. That's why I say he's scum! How can it be my fault? Should I blame Jesus, the way Kristine does? No, I'm too proud – and too sensible – thanks to what my father taught me. As for

[48] *The Father* 72-73.

> someone rich not getting into heaven, that's a lie. But at least Kristine won't get in – how will she explain the money she has in the bank?[49]

Julie's repeated use of question and answer allows her to think out loud, verbalizing her own negative feelings and fears. Although she is not necessarily physically confined in a strait jacket like the Captain, she is physically and emotionally exhausted from the trauma of the seduction and the murder of her canary. In our production, Julie was also confined by the blood on her hands, which prohibited her from making contact or connecting with anything or anyone on stage. During this monologue, she used a rag to wipe the blood away, trying physically to cleanse her hands just as mentally she tries to erase her confusion and fear.

The next structural element is the Captain and Julie's realization that there is no way to solve the problems that have caused them to suffer. The Captain explains:

> If there were any grounds for my suspicions, at least I would have something to hold onto, cling to. Now there are only shadows, hiding in the underbrush, which poke out their heads and smirk. It's like fighting with air, or firing blank cartridges in a trumped-up duel. Something tangible, however fatal, would have strengthened my resistance, roused me to action. But now my thoughts melt into thin air, my brain grinds like tinder before a fire . . . Put a pillow under my head, throw something over me. I'm so cold, so terribly cold.[50]

---

[49] August Strindberg, *Miss Julie,* trans. Truda Stockenström (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996) 60.
[50] *The Father* 73.

The Captain, remaining lucid, admits that because there is no evidence, he cannot continue to suspect Laura of infidelity and lying about Bertha's paternity. He is physically and emotionally immobile because he no longer has the strength or desire to search for the truth. The Captain finds himself weak and in need of help, much like Julie. She asks, "Who's to blame? What difference does it make? I'm still the one who has to take on the guilt, face the consequences... Oh, I'm so tired! I can't do anything. Can't regret, can't think, can't run, can't stay, can't live – can't die. Help me."[51] As with the Captain, Julie realizes that she must take responsibility for the events of her life, and she too finds herself trapped, unable to move forward. Her line, "Oh, I'm so tired," which appears several times throughout the play, is reminiscent of the Captain's, "I'm so cold, so terribly cold." Both characters seem to break down in preparation for death They are tired, cold, weary, and unable or unwilling to continue to fight against the world.

This despair and acceptance of blame quickly spirals into madness, however, as the characters hallucinate and lose touch with reality. When Laura asks to hold the Captain's hand, he responds:

> My hand? The hand you've strapped behind my back? Omphale! Omphale! But I can feel your shawl against my mouth. It is warm and soft like your flesh and it smells of vanilla, like your hair when you were young. When you were young, Laura, and we used to walk in the birch woods, through the primroses and thrushes – lovely, lovely! Think how beautiful life was then – and what it is now . . . Ah, my tough old lion-skin that you tried to take from me. Omphale! Omphale! Ah, you cunning female, lover

[51] *Miss Julie* 60.

> of peace, contriver of disarmament. Wake, Hercules, before they rob you of your club! You would steal away our armor, too, and say it was only tinsel. No, it was iron, do you hear me, before it turned to tinsel. In the old days the smith forged the soldier's uniform, now it's sewn by needle-women. Omphale! Omphale.[52]

Here, the Captain has two major deviations from reality. The first occurs in his likening of Laura to Omphale, a mythical Queen of ancient Greece, queen who enslaved Hercules and forced him into marriage. The Captain is easily distracted, however, by Laura's scent and he reminisces about their past and the happiness they once shared. With little warning, he returns to his Omphale hallucination, speaking to Laura as though she is the Greek queen and he is Hercules, enslaved and forced to give up his club against his will. It seems likely that the club is a phallic reference and the Captain's desire as Hercules to keep his club is much like his own desire to preserve his manhood and dignity by proving that he is truly Bertha's father. Once again, Strindberg repeats the theme of man as a slave to woman. The Captain's subsequent discussion of the tinsel and iron may be a reference to the Industrial Revolution and the importance of metal and non-natural elements in the world. It strongly contrasts his comments in the beginning of the monologue, which praise the birch woods, primroses, and thrushes that he and Laura so enjoyed. While the references that the Captain makes, both to his own memory and Greek mythology, are relevant to his feelings, they do not seem to be rational arguments tied together by any shred of logic. Rather, he has temporarily lost control of his own mind and succumbs to his hallucinations. Julie, too, hallucinates, as she describes what she sees to Jean:

---

[52] *The Father* 73-74.

> I'm already asleep . . . the whole room is like smoke around me . . . and you look like a cast-iron stove . . . like a man dressed in black with a stovepipe hat . . . your eyes glowing like fading coals in a dying fire . . . your face like a patch of light. It's so nice and warm. And so bright . . . and so peaceful.[53]

Julie's hallucination, like the Captain's, also deals with elements of industry and technology. It is interesting that both characters reference these progressive ideas, since both are actually trapped by their own lives and circumstances and are unable to grow or change in any healthy way.

The final element leading to the Captain and Julie's deaths is a prayer of some kind, issued shortly before death to alleviate their suffering and pain. The Captain's prayer seems to be literal. "'Now I lay me down to sleep. I pray the Lord my soul to keep.'" When the Nurse points out that the Captain is praying to God, however, he is quick to rebut. "No, Margaret, just to you, to put me to sleep. I'm tired, so very tired. Good night, Margaret, blessed among women."[54] Here is the repetition of Julie's often-used line, "I'm so tired," as well as a double meaning for the word sleep. Perhaps the Captain simply means that he wishes to rest and take a nap, although it seems likely that he has no more desire to live. Not only has he lost his respectability as an officer and scholar, control over his daughter, and control over his own body due to the strait jacket, but he knows that he will be put into a mental facility and never know true freedom again. He has lost the will to live and welcomes death. Ironically, although the Captain is a blatant chauvinist, as well as an atheist who disparages the faith of the Pastor and his Nurse, his last line in the play is

---

[53] *Miss Julie* 61.
[54] *The Father* 74-75.

"Good night, Margaret, blessed among women." It seems as though despite his staunchly negative feelings towards women and religion throughout life, ultimately, death and the madness that accompanies it leave the Captain unsure of any of his former convictions. Similarly, Julie's final moments also reference religion, which she has expressly exhibited little interest in throughout the play. She says to Jean, "Now I'm going to my rest. But tell me one thing – that the first can receive the gift of grace. Say it – even if you don't believe it! . . . And the first shall be the last!"[55] Clearly, Julie is referencing Kristine's earlier words on how the last receives the grace of God, and it seems as though now that she is prepared to die, she wants to protect herself in the afterlife. Her decision to die is more deliberate and conscious than the Captain's, so it makes sense that she purposely comments on God and receiving his forgiveness in her final moments. This idea of "going to my rest" relates to Julie's complaints throughout the play that she is exhausted, as though she is finally receiving the relief she has desired. It also directly complements the Captain's final moments, as he too asks to be blessed before going to rest. Both characters die after asking for help from a God that neither has previously seemed to believe in.

In the end, it seems that Laura is left to suffer much less than Jean, although both are responsible for their lover's deaths. Although she is impoverished, Laura will receive insurance money from the Captain's death and will continue to live comfortably as a widow. She will have full control over Bertha's education and future, and although there may be some scandal associated with the Captain's death, it will most likely be minimal. Jean, on the other hand, ends the play with nothing. He is on the verge of insanity after convincing Julie to end her own life and he finds himself without money, a job, or any self-

[55] *Miss Julie* 61-62.

respect. Nonetheless, the similarities between the plays are undeniable, both in terms of theme and structure, particularly in the final monologues of the Captain and Julie. Interestingly, both *The Father* and *Miss Julie* are named after the character who loses everything he or she has, drawing yet another parallel between the title characters.

SCHOLARLY CRITICISM

"Miss Julie" in *The Crown Guide to the World's Great Plays* by Joseph T. Shipley

This brief analysis offers insight not only into the production history of *Miss Julie*, but also the biographical motivations that may have driven Strindberg to write the play. Shipley stresses that unlike other naturalistic dramas, which place emphasis on routine actions that the audience happens to observe, Strindberg structured *Miss Julie* so that it is naturalistic but full of growing tension and complexity. As the play unfolds, the characters become more fully developed and the audience is embroiled in their increasing complexity, both as individuals and a couple. The production elements Strindberg suggests in the preface, such as the removal of footlights and minimal makeup, seem traditional to contemporary audiences, but at the time, constituted a rather radical change in theater production.

As for the play's origins, Shipley comments on Strindberg's turbulent marriage to Siri von Essen, and the struggles between Julie and Jean appear to be a reflection of Strindberg's own personal unhappiness in his relationship. Shipley goes on to point out, however, that the issues of class hierarchy and social stratification arise out of Strindberg's own unhappiness with his family's societal position during childhood, and his uneasiness in being unable to define his own identity. Many of Julie's struggles with finding herself may stem from Strindberg's personal identity issues. Although *Miss Julie* is disturbing and provides commentary on the unreliable and indecent behavior of humanity, Shipley suggests that it may also offer hope for a more civilized, moral, honorable type of man in the future.

"Miss Julie" in *International Dictionary of Theater, Vol. 1: Plays* by Gunilla Anderman

Anderman's criticism first addresses *Miss Julie* as a naturalist play before exploring the true stories behind Strindberg's drama, which partially inspired him during its creation. She contends that although Strindberg observes the naturalist elements of the unities of time, place, and action, obvious symbolist attributes remain part of *Miss Julie* as well, specifically the beheading of Julie's canary, Serena, which acts as foreshadowing for her own suicide shortly thereafter. Although some may argue that Serena's death is not a metaphor for Julie's, Andersman posits that the action is clearly symbolic, as the response in a truly naturalist play, or in real life, for the matter, would not be to kill the bird, but to set it free. That the canary must be murdered violently with a sharp knife or cleaver mirrors Julie's own demise and is an intentionally violent symbol for Julie's own violent end.

Anderman also explores the issue of Darwinism, as the class struggle between Julie and Jean may be seen to represent his evolutionary theory of survival of the fittest. Because he is a male and belongs to the lower class, granting him room for social mobility, Jean is the stronger of the two characters, and this is symbolized by his dreams of climbing the apple tree to look out over the Count's estate. Julie's nightmare involves falling down from a high platform, foreshadowing her own descent into madness and death, and her fall from the aristocracy to which she was born through her father's bankruptcy and her own ignorance of societal rules. Strindberg had been interested in Darwinism and evolutionary theory for several years, owing largely to his interest in science, and probably felt a connection to Jean through his ability to survive, largely due to his masculinity. However, Anderman argues that Strindberg's tempestuous nature and tendency towards insanity, as

well as his frequent emotional outbursts, may also have led him to relate to Julie. It is highly likely that both characters represent aspects of Strindberg's own identity, which he, like Julie, struggled to find.

Much of the inspiration for *Miss Julie*, in addition to Strindberg's own life, came from two true stories he heard shortly before writing the play. The first involved the seduction of a stableboy by his master's young, aristocratic daughter, which serves as the premise for the first act of *Miss Julie*. In reality, the aristocrat was forced to work as a waitress in Stockholm as punishment for her transgression against her servant, although in the play, Julie commits suicide instead. The inspiration for the ending of the play may have come from the suicide of Swedish writer Victoria Benedictson, who killed herself after ending a tumultuous relationship with George Brandes, a Danish literary critic and friend of Strindberg's. It is highly possible that these two stories greatly influenced Strindberg's construction of *Miss Julie*, and provided him with a plot to express his own frustration with gender and societal inequalities.

"Miss Julie" in *The Columbia Encyclopedia of Modern Drama* by Egil Törnqvist

Törnqvist's criticism offers insight into many little known facts about the writing and early production of *Miss Julie*. When the play was originally written, Strindberg's editor made a number of changes without his permission, and these remained part of the published text until 1984, when a differentiation between Strindberg's original *Miss Julie* and the editor's changes were made. For nearly 100 years, audiences were exposed to a *Miss Julie* apart from Strindberg's original intentions.

Törnqvist goes on to explain that while writing the play, Strindberg lived with his wife, Siri von Essen, and their children, in a manor house outside of Copenhagen. The house itself may have been similar to the house used as the setting for *Miss Julie*, and events of Strindberg's life in the countryside seem to have influenced the play's action. Although much of *Miss Julie* comes from the story of a young aristocrat who seduced her stableboy and the suicide of Victoria Beneditsson, Strindberg also had an inappropriate affair with a member of the lower class during his stay at the manor house. Owned by Countess Louise de Frankeneau, an unmarried woman, the estate was cared for by her steward, Ludvig Hansen, who may have been her lover. Hansen's sixteen-year old sister, Martha, may have conducted a private affair with Strindberg, since his marriage was dissolving and he was left sexually unsatisfied. Although they only engaged in one or two trysts, Ludvig Hansen tried to claim that Martha was pregnant in order to blackmail Strindberg, but his attempts were unsuccessful. Törnqvist theorizes that the relationship between Strindberg and the Hansens may have influenced Strindberg's characterization of Jean.

Another major influence on Strindberg was his desire to appease Emile Zola, a father of naturalism, by creating a thoroughly naturalistic play. Hurt by Zola's criticism of *The Father* as "too abstract," Strindberg focused on class and gender inequality as the basis for his drama, hoping that these relevant contemporary issues would ring true to audiences, and Zola himself. Törnqvist is quick to observe, however, that despite his claims that *Miss Julie* is purely a naturalist drama, Strindberg includes a variety of symbolic elements throughout the play. Notably, the location of the kitchen directly below the Count's bedroom and office references the hierarchy of Swedish society, with the nobility above the

working class and servants. Julie and Jean's dreams of falling and climbing, respectively, are reflective of their own desires in life, as are their obsessions with death and getting ahead in life, which are ultimately indicative of their positions at the end of the play. The relationship of Julie's dog Diana with the gatekeeper's mutt foreshadows Julie's relationship with Jean, as does the murder of Julie's canary with her own suicide.

Törnqvist notes that although Strindberg spends time in his preface emphasizing the natural circumstances and motives that propel the action of the play in order to prove it is an example of naturalist drama, it seems improbable that Julie would kill herself. One critic argues that the situation does not merit such a violent and dramatic response, and Törnqvist suggests that Strindberg tried to anticipate this critique by having Jean hypnotize Julie. Julie's hypnosis allows the audience to understand why Julie feels the need to kill herself, and gives her a valid and natural reason to do so. Although he acknowledges naturalist elements in the play, Törnqvist suggests that Strindberg's preface is not wholly accurate in the way that it describes *Miss Julie* as a solely naturalistic production. Instead, he suggests that *Miss Julie* is a hybrid of naturalism and symbolism, not unlike Julie, a hybrid of aristocracy and lower class, as well as male and female.

JOURNALISTIC CRITICISM

"Miss Julie and The Stronger" from *The New York Times* – February 22, 1956

Review by Brooks Atkinson of *Miss Julie,* presented by George Tabori at the Phoenix Theater

Atkinson's review places much emphasis on the play's text and the background of Strindberg as a playwright, rather than the Phoenix's actual production. He argues that Strindberg is a modern author and that *Miss Julie* remains relevant and contemporary, even 85 years after its original production. The play itself is filled with bitterness, resentment, and scorn, and much of this is born out of Strindberg's own attitude towards aristocracy and the upper class. Atkinson praises many aspects of the Phoenix production, in particular the set, costumes, and directing. He feels that the three principal actors all provide intelligent and interesting performances that feel true to Strindberg's intentions, although he can't help but think that some piece of Strindberg's power is missing. Although the production is pleasant to watch, Atkinson wishes that it better captured the insanity and tempestuous nature of Strindberg himself.

"Strindberg in Tandem" from *The New York Times* – December 10, 1981

Review by Frank Rich of *Miss Julie,* presented by the Roundabout Theater Company, Inc.

In his review of the Roundabout Theater's 1981 production of *Miss Julie* and *Playing with Fire*, Frank Rich praises Giulia Pagano's portrayal of Julie, citing her ability to play a confused, unstable aristocrat as believably as possible. Rich references Strindberg's preface to provide support for his argument, arguing that as Strindberg intended for his characters to be shreds of human beings, Pagano has succeeded in creating a woman who is

unfulfilled and incomplete. Rich makes allusions to Strindberg's "Free-association"-style dialogue, yet another reference to the preface, in which the playwright explains that in reality, the human mind does not focus solely on one topic or idea, but rather, is constantly working by making connections. Because *Miss Julie* is his first attempt at naturalism, Strindberg wanted the dialogue to truly reflect the way a person thinks, so it is not always linear or easy to follow. Especially since Julie is mentally unbalanced, her thought process does seem associative, as one statement triggers a memory which triggers a dream which instigates fear, and this is all expressed through her long and often-rambling monologues, as well as shorter pieces of dialogue with Jean and Kristine.

Rich is less kind to other elements of the production, in particular Stephen Schnetzer's Jean. Rich faults Schnetzer for his inability to play Jean's insanity with the same power that Pagano portrays Julie. Because his character is less dimensional and does not capture the psychological unrest and torture that Strindberg may have intended for the valet, Rich complains that the entire production seems to take on the quality of a melodrama, and although this may have influenced Strindberg at the end of the play, as Julie prepares for suicide, he feels that it happens far too early.

"Strindberg's Miss Julie via Ingmar Bergman" from *The New York Times* – June 12, 1991

Review by Mel Gussow of *Miss Julie* presented by Ingmar Bergman and the Royal Dramatic Theater of Sweden

Gussow's review of Ingmar Bergman's *Miss Julie* commends the director for his ability to capture the multifaceted, ever-changing world Strindberg has created. Lena Olin as Julie and Peter Storemare as Jean capably depict two people on the brink of insanity,

and their turbulent personalities and relationships are communicated not only through their own acting, but through the production's design elements as well. Bergman's *Miss Julie* runs nearly two hours, which Gussow attributes to Bergman's history as a cinematographer. Bergman's use of silence, as well as set design, conveys the play's dark mood and evokes thoughts and feelings in the audience without explicit dialogue. Because the production is sponsored by the Royal Dramatic Theater of Sweden, the dialogue remains in Strindberg's original Swedish, and Gussow explains that although many New Yorkers seeing *Miss Julie* cannot understand the text, Strindberg's intentions and the overall meaning of the play are still communicated effectively. Furthermore, the theater does offer English-speaking patrons headphones that play an English translation of the dialogue, should theatergoers wish to follow along in their own language.

Gussow also notes that Bergman defies traditional representations of Kristine, using Gerthi Kulle to portray the moralizing servant as attractive and desirable in her own right. Although many productions traditionally depict Kristine and Julie as polar opposites in terms of sexuality and charisma, Bergman uses Kristine in a new way, by presenting her as a pleasant and alluring alternative to the insane but provocative Julie.

"Miss Julie" from *Theatre Journal* – January 26, 1997

Review by Rinda Frye of *Miss Julie* presented by Anne Bogart at the Actors Theater of Louisville

Frye criticizes Bogart's production of *Miss Julie* for its flat depiction of Strindberg's insane world. Although Bogart does have a few moments where the characters seem truly lost and the audience gains insight into their psychological struggles, these moments are rare and fail to leave a major impression on audience. Frye likes the approach of *Miss Julie*

as a marriage of Brecht and Beckett, but feels that the execution is lacking. The stage design is minimalist and unnatural, and the effect of a set with no windows or doors is a sense of imprisonment and claustrophobia that suits the play well. Bogart employs a boxing metaphor in the small battles between Julie and Jean, sounding a bell at critical moments like Julie's handkerchief drop and demands for Jean to kiss her shoe, so that the audience realizes that this is a struggle for power. Frye finds this metaphor to be distracting and unhelpful, however, especially because it does not allow Ellen Lauren, as Julie, to build the frustration and fear that leads to her final break with reality and ultimate suicide. By sounding the bell and segmenting the major actions, Julie's insanity has no way to develop and grow, and Lauren's performance is flat. In his preface, Strindberg explicitly states that the action must be allowed to go on without interruption, which is why he eliminated the intermission and wrote the play in one act. He stresses that the audience must be able to follow Julie's madness as it transforms and overpowers her. If they cannot observe her path to destruction, the tragedy of the play is lost.

Frye also points out that in this production, although the characters "box" out their issues and inner demons, the play does not end with a victory for either. Julie leaves the stage to end her own life, but Jean's life is over as well, as he is permanently trapped by the class distinctions and servitude to which he is bound but so loathes. Although Strindberg's preface indicates that Jean has triumphed and ends the play the winner of his battle with Julie, in Bogart's world, he too has lost.

MISS JULIE A: A POST-MODERN APPROACH

Miss Julie A, staged in the Burlington Road Building's Black Box Theater, offered a postmodern take on Strindberg's tragedy, using mime, burlesque, puppetry, shadow-play, and direct quotation from Strindberg's preface to explore gender and class issues. Although Strindberg believed the play to be naturalistic, *Miss Julie A* interpreted the text within a broader scope of theatrical movements ranging from expressionism to melodrama.

The goal of this production was to present *Miss Julie* using metatheatrical devices in a way that was relevant to contemporary audiences. Throughout the course of the performance, audiences experienced and observed class and gender struggles in a variety of forms, beginning with film and ending with live, modern dance. Director Donald McManus described his goals for the production to the Emory Report in September 2009, highlighting the variety of mediums used to convey *Miss Julie's* central themes:

> 'Miss Julie' helped define modern theater. I wanted to present its legacy from a contemporary point of view. Strindberg included an ensemble of farm workers who enter and perform a dance at one point in the play. I decided to amplify this aspect of the original text and use it as a framing device. The ensemble is extremely active in my version and actually presents text from Strindberg's published preface during the play. I chose the most controversial paragraphs from the preface and juxtaposed them with popular music and film footage from classic movies as counterpoint to the central action.[56]

---

[56] Donald McManus, "Three Takes on a Classic Play," Interview by Jessica Moore, *The Emory Report (*14 Sept. 2009).

The general aesthetic concept of the production was abstraction, as opposed to naturalism, but each design element was intended to enhance the emotional intensity of the piece.

The kitchen set was modern and unrealistic, decorated only in white, red, and black. Two large, white, triangular, muslin-covered screens created a backdrop, and both were able to pivot in certain directions. The screens could be moved upstage or downstage to create more or less playing space for the actors, depending on the emotional intensity of the scene. These large white screens were especially important in conveying the multi-media aspect of the production, as film clips and images were projected onto the white muslin and shadow-play took place behind it. A white table was the only recognizable piece of furniture on stage, while red, white, and black wooden blocks in a variety of sizes were used as chairs and a stove, stacked and unstacked periodically throughout the play. This process of building and deconstructing the set during the course of the performance lent itself to the metatheatrical approach of the entire production. The floor was covered in white muslin, but during the peasant scene, as the ensemble destroys the kitchen and Julie and Jean have sex, sections of the floor were ripped up to reveal blue, Impressionist-style painting on the floor below. As the only part of the set that was not red, white, or black, the blue floor added a sense of strangeness and unfamiliarity to the kitchen, building on the tension and confusion that climaxes in Julie's suicide at the end of the play. The symbolic tearing of the floor also conveyed the aggressive and destructive nature of the servants.

The set was lit using a variety of colored gels, and as the play's tension grows and Julie loses touch with reality, the lighting began to shift as well. In the second half of the play, especially, lighting echoed the expressionist text and acting style, as bright colors created an intense "mood" for the audience. Special lighting effects, such as violent red

light on Julie as she stalks Jean with the bloody meat cleaver, or white backlight illuminating Julie and the ensemble during their return after her suicide, communicated the characters' complex feelings and established an emotional intensity the audience could recognize.

In terms of sound, very little ambient noise and few sound effects were used in the production. Instead, contemporary music provided a more modern flavor, with selections ranging from Frank Sinatra to Ray Charles to atonal composer Anton Webern. Because the play incorporated dance and pantomime, music was integral in communicating the emotions of specific moments. At times, sound even provided commentary on the play's major themes, such as the opening film sequence set to James Brown's "This is a Man's World." From the first moment of the performance, this music was used to establish an issue that is explored for the entire remainder of the play. The fact that many of these songs are recognizable to contemporary audiences also helps create a relationship between the action on stage and the modern viewer.

Miss Julie A's costumes were also contemporary while still informed by 1880s Swedish dress, and the distinction between the ensemble and the principal characters was made evident by a difference in color and style. Julie, Jean, and Kristine's clothing took much of their shape and vivid color from period costume, while the unnatural ensemble echoed the set in white and black, wearing more contemporary dress. Julie was the only character to wear bright pinks, purples, and reds, and her palette defined her as an outsider in this stark, mostly colorless environment.

Although these design elements were largely abstract and a departure from the naturalistic approach often taken when presenting *Miss Julie*, the text and acting styles harkened back to Strindberg's original, realistic intentions. Truda Stockenström wrote the

translation used for *Miss Julie A*, and her interpretation of Strindberg's text features contemporary language, preserving some of the vulgar and shocking elements of the text that can be found in the original 1888 Swedish version, such as cursing and the discussion of Julie's menstruation. The speech patterns and colloquialisms used are familiar to twenty-first-century Americans and although the text does not attempt to set *Miss Julie* in the United States in 2009, it does convey the dialogue and action in a way that is recognizable and relatable for contemporary viewers. The actors attempted to use this modern text to portray the characters truthfully, without stylization or abstraction. This truthful representation further enhanced the audience's relationship to the play, for even though the characters inhabited an unfamiliar environment, their struggles and emotions still ring true for modern viewers. As Strindberg indicated in his preface, class and gender issues are timeless and unavoidable.

Ultimately, the text, acting styles, and design elements cohered to create a postmodern *Miss Julie* that affected contemporary audiences while remaining true to Strindberg's original play. Through film, music, dance, puppetry, and mime, *Miss Julie A* used an unorthodox approach to comment on gender and class struggles, 1880s issues that still remain relevant today.

ACTING STYLES RELEVANT TO *MISS JULIE*

The process of bringing Strindberg's characters to life is difficult, given Julie, Jean, and Kristine's complexity and refusal to adhere to any particular "type." In order to best determine how to portray them, a variety of acting techniques and styles should be examined and explored, with particular attention to both Strindberg's original intentions and the goals of the specific production. Given the postmodern approach of *Miss Julie A*, I found it helpful to consider the methods of one of Strindberg's contemporaries, as well as a more modern theorist.

Working shortly after Strindberg, Russian actor and director Constantin Stanislavski popularized an acting theory known in the United States as "The Method," which involved close identification with characters and careful study of the text to bring a character to life. Playwright and director Bertolt Brecht, working from roughly 1920 until the 1950s, also revolutionized acting style with his work on Epic Theater, stressing the importance of dramaturgy and research in an actor's preparation. Both Stanislavski and Brecht offer advice on how to best create a role, and although their theories differ in some respects, in many ways they are quite similar.

THE STANISLAVSKI METHOD

Stanislavski technically published his method almost twenty years after *Miss Julie* was written, but it was developed and practiced since the beginning of his career in the late 1870s. Through the books *My Life in Art, An Actor Prepares, Building a Character,* and *Creating a Role,* he disseminated his ideas on how to communicate text to audiences, bringing characters to life on stage. This process of "bringing characters to life" was truly

Stanislavski's goal, and he emphasized the importance of "living the part" in *An Actor Prepares*:

> This is of supreme significance in creative work. Aside from the fact that it opens up avenues for inspiration, living the part helps the artist to carry out one of his main objectives. His job is not to present merely the external life of his character. He must fit his own human qualities to the life of this other person, and pour into it all of his own soul. The fundamental aim of our art is the creation of this inner life of a human spirit, and its expression in an artistic form.[57]

By "living the part," Stanislavski suggests that an actor must completely identify himself with his character, dismissing his own personality in favor of the character's. Acting is not confined to time on the stage, as the actor must think and behave like his character at all times. Stanislavski explicitly states that, "In our art you must live the part every moment that you are playing it, and every time."[58]

This is not to say that he believes actors should just create a character based on their own whims and desires. He suggests a close analysis of and familiarity with the text, noting, "All action in the theatre must have an inner justification, be logical, coherent, and real."[59] In order to determine these inner justifications and develop logical action, Stanislavski divides an actor's preparation into three phases: studying a role, discovering the

---

[57] Constantin Stanislavski, *An Actor Prepares*, Trans. Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood, (New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1948) 14.
[58] *An Actor Prepares* 18.
[59] *An Actor Prepares* 43.

life of the character, and establishing the character's physicality.[60] While he believes that dramaturgy and textual research can be useful to some extent, he cautions against attempting to intellectualize a character too much. Stanislavski believes much of the work in developing a character should be done alone by the actor, free of suggestions or advice from research or directors. In *Creating A Role*, he explains:

> Let the actor for the time being keep to himself, store up his emotions, his spiritual materials, his reflections about his part, until his feelings and a definite, concrete, creative sense of the image of his part have become crystallized. It is only with time, when an actor's own attitude toward his part has become established, has matured, that he can make wide use of outside advice and opinions without running the risk of infringing on his own artistic independence.[61]

He also stresses that too much research can actually be detrimental to the actor's freedom as a creator, arguing that, "In art any *intellectual* analysis, if undertaken by itself and for its own sake, is harmful because its mathematical, dry qualities tend to chill an impulse of artistic élan and creative enthusiasm."[62] The important thing to note is that Stanislavski discourages intellectual analysis "for its own sake." He goes on to amend that it can actually be helpful to study the playwright's other works, searching for common themes or characterizations, but only to a certain degree. Excessive research can inhibit creativity, so most of an actor's preparation should be based on his relationship with the text, as opposed to additional resources.

---

[60] Constantin Stanislavski, *Creating a Role*, Trans. Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood, (New York: Routledge, 1989) 3.
[61] *Creating a Role* 4-5.
[62] *Creating a Role* 8.

One of Stanislavski's most important tools is the identification of objectives. He argues that only when an actor is completely familiar with the text and has established a series of logical motives can his character come to life. For Stanislavski, the objective is essential in capturing the drive of the character and understanding why he speaks and behaves the way he does. He writes, "The objective gives a pulse to the living being of a role. Life on the stage, as well as off it, consists on an uninterrupted series of objectives and their attainment."[63] In order to accomplish the goal of "living the part," then, an actor must identify his character's objectives and find the motivation to propel his action throughout the play. The entire play is divided into a series of beats, tiny subsections of the text in which the focus is dedicated to one objective. When an objective changes or focus shifts, the beat is over and a new one begins. The connection of each beat and objective creates a through line, a logical relationship between the character's goals and attempts to achieve them throughout the course of the text.

Generally, Stanislavski stresses the importance of textual analysis and self-identification with character as the major aspects of character development. His method can be applied to any variety of roles, including the complicated and troubled Miss Julie.

THE BRECHTIAN MODEL AND EPIC THEATER

Bertolt Brecht was not unlike Strindberg in his belief that theater required change in order to remain relevant for audiences. In some ways, Brecht's Epic Theater and its metatheatricality can be seen as a shift away from the naturalism that Strindberg so fervently advocated. Brecht's commentary on actors, however, can still be helpful for actors performing in *Miss Julie*, particularly in a postmodern production like *Miss Julie A.*

---

[63] *Creating a Role* 51.

One of Brecht's major beliefs is that actors must work with dramaturgs and directors in order to discover their characters. Research and in-depth knowledge of the material is critical to an actor's success, and much of the rehearsal process is dedicated to using knowledge to explore ways to communicate the text effectively. As opposed to Stanislavski's belief that the actor should work as an individual, Brecht stressed the communal nature of theater, explaining that:

> Only when directors, designers, dramaturgs, and actors work continuously together using a shared dramaturgical approach and developing group methods to explore a number of productions treating texts from different historical periods and different genres can they create the common vocabulary necessary to allow the ensemble members to use their particular training, experience, and techniques towards the creation of a production that bears the stamp not just of individuals but of a recognizable whole.[64]

Hence dramaturgy plays an important role not only for the actor, but for the production staff as well. According to Brecht, when the entire staff and cast cooperate, creating work based in shared research and knowledge, the production can be successful.

Although his approach to acting is often described as fundamentally opposed to Stanislavski's method, Brecht and Stanislavski actually share many similarities. Both methods use the same basic tools for creating a role, but the way they employ those tools varies. Stanislavski's system of dividing the text into objectives and beats is similar to Brecht's concept of the "individual occurrence," in which the text is deconstructed to identify major conflicts or events. But while beats are a tool for the actor to use in order to

---

[64] John Rouse, "Brecht and the Contradictory Actor," *Theatre Journal* 36.1, Mar. 1984, Johns Hopkins University Press, 15 Mar. 2010 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3207358>, 41.

pace his performance and gain an understanding of the through line of his objectives, Brecht advocates individual occurrences as a way for the director to map the interactions between characters. Stanislavski's focus is on the individual actor and his understanding of the character's actions, while Brecht prefers examining the interactions as a whole rather than stressing the objectives of any particular character. Once again, Brecht's holistic attitude toward theater is evident, as he values an actor's contributions to telling the story over the actor's individual success at playing his role.

Yet another functional difference between Brecht and Stanislavski is their attitude toward the relationship of each beat or occurrence to one another. While Stanislavski relies on through line and the super objective to connect each objective, Brecht is interested in exploring the disjunction between each occurrence, and does not attempt to create a cohesive connection from one occurrence to the next. For him, "the transitions between beats [are] as significant as the beats themselves, and he demanded that these transitions occur dialectically."[65] The idea of occurrences and transitions as dialectic elements makes sense given Brecht's interest in exploring conflict and relationships on stage. Not only do the plots of his plays feature major conflict, but even their staging reflects the importance of tension and opposing ideas.

In order to communicate these ideas and convey the intense emotions that accompany them, Brecht advocated the use of *gestus*, specific repetitive or stylized gestures that indicated important events or dialogue for the audience. As with Stanislavski, the physicality of a character is important, but in a different way. Stanislavski's method contends that every movement, gesture, breath, and blink of the eye should communicate a

---

[65] Rouse 30.

character's objectives and feelings, but Brecht uses specific movement and gesture as a communicative device, highlighting important themes or events for the audience. Because his actors are encouraged to remain aware of themselves as actors, rather than lose themselves in their character, the conscious decision to use a particular *gestus* carries greater importance. By selecting only certain occasions to emphasize using gesture, Brecht can communicate the most important elements of his interpretation clearly and effectively.[66]

A final similarity between Stanislavski and Brecht is their three-step method to creating a character, although each places more importance on a different step. First the actor must research and understand the history and context of the play, although Brecht encourages much more thorough and in-depth dramaturgy than Stanislavski. Next, the actor tries to learn about his character and understand his objectives. Stanislavski's method uses every realization the actor makes to inform his performance in some way, but for Brecht, much of what the actor discovers will not be used, as only material that explores the societal conflicts and issues is relevant in his eyes. The actor must think about his character in terms of the ensemble, focusing on how interactions with other characters shape his own performance. Once again, Brecht's theater de-emphasizes the individual actor, stressing human relationships as the most important part of acting. Finally, the actor must identify the critical gestures and movements that allow him to communicate his objectives most clearly to the audience. For both Stanislavski and Brecht, an actor must reflect the emotional and intellectual discoveries he has made during the second phase in his physicalization of the character, but once again, Brecht asks the actor to censor himself,

---

[66] Rouse 31-32.

eliminating anything that does not pertain specifically to the play's study of social behavior from the externalization of his character.

Although their approaches to acting are different, both Stanislavski and Brecht adopt many of the same basic ideas and processes when creating a role. In Brecht's Epic Theater, however, the emphasis shifts from the individual actor to the ensemble, presenting a sociological, rather than psychological, interpretation of the text.

USING STANISLAVSKI AND BRECHT TO CREATE *MISS JULIE A*

After gaining a basic understanding of both Brecht and Stanislavski's methods, it is important for an actor to determine which approach works best for his particular production. In becoming Miss Julie, I found that blending elements of both theories allowed me to create a character that captured Strindberg's desired complexity but also communicated his commentary on class and gender issues.

I was initially opposed to using Stanislavski's method because Julie is so volatile and unstable that I feared it would be dangerous to my own mental health to try to "live the part." Although Stanislavski advocates living the character both on and off stage, I found Julie too unlike myself to adjust my own behavior to reflect hers. I did not realize that in trying to create distance between Julie and myself, I would actually inherit some of her instability, but I did eventually learn that elements of the method could actually be useful in my work. Because Julie is so complex and her emotions shift so rapidly, I found it very helpful to try to map her objectives, ultimately developing a through line that allowed her insanity to grow throughout the course of the play.

I contemplated using Brecht's approach to individual occurrences, but his notion of dissociating each occurrence and giving the transitions their own importance directly contradicts the wishes Strindberg expressed in his preface. Brecht does not care about disjunctive beats or abrupt transitions because discontinuity plays into his larger concept of *verfremdung*, or defamiliarization. Radical shifts in mood, emotion, or motivation are clearly not natural, but he appreciates this because it is not his goal to recreate a world of realism. From a Strindbergian point of view, however, the shifts written into the text are a naturalist element, meant to offer insight into the psychological "free association" way of thinking that most human beings employ. Rather than alienate the audience by blatantly pointing out that a significant beat has ended in the theatrical production they are watching, Strindberg's intention is the opposite. He hopes to draw the audience into the play, involving them in the theatrical process by providing a "slice of life" for them to examine and analyze. Strindberg's ability to depict such complex, multifaceted characters in *Miss Julie* is one of the play's major innovations in naturalist theater.

Although our production attempted to challenge certain notions in Strindberg's preface, the psychological aspect of the play is so ingrained in the plot and dialogue that it would be difficult to eliminate it from staging. As Strindberg states in his preface, "I believe that people today are most interested in the psychological process. Our inquisitive souls are not satisfied just to see something happen; we want to know how it happened."[67] While Brecht's Epic Theater focused on the ensemble and the sociological elements of theater, *Miss Julie* is written to be a psychologically provocative play. As a result, in this instance,

---

[67] August Strindberg, preface, *Miss Julie*, trans. Harry G. Carlson, *Theatre/Theory/Theatre: The Major Critical Texts from Aristotle and Zeami to Soyinka and Havel*, ed. Daniel Gerould. (New York: Applause Theatre & Cinema, 2000) 377.

Stanislavski's attention to a character's inner psychology and through line of objectives lends itself better to Strindberg's intentions than Brecht.

This is not to say that Brecht's desire to explore human relationships does not have merit in a production of *Miss Julie*, since Strindberg was certainly interested in the conflict and tension between Julie and Jean. The gender and class struggle between couples features prominently in most of his work during this time, so a production that does not examine the interactions between man and woman would be untrue to Strindberg's purpose. According to Brecht, "The theatre is for him precisely the place best suited to examine the social conditions in any historical period as constitutive elements in human relationships."[68] Strindberg agrees, commenting in the preface that his choice to examine Jean and Julie's relationship stems from the timelessness of the subject. He writes, "I have chosen, or let myself be moved by, a theme that can be said to lie outside partisan politics since the problem of social climbing or falling, of higher and lower, better or worse, man or woman, are, have been, and will always be of lasting interest."[69] Both Brecht and Strindberg believe that theater is an appropriate venue to observe and analyze interactions between couples, despite their varying approaches to doing so.

Finally, the emphasis on dramaturgy in Brecht's method can be useful in creating a character like Julie because she is so highly complex. Strindberg describes Julie and Jean as "conglomerates of past and present cultural phrases, bits from books and newspapers, scraps of humanity, pieces torn from fine clothes and become rags, patched together as is the human soul."[70] This admission that Strindberg was inspired by real people and events

---

[68] Rouse 29.
[69] Strindberg 372.
[70] Strindberg 374.

when creating his characters should immediately indicate to an actor that it is important to explore who and what influenced the composition of Julie and Jean. Beyond simply reading other works by Strindberg to investigate repetition of themes or character traits, an actor's preparation will be greatly affected by a thorough knowledge of the world that the play was written and set in. Learning about the roles, obligations, and education of aristocratic women in 1880s Sweden, opportunities for the working class in Stockholm or other Scandinavian countries, and the Swedish attitude toward pre-marital sex could all be very helpful in informing an actress's portrayal of Julie, and Brecht recognizes the importance of research in defining a character.

Furthermore, although Stanislavski warns that too much research or influence from outside sources can inhibit an actor's creativity, he does not address its impact on an actor who struggles to understand and relate to a character, as I did. Examining the historical and social background of a character can be extremely helpful in determining how to bring her to life. In addition to my own analysis, I was able to use my knowledge of Strindberg's relationship with his wife, as well as the real life stories that partially inspired the plot of *Miss Julie* to discover the emotion and motivations that propel Julie through the play. Without this research, my performance would have had far less complexity and dimension.

In regards to my own portrayal of Julie, I ultimately used elements from both methods to shape my performance. From Stanislavski, I inherited the through line and an analysis of objectives to help make sense of Julie's rapid shifts in emotion and sanity. I also relied on his interest in the psychology of a character, experimenting with various degrees of mental instability and exploring what sort of illness Julie may have suffered from. This type of extensive research came from Brecht, as well as a desire to convey the complexity

and fragility of human relationships. Although I struggled to identify with and capture the essence of Julie, it was ultimately when I embraced both Stanislavski and Brecht's approaches that I was able to find myself in the character and portray her in an effective and informative manner.

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE: BECOMING MISS JULIE

My initial reaction to *Miss Julie* when I read it during the summer of 2009 was, "Who would ever want to be in this play?" I found the dialogue difficult to follow, the characters unlikable, and the ending unnecessary and confusing. Although I knew that I would be serving as a dramaturg for Theater Emory's production of *Miss Julie A*, I assumed that my role would be limited to collecting research and perhaps presenting it to the cast and production staff. I did not like the play, but I vowed that this would not prevent me from producing a helpful protocol to assist both the director and cast.

As auditions for the *Miss Julie* project neared, I was disengaged from the process. It was not until the evening before auditions that I received encouragement from several people connected to *Miss Julie*, and although I had little interest in being a member of the cast, I decided to audition anyway. Immediately, I began to question myself. Why was I so resistant to the idea of acting in *Miss Julie?* What was it about the play that bothered me so much? Was it possible for me to overcome these issues should I be cast?

I spent a great deal of time attempting to answer these questions and make sense of the myriad of thoughts I had about *Miss Julie*. It wasn't until I arrived at the callback for *Miss Julie A* and spoke with the director that I realized the source of all of my hesitancy: fear. When he asked me what my reasons for coming to the callback were, I could not help but cry. I was overcome, much like Julie, by emotions that I did not know existed, and I confessed my concerns about portraying Julie, completely unaware that I had been harboring this insecurity. I could not understand Julie's motivations. Why did she flirt with Jean? Why was she so unstable? How could she transform so quickly from proud and authoritative to frightened, confused, and helpless child? As a naturally optimistic person

who has always been close with my family, I could not relate to her isolation and confusion about her own identity. Julie harbors such rage, and I was unsure where it had come from. Most importantly, I was unsure whether I would be able to channel that rage and portray this tempestuous, unhappy, larger-than-life woman. When I read the play, I didn't like Julie, and I was unsure whether I could play someone I didn't like.

After I was cast, I felt a number of emotions. Excitement, certainly, since I was being given a chance to prove myself and take on an immense challenge. But I also felt a great deal of doubt regarding my own abilities, worrying that my performance would be unbelievable or that I couldn't accurately portray Julie's complexity. From the outset, I suffered from the same self-esteem issues, fear, and apprehension as Julie. Although I could not see it at the time, my struggle to find my inner-Julie became much like her struggle to find her own identity.

Looking back, many of my actions during rehearsal were reminiscent of Julie's. Early in the rehearsal process, I tried to display a confidence and self-assuredness I did not possess. I wanted to seem in control of myself and attempted to convince others that I was a capable actor, even though I secretly doubted my own abilities. This is not unlike Julie, who refuses to admit that she does not know how to be the civilized, well-mannered aristocratic young lady she longs to be.

When I realized after several rehearsals that I was having trouble finding the rhythms and motivations that seemed essential to Julie, I grew angry. Why had Strindberg written this play? What had he meant it to be about? Wasn't he just a mentally unstable outcast who was looking to express his misogynistic views due to his inability to get along well with women? I assumed a new attitude of disdain, replacing my earlier attempts at self-

confidence. The thought of going to rehearsal and watching other actors develop their characters filled me with dread, and as their confidence and strength grew, so did my jealousy and embarrassment. Just as Julie envied the relationship between Jean and Kristine, I saw others who had what I wanted and I could not understand why it couldn't be mine. I wondered what qualities or skills the other actors possessed that I lacked. Why could they discover something new in every scene while I struggled to break my bad habits, fighting to find some connection to my character? I was constantly reminded that I used too many upward inflections and told to stop shifting my weight nervously between my legs while I tried to remember monologues. I needed to break these "Leesa" habits and take on Julie's, but I wasn't sure how to do that. Like Julie, I became jealous of Jean and Kristine and their ability to be great.

My jealousy soon fueled a deep motivation to improve and I decided that I could no longer feel sorry for myself. I had to be better. I had to improve and be the best Julie I could be. Filled with determination, I approached each rehearsal as a challenge, hoping to find a new way to read a line or improve my physicality. This was a major struggle, for beyond my inability to channel Julie emotionally and psychologically, I could not find an appropriate physicalization. Raised as one of five girls by a very traditional mother, I was taught to be dainty and feminine. I had no idea how to approach this half-woman and could not embody her boldly sexual, masculine side. Once it was pointed out that I would have to adopt a more gender-neutral way of moving, and even needed to act in a more masculine manner at times, I became increasingly self-conscious. When I tried to focus on my body, I lost any progress on my lines. When I focused on using a fuller voice or a more commanding tone with the text, I resorted back to my girlish gait and tendency to

constantly curtsey. I felt overwhelmed, as though I was making too many adjustments at once, and my determination grew into weariness.

Just as Jean kills Julie's canary and sends her into a spiral of self-loathing and doubt, the constant suggestions of my director, coupled with my own self-disapproval, sent me into a tailspin of shame. Unlike Jean, my director did not mean to be cruel; he intended to help. But at the time, I was so scared, overwhelmed, exhausted, and frustrated, I could see little hope and did not register the assistance he and my castmates were trying to offer. Without realizing it, I had become Julie: an insecure girl trapped in a world where I was uncomfortable and unfamiliar with any of the rules. Ironically, my own fears about not being able to inhabit Julie had caused her to inhabit me.

When opening night arrived, I resigned myself to the fact that I had done all I could. I had tried my best and listened to my director and rehearsed as much as I was able. Like Julie at the end of the play, I accepted my fate, and although I had no intention of committing suicide, as she did, I decided to free myself of any negative feelings and give the best performance I could give. As with Julie, this acceptance was what liberated me, granting me the happiness I longed for.

I wish I could remember what opening night felt like, but the entire evening is a blur. I remember the moments leading up to my first entrance, as I thought I might throw up or faint due to excessive nerves. I remember standing on stage during the curtain call, hearing applause and wondering if the audience had believed me. But as for the performance itself, I remember nothing. It was as if my transformation was complete and I had finally become Julie. Onstage during the performance, I moved as she moved and spoke as she spoke, leaving myself behind.

The run of *Miss Julie*: *A* was a major accomplishment for me because it proved that I could handle Julie. I had struggled, but I ultimately overcame my fears and performed without breaking character or removing myself completely from the play. Although I never imagined that I would feel any connection to Julie, I came to realize that we are much more similar than I originally thought, and although perhaps this should fill me with fear, instead, I find it comforting.

After the performance, I received a lot of feedback that intrigued me. It was the director of another version of *Miss Julie* who said it most eloquently. As I complained about feeling lost and overwhelmed, he merely said, "That was your greatest strength. The difficult journey and fear you felt in reality allowed hers to come to life onstage." Although I never expected it, my own struggles were ultimately the key to successfully portraying the character I feared.

My experience with *Miss Julie* began with disdain and confusion toward the title character, but in time I came to identify with and love her. My difficulty learning to speak in a lower register, take longer strides, move more confidently, and truly absorb what the other actors were saying were not unlike Julie's lessons to ride, milk cows, read Latin, and flirt. While we both felt outside of our comfort zones, we were ultimately able to find peace. Julie had to end her life to do so, and I had to begin mine, this time as a more confident and self-aware actor.

OBSTACLES TO BECOMING *MISS JULIE:* ANALYSIS OF JULIE'S MAJOR SHIFTS

After being cast as Miss Julie, one of the biggest obstacles I faced was finding a way to bring this character to life. Not only has Strindberg intentionally written Julie to be complex and multifaceted, but much of the material included in the play is traumatic and difficult to approach. Prone to rapid shifts in mood and mental instability, Julie is challenging to play as a cohesive character whose actions and emotions are motivated out of one major conflict: her confused gender and class identity. During rehearsals, I attempted to remedy this problem by identifying the major events that lead to Julie's death. Not only did I analyze their importance in the text, but I also developed an approach toward each incident so that the suicide would ultimately seem like a necessary action. Because much of Julie's turmoil stems from this gender and class confusion, I examined a way to convey that in each moment.

The first major obstacle I encountered is Julie's initial entrance. Strindberg structures the opening of the play so that much is said about Julie before she actually appears. Through Jean and Kristine's discussion of their mistress, the audience learns that Julie is difficult and emotionally unstable, especially on this particular evening. Jean recounts how Julie recently abused her fiancé, resulting in the end of their engagement, and Jean and Kristine express horror at Julie's inappropriate behavior with the servants during the Midsummer Eve celebrations. Besides the negative descriptions of Julie, the audience is also exposed to the loving relationship between Jean and Kristine. Although they complain about one another, Kristine openly admits her love and the audience sees them in a happy and comfortable environment as Kristine serves Jean his favorite meal. By the

time Julie actually appears on stage, she is an unwanted intrusion on this scene of domestic bliss.

Julie's first entrance provided me with a great deal of apprehension, as I needed the audience to like and empathize with her but was burdened by Jean and Kristine's negative reviews. In the audience's minds, Julie was the villainess, threatening to break up the cozy and likeable couple and wreak havoc on the estate she so blatantly disrespects. Strindberg does not make the task of making Julie likeable easy, as he gives Julie a very brief initial appearance on stage, during which she brazenly flirts with Jean while rudely commanding Kristine to do her bidding. She speaks pretentiously, telling Jean and Kristine, "As mistress of the house, I honor your dance with my presence. And if I feel like dancing, I want to dance with someone who knows how to lead, so I won't look ridiculous."[71] With one line, Julie exposes herself as an elitist and admits that her appearance and reputation are important to her. She is neither endearing nor warm, and she quickly leaves the stage on Jean's arm, antagonizing Kristine by assuring her, "Don't worry, Kristine! I won't run off with your boyfriend!"[72] as she does so.

Although the dialogue in this opening scene lends itself to playing Julie as a callous snob, I tried to show her vulnerable side as well. While I used an authoritative and commanding tone when issuing orders to Kristine, I also explored Julie's youthful excitement about the dance and her flirtation with Jean. I believed that if I could display Julie's dichotomy, both arrogant aristocrat and confused child, from her very first entrance, the audience would have an easier time accepting her rapid shifts in emotion and sanity. In

---

[71] August Strindberg, *Miss Julie,* trans. Truda Stockenström (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996) 16.
[72] Strindberg 16.

a Stanislavskian effort, I attempted to establish a through line of instability that grew throughout the course of the play.

The next major incident in Julie's path to insanity occurs after Julie's second entrance, as her flirtation with Jean escalates once Kristine has fallen sleep. Julie plays with Jean as though he were a toy, ordering him to fetch her drinks and make toasts in her honor, all the while pretending that their relationship is one of friendship and camaraderie rather than master and servant. The climax occurs as she exclaims, "Now kiss my shoe and everything will be perfect. Excellent! You should have been an actor!"[73] As written, Julie shows no sign of hesitation or uncertainty about the path their relationship is taking. It is only Jean's protests that distract Julie from her relentless pursuit. This scene is problematic because the implications of shoe kissing have changed since *Miss Julie* was written in 1888. Although to contemporary audiences, the act is bizarre, in the nineteenth century it was a bold request. Allowing Jean to touch her foot and leg, not only with his hands but his mouth, was quite provocative, and it was a challenge to convey this to a modern audience.

I struggled with how to communicate that the flirtation had reached a dangerous level, and once again relied on playing Julie's contrasting emotions. Emboldened by her earlier successes at coercing Jean to fetch her beer and toast to her, my Julie requested a kiss on the shoe playfully, without considering its implications. As Jean contemplated following her instructions, I played a slow realization of the severity of the situation. Jean's deliberate approach toward the foot and his removal of the shoe merited increasing anxiety and fear, and Julie began to question whether she had allowed her flirtation to go far. Anton Webern's melodramatic atonal music as underscoring heightened the tension, and

---

[73] Strindberg 20.

as Jean replaced the shoe on my foot, my approval was hesitant, more out of a need to acknowledge his obedience than actually express enjoyment. Although the moment could easily be played out of haughtiness and a desire to control and manipulate Jean, my Julie felt more complex and ambivalent emotions, continuing the through line of a woman who is unsure of what she wants or thinks at any given moment.

This theme is echoed yet again when Jean tries to kiss Julie. Strindberg's stage directions indicate, "*Jean boldly tries to put his arm around her waist and kiss her. She boxes his ear,*"[74] but our production adjusted the action slightly while remaining true to Strindberg's intentions. Prior to the kiss, my Julie practically climbed on top of Jean at the table as she tried to remove dust from his eye. I flirtatiously demanded that Jean kiss my hand to thank me and when he refused, I implored again, with more urgency. Julie's playful teasing became frustration, which culminated as I crossed the stage in defiance, abandoning Jean at the table. Melodramatically, my Julie flung herself against a wall, and Jean approached me, angered by Julie's constant attempts to manipulate him. Julie's ire dissipated into fear as Jean began to corner her, accompanied by the revelation, "Bless my soul, that's it! You're a Joseph!"[75] Suddenly aware that Jean was teasing her without any intention of actually acting on his desire, my Julie became bewildered. As Strindberg has written her, she is not only overwhelmed by her own desire and the knowledge that her feelings are inappropriate, but she may be slightly inebriated from the beer she forced Jean to fetch. When Jean tried to disprove her theory by forcefully pinning her against the wall with one hand and kissing her, my Julie initially submitted. I allowed Jean to kiss me

---

[74] Strindberg 24.
[75] Strindberg 24.

passionately for a moment, but as he led me away from the wall and back toward the table, I realized the danger of letting the flirtation go too far. Rather than box his ears, as Strindberg indicated, my Julie slapped Jean across the face, ending the kiss and the spell that temporarily overcame her.

This moment is pivotal in Julie's ultimate submission to Jean because it is the first time that the audience truly sees her lose control of herself. I wanted to convey Julie's conflicting attitudes about the kiss, since she finds it both enjoyable and frightening, as well as her confusion about the situation. Julie is very easily confused, especially during the second half of the play, as she quickly loses touch with reality. By playing this uncertainty and confusion early on, I was able to establish her as a character that constantly finds herself in undesirable and inappropriate situations and is unsure how to escape them.

One such undesirable situation occurs in the moments leading up to the peasant invasion of the kitchen. Both attracted and repulsed by Jean's childhood story and the knowledge that he observed the embarrassing end to her engagement, Julie once again tries to convince Jean to perform tasks for her, imploring him to "row me out on the lake."[76] Her anger at his refusal is interrupted by the sound of the servants singing dirty songs outside, preparing to bring their Midsummer Eve celebration into the house. Julie is initially filled with courage, bolstered by the elitist notion that because her servants respect and admire her, they would never cause her harm or speak ill of her. But as she realizes that their music is actually intended as a mockery, Julie becomes frightened of the damage they are about to cause. Encouraged by Jean's assurances that the only way to save herself is to escape to his room, Julie follows him offstage and the two engage in intercourse.

---

[76] Strindberg 29.

In *Miss Julie A*, the tension of this moment was heightened by the increasing volume and physical presence of the servants throughout the course of the scene, as well as the larger-than-life shadows created behind Julie using puppets. As Julie's fear grew, so did her claustrophobia, and members of the ensemble pushed in parts of the set to reduce the size of the playing space, literally trapping Julie, leaving her nowhere else to run. The text was helpful in capturing the emotional shifts Julie undergoes because Strindberg clearly builds an identifiable change into her attitude. By allowing her to ask, "What are they singing?,"[77] Strindberg establishes the precise moment that Julie realizes her servants are not actually loyal. Rather than play both her authority and confusion at once, or even a gradual development of one to the next, Strindberg creates an abrupt shift that guides the actor's interpretation. Physically, my Julie embodied this by remaining still and refusing to move while stubbornly contending that the servants mean no harm. Once she began to hear the song's lyrics and asked Jean about them, however, my Julie traveled rapidly across the stage, desperately searching for some escape. The anxiety climaxed as I reached the audience, collapsing in hopelessness at their feet. Here, Julie's vulnerability became apparent, and this moment is important because it is when Julie seals her fate. Before consenting to Jean, she asks, "Do you promise me that . . . ?"[78] Strindberg does not explain what Julie wants Jean to promise, but his agreement ultimately convinces Julie to run into his room.

In order to make sense of this line and Julie's decision to hide with Jean, I had to determine what she wanted him to promise and whether she actually believed him. I ultimately came to believe that Julie was asking Jean to promise not to seduce her and that

---

[77] Strindberg 30.
[78] Strindberg 31.

she believed his promise to be true. As she entered Jean's room, my Julie believed that she would be safe and Jean would not make any advances toward her. My rationale was that if Julie's trust in Jean was shattered, she would have justifiable reason to feel furious for the remainder of the play, and that fury could build towards her insanity. Furthermore, immediately following the destruction of the kitchen, Julie's dialogue shifts from verbose to reticent. For my Julie, unwanted and unexpected intercourse with Jean was the cause of this sudden, shy dejection.

Later in the play, after much name-calling and disagreement, Julie regains her voice and reveals her family's secrets to Jean. As she recounts her parents' turbulent marriage and her own gender-confused childhood, culminating in her mother's affair with a local brick maker and arson of their own home, Julie expresses disdain for her mother. She cites her as the cause of her own feminist beliefs, explaining, "I learned from her [my mother] to hate men. You know she hated the whole male sex, and I swore to her that I'd never be a slave to any man."[79] This insight helps explain why Julie continuously attempts to use her status to manipulate Jean, and based on my interpretation that their intercourse was unwanted, suggests that she sees herself as a failure for submitting to Jean, rather than dominating him.

The monologue in which Julie reveals these revelations is quite lengthy, proving challenging because it requires a sense of nostalgia, anger, sadness, acceptance, and loss within the course of one speech. As with earlier incidents, my Julie played more than one feeling at once, expressing this range of emotions through introspection. While our production staged Jean's story of childhood trauma as a grand performance, involving wild

[79] Strindberg 42.

gestures and movement across the stage, I approached Julie's back-story as intensely personal. As I told Julie's tale, I played with a set of red, white, and black wooden blocks, originally intended as a children's toy. The blocks resembled miniature versions of the larger blocks used to create the set, and just as the ensemble began the play by building the set out of these life-size blocks, my Julie constructed her own childhood world out of the toy version. The wistful emotions conjured by recounting this story of her youth were enhanced by the sight of mature Julie still playing with toys, and I was able to explore Julie's immaturity and difficulty accepting her mother's traitorous actions.

I also attempted to bring Julie's gender identity issues to life in this monologue, and as Julie describes how she "was left was run to wild, and on top of that, I had to learn everything a boy learns, so that I could be living proof that a woman is just as good as a man. I had to wear boys' clothes, I was taught to take care of horses, but I was never allowed to milk the cows,"[80] I blended feminine and masculine gesture and movement to depict her confusion. My Julie crossed her legs suggestively in feminine flirtation one moment, but then drank wine straight from the bottle the next. I swung my leg forcefully over a block, recalling images of cowboys climbing atop their horses, before daintily tidying the blocks, placing each one in its proper place in a tiny box. The interplay of masculine and feminine movement created a clear picture of Julie's resentment and confusion about her gender. Although the text provides a great deal of insight into the origins of Julie's gender issues, my physical interpretation further commented on the results of these experiences, depicting a young woman still as lost and confused as she was during childhood.

---

[80] Strindberg 40.

The death of Julie's canary, Serena, provided the final major obstacle I encountered while bringing Julie to life. Although she agrees to allow Jean to murder Serena, Julie is instantly horrified by the bird's death and expresses her rage through yet another lengthy monologue. Julie's deep animosity toward Jean is revealed, as she tells him, "I'd like to see your blood, your brains on a chopping block! I'd like to see all of you swimming in a sea of blood! . . . You think I love you because my womb craved your seed! You think I want to carry your spawn under my heart and feed it with my blood – bear your child and take your name!"[81] The death of Serena triggers Julie's hatred toward men once again, and her refusal to "be a slave to any man" is echoed by her revulsion at the idea of carrying Jean's child. Although these sentiments are familiar, they are expressed through deep-seated anger and rage that Julie has not previously exhibited. Her ire toward Jean quickly dissipates into self-hatred, however, as Julie vows, "I'll tell everything! Everything! Oh, what a relief to end it all! A real end . . . My father will have a stroke and die, and that'll be the end of all of us. There will be calm . . . peace . . . eternal rest!"[82] Julie realizes that confessing her crime will result in the death of her father, the man who has trapped her with his aristocratic lineage and refusal to insist on a proper feminine education. She sees that the Count is responsible for her fragmented identity and believes that his death will liberate her from the gender and societal constraints that cause her so much angst.

Portraying Julie's extended hysteria, hatred, and realization of the impact of her actions on her family required a series of emotional shifts that yet again explored Julie as both aggressor and victim. As indicated by Strindberg's stage direction "*screaming*,"[83] I

---

[81] Strindberg 53.
[82] Strindberg 54.
[83] Strindberg 53.

began Julie's monologue with fury, letting anger at Jean's brutality inform my interpretation of the text. Jean's suggestion that they run away was met by a hushed intensity, as my Julie was fascinated by the sight of the blood on the table. The design of both the table and blood in our production was particularly helpful, as a large quantity of vibrant, thick, red blood covered the stark white table, dripping eerily down the legs and creating a pool of blood on the white floor below. An interest and attachment to the blood guided the remainder of the monologue, as my Julie became overwhelmed by a desire to cover herself in blood, clinging to this last vestige of Serena.

As Julie attacks Jean, calling him "a dog with my name on your collar! You lackey with my crest on your buttons!,"[84] the large, shiny silver meat cleaver used to kill the canary caught my Julie's eye. Picking up the weapon, I advanced toward him, cornering Jean and dragging the cleaver against the wall. Not only did the blade scraping against the wooden wall result in an unsettling and unpleasant noise, it also left a trail of blood smeared against the wall. Just as Jean pounded one hand against the wall when trapping my Julie to kiss her earlier in the play, I repeated this motion while holding the cleaver dangerously close to his face. The repetition and slight adjustment to this movement acted as a comment on the shift in power throughout the play. Although she was forced to submit earlier, Julie has now regained the upper hand in her relationship with Jean. The image of a bloody handprint, left from my Julie's attack on Jean, remained on the wall for the duration of the play, serving as a reminder of Julie's aggression and power.

Throughout my performance in *Miss Julie A*, I tried to blend the psychological complexity Strindberg wrote into his dialogue with masculine and feminine physicalizations

---

[84] Strindberg 53.

to capture a confused, conflicted Julie. By establishing her as unstable and emotional from the very beginning, I was able to portray her ultimate insanity without seeming forced. I attempted to let Julie's mental illness progress throughout my performance, using repetition of emotional and physical themes to establish a consistent character despite her constant shifts in mood and tone.

INTERVIEW WITH LEESA HASPEL, *MISS JULIE A*

1. How did you prepare for your role?

LH: I wanted to gain some scholarly knowledge about the play, Scandinavia in the late 1880s, Swedish society and the role of aristocratic women, and Strindberg, but I also examined and experimented a lot with the physicality of the character. I worked a great deal with my director to distort my natural posture, gesture, gait, and vocal pitch to reflect Julie, as opposed to Leesa.

2. Did you do any reading? If so, what sort of material?

LH: First, I read some of Strindberg's other works, particularly *The Father* and *The Pelican*. Both of these plays share themes and conflicts with *Miss Julie*, so it was interesting to see how Strindberg's fascinations remained constant or changed throughout his career. I also gained insight into how other characters dealt with situations similar to the one Julie finds herself in. *The Father* was the most helpful, as I saw a lot of similarities in structure and characters between the two plays. This certainly makes sense, as *The Father* was written just a year before *Miss Julie*.

I also read about Strindberg's biography. I researched his history and examined the way his own mental illness affected Julie's. I also read about Swedish history and culture in order to shape my performance and make it both relevant to contemporary audiences, but still informed by the actual society that Strindberg based the character on.

3. Did you examine previous productions or try to learn about the original production?

LH: I did a little bit of research on earlier productions but not a great deal. For one thing, I was nervous that I would not be able to continue to develop my own sense of the character

if I was too familiar with what other Julie's had done. I struggled with the creation of Julie and I think if I had been exposed to other examples, I would never have found the Julie I ended up playing. I did look at a few production photos, however, from the first Swedish production, as well as Ingmar Bergman's stage production.

In terms of the original production, I wanted to know about its history: where it took place and when. I was interested in the censorship of *Miss Julie* by the Copenhagen government, but I did not want to know too many particulars about the production itself, since I wanted to focus instead on my own work.

4. **Did you learn about Strindberg? What did you find useful? Was any research detrimental?**

LH: I read about his life and tried to examine the way that Strindberg inserted himself into Julie. Much of the research I did about his work was conducted after the play was over though. I found biographies useful, and as I have come across letters and diary entries he wrote, I am wishing that I had found them earlier, as they offer a lot of insight into what he was thinking when he was writing the play. I think his relationship with Siri von Essen is fascinating, and am also intrigued by the true stories that influenced the plot of *Miss Julie.* Along with other Strindberg plays, that was definitely the most helpful for me, and I don't know that anything was detrimental.

5. **Did you examine life for women in 1880s Sweden or contemplate Julie's options beyond living at home as a disgraced woman or running away with Jean? How did you approach her suicide, and do you think it could have been prevented?**

LH: One of my major interests was to look at what Julie's options would have been in order to determine if her suicide was really necessary. I was disturbed by the ending of the play and felt as though she had other choices, so I need to reconcile the knowledge of her options with her ultimate decision. I examined the role of women as teachers in 1880s Sweden, as well as factory workers and shop girls. Julie was probably ill suited for all of these jobs, as she was an aristocrat who had little work ethic, and to take up a job would have been beneath her social standing. Nevertheless, she could have moved away and tried to make a fresh start, especially in a big city like Stockholm. With the money she stole from her father, she could have funded a move from the country and escaped her past.

I do think Julie could have avoided suicide, but I think she was too emotionally disturbed to realize that. Much of the tragedy in *Miss Julie* is that she does not have to die, but she is so beaten down by her life that she cannot see any hope.

6. **Did you focus only on learning about Julie, or did you try to learn about what life would have been like for Kristine and Jean? How much of your research, if any, was devoted to characters other than your own?**

LH: I did not consciously choose to learn about lower and working class life in 1880s Sweden, but much of my research about Julie's options led to me to discover more about it. Because it would have been difficult for Julie to reinvent herself as an aristocrat, especially given her father's poor reputation and lack of money, she would almost certainly have had to lower herself to a different social class in order to survive away from the estate. The working conditions for the lower class were difficult, especially for those working in factories, since the Industrial Revolution was in full swing. The cities were crowded and

could be dirty, so the quality of life was relatively poor. Although they complain, Kristine and Jean probably had a much easier life living in the country than they would have had in a large city like Stockholm or Copenhagen.

7. **Did you study any particular type of acting method or learn about period acting? How did anything you studied affect your final performance?**

LH: I reviewed some essays on the Stanislavksi method, although I employed it minimally in my own performance. Much of the work I did was more personal and experimental, and I spent a lot of time with my director trying different voices, line readings, and physicalizations to find what would be most effective. I wanted to find a way to portray a Julie that seemed true to the text, but also comfortable for myself. I was very much uneasy about the whole process, since I could not understand or relate to Julie. Trying to become comfortable with her movements and speech was a big challenge, and we tried everything from breaking lines and monologues into smaller pieces and beats to letting go of the emotion and just reading the line casually and without subtext. I juggled while reciting monologues to take my mind off the words and let the text come more naturally, and I also practiced walking with bigger strides than I normally take. We tried to build up strength in my legs so that I could appear and feel more solid and grounded, as I am naturally a dainty person. It was a lot of hard work and gave me a great deal of anxiety, but I think the result was effective.

I didn't really focus on period acting. Because the focus of our production was more contemporary, I did not want to burden myself with historical notions of exaggerated

speeches or gestures. I think that Strindberg would have preferred this as well, since his preface is focused on making *Miss Julie* a modern piece and Julie a modern woman.

8. **How did your particular production's style affect your performance or preparation? Do you think it would have been different had you been cast in another production at Theater Emory?**

LH: I was definitely uncomfortable with our production style at the beginning, because I was not sure how puppetry, mime, and burlesque were going to make sense in the context of this play that is allegedly naturalist. The abstract nature of the design and concept was daunting for me, but I ultimately think it was hugely helpful. Because we were not confined by an elaborate set or a lot of props, it was essential that the actors relied on themselves and each other to make their characters come to life. Although my kitchen was made of white cloth and some blocks, I had to envision it and make it real so that the audience could make it real as well. I also think that the abstract nature of the production design led to a more naturalistic and realistic performance style. The production would have been completely ineffective if we had not communicated our characters in a way that was natural and identifiable to a contemporary audience. Because our concept was so abstract, we were free to read lines and move and feel the way that we would feel today, as citizens of the twenty-first century. We did not spend a lot of time dwelling on what was appropriate or natural in 1888, and this was very liberating during rehearsal because we were free to experience the action without historical constraints.

I actually can't imagine what it would have been like to play Julie in another production, as they were so radically different from *Miss Julie: A*. I admired the other performances and found them effective and appropriate given their translations and overall

concepts. I don't know that my approach and thoughts about Julie would have worked in another environment, but I would have been interested to observe other *Miss Julie* rehearsals to learn about what their process was like and how it differed from my own.

9. Did you feel that your performance was successful?

LH: I do not think that I was necessarily *good*, but I do think my performance was *successful*. Julie is a fragile, fragmented, frightened young girl and because I was a fragile, fragmented, frightened young girl at the time, I was able to communicate those elements to the audience effectively. My hatred and anxiety about *Miss Julie* ended up being one of my strengths, so I am told, and although there are a lot of things I would do differently if I could perform it again, I am generally satisfied with my performance. At the time, given my own self-imposed limitations, I did the best I could.

10. What sorts of stresses or pressures did you feel as Julie?

LH: As the title character, I felt that I had to bring Julie to life and make her someone that the audience could sympathize with. This was really difficult for me because I could not identify or sympathize with her for the longest time. It took a while for me to get over my hatred of Julie and realize that in many ways, she is a victim. I think that especially during the beginning of the play, she can come off as controlling, vindictive, and spiteful, and if the actress playing her does not have vulnerability or likeability, the audience will not care about her fate. It was really tough to balance her commanding presence and sense of self-importance as an aristocrat with the frightened, meek young woman who actually knows nothing about the world. Strindberg has also written the character so that she has to go though *a lot* during the 90 minutes of the play. She switches from demanding to devastated in a matter of minutes, and finding a way to portray these shifts and mood swings without

seeming totally forced was a challenge. I don't know that I was always successful in making these transitions natural, but I think that Julie's mental instability makes that tough. In some ways, I felt as though it is okay if things don't make sense, because she is irrational and doesn't know what she is saying or doing. But at the same time, I wanted the audience to identify with her and not just write her off as "that crazy girl who makes no sense." This was definitely my biggest challenge.

11. Did you enjoy the process? What was the best part of your rehearsal process? The worst? What was the biggest challenge you faced?

LH: There were definitely times when I felt as though the work was going well and I was developing a lot as both a character and an actor, but I have never been so self-conscious and unsure of myself before. I spent a lot of time crying and complaining about the play, and it isn't because it was not well put together. The cast and production staff were amazing to work with, and without their support, I never would have overcome my own insecurities. Although at the time, I often felt overwhelmed and unsure as to whether I could actually pull Julie off, in retrospect, I think this was an amazing opportunity and experience. I've realized now that I can really do anything if I believe in myself and work hard. I never thought I could play Julie with any conviction, but I feel good about my performance and I developed a lot of skills that I can carry with me to future projects.

12. How did you work with your director to shape your performance? Your cast?

LH: Donald and I worked together so closely on this production, because not only was I acting in it, but he was helping me research. I was initially asked to serve as the dramaturg for *Miss Julie A*, but once I was cast, it became clear that double duty was a little

overwhelming. We had many discussions both during and outside of rehearsal, not limited to my performance and ways to develop the character. A lot of time was spent looking at images and talking about 1880s Sweden, so that we could understand Strindberg's world and identify why he wrote the play the way he did. Donald was very much aware of my fears and confusion about the play and the character, so he spent a lot of time trying to educate me so that I could play Julie in a way that communicated something to the audience beyond just my own fear.

My cast was also hugely helpful in creating Julie, and in maintaining my own personal sanity. We were lucky to have the cast we did, and I think it was the perfect size. The idea of having three principal characters and then three ensemble members of the same gender to shadow them worked for our concept. It also helped us bond, since we could relate to one another in different ways. As an ensemble, they bonded in that they moved and spoke in an unnatural way and had to insert themselves into the play in places that Strindberg may not have originally intended. As for the core characters, we were able to work together to bring the text to life and integrate these unusual elements like mime, puppets, projection, and contemporary music to update the play. We truly became a family during our rehearsal process, and that encouraging and nurturing environment helped all of our performances. There was a lot of freedom to try new things and the fearlessness of some of the other performers helped me step outside of my comfort zone and pushed me to try new approaches, which was vital and really helpful.

13. **What was the biggest resource for your performance? Did anything specifically inspire or motivate you?**

LH: Fear was a huge motivator, since I decided I needed to find a way to bring Julie to life in some sort of believable and likeable way. Letting go of that fear and the need to be liked and laughed at in a play was really important for me, since I have usually performed comedic roles in musical comedies and I wasn't used to being "a bad guy" or playing someone so dark. I think that looking at images of death from the 1880s and continuously reading the text very closely informed my performance a lot. I tried to become so familiar with the play that I could recite it in my sleep, and that familiarity helped allay a lot of my fears, which in turn allowed me to try new things.

14. If you could do it over again, would you change how you prepared for your role?

LH: I might spend more time familiarizing myself with other works by Strindberg and I wish I had examined his own insanity more closely to understand Julie's a little better, but for the most part, I think that what I did worked. I would like to have spent less time worrying about my inadequacies and more time thinking positively. If I had had my way, I would have been in rehearsal for 24 hours a day. I crave familiarity, ritual, and comfort in a performance, and there were a lot of elements of the production, ranging from text to costumes, that I didn't feel totally comfortable with even during the run. This may have added to my performance, since my discomfort with the world around me and uncertainty about what was going to happen was real, as I didn't know if I would make my costume change or whether my props would be in the right place. For my own peace of mind, I wished I had had more rehearsal time.

15. What did you learn from this experience that you will take with you to future roles? Will you employ the same research techniques again in the future? Why?

LH: This was the first time I have done so much research to prepare for a role and I found it very helpful. I think that understanding a character is important in forming him or her, and without my research, I would have had no idea how to approach Julie. I think that it depends on the role and the production, however, since *Miss Julie* was something I really couldn't relate to. I had to find some way to understand her and this world or I would have been lost. Should I play a character more like me, however, I may not need as much research because I already have that connection and insight.

16. What advice do you have for future Julie's?

LH: The best advice I can offer is to remain positive and never lose hope. Julie is a tough role to play. That is how she was written. She is complicated and unlikable at times and overwhelming and scary, but you need to remember that you can do it. Being a successful Julie means accepting your fears instead of trying to overcome them, and allowing them to inform your performance. I hope that some day I will be able to play Julie again, as I now find her a fascinating character. Anyone who was the chance to bring her to life should be thankful, as not only is she complex, interesting, and challenging, but she provides a wonderful opportunity to learn about yourself and grow as an actor.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this project was to use dramaturgy to inform my performance as Julie in *Miss Julie A.* Through an investigation of the history of dramaturgy, Swedish culture, Strindberg's biography and other dramatic works, previous productions of *Miss Julie*, and relevant acting styles, I was able to shape my performance with historical and cultural knowledge, enriching my approach to the character.

I have attempted to collect my research, as well as an analysis account of my preparations, to create a guide advocating the merits of practical dramaturgy. I am arguing that a thorough understanding of material relevant to a specific character can greatly assist the actor in developing an emotional and physical interpretation of the text. Combining the Stanislavski and Brechtian approaches, I was able to structure my own performance as Julie, considering both text and research as critical elements in my character development. My roles as both researcher and performer led to a deeper appreciation and understanding of the character, lending my Julie a depth that would not have been possible had I not been exposed to such a wide breadth of information.

Although Julie is a complex, and at times, unlikable, character, I was able to understand her struggles by experiencing my own. This record of my journey to discover Julie and bring her to life on stage will hopefully serve as a resource for other actors, encouraging them to conduct their own research when creating a role. As an advocate for practical dramaturgy, I suggest that this approach creates more meaningful, thoughtful, and effective performances, strengthening the connection between actor and character, and ultimately bringing the text of a play to life on stage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, Stella. *Stella Adler on Ibsen, Strindberg, and Chekhov*. Ed. Barry Paris. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999. Print.

Atkinson, Brooks. "Miss Julie." Rev. of *Miss Julie*. *The New York Times* 22 Feb. 1956, Theater Reviews sec. Print.

Berghahn, Klaus L. "German Literary Theory from Gottsched to Goethe." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Vol. 4 The Eighteenth Century*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.

Brown, Russell E. "Bertolt Brecht as Dramaturg." *What is Dramaturgy?* New York: P. Lang, 1995. Print.

Cardullo, Bert. "Enter Dramaturgs." *What is Dramaturgy?* New York: P. Lang, 1995. Print.

"The Critic Comes Full Circle: An Interview with Kenneth Tynan." Interviewed by the Editors of *Theater Quarterly*. *What is Dramaturgy?* New York: P. Lang, 1995. Print.

Dahlström, Carl. *Strindberg's Dramatic Expressionism*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 1930. Print.

Esslin, Martin. "The Role of the Dramaturg in European Theater." *What is Dramaturgy?* New York: P. Lang, 1995. Print.

Evenden, Michael. Personal Interview. 2 April 2010.

Farfan, Penny. *Women, Modernism, and Performance*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.

Fraser, Neil. *Theatre History Explained*. Ramsbury, England: Crowood Press, 2004.

Hawkins-Dady, Mark, ed. "August Strindberg." *International Dictionary of Theater:*

Playwrights. Vol. 2. Washington D.C.: St. James, 1994. 925-30. Print.

Hawkins-Dady, Mark, ed. "Miss Julie." *International Dictionary of Theater: Plays*. Vol. 1. Chicago: St. James, 1992. 525-28. Print.

Hay, Peter. "American Dramaturgy: A Critical Re-Appraisal." *What is Dramaturgy?* New York: P. Lang, 1995. Print.

Ignatieva, Maria. *Stanislavsky and Female Actors: Women in Stanislavsky's Life and Art*. New York: University of America, 2008. Print.

Johnson, Walter. *August Strindberg*. Boston, MA: Twayne, 1976. Print.

Klaf, Franklin S. *Strindberg: The Origin of Psychology in Modern Drama*. New York: Citadel, 1963. Print.

"Literary Management at the National Theatre, London: An Interview with John Russell Brown." Interviewed by Richard Beacham. *What is Dramaturgy?* New York: P. Lang, 1995. Print.

Luckhurst, Mary. *Dramaturgy A Revolution in Theatre (Cambridge Studies in Modern Theatre)*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.

Madsen, Børge G. *Strindberg's Naturalistic Theater: Its Relation to French Naturalism*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, 1962. Print.

Marker, Frederick J., and Lise-Lone Marker. *A History of Scandinavian Theater*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1996. Print.

McManus, Donald. "Three Takes on a Classic Play." Interview by Jessica Moore. *The Emory Report.* 14 Sept. 2009. Print.

Meyer, Michael, comp. *File on Strindberg*. London: Methuen, 1986. Print.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy*. Trans. Clifton P. Fadiman.

Theatre/Theory/Theatre: The Major Critical Texts from Aristotle and Zeami to Soyinka and Havel. Ed. Daniel Gerould. New York: Applause Theatre & Cinema, 2000. 336-50. Print.

Rich, Frank. "Strindberg in Tandem." Rev. of *Miss Julie*. *The New York Times* 10 Dec. 1981, Theater Reviews sec. Print.

Rouse, John. "Brecht and the Contradictory Actor." *Theatre Journal* 36.1 (1984): 25-42. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 Mar. 2010.

Rudakoff, Judith D. and Lynn M. Thomson. *Between the Lines the Process of Dramaturgy*. Toronto: Playwrights Canada, 2002. Print.

Schechter, Joel. "Lessing, Jugglers, and Dramaturgs." *What is Dramaturgy?* New York: P. Lang, 1995. Print.

Shipley, Joseph T. *The Crown Guide to the World's Greatest Plays*. Vol. 2. New York: Crown, 1984. Print.

Sprigge, Elizabeth. *The Strange Life of August Strindberg*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1949. Print.

Stanislavski, Constantin. *An Actor Prepares*. Trans. Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1948. Print.

Stanislavski, Constantin. *Creating a Role*. Trans. Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood. New York: Routledge, 1989. Print.

Stanislavski, Konstantin. *My Life in Art*. Trans. Jean Benedetti. New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Strindberg, August. *The Dance of Death*. Trans. Arvid Paulson. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1976. Print.

Strindberg, August. *The Father*. Trans. Robert Brustein. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1992. Print.

Strindberg, August. *Miss Julie*. Trans. Truda Stockenström. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996. Print.

Strindberg, August. *Preface to Miss Julie*. Trans. Harry G. Carlson. *Theatre/Theory/Theatre: The Major Critical Texts from Aristotle and Zeami to Soyinka and Havel*. Ed. Daniel Gerould. New York: Applause Theatre & Cinema, 2000. 368-80. Print.

Törnqvist, Egil. *Strindbergian Drama*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities, 1982. Print.

Turner, Cathy, and Synne Behrndt. *Dramaturgy and Performance (Theatre and Performance Practices)*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. Print.

Ward, John. *The Social and Religious Plays of Strindberg*. London: Athlone, 1980. Print.