

RESEARCH ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.68251/cjmr.v3i5.6>

Gender Roles and the Failing Institution of Marriage in Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House*

Abdulazeez Jatto 

Department of English and Literary Studies, Federal University Lokoja, Kogi State, Nigeria

Correspondence: abdulazeez.jatto@fulokoja.edu.ng

RECEIVED

07 September 2026

REVISED

01 October 2026

ACCEPTED

22 October 2026

PUBLISHED

23 October 2026

ABSTRACT

This article examines the relationship between gender roles and the failure of marriage in Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House*, employing feminism and existentialism as complementary theoretical frameworks. Drawing particularly on Simone de Beauvoir's conception of woman as "Other" and her distinction between immanence and transcendence, Judith Butler's theory of gender performativity, and Jean-Paul Sartre's concepts of freedom, choice, responsibility, and bad faith, the study argues that Ibsen presents marriage as a social institution shaped by unequal gender expectations, economic dependence, patriarchal authority, and the performance of respectability. Through close textual analysis of dialogue, characterisation, symbolism, dramatic structure, and domestic space, the article demonstrates that Nora Helmer's apparently comfortable marriage depends upon her performance as obedient wife, devoted mother, attractive companion, and dependent consumer, while Torvald Helmer performs the complementary roles of provider, protector, moral authority, and patriarchal husband. The crisis surrounding Nora's secret loan and forgery exposes the fragility of these performances and reveals the absence of genuine mutual recognition within the marriage. Nora's eventual decision to leave her husband and children constitutes an attempt to move from socially prescribed identity towards autonomous self-definition. Torvald's inability to recognise this emerging self also exposes the restrictive consequences of patriarchal masculinity. The article concludes that the Helmer marriage fails not simply because of Nora's secret but because its foundation is inequality rather than reciprocal recognition. Ibsen's drama consequently raises enduring questions about whether marriage can remain meaningful when the identities of its participants are determined more by social expectations than by freely negotiated human relationships.

KEYWORDS: Gender roles • Marriage • Feminism • Existentialism • Patriarchy • Gender performativity • Freedom

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE • APA 7

Jatto, A. (2026). Gender roles and the failing institution of marriage in Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House*. *Concrescence Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Research*, 3(5), 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.68251/cjmr.v3i5.6>

Copyright: © 2026 The Author. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Introduction

Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House* (1879) occupies a significant position in the history of modern drama because it transforms an apparently ordinary middle-class marriage into an extended interrogation of gender, domestic power, economic dependence, morality, and individual freedom. The play opens in an atmosphere of apparent comfort. Christmas is approaching, money seems available, Torvald Helmer has secured an important position at the bank, and Nora Helmer appears to be a cheerful wife enjoying the security of a respectable home. However, Ibsen gradually reveals that the apparent harmony of the Helmer household rests upon an unequal distribution of authority. Nora is loved, but she is also patronised; she is protected, but economically dependent; she is praised, but largely for qualities that conform to conventional femininity. The home is therefore comfortable without being genuinely equal, and affectionate without necessarily providing the conditions for mutual recognition.

Ibsen's dramatic method is particularly effective because Torvald is not introduced as an obviously brutal or tyrannical husband. He is affectionate, attentive, and apparently concerned about Nora's welfare. His language, however, repeatedly places her in a subordinate position. His descriptions of her as "my little skylark" and "my squirrel" (Ibsen 8) appear affectionate, but their cumulative effect is infantilising. Nora is addressed less as an intellectually and morally autonomous adult than as a charming domestic possession. Torvald's language consequently reveals a central contradiction in the marriage: what appears to be tenderness is inseparable from a conception of Nora as someone who must remain small, dependent, attractive, and manageable. His affection is therefore structured by the same hierarchy that determines his authority. The economic organisation of the marriage makes this inequality even clearer. Nora's secret loan is not merely a convenient plot mechanism through which Ibsen generates suspense. It exposes the contradiction between the responsibilities imposed upon women and the limited authority granted to them. Nora has sufficient intelligence, courage, and practical capacity to obtain the money necessary to save Torvald's life, yet she cannot exercise this agency openly without violating legal and social expectations. Her action must therefore remain secret. She assumes a responsibility the social order does not formally recognise as hers, and the resulting conflict shows the gap between marriage's moral expectations and the institutional conditions in which it operates. This contradiction is central to the present study. *A Doll's House* does not simply portray an unhappy marriage; it asks what happens when the two people within a marriage are prevented from encountering each other as autonomous human beings. Torvald is expected to be the provider, protector, moral authority, and head of the household, while Nora is expected to be the wife, mother, dependent, and attractive ornament of the home. They consequently enter marriage carrying identities that have already been socially prescribed. Their relationship depends on successfully performing these identities until Nora's secret makes continued performance impossible. However, the historical context of the drama is important to understanding this conflict. Nineteenth-century bourgeois society assigned men and women different social functions, associating masculinity with economic independence, public authority, rationality, and decision-making while associating femininity with domesticity, emotional care, motherhood, obedience, and the preservation of family respectability. The ideology of separate spheres did not simply distinguish men's and women's activities; it also established a hierarchy between them. Public and economic life was associated with autonomy, while domesticity was represented as women's natural sphere (Welter 151–74; Davidoff and Hall 28–35). Simone de Beauvoir's observation that "Woman is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her" (*Second Sex* 26) provides an illuminating vocabulary for understanding Nora's position. She is repeatedly defined through her relationships to men: she is her father's daughter, Torvald's wife, the mother of his children, and the attractive woman who makes his domestic life pleasant.

Ibsen himself recognised the gendered character of the social order the play represents. In his "Notes for a Modern Tragedy," he observes that "a woman cannot be herself in modern society, since it is an exclusively male society, with laws made by men" (qtd. in Templeton 28). The statement is particularly relevant to Nora because the structures surrounding her - law, marriage, morality, family, and social respectability - are not neutral. They determine beforehand what a respectable woman may do and what

she must not do. Nora's forgery is judged according to legal standards formulated without adequate consideration of the circumstances that produced her action. The resulting conflict reveals how supposedly universal moral principles can operate differently by gender and social position. Thus, from the existentialist perspective, Nora's crisis ultimately becomes a crisis of selfhood. She discovers that she has spent her life occupying identities created by others. As a child, she was her father's "doll-child"; as a married woman, she has become Torvald's "doll-wife" (Ibsen 71). The movement from one role to another has occurred without the development of an autonomous identity. Nora's final question is therefore not simply whether she should remain married. It is whether she has ever been permitted to become a self in her own right. This concern brings Ibsen's drama into productive dialogue with Jean-Paul Sartre's existentialist emphasis on freedom, choice, responsibility, and authenticity. However, Judith Butler's theory of gender performativity further illuminates the repetitive character of Nora's social identity. Butler argues that gender is "an identity tenuously constituted in time through a stylized repetition of acts" (*Gender Trouble* 191). Although Butler's theory belongs to a later intellectual context, it provides a useful conceptual vocabulary for understanding Ibsen's dramatic representation of femininity. Nora continually produces the identity of the desirable wife through speech, dress, gesture, obedience, consumption, flirtation, motherhood, and domestic performance. Torvald similarly produces his masculine identity through economic provision, moral instruction, authority, and managing Nora's behaviour. The marriage consequently resembles a theatrical arrangement in which each participant has learned a role and expects the other to continue performing it.

This article argues that the Helmer marriage fails because it is sustained by unequal gender roles, economic dependence, performance and illusion rather than genuine mutual recognition. The crisis does not begin when Nora leaves; her departure is the culmination of a failure that has existed from the beginning. Nora and Torvald have lived together without truly knowing one another because their relationship has been mediated by socially prescribed identities. Feminism is therefore necessary to explain the structures that constrain Nora, while existentialism helps explain the inward transformation through which she assumes responsibility for defining herself. Together, these perspectives illuminate the interaction between social structure and individual agency that constitutes the central tension of Ibsen's play.

Feminism, Existentialism and the Construction of Gendered Identity

Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* provides an important foundation for a feminist reading of *A Doll's House*. Beauvoir's famous assertion that "one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" (283) shifts attention from biological difference to the social processes through which femininity is produced. Her argument challenges the assumption that women's social roles follow naturally from their biological sex. Instead, femininity is constructed through institutions, customs, education, morality, family expectations, and cultural practices. Nora's experience embodies this process. She has been taught what a daughter should be, what a wife should be, what a mother should be, and what a respectable woman must avoid. Her identity has consequently been shaped before she has had the opportunity to define it herself. Beauvoir's conception of woman as the "Other" further clarifies Nora's position. If man occupies the position of the Subject or norm, woman is defined in relation to him. Nora's identity is therefore relational: she is "Torvald's wife" rather than simply Nora; she is a mother whose motherhood is understood through the patriarchal family; and she is a daughter whose earlier identity was determined by her father's authority. The problem is not merely that Torvald personally treats Nora as inferior. His behaviour reflects a larger cultural structure that grants legitimacy to male authority. Nora's subordination appears natural precisely because it has been normalised.

Beauvoir's distinction between immanence and transcendence is equally significant. Immanence is associated with repetition, confinement, passivity and the maintenance of existing conditions, while transcendence involves projects, action, creativity, and the exercise of freedom. Patriarchal arrangements tend to confine women to immanence by defining them primarily through domestic repetition - cooking, cleaning, caring, reproduction, emotional labour, and the maintenance of the home - while men are more

readily permitted to pursue public projects. Nora's early existence in the Helmer household largely conforms to this pattern. She shops, decorates, entertains, cares for the children, performs affection, and helps preserve the appearance of domestic happiness. Yet Nora's secret financial activity complicates the picture. She has already demonstrated capacities that exceed the identity assigned to her. She has borrowed money, negotiated repayment, saved Torvald's life, and worked secretly to repay the debt. Her problem is therefore not incapacity but the social prohibition against openly claiming her capacity. Her action has been forced into secrecy because her society recognises male economic agency more readily than female agency. Her eventual departure thus represents an attempt to transform an already existing capacity for action into conscious self-definition.

Judith Butler's (2006) theory of performativity complements Beauvoir by drawing attention to the repeated acts through which gender becomes socially intelligible. Nora does not simply possess a feminine identity; she continually performs femininity. She knows when to appear helpless, when to ask Torvald for money, when to flatter him, when to dance, when to hide her anxiety, and when to make herself attractive. These behaviours are not necessarily insincere. Nora genuinely loves Torvald and her children. Butler's insight is instead that even sincere emotions may be expressed within socially regulated forms. Nora's affection is channelled through a gendered script. The title *A Doll's House* makes this theatrical quality particularly significant. A doll's house is a miniature domestic environment in which objects and figures have predetermined places. The Helmer home operates in a comparable manner. Torvald occupies the position of provider and authority; Nora occupies the position of dependent wife; the children reinforce the domestic structure; and social respectability provides the background against which their behaviour is judged. The house appears harmonious because everyone performs the expected role. Once Nora refuses to continue performing that role, the structure becomes unstable.

Sartre's existentialism introduces individual responsibility. In *Existentialism Is a Humanism*, Sartre argues that "existence precedes essence" (22), meaning that human beings are not simply born with a predetermined social or moral essence that dictates their lives. They become what they make of themselves through choices and actions. Sartre's concept of bad faith is particularly useful here because individuals may attempt to escape responsibility by reducing themselves to fixed identities or by pretending that social roles completely determine them. Nora initially understands herself through the identities Torvald and her father assign her. Her secret action shows genuine agency, but she interprets it primarily through the conventional language of wifely devotion. Her final awakening changes this relationship to herself. She comes to understand that neither her father nor her husband can provide the identity she must live by. When she declares that she must "stand quite alone" if she is ever to know herself and the world (Ibsen 72), she accepts the uncertainty of freedom. Her decision is existential because it provides no guarantee of happiness. She leaves without knowing exactly what will happen next. What matters is that she refuses to continue living according to an identity she no longer accepts.

Feminism and existentialism therefore illuminate different but interconnected dimensions of Nora's predicament. Feminism explains why her choices have been constrained: she inhabits a gendered social order that restricts female autonomy. Butler explains how this order is reproduced through everyday performances of femininity. Existentialism, meanwhile, illuminates the moment when Nora recognises that social identity cannot completely determine personal existence. The combination avoids reducing Nora either to a passive victim of patriarchy or to an unrestricted individual who can simply choose whatever she desires. She is a socially constrained subject who nevertheless possesses the capacity to act and eventually assumes responsibility for that capacity.

Gender Roles and Domestic Power in *A Doll's House*

The unequal structure of the Helmer marriage first becomes visible through language. Torvald's diminutives - "little lark," "little squirrel," and "little spendthrift" - create an atmosphere of affection, but they also reduce Nora to something small and dependent. His vocabulary places her within a hierarchy in which he is the mature authority and she is the playful subordinate. The important point is that

domination does not have to take the form of physical violence. In the Helmer household, power operates through language, money, social expectations, moral instruction, and the apparently harmless routines of married life. Torvald's insistence on financial discipline provides an especially revealing example. His injunction, "No debts! Never borrow!" (Ibsen 6), seems morally responsible, yet its significance changes once the audience learns about Nora's secret loan. The principle he applies to Nora does not acknowledge the circumstances that forced her to act. Nora borrowed money because she believed that Torvald's life depended upon it. She therefore acts according to an understanding of marital responsibility that conflicts with the masculine conception of financial independence represented by Torvald. The secret loan consequently exposes a contradiction at the centre of the marriage. Nora is expected to sacrifice herself for her husband, but she is denied the full authority required to make decisions on his behalf. Her role requires devotion while restricting agency. Her forgery is legally wrong, but the drama deliberately complicates the moral judgement by showing that the action emerges from care, responsibility and love. The situation exposes the gap between formal law and lived moral experience.

Money also functions as a language of power. Torvald enjoys occupying the role of provider, while Nora must ask him for money. His description of her as a "sweet little spendthrift" combines affection with economic superiority. The playful language masks the serious fact that one person controls the resources upon which the other depends. The domestic relationship therefore reproduces the wider economic hierarchy of the society in which the play is set. Nora's secret financial activity challenges this hierarchy because it shows she can act economically on her own. She has negotiated the loan and worked to repay it. Her independence, however, must remain hidden because acknowledging it would disturb Torvald's conception of masculine authority. The secret therefore becomes symbolically important: it is evidence of a self that exists beneath the role assigned to Nora.

Marriage as Performance and the Illusion of Happiness

What is described as domination through language and money is, on the surface of the marriage, experienced as contentment. The Helmer home looks happy precisely because both partners keep performing the roles their society treats as natural, and that performance is itself the illusion the play sets out to dismantle. Torvald performs the successful husband and provider; Nora performs the cheerful, attractive, obedient wife. Their happiness is therefore partly theatrical. The Christmas setting, gifts, money, domestic conversation, and affectionate language create the appearance of harmony, but the appearance depends upon both participants remaining within the boundaries of their assigned roles. The problem becomes visible when Nora begins to question those roles. Her statement that she and Torvald have lived together for years without ever having "talked seriously" (Ibsen 70) is devastating because it reveals that the marriage has been based on performance rather than communication. They have shared a home, children, economic responsibilities, and social identity without developing an equal intellectual or moral relationship.

The title of the play consequently becomes a metaphor for the marriage itself. Nora eventually describes herself as Torvald's "doll-wife," just as she had previously been her father's "doll-child" (Ibsen 71). The continuity between these two identities is crucial. Marriage has not liberated her from paternal authority; it has transferred her from one male-controlled domestic space to another. The house is therefore "doll-like" not because it is unreal in a literal sense but because its inhabitants have been arranged according to roles created outside themselves. The crisis surrounding Krogstad's letter destroys the illusion because it forces the characters to respond to a real moral problem rather than continue performing happiness. Nora has expected Torvald to prove the depth of his love by accepting responsibility for the situation. Instead, his immediate concern is his own reputation: "You have destroyed all my happiness. You have ruined my whole future" (Ibsen 66). The statement reveals that the threatened object is not primarily Nora's well-being but Torvald's social identity. Nora's shock is therefore not simply that Torvald becomes angry. It is that his reaction reveals the nature of the relationship she has been living in. She had imagined a marriage founded on mutual sacrifice. Torvald's response reveals a relationship in which her value is conditioned by her ability to support his self-image. His affection can accommodate the

charming and dependent Nora; it struggles to accommodate the autonomous woman who has acted independently.

The Tarantella and the Performance of Femininity

The tarantella scene condenses the play's treatment of gender performance into a single dramatic spectacle. Nora appears in costume and dances while Torvald watches, comments, and attempts to regulate her movements. His instruction, "Not so fast, Nora! Not so wild!" (Ibsen 51), is significant because it reproduces the larger pattern of the marriage: Nora is permitted to perform, but Torvald expects to control the limits of her performance. The dance also externalises Nora's anxiety. She simultaneously performs the role of the attractive wife and tries to prevent the revelation of her secret. Her body becomes the site at which social performance and private fear collide. The increasing intensity of the dance makes visible the instability beneath the surface of domestic happiness. From a Butlerian perspective, the tarantella demonstrates that gender is maintained through repeated bodily acts. Nora's femininity is not merely an inner identity; it is displayed through costume, movement, speech, and behaviour. The scene becomes especially revealing because the performance begins to exceed the controlled boundaries Torvald prefers. What appears to be natural femininity is revealed as an activity that requires continual performance. The tarantella also anticipates the final confrontation. Nora's body first resists the choreography before her language ultimately rejects the identity imposed upon her. The dance therefore functions as more than entertainment. It prepares the audience for the moment when Nora will cease performing altogether and speak to Torvald without the protective language of conventional marital roles.

Nora's Awakening and the Crisis of Recognition

Nora's awakening does not arrive in a single moment of revelation. It gathers slowly, as the distance between how she is seen and who she actually is becomes harder and harder to ignore. At first, she believes that the moral value of her secret action will eventually be recognised. Her questions to Krogstad - "A daughter hasn't a right to protect her dying father from anxiety? A wife hasn't a right to save her husband's life?" (Ibsen 25) - reveal a developing moral consciousness. She believes that love creates responsibilities that may exceed formal legal rules. Yet the fact that she must ask these questions shows that she has not fully developed an independent moral framework. Torvald's reaction to the crisis becomes the decisive moment because it destroys Nora's faith in the marriage. She has expected him to understand the sacrifice she has made. Instead, he condemns her. The result is an existential shock. The woman she believed herself to be - a beloved wife protected by a loving husband - can no longer exist in the same form. Her realisation culminates in the declaration: "You have never loved me. You have only thought it pleasant to be in love with me" (Ibsen 70). The distinction between loving a person and enjoying being "in love" with a person is central to the play. Nora recognises that Torvald's affection has been directed toward an image of her rather than toward a fully independent self. He loves the performance because it confirms his identity as husband and provider. This is the point at which the failure of recognition becomes the failure of marriage. Nora wants to be recognised as a thinking, morally responsible individual; Torvald continues to define her through conventional categories. The conflict is therefore deeper than whether Nora committed forgery. It concerns whether she has the right to exist as a person whose judgement is not permanently subordinate to that of her husband.

Nora, the Other and the Search for Self-Definition

Beauvoir's concept of woman as the Other provides a particularly useful interpretation of Nora's awakening. As long as Nora defines herself through her relationship to her father and husband, she remains within a structure in which another person occupies the position of Subject. Her statement, "I have other duties equally sacred... duties to myself" (Ibsen 68), challenges that arrangement. The statement should not be interpreted simply as a rejection of motherhood or marriage. Nora does not claim that her responsibilities to her children have no value. Instead, she argues that these responsibilities cannot completely eliminate her responsibility to herself. She recognises that she cannot become a

genuinely responsible human being if she remains permanently dependent upon someone else's definition of her identity. Torvald's response - "First and foremost, you are a wife and a mother" (Ibsen 71) - summarises the patriarchal position against which Nora is struggling. He defines her through social roles. Nora's answer, "Before all else I am a reasonable human being" (Ibsen 71-72), rejects that reduction. She does not deny that she is a wife or mother; she denies that these categories exhaust her humanity.

The significance of this moment lies in its insistence upon personhood before prescribed social function. Nora must become a person capable of independent judgement before she can determine what wifehood or motherhood should mean for her. Her decision is therefore not simply an escape from domestic responsibility. It is an attempt to acquire the capacity for responsible choice. This is where Beauvoir's distinction between immanence and transcendence becomes particularly useful. Nora has spent years maintaining an established domestic order. Her departure interrupts that repetitive existence and opens the possibility of self-directed activity. Yet transcendence is not presented as a guaranteed achievement. She must create a new life rather than enter one that has already been prepared for her.

Read through Sartre, Nora's departure looks less like an escape than like the taking-up of a burden. To walk out is to accept responsibility for a self that no one else will define for her any longer. Sartre's claim that human beings are "condemned to be free" (*Existentialism Is a Humanism* 34) captures the paradox of Nora's final decision. Freedom is not represented as comfort or certainty. It means accepting responsibility for choices without possessing a guarantee that those choices will produce happiness. Nora's earlier life has been protected by predetermined identities. She was a daughter; then she became a wife and mother. These roles provided a framework within which she could understand herself without confronting the full burden of self-definition. At the end of the play, she abandons that certainty. She does not know where she will live, how she will support herself, or what her relationship with her children will become. Her decision is nevertheless meaningful because she refuses to continue living according to an identity she has recognised as inadequate.

This movement also complicates any interpretation of Nora as simply a rebellious woman. Her action is not merely oppositional. It is constructive in the existential sense because she leaves in order to discover what kind of person she can become. Her freedom is therefore inseparable from responsibility. She must learn, decide, work, and live without the guarantee that another person will define reality for her. The existential dimension of the ending also prevents the play from becoming a simple argument that leaving marriage automatically produces liberation. Nora's future remains unknown. Ibsen does not replace one predetermined identity with another. Instead, he leaves her at the beginning of a process of self-definition. The uncertainty of the ending is therefore part of its philosophical force.

Torvald and the Crisis of Masculinity

Nora occupies the dramatic centre of the play; however, Torvald's character is essential to understanding Ibsen's critique of gender. Patriarchy does not simply privilege men; it also confines men within rigid expectations of masculinity. Torvald's identity depends upon being the provider, protector, moral authority, and guardian of family reputation. He has social power that Nora does not, but his identity is still shaped by expectations he has not consciously chosen. His reaction to Nora's secret demonstrates how deeply his sense of self depends upon reputation. The possibility of public exposure threatens not merely his marriage but his masculine identity. His statement that "No man would sacrifice his honour for the one he loves" (Ibsen 70) exposes the gendered moral standard governing his thinking. Nora's response - "Millions of women have done just that" (70) - reveals the asymmetry: women are expected to sacrifice themselves for family, while men are expected to preserve honour and authority. Torvald therefore cannot imagine love outside the hierarchy that has defined his marriage. He believes that being a husband means protecting Nora, but his conception of protection assumes her dependence. He believes that being a provider gives him the authority to regulate her conduct. He believes that being a moral guide gives him the right to determine the boundaries of acceptable behaviour. His problem is not merely personal selfishness; his understanding of masculinity has made equality difficult to imagine. This

observation does not make Torvald and Nora equivalent victims. Nora's position is structurally more restricted. Torvald enjoys economic and social privileges that Nora lacks. Nevertheless, the play suggests that hierarchical gender roles damage relationships because they deny both participants the possibility of meeting as fully autonomous individuals. Nora is confined by femininity, while Torvald is confined by a masculinity that equates authority with love and control with responsibility.

Marriage and the Failure of Mutual Recognition

The central failure of the Helmer marriage is therefore not the secret loan itself. The loan is the immediate cause of the dramatic crisis, but the deeper cause is the absence of mutual recognition. Nora and Torvald have lived together for years without developing the equality necessary for genuine partnership. Nora's description of the household as a "playroom" is crucial because it connects the institution of marriage directly to the title of the drama. She has been Torvald's "doll-wife," just as she was previously her father's "doll-child." The children, in turn, have become dolls within the same domestic arrangement. The house is attractive, orderly, and respectable, but its inhabitants have been assigned roles rather than encouraged to develop autonomous identities. Marriage in the play therefore becomes an institution whose meaning depends upon what occurs within it. Ibsen does not suggest that marriage must necessarily destroy individual freedom. Instead, he exposes what happens when marriage is organised around hierarchy. The institution claims to unite two people, but the relationship can become oppressive when one person is treated as the subject and the other as an extension of that subject. This is why Nora's departure has such dramatic force. She is not merely leaving a husband she no longer likes. She is leaving a model of marriage in which equality has been sacrificed to appearances. Her departure forces the audience to distinguish between marriage as a legal and social institution and marriage as a relationship between autonomous human beings. The contrast with Mrs. Linde and Krogstad further develops this issue. Mrs. Linde's experience demonstrates the material pressures under which women make decisions. Her life has been shaped by economic necessity, widowhood, and responsibility. Her eventual movement toward Krogstad differs from Nora's relationship with Torvald because it involves a greater recognition of shared vulnerability and the need for honesty. Through these contrasting relationships, Ibsen suggests that marriage becomes more meaningful when it is based upon mutual responsibility rather than prescribed hierarchy.

The Wider Social Critique

The Helmer household cannot be separated from the larger social institutions surrounding it. The crisis in the Helmer household is never purely private. The forces bearing down on Nora, the bank, the law, the marriage contract, the expectations of respectability- reach well beyond the drawing room, and Ibsen keeps them deliberately in view. The bank represents economic authority; the law determines the legitimacy of Nora's financial action; social morality defines respectable femininity; and the family reproduces expectations concerning male authority and female sacrifice. Nora's crisis therefore exposes a network of social structures rather than an isolated marital problem. The law matters because Nora's situation shows the difference between formal equality and lived equality. She is expected to care for her husband and family, but the legal and economic structures available to her restrict her ability to act openly on those responsibilities. Her forgery is thus morally and legally complicated. Ibsen does not simply excuse the action; instead, he puts the audience in the uncomfortable position of asking whether a law can be morally complete when it fails to recognise the circumstances of the person it judges. Mrs. Linde's experience reinforces this social dimension. Her life shows that women cannot be understood solely through domestic sentiment because economic survival shapes personal decisions. Marriage, work, money, and social status are interconnected. Her experience also complicates a simplistic opposition between men and women by showing that women themselves negotiate patriarchal structures in different ways. The play's critique therefore extends beyond Torvald as an individual. Even if Torvald were replaced by another man, the social expectations surrounding marriage would remain. Ibsen's dramatic achievement lies in making the private household reveal the larger structure of society. The apparently

intimate relationship between husband and wife becomes a site where law, economics, morality, gender, and social reputation intersect.

The Door Slam and the Meaning of Freedom

The final closing of the door remains one of the most memorable gestures in modern drama because it condenses the play's central conflict into a single physical action. The door separates Nora from Torvald, but it also separates two conceptions of human existence. Before it closes, Nora remains physically within the domestic structure that has defined her. After it closes, she enters an uncertain world in which she must take responsibility for herself. The significance of the door should therefore not be reduced to the idea of escape from an unhappy husband. It represents the rejection of a particular conception of marriage—one based on hierarchy, dependence, performance, and illusion. The door closes because the old relationship can no longer provide the conditions for genuine recognition.

Toril Moi's (2006) discussion of Ibsen's modernism is useful here because the drama does not simply substitute one stable social identity for another. Nora enters uncertainty. The audience is denied the reassuring conclusion that her new life will automatically be successful. The absence of certainty makes the ending more existentially significant. Nora has not reached a final identity; she has claimed the right to begin creating one. The closing door therefore functions simultaneously as an ending and a beginning. It ends Nora's participation in the Helmer marriage as previously constituted, but it opens the possibility of a life in which she can make choices without first asking whether they conform to Torvald's expectations. The sound of the door is therefore the dramatic expression of a philosophical transformation: Nora moves from being defined to attempting to define herself.

Conclusion

Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House* presents the failure of marriage as the consequence of a deeper failure of equality, recognition, and authentic human relationship. The Helmer marriage appears stable because Nora and Torvald perform identities that nineteenth-century bourgeois society recognises as appropriate. Torvald is the provider, protector, moral authority, and head of the household, while Nora is the charming wife, mother, dependent, and ornament of the domestic sphere. Their apparent happiness therefore depends less upon mutual understanding than upon the successful maintenance of prescribed gender roles. The feminist framework developed through Simone de Beauvoir and Judith Butler makes this structure visible. Beauvoir's conception of woman as the Other explains why Nora has difficulty understanding herself outside her relationships with men. Her distinction between immanence and transcendence further clarifies the significance of Nora's movement from repetitive domestic conformity towards self-directed action. Butler's theory of gender performativity reveals how femininity is maintained through repeated acts of speech, dress, gesture, obedience, consumption, and domestic behaviour. The doll's house, the tarantella, Nora's costume, and Torvald's diminutive language all contribute to Ibsen's representation of gender as something continuously enacted and socially regulated. On the other hand, Sartrean existentialism adds a complementary dimension by illuminating Nora's movement towards responsibility and self-definition. Her final decision is significant not simply because she rejects Torvald but because she accepts the difficult responsibility of discovering who she is outside the identities imposed upon her. She leaves without certainty. She has no guarantee that independence will bring happiness, economic security, or social acceptance. Her freedom is therefore not presented as an easy reward but as a difficult responsibility. Torvald's character further demonstrates the complexity of Ibsen's treatment of gender. Patriarchy grants him authority and privilege, but it also binds him to a restrictive conception of masculinity based upon provision, honour, reputation, and control. His inability to recognise Nora as an autonomous person reveals the limitations of a masculine identity constructed through authority over others. This does not make his position equivalent to Nora's. Rather, it shows that hierarchical gender arrangements damage the possibility of genuine reciprocity even while distributing power unequally.

Ultimately, the Helmer marriage fails because it attempts to unite two people while denying one of them full subjecthood. It celebrates love while organising love through possession and dependence; it values morality while allowing social conformity to replace moral reflection; and it presents the home as a place of security while making independent selfhood difficult within it. Nora's secret loan exposes these contradictions, but it does not create them. The crisis merely makes visible what the marriage has always concealed. Nora's departure consequently represents more than the dissolution of a particular marriage. It marks the collapse of a model of marriage founded upon hierarchy and illusion and opens the possibility of another model based upon equality, dialogue, responsibility, and recognition. The famous door slam does not promise that Nora will succeed. It does not even guarantee that her decision will lead to happiness. Its significance lies in the fact that she chooses to confront uncertainty rather than continue living within an identity created by others.

Ibsen's continuing relevance lies precisely in this refusal to provide a simple resolution. *A Doll's House* asks whether love can survive without equality, whether marriage can remain meaningful without mutual recognition, and whether a person can live authentically while continuously performing an identity determined by social expectations. Nora's departure does not answer these questions conclusively. Instead, it transfers them from the stage to the audience. The door closes on the old arrangement, but the larger question remains open: what kind of relationship becomes possible when two human beings are permitted to encounter each other not primarily as roles, possessions, or social functions, but as autonomous and responsible individuals?

ORCID iD

Abdulazeez Jatto  <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6261-6075>

Declarations

Conflicts of interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Works Cited

- Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Translated by H. M. Parshley, Vintage Books, 2011.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge, 2006.
- Davidoff, Leonore, and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780–1850*. University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Ibsen, Henrik. *A Doll's House*. Translated by Michael Meyer, Methuen, 2010.
- Moi, Toril. *Henrik Ibsen and the Birth of Modernism: Art, Theater, Philosophy*. Oxford UP, 2006.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*. Translated by Hazel E. Barnes, Routledge, 2003.
-*Existentialism Is a Humanism*. Translated by Carol Macomber, edited by John Kulka, Yale UP, 2007.
- Templeton, Joan. *Ibsen's Women*. Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Welter, Barbara. "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820–1860." *American Quarterly*, vol. 18, no. 2, 1966, pp. 151–174.