

This article was downloaded by:

Publisher: KKG Publications

Registered office: 18, Jalan Kenanga SD 9/7 Bandar Sri Damansara, 52200 Malaysia



Key Knowledge Generation

Publication details, including instructions for author and subscription information:

<http://kkgpublications.com/social-sciences/>

Counterattack of Julie: Feminist Reading of August Strindberg's *Miss Julie*

NAYOUNG YANG

Yonsei University, Seoul, South Korea

Published online: 18 June 2016



CrossMark

To cite this article: Yang, N. (2016). Counterattack of Julie: Feminist reading of August Strindberg's *Miss Julie*. *International Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 2(3), 91-97.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.20469/ijhss.2.20001-3>

To link to this article: <http://kkgpublications.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/2/Volume2/IJHSS-20001-3.pdf>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

KKG Publications makes every effort to ascertain the precision of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, KKG Publications, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the content. All opinions and views stated in this publication are not endorsed by KKG Publications. These are purely the opinions and views of authors. The accuracy of the content should not be relied upon and primary sources of information should be considered for any verification. KKG Publications shall not be liable for any costs, expenses, proceedings, loss, actions, demands, damages, expenses and other liabilities directly or indirectly caused in connection with given content.

This article may be utilized for research, edifying, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly verboten.

COUNTERATTACK OF JULIE: FEMINIST READING OF AUGUST STRINDBERG'S *MISS JULIE*

NAYOUNG YANG *†

Yonsei University, Seoul, South Korea

Keywords:

August Strindberg
Miss Julie
Modern Drama
Female Subjectivity
Feminist Reading
Re-Reading
Nineteenth Century

Received: 28 February 2016

Accepted: 25 April 2016

Published: 18 June 2016

Abstract. *Miss Julie* is mostly judged as an anti-feminist play reinforcing patriarchy, especially in that the author himself claims to be a misogynist. According to his preface to the play, Strindberg is exerting his offense against female subjectivity as far as he could. However, regardless of what the playwright intended or believed, the text itself rather subverts and criticizes traditional male-oriented society. This study argues how *Miss Julie* originally purposed to trample female subjectivity creates counter-effects, based on textual evidence such as characterization of the main character (Julie), theatrical devices, and the ending. Before delving into the text, stereotypical female representations prevalent in nineteenth-century male-authored texts will be discussed in order to demonstrate how *Miss Julie* is different from them. Then, previous studies' predominant views of the play are introduced briefly. Furthermore, similarities between *Miss Julie* and other feminist texts will be presented as a schema to illustrate how the play can be viewed as feminist. Feminist readings of *Miss Julie* are significant that a male misogynist playwright writes the play in the nineteenth century. It not only deconstructs another bias that only women can discuss woman's rights.

©2016 KKG Publications. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

August Strindberg was in the vanguard of modern drama along with Henrik Ibsen; however, his own notion about gender seems to be ironically not so much "modern". He believed that females are untrustworthy, and the most and only suitable position for them is to be submissive and subordinate supporting males. He claimed to be a misogynist, expressing antipathy and repugnance toward modern females—subject, independent women who speak up their voice to be heard. According to his preface to *Miss Julie*, such modern females are "inferior species" who spread wretchedness that they cannot sustain (Strindberg, 1999a, p. 859). Also, by saying that "unfortunately" (Strindberg, 1999a, p. 859) they breed "indeterminate sex to whom life is a torture" but "fortunately" their descendents are destructed at the end (Strindberg, 1999a, p. 860), Strindberg is exerting his offense against modern females as far as he could.

As Vowles and Steene (1973) mentioned "Strindberg's dramatization of one of Sweden's earliest feminists is both biased and provocative" (p. 133), *Miss Julie* has been often read as an anti-feminist text along with Strindberg's preface as if it operates as a predetermined guide in terms of reading the play. On the other hand, regardless of what the playwright intended or what he believed, the text itself seems to have its own vitality; in other words, the text originally intended to trample female

subjectivity rather creates counter-effects. This paper argues how *Miss Julie* written by a misogynistic author rather subverts and criticizes the pre-existing patriarchic society based on textual evidence such as characteristics of the main character (Julie), theatrical devices, and the ending.

Feminist readings of *Miss Julie* are significant in that it deconstructs another stereotype—possessive exclusivism: a misconception that female characters represented by male authors can hardly achieve more freedom from patriarchy than those by female authors and reevaluates the male author's work from a different perspective. It also signifies the change within modern society without one's awareness.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Miss Julie is widely renowned play of the playwright, as Marker and Marker (2009) also mentioned, "[it] is probably still the play most commonly associated with Strindberg's name" (p. 135). The play has been performed and enjoyed throughout the world. Moreover, the play was not merely confined to the stage but "inspired many transpositions into other media, including film, opera, musical, radio, television, and ballet" (Szalczar, 2011, p. 122). Regarding the recent release of the namesake film in 2014, it is more timely opportunity than ever to revisit the original. Strindberg's *Miss Julie* is significant not only because it represents one of the important modern dramatists

*Corresponding author: NaYoung Yang

†Email: cherrymarble@naver.com



but because of the powerful cultural influence on the public inherent in the play.

Previous studies predominantly viewed *Miss Julie* as an anti-feminist play that merely reinforces patriarchy, reflecting the author's misogyny revealed in the preface. Written afterwards, the preface functions as a compass, considered inevitable to navigate the play. Even though the total separation is impossible and unnecessary, Chaudhuri (1993) claimed, "The preface is wrapped around and folded into the play it introduces to a degree unusual even for the heavily prefaced documents of a self-conscious dramatic modernity" (p. 319). Chaudhuri (1993) pointed out that, regardless of the actual timeline, being attached at the very front of the publication is the reason why the exclusive relationship between the play and its preface was formed, creating disjunction from "the plays compositional past" (p. 319).

It is undeniable that Strindberg's preface to *Miss Julie* entails a few fairly significant concepts relevant to his dramaturgy; however, it should not reign over the play, since "Strindberg's preface utterly disproves the assumption that a prefatory essay is inherently more univocal and less ambiguous than a literary work" (Chaudhuri, 1993, p. 321). Self-reliance of a text is not an exceptional case of *Miss Julie*. Macherey (1978) discoursed on the autonomy of literary work: "It is a law unto itself and acknowledges only an intrinsic standard, an autonomous necessity" (p. 52). What he meant by autonomy is different from closure. According to Macherey (1978), as much as its independency, "The literary work must not be considered as a reality complete in itself, a thing apart, under the pretext of blocking all attempts at reduction; this would be to isolate it into incomprehensibility as the mythical product of some radical epiphany" (p. 53). It is, thus, important to read, to view literary texts from miscellaneous and compositional perspectives apart from everything attached precedent from the point where the reading begins.

Another major factor which leads to the assumption that *Miss Julie* is anti-feminist is the ending of the play: the suicide of Julie. Oh (1996) defined *Miss Julie* as a frustrated romantic comedy where Julie's love cannot be achieved (p. 126). In her view, Julie is controlled and dominated by Strindberg to kill herself which, as a result, defeats her (Oh, 1996, p. 140). Likewise, Hong (2010) concluded that Julie's choice is an inevitable outcome from giving up her own freedom or/and subjectivity (p. 324). Szalczar (2011) also claimed "[Jean] suggests that [Julie] cut her throat with his razor" (p. 35). Vowles and Steene (1973) viewed Julie's suicide is her choice; however, it is the reaction, according to Vowles and Steene, only after Jean hypnotizes Julie (p. 52). Moreover, quoting from Strindberg's preface,

Vowles and Steene (1973) defined Jean as a "race-builder to whom Julie must succumb" (p. 52). Here is the interesting point where the distinctiveness of this paper from others appears. Unlike its predecessors, this paper argues that Julie's suicide is not only her own choice but also an extreme defiance at the same time, which will be elaborated later.

To demonstrate why *Miss Julie* can be read feminist and how it is different from other anti-feminist texts, stereotypes of women should be provided first. The representations of female characters in literature of that time were problematic. Most of them were either "the angel in the house" or "the monster-woman" (Gilbert & Gubar, 1979, p. 2031). What is worse than the binary itself is that either way, women are eventually effaced by diseases or deaths. Gilbert and Gubar (1979) argued that "the angel in the house" suffered from "sickness unto death" giving the example of Snow White (p. 2031). It is one side of the stereotypical male fantasies considering women as fragile creatures who have to be rescued or cured by prince charming. On the other hand, "monster-woman" (Gilbert & Gubar, 1979, p. 2031) often represented as a witch, prostitute, queen or femme fatal cannot avoid such disastrous consequences as well because she has to be punished for being talkative; in other words, under patriarchal socialization, both active and passive females are repressed and imprisoned by appropriated illness, especially by what is defined as "female disease[s]" (Gilbert & Gubar, 1979, p. 2031). Julie cannot be summarized or categorized under patriarchy, due to the complexity that the character bears, which will be discussed later.

As well as the distance from anti-feminist stance, it is noteworthy that *Miss Julie* has various similarities with other so-called "feminist texts" such as "Red Shoes," *Jane Eyre*, and *Trifles*. To begin with, physical or mental condition of Julie portrayed by others, especially by Jean, demonstrates the relation between subjectivity and madness of females in the nineteenth century. Julie who constantly dances is described as "strange," "crazy," and "sick" according to Jean. In a poem "Read Shoes" written by Anne Sexton, the act of dancing represents female subjectivity (Gilbert & Gubar, 1979, p. 2032). Dancing Julie, exerting her desire, toward her sexuality or/and identity, is incomprehensible in his perspective. More explicitly, Julie's mother who commits arson as a revenge to her husband is identical with Bertha in *Jane Eyre*. Moreover, the play has several symbols in common with *Trifles*. Both not only are set in a kitchen, which symbolizes oppressed female, but also use the bird in a cage as a symbol that signifies female imprisoned in the patriarchy. All of those mentioned above is not merely mimetic but parallel. *Miss Julie* does not simply reinforces the patriarchal society but demonstrates what it was like to be a woman in the nineteenth

century.

Characterless Julie

It is significant to recognize that Julie is a non-stereotypical, multi-dimensional character. As enshrined in the title, *Miss Julie* is full of intense presence of Julie and her feminine force. She is “characterless” as to quote from Strindberg (1999a), meaning “the person who continued to develop. so difficult to understand, classify, and keep track of” (p. 858). The consequence that Julie encounters does not arise from a single cause. It is in fact triggered by multiple factors as Strindberg (1999a) mentioned in his preface:

I have motivated Miss Julie's tragic fate by a great number of circumstances: her mother's primary instincts, her father raising her incorrectly, her own nature, and the influence of her fianc on her weak and degenerate brain. Also, more particularly: the festive atmosphere of midsummer night, her father's absence, her monthly indisposition, her preoccupation with animals, the provocative effect of the dancing, the magical midsummer twilight, the powerfully aphrodisiac influence of flowers, and finally, the chance that drives the couple together into a room alone-plus the boldness of the aroused man (p. 858)

Since Strindberg (1999a) “does not believe in simple theatrical characters,” (p. 859) in the process of building an authentic dispositions of human beings, he naturally reflected that of women not different from men without being aware of it.

Julie's characteristic of non-traditional female is also revealed through her use of language during the conversation with Kristine. Given that she uses verbs such as “lend” and “steal,” Julie views Jean as a property, which might be plausible for their class hierarchy. What is interesting is that she does not treat Jean as a valet who belongs to her or her family. She rather treats Jean as a male who belongs to a female character, Kristine, by asking her “Won't you lend me Jean?” (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 466); saying “Don't worry. Kristine! I won't steal your sweetheart!” (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 467). Her viewpoint on relationship between Jean and herself no longer exists in terms of class issues, but in terms of female power as Kristine is involved.

The importance of complexity that female character has is enlarged as Strindberg focused on emotional aspects of Julie; in other words, as he focuses on the psychology of her in the process of incarnating the character as a Naturalism playwright, it implicitly highlights the reality: women's oppressed sexuality and subjectivity under the patriarchy. The focus here is not on the psychoanalysis of the character but on the effects of Strindberg's ways of building the characteristic of Julie. Through Julie's voice, the difficulty of acquiring identity as a female

under male-oriented society is revealed:

Julie: Whose fault is what's happened? My father's, my mother's, my own? My own? I don't have anything that's my own. I don't have a single thought that I didn't get from my father, not an emotion that I didn't get from my mother, and this last idea that all people are equal I got that from my fiance. (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 480)

Julie constantly pursues her identity in her own way. She is aware of the social context expected to be followed by females that sexual desire of female cannot be expressed. Julie knows that her mother had to suffer due to the society that tried to inflict on her subjectivity; however, Julie expresses hers and constantly endeavors to escape from the imprisonment by appropriating Jean as a tool. Therefore, she chooses love “to protect and excuse herself” (Strindberg, 1999a, p. 861). As she says “But I don't care about that - that's what I'm putting behind me! Show me you love me, otherwise, what am I?” (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 472), it is clear that Julie is trying to define herself other than class and gender, both of which are made by and expected from the patriarchy.

The most dramatic scene is where Julie pours her resentment in the middle of the blood-pool where her greenfinch is killed by the Jean. “I'd like to see your blood and your brains on a chopping block! I'd like to see your whole sex swimming in a sea of blood, like my little bird. I think I could drink from your skull!” (Strindberg, 1999, p. 477). According to Gilbert and Gubar (1979), women under patriarchal socialization can only exist as an image in miniature since they are not empowered to escape the fabricated world set by men (p. 2029). The greenfinch in a cage symbolizes Julie trapped under the patriarchy. The death of the bird implies the death of Julie and her rebirth out of the confinement. Pinching out the errors in Jean's viewing of her, Julie rebuts the misconception about females that males have.

Theatrical Devices

Strindberg deployed several theatrical devices in the play which as a result support feministic reading of the text. Unfortunately for Strindberg, unlike his original intention to defeat Julie by abusing his authoritative power as a playwright, continuous frustration of her rather discloses the paradox and anxiety of patriarchal society. From the beginning to the end of the play, Strindberg constantly pushed Julie to the edge and executes her, at least in his opinion, for attempting to reach subjectivity; however, constantly frustrated and confused Julie ironically makes the readers wonder what her problems are, of which makes them deeply focus into her.

Also, on the other hand, Strindberg empowered Jean with the romanticized masculinity as he mentioned in his preface “[Jean]

is superior to Miss Julie because he is a man. Sexually, he is an aristocrat because of his masculine strength..." (Strindberg, 1999a, p. 861) and projected his own voice. When Julie asks about the difference between men and women, Jean postulates that there is fundamental difference between them by saying, "The usual difference between man and a woman" (Strindberg, 1999a, p. 479). All of Strindberg's efforts not only reveals male anxiety but also demonstrates the reality where chasm within traditional society occurs. By suppressing females as object, males trying to sustain their world only prove, in the end, the anxiety they feel.

Male anxiety is also revealed through a layer of concealment: class. It is clear that Jean is deeply aware of class issues. What he owes to Kristine is neither love nor affection but identity politics based on their class. It is more plausible in the scene where he defends Kristine who falls asleep against Julie; however, relationship between them should not be viewed based on their class difference in that Jean's desire to reverse the hierarchy is only applied to Julie. After sexual relationship, to Jean, his inferiority coming from his class is overcome with physical conquer. By saying "We're in the same boat!" (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 472), Jean exerts his recovered masculinity which results from by thinking he successfully degraded her. On the other hand, Jean does not show any kind of inferiority or antipathy against the Count, male counterpart whose economic class is equivalent to Julie. Therefore, class is not a single issue in power dynamics between Julie and Jean, which again, exposes and reflects male anxiety for females superior to them. *Miss Julie* is a consummate play replete with remarkable assets of the genre. Unlike other literary texts, drama comes into its completion finally when it is staged. The performativity of the genre understandably highlights what will be happening on stage. What is more important, however, is, paradoxically, what is not happening, what is not verbalized or enunciated, and what is not staged or visible—the presence of absence which does not mean nothingness but ambush. Reading (or viewing) the play without considering implicit nonverbal language and invisibility oversimplifies the compound beauty lied in the play. *Miss Julie* can be appreciated by reading between the lines meticulously, which as a result enables feminist reading of the play.

Julie is the one who takes advantage of nonverbal communication to have Jean in her pocket. When they encounter at the beginning of the play, what needs to be focused more than the dialogue is the stage directions:

Jean (gallantly): Are you ladies up to something secret? Julie (flicking her handkerchief in his face): None of your business! Jean: Hmm! I like the smell of violets! Julie (coquettishly): Shame on you! So you know about perfumes, too? You certainly

know how to dance. Ah, ah! No peeking! Go away (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 466).

She flicks her handkerchief scented with violets at Jean who "gallantly," and yet, ignorantly enjoys the fragrance. Sensuous olfaction synergizes secrecy that Julie creates for Jean, adding mystique. Julie might have known her handkerchief smelled like violets as she "coquettishly" says, "So you know about perfumes." Through flowery scent as a tempting bait, she is emanating her sexuality to drive Jean to the direction preset by her.

Julie's desire toward her sexuality is implied later again when she spots Jean with Kristine making physical contact. Witnessing Jean's arm around Kristine's waist, Julie peevishly accuses Jean of leaving her while dancing. Since dancing deeply involves physical movements, it is presumable that she is keep asking him to dance with her for some kind of involvement, whether it is physical, or at least an eye contact, which is expected to lead herself to the fulfillment of her own desire. When Jean makes a reasonable excuse, Julie quickly changes the subject in different tone into his attire which should be removed: "Take it off at once!" (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 467). Given that both dancing and undressing are related to a body, Julie is searching a way to access Jean's body without letting him know.

Julie's research on Jean in terms of her sexuality becomes more drastic and manipulative as the drama unfolds. She starts to ask for sexual information to Jean:

Jean: No, she doesn't, but she talks in her sleep. Julie (cynically): How do you know? Jean (audaciously): I've heard her! (Pause, during which they stare at each other.) (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 467)

As Jean blurts out that Kristine talks in her sleep, Julie "cynically" asks him "how does [he] know" that. The question can never be interpreted literally. Julie is not curious about the route of the discovery. What she means is: how does he know, unless they have spent nights together. Realizing the connotation, Jean tells her that he overheard it, which apparently is a lie. What is noteworthy is the "pause, during which they stare at each other." By reading between the lines, it can be told that Julie knows Jean is lying, and Jean notices Julie is aware of his lie. The awkward moment creates peculiar tension between them. Both of the characters are speaking by not speaking. The silence euphemistically forms the presence of erotic undertone.

The presence of erotic vibe created before becomes explicit when Julie helps Jean whose eyes might have swept by her sleeve (Rokem, 1997, p. 232). Here, the nonverbal language of Julie is as significant as it has been. First, "she takes [Jean] by the arm and seats him. She tilts his head back and with the tip of

a handkerchief [scented with violets] tries to remove the speck.” Then, “she slaps his hand” and “feels his biceps,” exclaimatorily saying “What muscles you have!” (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 469). Taking advantage of the situation, Julie directly projects her sexuality on her hands. Her hands become the representatives of her sexual desire. They no longer exist and function as external body parts merely in charge of tactile sense but refer to Julie’s entire body as a synecdoche, which eventually are transposed to vocal apparatus. She is speaking nonverbally. In that sense, demanding Jean to “kiss [her] hand and thank [her]” (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 469) is the most covert, and yet explicit enunciation of her sexual desire.

Julie’s demand continues as following: “Have you ever been in love?” (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 469). Here and afterwards, “[she] insists on continuing down the road she has taken by starting a discussion about the women Jean has loved, again asking for erotic information from a servant” (Rokem, 1997, p. 233).

From the beginning, Julie relentlessly searches ways to fulfill her desire, all of which quite does not content her, because according to Rokem (1997), information she gets from Jean is “the relevant abstract information so she uses him to get the experience itself” [italics mine] (p. 228). It might seem that Julie and Jean are forced off to his room unavoidably by the external factor, approaching villagers, which drapes the fact that it is Julie herself who hints that they should go into Jean’s room and bolt the door. Julie is rafting on the flow of the situation, mixing herself in.

Again, however, as Julie’s sexual desire has been lurking beneath throughout the play, the experience itself is hidden from the audiences/readers; offstage; invisible; veiled; which only allows them to imagine. The missing page can be traced down from what happens right after. “Miss Julie enters alone. She notices the mess in the kitchen, wrings her hands, then takes out her powder puff and powders her nose” (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 471).

Julie does not panic, cry, or lose her composure. She is calm as if nothing has ever happened. Therefore, the implied sexual intercourse between them can never be a manifestation of male sexuality. As Rokem (1997) mentioned “in *Miss Julie*, the servant Jean serves as the direct tool as well as object of Julie’s sexual experience” (p.228), Julie is a puppeteer who pulls the strings from behind. The strings, nonverbal or invisible, are the chains that interlink and bridge apertures within the play.

Survive through Death

The death of Julie is controversial in that she voluntarily ends her life by her own hands. Higonnet (1985) admitted that “women’s voluntary deaths are even more difficult to read than

men’s because women’s autonomy is always in question and their intentions are opaque” (p. 103). Ambivalence is inherent in suicide, caused by the collision between the connotations of death and choice, and yet, it is often (mis)treated and downgraded as surrender. Julie’s death, in particular, requires to be read meticulously between the lines because of non-verbal language and non-visibility enfolding her death.

When Julie narrates an anecdote of her parents, “death” begins to overcast the play inch by inch. From Julie’s narration, it is clear (or at least to her) that both of her parents lived unhappy lives. It is significant to recognize that her father does attempt to kill himself by a gun but fails, and her mother does not even try: “It nearly drove him to suicidethere was a rumor that he tried with a pistol, but failed. So, he managed to live through it and my mother had to suffer for what she’d done” [italics mine] (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 474). Witnessing her parents’ frustrated life, Julie might have not wanted to follow their footsteps. Julie’s attitude toward life and death is contoured through her narrative. While talking to Jean about their afterwards, Julie recurrently conjures up death:

Julie: No! To be happy fortwo days, a week, as long as we can be happy, and thendie...

Jean: Die? That’s stupid! It’s better to open a hotel!

Julie: You don’t want to die with me?

Jean: I don’t want to die at all! For one thing, I like living, and for another, I think suicide is a crime against the Providence which gave us life. (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 475)

Without directly speaking “I want to die” or “I will kill myself”, she is speaking through what she does not say. Long before Jean so-to-speak “commands” her to kill herself, she decides to disconnect herself from where she cannot find her self.

Though conceding that “a woman may thus choose death after defilement, not to confirm her status as property, but to reaffirm her autonomy” (Higonnet, 1985, p. 109). Higonnet (1985) viewd Julie as a puppet manipulated by Jean: “When the valet Jean hands his mistress the razor with which she will kill herself, he commands her to do the deed and she walks offstage in a hypnotic stupor. The reversal of their social relationship in this moment is a superficial irony, for his is indeed the voice of a larger, patriarchal social order” (p. 113). As examined above, however, Julie has been already considering suicide as the ultimate resolution, as a drastic defiance, as a “way out” (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 475). To her, death is a sanctuary of which no one or nothing can deprive: “And then he’ll have a stroke and die That’ll be the end of all of us and therell be peace quiet eternal rest!...” (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 478).

The ending of the play is the most important part where subversion occurs implicitly but dramatically. As the bell rings twice,

notifying the return of the Count, both Julie and Jean panic. As other studies viewed, as introduced before, on the surface, Jean seems to be the one that hypnotizes Julie. Surprisingly, it is Julie who hypnotizes Jean to re-hypnotize her. Moreover, Jean is the one paralyzed and suffocating from his fear:

Julie: ...You will it, you order me to do it! Jean: I don't know why-but now I can't either-I don't understand. It's as if this coat made it impossible for me to order you to do anything...I think if the Count came down here now and ordered me to cut my throat, I'd do it on the spot. Julie: Then pretend you're he, and I'm you!... (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 480)

Julie's suicide is not a defeat but a victory. She "firmly" (Strindberg, 1999b, p. 480) denies the reality by her death, whereas Jean is willing to succumb to the oppressive reality as the Count comes back. Moreover, open ending of the play intensifies her dignity even more. Without showing her suicide on the stage, the play only implies her death. This does not make her as a victim lying on the floor but a tragic hero walking out of the play, which as a result creates a new center outside what used to be the one. As Chaudhuri mentioned "Invoking the impressionist painters and their idea of asymmetrical and open composition, Strindberg breaches the naturalistic contract of total visibility in its own name, substituting a partial visibility offered as an invitation to the spectator's cooperative imagination: Because the audiences cannot see the whole room and all the furniture, they have to surmise what's missing; that is their imagination will be stimulated to fill in the rest of the picture" (p. 325) about the expressionistic stage, there are somewhat a lot of blanks to be filled in Strindberg's play including its ending. The invisibility, non-visibility of the play ironically demands the audiences, the viewers, the readers to focus on what is missing, concealed, hidden through their imagination.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Miss Julie is full of the presence of feminine forces. The title that represents the play itself already indicates it, and a single act amplifies the spotlight on Julie. Her passion toward her sexuality, her identity, emerges through her alluring and brutal language of which both verbal and nonverbal. Also, along with menstruation appeared in Jean and Kristine's dialogue, other bodily movements such as mime and ballet all together highlight female sexuality. Julie is a self-conscious figure already aware of social context that confines her own desire; however, she manipulatively expresses her desire through appropriating Jean as a tool to escape from the suppression. She is not a victim defeated by sexual desire of male, but a subversive subject who achieved the identity in her own way by sublime method.

Even though Strindberg asserted his own hatred in the preface, "Strindberg's portrait of Julie in the play is much more sympathetic than his view of her in the preface" (Vowles & Steene, 1973, p. 53). No matter what the author intended, the text itself lives its own life and is completed by the readers (or the audiences). "Writing" according to Barthes (1977) "is that neutral, composite, oblique space where our subject slips away, the negative where all identity is lost, starting with the very identity of the body writing" (p. 142). The voice of the author evaporates, "the author enters into his own death" (Barthes, 1977, p. 142), and "the author is never more than the instance writing, just as I is nothing other than the instance saying I" (Barthes, 1977, p. 145). To read a text keeping the author or his voice in mind is only to hinder the infinite imaginative potentials of literary works, as Barthes (1977) trenchantly evinced, "To give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing." (p. 147)

REFERENCES

- Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, music, text*. (S. Heath, Trans.). New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
- Chaudhuri, U. (1993). Private parts: Sex, class, and stage space in *Miss Julie*. *Theatre Journal*, 45(3), 317-332.
- Gilbert, S. M., & Gubar, S. (1980). *The madwoman in the attic: The woman writer and the nineteenth-century literary imagination*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Higonnet, M. (1985). Suicide: Representations of the feminine in the nineteenth century. *Poetics Today*, 6(1/2), 103-118.
- Hong, J. (2010). Woman's image and the struggle for the power in Strindberg's *Miss Julie*. *Foreign Literature Studies*, 38, 309-330.
- Macherey, P. (1978). *A theory of literary production*. London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Marker, F. J., & Marker, L. (2009). Strindberg in the theatre. In M. Robinson (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to August Strindberg*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Oh, K. (1996). *Miss Julie* as a frustrated romantic comedy. *Journal of Modern British and American Drama*, 5, 125-141.
- Rokem, F. (1997). Slapping women: Ibsen's *Nora*, Strindberg's *Julie*, and Freud's *Dora*. In L. H. Lefkowitz (Ed.), *Textual bodies: Changing boundaries of literary representation* (pp. 221-243). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Strindberg, A. (1999a). Author's preface to *Miss Julie*. In W. Levy (Ed.). (1999). *Modern drama: Selected plays from 1879 to the*

present. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Strindberg, A. (1999b). Miss Julie. In W. Levy (Ed.), *Modern drama: Selected plays from 1879 to the present* (pp. 465-480). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Szalczner, E. (2011). *August Strindberg*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Vowles, R. B., & Steene, B. (1973). *The greatest fire: A study of August Strindberg*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

— This article does not have any appendix. —