The theme of female emancipation is relevant in both Ibsen’s *A Doll’s House* and Hauptmann’s *Einsame Menschen.* Yet, the extent in which this theme is explored will differ between the two plays as a result of a number of differing factors. In the case of *A Doll’s House,* the play deals with the theme of female emancipation as the forefront of its narrative course, embodied in the female characters of Nora and Mrs. Linde in order to illustrate Ibsen’s view in regard to female oppression. Having been known to traditionally hold conservative views towards women, it is thanks to the influence of Camilla Collett, a renowned outspoken feminist that Ibsen underwent a change in opinion in regard to the oppression of women and their right to freedom which is demonstrated in *A Doll’s House.*

In Hauptmann’s *Einsame Menschen,* the exploration of the theme of female emancipation comes in a different form in comparison to that of Ibsen’s *A Doll’s House.* Although Hauptmann’s character of Anna Mahr can be considered to demonstrate ideals of the emancipated woman by representing the age of new enlightenment, due to the lack of development within the character herself, many critics seem torn in advocating the argument in favour of her emancipation which has led to differing interpretations of Anna and thus a different treatment to the theme of emancipation in the play as a whole.

Due to Collett’s apparent heavy involvement in the influence of the play, applying analysis in reference to her emancipation ideology seems appropriate and can provide some insight into Ibsen’s treatment of the theme. Collett was very much in favour of the notion that marriage should be a fruitful union, a union which would promote mutual growth among ‘two equal partners with mutual duties to respect and guide each other’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.24). She argued that in the same way the husband was expected to teach the wife, the wife also carried this obligation for her husband. Although upper class men were educated and developed reflective minds and thus were considered superior, they seemed to lack in the area of moral standards whereas women were deemed more naturally refined in this regard. Therefore, through this argument, men needed guidance from their female counterpart just as much as the wives did from their husband deeming the two to be equal within their marriage.

In a similar fashion, it would be significant to also quickly note the outline of the nature of the characters in *Einsame Menschen* in comparison to Hauptmann’s earlier works to also provide some insight into Hauptmann’s characterization of Anna and subsequently his treatment of the theme of women’s emancipation: ‘the figures of Einsame Menschen are no longer specimens chosen to demonstrate a specific thesis, they are no longer isolated from the world around them, and Hauptmann no longer dislikes them. He has achieved simultaneously both fuller characterization and a more sympathetic understanding of his people, has found for the first time in the drama, his true focus’ (Sinden, 1957, p.37). With this notion in mind, this perception holds true for the characters of Kathe, whose role of the average German housewife seems fitting, alongside the older Vockerats, who ‘are of a sturdier material, more practical more dogmatic, more certain of themselves and of their world’and who’s ‘conception of the nature of man and of God are rigid, absolute, and unswerving’. (Sinden, 1957, p.39). Additionally, the character of Braun also remains close to this notion, who ‘as a harmless Mephisto to Johannes’ crippled Faust, he provides an excellent foil for his impatient friend’ (Sinden, 1957, p.39).Collectively**, ‘**there has been general agreement that all of these people, Kathe, Braun, and the father and the mother, are both intensely alive and completely fitted to their roles in the total economy of the play’ (Sinden, 1957, p.39).Yet, for the characters of Johannes and Anna, this is not the case, as agreed upon by other critics as ‘the serious representatives of the new generation offered problems of presentation and of comprehension which the other characters did not, and problems which Hauptmann die not always solve easily and completely’ (Sinden, 1957, p.39).The ambiguity of Anna’s role and function in the play is seen as one of the contributing factors to the debate surrounding her argument as an emancipated female. With these frameworks in mind, a contrast in the way in which both author’s deal with the theme of female emancipation can already be inferred. As Collett’s ideology runs so closely to many key aspects of Ibsen’s play, the theme of female emancipation is going to protrude more distinctively in comparison to *Einsame Menschen,* where there is debate surrounding Anna Mahr, the female representative who may controversially demonstrate ideals of female emancipation but may also be considered to reject them as well.

With the ideals of Collett’s feminist attitude in mind, they are explored through the marriage of Nora and Torvald and her role as his wife, with the title of the play drawing upon a few underline themes and ideas. The motif of the ‘doll’ is significant when we draw the comparison to Nora. A doll is a toy, an object devoid of any thought or emotion and is a form of amusement for its owner. On the surface, Nora can be considered to very much adhere to these ideals as she appears as an ‘eager-to-please, doll like wife, nearly a child’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.29). However, this image is disputedthrough the saving of her husband’s life which demonstrates that she is not a child but only upkeeps this façade in order to fulfil her longing for having and maintaining a family. Relating Nora’s act of saving her husband’s life to Collett’s feminist ideology, this can be seen as a form of emancipation as ‘by quest for freedom, Camilla Collett meant respect for women’s value and worth as human beings’**(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.29).The concept of respect and more specifically self-respect was of particular significance to Collett when it came to freedom, forwarding the notion that ‘to become free, women had to be treated with respect by their surroundings in order to be able to become aware of their worth, and then they had to do substantial inner work to gain self-respect’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.29). Ibsen very much explores this idea of self- respect being linked to ideas of freedom in the character of Nora. This is demonstrated in the strong sense of pride expressed by Nora in the fact that she was able to save her husband’s life and raise the money herself to pay off the debt stated in her dialogue with Krogstad:

* “Hat eine Tochter nicht das Recht, ihren Vater vor Sorgen und Ängsten zu bewahren, wenn er alt und im Sterben liegt? Hat eine Frau nicht das Recht, das Leben ihres Mannes zu retten?“ (Ibsen, 1992, p.50)

In this regard, Nora can be seen to demonstrate an example of emancipation through her own self-worth.

The child-woman complex played by Nora is not a new kind of persona, harking back to the works of Goethe and Shakespeare. However, in this instance Nora is playing a very risky game as Torvald expects her to be obedient but as the narrative progresses the cracks in her façade begin to show as her ambivalent character comes to the fore. The concept of hiding and keeping things hidden are inextricably linked to the character of Nora, right from the outset of the play. Whilst hiding things like the Christmas tree and her eating of the macaroons inside the house, she also hides her true characteristics, playing the role of his ‘squirrel’ and ‘lark’. Nora completely masquerades herself at the fact that she is the one who saved her husband’s life by borrowing money and this remains completely unknown to him. When we depict the nature of Nora’s and Torvald’s relationship, it is clear that Torvald treats her as a possession rather than a partner who he treats as an equal.Ibsen even subtly hints that because Torvald covered up Nora’s father’s embezzlement and therefore saved him from public disgrace, Torvald bought his wife as an exchange. In this sense Torvald has always considered Nora as his possession from the outset of their relationship and this is also how Nora interprets their marriage**.** Ibsen is clearly forwarding the notion that their marriage could have been more successful if Torvald had treated Nora as an equal and less of a possession. Relating the dynamic of Nora and Torvald’s marriage to Collett’s ideological framework, Ibsen has set up their marriage to indicate how an inequality in treatment towards your partner will not allow a woman to feel emancipated in her own marriage therefore the two become separated by the end of the play.

The depiction of their marriage allows Ibsen to highlight ‘two disparate ethical standards’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.31). Torvald’s being ‘based on his concerns about his own reputation in the perspective of society’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.31) whereas ‘Nora’s ethics are based on her concerns about the welfare of the family as a separate unity’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.31)**.** Although Nora could be considered to adhere to the typical expectations of a woman in bourgeois society by being bound to her family, it is within Nora staying true to her ethical standards that we can consider her to be emancipated as this is also a rejection of ‘the traditional interpretation of the husband as the family’s rational mind’**(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.31)**.** However, linking back to Collett’s definition of a marriage in which both partners should be regarded as equals and despite Nora’s interpretation of marriage being very much in line with this definition, she must have a change in behaviour if she ever wants her marriage to become this. In order to upkeep the dynamic of their relationship in which Torvald’s has the position of authority, Nora remains constantly subservient to him, undermining her won talents. However, if Nora truly wants there to be a shift in their relationship, she must abandon her façade of the child- women as their marriage will never be equal if she maintains this. Subsequently, Torvald must also be willing to comply and allow Nora to live by her own standards yet this idea seems quite far-fetched according to the final discussion between the two.

In this play, Ibsen depicts the institution of bourgeois marriage as ‘a masquerade where neither of the partners is honest to the other and women are traded as commercial objects rather than respected as worthy human beings’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.33). Although on the surface, Nora’s acts of rebelling and acting on her own accord (by saving her husband’s life) can be seen as a form of emancipation to an extent, this fact still remains hidden from her husband and within the marriage which draws upon the real issue. Ibsen is thus implying that in order for a woman to feel emancipated within her marriage both partners must be treated equally and be given equal opportunity and as this is not the case for Nora and Torvald they break up.

Contrasted with Nora and Torvalds marriage, Mrs. Linde and Krogstad newly established relationship seems to depict the ideal marriage and thus can also serve to illustrate a similar point that equal treatment between partners is needed for a successful marriage to work. Unlike that of Nora and Torvald, their relationship is based upon a mutual realization of a need for each other. Krogstad has no objection to accepting the fact that he wants the guidance of Mrs. Linde, ‘claiming he would have been different had Mrs. Linde stayed with him’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.33). Mrs. Linde can be seen to embody the ideals of natural female refinement demonstrated through Krogstad’s transition from a crook to a gentleman by the end of the play under her female guidance.Mrs. Linde openly stating how she wants to assume the role of a mother to Krogstad’s children is in her view not sacrificing herself but ‘claims that she is fulfilling her need to be of use’**(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.34)**.** Although adhering to traditional gender expectations, it is different in this case when Mrs. Linde wants to pursue the role of a mother as it brings her fulfilment, granted to her by her relationship with Krogstad. A parallel between Nora and Mrs. Linde can be drawn here as both wish to become mothers as a form of fulfilment, rather than seeing it as a sacrifice. As a result, Krogstad is pronounced the winner of play, being rewarded with a loving relationship in which both members acknowledge the importance of mutual respect and treatment within the framework of a marriage. In essence, both the couples of the play act to demonstrate Collett’s ideals when it comes to marriage to a certain extent but in differing ways. Nora and Torvald’s marriage did not conform to Collett’s idea of a real union and thus had to break up whereas Krogstad and Mrs. Linde seem to adhere to these ideals, so the potential of a successful marriage looks more promising.

The exploration to the theme of female emancipation is clearly indicated in the character development of Nora and Mrs. Linde and their marriages. Contrastingly, the character of Anna features holes and contradictions. However, for arguments sake it would be significant to note how **‘**Hauptmann understood better than some of his critics what may happen to a woman when she moves into fields formerly considered the province of men’ (Sinden, 1957, p.40).Anna’s past and upbringing may position her in favor of an emancipated female; she was brought up through a hard education and ‘she has had to stand alone, in a new position, in a changing world, with little money’ (Sinden, 1957, p.40).Her experiences echoed in her cry: “Ach! Freiheit!! Freiheit!! Man muss frei sein in jeder Hinsicht. Kein Vaterland, keine Familie, keine Freunde soll man haben“ (Hauptmann, 1942, p.84). With the knowledge of Anna’s upbringing in mind, it seems less incredible that in the warming presence of family life which is new to her combined with the love she has for Johannes, Anna can be seen to relax as she finds comfort in her surroundings and in ‘understanding Käthe’s limits, she cannot always refrain or feel that she ought to refrain from moving towards the possession of the man whom she loves’ (Sinden, 1957, p.41).As ‘Hauptmann was never given to underestimating the power of hearth and eros even on enlightened and clear-sighted people’ (Sinden, 1957, p.41), it serves to provide some explanation in his choice of characterization and also serve to alleviate some critique towards her actions.

Anna’s inability to refrain from that which would object to her ideal of ‘Freiheit’ eg. ‘keine Familie’ and ‘keine Freunde’, is exactly what would alleviate her from being assumed as a female ideal. Although seemingly contradictory, her actions make her more human as she, in the first time in in her life, finds herself among a family. In contrast to *A Doll’s House,* Anna’s orientation into family life and acceptance of such is precisely what objects her to the ideal of the emancipated female whereas the exact opposite is the case for Nora and Mrs. Linde. As both Nora and Mrs. Linde wish to fulfill the role of the mother and create a family as it provides them with a sense of fulfilment, this is considered as a form of emancipation as it is a role they are choosing to assume, rather than viewing it as self-sacrifice. However, a direct comparison that distinctly separates the two from one being an example of not conforming to the ideals of female emancipation and one that does demonstrate such ideals may not be accurately drawn here as the circumstances differ between character to character. In the case of Anna, her motivations do not align with that of Mrs. Linde and Nora who want to create a nurturing family in comparison to Anna who just finds herself in one so naturally the interpretations between the characters will conclude differently. Nevertheless, there is a clear point illustrated in each narrative where the concept of family orientation favours female emancipation in one (*A Doll’s House)* and subverts this idea in the other (*Einsame Menschen)*.

It is clear that the problems surrounding Anna are only indicated rather than being fully explored by Hauptmann. For this reason, as already stated, it makes the character of Anna open to interpretation. However, much of the debate regarding her position as an emancipated female can be disputed when we regard Anna only as a secondary character and thus justifying Hauptmann’s narrative choice in her lack of development. In viewing the central theme of the play to predominantly revolve around the Vockerat family and ‘on the breakdown of their middle- class ideals of marriage, faith, and a settled career in the service of church or state’ (Sinden, 1957, p.42),Anna assumes a secondary role, as we mainly see ‘her reaction to their problems, to the life such a family is accustomed to lead, and its attraction for her’ (Sinden, 1957, p.42).In this sense, her traits of being a philosophy student and an emancipated woman are overlooked as the main themes of the play take their course. With this in mind, Hauptmann’s treatment of the theme of female emancipation contrasts quite significantly with that of Ibsen. In *A Doll’s House*, the theme of female emancipation is explored significantly as one of the main themes of the narrative through Nora, who is one of the central characters of the play. Additionally, Mrs. Linde also acts as a central figure in exploring the ideals of female emancipation as she serves to illustrate a similar point. With this in mind, the exploration of the theme of female emancipation is naturally going to contrast between both plays if in one play (*Einsame Menschen*) the central narrative does not revolve around exploring such a theme and if the assumed female representative of emancipation (Anna Mahr) is regarded as a secondary character whereas Nora and Mrs. Linde are more central characters to the plot and are used to represent the ideals of Ibsen and Collett.

Drawing further on the idea of respect and its significance in regard to female liberation,according to Collett ‘only the respect of the surroundings can initiate the sense of inner worth necessary to start the liberation process’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.34). However, both Nora and Mrs. Linde do not fit this description as the idea of sacrifice, a concept relevant to both characters contradicts this statement. Mrs. Linde married a man out of necessity for financial support in order to aid her mother in her last years and provide an education for her brothers. In a similar fashion, Nora sacrificed her integrity and committed a criminal act in order to save her husband by forging her father’s signature and both females appear proud of their sacrifices, thus ‘the play demonstrates that sacrificing one’s own happiness for the sake of other people’s wellbeing was regarded as a female duty’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.34)**.** In her other works, Collett explores themes of female sacrifice and its destructive consequences yet here Ibsen subverts this notion, ‘demonstrating how the habit of making sacrifices gives women self-respect’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.34)**.** Despite this, in the context of the 1870s, self-sacrifice for the well- being of others would not be enough for women to gain respect, particularly if it was initiated and carried out on the ethical standards of women themselves. The example of Laura Kieler, a Norwegian woman who Ibsen knew, can be used as an example and some direct parallels can be seen to Nora’s narrative. She married a Danish minister who was ill and she borrowed money to save his life without him knowing. She struggled to repay her debts and after this was uncovered, her husband rejected her, took away her children and she was put into an asylum. Nora’s final exit is an indication of a rejection of this notion thus depicting her as a utopian model as ‘in 1879 even the strength to make a break was a utopian female role model’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.36). In essence the character of Nora doesn’t so much explore ideals of female emancipation only through act but also through the rejection ‘of conventional Victorian womanliness’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.36)**.**

In citing Wilhelm Heise, his analysis of Anna Mahr concluded that ‘the dramatist (Hauptmann) has not made it clear what kind of woman she is’(Sinden, 1957, p.40).Much of Heise’s misunderstanding towards Anna stems from many of her contradictory features. In reference to Johannes and Kathe’s marriage, Anna implies that it was just youthful folly: ‘Er war noch Student…’ (Hauptmann, 1942, p.62) and she says to Kathe, ‘Du warst noch sehr jung…’ (Hauptmann, 1942, p.62). Despite this, many critics including Heise question as to why Anna did not decide to stick to her original plan and leave having stayed for two weeks after realizing how Käthe was suffering. However, she appears sincere in the end when she explains to Johannes that she must leave for the sake of his marriage. Additionally, she remains ‘too sensitive to the feelings of others to attempt to defend herself when Frau Vockerat asks her to go’ (Sinden, 1957, p.40). For these reasons, ‘a woman with such contradictory features is, according to Heise, not feasible’ (Sinden, 1957, p.40). However, in viewing Anna’s departure from a different perspective, we can consider it to be a form of self-sacrifice and thus draw a parallel to that of Nora and Mrs. Linde. If we carry over the notion from *A Doll’s House* in which ‘the habit of making sacrifices gives women self-respect’ **(**Ørjasæter, 2005, p.34)**,** Anna’s departure can be considered to adhere to this as she decides to leave for the sake of Johannes and Käthe’s marriage despite her love for Johannes herself. Drawing upon this comparison, we can consider Anna to demonstrate ideals of the emancipated woman if we apply the notion of self-sacrifice being an example of female emancipation across all the afore mentioned female characters.

In drawing comparison between the characters of Nora and Anna Mahr and their involvement in the theme of female emancipation, both can be seen to both conform and subvert the idea of being considered as the ideal emancipated woman to different extents. Although Nora ‘represents a dawning women’s rights emancipation movement’ **(**Schyberg, 1939, p.133) as stated by Schyberg, Ørjasæter goes further in stating ‘**t**hat Nora is so much stronger than the real bourgeois women of her day because she has the self- respect they were denied. Nora is not a realistic image of a bourgeois woman of her time’ (Ørjasæter, 2005, p.21)**.** Her role within the narrative is probable, however the strength demonstrated from Nora to ‘turns her into a possible utopian model for women of the future, allowing them to create a free individual identity’(Ørjasæter, 2005, p.22). The depiction of Anna as a utopian model for women and thus not an accurate portrayal of a bourgeois woman detracts from her realistic presentation of an emancipated female, a notion forwarded by Orjasaeter as he states ‘Nora is a utopian model for the time to come when women are given possibilities to develop their self- respect/ Nora’s role is to become the new, free woman but to reject the old model’(Ørjasæter, 2005, p.36).

In a similar fashion, Anna Mahr can also be considered as a rejection of the ideal female model through her assimilation with the Vockerat family, as her inability to refrain from finding comfort within the family objects to her definition of ‘Freiheit’. Although both characters can be interpreted to not entirely adhere to the ideals of female emancipation to an extent, Ibsen still definitively uses the character of Nora to express his opinions in regard to female oppression whilst her depiction as a utopian model for the future still carries its legitimacy whereas Anna Mahr’s rejection of the female ideal can still support the notion of her disputing her identification of an emancipated female as her characterization as one is the topic of much debate.

Both Nora and Anna Mahr make a departure in their respective texts, Anna departing from the Vockerat family and Nora leaves Torvald and her marriage and the departure in both contexts can be considered as demonstrating their advocation as emancipated females. In the case of Nora, her marriage is presented as an environment which is unable to provide her with the possibility of feeling emancipated as the concept of mutual respect is lacklustre, thus Ibsen uses her departure as a rejection of this notion as this is essentially an indication of Nora’s liberation as well as a dismissal of identifying her as a realistic submissive woman from 1879.

As for Anna Mahr, her departure can be interpreted as an argument for her role as an enlightened woman. Her experience and education seem to have allowed her to gain an understanding of the distinctive differences that separate the younger generation with that of the older generation as well as how an individual’s perception of the world can differ profoundly to that of another. “Sie werten anders, als Ihre Eltern werten “(Hauptmann, 1942, p.283). Anna tell’s Johannes, „Ihre Eltern werten anders als, als Frau Käthe wertet. Darüber lässt sich gar nichts sagen, meiner Ansicht nach” (Hauptmann, 1942, p.283).Due to her ability to step back and assess the situation, Anna chooses to leave for the sake of Käthe and Johannes’ marriage and if we consider this as a form of self- sacrifice, it can also be considered to demonstrate the ideals of the emancipated woman. In this sense, both authors have chosen to feature a character’s departure to infer some advocation of them being representative as emancipated women.

The reception regarding the theme of female emancipation in Hauptmann’s *Einsame Menschen* is one that has left many critics with differing opinions, particularly in regard to the character of Anna Mahr. Andreas Salome who many would consider as a prime example of an emancipated woman and had a close relationship with Hauptmann was very much in favour of this notion. Being very much under the impression that she herself had influenced Hauptmann in his writing of Anna Mahr, she very much rejected the idea of being identified with her, suggesting ‘als Studentin aus Zurich sei sie nur erkenntlich, weil sie als solche bezeichnet sei’ (Peters, 1976, p.222). Consequently, this led to ‘die zunehmende Entfremdung zwischen Lou und Hauptmann‘ (Peters, 1976, p.222), as Hauptmann did not portray ‚jenes Geistes und Charaktereigenschaften der modernen Frau, die Lou am höchsten schätzte‘ (Peters, 1976, p.222). Despite this ‘On the other side of the issue are those critics for whom Anna is a totally emancipated woman, as well as a convincing character within the play’ (Schroeder, 1979, p.125). In Paul Fetcher’s analysis, Anna is in fact the heroine of the play, whose only criticism may be ‘etwas zu viel tendenziöse Geistifkeit’ (Fechter, n.d, p.56). Additionally, many critics highlight her intelligence indicated by her enrolment as a student at the university of Zürich. Hauptmann’s characterization of Anna Mahr has resulted in a mixed reception to her assumption as an emancipated woman, even ninety years after its first staging.

In a similar fashion, the reception to Ibsen’s *A Doll’s House* has also received mixed responses in terms of the play’s feminist issues, which have been incited by Ibsen himself in his speech to the Women’s league in 1898:

* ‘‘I am not a member of the Women’s Rights League. Nothing I have written stems from any deliberate trend. I have been more of a poet and less of a social philosopher than is usually believed. I thank you for your toast but must disclaim the honor of having deliberately worked for women’s rights. I am not even sure what women’s rights really are. To me it has been a matter of human rights. And if you read my books carefully, this point will be clear. Solving the woman question would of course be a desirable effect, but this has not been my sole purpose. My task has been to describe mankind” (Bull, 1930, p.417).

The speech itself conveys Ibsen’s own intention in not wanting to put the play’s entire emphasis onto its feminist concerns. Consequently, this has led to many scholars arguing that Ibsen’s play‘is about freedom in general rather than freedom for women in particular’ (Ørjasæter, 2005, p.40). A notion stressed by Collett was the interconnectedness of the sexes and how, ‘in her view, women’s freedom was not separate from men’s. Men and women were equally dependent on each other, which meant no man was free either until women were treated with respect’ (Ørjasæter, 2005, p.41).This notion is clearly agreed upon by Ibsen in his writing of the play. Although the play predominantly concerns itself with feminist issues, with the knowledge of Ibsen’s speech to the Women’s league in 1898 in mind, his treatment to the theme of emancipation gains a different angle of interpretation, one in which his dealing solely into the theme of female emancipation becomes less transparent. With this notion, a comparison here can be drawn to *Einsame Menschen,* in which the treatment of the theme of emancipation is similar if we consider both author’s initial intention to not predominantly want to focus on it.

In conclusion, the theme of female emancipation is prevalent in both Ibsen’s *A Doll’s House* and Hauptmann’s *Einsame Menschen,* yet they differ in the manner in which such as theme is explored. Being mainly interpreted through the female characters of Nora, Mrs. Linde and Anna Mahr, the characterization of each female allows for a variety of analyses but the lack of development in Anna Mahr’s character inhibits a direct comparison to that of Nora and Mrs. Linde. Nevertheless, some comparison can be drawn across these characters which can argue them to be more similar than one might initially infer. Ultimately though, Ibsen’s play revolves around the image of a utopian female ideal, alluding to a future in which women would be able to gain respect and achieve inner freedom whereas the theme of emancipation is not explored as exclusively if we consider the events revolving around the Vockerat family to be the inherent focus of Hauptmann’s play.
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