

Vreni Hockenjos

## Strindberg through Bergman A Case of Mutation

The work of Ingmar Bergman seems to be connected to that of August Strindberg in a very close and special way. Bergman once described his relationship to the famous playwright with the following words:

If you live in a Strindberg tradition, you are breathing Strindberg air. After all, I have been seeing Strindberg at the theater since I was ten years old, so it is difficult to say, what belongs to him and what to me.<sup>1</sup>

Ever since the early 1960s, literature and film scholars have pointed out parallels between single Bergman films and selected Strindberg plays.<sup>2</sup> My own focus lies not so much on how Bergman is influenced by Strindberg, but how he has worked with the material and shaped it through his own understanding and interpretation.<sup>3</sup> This 'mutation' I want to follow through Bergman's productions of Strindberg's *Ett Drömspel* (*A Dream Play*, 1901) for stage and television, to his film *Persona* (1966). In particular, I aim to look closer at how Bergman treats and

---

<sup>1</sup> Samuels, 'An Interview', 1975, p. 130.

<sup>2</sup> As examples might be mentioned: Steene, *Ingmar Bergman*, 1968; Johns, *Strindberg's Influence*, 1976; or Törnqvist, *Between Stage and Screen*, 1995.

<sup>3</sup> Egil Törnqvist in particular has worked in this field before.

elaborates the issue of subjectivity under the different media conditions, since Strindberg's ideas on subjectivity seem to have played an important role for Bergman, as Egil Törnqvist has pointed out:

Man kan i själva verket fråga sig om det inte är just subjektivismen - eller kanske rättare svävningen mellan subjektivt och objektivt, dröm och verklighet, svårigheten att fastställa vad som är vad - som gjort att Strindberg betytt så mycket för Bergman.<sup>4</sup>

The notion of subjectivity reflects a philosophical view of reality as no longer existing as an unproblematic and objective phenomenon.<sup>5</sup> Summarized in Strindberg's words out of *En blå bok* (*A Blue Book*, I-IV, 1907-1912): "Vi leva ju icke i verkligheten utan i våra föreställningar av verkligheten."<sup>6</sup> This idea of a subjective reality is also used as a compositional principle for their fictional works. Strindberg is said to be one of the first in literary history to have written 'subjective dramas', most prominently in his post-Inferno phase. But already Strindberg's Naturalistic play *Fadren* (*The Father*), published in 1887, seems to be an early experiment of what Hanno Lunin has referred to as "[t]he self and its subjective perspective becoming, through what is spoken, understandable as the linking moment of unity instead of [a] plot-oriented or chronological context".<sup>7</sup>

Both Strindberg and Bergman have repeatedly used the same meta-

---

<sup>4</sup> "One can actually wonder if it is not exactly subjectivity - or maybe more correctly, the hovering between the subjective and the objective, dream and reality, the difficulty of determining what is what - that made Strindberg mean so much to Bergman." Törnqvist, 'Subjektivt gestaltande', 1996, p. 83. Translations from Swedish and German to English are mine.

<sup>5</sup> Also other scholars have acknowledged that it is the specific perception of reality that constitutes the core of Bergman's great affinity for Strindberg: e.g. Marker, *Life at the Theater*, 1992, p. 122; Steene, 'Strindbergs språk', 1995, p. 40.

<sup>6</sup> "We do not live in reality but in what we imagine to be reality." SS 46-48:169.

<sup>7</sup> "Das Ich und seine subjektive Perspektive werden durch das Gesagte als bindendes Einheitsmoment anstelle [eines] handlungsmässigen oder chronologischen Zusammenhangs verständlich." Lunin, *Dramen*, 1962, p. 44.

phor to describe their perception of life and art: the metaphor of a dream. It is in the state of dreaming that a subjective reality is fully experienced; an inner cosmos becomes the only existing reality. A reality that is created and ruled by the dreamer in its center, even though the dreamer is not aware of this condition until the moment he or she awakens. That Strindberg's *A Dream Play* seems to occupy a key position in Strindberg's work as well as in Bergman's, comes therefore as no big surprise. Strindberg is by far Bergman's first choice among playwrights to produce and it is *A Dream Play* that holds a record, for Bergman has staged it no less than four times during his career.<sup>8</sup> At the same time one can find allusions to the famous play in several of Bergman's films. The television production *Efter repetitionen* (*After Rehearsal*, 1983) deals with an elderly theatre director who is about to stage *A Dream Play* for a fifth time.<sup>9</sup> In *Viskningar och rop* (*Cries and Whispers*, 1974) Bergman named the main character "Agnes" after Indra's Daughter from *A Dream Play* as an "hommage à Strindberg".<sup>10</sup> Possibly most important is the fact that Bergman also chose to end his last feature film *Fanny och Alexander* (*Fanny and Alexander*, 1982) with a tribute to the play by letting Alexander's grandmother (Gunn Wällgren) quote from its preface ("Erinran"): "Allt kan ske, allt är möjligt och sannolikt. Tid och rum existera icke; på en obetydlig verklighetsgrund spinner inbillningen ut och väver nya mönster".<sup>11</sup> If we continue the quote from Strindberg's introductory note, we come upon the often cited lines that point to the idea of a dreamlike subjectivity:

---

<sup>8</sup> *The Ghost Sonata* vies for second place. With Bergman's forthcoming production at the *Royal Dramatic Theatre* in Stockholm (1999/2000), he will have staged this Strindberg play also four times including one non-professional production.

<sup>9</sup> One should be cautious when attempting to read *Efter repetitionen* as some exact autobiographic document; at the time Bergman wrote the manuscript, he had only produced *A Dream Play* three times.

<sup>10</sup> Bergman, *Bilder*, 1990, p. 88.

<sup>11</sup> "Everything can happen, everything is possible and probable. Time and space do not exist; on an insignificant basis of reality the imagination spins, weaving new patterns."

En blandning av minnen, upplevelser, fria påhitt, orimligheter och improvisationer.

Personerna klyvas, fördubblas, dubbleras, dunsta av, förtätas, flyta ut, samlas. *Men ett medvetande står över alla, det är drömmarens*; för det finns inga hemligheter, ingen inkonsekvens, inga skrupler, ingen lag. [my italics]<sup>12</sup>

Strindberg's reference to an all-encompassing dreamer seems a clear indication of *A Dream Play's* subjective perspective. The problem is, however, that looking closer at the actual dramatic text, one soon becomes aware that such an idea is only realized very ambiguously. Theatre producers and scholars alike are still at variance about whether Strindberg is referring to one of the stage figures as the ruling consciousness, or to himself as the actual author of the play. Alternatively, he may have intended the spectator to be the dreamer since it is in his or her imagination that the play is finally put together.

Bergman also intended to find answers to this question; as different as his four productions of *A Dream Play* are otherwise, they all share the same basic conception of establishing the identity of the dreamer. At *Dramaten* in 1970 Bergman appointed the stage figure of the *Poet* to be the dreamer. In Strindberg's original text the Poet does not appear until the latter half of the play, but Bergman recognized his central role by appending a short scene at the beginning of the performance. In this scene, the Poet sat at his writing desk and initiated the events by whispering Agnes' first lines into her ear. Even when Agnes and the other characters acted out a life of their own, Bergman left no doubt about their connection to a dreamer-creator, for he kept the Poet and his writing desk present on stage throughout the play.

---

<sup>12</sup> SV 46:7. A mixture of memories, experiences, free fantasies, absurdities, and improvisations.

The characters split, double, multiply, evaporate, condense, dissolve, assemble. *But one consciousness rules over them all, that of the dreamer*, for him (it) there are no secrets, no incongruities, no scruples, no laws."

In Bergman's second *Dramaten* production of *A Dream Play* in 1986, which was also his most recent one, a similar concept was used. Only this time the special position of the Poet seemed to be directly linked to Strindberg. Bergman made this clear by adding to an omnipresent writing desk, pieces of *Jugendstil* furniture, which - as Lise-Lone and Frederick Marker have observed - "alluded unmistakably to Strindberg's room in the Blue Tower."<sup>13</sup> Bergman thus turned the Poet into an *alter ego* of Strindberg.

In his German production of *A Dream Play* at the *Residenztheater* in Munich some nine years earlier, Bergman decided to double the parts of the Poet and Agnes, but even here an added initial scene was used to clarify the play's subjective status. Bergman chose again a biographical approach and explained during rehearsals that the play should be understood "not as a big dialogue, but a monologue by Strindberg, a love letter ... to his wife [Harriet Bosse]."<sup>14</sup>

These biographically-oriented text interpretations have to be seen in the context of a long tradition of scholarly writing and staging practice in Sweden. One of the first Strindberg scholars, Martin Lamm, set the tone for such approaches with comments like: "Det finnes säkerligen i världslitteraturen få författare, hos vilka liv och dikt så helt falla samman [...] At läsa honom är detsamma som att leva tillsammans med honom."<sup>15</sup> Bergman, who had Lamm as a teacher during his short time of literature studies in Stockholm, recalled Lamm's lectures on Strindberg

---

<sup>13</sup> Marker, *Life in the Theater*, 1992, p. 120. It should be mentioned though that Strindberg at the time he wrote *A Dream Play* not yet had moved to his last apartment at Drottningsgatan 85 (which was later to be known as "The Blue Tower"); instead he was still living at Karlavägen 40, where he had chosen dark and 'renaissance inspired' furniture.

<sup>14</sup> "eine grosse, nicht Dialog, sondern Monolog von Strindberg, ein Liebesbrief ... zu seine Frau [Harriet Bosse]". Quoted in Müller, *Theaterregisseur*, 1980, p. 43.

<sup>15</sup> "In world literature exist only a few writers where life and fiction are so completely congruent [...] To read him is the same as to live together with him." Lamm, *Strindbergs dramer*, 1924, p. 19.

as having been “crucial” to him.<sup>16</sup>

Next to Lamm, it is well-known that also Olof Molander influenced Bergman’s understanding of Strindberg. When Bergman directed his first Strindberg play for a professional stage<sup>17</sup> he expressed his admiration for the older colleague in the performance program: “Den som kommit oss svenskar att fatta Strindbergs storhet som dramats reformator och scenisk nydiktare är otvivelaktigt framför alla andra Olof Molander.”<sup>18</sup> Bergman has also repeatedly mentioned Molander’s famous production of *A Dream Play* in 1935 as an early and vital theatre experience - a production where the search for the dreamer was already at stake. After extensive biographical studies, Molander had identified three figures - the Poet, the Officer and the Lawyer - as what he called “Strindbergs egen livslinje”.<sup>19</sup> Yet this threefoldedness did not stop him from applying Strindberg’s bodily features only to the Poet.

Such biographically-oriented approaches, though somewhat antiquated today, have however in the case of Strindberg proved to be very persistent. Egil Törnqvist has referred to the problem as a blending of “textual” and “biographical subjectivity”.<sup>20</sup> A confusion of course that is much due to Strindberg’s own intentional blurring of the textual and biographical realms, founded on the conviction that the borderlines between life and fiction are fleeting. In recent years, this obvious difficulty inherent in Strindberg’s writings has been highlighted more and more by scholars.<sup>21</sup>

Bergman’s very first production of *A Dream Play* was no exception

---

<sup>16</sup> “livsviktiga”. *Bergman om Bergman*, p. 25. Birgitta Steene has treated the topic more extensively; Steene, ‘Strindbergs språk’, 1995, p. 43.

<sup>17</sup> *Pelikanen* (*The Pelican*, 1907) at Malmö *Stadsteater* in 1945.

<sup>18</sup> “The one who made us Swedes understand Strindberg’s greatness as a reformer of drama and renewer of the stage is doubtless above all others, Olof Molander.” Quoted in Sjögren, *Bergman på teatern*, 1968, p. 36f.

<sup>19</sup> “Strindberg’s own life line”, quoted in Bark, *Drömspelsteknik*, 1981, p. 119.

<sup>20</sup> Törnqvist, ‘Subjective drama’, 1991, p. 98f.

<sup>21</sup> See for instance Robinson, *Strindberg and Autobiography*, 1986; or Dahlbäck, *Ändå tycks allt vara osagt*, 1994.

what concerned the biographical approach; but it was remarkable for another reason since Bergman chose for its realization not a conventional theatre stage, but a medium that had been officially introduced to Sweden only seven years earlier: television. The adaptation was broadcast in Sweden on May 2nd, 1963. And a filmic medium indeed seems to be in many ways very suitable to carry out the ideas stated in the *Dream Play* preface. Already in the 1910s, film was praised for its freedom from temporal and spatial conventions, thus perfectly corresponding to Strindberg's dictum that "time and space do not exist". Considering the demand for a subjective dreamer, the monocular perspective of the camera and the film projector furthermore seemed able to offer advantages over a theatre stage.

Subjective perspective is not only extremely common in film, but we also accept it as 'natural'. The film theorists David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson distinguish between two modes - *perceptual* and *mental subjectivity*. Perceptual subjectivity refers to "shots taken from the character's optical standpoint (the point-of-view shot)" whereas mental subjectivity might let the spectator "see the character's 'inner images', representing memory, fantasy, dreams or hallucinations."<sup>22</sup> In modern narrative theory, these filmic types of subjectivity have often been referred to as *focalization*, while the "dreamer" is named the *focalizer*.<sup>23</sup> But the tacit agreements or set of rules through which focalization is allowed to appear are rather rigid. Focalized scenes are usually quite short and interwoven in an omniscient narration, only employed occasionally for a dramatic effect (e.g. suspense) or to increase our involvement with a character. Subjective scenes always demand to be explained in some way or the other. The visual mode of the images might change (e.g. shaky handcamera for the subjective vision part). Often they are guided by a voice-over narration or marked by track-in and/or track-out shots of the character whose gaze we follow or whose dreams or memories we partake in. In the case of perceptual subjectivity, the transitional shots

---

<sup>22</sup> Bordwell & Thompson, *Film Art*, 1993, p. 78.

<sup>23</sup> See Branigan, *Narrative Comprehension*, 1992, passim.

that signal the subjective nature of the images often concentrate on the eyes of the looking character to establish an eyeline-match. But also in the case of mental subjectivity, these signifying shots are often dominated by the face or the eyes of the focalizer in accordance to the Western tradition of viewing them as the 'mirror of our soul'.

In his theatre productions of *A Dream Play*, Bergman chose to realize the idea of the play as the subjective fantasy of its author by appointing the character of the Poet to be Strindberg's corporeal stand-in on stage. Such a measure was not necessary in the 1963-television adaptation, where Bergman presented his version as a direct access to Strindberg's mind, treating *A Dream Play* as if it were an x-ray picture of Strindberg's imagination. For this approach Bergman made use of the conventions of focalization, at the same time as he undermined them. Instead of just including some single subjective scenes, Bergman avoided almost completely any larger background of an objective omniscient narration.<sup>24</sup>

The TV-version begins with the title of the play in Strindberg's handwriting. The title dissolves into a portrait of Strindberg with his face in extreme close-up, looking directly back at the spectators. The image gets blurred and the text of the *Dream Play* preface is superimposed on it in shorter passages. For a brief instance Strindberg's face becomes focused, but the camera then moves in on the portrait so that it once again loses its sharp outlines before dissolving into an image of dramatic clouds. Vertical iron bars that allude to a prison cell or a high fence wall now become visible, through which Agnes (Ingrid Thulin) makes her first entrance. It is not until this point of the action that Strindberg's text takes over. At the end of the film we see a reversal of the prologue; only this time, it is the Poet (Olof Widgren) who disappears into a layer of clouds dissolving into the blurry shadows that slowly transform into Strindberg's face.

By adding this short prologue and epilogue Bergman seems to offer us his *Dream play* mediated through a frame of subjectivity. Bergman made use of a photograph of Strindberg as the focalizer's face in extreme close-up in order to indicate the transition to the subjective perspec-

---

<sup>24</sup> Compare also with: Törnqvist, *Between Stage and Screen*, 1995, pp. 24-25.



tive. The camera movement suggests a journey through the facade of the face directly into the author's consciousness. Thus Strindberg's face marks not only the threshold between objective being and subjective mind, but also between outside and inside reality. Once this inside level is reached, Bergman seems to literally free the *Dream Play* figures from their imprisonment in Strindberg's mind by letting Agnes make her entrance through the iron bars.

In Bergman's theatre production of *Spökesonaten* (*A Ghost Sonata*, 1907) at *Dramaten* in 1973, Strindberg's face was to be used in a very similar way. Bergman had already staged the play in Malmö in 1954, and for both adaptations, he was determined to find the play's ruling consciousness, treating *A Ghost Sonata* as if it were yet another dream play. Bergman explained: "I min Malmöuppsättning utgick jag från att Studenten är drömmaren men det går inte ihop: han är ju borta från sammanhanget långa stunder. Nej, det är Strindberg själv som drömmar."<sup>25</sup> To visualize this idea, Bergman projected small suggestive spots of light on each intermediary curtain separating the acts, including a huge portrait of the elderly Strindberg on the curtain before the final act. Thus, to indicate the subjective dream nature of the play, Bergman adopted, or rather - quoted from - the filmic practice of focalization. This brought along the problem that the projection of Strindberg's face in "extreme close-up" as a cinematic signal for subjectivity could not be readily understood by the theatre audience. Richard Bark, for example, stated in his analysis of the production, that the projected portrait of Strindberg was not a sufficient reason for him to interpret the play according to Bergman's intentions.<sup>26</sup> This example does not only illustrate how Bergman creates a dialogue between theatre and film; it also shows the limitations of such an exchange since signs, in order to be readable, need to be adjusted to spectator expectations within the different media conventions.

---

<sup>25</sup> "In my Malmö adaptation I presumed that the Student is the dreamer, but that does not work: he is out of the context for too long. No, it is Strindberg himself who is dreaming." Bergman quoted in Törnqvist, *Bergman och Strindberg*, 1973, p. 97.

<sup>26</sup> Bark, *Drömspelsteknik*, 1981, p. 164.

Bergman was never really satisfied with his TVproduction of *A Dream Play*. At first, he blamed the inadequate technical standard of television in 1963. When Bergman was working on his German production of *A Dream Play* in 1977, plans existed for another film version but they were never put into action.<sup>27</sup> A few years later, while editing *Fanny and Alexander*, Bergman had abandoned any such project, declaring the film medium to be generally incapable of capturing the essence of a Strindberg play:

men jag tror aldrig att det skulle gå att filma t ex Drömspelet eller Spöksonaten. Och det beror helt och hållet på att det finns en sorts hemlighetsfull magi i kombinationen skådespelare-scenrum. [...] Tänk Dig Fingalsgrottan i Drömspelet ... om Du ska filma det ska du [*sic*] ha vattnet, droppstenen, det sjunkna skeppet, livbojen, galjonsfiguren och ... hur fan ser golvet ut i grottan ... det blir ett djävla byggande eller också går du in i en befintlig grotta och det blir ännu konstigare. [...] Jag vet det, därför att för många år sedan försökte jag göra Drömspelet på TV. Och det var verkligen ett kapitalt misslyckande.<sup>28</sup>

It should be stressed, however, that it is not so much *A Dream Play* itself as apparently Bergman's understanding and interpretation of the text that is irreconcilable with a presentation on screen. Less than three years after the "capital failure" with the television *Dream Play*, Bergman made his film *Persona* (1966).

---

<sup>27</sup> Müller, *Theaterregisseur*, 1980, p. 86.

<sup>28</sup> "but I don't think it would ever be possible to film e.g. *A Dream Play* or *Ghost Sonata*. And that is completely due to the fact that there exists a secret magic in the combination of actor and stage. [...] Imagine the Fingal cave in *A Dream Play* ... if you want to film it, you must have water, dripstones, the drowned ship, the lifebelts, the figure head and ... how the devil does the floor look like in the cave ... it would be a hell of a lot of construction work alternatively you could also take an existing cave and that would be even stranger. [...] I know that, because many years ago I have tried to do *A Dream Play* for television. And that was really a capital failure." Interview in Timm, *Ögats glädje*, 1994, p. 127f.

Most often *Persona* has been acknowledged for its resemblance to Strindberg's Naturalistic one-act play *Den starkare* (*The Stronger*, 1889) due to their similar conflict constellation with two women, of whom only one is talking.<sup>29</sup> But also *A Dream Play*, although less frequently, has been mentioned.<sup>30</sup> Instead of comparing *Persona* to Strindberg's dramatic text, I rather want to focus on the film's parallels to Bergman's television adaptation of *A Dream Play*. It is the idea of a ruling dreamer as the framing focalizer extracted from the *Dream Play* preface that makes a prominent reappearance in *Persona*. The Strindbergian influence is thus in the present case only an indirect one.

Although the issue of subjectivity has been frequently discussed in connection with *Persona*, scholars and film critics have reached very diverging results. Bruce Kawin, for example, invented the term "mind-screen" to express *Persona's* subjective inner-eye perspective, pointing out as this filtering instance no other than the film medium itself.<sup>31</sup> Susan Sontag on the other hand rejected any attempts that described "*Persona* as a wholly subjective film, one taking place entirely within someone's head" since approaches like these were not really "helpful" in tackling the more important questions that the film was raising.<sup>32</sup> And also Robin Wood objected to interpretations that classified *Persona* as "entirely subjective from Alma's viewpoint".<sup>33</sup> Instead he concluded:

The doubt is as to the precise level of reality or unreality on which ... [the different parts of the film] are to be thought operating. Subjective fantasy? If so, whose? Bergman does not, I think, for reasons both thematic and formal, intend us to be able to ans-

<sup>29</sup> Scholars who have mentioned *The Stronger* in connection to *Persona* are e.g. Sontag, 'Persona', (first published in 1966) 1975, p. 268; Simon, *Bergman Directs*, 1972, p. 299ff.; Kawin, *Mindscreen*, 1978, p. 106; Cowie, *Ingmar Bergman*, 1982, p. 237; Blackwell, *Persona*, 1986, p. 100ff.; Törnqvist, *Between Stage and Screen*, 1995, p. 137.

<sup>30</sup> Koskinen, *Spel och speglingar*, 1993, p. 137; Törnqvist, *Filmdiktaren*, 1993, p. 69.

<sup>31</sup> Kawin, *Mindscreen*, 1978, passim.

<sup>32</sup> Sontag, 'Persona', 1975, p. 255.

<sup>33</sup> Wood, *Ingmar Bergman*, 1969, p. 146.

wer such questions.<sup>34</sup>

As is known since Bergman published the information in *Bilder* in 1990, the intention to create an all-encompassing focalizer for *Persona* indeed existed from an early planning stage. A note in his working journal for the project reveals the thoughts in this direction: “Kan man göra det här till ett inre förlopp? Jag menar antyda att det här är en tonsättning av olika stämmor i samma själs *concerto grosso*?”<sup>35</sup> That scholars still had come up with so different conclusions concerning this point might be more easily understood through a comparison to Bergman’s television *Dream Play*. Both productions are characterized by a similar symmetrical composition, where two different narrative levels can be distinguished. In the television adaptation, Bergman created the subjective perspective on the basis of the short introductory and concluding scenes with Strindberg’s face as transitional shots, while *A Dream Play*’s inherent hovering and ambiguous narrative technique was being preserved. Also in *Persona* Bergman established a framework surrounding the main plot of nurse Alma and the mute actress Elisabet Vogler. On the inner level it seems indeed impossible or irrelevant - as Wood and Sontag have claimed - to attempt to single out when omniscient narration is taking place, or when we follow the subjective dream of either Alma or Elisabet. Yet through the framing epilogue and prologue, the main story is once again turned into a subjective play-within-a-play. The spectator literally is only granted access through the peephole of a dreamer’s inner-eye.

But who is that dreamer? And how is he established? In an analogy to the TV adaptation, where Bergman had identified Strindberg as the focalizer, one can detect a similar strategy in *Persona* - not visualized through a photographic portrait of the author but only slightly more disguised. In both prologue and epilogue a little boy (Jörgen Lindström)

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid, p. 152.

<sup>35</sup> “Can one turn this into an inner course of events? I mean, suggest that it is a composition with different parts (voices) of a single soul’s *concerto grosso*?” Bergman, *Bilder*, 1990, p. 55.

appears, whom a great majority of scholars has identified as Bergman's *alter ego*.<sup>36</sup> A frequently recurring shot in the title sequence, which separates the introductory part from the main plot, depicts the little boy in close-up facing the audience directly; a shot corresponding to Bergman's use of Strindberg's face as signifier for focalization. Apart from the more narrative sequence with the child in the morgue, one can also find a disconnected series of images on the outer frame of *Persona*. This more abstract part has also often been interpreted as a reference to Bergman, alluding both to earlier films and autobiographical events.<sup>37</sup> Some of the images directly portray the film medium and its apparatus. Thus, one of the important formal differences between *Persona* and the television adaptation of *A Dream Play*, is the fact that Bergman successfully expanded his concept of the dreamer with a clearly metafilmic impact. Whereas Strindberg, in the television *Dream Play*, was presented as an unchallenged ruling consciousness, Bergman recognizes in *Persona*, next to the artist-dreamer, the film medium itself as another powerful and filtering instance.

That Bergman has been breathing "Strindberg air" throughout his life, as indicated in the quotation at the beginning of this article, appears indeed to be an adequate description. Strindberg seems to be strongly present in the background of Bergman's work. However, Bergman very actively shapes and elaborates the Strindbergian material for his own purposes, using it as a point of departure to stretch and expand his different media tools.

---

<sup>36</sup> Examples are Wood, *Ingmar Bergman*, 1969, p. 158; Simon, *Bergman Directs*, 1972, p. 239; Törnqvist, *Between Stage and Screen*, 1995, p. 140. Also Bergman himself drew this connection; *Bergman om Bergman*, 1970, p. 218.

<sup>37</sup> Simon, *Bergman Directs*, 1972, p. 230f.; Törnqvist, *Between Stage and Screen*, 1995, p. 137.

References

- Bark, Richard, *Strindbergs drömspelsteknik - i drama och teater*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 1981.
- Bergman, Ingmar, *Bilder*. Stockholm: Norstedts, 1990.
- Björkman, Stig, Torsten Manns, Jonas Sima (ed.), *Bergman om Bergman*. Stockholm: Norstedts, 1970.
- Blackwell, Marilyn Johns, *Persona*. The Transcendent Image, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986.
- Bordwell, David, and Kristin Thompson, *Film Art. An Introduction*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 4th ed. 1993.
- Branigan, Edward, *Narrative Comprehension and Film*. London, New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Dahlbäck, Kerstin, *Ändå tycks allt vara osagt. August Strindberg som brevskrivare*. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur, 1994.
- Johns, Marilyn Elizabeth, *Strindberg's Influence on Bergman's Det sjunde inseglet, Smultronstället, and Persona*. Ann Arbor, 1977.
- Kawin, Bruce, *Mindscreen. Bergman, Godard, and First-Person Film*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- Koskinen, Maaret, *Spel och speglingar. En studie i Ingmar Bergmans filmiska estetik*. Stockholm: University of Stockholm, 1993.
- Lamm, Martin, *Strindbergs dramer. Förra delen*. Stockholm: Bonniers, 2nd ed. 1924.
- Lunin, Hanno, *Strindbergs Dramen*. Emsdetten: Lechte, 1962.
- Marker, Lise-Lone and Frederick J., *Ingmar Bergman. A Life in the Theater*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Müller, Wolf-Dietrich, *Der Theaterregisseur Ingmar Bergman. Dargestellt an seiner Inszenierung von Strindberg's 'Ein Traumspiel'*. München: Kitzinger, 1980.
- Robinson, Michael, *Strindberg and Autobiography. Writing and Reading a Life*. Norwich: Norvik Press, 1986.
- Samuels, Charles Thomas, 'Ingmar Bergman: An Interview'. In: Kaminsky, Stuart M. (ed.), *Ingmar Bergman. Essays in Criticism*. London: Oxford University Press, 1975, pp. 98-132.

- Simon, John, *Ingmar Bergman Directs*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.
- Sjögren, Henrik, *Ingmar Bergman på teatern*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1968.
- Sontag, Susan, "Persona. The Film in Depth". In: Kaminsky, Stuart M. (ed.), *Ingmar Bergman. Essays in Criticism*. London: Oxford University Press, 1975, pp. 253-269.
- Steene, Birgitta, Ingmar Bergman. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1968.
- Steene, Birgitta, "Strindbergs språk brände sig in i mitt kött". In: *Parnass*, No. 1, 1995, pp. 40-44.
- Strindberg, August, *En blå bok* I-IV. Samlade Skrifter, Vol. 46-48. Stockholm: Bonniers, 1907-1912.
- *Ett drömspel*. Texten redigerad och kommenterad av Gunnar Ollén. Samlade Verk i Nationalupplaga, Vol. 46. Stockholm: Norstedts 1988.
- Timm, Mikael, *Ögats glädje. Texter om film*. Stockholm: Carlssons, 1994.
- Törnqvist, Egil, *Bergman och Strindberg. Spöksöndagen - drama och iscensättning. Dramaten 1973*. Stockholm: Prisma, 1973.
- *Between Stage and Screen. Ingmar Bergman Directs*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1995.
- *Filmdiktaren Ingmar Bergman*. Amsterdam: Arena, 1993.
- "I min fantasi! Subjektivt gestaltande hos Ingmar Bergman". In: Margareta Wirmark (ed.), *Ingmar Bergman. Film och teater i växelverkan*. Stockholm: Carlssons, 1996, pp. 79-99.
- "Strindberg and Subjective Drama". In: Michael Robinson (ed.), *Strindberg and Genre*. Norwich: Norvik Press, 1991.
- Wood, Robin, *Ingmar Bergman*. London: Studio Vista, 1969.