UNIVERZITET U SARAJEVU

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

POJAM EKVIVALENCIJE NA NIVOU LIKOVA U PREVODILAČKOJ PRAKSI: ANALIZA PREVODA NA NIVOU LIKOVA U DVIJE DRAME:

"STAKLENA MENAŽERIJA" AUTORA TENESI VILIJAMSA I "KO SE BOJI VIRDŽINIJE VULF" AUTORA EDVARDA OLBIJA.

MAGISTARSKI RAD

STUDENT:

BRANKO KRSMANOVIĆ

MENTORI:

Prof. dr. Amira Sadiković

Prof. dr. Ifeta Čirić-Fazlija

SARAJEVO, SEPTEMBAR 2021

UNIVERSITY OF SARAJEVO

FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

TRANSLATION STUDIES

THE NOTION OF EQUIVALENCE ON THE LEVEL OF CHARACTERS IN TRANSLATION: ANALYSIS OF THE TRANSLATION ON THE LEVEL OF CHARACTERS IN TWO DRAMAS:

"THE GLASS MENAGERIE" BY TENNESSEE WILLIAMS AND "WHO'S AFRAID OF VIRGINIA WOOLF" BY EDWARD ALBEE

MASTER THESIS

Supervisors: Associate professor Amira Sadiković, PhD

Associate professor Ifeta Čirić-Fazlija, PhD

Student: Branko Krsmanović

Index number: 2867/2018

Department: English Language and Literature Department

Master Studies

Sarajevo, September 2021

CONTENTS

1. Introduction

The main goal of this paper is to point out any inconsistencies that occur in the respective translations of the two plays. The primary focus will be on the analysis of the effects that the translations in the research material had on the characters. This paper will, likewise, attempt to shed some light on the psychology of characters in the original text. This will serve as the foundation on which further analysis will be built. The second phase of the analysis will be the comparison of these observations with the translation texts. I intend to capture and comment on instances where the parallel between characters in the source text and the translation text has been lost.

Method implemented for the analysis will be strictly descriptive. The aforementioned foundation for the analysis will be laid in the respective introductions to the two plays. I will approach Tennessee Williams and his play by giving an introduction to *The Glass Menagerie*. The introduction to this work will consist of a careful selection of critical essays, which contain ideas concerned with either characterization or some of the main notions loosely connected with the issue of characterization. A small portion of this chapter will also give some general information about the characters and their origin in Williams' earlier work. Numerous critical essays will be consulted in this chapter of the paper; most of these come from Parker's collection of critical essays (1983) on *The Glass Menagerie.* From that point on, the focus will be shifted to Ivo Juriša's translation text. My aim in this section of the paper is to present evidence of discrepancies between the source text and the translation text and also to point out some commendable solutions, (that is point out some of the instances in which Ivo Juriša has managed to convey the intended meaning, but also to show the poetic beauty of the source text in all its original luster). All this is aimed towards shedding some more light on the question of equivalence and whether it was achieved on the level of characters. Hence, the primary focus throughout my analysis will be strongly pinned to figural, as well as narrational characterization (Jahn, 2021). Both these features of characterization analysis will be examined so as to stress the importance of Tom's role as a narrator, as well as to point out the complexity and the implications this narratorial figure has on the entire play. When it comes to the character of Tom, the reader is faced with an issue of self-characterization. Without this element, further analysis would have been futile; luckily, King's views on irony in Tom's speech (in Parker, 1983) proved sufficiently helpful. Having this in mind, other characters are more easily analyzed, since they are, for the most part,

descriptively characterized by the narrator. For the sake of clarity, the segment regarding the translation analysis of *The Glass Menagerie* will be subdivided into chapters in accordance with their order of appearance through scenes. The analysis for this text will be finalized with a general overview of the character of Tom as seen in the role of a narrator.

The focus of the thesis will then consequently switch to the other of the two plays in the analytical corpus, *Edward Albee's Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*. Introduction to this play will consist of an effort to establish some of the preliminary notions needed for comprehensive understanding of the translation analysis that is to follow the aforesaid introduction (such as Albee's relation to the theatre of absurd, the means of characterization of the four protagonists of the play, the features of primary and secondary dramatic text of the play, and alike). In the translation analysis focus will be shifted to Ileana Ćosić's translation text. More elaborate subdivision of chapters will be implemented to this section of the paper, because of the sheer volume of errors, looking primarily into the secondary dramatic text, the use of italics as intensifiers, and then primary dramatic text of individual acts of the three act play.

2. Introduction to Tennessee Williams' *The Glass Menagerie*

The Glass Mengerie premiered on Broadway in 1945, propelling Williams from obscurity to fame. Tennessee Williams' *The Glass Menagerie* began as a short story entitled "Portrait of a Girl in Glass", composed in 1943. The following short epigraph, half of which Williams borrowed from E.E. Cummings' poem, best encapsulates the elegiac tone and also the central delicate figure that inspired the entire play: "Not even daring to stretch her small hands out! – nobody, not even the rain, has such small hands" (as cited in Williams, 2001, p. 12). The delicate hands belong to the character of Laura Wingfield sketched in the short story, and the sketch already provides the fine lines of fragility and timidity of the play's character as well. In the "Portrait of a Girl in Glass", Williams goes even further in establishing similar qualities to this dramatic character: "she made no positive motion toward the world but stood at the edge of the water, so to speak, with feet that anticipated too much cold to move. (Williams, 2001, p. 12)". These two lines of the text show not only where the character of Laura came from, but also where most of the poetic beauty of the play was born. The setting for the play, as well as dramatis personae of Tom and Amanda, obviously came from this short story. In the narrative Tom is self-characterized in the following manner: "Mine was an anomalous character, one that appeared to be slated for radical change or disaster, for I was a poet who had a job in a warehouse." (Williams, 2001, p. 11). Tom paints himself as someone with a strong instinct for wandering, but also as someone unreliable because of his restless spirit. Therefore, the looming of his departure is jotted down even in this short story preceding the play.

Another important detail, that will later define the atmosphere of the play, is already present in the short story, given in Tom's following words: "I always wrote such strange and sorrowful poems in those days. Because I had in my ears the wispy sound of my sister serenading her pieces of colored glass." (Williams, 2001, p. 14). This image awakens in its readership a strange feeling of poetic, elevated pity. Meek Laura polishing her glass figurines and accompanying her phonograph with shy, wispy voice is an image that seems to be idealized to the point of sublimity and otherworldliness.

In the short story Laura is noted to have been reading a certain book over and over again, reliving the sorrowful destiny of its main character. Her relationship with this character in the novel is depicted as not that different from her relationship with real people, such as her brother whom she regards with the same amount of attentiveness. This helps the readers get an insight into the fragile emotional state of seeming detachment Laura is attuned to. Williams includes another "sorrowful anecdote" in the narrative, aiming to affirm the character's

naivety: Laura is holding up a Christmas star decoration wondering whether stars really have five points; when Tom points out the faultiness of such a notion, she looks out of the window to confirm his argument. She concludes that it is difficult to establish whether what he said was true, which is a quite childlike retort. Hence gradually, the naïve aspect of Laura's character is taking shape.

In the narrative Laura's red-haired Irishman "gentleman caller" is portrayed in the following manner:

> Jim was a big red-haired Irishman who had the scrubbed and polished look of well-kept chinaware. His big square hands seemed to have a direct and very innocent hunger for touching his friends. He was always clapping them on your arms or shoulders and they burned through the cloth of your shirt like plates taken out of an oven. He was the best-liked man in the warehouse and oddly enough he was the only one I was on good terms with. He found me agreeably ridiculous I think. He knew of my secret practice of retiring to a cabinet in a lavatory and working on rhyme schemes when work was slack in the warehouse. ... No doubt I was classified as screwy in Jim's mind as much as in the others. (Williams, 2001, p. 17)

This excerpt describes Jim as a light-hearted, warm and friendly man, but also a simple-minded character. Tom's projection of self-image or reflection is an important and curious aspect of Jim's description above. Tom imagines the impressions he must have left on Jim and others at the warehouse. The reflection tells us a lot about the peculiarity of Tom's character, tinged with a sort of vainglorious inferiority. This peculiarity in him is just a part of what he is. Wanderlust and bravery to face the world overshadow his otherwise meek and withdrawn personality. As one can see, Tom covers up for his weaknesses with a certain amount of pride which comes from his propensity towards poetry. He and his sister are essentially two sides of the same coin. Poetry gives Tom purpose, it gives him strength, maybe even forces him to face the world, to look outward. Laura is denied such purpose, because she herself is poetry. Her fragile life is art itself. This is best seen in the following excerpt when Jim reads the titles of phonographic records: ". . . and reading their titles in a voice so hearty that it shot like beams of sunlight through the vapors of self-consciousness engulfing my sister and me." (Williams, 2001, p. 19). The "vapor of self-consciousness" referred to in the excerpt is a product of the hidden agenda Tom had when inviting Jim to dinner. It is the discomforting self-consciousness and insecurity that Laura and Tom share as mutual, sibling traits. There is also an unpublished draft of the play that characterizes Tom as

the shy one, whereas Laura is portrayed as sharp and sarcastic (Parker, 1983). Although this was only a discarded draft, some of these nuances in the nature of protagonists remained in the final work through a synthesis of various sketched elements.

The short story character of Amanda can only be viewed as an old hag, fallen from grace of the southern aristocratic life. In the play, however, she takes the image of a warm, loving mother with nothing but best interest for her children. This warmth with which the figure of the play is infused serves the purpose of counterbalancing her presumptuousness, making Amanda's character less iritable, and able to evoke empathy in the audiences.

Apart from the early characterization of the protagonists in the play, the narrative offers the main motif, and also the title of the play, in its rough form of pure inspiration, as follows: "She [Laura] loved colored glass and had covered the walls with shelves of little glass articles, all of them light and delicate in color." (Williams, 2001, p. 15). Later, with the help of Hart Crane's poetry Williams was fascinated with, the rough image would be honed into the title of indubitable poetic beauty we are familiar with today. *The Glass Menagerie* as a title embodies every facet of the play's action; it carries a lot of symbolic beauty, and it can be said that the entire play serves as an extension of this short, but poetically powerful phrase.

Before any grinding work is to commence the notion of a memory play has to be addressed. This term was coined by Tennessee Williams. In the introduction to the play, Williams gives detailed justifications and instructions for the production and to his readers, and expounds on the concept of a "memory play" and its origins. The author explains that the character of Tom should assume the position of a narrator and the readers are immediately brought to the realization that the entire play is based on Tom's account of the events, reconstructed from his memory. Thus, the events depicted in the plot, as well as the characters portrayed, are presented through Tom's perspective and are a product of his guilty conscience and unreliable reminiscence. Tom is a poet; therefore the language of the play is elevated to a certain, appropriate degree. The translator has to keep this poetic viewpoint of the narrator in mind; whether or not this was accomplished in the translation text and to what degree will be examined later in the paper.

There are arguments made in a short essay by James L. Rowland that the performed version of the play is far superior to its play-text (which is what I am in a possession of and which is the analytical corpus of the paper). In short, Rowland's argument is that the dialog flow of the enacted version of the play is more natural, more life-like (Rowland in Parker, 1983). He does not fail to mention the obvious instance that *The Glass Menagerie* is a memory play, but nonetheless Rowland does fail to comprehend the importance of some of

the seemingly stagnant dialog lines. These serve to establish the understanding that the readers are given a glimpse at Tom's poetically modified and guilty conscience ridden memory. In an attempt not to distort, or caricaturize Rowland's argument in my favor, I am compelled to state that most of his points are aimed at presenting the differences in dramatization of Amanda's character. Amanda's character in the play-text does sometimes fall into the pit of giving unnatural, and sometimes even overly cruel responses; this, however, could be interpreted as Tom's animosity towards his mother, the image of which his mind created. Omitting or changing these lines to achieve a more favorable image of Amanda is to miss the very point intended by Williams; this is a memory play. What follows is one example of such a change aimed at showing Amanda in a more favorable light, at the expense of relating some cruel, blunt humor to the audience. The scene depicts a moment when Amanda is persuading Laura to wear "gay deceivers", or in other words to stuff her brassiere. It plays out like this:

Laura: I won't wear them!

Amanda: You will!

Laura: Why should I?

Amanda: Because to be painfully honest, your chest is flat. (Williams, 1999, p. 275)

The bluntness of this moment in the play, although quite brazen, did not fail to produce a chuckle in me as a solitary reader. Below is the scene's revision that Rowland (in Parker, 1983) deems superior:

Laura: I won't wear them!

Amanda: Of course you'll wear them.

Laura: Why should I?

Amanda: Well, to tell you the truth, honey, you're just a little bit flat chested. (Parker, 1983, p. 71)

Such revision does help imagine Amanda as a more relatable motherly figure, which, on the other hand, is not the same figure Tom's mind (or Williams', as a matter of fact) created. The rewriting possibly has the audience dumbly looking at the stage, seeing only a plain, natural, ordinary conversation between the mother and the daughter, and not an exchange between the shy and introvert Laura and the brazen and domineering Amanda of the play.

Rowland (in Parker, 1983) also argues that the play-text only gives Tom and Laura a character to play off of, whereas the enacted version gives them a mother. Maybe, giving the two characters a mother is not such a great idea, as that would draw attention from Laura and Tom who are the main characters. The play does not give an objective truth of human relations, but rather it provides Tom's subjective rendering of the events, which presents the audience with even greater insight into the psyche of an individual. If the protagonist wishes to paint his mother as sometimes being vicious, without the motherly cloak of politeness, then it should be respected, in my opinion. Other points of Rowland are well grounded, because the enacted version gave the play an opportunity to be physically realized, and this brought about some curious revisions of characters conveyed through sheer movement, or a simple look.

Thomas L. King's views on irony and distance in the play will help propel the previous argument. King (in Parker, 1983) claims, that the play is an artist's (Tom's) rendition of events or the raw material of life and from that fact alone one should deduce that the play-text should not be meddled with. The distance King talks about in his essay is very important, in the sense that it provides the main protagonist with a freedom to construe or even completely imagine events. If this was not so, how then could the seventh scene, in which only Laura and Jim are in the room be even feasible? At the same time, Tom is with Amanda in the kitchen, therefore he is not capable of conveying those private moments to the audience as he was not privy to them in the first place. The only conclusion that one can arrive at is that the things Jim says to Laura are actually Tom's own words assigned to the version of Jim, that Tom invents for the sake of artistic comprehensiveness. This argument is reinforced with an excerpt from Tom's opening soliloquy:

> He [the gentleman caller] is the most realistic character in the play, being an emissary from a world of reality that we were somehow set apart from. But since I have a poet's weakness for symbols, I am using this character also as a symbol; he is the long-delayed but always expected something that we live for. (Williams, 1999, p. 235)

King's understanding of the play will be employed for the analysis of Tom's soliloquies further in the paper, the reason arising from the fact that King seems to have grasped the subtle nuances between nostalgia and irony in Tom's speech. Other critics have made cardinal mistakes in their understanding of the undulatory motions of these two modes. For instance, Joseph Wood Krutch in no way detects the irony in Tom's speech and hence is taken aback by what he describes as "Oscar Wilde's worst style". As an example of the

former Krutch gives the phrase “like white china” which is a segment from Tom’s description of Jim, by which the protagonist describes the latter’s paleness. If the ironic dimension of the play is disregarded or misunderstood, or concealed from one’s perception, Krutch’s is a reasonable critique (in Parker, 1983). Whether or not Ivo Juriša managed to detect and convey this irony in his translation will also be discussed later in this paper.

King also makes an impressive argument about the difference in Tom’s and Laura’s respective characters by equating them to a real-life pair of James Joyce and his daughter. King (in Parker, 1983) references Jung when he says that the difference between the two is in the fact that the former was an artistic genius who was capable of directing or diving into his schizophrenia, whereas the latter was just a victim of her mental disturbances. This analogy firmly establishes the point previously made about Tom and Laura representing two sides of the same coin. One objection to this King’s analysis is that in it Laura seems to be slighted. Her character is not given proper treatment, she is simply dismissed. Conversely, I am compelled to view her as a timid heroine. The fact that she is not productive artistically or for that matter productive in any other way should not reduce the ideal beauty she represents as a symbolic character. Even if Laura lacks this productivity, that does not make her a victim. Moreover, with the degradation of Laura’s character to the level of a plain sufferer, Tom loses justification for his main inspiration.

The character of Amanda seems to spark most debates in critical literature. It is important to discuss her position and relevance in the play, because many would argue that she is the central character, whereas I agree with those critics who refute the viewpoint. As King (in Parker, 1983) points out, the misconception that the play is Amanda’s began with the original production because Laurette Taylor’s rendition of the character seems to have shifted the focus of the play away from Tom. In his essay *The Play is Memory* Benjamin Nelson (in Parker, 1983) gives a lot of valuable insights into the character of Amanda. This character was largely misunderstood and Nelson’s insights were overlooked by those who praised the enacted version in which Amanda overshadows all other characters. Nelson sees the character of Amanda as a foolish old woman impossibly attempting to relive a wasted life. For Nelson she is puritanical and narrow-minded, but also appealing in her unreasonable devotion to the past. Moreover, Nelson (in Parker, 1983) deems Amanda shrewish, nagging and vulgar in her attempts to cope with the bleak reality of her environment. Conversely, these negative character traits are ballasted by her taking on the struggles which her family encounters in life. Nelson shows this counter-balance in Amanda’s character in the most favorable heroine-like light: “Amanda possesses a fighting spirit and a stubborn gallantry in the face of

overwhelming odds." (Parker, 1983, p. 104) Balance is an important word when the character of Amanda is in question. She should not tip over to either of the two figures: the shrew or the mother. If her blunt remarks are watered down, if she is made amiable, the effect of her overwhelming strength and composure, foregrounded in the final scene when the crushing truth of Jim's engagement status comes to the surface, would be lost:

> Laura's dark hair hides her face until at the end of the speech she lifts it to smile at her Mother. Amanda's gestures are slow and graceful, almost dancelike as she comforts the daughter. At the end of her speech she glances a moment at the father's picture - then withdraws through the portières. (Williams, 1999, p. 312)

The characters in the play seem to function on a symbolical level as well, similarly to the iconic portrait of the father looming large over the mis-en-scene or the titular glass figurines Laura attends to. In his defense of the amount of symbols included in his plays Tennessee Williams said the following:

> We all have in our conscious and unconscious mind a great vocabulary of images, and I think all human communication is based on these images as are our dreams; and a symbol in a play has only one legitimate purpose, which is to say a thing more directly and simply and beautifully than it could be said in words. (as cited in Esslin, 1971, p. 85)

Because of such relevance and frequency of symbols in Williams' plays, raised to the level of protagonists and their respective characterization, a translator has to pay due attention to these in his or her rendering of the source text. Thus, a segment of my paper later will discuss the translation of certain symbols that give this play the depth of a great literary work, or the deep artistic reach into the collective unconscious (and the above cited statement of Williams will necessarily be revisited).

There is no artificiality of dramatic speech in *The Glass Menagerie*, only a more elevated version of ordinary, day-to-day communication. The critic Marion Migid (in Parker, 1983) speaks of Williams' Southern aesthetic with utmost praise. She even goes so far as to claim that it gives his plays the basic linguistic structure comparable to that which appeared in elementary stages of Greek tragedy. Whether this quality of Southern speech is reflected in the translation will also be looked into in the segment that follows. For this analysis I intend to take a few excerpts that best exemplify the Southern speech qualities, few other excerpts

where the Southern drawl is impossible to omit, and finally those that radiate with Southern spirit both linguistically and in the imagery.

3. Translation Analysis of *The Glass Menagerie*

The translation text proves itself reliable from the very start. The whole translation text gives of an impression that not a single word, or intended thought was left out. This remarkable feat of translation artistry achieves its culmination at the end when a cathartic feeling overwhelms a careful reader. This hardly could have been achieved if the translation lacked original evocativeness in the majority of sentences. Whether a full spectrum of associations brought about by certain expressions has been retained in the translation text is a matter that needs careful analysis. This issue will be tackled in the latter segments of the paper and probably leave an unfortunate impression of hair splitting. Of course, this is just a matter of authentically conveying cultural references and properly showing idiosyncrasies of certain protagonists in the phrases they use. The following analysis will primarily deal with phrases and not larger chunks of text, since Ivo Juriša achieved fullness making each scene well-rounded and rich with original meaning.

The translation of the production notes will not be incorporated in the analysis because the aim of my paper is to show whether the consistency and authenticity are achieved in characterization and the set-up of the play does not offer a rich ground for analysis with this aim. However, there is one phrase to which I would like to point the attention of the reader, since symbols do play a major role in this play regarding characterization. In the production notes, in the segment regarding music, Ivo Juriša uses a curious term "fina staklena nit" (p. 28) instead of "delicately spun glass" that is resting in Laura's hands while the melancholy circus music is playing. "Delicately spun glass"(p. 231) does not carry any connotations of the shape of glass, whereas "thread" does. It is even symbolically richer and ampler than Williams' allusion. It carries an association to destiny, that is, the delicate threads of destiny on the loom of Fates. But here, Fates no longer practice weaving; they seem to have taken up glassblowing. All this gives an emphatic effect to the whole story, especially at the end when this fine glass thread breaks and the destiny rips Tom from the fearful hands of Laura. Even though, none of this was probably intended by the author or even the translator for that matter, I wanted to underline it as nothing more but an instance that shows the fecundity of Ivo Juriša's word-choices in the translation.

3.1. Scene I

I will start the analysis with the first moment where the translation shows something a little short of perfection. Tom is prone to enriching his speech with poetical qualities every now and then, and in the following instance the translator did not convey Tom's intentional or incidental rhyming. Tom says the following: "In Spain there was revolution. Here there was only shouting and confusion." (Williams, 1999, p. 234) Ivo Juriša gives his readers the following solution: "U Španjolskoj je bila revolucija. Ovdje je bilo samo galame i zbrke." (Juriša, 1967, p. 33). Here, poetry invades Tom's lonesome ponderings, and the readers become aware of the importance poetry holds for him. Any indication of Tom's intent to rhyme would have sufficed, no matter how artificial it might have seemed, since even in the source text Tom does not offer a sublime poetical construct, but rather a by-catch poetical trifle, maybe even a trifle tinged with irony. This affects the characterization in that it shows us the pervasiveness of poetry even in Tom's private thoughts. Furthermore, it is only the beginning of the play or to put it differently the beginning of Tom's rendering of events, and not even three pages into the story that Tom cannot contain himself from rhyming. The text can do without the rhyme, but it would have been so much richer if Tom had actually rhymed in the translation text as well.

Amanda's first few lines of dialog, subtly portray her past days of being a Southern bell. Amanda shows symptoms of benevolence, maybe even naivety in her racism, very early on. The first term she uses for black people is "darkey" (Williams, 1999, p. 237), the translation text gives the reader this term "crnac" (Juriša, 1967, p. 36). Every subsequent term for black people is translated with the same word. The immense cultural chasm makes this an inevitable issue. However, there are plenty of terms in B/H/S that would express the different degrees of severity in racial slurs. B/H/S languages do lack derogatory nuances in terms used to describe black people in the Southern context, but the biggest objection here is that no aforementioned nuances were even attempted in the translation text. "Obojena posluga" might serve its function as a much needed substitute for "darkey". It would differentiate this term from the one that is to pop up later in the text, that latter term being "nigger" (Williams, 1999, p. 237). This differentiation will serve to at least make some distinction in the multilayered nuances of Southern racism. However, there is another issue arising from that latter term as well. Ivo Juriša translates this term as "crnac" also. The problem with this term "crnac" is that it does not fall as hard on the ears as the term in the source text does. However vulgar or chauvinistic it may seem, this issue cannot escape being categorized as a unique Southern aesthetic element in Amanda's speech (and character).

When discussing her admirers Amanda uses a picturesque idiom of Southern origin: "turned up their toes to the daisies" (Williams, 1999, p. 239), to express the condition of being dead. Flowers are also a recurring motif in Amanda's life, as can be seen later in the text. Ivo Juriša gives the following solution: "pod ledinom" (Juriša, 1967, p. 37). Idiosyncrasy of the idiom is lost, whereas it could have been retained with the phrase: "miriše nebesko cvijeće". The latter solution would have been satisfactory for relating the meaning of the idiom, and it would leave intact the subtle fiber of Amanda's Southern origin which is closely knit into the fabric of the narrative.

Now I will approach the analysis of the most prominent phrase of the entire play, a motif, this being the "gentleman caller" (Williams, 1999, p. 235). "Posjetilac" (Juriša, 1967, p. 34) is the word Ivo Juriša uses. It is slightly vague, but the context in which it is first mentioned makes its meaning obvious. The charm of the original word is in its unassuming quality and vagueness, therefore if any word with stronger connotations of courtship had been used in the translation it would have been detrimental to the aesthetic quality of the play. Therefore, "posjetilac" perfectly mirrors the qualities of Southern aristocratic decorum. This is a perfect example of how to handle non-equivalence at word level. Since the target language has no direct equivalent for the word which occurs in the source text, Ivo Juriša relied heavily on context and conveyed the original meaning without omitting any underlaying conotations. (Baker, 1992, p. 20)

3.2. Scene III

I chose to skip scene two, since there are no issues arising there, the text is clear and the translation seemingly impeccable. The third scene opens with Tom's soliloquy, and the first mistake in the translation arises when Tom mentions Amanda's obsession with getting Laura (a visit from) a gentleman caller. Tom describes this invasive idea of the gentleman caller as an archetype of the universal unconscious haunting their small apartment. Ivo Juriša interprets this description of Tom's as a prototype of human fantasy. For the sake of clarity and precision, I will provide the entire excerpt from the translation here: "Kao neki prototip ljudske fantazije, slika tog mladića počela je poput duha obilaziti naš mali stan. . . " (Juriša, 1967, p. 45). Three mistakes occur at the word level in this sentence. The first, but tolerable, mistake is the translation of "archetype" to "prototip". The second mistake is the equation of the term "collective unconscious" to "fantazija". The third mistake is that the word "idea" is translated as "duh". Ivo Juriša seems not to have been acquainted with the writings of Jung, because if he had been, he would have known what Tom tried to express in this instance.

"Prototip" does express a small part of what "archetype" stands for, but it is not an exclusive term like the one from the source text, since a large part of Jung's oeuvre was built around the idea and the classification of archetypes, therefore the word carries different, specific connotations when considered in the context of psychology or literary theory. The Jungian phraseology had to be respected in order for maximum intelligibility to be attained. The second mistake moves away from Jungian notions in a major way. "Fantazija" is not the same as the "collective unconsciousness". The latter represents the lower layer of consciousness, which is outside of the reach for the conscious ego's comprehension, and the former is a term depicting a fabrication, well in reach of the conscious mind, if not its creation. Finally, "duh" breaks away from Tom's notion of image completely. "Archetype - collective unconscious – image" is a correlation that follows Jungian school of thought, but "prototip – fantazija – duh" lacks entrenchment in any tradition of thought, and therefore seems arbitrary and spurious. This oversight derails one of the plays major subjects out of its trajectory. Since Williams was not a stranger to psychology, evidence of which can be found in his body of work which contains one psychological play and many more that dance around this subject, this can be considered one of very few major oversights in the translation. To put it in other words, the register of psychology and its collocational patterns had not been conveyed in a proper manner. (Baker, 1992, p. 52)

The third scene closes with Tom's sarcastic reply to his mother's nagging questions. I chose to mention this chunk of text in my analysis because it is abounding in authentically American cultural references. Ivo Juriša managed to keep the mood and the naturalness of speech, while also translating every reference authentically and without any loss of meaning. This naturalness of speech which perfectly mirrors the speech in the source text is one of the most commendable qualities of this translation.

3.3. Scene IV

In the middle of Scene Four Tom and Amanda reconcile, since this is the aftermath of their big fight. Amanda pleads for Tom not to become a drunkard. Tom is barely amiable to these requests, but manages to hold a reconciliatory disposition and agrees to her wish. Tom does this through a grin, which is indicated in the stage directions. Ivo Juriša translates"grin" into a smile. Therefore, the translation text offers the readers a slightly different sentiment, which easily could have been executed appropriately.

Later in the scene Tom and Amanda discuss Laura's situation, and they touch upon the subject of her timid character. To find and express a silver lining in her timidity Amanda uses

a proverb: “still water runs deep” (Williams, 1999, p. 259). Ivo Juriša translates this as follows: “tiha voda brijeg dere” (Juriša, 1967, p. 56). Both of these variants are evocative, but unfortunately of different things. The latter proverb presumably pertains to gradual hard work that is to bear fruit, eventually. Therefore this proverb in no way can be used to describe Laura, who can hardly do anything but quietly contemplate things. On the other hand, the former proverb can, easily, be brought into connection with Laura’s pensiveness. The proverb in the source text also makes use of the two adjectives contained there to equate them with some of Laura’s more prominent character traits. Stillness from the proverb fits in with her timidity, and the depth represents an attempt on Amanda’s side to give her idle contemplation some merit. This colors Amanda’s character and gives it psychological nuance. The reader in this instance can perceive Amanda trying to persuade Tom, or even more herself, that her daughter’s non-pragmatic character traits can have a positive side to them. This psychological element is discernible in the translation as well, even though the meaning of the proverb is off point. Also, the verb “dere” is too aggressive to be ascribed to Laura. To add one more thing, the proverb in the translation implies too much persistence, stability and focus for it to be equated to the one in the source text. Ivo Juriša failed on all accounts in the translation of this proverb. He misunderstood the meaning, which in effect brought about additional stylistic mess.

Now I will move on to one of the subtle peculiarities of the translation of Scene Four. Almost every time Amanda says “Christian” or a word in that milieu, the translation text attempts to rid off the religious veil, and just present the reader with the essence of what the word “Christian” means in the given context. A good example of what I am aiming at here can be found in the dialog between Amanda and Tom, where they discuss instinct, or as Ivo Juriša puts it “nagon”. Amanda protests any mention of this *beastly* quality and eventually arrives at this statement: “ . . . Christian adults don’t want it!” (Williams, 1999, p. 260). She opposes instinct to Christian values and the spiritual elevation of man. Ivo Juriša, on the other hand, strips the word of its religious tone, and what remains is the following: “. . . Zrelim časnim ljudima on nije potreban!” (Juriša, 1967, p. 58). The translation does function contextually, but the religious element in it is paramount, on account of Amanda’s Southern background and upbringing, therefore this must be considered a big oversight. If this happened on only one occasion in the translation text, it could be considered as unnecessary nitpicking on my part, but it does not. It occurs regularly, almost every time Amanda mentions Christianity.

Not long after this instance, the translation text yet again misrepresents Amanda, on account of her piety. Amanda is worried about Laura becoming a spinster, and a dark premonition is expressed by Amanda later about Tom leaving them both, just like his father did. Amanda does not use the word premonition, but rather a wide-spread English idiom: "Oh, I can see the handwriting on the wall . . ." (Williams, 1999, p. 261). Ivo Juriša finds this solution for the idiom: "Vidim ja strahote budućnosti jasno kao na dlanu!" (Juriša, 1967, p. 58). It is hard to say whether this idiom came out of Amanda's religiousness, or if she used it matter-of-factly, not knowing its origin, like any English speaker could have. The essential meaning of both idioms is parallel. The only difference between the two is their respective connotations. One comes from Judeo-Christian tradition, or to be more precise from the biblical story of the prophet David and king Bellshazzar. The other has a distinct pagan note of Gypsy magism, and because of this the idiom in no way corresponds to the vernacular of deeply religious aristocratic American South. However, it is difficult to say whether this is an appropriate translation or not. The difficulty arises from the fact that the essential meaning has been authentically translated, and I will also allow myself to assume that this idiom in the source text would have gone undetected by a native reader on account of them being too used to its occurrence in speech; the same applies to the readers of the translation text. (Baker, 1992, p. 50) Therefore, I will pivot my argument from the function of these two idioms as translation equivalents, because when it comes to cohesion of the translation text it works perfectly, and the focus will remain only on the aesthetic of the images evoked by the two idioms. The palm reading calls forth an image of exclusively pagan nature, whereas an ephemeral divine hand appearing from thin air and writing on the wall of the reception room of errant king Belshazzar is a lot more poetic and richer in content. Therefore, aside from its function as an idiom it can also work as a poetic image. Another thing to consider is that the artificiality would have occurred if the idiom was translated word for word, but doing this would have supplanted the lack of religiosity in Amanda's vocabulary in the translation text in other instances. This idiom "handwriting on the wall" is not used in the vernacular of B/H/S, therefore it would have sounded out of place, but because of that it would have stressed the much needed trait of religiousness in Amanda. If clarity became an issue after a direct translation from the source text, than a foot note could easily have been employed, as it is in a few other instances in the translation text.

The biggest error of the translation text lies in its hesitation or reluctance to present the religious thread in the Southern American spirit. In the same scene Amanda talks over the telephone with one of her clients, and upon hearing the clients situation and her complaints,

Amanda calls her a Christian martyr two consecutive times. Ivo Juriša translates this as “prava mučenica”(Juriša, 1967, p. 60), which is understandable. The naturality of his phrasing cannot be compared to the artificiality that would have occurred with verbatim phrasing “hrišćanska mučenica”.

3.4. Scene V

For better understanding of Tennessee Williams’ symbols, which is needed for the following analysis, I will present here a short poem of his entitled “Lament for the Moths“:

A plague has stricken the moths, the moths are dying,
their bodies are flakes of bronze on the carpet lying.
Enemies of the delicate everywhere
Have breathed a pestilent mist into the air.

Lament for the velvety moths, for the moths were lovely.
Often their tender thoughts, for they thought of me,
eased the neurotic ills that haunt the day.
Now an invisible evil takes them away.

I move through the shadowy rooms, I cannot be still,
I must find where the the treacherous killer is concealed.
Feverishly I search and still they fall
as fragile as ashes broken against a wall.

Now that the plague has taken the moths away,
who will be cooler than curtains against the day,
who will come early and softly to ease my lot
as I move through the shadowy rooms with a troubled heart?

Give them, O mother of moths and mother of men,
strength to enter the heavy world again,
for delicate were the moths and badly wanted
here in a world by mammoth figures haunted! (Williams, 2002, pp.45–46)

The reason for this extensive citation is somewhat justified, since I want to approach the question of poetry in the translation of the following stage direction:

> "*AMANDA and LAURA in light-coloured dresses are removing dishes from the table, in the upstage area, which is shadowy, their movements formalized almost as a dance or ritual, their moving forms as pale and silent as moths*." (Williams, 1999, p. 264)

Here is the sam excerpt from the translation text:

> *. . . Amanda i Laura, u svijetlim haljinama, raspremaju stol; njihovi su pokreti tako ujednačeni da djeluju kao neki ples ili obred, njihovi likovi u pokretu blijedi su i nečujni kao noćni leptiri*. (Juriša, 1967, p. 61)

The poem and the excerpt from the play are embroidered with the same images of curious beauty. Moths are hardly ever viewed as poetical objects of beauty, but Williams manages to turn people's aversion to moths into an advantage and make it an element which gives the poem its depth. Moths are not, poetically, as appreciated as butterflies are, and it is exactly this that gives moths their association to the castaways, the meek, the underappreciated, but at the same time retaining the association to the delicate and fragile. The knottiness of meaning presumably intended by Williams and associations connected to such a vile insect is what makes this such a difficult word to translate. Ivo Juriša uses the term "noćni leptir" and achieves an association to a quiet, pale moth, while preserving and maybe even accentuating the poetical beauty implied in the word. The poetry is emphatic in the phrase chosen in the translation text, and what is even more impressive is that it is not lost in the plainness and simplicity which would have occurred if the more common word "moljac" was used.

Amanda's aristocratic bearing, as opposed to the religious note of her character, is perfectly depicted in the didascaly. There will be myriad of examples of how this was achieved as I go through the rest of the scenes, but for now I will concentrate on Amanda's phrasing "handsome appearance" (Williams, 1999, p. 270) and how this was conveyed in the translation text. Amanda tells Tom of her days at the Blue Mountain, explaining to him how the ritual of courtship would play out in those days. After telling him of the precautions a young girl would have to take in order not to make a mistake in her selection, Tom inquires how it is that she made such a tragic mistake as marrying his father was. She than tells him of his father's undeniable charm, and the dangers a young girl faces with the prospect of a man with a "handsome appearance". Ivo Juriša translates this phrase in coherence with the

previous narrative of a traditional conservative nature "pristalog izgleda" (Juriša, 1967, p. 67). This phrasing could be considered slightly overemphatic, if there was not a slight fall in the grace of speech a few lines later, when Amanda inquires of Jim's appearance and uses the word "homely" (Williams, 1999, p. 270) as a gentler variant of "ugly". Ivo Juriša uses "ružan" (Juriša, 1967, p. 67) here, which is completely valid. Therefore, the former phrasing of "pristalog izgleda" (Juriša, 1967, p. 67) can be viewed as a sort of compensation for the lack of a more gentle term in the case of the latter.

Later in the scene the same splendor of vocabulary is given to Tom, but this time to the detriment of the context. When Tom and Amanda start discussing Laura's character and how she might seem to other people, Tom starts hitting a string of trigger words for Amanda. First word that gets a rise out of Amanda is "cripple" (Williams, 1999, p. 271). The second one is "peculiar" (Williams, 1999, p. 271), which gets just a slightly milder reaction out of Amanda. Nonetheless, Amanda still protests such a description of her daughter. Ivo Juriša chose "osebujna" (Juriša, 1967, p. 68) as the translation equivalent. The positive connotations of "osebujan" make Amanda's reaction counter-intuitive. "Neobična" would have served the context better, since "neobična" and "peculiar" have that vagueness about them, which makes them susceptible to various interpretations, both derogatory and complimentary.

3.5. Scene VI

Sixth scene begins with an image saying: "High school hero" (Williams, 1999, p. 273). This is translated as "Gimnazijski idol" (Juriša, 1967, p. 70). The translation captures the idea of the source text, and no association with the term is found lacking. The translation equivalent of the phrase sounds slightly Yugoslavian and archaic, but this does not go to the detriment of the translation, quite the contrary it enhances it with all the connotations to the days past. This is just one of many examples where Ivo Juriša manages to find equivalence at word level and convey a culture specific concept from the source text into the target text, without it loosing any of the underlying connotations. (Baker, 1992, p. 10)

After Tom's soliloquy the dialog between Amanda and Laura commences. Amanda asks Laura why it is that she is trembling. Laura says that it is she who had made her nervous with all the preparations. "Ti si me, majko, tako iznervirala!" (p. 71) is the translation Ivo Juriša (1967) opted for. The mistake here is rather obvious. There is no way Laura could be so blunt with her mother, in a fashion of a spoiled child. Aside from that, the intended meaning is off point. "Iznervirala" implies arousal of anger, and what Laura is actually saying is that she is made nervous or anxious by her mother's preparations, and not annoyed or aggravated.

I will refer back to this chapter's introduction introduction now, where I talked about the part of the text pertaining "gay deceivers." The source text offers this line of dialog: "Because to be painfully honest, your chest is flat." (Williams, 1999, p. 275). This line contains the blunt humour I discussed earlier. The revised line, considered superior by some critics, goes like this: "Well, to tell you the truth, honey, you're just a little bit flat chested." (Rowland in Parker, 1983, p. 71). As is obvious, this line does not contain the unintentional humour which issues from the bluntness of the statement. The translation text, however, balances between these two variants and gives the readers this solution: "Da ti iskreno kažem, tvoje su grudi na žalost ravne." (Juriša, 1967, p. 72). "Na žalost" introduces a needless new emotional layer to the statement. If I guide myself by what I stated in the introduction, I will have to object to such a solution. More true to the source text would have been a statement of lackluster detachment.

Upon meeting the gentleman caller, Amanda turns into her past Southern self. This is symbolically evident in her putting on her quaint, old, extravagant dress, but there is yet another subtle peculiarity about her revisitation of the days past, and this is the emphasis of the Southern accent. When Jim is introduced to her, Amanda starts leaving out phoneme "r" in an authentic Southern manner. "Fo'" as in "for" and "ou'selves" as in "ourselves" are just some of the examples, there are myriad others, which were not present up to that point in Amanda's speech. The translation practice reaches its limit when faced with a problem such as this. The only way to compensate for this untranslatable aspect of the play is to rely on the myriad Southern references, such as Southern geography, repeated references to Southern hospitality and etiquette and so on, which Ivo Juriša undeniably does.

Near the end of the scene Laura starts feeling faint and is almost swooned by Jim's presence. She refuses to join them at the dinner table on account of this overpowering feeling. Amanda insists on Laura joining them, and so she does. Eventually, Laura enters the room, and the stage directions convey the manner in which she does this: "*The back door is pushed weakly open and LAURA comes in. She is obviously quite faint, her lips trembling, her eyes wide and staring. She moves unsteadily toward the table*." (Williams, 1999, p. 286). This is how Ivo Juriša translates these directions: "*Vrata u dnu se polako otvore i Laura uđe. Njoj je očito vrlo zlo, usne joj dršću, a oči su joj širom otvorene i nepomične. Ona nesigurno prilazi stolu."* (Juriša, 1967, p. 83). My analysis will deal primarily with the adverb "weakly" and its equivalent "polako", but I have presented the entire chunk of text for the sake of allowing a wider glimpse at this particular moment in the play. The issue with the aforementioned equivalent is that the door is not "slowly", but "weakly" opened. This is a negligible mistake

when the play is performed, but it does hold some significance when it is read as a work of literature. In this instance, it almost seems as if the door becomes the extension of Laura and her emotional state. Laura's insecurities pour over to her surroundings. This is the extent to which she is overflowing with weakness, shyness and timidity. Her every motion and everything she touches becomes the manifestation of that same weakness.

3.6. Scene VII

Once Jim and Laura are left alone they start in on a duologue that spirals into a whirlwind of emotion. Every sentence is consistent and authentic. The stage directions are likewise flawless. Jim O'Connor from the translation text can be ascribed all those character traits aforementioned in the introduction to the Jim from the source text. Now, I will just list a few minor details, which diverge from the source text. The first can be found right after Jim kisses Laura. This part is dense with captivating stage directions, from her smile, and dazed, pleasantly bewildered look, to his stumbling for a cigarette as if trying to sober up from an exulted state of mind. What he does after fishing a cigarette out of his pocket is cough, "decorously"(Williams, 1999, p. 305). Ivo Juriša interprets this cough differently, he ascribes it a curious adjective "dostojanstveno". This is not exactly a mistake, since we can view the use of this term in its broader sense. Ivo Juriša might even have used this term in accordance with the bourgeoisie notions of dignity and civil restraint, which would have been suitable for the time in which the play is set. "Pristojnost" or "uljudnost" would have been more exact terms, but "dostojanstveno" (Juriša, 1967, p. 100) has an air of the time in which the play is set and is perhaps aesthetically a more ample solution for that matter.

3.7. Tom as a Narrator

This part of the analysis refers back to the problem proposed in the introduction to this play and will deal with Tom as a poetic narrator. It will aim at determining whether the poetical quality of Tom's narration can be found in the translation text. As the material for the analysis I will consider only few of Tom's soliloquies since these abound in what can be viewed as prose poetry. As the very name suggests, prose poetry is poetically potent writing without the traditional verse form. With the very decision to compose the play in the genre of a memory play and by having his main protagonist/narrator characterized as a would-be poet, Tennessee Williams sneakily managed to put poetry into his play, avoiding the unfashionable "artificiality" of verse. Another notion that is going to be simultaneously analyzed in this segment of my paper is the use of irony, likewise a problem proposed in the introduction.

Vivacity of language is evident from the start of the play. Moreover, this quality of language plays a major role in the process of Tom's characterization, since it strongly establishes him as a person with poetic proclivities, and this quality is than conducted onto the entire play, since it is Tom who is orchestrating his memory into a coherent and artistic whole. Almost every line in the soliloquies is rich in poetical expressions and on rare occasions there appears a beautifully convoluted aphoristic construction. Images Tom paints for the reader are heightened and emphatic. They also contain a tinge of irony as can be seen in this chunk of text from the opening of the play:

> Their eyes had failed them, or they had failed their eyes, and so they were having their fingers pressed forcibly down on the fiery Braille alphabet of a dissolving economy. (Williams, 1999, p. 234)

These soliloquies are often filled to the brim with potent allusions and analogies and there is no deficit of paradoxical constructions in them. All of these elements are of course mirrored in the translation text to one degree or another.

The first chunk of text that is to be analyzed here is Tom's soliloquy at the opening of Scene Three. I chose this specific part of the text because of its ironic nuances and poetic quality. Therefore, this chunk of text promises to be potent for the analysis of both of the aforementioned issues.

This excerpt can be divided into two separate modes, one of artistic, detached irony and the other of obvious, contemptuous irony. To truly feel this dichotomy one only has to compare the first part of the text with the latter. The first part is measured, paced and contains carefully chosen analogies from the Jungian phraseology which are then infused with effective irony made evident in the verb "haunt". The second line, likewise artistically ironic, is bursting with oxymoronic evocations like the synonymous use of "image", "spectre", "hope" for the gentleman caller. If we follow King's (in Parker, 1983, p. 79) reasoning on the use of irony in the play, than this final word "hope" should reverberate with ironic detachment because of its discrepancy with the former terms. Ivo Juriša achieves the same effect and allows a careful reader of the translation text an opportunity to recognize this idea of detached irony. The descriptions of Laura and Amanda also remain in the realm of detached irony. This time irony takes on a more bitter quality. The image of the gentleman caller is now implanted into the descriptions of Amanda and Laura: "Mother's preoccupied look" and "sister's frightened apologetic manner." (Williams, 1999, p. 248). The idea of this obsession inducing archetype of a gentleman caller is rounded up and brought to its conclusion with this last

sentence, and the apotheosis of Tom's ironic detachment is reached with this bitter remark: "his presence hung . . . like a sentence passed upon the Wingfields!" (Williams, 1999, p. 248).

From this point onward Tom starts in on his obvious, mocking mode of ironic expression. Best indicator of incoming irony is Tom's construction: "to properly feather the nest and plume the bird." (Williams, 1999, p. 248). Then the language describing the content of the books of the "ladies of letters" (Williams, 1999, p. 248) becomes congested with a surfeit of overly-sentimental adjectives. Here, irony stands in clear view. The translation text is problematic in the first few lines because of its inconsistency with the Jungian phraseology, but this was already discussed in the previous segment of the paper. What was not discussed is Ivo Juriša's solution for the effective verb "haunt" which is the centerpiece of poeticism in the sentence. Ivo Juriša (1963) presents the readers with a convoluted sentence that lacks the final effect because of his choice of a somewhat meek verb "obilaziti" (p. 45), which is understandable since there is no direct equivalent in the target language for specters haunting the living, a concept so pervasive in the culture from which the source text sprung. Nonetheless irony is still evident in the diminutive phrasing "naš mali stan" (Juriša, 1967, p. 46). The oxymoronic nouns in the second sentence are translated to the point and seem to achieve the same effect. The two constructions: "Majčinom zabrinutom pogledu" and "sestrinom vladanju punom ispričavanja" (Juriša, 1967, p. 46) are perfect, with the latter one being wordier than the source text but nonetheless evocative. Once Tom goes into his mode of obvious, mocking irony in the narration, Ivo Juriša consistently mirrors him.

For the sake of providing a more challenging example of irony I will switch to Scene Six and its opening soliloque, a part of the text that contains the phrase highlighted in the introduction, or to be more precise the "Oscar Wilde's worst style" issue between Krutch and King (in Parker, 1983, p. 86). King talks about the powerful tool of irony employed as a distancing device from the world of reality which is to be rendered for artistic purposes. According to King, bitter irony and sweet nostalgia oscillate in Tom's soliloquies (p. 79). For further probation into the notion of irony, I will present here a quote by Irving Babbit (as cited by King in Parker, 1983): "Hot baths of sentiment . . . followed by cold douches of irony." (p. 80). The irony in the sixth scene can be viewed in degrees of severity. The soliloquy starts from a place of sweet reminiscence and exponentially becomes more bitter. Irony grows almost unnoticeably from sentence to sentence. First Jim is compared to white chinaware, which can hardly be perceived as ironic if the irony was not heralded by the previous phrase "tremendous Irish good nature" (Williams, 1999, p. 273). This is not a jab at Jim O'Connor. Tom is, perhaps, only sporting with his phrasing in depicting a man that he truly holds to be

good-natured. The latter phrase “like white chinaware” (Williams, 1999, p. 273) can than be interpreted as mild irony. Afterwards, irony increases with the use of hyperbole in the sentence “He seemed to move in a continual spotlight” (Williams, 1999, p. 273). When listing Jim’s accomplishments Tom starts doubling down on irony in each successive sentence:

> He was always running or bounding, never just walking. He seemed always at the point of defeating the law of gravity. He was shooting with such velocity through his adolescence that you would logically expect him to arrive at nothing short of the White House by the time he was thirty. (Williams, 1999, p. 273)

Irony increases after this sequence of mild mockery, and ends with some self-deprecating humor: “. . . and they also began to smile at me as people smile at an oddly fashioned dog who [sic!] trots across their path at some distance.” (Williams, 1999, p. 274). When he mentions Laura, the irony stops and an emotion of nostalgia supplants it. The oscillatory motion in the use of irony reveals itself soon after, when Tom says that Laura had been unobtrusive in high school as much as Jim was “astonishing”. From that point on Tom builds his soliloquy up to the point of an expected laugh from the audience at the end of it.

Ivo Juriša seems to have mirrored these rhythms of irony well in the translation text. The entire string of ironic hyperboles and jabs are well introduced with a sardonic phrase “sjajnu irsku narav” (Juriša, 1967, p. 70). From that point on, no discrepancies occur in the translation text.

There are two very clear moments of ironic detachment in the final soliloquy of the play. The first one is Tom’s belated retort to Amanda’s line: “Go, then! Then go to the moon – you selfish dreamer!” (Williams, 1999, p. 312). Tom says: “I didn’t go to the moon” (Williams, 1999, p. 313), which is a statement that verifies Tom’s ironic attitude and the way he implements ironic detachment in his soliloquies. “Go to the moon you selfish dreamer” is a cliche phrase of over the top sentimentality, and Tom’s retort assures the reader of his intended irony, not only in this instance, but throughout the entire play. As King (in Parker, 1983) points out, the serious nature of the situation impedes laughter in this instance, but the absence of laughter after Tom’s phrase makes this line no less ample with ironic detachment (p.80). The second instance of detached irony appears at the very end of the play with Tom’s closing remark: “and so good-bye” (Williams, 1999, p. 313). What makes this an instance of detached irony is the evident drop off from the powerful and elevated poetical phrasing. Therefore, the effect of the last remark (that of ironic detachment), depends wholly on conveying the poetic beauty of imagery that leads up to it. Ivo Juriša conveyed the beauteous

imagery with utmost precision, from that of cities sweeping around Tom like dead leaves, the windows filled with coloured glass resembling bits of a shattered rainbow, to that of the world being lit by lightning. The problem is that the closing remark was not recognized as ironic. It was translated into a construction with a clear intention of conveying pathos: ". . . jer svijet je danas osvijetljen munjama! Ugasi svoje svijeće, Laura . . . i . . . zbogom. . . . " (Juriša, 1967, p. 108).

4. **Introduction to Edward Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Wolf?***

First, I would like to place Albee's text within its theoretical and literary framework . Having been aligned as a writer of the Theatre of the Absurd, Edward Albee eloquently retorted:

> The Theatre of the Absurd is an absorption-in-art of certain existentialist and post-existentialist philosophical concepts having to do, in the main, with man's attempts to make sense of himself out of his senseless position in a world which makes no sense - which makes no sense because the moral, religious, political and social structures man has created to "illusion" himself have collapsed. (New York Times Magazine February 25, 1962, p. 2)

Usually one would not choose to begin an introduction with such basic information as is a classification of a play to a certain genre, but Albee's play is difficult to approach if this task is not met with early, since every play of his has an amalgam-like quality. The following excerpt from Martin Esslin's theory on the Theatre of the Absurd will hopefully shed some more light on this issue. Esslin says that *Who's Afraid of Virginia Wolf?* is:

> ... a savage dance of death reminiscent of Strindberg, outwardly realistic in form, but in fact, as in the case of Pinter's best work, existing on at least two levels apart from the realistic one: as an allegory of American society, a poetic image of its emptiness and sterility, and as a complex ritual on the pattern of Genet. (Esslin, 1960, p. 22)

Eslin's take on Albee says a lot about the complexity of his work. He had to reach for three distinct points of comparison to properly describe the play of Albee: Strindberg's naturalist plays, Pinteresque drama and Jean Genet's absurdist works. This combination of different views on the prior dramatic traditions makes Albee a rather challenging author to translate, especially because a translator always has to keep in mind the sub-text, or rather the web of meaning behind the seemingly obvious denotation of a line of dialog. Even though this play of Albee is indubitably reminiscent of an absurdist drama, because of, among other things, its embeddedness in existentialist philosophy, it would be a mistake not to view it as a version of naturalist drama as well. Its presentation of authentic psychology of characters will be set as one of my primary concerns when analyzing the translation of the play-text. Emotion and action seem to be centerpieces of this play, therefore these will assume the position of relevance in my translation analysis.

In *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* the character's lives are revealed through a multitude of brief references, interrupted, fragmentary stories and narrative contrivances. A dark, existential essence surges behind these surface elements, which is exactly the reason why no part of the dialog can or should be lost in translation. That would be risking unintelligibility of an already barely-sensical absurdist aspect of the play.

The basic structure of the play corresponds to traditional conventions of realism, and even the Aristotelian unity of time is maintained. Characters, their interactions, the setting, and the dialogs are all realistic. The beginning of the play is an overtly natural mirror-image of a slice of life realist drama would generally portray, but as the drunken bacchanalias progress into the wee hours of night the audience is faced with subtle absurdity lying behind the curtain of ordinary human interactions. Therefore, absurdist qualities spring up over the course of the play, subtly, almost unnoticeably until the end where they reach their apotheosis. This is not to say that Albee uses old conventions to present new absurdist content. He is embracing absurdist philosophy to a certain degree, and masking it with a fine furnish of realistic tradition.

The speech in Albee's play is mostly void of poeticism exempting the titles of acts (named "Fun and Games", "Walpurgisnacht", "The Exorcism"), and the Requiem mass at the end. What the readership is presented with is a series of cliché responses, minor witticisms contrasting the bleak atmosphere, occasional silences or pauses, speech interruptions, hesitations, stuttering, stammering, and so on. Clichés in Albee's play are somewhat differently implemented than Beckett's, who presumably employed cliché to express the inadequacy of language to communicate any substantial idea, Albee endows these with certain power and capacity of affecting human emotion. Whereas Beckett might move audience to laughter in *Waiting for Godot* using pure absurdity and inadequacy of a line of dialog, Albee offers straight-forward sarcasm, insults and witticism. Humor in the play is one of repressed anger, existential angst, discontent, and frustration. It is imperative for the translator to express every single humorous line of dialog and give it as much original emphasis and effect as possible, since this is exactly what gives Albee's play its naturalistic aura and a firmer grip of reality that is breaking apart. For the absurdist element, which becomes obvious mostly near the end of the play, to be properly accentuated, naturalist convention must be foregrounded elsewhere. According to Esslin (1960), since this drama combines naturalist with absurdist convention, it should be judged by the quality of imagery, the depth of intuition, and the validity of poetic imagination. Of course, this paper will not tackle the aforementioned aspects on the level of Albee's play-text as such, since its focus is on the

analysis of the play's translation, yet that is exactly the level on which I will try to analyse whether these aspects Eslin points out are properly mirrored.

Unlike in the plays of the Theatre of the Absurd proper, the protagonists George, Martha, Nick, and Honey are fully realized characters, and therefore each can be discussed at length. All four of them at first seem to exemplify campus novels' types engaged in relationships that can be defined only as dysfunctional from the start. They all convey a clear allusion to the fear of isolation and reveal a strong tendency to belonging. Their symbiotic relationships are based on various delusions, such as Honey's phantom pregnancy or Martha's imagined son, and are therefore neurotic in essence. All the games they play and illusions they create are just derivative of the basic psychological principle on which their relationships are based on.

The more prominent pair is George and Martha, for various reasons, and thus, the next thread of this paper's analysis deals exclusively with their relationship. There is hardly a reason for George to endure Martha's constant nagging, other than attempting to escape angst connected with the idea of hardly attainable, but highly sought after independence in modern society. Neither character possesses true independence, which sends them on an incessant struggle for supremacy. They try to best one another, since they are co-dependent and in need of validation, that they seem to seek for, but never gain from the spouse. I consider the notion of power struggle to be the central leitmotif in the play, which underlines all the characters' endeavors and relations, and which moves the plot further; thus it should be mirrored well in the translation of the play. The translation can, therefore, easily crumble if even the smallest mannerism, which usually carries important implication for the sub-text of the play, is omitted. There are myriad examples of the mentioned pattern, starting from the very begining, then proceding with George verbally taunting Nick, and tables soon turning with Martha revealing her husband's week spots. This dynamic will be exemplified in the translation analysis. Martha, on the other hand, has different reasons for enduring her husbands inadequacy to be a prolific member of academic society as she herself and her father had hoped for, and not just a mediocre history profesor. My research has lead me to this insighteful analysis of Martha's character: "This illusory suffering is also a signifier of the nothingness and absurdity of Martha's existence as it exposes how her life is shaped by expectations and betrayed by her inadequacies." (Sarkar, 2006, p. 36). This recognition of Martha's psyche accurately captures the condition of a modern man bamboozled by his/her own distorted ideas of what life should be. The comment given above can be reiterated by a reference to Martha's futile wish for progeny. This kind of view changes the scope of the play

completely, since the audience can no longer be perceiving Martha as university dean's daughter, professor's idle wife, or an upper-middle class socialite, but as an archetype that majority of readership can identify with. The metaphysical surge below the apparent surface elements is one of the prerequisites for a play to explore the essence of the theatre of the absurd. Albee weaved this dimension into his work, and one of the goals of my paper is to see whether it was satisfactorily mirrored in the translation.

The characters' past is revealed in series of small, usually interrupted responses, monologues and soliloquies. Even though these responses are probably just another set of illusions they should be taken seriously by the translator and conveyed verbatim to the reader. This is not only the case with recollections, but also stances the characters take on various subjects that come up during the night. George's historical references and allusions, Nick's verbal defenses from George, Martha's jabs, and Honey's platitudes all fall under the same umbrella of translational importance.

The surface elements of characterization such as their occupations, positions in society and so on, carry little significance for a foreign reader, but there are some purely American allusions that can be caught on close inspection. George being a book-worm unable to act in an overly pragmatic and status-oriented capitalist society is to a degree a reversed symbol of an Emersonian scholar. Plagued by existential angst, made immobile or impotent by his suffocating success-oriented surroundings, he can represent the disillusionment with the deviation from the principles on which American academic strata of society was founded on. Names of the hosts, George and Martha, also echo American presidential past, alluding to the roots of the country.

Musicality and the rhythm of the play must be tackled as well since these are often mentioned qualities of Albee's writing. Moreover, these qualities play a major role in the overall aesthetic impression that this play leaves on the reader. William Flanigan (in Amacher, 1969) suggested that: "An Albee play - once given its plot idea – is conceived in structural blocks of cannily contrasted rhythmic and sonic textures. Consider the coda-like fragmentation of the two solo voices that bring *Who's Afraid of Virginia Wolf?* to its final unresolved cadence. Or consider the agitato solo aria ... of *The Zoo Story*." (p. 42). Albee's composer friends additionally recognized the largo (slow tempo or dignified in style), and allegro (performed at a brisk speed) rhythms in the dialogs of *Who's Afraid of Virginia Wolf?* (Amacher, 1969). This is one of the major problems the translators of the source text might be faced with, but more on that will be said in the latter text of the paper.

The setting of the play is New Carthage. Implications of New Carthage might be immense, and therefore the setting should be made obvious to audiences early on in a production or translation of the play. Carthage is the setting for the story of Dido and Aeneas, told by Virgil in his epic on the adventures of the Trojan hero who becomes ancestor to the Romans. It is possible, or even probable that New Carthage is a symbol, and not just a random choice of a non-descript New England college campus. To omit this symbol, which references ancient classical literature and mythology, is to commit a great injustice to the symbolical aspect of the play. This symbol gives many valuable implications to the reader. If their place of residence is New Carthage, could George then be the modern Aeneas, and could Martha be the modern Dido? It is hard to imagine that Albee included this parallel into his work without the slightest intention at an ironic jab.

"Fun and Games" is the title of the first act. This establishes pretty straight-forwardly the main premise; that being, a married couple trapped inside a loop of quarrelsome, but in a certain vain satisfactory game-like fabrications. The notion of games stretches throughout the play. Everything that happens, that is brought up, or discussed is a game. This illusionary quality of games in the play corresponds perfectly to Tom's opening soliloquy in *The Glass Menagerie*: "I give you truth in the pleasant disguise of illusion." (Williams, 1999, p. 235). Therefore, one can assume that the Act One aims at establishing the main premise of characters fabricating games and illusions. Act Two, entitled "Walpurgisnacht" is symbolically straight-forward. It alludes to pagan rites of fertility, gathering of witches, and so on. This is where the play's action escalates, and where, at the ending of the act, the author introduces macabre element of the hosts' son's death. Act Three is dubbed "Exorcism", which is the act of cleansing, and in this case the act forces an exorcism of delusions. Once purged of these personal fables all the characters are left with is vanity, perennial emptiness of human existence. At the end of the play Martha in one instant seems to be displaying true emotions toward her husband, but the presumption is that soon everything will go back to the incessant bickering. After this anticipated disillusionment all that is left for us is to lament over the protagonists in the words of King Solomon: "vanity of vanities; all is vanity."(Ecclesiastes 1:2–3.).

.

5. Translation Analysis of *Who's Afraid of Virginia Wolf?*

There are many parts of the text left out of the translation which is the analytical corpus of the paper, and analyzed here. This is strictly a play-text and therefore it should not be exempt from criticism on the pretenses of it being intended for staging. The sheer amount

of omitted content leaves one genuinely confused, since the reason for such quantity of erasure of the source text is definitely not the conceptual intricacy, nor can these parts be deemed superfluous. In the following paragraph of my paper I will discuss potential consequences of the above mentioned omissions.

The first large chunk of the text omitted can be found in the Act One of the source text where two male characters are left alone, while Martha is giving Honey a tour of the house. The part of the omitted dialog follows directly after the end of their discussion on the topic of biology. Right after George's Huxlian prediction on the future of humankind the subject of settling down is brought up. George feels strongly about New Carthage. Many pictures are painted in his page-long soliloquy. He starts off with three symbolically meaningful mentions. New Carthage is rejected as a good place to settle down. Other hyperbolic options George puts forth are Illyria, Penguin Island, and Gomorah. Following these hyperbolic allusions is George's question if Nick thinks he is going to be happy in New Carthage. This part of the omitted text is very important for the depiction of George's growing discontent with the place. Nick says, a little defensively, that he hopes to stay there. Then George, showing ever more of his discontentedly colored outlook on his situation, says that there are far better colleges to choose to settle down in. After Nick says that he does not indeed plan to stay there forever, George is sent on a mild tirade, which begins with an off the cuff remark that the old man, meaning Martha's father, would not like such a plan. This piece of text is very important in creating a more detailed image of Martha's father, who is an unseen character and therefore in a dire need of a few more mentions in order to be depicted correctly and believably. This also affects the information dynamics, (Baker, 1992, p. 119) a fact which will become palpable in the later portion of the text when Martha's father will be mentioned without proper background information rendering his presence in the context of the given situation unsatisfactory relative to the source text. The translation does not offer further characterization of Martha's father in this instance, and therefore commits a literary faux pas of considerable gravity. The unseen character is depicted by George as being a possessive, overbearing, and to a degree even unintentionally evil character. A grim picture is painted of professors being buried under the shrubbery around the college campus chapel. This is preceded by a melancholy comparison of professors who stay there with ivy that keeps growing on the walls. The old man is then compared with a Micronesian tortoise, on account of his old age. This remark speaks volumes of George's hatred towards Martha's father and his boss, because when commenting on his longevity George implies that he wishes him dead.

Stepping over this large a chunk of text must come with an explanation in the foreword or at least a mention in footnotes.

In the Act Two, at the very beginning, right after George's narration of a story about his days as a youth during prohibition there is a short exchange between George and Nick, while Martha is in the kitchen making coffee for an already inebriated Honey. George's inquiry about Martha's whereabouts sparks this omitted part of the dialog. In the translated text we learn that she is making coffee for Honey, but George's sardonic comments are nowhere to be found. In his condescending remarks George makes a reference to Honey's previously mentioned hysterical pregnancy, to which Nick reacts in an accepting manner. We as readers see him playing along with George the game of verbal provocation and mockery. This dialog of the two men has indeed been established earlier, but there is no reason not to expand on it and show the readers the depths of mockery into which the two protagonists are prepared to descend. The translation leaves this out and just continues with George's views on correlation between aging and insanity. He states that insane men, at least those quiet ones, do not age with the same stead-fast tempo the normal ones do. I will continue narrating the aftermath, because not long after the first omission we are faced with yet another one. This time small dispersed chunks of text are missing. It cannot be said that these are concentrated into shorter lines that contain all the needed information, since there is a wordy explanation missing. George has an idea of insane men growing old at a slower rate. This is conveyed in the translation, but what the translation does not express is a short, simple explanation of this idea. This mistake paints George as an impulsive character prone to non-sequiturs, which evaporate in thin air right after they are said, or rather, which are trumped by his interlocutor, because they are deemed meaningless. Even George seems to dismiss his own remarks right after he states them. For the sake of clarity, what follows is the original scene and the ommited segment in the translation:

George: The saddest thing about men . . . Well, no, one of the saddest things about men is the way they age . . . some of them. Do you know what it is with insane people? Do you? . . . the quite ones?

Nick: No.

George: They don't change . . . they don't grow old.

Nick: They must.

George: Well, eventually probably, yes. But they don't . . . in the usual sense. They maintain a . . . a firm skinned serenity . . . the . . . the under-use of everything leaves them . . . quite whole.

Nick: Are you recommending it?

George: No. Some things are sad, though. (imitates a pep-talker) But ya jest gotta buck up an' face 'em, 'at's all. Buck up! (Pause) Martha doesn't have hysterical pregnancies. (Albee, 1963, p. 63.)

Džordž: Najtužnije kod ljudi je . . . odnosno jedna od najtužnijih stvari kod ljudi je način na koji stare. Znate li kako to izgleda kod nenormalnih osoba? Mislim kod onih mirnih?

Nik: Ne znam.

Džordž: Oni ne stare. Odnosno, nije da ne stare na uobičajeni način. Ostaju nekako netaknuti.

Nik: Nemoguće. Ovo mi zvuči kao preporuka.

Džordž: Marta ne pati od lažne trudnoće. (Ćosić, 2002, p. 362)

The translation seems compacted, as if the goal was to fit as much content into as fewer lines of dialog as possible. Even if the obvious omissions are overlooked, we are still faced with the problem of a more serious kind and that is the loss of spontaneity of speech. It is clear in the source text that we are witnessing two drunk men going back and forth and barely holding on to the subject of their discussion. There are interruptions, pauses, the train of thought is lost on more than one occasion, but still the reader is presented with a comprehensible, if quirky text. The target text, however, does not retain the same qualities. The interruptions, the pauses, and the incessant back-and-forth quality of the speech are lost and we are only given the bare minimum of what the author devised. The fourth line in the translation sounds especially contrived, with Nick's robotic, monotonous reply.

The next omission is relatively minor, if not easily overlooked, compared to the rest, but it holds slight significance characterization-wise. The dialog that leads to this omission is George's narration of a story based on the information Nick conveyed to him in one of the previous scenes. This is a part of the game George proposed earlier called "Get the Guests". The point of the game is George's re-telling of private, intimate, embarrassing details of Nick's and Honey's relationship. His narration is met with Honey's consistent, almost rhythmic, near-recognitions of the story, which are accompanied by Nick's pleads for George to stop. Martha also interjects a couple of times. These rhytmic interjections pertain to what has already been stated in the introduction to the play, where *Who is Afraid of Virginia Wolf* is

said to have rhythmic and sonic textures characteristic of an opera and the rhythmic qualities of the play-text have to be observed in its translations.

Near the end of the Act Two there is a scene that robs George of further characterization. The scene is introduced in George's absence. Martha and Nick are starting to dance around the idea of committing adultery. Martha is enticing Nick with a proposition of a kiss, while George is getting ice in the other room. He is heard off-stage finishing the lines of the leitmotif ditty. His entrance is marked by a speech ornamented with baffling historical references, which carry important implications about George's condescending stance of intellectual superiority towards other characters in the room, in this case Martha and Nick. For the sake of clarity, here is the excerpt:

George: . . . of Virginia Woolf,

Virginia Woolf

Viginia . . .

. . . ah! Here we are . . . ice for the lamps of China, Manchuria thrown in. (To Nick) You better watch those yellow basterds, my love . . . they aren't amused. Why don't you come on over to our side, and we'll blow the hell out of 'em. Then we can split up the money between us and be on Easy Street. What d'ya say?

Nick (not at all sure what is being talked about): Well . . . sure. Hey! Ice! (Albee, 1963, p. 99)

The translation conveys the same scene in the following manner:

Džordž: . . . vuka još, vuka još . . . Stiže led!

Nik: Baš lepo! (Ćirilov, 2002, p. 393)

The impoverishment of the above presented dialog is faulty on two accounts. The first is the apparent loss of spontaneity and the second one is the loss of George's claim for superiority in an otherwise humiliating situation. Deeper understanding of George's lines in the excerpt above calls for a paraphrase of J. Albert Robbins. First of all, Robbins (1983, pp. 17-19) presents us with an explanation put forth by dr. Kai-Ho-Hah. Apparently, there is a commonly used lamp in China called "chou ma teng" or "wan teng". The allusion in the play pertains only to the shape of the bucket which is likewise cylindrical. The lamp is commonly known in China as the "illusion lamp" — which corresponds to the play in its motif of games and illusions. This interpretation is satisfactory only to a certain degree. To be more concrete,

this explains only the first sentence, or rather the ice bucket – lamp correlation. Further on in the article, Robbins (2010, pp. 17–18) gives a more likely analysis. He presents its audience with abstruse information, which brings the best selling novel by Alice Tisdale Hobard into the light. The name of the novel is *Oil for the Lamps of China*, and it tells a story of an American manager of Socony Oil Company. The novel is riddled with romanticism pertaining to Chinese peasants. Glorification of the manager, who was actually the employer of the author's husband in real life, is also there. This tells us that the novel is drenched in subjectivity and sentimentality to the core. After it was written, *Oil for the Lamps of China* quickly descended into obscurity, making this reference in the play overly abstruse, and therefore hard to translate. Robbins interprets the rest of George's speech very freely. He muses with the idea of criticizing Hobard's novel from an assumed perspective of George. Robbins sees George as a keen but sardonic professor of history who would certainly dislike the novel. He goes on assuming that for George this novel would be representative of the worst aspects of American Orientalism (2010, p. 18). The aspects that Robbins is talking about are economic exploitations masked as beneficence, erroneous sentimentalist view of interracial brotherhood, the protagonist's stupidity in thinking that the corporation would treat him equitably. Robbins (2010) ends his short, but for my paper very significant, analysis with these words:

> With his cynical view of history, so pervasive in the play, George sees through the hypocrisy and ignorant governmental and corporate policies toward China and such sentimental novelistic memoirs as *Oil for the Lamps of China*. It is totally in character for George to transpose "ice" (what he carries in his hand) and "oil" for two reasons. His naive colleague, Nick, will be baffled, wondering what ice has to do with oil lamps in China. And, as a private joke, it succinctly expresses George's cynicism about American foreign policy. (p. 18)

Having all this in mind, let us return to the consequences of translating this meaningful an excerpt in altogether eight words. Even if this information from J. Albert Robbins' article was not present back in 2002, when the translation was produced, this excerpt in the translation still could have been put in different words, where the entire dialog could have been enriched with absolutely any indication of George's attitude. His sentiment could have been realized in a myriad of ways. Historical references, however obscure, should not be omitted from George's speech, since being a historian is a big, if not essential part of his character, but even if the translator opts for the omission, some elements indicating his mental

state should still be present. George's drunken intellectual bravado in the face of what could only be termed an adulterous conspiracy must be emphatic in this short excerpt; otherwise he just ends up looking like a naive "schmuck". Nick, on the other hand, instead of seeming uninformed, even confused by the situation, is portrayed as being facetious and having the upper-hand on George.

Approximately half a page later in the target text the readers are faced with another, not negligible, omission. This time, I will bring into question the basic intelligibility of the dialog, since the chunk of the text missing interferes with basic comprehensibility of the situation. A few inconsequential lines after the last omission, George goads Martha about her drinking habits. Nick does not interfere until his wife's, now completely inebriated, condition is brought up. George matter-of-factly mentions passing the bathroom, and then makes a flippant remark about Honey curling up like a fetus and sucking her thumb. Martha finds this situation cute, and expresses this with an onomatopoeic interjection that would best suit that emotion. Nick is indifferent and only inquires about Honey out of slight social discomfort. The translation overlooks these small instances and just continues the dialog as if none of it happened. The result of this is a non-sensical dialog between Martha and George:

> Džordž (Niku, koji stoji pored bara): Vidim da sami sebi sipate. Fino, fino . . . Sad ću i ja da napojim Martu i biće sve uredu.
>
> Marta (podozrivo): U kakvom redu?
>
> Džordž: Naravno! (Pruža Marti piće.) Izvoli.
>
> Marta (I dalje obazrivo): Hvala. (Ćirilov, 2002, p. 393)

Apart from this exchange not making even the slightest sense, we are left without the crucial information of Honey's whereabouts or state. From the context of the play we can conclude that she is still in the bathroom, but a verification of this detail, which was intended by the author, would have been appropriate.

The next omission takes place in the same act, the "Walpurgisnacht". Minor jabs have been thrown on both sides, and now infidelity is under way in the form of Martha's and Nick's lascivious kissing, happening right under George's nose. He pretends to be indifferent, but underneath it all, he is actually nonplussed. Martha takes his pretenses seriously, and becomes clearly annoyed and expresses it. George continues with his pretense of indifference, which escalates the situation. At this point Nick is seen commenting in disbelief:

> Nick (turning away, a look of disgust on his face): I . . . I have no respect for you.

George: And none for yourself, either . . . (indicating Martha) I don't know what the younger generation's coming to.

Nick: You don't . . . you don't even . . .

George: Care? You're quite right . . . I couldn't care less. So, you just take this bag of laundry here, throw her over your shoulder, and . . .

Nick: You're disgusting. (Albee, 1963, p. 103)

The translation offers a different situation. In it George does not express his indifference:

Nik (okreće se; gleda ga s prezirom): Ne osjećam ni trunku poštovanja prema vama.

Džordž: A ni prema samom sebi . . . (Pokazuje na Martu.) Uzmite ovu vreću prebacite je preko ramena i . . .

Nik: Vi ste odvratni. (Ćirilov, 2002, p. 395)

George's feigned indifference is left out, and although it is implied throughout the scene we are still left dissatisfied if it is not accepted by Nick in his disconcertment. This changes the power struggle of the two characters in a major way, and in a decisive moment for that matter.

The final Act has no significant omissions and thus the paper turns to the issue of the use of italics in the source text.

5.1. Italics As a Tone Intensifier

Aside from the obvious use of italics in didascalies, there is another one used in Albee's playtext, equal in importance. Throughout the original text italics is used to signify elevation in tone, or as an emphatic device to stress certain words and with that, change the sub-textual intent of the speaker, the intent which would otherwise stay hidden from the reader. These tonal elevations and word accentuation bring out the aforementioned rhythm and musicality of the play. The translation does not use italics, and in no other way does it ensure that the emphasis becomes apparent, which produces a myriad of examples of lost meaning. Because of this, I will tackle examples in order in which they appear, until the register becomes sufficient for the insight into the gravity of such errors and the way they affect characterization. I will not, however, expound on the rhythm and musicality too much, since my education in this field is lacking.

To begin with, here is an example from the very beginning of the play:

Martha: Jesus . . .

George: . . . Shhhhhh . . .

Martha: . . . H. Christ . . .

George: For God's sake, Martha, it's two o'clock in the . . .

Martha: Oh, George!

George: Well, I'm *sorry,* but . . .

Martha: What a cluck! What a cluck you are.

George: It's late, you know? Late.

Martha (looks about the room. Imitates Bette Davis) : What a dump. Hey, what's that from? "What a dump! "

George: How would I know what . . .

Martha: Aw, come on! What's it from? *You* know . . .

George: . . . Martha . . .

Martha: WHAT'S IT FROM, FOR CHRIST'S SAKE? (Albee, 1963, p. 11)

In the citation we can see two italicized words, the meaning of which will be discussed further on in the text, side by side with the examples from target text, given here below:

Marta: Gospode . . .

Džordž: Š-š-š-š . . .

Marta: Bože . . .

Džordž: Ali zaboga, Marta, sada je dva sata . . .

Marta: Uh, Džordž!

Džordž: Dobro, izvini, ali . . .

Marta: Ti nikako da prestaneš s tim tvojim kokodakanjem!

Džordž: Ali zar ne vidiš da je već kasno?

Marta (gleda po sobi. Podražava BET DEVIS): Užasan nered! Je li, odakle je ova rečenica: „Ovo je pravi ćumez!"?

Džordž: Otkud ja znam . . .

MARTA: Ma hajde, reci, odakle je? Ti sve znaš.

DŽORDŽ: Marta!

MARTA: Ali za ime božije, odakle je ta rečenica? (Ćirilov, 2002, p. 321)

The first italicized word in the source play-text is "sorry", expressed by George. In the original, he is obviously being sardonic. Martha intuitively recognizes this and reacts the way she regularly does to his scathing behavior. The dialog quality between the two is established

here, and we can already feel that these are common proceedings in their home. His "sorry" refers to the lateness of the hour and is a plead for her to stop; therefore, her counterattack is justified. Of course, the context of the situation offers this clarity of meaning in the translation as well, with only one little exemption that ties in with this paper's subject of the translation analysis focusing on characterization. What is not evident in the translation is George's attitude towards his wife's behavior. At first glance, he appears to be apologetic, without the "little lower layer" applied to the meaning of the word in the original. Impression that the translation equivalent of George left upon me in this instance is that of a weak, spineless man, incapable of counterargument and hard pressed on retaining his wife's affection with the price of losing face. For the sake of saving space which would otherwise be consumed, in further use in this paper, I will assume the term "translation George" instead the redundant phrasing "translation equivalent of George". I, personally, take George from the translated play-text not to be the same protagonist George from the original, Albee's play-text. The difference is in nuances of course; many aspects of his personality are retained through various situations in the play.

Now, we will place our attention to the second italicized word, which is Martha's whimsical "you" in "Aw, come on! What's it from? *You* know . . . . " The translation offers a nuanced difference in meaning when Martha says "Ti sve znaš". Her capricious character is overcast by a dark cloud of unbefitting sarcasm. Martha, here, actually says something in a tone a lot more suitable to George. This "you" is a looming verbal representation of a character trait that will later become more apparent in her bursts of open, vulgar sexuality, often preceded by berating, as is the case here. Aftermath of her caprice can also be seen here. After the discussed line, George barely gets a word in edgewise before he is interrupted by her yelling and swearing. His interrupted ". . . Martha . . . " carries a sentiment of melancholy and disappointment with the situation and to a degree, possibly, with her. "Translation George", on the other hand, yells her name in anger reminding her that it is too late for such antics. "Translation Martha" replies with a calm question and a curse besmeared with timidity. This is just a small chunk of text, but it can already be used to show how much the translation is going to meander off the track when it comes to emphatic use of certain words, tone, and rhythm.

Next example comes shortly after when Martha tries to recall the name of the Bette Davis movie through many associations. The subject turns to the name of the leading actor. The mistake here is very small, and does not affect characterization in any major way. What it does is alleviate Martha's response, changing the direction of her contempt:

GEORGE: What actor? What scar?

MARTHA: *I* can't remember his name, for God's sake. (Albee, 1963, p. 12)

It is clear from her phrasing and stressing of the pronoun that she is angry with George for even asking such a redundant question. Translation cannot be construed in this way:

DŽORDŽ: Kakav glumac? Kakav ožiljak?

MARTA: Do đavola, ne mogu da se sjetim njegovog imena. (Ćirilov, 2002, p. 322)

Her anger in the translation is not directed towards George's disinterested, automaton-like question, it is directed towards her own incapability to recall the name. This means that she is not opposing his absent-minded responses, but giving them merit, which makes her seem simple-minded, and unaware of her interlocutors' intentions. Also, the flow of their incessant argument is lost with her momentary amiability.

Another function of inflections, which will not be discussed in detail here, is stressing the words that have important implications for the psychology of characters. Martha, at the end of the Act One stresses the words that carry significant implications about her view of George. These words are "stuff" and "guts". Both used to refer to exactly the same things, indicating her disgust with George's inactivity and lack of courage to act in the world where action is paramount. Another example of this would be the constant inflection on the verb "do" at one point in the play in which Martha nags George about not being a particularly hardworking individual. Of course, all this can be gathered from the context of the scene, but inflections are there for a reason, they avert our attention to details that can be easily overlooked, and exempted from the general impression.

Nuances are added to the character of Honey with inflections she uses in her speech. These do not change the overall impression she leaves on the reader, but they do accentuate her childlike simplicity and the tendency to get easily excited. A few examples might elucidate what I mean by this:

HONEY: Well, I certainly had fun . . . it was a *wonderful* party. (Albee, 1963, p. 23)

The same line is translated in the following manner:

HANI: Ali, ja sam se vrlo lepo zabavljala . . . Bio je to sjajan prijem. (Ćirilov, 2002, p. 331)

Not accentuating the marked word in the translation, robs the readers of the clearer depiction of her trigger-happy excitability. Also, we can note the objectionable translation of the final noun "party" realized as "prijem". The latter being in all respects a word with a higher note of seriousness, suitable to mature personages, and in no respect can it find a place in Honey's juvenile vocabulary. Mona Baker calls this issue the tenor of discourse.(Baker, 1992, p. 16) The translator infused the character of Honey with a higher degree of formality than is suitable The translator could have been redeemed for both indiscretions with the use of "zabava" instead of "prijem".

5.2. Stage Directions

Manifold are the instances where translation does not convey stage directions properly, or simply omits them. In the following text I will discuss the consequences of some poorly executed translations of stage directions at the level of characterization.

At the very beginning of Act One "Translation George" continues to be depicted as a weak, broken husband seriously lacking self-esteem and vigor:

George: I'm tired, dear . . . it's late . . . and besides . . .

Martha: I don't know what you're so tired about . . . you haven't done anything all day; you didn't have any classes, or anything . . .

George: Well, I'm tired . . . If your father didn't set up these goddamn Saturday night orgies all the time . . .

Martha: Well, that's too bad about you, George . . .

George (grumbling): Well, that's how it is, anyway

Martha: You didn't *do* anything: you never *do* anything; you never *mix.* You just sit around and *talk.* (Albee, 1963, p. 13)

The translator opts for a puzzling solution for stage directions, as seen in the excerpt below:

Džordž: Umoran sam, draga . . . kasno je . . . a osim toga . . .

Marta: Ne vidim od čega bi bio toliko umoran . . . Ceo dan nisi baš ništa radio. Nisi održao ni jedno predavanje ili bilo šta drugo

Džordž: Ali sam umoran . . . Kad ne bi bilo ovih prokletih orgija koje tvoj otac priređuje subotom uveče . . .

Marta: Nešto nije u redu s tobom, Džordž . . .

Džordž (slomljeno) : Možda i nije uredu, ali tako je.

Marta: Ništa nisi radio. Ti nikad ništa i ne radiš. Ti nikad ne uspostaviš kontakt. Samo sediš i pričaš. (Ćirilov, 2002, p. 323)

I offer such a seemingly unnecessary and long excerpt for the sake of a deeper understanding of consequences of this misguiding stage direction. I could have gone on, and showed the following excerpt which would prove the further gravity of the mistake, but a simple narration of what happens later will suffice. "Grumbling" can be translated with surgical exactitude to "gunđajući". "Slomljeno" shows not George only in the aforementioned unflattering light, but also proves oxymoronic in this context, because two lines before the faulty stage direction, he scathingly refers to her father's late night parties, proving himself worthy in contending with his wife's bickering habits. But all that immediately falls into the water when his wife "breaks" him and his unceasing resistance. Further on in the translation George seemingly reaffirms his poise with an insult, attributing his wife's behavior with asinine qualities. Sharpness is lost on George, and here we are left no other option but to ascribe inconstancy to his character.

Few lines later, after George says to Martha that she brays at people, she negates this by braying, which is a clear attempt at humour and an indicator of Martha's lack of self-awareness, or more likely, her contrarian nature, necessary in this parasitic relationship. This escapes the translator, since she opted for the adverb "loudly". The cause for this might be the fact that "braying" is translated in diverse ways, most of the time it is "kreveljenje", but this word takes on manifold variations throughout the text. This inconsistency and obvious inadequacy in the choice of words, deprives the word of its almost leitmotif quality in the process of careful weaving of Martha's character, and makes it an ephemeral comment that accordingly dissipates into thin air after it is read, not leaving the lasting impression, which is achieved in the original.

In a slight defense of the translation, I must mention that later in the original text, stage directions do offer this description of defeat, but even though this happens, it is no excuse for such a merciless contraction of the play. The entire translation is guilty of this narrowing down and unnecessary meddling with the text. Act One offers a plethora of examples of misguiding stage directions. I will try to put fourth only those which are obviously faulty. The scene I am about to describe takes place some time after the arrival of guests. Martha talks of the immense career opportunity of being married to the University president's daughter, an opportunity George is not taking advantage of. George does not believe that this is such an easy position to be in, and expresses it, directing his response toward Nick. Stage direction

clearly states that this sentence is accompanied by George's "solemn wink". The wink looses its solemn, dignified quality in the translation, by being contrived into a syntagm of unreasonable contradiction to the context, "nestašno namigne". This affects the versatility of George's character. He is portrayed in the source text as taking on a different attitude. His demeanor changes in front of the guests in this instance. George takes the poise of dignity and not that of playful irony. Not conveying this difference in attitude puts George's character at risk of becoming flat and stagnant.

Near the end of Act One there is a scene which requires a small discussion. Since this is the apotheosis of the act, it should be executed with utmost precision. In this scene Martha pushes George to his limits, getting under his skin and finishing this act in a vainglorious triumph:

George (still with his back to them all): Stop it, Martha

Martha (viciously triumphant): The hell I will! You see, George didn't have much . . . push . . . he wasn't particularly aggressive. In fact he was sort of a . . . (spits the word at George's back) . . . a FLOP ! A great . . . big . . . fat . . . FLOP!

(CRAH! Immediately after FLOP! GEORGE breaks a bottle against the portable bar and stands there, still with his back to them all, holding the remains of the bottle by the neck. There is a silence, with everyone frozen. Then . . .)

George (almost crying): I said stop, Martha.

Martha (after considering what course to take): I hope that was an empty bottle, George. You don't want to waste good liquor . . . not on your salary.

(George drops the broken bottle on the floor, not moving.)

not on an Associate Professor's salary. (To Nick and Honey) I mean, he'd be ...no good . . . at trustees' dinners, fund raising. He didn't have any . . . personality, you know what I mean? Which was disappointing to Daddy, as you can imagine. So, here I am, stuck with this flop . . . .

George (turning around): . . . don't go on, Martha . . . .

Martha: . . . this BOG in the History Department . . . .

George: . . . don't, Martha, don't. (Albee, 1963, p. 56)

The translation text offers the following solution:

Džordž (još okrenutih leđa): Dosta, Marta.

Marta (oličenje poroka u svom likovanju): E baš hoću! Znate, Džordžu je nedostajala pokretačka snaga . . . Nije bio, kako bi se reklo, prodoran. On vam je pravo (vikne Džordžu u leđa) ništavilo . . . oličenje životnog promašaja.

(Čuje se tresak razbijene boce. Odmah posle reči „neuspeh“, Džordž razbija bocu o bar i, još okrenutih leđa, drži u ruci grlić. Nastaje tišina. Svi su sleđeni. Zatim . . .)

Džordž (gotovo urla): Rekao sam ti da prestaneš, Marta!

Marta (razmišlja kojim tonom da nastavi): Nadam se da je boca bila prazna, Džordž. Ne bi trebalo da bacaš dobro piće . . . s obzirom na tvoju platu. (Džordž baca slomljenu bocu na pod i ne pomera se.) Mislim na tvoju platu vanrednog profesora. (Niku i Hani.) Htela sam da kažem da ne bi ostavljao nikakav utisak na one koji finansiraju ovaj koledž, ne bi uspio da dobije sredstva. On nije snažna ličnost, razumete šta hoću da kažem? Možete zamisliti koliko je tata bio razočaran. A ja, eto, vezana za ovo ništavilo . . .

Džordž (okreće se): Marta . . . ne nastavljaj priču . . .

Marta: Ovo ništavilo na katedri za istoriju . . .

Džordž: Marta, prestani . . . . (Ćirilov, 2002, p. 357)

I will slightly swerve off of the discussion of stage directions here, and analyse the ending in its entirety. The phrase “Viciously triumphant” is carried out as “oličenje poroka u svom likovanju”. This translation works perfectly, since “oličenje poroka” portrays Martha here as Hubris incarnate. Arrogance and blinding haughtiness prepare her for the fall, or final defeat in the following act, when George breaks the news of their imaginary son’s death. Therefore equating her viciously triumphant attitude to sinful behavior is well grounded. Shortly after, Martha spits the word “FLOP” at George’s back. Translation fails to deliver the same effect. “Translation Martha” does not spit the word at George’s back, she yells it, because the word chosen for the translation of “flop” does not have the explosive power of phoneme “p”. Therefore, one of the most powerful expressions of contempt in the play is lost. “Translation Martha” continues to scorn George right after this with the phrase “oličenje životnog promašaja”. This line offers an immediate solution to the previously lost effect. “Promašaj” could easily substitute the word “flop”, the only insignificant difference being that the spiting will occur at the beginning of the word and not the end.

George reacts to all this by almost breaking into a cry of frustration while telling her to stop. This frustration is not clear in the translation where we see George almost screaming at her. Screaming is considerably lighter in this context. To add to the misguiding quality of this

stage direction he is not even entirely committed to screaming, but he "almost screams". Because of this, frustration and degradation of his character are not complete.

Apart from being ineffectually used in the previous instance, "ništavilo" is now used instead of the emphatic word "BOG". This is clear carelessness on the translator's part. Not only is the translator using one word for almost every insult, but the stagnancy of George's character, perceived by Martha in the source text, fails to be expressed. This is a big mistake, on account of this word's quality being the same as the aforementioned "braying" attributed to Martha.

Act Two and Act Three will not be discussed on the bases of stage direction, since I hope these few scenes exemplified sufficiently the issue. The aforementioned acts will be dealt with in detail in the following analysis.

5.3. Text Analysis of Selected Lines

This part of analysis will deal in detail with certain in-text issues. Lines of dialog will be dealt with in order of their appearance, and examples will be selected on the basis of their influence on characterization.

5.3.1. Act One "Fun and Games"

When trying to remember the name of the Bette Davis movie, Martha, for the first time in the play, utilizes her sense of humor by referring to the movie in an oxymoronic manner: "one single little epic" (Albee, 1963, p. 12). This is lost in the translation, where this line is phrased in a flat, not-at-all-humorous pleonasm: "jedan jedini epik" (Ćosić, 2002, p. 322). Simplification is a big issue in the translation, which is evident when Martha tells George that he makes her puke, and the translator whitewashes this harsh, uncalled for insult with "odvratan si mi" (Ćosić, 2002, p. 325). The same issue is evident later when Martha's capricious sexuality takes form in the phrase "give your Mommy a big sloppy kiss" (Albee, 1963, p. 17), and in the translation we are presented with a phrase of considerably lessened vulgarity in the description of the kiss: "poljubi tvoju mamicu da sve puca." (Ćosić, 2002, p. 326).

Adjectives are frequently omitted. George constantly uses diminutives to refer to his guests, especially Nick. In my opinion, this might be a defense mechanism of his, to combat the approaching, unavoidable adultery. By constantly talking down to Nick, he is showing his jealousy in an indirect way, and subconsciously attempting to lessen humiliation that he is to encounter later. Therefore George's line "where are our little guests" (Albee, 1963, p. 18) should be translated in its entirety, without the exemption of "little". Near the end of the Act

One, George repeatedly refers to their son, as a "little bugger" (Albee, 1963, p. 55). The problem of adjective omission arises when Martha describes their son contrarily as a "great, big son" (Albee, 1963, p. 56), which is a phrase that not only depicts Martha as a hardy contrarian, but also clarifies their interrelationship differences in view.

Martha's alcoholism is presented when George tells her not to pass out or throw up. "Translation George" warns her not to spill or throw anything, which is completely wrong, and requires no further discussion. We need to see the severity of her alcoholism, and stumbling around, spilling drinks, knocking stuff over is not that severe, but passing out, throwing up, and lifting her skirt up, definitely is.

Before Nick and Honey arrive, George tells Martha not to "start in on the bit about the kid". "Bit" is translated as "bezvezan razgovor" which might be a hefty mistake. One has to be careful about this word, since its meaning is not concrete. One has to turn to the register of a certain, authentically American form of entertainment, contemporary with the release of the play. In 1966, stand up comedy was on the rise in America, preceded by radio comedy and sketch troops like Marx brothers. In all these forms of entertainment the word "bit" was used to signify a small, rounded chunk of their routine. Martha being flabbergasted by the word would indicate its seeping into the colloquial speech. Therefore, meaning of the word is lost on Martha, but not on George, who, with this word shows us the nature of their relationship and its correlation to the story of the imaginary kid. "The bit about the kid" (Albee, 1963, p. 18) seems to be a well rehearsed fantasy routine of theirs. Therefore the theme of "Fun and Games" so carefully weaved into the fabric of the play takes on yet another dimension. "Bezvezan razgovor" (Ćosić, 2002, p. 328) on the other hand does not seem to carry this meaning over to the translation. Obviously, the issue here is that of a lack of direct equivalence. The target language lacks the cultural context from which the word sprung in the language of the source text. Any word that shows this quality of well rehearsed, or sometimes ad libbed routine might be a more suitable solution, perhaps one from the register of theater. Few lines down one sees George non-chalantly advising against the mentioning of the kid. In the translation the tone is changed. It losses the elevated tone of advice, and takes the brute form of a threat. This is achieved with a poor selection of words and the use of an exclamation mark.

Series of mistakes are made in the depiction of the arrival of the guests. Nick and Honey of the original are uncomfortable and confused upon the arrival. This is shown in their interrupted speech. Pauses between words are plentiful, especially in Nick's speech. In no

way is this expressed in the translation. Pauses seem to be omitted throughout the text, sometimes with unnoticeable, other times with dire consequences.

After everybody is seated down and guests are served their drinks, a charming, repartee, drenched in light playful irony is established between George and Martha. Martha compliments George's poetic nature in a sentence with a light sexual overtone, to which he replies: "Vulgar girl! With guests here!" (Albee, 1963, p. 22). This replica of George is clearly playful, but the translation makes it seem as if he was reprimanding her with the words: "Baš si vulgarna! Nismo sami!" (Ćosić, 2002, p. 330). A better solution would have possibly been something like this: "Vulgarna djevojko! I to pred gostima!" This leaves some of that charm in.

George and Martha constantly take jabs at each other, and the translation most of the time fails to deliver the exact meaning. When George wants Martha out of his way, he tells her to trot along, which is a scathing comment with a lot of implications. The translator made this into a hateful, command: "makni se već jednom" (Ćosić, 2002, p. 333). A simple "odgegaj se odavde", would have been sufficient. I will only present one more example of this. The following example is not just a mistake in a single line of dialog, but rather the whole sequence strays completely of the track in terms of tone and intent. George berates Martha, and she unwillingly shows amusement with this. The scene is played out in a tone of feign argument. The feign argument does not make an appearance in the translation. What we are presented with is a real, almost childish argument between the two:

> George: . . . We've got half-filled glasses everywhere in the house, wherever Martha forgets she's left them . . . in the linen closet, on the edge of the bathtub . . . I even found one in the freezer, once.
>
> Martha (amused in spite of herself) : You did not!
>
> George: Yes I did
>
> Martha (ibid.) : You did not! (Albee, 1963, p. 43)

The translation text offers the following solution:

> Džordž: . . . Svuda po kući se vuku – poluprazne čaše, gdje god ih Marta spusti pa zaboravi gdje ih je ostavila . . . Čak i u plakaru za rublje, na ivici kade . . . jednom čak i u zamrzivaču.
>
> Marta: Nije istina.
>
> Džordž: Jeste
>
> Marta: Nije. (Ćirilov, 2002, p. 347)

5.3.2. ACT TWO "WALPURGISNACHT"

Inebriation has to be evident in the second Act. George shows this in the following line:

> George: Oh! Mine. (Pause) No, no, she doesn't . . . I would; I mean if I were . . . her . . . she . . . I would. But I'm not . . . and so I don't. (Pause) I'd like to, though. It gets pretty bouncy around here sometimes. (Albee, 1963, p. 58)

"Translation George" is more composed and to the point with his statement:

> Džordž: A, moja žena! Ne. Nije. Ali ja bih to učinio da sam na njenom mjestu. (Ćirilov, 2002, p. 359)

George's most significant monologue of the play, in which he narrates his excursion to the gin mill, during his teenage years, is ripe with historical references which are omitted from the translation. The first omission occurs when George jocularly refers to his youth being parallel with Punic Wars, exemplifying his enamorment with history in a humorous manner. Than he offers a synonym for the prohibition – The Great Experiment. "Translation George" does no such thing. He is narrow and exact in his narration, and in no way is his ample historical knowledge evident.

The following excerpt does not affect characterization in any way, but is nonetheless an interesting representation of how the text is stripped bare in places that would otherwise have great effect on the reader:

> GEORGE: Monstre!
>
> MARTHA: Cochon!
>
> GEORGE: Bete!
>
> MARTHA: Canaille!
>
> GEORGE: Putain! (Albee, 1963, p. 65)

The translation as follows:

> Džordž: Čudovište!
>
> Marta: Svinjo!
>
> Džordž: Stoko!
>
> Marta: Đubre!
>
> Džordž: Droljo! (Ćosić, 2002, p. 364)

It is my opinion that George and Martha are filled to the brim with contempt for each other. The English language seems not to contain a register of insults large enough to express their overwhelming hatred for each other. The effect achieved here, in the original text, is lost in the translation, and one of the more memorable exchanges in the play is completely bleached. Moreover, the use of foreign (French) phrases instead of local language slurs suggests something about the characters' belonging to the community of "intellectuals".

In one instance George says a rather simple and easily translatable sentence: "Sure! I'll bet she has money, too!" (Albee, 1963, p. 65). The translation, for some reason, opts for an undignified slang solution: "Kladim se i da je zvecnulo malo miraza, >Keš< [sic] lova!" (Ćosić, 2002, p. 365). It suffices to say, that this seems to be completely out of character for an academically educated person to say.

In the following scene, Nick tells George about the beginning of his relationship to Honey. They go way back and seem to know each other since childhood. Nick tells George of the time when he and his current wife were children, he was eight and she was six, and they had played a game of doctor, a game generally known for its exploratively sexual undertone. George responds to Nick's story, saying that this shows a healthy heterosexual beginning. "Translation George" says: "To je odličan početak za suprotne spolove." (Ćosić, 2002, p. 366). The latter sentence does not mean the same as the first. It is completely off point and makes very little sense, almost as if the translator was embarrassed to say what was implied in the original.

A slight word play is lost in the following excerpt. The "Translation Nick" ends up seeming awfully humourless and nonsensical with his perplexing remark, whereas Nick in the original makes a completely sensical, but not at all well received joke. Here is the excerpt:

> George: We drink a great deal in this country, and I suspect we'll be drinking a great deal more, too. . . if we survive. We should be Arabs or Italians . . . the Arabs don't drink, and the Italians don't get drunk much, except on religious holidays. We should live on Crete, or something.
>
> Nick (sarcastically . . . as if killing a joke): And, that, of course, would make us cretins. (Albee, 1963, p. 67)

George's mind involuntarily seems to wonder to classical references such as living on the island of Crete. Nick interrupts him with a lowly, foolish word play. This word play is very easily translatable with just a little adjustment. Instead of using the correct form of the

word referring to the inhabitants of the Greek island "Krićani", one could use the following form instead and that way the joke would at least remain perceptible: "I, tada bismo bili Kriteni, a ne Amerikanci".

The characters live in New Carthage, but the translation fails to mention this crucial information in the places where it is found in the original. Instead it comes up very late in the second act as just a passing, casual mention in George's speech. As stated earlier in this paper, New Carthage is perplexing as a symbol in the play. Maybe it is used as just a nondescript location of a little college town in New England, but this stance must be doubted, because of the amount of classical references throughout the play. The issue with the translation text here is that the mention of New Carthage is unreasonably delayed, since the original offered this information very early on and kept repeating it throughout.

Nick and George soon fall into an uneasy, but jocular dialog regarding the issue of infidelity and sexuality on the campus in the connection to progressing ones own station. The whole dialog began as a provocation by George, but Nick soon started playing along. The scene plays out in the following way:

> George: No? I thought we'd decided that you'd take over the History Department first, before you took over the whole works. You know . . . a step at a time.
>
> Nick (stretching . . . luxuriating . . . playing the game): Nyaah . . . what I thought I'd do is . . . I'd sort of insinuate myself generally, play around for a while, find all the weak spots, shore 'em up, but with my own name plate on 'em . . . become sort of a fact, and turn into a . . . a what . . . ?
>
> George: An inevitability.
>
> Nick: Exactly . . . An inevitability. You know . . . Take over a few courses from the older men, start some special groups for myself . . . plough a few pertinent wives . . .
>
> George: Now that's it! You can take over all the courses you want to, and get as much of the young elite together in the gymnasium as you like, but until you start ploughing pertinent wives, you reallly aren't working. The way to a man's heart is through his wife's belly, and don't you forget it. (Albee, 1963, p. 71)

Now I will put forth the translation of the same chunk of text, for the sake of comparison:

> Džordž: Ne? Mislio sam da smo odlučili da najpre preuzmete katedru za istoriju, pre nego što preuzmete sve ostalo. Što bi se reklo . . . korak po korak.

Nik (proteže se, pravi se važan, igra igru): Ne . . . ja nisam tako mislio . . . hteo sam da se svuda uvučem, da se malo poigram, da otkrijem sve slabe tačke, da ih pojačam, ali da na podupiračima stoji moje ime. Hteo sam da postanem činjenica, a onda da se pretvorim u . . . u . . . pomozite mi da nađem pravu reč . . .

Džordž: Neminovnost.

Nik: Tačno. U neminovnost. Da preuzmem nekoliko kurseva od starijih, da organizujem nešto na svoju ruku, da obradim nekoliko zgodnih supruga . . .

Džordž: A, tako! Možete da preuzmete sve kurseve i da okupite oko sebe svu elitnu omladinu, ali, dok ne obradite određene supruge, niste postigli ono pravo. Put ka srcu jednog čovjeka vodi preko bokova njegove supruge. To dobro zapamtite! (Ćosić, 2002, p. 369)

The first part of the dialog is there just to provide context. The second line that Nick offers the reader is what I want to analyse. The source text uses the word "pertinent" to describe the wives, whereas the translation uses "zgodnih". Through this mock discussion of theirs a lot is revealed, especially in Nick's use of the word "pertinent". "Pertinent" could more closely be translated to "važnih" or "uticajnih". The use of the latter words would correctly display Nick's career-oriented mindset, and his lack of carnal desire for these women, including Martha. This will later be clearly shown in Nick's unsatisfactory sexual performance with Martha, but here, it is only insinuated with an unassuming adjective. George's final line in the translation does not reliably capture the tone of the original. "Now that's it!" means that George is still playing along with heightened irony in his voice, and it conveys an entirely different mood than "A, tako" in the translation, which shows him offended, and perhaps even flabbergasted at Nick's inappropriate candor.

Honey's sudden thirst for dancing sets off the next scene, and the tone of her request is that of a pampered child. This tone, and Nick's annoyance with Honey is well translated, although, Honey's spoiled child aura could have been more emphasized. Martha is excited by the idea of dancing as well, and George does not miss an opportunity to mock her. He says the following:

Martha had her daguerreotype in the paper once . . . oh, 'bout twenty-five years ago . . . Seems she took second prize in one o' them seven-day dancin' contest things . . . biceps all bulging, holding up her partner. (Albee, 1963, p. 78)

George's sense of humor must be emphasized here, since he was berated about his novel by Martha in the scene prior to this one. He is making fun of Martha's age in the first part of the joke, and later he wryly comments on her burly physique. The translation does not deliver the joke with even half of its original intensity:

> Martina slika je jednom bila objavljena u novinama . . . otprilike pre dvadeset pet godina. Osvojila je drugu nagradu na nekom sedmodnevnom takmičenju: napetih mišića, sva napregnuta, čvrsto drži svog partnera. (Ćosić, 2002, p. 376)

First of all, the effect of the word "daguerreotype" is watered down, and substituted with the superordinate term "slika". There is no need for this, since "dagerotip" is a word present in B/H/S dictionaries. "Slika" offers no comedic effect and makes this entire sentence mystifyingly bland and unnecessary, which could have been avoided with the use of the hyponym. It seems almost as if George is just mentioning his wife's success. Even the latter part of the translated joke does not help the reader see the intended humour. The intent of the original text is to make us imagine Martha mannishly holding up her dance partner, with her biceps bulging. Translation opts not to convey the image of Martha holding someone up, but rather embracing them tightly, as if in a fit of passion, this faulty image is further propagated with her "biceps" being substituted with "muscles" and "bulging" with "tenseness". None of these terms show the bulkiness or old age that George is talking about, but rather present Martha simply as a virile runner-up in a dance competition. The main problem with this excerpt is the fact that the evocative meaning of the terms which produce comedic effect in this scene had been poorly executed and substituted with superordinate terms and unfortunate near-synonyms. A small bickering sequence ensues when George puts Beethoven's 7th Symphony on. Afterwards, George gives Martha the control of the phonograph, but not without a remark of considerable symbolic importance for the Act, as well as one of obvious humour. George suggests that a suitable tune for Martha at this moment would be Igor Strawinski's "Sacre du Printemps". Symbolism of the reference corresponds to the title of the Act, the only difference being that Walpurgisnacht is a pagan rite of Germanic and Northern peoples, and Strawinski's ballet draws inspiration from ancient Russian paganism. But the similarity is indubitable in its theme of pagan rites of spring and fertility. The subtle humour of George's sentence lies in the fact that this tune is impossible to dance to, since the choreography for the ballet is highly primitive and awkward in motion and considered to be very avant gard for the time of its composition (Hill, 2003, p. 56). "Proljećni žubor" is the syntagm used in translation for this ballet composition. This brings about some ambiguity,

which could have been avoided if the original title was used, or at least if the name of the composer was added to the existing translation. George did not use "The Rite of Spring" to refer to the ballet in the source text, presumable for the prestige value of French language and its seeming intellectual luster. If the title of the ballet was translated in the source text, that would have been a sufficient reason for the aforementioned solution in the target text. (Baker, 1992, p. 25)

Further on, the reader will witness a shift in the power dynamic. George will be put down by Martha's relating of the story of his attempt at publishing his first novel. Nick will join Martha's jabs, making the situation even more painful for George. The relish with which Nick savors George's overthrow from his high-and-mighty pedestal of indifference and wry humour is palpable in every utterance of his. The translation does not achieve the same effect. The stage directions are the only tell-tale sign of Nick's mocking. The first instance of this is when George threatens his wife with over the top phrasing: "DESIST! DESIST!"(Albee, 1963, p. 82). Nick of course finds this god-like eruption of temper ridiculous, and starts mimicking him through condescending laughter. The "Translation Nick" does not mimic George, but rather advises the latter to control himself, through ostentatious laughter. Martha continues the story, until George, again, cries out in rage: "I will not be made mock off!" (Albee, 1963, p. 83). Again, Nick follows his outcry with a condescending mimicry: "He will not be made mock off, for Christ's sake." (Albee, 1963, p. 83). "Translation Nick" says something completely different, but nonetheless humiliating for George, therefore the translation does achieve the sought after effect, but with dubiously specific tone, which might contain a subtle difference: "Ali, zaboga, niko vas ne izvrgava ruglu." (Ćosić, 2002, p. 380). This is uttered through the same taunt laughter as the previous remark. On the first glance this is completely wrong, but on the close inspection, and if one empathises with George in this scene the latter remark is much harder to bear. In mimicry, Nick, from the source text, reveals that he is only cowardly accompanying Martha in the ridicule. But the translation text gives George a much harder pill to swallow. Here, Nick is not only laughing at George, but he is simultaneously assuring him that he is delusional in thinking anyone is mocking him, as if he were a child, unaware of goings-on. This makes Nick look like someone taking charge in the current situation, taking the reins of humiliation from Martha. After the altercation escalates further the ground is set for a temporary calm, out of which George surges to the surface with all the accumulated anger and furthers the calamitous night with a different "game". This time the game is given the appellation "Hump the Hostess". George is hurt, and beside himself with anger, but he collects himself and keeps his characteristically ironic demeanor. The anger

concealed under his superficially collected poise is slowly unraveled and becomes quite plane is his final: “HUNH? HUNH?” (Albee, 1963, p. 85). The game of “Hump the Hostess” is proposed and then the proposition is many a time repeated. The same game in the translation is not given an appellation, but its content is only subtly insinuated, at first. Later in the translation, the subject of the game is only creased with a minor description, barely is it conveying the explicit nature of the game found in the original. George’s anger in the translation is not as palpable as it is in the original. His wild, anger driven, retaliatory rant keeps on growing in creativity of insult. Nowhere is this felt more than in this softly-worded insult directed towards Martha: “Book dropper! Child mentioner!” (Albee, 1963, p. 85). Anger is palpitating beneath this statement, but on the surface it gets veiled in this ironic suavity. “Translation George” lacks this versatility of character when the aforementioned statement is replaced with: “Ti, brbuljušo.” (Ćosić, 2002, p. 382).

Furthermore, George keeps insisting on them playing yet another game, after he authoritatively demands silence, he proposes that they should play “Get the Guests”. Under the guise of narrating the plot of his second novel, he uncovers Nick’s intimate story. After George satisfies his vanity by finishing the revealing story, Martha utters “God Almighty” upon seeing Honey running out of the room yet again in a fit of hysteria.(Albee, 1963, p. 90) These words are most probably not the words of empathy, but rather words of mild annoyance with Honey’s fragile psyche. The “Translation Martha” does not leave us any room for guessing what she might be thinking, she is completely empathetic: “Jadna mala. Ovo joj stvarno nije bilo potrebno.” (Ćosić, 2002, p. 385).

Now, I will move on to analyse the finale of the Act. George and Honey are left alone in the room. Honey has retreated from the bathroom and is now accompanying George. George was left alone. Martha and Nick are entertaining themselves in the bedroom. George is suddenly captivated with the idea that Honey is actually aborting her pregnancies. He starts guessing the means by which she does that. First guess, and also the only one translated, is that she uses pills. The following remark is not: “Apple jelly? WILL POWER!” (Albee, 1963, p. 106). George’s wit in situations similar to this, gives his character, and the entire play, a nice little nuance, a decoration. Without it, this entire sequence becomes unbearably pale in comparison to the source text. When George insinuates what her husband might be doing at that moment, she exclaims: “I don’t want to know anything!” (Albee, 1963, p. 106), implying that she might actually not be as clueless as one might assume, but rather suppresses this knowledge. The “translation Honey” is truly clueless: “Nemam pojma!” (Ćosić, 2002, p. 398).

The act ends with the news of the imaginary son's death and with that I will be moving on to the analysis of Act Three.

5.3.3. ACT THREE "THE EXORCISM"

Act Three opens up with Martha sitting by herself. She is soon accompanied by Nick, and the two start in on a dialog. Further on, the reader can witness Martha coming to realization that George, after all, is good for her. This surprises Nick, and he reacts correspondingly. Martha keeps on provoking Nick, which causes his protest to this sudden shift in her mood. He, naturally, raises his voice on one of the occasions, after Martha berates him, to which Martha responds as follows: "Ohhhh! The stallion's mad, hunh. The gelding's all upset. Ha, ha, ha, HA!" (Albee, 1963, p. 114). Nick's response is soft, and as the stage directions instruct us, he is wounded: "You . . . you swing wild, don't you." (Albee, 1963, p. 114). The translation text makes this situation complicated, and emotionally unclear:

Marta: Misliš da je čovjeku slomljena kičma jer se ponaša kao klovn i hoda poguren. Nije valjda da je to sve što znaš?

Nik: Ma, pustite to sad . . .

Marta: Vidi, vidi, pastuv se pomamio, nije više jalov! Ha, ha, ha . . .

Nik (blago, ranjeno): Vi ste ta koja se pomamljuje. (Ćosić, 2002, p. 404)

There are a number of mistakes here. The first and foremost is that Nick is amiable to her every remark, he does not get excited, nor yells out, which makes her response completely unnatural and illogical. The second mistake comes at the end of the given dialog, where Nick should have said "baš nisko udarate". Instead of that he responded in the same unclear way, as Martha did previously to his poorly translated utterance. Previously in Act Three there have been comments made by Nick that Martha is going crazy, and in fact, her manner and speech, at the beginning of this act, are affected with a tinge of discord, which is presumably there to insinuate her unbridled disappointment with the current situation. The subtle element that indicates this growing "madness" is found in her mad, scorning laughter. "Translation Martha" laughs as she laughed so far, naturally, but the source text shows this laughing rhythm: "Ha, ha, ha, ha, HA!" (Albee, 1963, p. 114). That last "HA!" is paramount in the depiction of her current state.

What follows is Nick's comparison of Martha to a gattling gun, meaning she is firing at all cylinders. The translator mistakes "gattling gun" for "getting a gun" and a complete disarray of meaning leaves this chunk of text in ruins. Following this, is a scene where Martha starts referring to Nick as her houseboy jokingly. She instructs him to open the door, since

there is someone ringing. Here, one can note the aforementioned exclusion of adjectives that seemingly serve the purpose of expressing derision. Martha does not tell him to go and open the door, but rather to go and open the "little" door. This phrase "little" is not, of course, used to describe the door, but rather to demean Nick, and "vratašca" or "mala vrata" would have been a better choice. George uses this tool of derision throughout the entire play, and none of these instances have been properly translated.

When Nick opens the door, he finds George standing there with a nosegay of flowers in his hands. George, then, starts speaking Spanish, which should have been left in the translation, because his whole demeanor in this scene is parodic, expressing nothing but persiflage, and speaking Spanish and later substandard English is what marks this behavior. Martha and George have conspired now against Nick. His sexual performance is brought into question here, and I will use this opportunity to put fourth an example that shows serious poverty of vocabulary in the translation text, the poverty that is kept consistent throughout, but most evident in this little play on words:

> Nick: Something like it.
>
> George: Screw, baby
>
> Martha: Him can't. Him too fulla booze.
>
> George: Weally? (*Handing the snapdragons to Nick*) Here; dump these in some gin.... (Albee, 1963, p. 116)

> The following chunk of text is the respective translation:
>
> Nik: Otprilike
>
> Džordž: Baš mi je žao
>
> Marta: Ma, pusti ga! Taj se dobro nacugao.
>
> Džordž: Stvarno? (Pruža buket Niku.) Evo, stavi ovo u džin... . (Ćosić, 2002, p. 406)

This chunk of text is playful and almost humorous, with the characters speaking substandard English, using baby-talk, and making a simplistic play on words. The richness of this chunk of text could not be observed without the translation text which completely pales in comparison. Putting these two texts side by side truly makes the source text show its dialogic exuberance, sadly that is not the point of a translation.

Snapdragons are also overlooked in the stage directions of this excerpt. Snapdragons have symbolic value and they should not be translated in a superordinate term such as "buket". This translation strategy of using a superordinate term is unacceptable, since the

target language does not lack an equivalent term First of all this impoverishes the reading experience because it does not pinpoint the readers' imagination to a specific flower. Sources differ on the exact symbolism of this flower, and the additional difficulty arises from the fact that different cultures ascribe different meaning to snapdragons; even inside one culture, for instance Western folklore, where consensus has not been reached and the symbolism ascribed to this flower varies from a complete contradiction to a difference in nuances. Therefore, I will not attempt to delve into the idiosyncracy of Albee's imagery, but I will state that it is a serious mistake to leave out a symbolic detail such as this.

I would like to direct my attention now to a little trifle of a mistake. It has to do with stage directions again. Further on down the text, George hits Martha on the hand, when she tries to touch him. He does this with vehemence, but underneath this aggressive vehemence is presumably mildly hateful playfulness, which is present throughout the sequence. The "translation George" does this same action with benevolence and magnanimity. This type of motion excludes playfulness and puts an unseemly emotional response in the place of a forceful, and yet playful action.

6. Conclusion

To conclude, the thesis looked into the translation equivalence on the level of characters. The manner in which I approached this subject was strictly descriptive. The purpose of my thesis was to examine the general quality of the translation texts in respect to the source texts with an emphasis on the characters, and all the accompanying elements that are used or contribute to the conception of the same said characters, including didascalies, symbols, and so on. The texts and their translations examined in the paper are different in many respects. The style of *The Glass Menagerie* is that of a memory play, with a narrator/ character who controls and introduces the play's action. Conversely, *Who's afraid of Virginia Wolf?* is outwardly realistic in form, but underneath the surface one can find clear signs of absurdist qualities. The former has a somewhat elevated tone, with clear dialogue that sometimes, especially during the soliloquies borders on poetic. The latter, however, manages to plunge the readership into the dark depths and emptiness of human existence thorough outwardly realistic dialog and quite mondain situations. The former is structured in seven scenes; the latter is a three act play. As far as the characterization goes, in both of the plays, the dramatis personae are portrayed realistically. The former, sometimes, primarily because of the poetic tendencies of the narrator, is prone to idealization of certain aspects of the characters; the latter play, however, shows proclivity towards making its characters into types. In order to understand how a translation text may affect characterization and relying on the critical work of James L. Rowland, Thomas L. King, Benjamin Nelson and others I've examined Williams's play in the translation carried out by Ivo Juriša in (1967), and Albee's drama as translated by Ileana Ćosić in (2002), and here is what I have come to observe.

Ivo Juriša's translation proved consistent throughout, and it can be said that he had removed a non-English speaker's cataract and allowed them to see the text in its entire original luster; even though some misrepresentations are evident he did not fail to weave out a complex web for conducting the emotional impulses found in the source text. This translation text can be conceptualized as a kind of plenum, a complete fulfillment of Williams' literary style. Therefore, almost everything in the translation functions in accordance or equivalence with the source text. This voidless substantiality of the translation text is one of the main qualities responsible for the final cathartic effect when a careful reader finds himself engulfed in the tenderness of Williams' style. Pertaining characterization Ivo Juriša delicately and scrupulously painted and recreated each character in a manner of a painter attempting to recreate some original work. Even though he worked at it meticulously, some strokes are to be of, since there is no way to replicate each intention and fortuity of the original master's brush

strokes. The best example of a misfortunate, but nonetheless scrupulous line tracing of the translation text can be found at the very end where Ivo Juriša misses the most emphatic instance of irony, noticed by King (in Parker, 1983), showing the reader that perhaps all up to that point he might have been unaware of this irony, nonetheless he conveyed it in other instances, using this very method of relentless replication of each word, and didascaly. Ivo Juriša complements the original characterization greatly when it comes to the poetic aspect of the play. The best example of this might be found in his choice for the word "moth". As was discussed earlier, with "noćni leptir" he managed to avoid the prosaicity of the term "moljac" and maybe even elevate poetically the original choice made by Williams, whilst staying true to the analogy of the source text. His biggest mistake can be said to have been the confusion with psychological terms in part of the text containing the Jungian analogy. Therefore, when the character of Tom is in question, Ivo Juriša managed to complement him poetically, and make him ignorant in the matters of psychology. Stripping Amanda of her Southern Christianity and leaving her morality bare and dry, might be his biggest mistake regarding that character. Ivo Juriša wronged the character of Laura in the respect of not following her meekness to its emphatic ideal. This mistake was brought about by a single didascaly, one misunderstood retort to her mother, and a misapplied metaphor. These mistakes and emendations do not affect the literary work as a whole in any major way.

On the other hand, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Wolf?* is a minefield of idiosyncratic expressions, which seem to have put Ileana Ćosić on the sure road towards unintelligibility. Carelessness is evident on more than a few occasions, as if the translator did not even attempt to wrangle out of the myriad difficulties. Furthermore, the discrepancy between the source text and the translation text is heavily felt. The main cause of this is that the translation text is made porous by constant, unnecessary omissions. Moreover, the gaping chasm between the source text and its not-altogether-respective translation is caused by naive mistakes, sloppy handling of colloquialisms and alike. There is almost no consistency in the translation text itself. Major leitmotif expressions are carelessly transposed, and others are assimilated with words of lesser aesthetic significance. Protagonists lack emotional luster. Source text contains nuances in character development that are a delight to follow. On the other hand, protagonists from the translation text have the same names and follow the same narrative but there is no emotional depth. For instance, when George is angry, this anger is dry and simple in the translation text, whereas the source text offers the reader a character whose anger, or any other emotion for that matter, takes different and intricate forms. His anger is made appealing with slight mocking irony, whereas the reader can continually and palpably sense the roaring

tempest of rage surging beneath this pleasant and charming veneer. The “translation George” seems to oscillate between two aesthetically unbecoming states, that of emasculated husband, and that of a bitter, angry, middle-aged man. There are no nuances or depth in other characters either.

7. REFERENCES

Albee, E. (1962, February 25). AVANT-GARDE ON AND OFF BROADWAY Which Theatre Is the Absurd One?. New York Times. pp. 2–3

Albee, E. (1963). Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf?: A play. New York: Pocket Books.

Amacher, R. E. (1969). Edward Albee. New York, Twayne Publishers.

Baker, M. (1992). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. Routledge.

Bloom, H. (Ed.). (2007). Tennessee Williams's The Glass Menagerie. Infobase Publishing. BROADWAY Which Theatre Is the Absurd One?. New York Times. pp. 2–3

Ćirilov, J. (2002) Pre i Posle "Kose" – Savremena američka drama, Beograd: Zepter Book World

Durham, F. (1983). Tennessee Williams, Theatre Poet in Prose. In Parker, R. B. (Ed.). The glass menagerie: A collection of critical essays. (pp. 121–134). Prentice Hall.

Esslin, M. (1960). The theatre of the absurd. The Tulane Drama Review

Esslin, M. (1971). Reflections: essays on modern theatre. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books

Esslin, M. (1987). The Field of drama: how the signs of drama create meaning on stage and screen. London; New York: Methuen

Gandouz, O. (2018). "Who can keep learning [the linguistic] games we play?" Linguistic Games and the Parody of Contemporary American Culture in Edward Albee's Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf. [Sic]: časopis za književnost, kulturu i književno prevođenje, pp. 20–25

Hill, P. (2003). Strawinsky: The Rite of Spring (Cambridge Music Handbooks). Cambridge University Press.

Jahn, Manfred. 2021. A Guide to the Theory of Drama. English Department, University of Cologne. URL www.uni-koeln.de/~ame02/pppd.pdf.

King James Bible, (2017). King James Bible Online. https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/

King, T. L. (1983). Irony and Distance. In Parker, R. B. (Ed.). The glass menagerie: A collection of critical essays (pp. 75–86). Prentice Hall.

Nelson, B. (1983). The play is memory. In Parker, R. B. (Ed.). The glass menagerie: A collection of critical essays (pp. 87–95). Prentice Hall.

Parker, R. B. (Ed.). (1983). The glass menagerie: A collection of critical essays. Prentice Hall.

Robbins, J. A. (2010). Albee's Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?: Indiana University

Roberts, J. L. (1979). Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf?: notes. Lincoln, Neb.: Cliffs Notes.

Rowland, J. L. (1983). Tennessee's Two Amandas. In Parker, R. B. (Ed.). The glass menagerie: A collection of critical essays (pp. 62–74). Prentice Hall.

Sarkar, S. B. (2006). European influence on post 1960 American drama. University of Kalyani.

Williams, T. (1967). Izabrane drame (I. Juriša, Trans.). Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska.

Williams, T. (1999). A Streetcar Named Desire and Other Plays. New York: New Directions.

Williams, T. (2001). Portrait of a Girl in Glass. Moscow: BSG–Press, NF Puskinskaya biblioteka.

Williams, T. (2002). The Collected Poems of Tennessee Williams (Vol. 1065). New Directions Publishing.