

Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Dr. Moulay Tahar University of Saida
Faculty of Letters, Languages and Art

Department of English



Theme



The Question of Language in Edward Albee's Plays

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English in Partial
Fulfilment of the Degree of Master in Literature**

Submitted by:

-Mr. Drouni Abdelkader

Supervised by:

- Dr. BENADLA Djamel

Board of Examiners:

- **President: Mr. Talbi Abdelkrim**
- **Supervisor: Dr. BENADLA Djamel**
- **Supervisor: Mr. Hadji Mohamed**

Academic Year 2016/2017

“In the name of Allah, The Most Gracious, the Most Merciful”

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this humble work to my mother, it's not much but it's just a small thing to express my appreciation for all what she did for me, and for making me the person which I am today. Through all our conversations... we've had too, too many to count, my Mother has been a constant reminder of faith, not just to me, but to countless people who were fortunate enough to meet her.

I also would like to dedicate it to my loving family and friends.

Acknowledgement

I acknowledge and give thanks to my supervisor Dr: Benadla Djamel, for his guidance through the making of this work, and for being an excellent example to look up to, Thank you, Sir.

I also would like to express my gratitude to the members of the board of examiner: Mr. Talbi Abdelkrim and Mr. Hadji Mohamed for their acceptance to examine my dissertation and for their precious remarks. Thank You.

I can't forget all my Teachers and the academic staff, whom I respect a lot. Thank you.

Abstract

This present paper is meant to explore the absurdist playwright Edward Albee and his uses of language throughout his plays. His use of language classified him as one of the leading playwrights in the theatre of the absurd.

Language as an essential element and a component in Albee's works, his mastery of the language and the word games gave him the ability to play with thoughts and ideas and even manipulate the audience's minds. Albee's language takes different forms and shapes, it changes its function to serve in different cases for different purposes.

My dissertation fell into three chapter, in each chapter I tried present a different use of language using passages from different plays, an attempt to illustrate and explore deep implicit meanings. Albee used the everyday language; the one used by the middle class mostly, he transformed language into a means of power to manipulate the characters and to show off superiority and authority. Yet, language is forged to serve the opposite of its real nature which is communication, so it became a means of non-communication that is used to alienate people from each other; characters use language to distance themselves from other.

Also, Albee used the vague language to hide what the characters do not wish to reveal to others, so the vague language is used to distract the reader and the other characters in order to keep mystery about the real identities of the characters. Clichés are consciously injected to reveal a significant side of Albee's characters in order to give a special and relevant meaning.

In short, Albee's language is an interpretation of facts and imagination with ambiguous and meaningless messages which make the reader wonder and asks questions about the nature of the language and the true meanings behind that.

Content

Dedication	I
Acknowledgement	II
Abstract	III
Table of content	IV
General introduction	05
Literature Review	07
Chapter one Language as Power	
1.1 Edward Albee and the Notion of Absurdity.....	08
1.2 Introduction.....	10
1.3 Language as power.....	12
1.4 Conclusion.....	21
Chapter Two Language as a Means of Non-communication in the Family Play	
2.1 Introduction.....	22
2.2 Language as a Means of Non-communication in the Family Play....	23
2.3 Conclusion	31
Chapter Three The Vague Language, Language of Truth and Illusion	
3.1 Introduction.....	32
3.2 The Vague Language, Language of Truth and Illusion.....	34
3.3 Conclusion.....	41
General Conclusion	42
Bibliography	

General Introduction

The Theatre of the Absurd refers to a drama that is based on an absurd situation, Martin Esslelin dealt with the term in his essay « the theatre of the absurd” 1960, he made a link between the absurd plays based on a broad theme of the absurd, just like Albert Camus and his essay “the Myth of Sisyphus” 1942. The absurd in these plays takes the form of a man’s reaction to this meaningless world, or a man as a puppet manipulated or menaced by shadowy powers. Despite the fact that the term is applied on so many plays, still some characteristics relate in most of these plays on: broad to comedy mixed with horrific or tragic images, character caught in hopeless situations forced to do repetitive or meaningless actions, nonsense and meaninglessness. The most known absurdist playwrights are: Samuel Beckett, Eugène Ionesco, Harold Pinter and Edward Albee.

Albee as an absurdist uses language to give an image of the meaningless of existence. He expresses the American society after the WWII which was full of hopes, struggling with a number of social and psychological issues and the difficulties to preserve a normal human life as an organized and civilized society in order to live in harmony. Albee focused his attention on language to convey and expose issues and the complicated situations, using language devices and word games instead of giving direct resolutions. He based his works on natural and informal language: the one used by the American individuals and among family members. He was influenced by the Christian humanism and the economical analysis of Marx about the desire to possess money and achieve success or what is called the American Dream.

WWII was the main reason behind the meaninglessness and the arbitrariness that reigned over the American mind; things seemed less meaningful at that time. Yet, individuals felt like facing a frightening and absurdly illogical world.

My work will be divided into three chapters. The first chapter entitled “Language as Power”. In this chapter I am going to start with a brief biography about Edward Albee and the notion of absurdity, then proceed with analyzing a variety of passages from his most known plays such as *The Zoo Story* (1958), *Who’s Afraid of Virginia Woolf* (1962), *Seascape* (1975), *The Goat or Who is Sylvia?* (2002). I am going to show how Albee’s language can take another form from a way to communicate to a way to manipulate and exercise superiority as a power and a weapon to make things happen.

The second chapter, “Language as a Means of Non-Communication in the Family Play”, it presents Albee’s families and their relationships and the way they communicate between each other. Not only communication between family members but also between strangers. Yet, a true communication is impossible in most cases, since Albee’s characters tend use language as a barrier or a veil to achieve non-communication and isolate themselves from others.

The third chapter entitled “The Vague Language, Language of Truth and Illusion”. This chapter is going to be dedicated to only two of Albee’s plays which I personally admired reading and found had a good time analyzing them. They are considered as Albee’s best works. The chapter will discuss the vague language in *The Zoo Story* (1958) and the difference between truth and illusion in *Who’s Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (1962).

In this research paper I will focus my attention on Albee’s various uses of language and the different connotations and the implicit messages behind the actual language being said by the characters. Many of Albee’s plays are taken into consideration as study cases, an attempt to answer the question about language and what is language according to Albee’s Absurdist play.

Finally, my dissertation will be closed by a general conclusion which will summarize the main aspects and uses of language in Edward Albee’s plays.

Literature Review

The absurd plays have always been under the focus of the critics, Edward Albee's plays are no exception to that. Critics think that every playwright is his own community's reflection, often criticizing their own communities present the problems and conditions to the world.

Albee's drama has always been controversial, according to Bruce J. Mann, Albee's plays are both autobiographical and archetypal at the same time; they deal with his personal life experiences, they also deal with social issues of the American families which he belongs to. He asserts that:

“What is remarkable in Albee's drama is that he gives a reliable image on the unresolved tensions in the middle-class America in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s” (Mann.B.J., 2003. p02)

Lee Baxandall criticizing Albee's plays asserts:

Albee's characters are interrelated and cohesive from play to play. They represent a family unit experiencing the failures, hopes, dilemmas and values of the American society. (Baxandall, 1967. p19)

He added:

Albee had dealt with uncomfortable subjects such as social conformism and women's equality, represented respectively by Peter in *The Zoo Story* and Mommy in *The American Dream*. Mommy represents an emergent force in the society, struggling for women's improvement at a social and economic level. She gains increasing professional positions, property and control in the home and community. (Ibid. 22)

Chapter One: Language as Power

1.1 Edward Albee and the Notion of Absurdity

Edward Albee, the leading American playwright of his generation. He was born in Washington DC in March 12, 1928. Son of Reed Albee. He was against his mother's wish to be a member of the Larchmont New York social scene, to follow his wish to be an artist and an intellect. By the age of twenty he had several different jobs; he worked as a record salesman, an office clerk, a messenger for western union, then he wrote his first play *The Zoo Story* in (1958). The play was a shocking phenomenal for the critics and the public for its absurdist moods and tones. Yet Martin Esselin as a critic was not a fan of this play because it fails as an absurdist drama (Esselin, 1978, 312). He died in September 16, 2016.

Albee had several prizes for his contribution in the American theatre with his best works *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (1989), *The Three Women* (1994), *A Delicate Balance* (1996), it won him a Pulitzer prize, *The Goat, Or Who Is Sylvia* (2002) it won him a Tony Award for best play. According to Ann Paolucci, Albee was influenced by the post World War II European Theatre, the plays of the Italian playwright Luigi Pirandello in particular, there are correspondences on their drama works.

Albee dismissed the literal message of the political and social realism of the forties, fifties and sixties as subjects for drama and gave the American theatre new content and form, portraying the post existential on a stage, and thus swept bare of *Standard Conventions* (Paolucci 2003 p30).

Albee's *The Zoo story* corresponds also to Europe's most remarkable playwrights such as Samuel Becket and Harold Pinter. Becket and Pinter's works seem to be realistic and *the Zoo Story* has a surrealistic nature. The Depression that reigned in the American society during the late thirties and early forties motivated Albee to write *the Zoo Story*. The play was a strike for the indifference and sterility of the contemporary American life. He asserted:

I wrote the Zoo Story in wobbly table in the kitchen of the apartment I was living at that time at 238 west fourth street, I did a draft, made a pencil revision, and typed a second script, and that's the way I've been doing my plays since. I finished the Zoo Story in three weeks. (Albee, 2003. p13)

Albee comes into the category of the Theatre of the Absurd because of his plays attack the fundamentals of the American optimism. Albee was influenced by the existentialist movement and the absurdist drama, Beckett's drama in particular. He expressed that influence in his American domestic drama and produced his unique style.

1.2. Introduction:

In a world full of words, everything that we do or see or when we see each other whether we struggle, play, pray, make love we talk. We talk to our families, colleagues, and even talk to strangers. Yet talking has been existing and by different means: either we talk face to face or we use signs and gestures to transmit any given message or idea. However we are often responded with words. (Benadla Djamel 1989-1990)

Talking isn't limited to that only, but we talk to ourselves too, when there is no one there to respond. We believe that maybe the talking is the only quality that distinguishes us from other animals which makes us humans.

Hence, to fully understand humanity we need to understand language, Which is considered by some religious and mythical philosophy as the "Source of human life and Power" (Rene Wellek and Austin Warren. 1956 p36).

It is in its ways towards language that the Theatre of the Absurd is considered as revolutionary. It attempts to renew the language of drama and to expose the bareness of conventional stage dialogue. Ionesco once described how he came to write his first play. (Cf. *The Tragedy of Language*. TDR. 1960). He had decided to take English lessons and began to study at the Berlitz school. When he read and repeated the sentences in his phrase book, those petrified corpses of once living speech, he was suddenly overcome by their tragic quality. From them he composed his first play, *The Bald Soprano*. The absurdity of its dialogue and its fantastic quality springs directly from its basic ordinariness. It exposes the emptiness of stereotyped language; "what is sometimes labeled the absurd".

According to Ionesco it is only the denunciation of the ridiculous nature of a language which is empty of substance, made up of clichés and slogans, Such a language has atrophied; it has ceased to be the expression of anything

alive or vital and has been degraded into a mere conventional taken of human intercourse, a mask for genuine meaning and emotion.

1.3 Language as Power:

In the conventional drama where every word means what it says and the situations are clear and normal, and all conflicts are tidily resolved, But in reality it is never like that; it is multiple, complex, many-dimensional and exists on a number of different levels at the same time. Language is far too straightforward an instrument to express all this by itself. Reality can only be conveyed by being acted out in all its complexity. Yet, it is the theatre, which is multidimensional and more than merely language or literature, which is the only instrument to express the bewildering complexity of the human condition. The human condition being what it is, with helplessness, insecurity, and being not able to handle the world in all its hopelessness, death, and absurdity, the theatre has to confront him with the bitter truth that most human endeavor is irrational and senseless, that communication between human beings is almost impossible, and that the world will forever remain an impenetrable mystery.

The question of language is to be traced and tackled for its variable uses in various fields, especially when language is given freedom to manipulate at times and submerge implicit meanings at others.

Thinkers and philosophers like Frege, Russell, Austin, Chomsky assert that language is a human activity; first it is the individual's attempts to be understood by others, and also to convey what is in his mind and be able to process what in the others' minds.

The question of language to be asked here is what is language?. All the attempts to answer it are about the essence of language if not about its nature. It should be stressed that language is not always a means of understanding between hearer and speaker and communication, but also to impress the listener and impose authority and superiority to lead the listener to accomplish what we want from them.

According to Bolinger Dwight:

if people use language to get the corporation of their fellows, then little of anything that is ever said is entirely neutral; communication is more to influence than to inform. (Bolinger Dwight, *Aspects of Language*, 1968. P250)

Language as a form of seduction or an instrument of domination or manipulation is one of the aspects that Edward Albee used in some of his plays. No doubt that language can take any form either written or spoken, but since we are dealing with the absurdist language particularly Albee's dramatic language, the spoken language will be given more importance.

Through the everyday language and the colloquial words and expressions and their functions, the meaningless and ambiguous expressions that Albee used in his plays, he believes that an audience has an obligation to be interested and sympathetic to these aims. Drama and art in general are for the purpose of communication as he explained to the American Council for art in 1998 "I hold that we are the only animal who has invented and used art as a method to communicate ourselves to ourselves... to hold an accurate mirror to ourselves to observe ourselves, to observe our behavior,... intention,..." (Albee VI 202). Therefore language is used for the betterment of the human's condition:

And so if a play can make us realize that we are skimming along, we're really not grabbing- participating- in our lives, and we're letting other people do all the stuff we should do ...then maybe we'll change a little bit, maybe we'll start being more socially and politically responsible animals. (Ibid VI 182).

Not only speech but also actions are important in theatre and they help the characters to impress the audience. "Albee's figures are often unsettling riveting precisely because of the disparity between their expected modes of behavior and their shocking routines that call into question the reality of the world which they appear" (Ben-Zvi 181). The use of realistic and naturalistic

settings and characters shock the audience because they do not expect those silly ideas or comical reactions and mind games in the middle of a serious scene and emotional moments. The power of language that Albee uses is to keep the audience distracted and not too much focused on emotions. The characters often use witty and sharp verbal fights and comment each other's words with word games and double meanings in the middle of the serious circumstances, the thing that creates an emotional involvement in the story.

The power of language games provides the character with a good defense mechanism against attacks and the audience is trapped being alerted all the time. Christopher Bigsby puts Albee's own language in front of the language of his characters to compare them: "there is often something guarded, wry, calculated, over precise about Albee's replies as if language were simultaneously exact, compacted with meaning provided is respected and a useful protection against intrusion"... "there are linguistic fencing matches in his plays ..." (Bigsby 157). So he implies that Albee's characters are his own reflection, they behave and talk the way he does.

In *Who's Afraid Of Virginia Woolf?*, George, Martha's husband, catches his wife and Nick petting each other, he acts as if nothing is happening and offers Ice cream to them, the audience is expecting a burst-out over the infidelity, however, they had a dispute over grammar;

George: "... I've got the Ice..."

Martha: "... gotten..."

George:" Got, Martha, Got is perfectly correct... it's just a little... archaic like you" (Ibid I. 267).

In *Seascape* (1975) the two couples are getting to know each other. The words and terms that seem completely normal to humans are odd to lizards and so Charlie and Nancy try to explain them to Leslie and Sarah. The audience is settling on talking lizards and their stupid and silly conversation

with humans. Leslie uses language in an accurate way to appear as the well educated character: “we may, or may not, but we’ll never know unless you define your terms. Honestly, the impression! You’re so thoughtless!” (Ibid II.419)

Albee shakes up the audience after engaging a certain convention, this technique is used throughout Albee’s career, We notice that when we recognize George and Martha’s way of communication in Stevie and Martin’s *The Goat or Who Is Sylvia?* (2002). Martin and Stevie are arguing over what happened to the goat:She yells: “... Vomit it all up! Puke it out all over me... DO IT! ... I’m naked on the table; take all your knives! Cut me! Scar me forever!”. Martin thinks a moment, “...Before or after I vomit on you?” Stevie a little later disentangles from the fight and comments on Martin’s remark: “Very good, by the way”. Martin: “thanks”. Stevie: “...and hopelessly inappropriate” (Albee III 595).

Albee’s naturalistic acting could gain the American audience’s attention and they seemed interested in “...because American theatre as opposed to European theatre is based on naturalism” “...they (American theatre-goers) see something that is not naturalistic- automatically the warning flags go up.” “There is nothing in any Becket play that I’ve ever experienced that is inaccessible to anybody with a reasonable mind” (Ibid VI.179).

The power of naturalistic stage and descriptions in (*All over 1971*): “...the room is solid and elegant, a man’s room, the furniture, all of which is good and comfortable, is most probably English... A tapestry, eighteenth century family portraits, an oriental carpet” (Albee II 304).

Albee’s naturalistic and realistic drama is by now acceptable by the audiences. They are used to it nowadays. In *The Goat* and *Homelife*, Albee addressed directly to the audience with naturalistic acting, and the plot was

shocking. The language is powerfully challenging the audience, the stories in *Homelife* give descriptions of the characters and their situations.

The language in the *Zoo Story* expanded the dimension of the spontaneity and the behavior of the characters. The conversation began in a raw ordinary and musical way but soon ended up engaging in a deep series of ideas and stories and questions about the small and large issues of existence. As Jerry asserts: "Sometimes it is necessary to go a long distance out of the way in order to come back a short distance correctly" (Albee.30). The poetic language of humanity elevated out of naturalism into realism.

The absurdity in the *Zoo Story* is well illustrated when Jerry could engage Peter; the man who is isolated and only interested about silence and his book, however, after the continuous stories by Jerry, Peter started to be less interested about the book and more engaged to know more about Jerry's life.

Jerry's language and stories were interesting but the random conversations turns into a serious fight when the bench that belongs to neither of them, and dramatically ended, "... with a rush he charges Peter and impales himself on the knife, for just a moment, complete silence, Jerry impaled on the knife at the end of Peter's still firm arm. Then Peter screams, pulls away, leaving the knife in Jerry. Jerry is motionless, on point. Then too, screams, and it must be the sound of a fatally injured animal" (Albee. 1958).

Jerry used language and his stories as a weapon to end his life by the hands of another man as an escape from his meaningless life and to make his point that says that a man is nothing but a talking animal.

Jerry changes the way he calls Peter as "MISTER" or "Friend" or "Comic person" to "Ridiculous" to "Vegetable" to finally "an animal" just to show Peter that a man's life is similar to a caged animal. Albee aiming on how he will convince the audience used Jerry as a second narrator after him.

Albee thinks through the *Zoo Story* that sacrifices are necessary to save the American society from the unfairness of the system, the man's feeling of emptiness and the need of isolation. Yet, Jerry is a symbol of the Christ sacrifice and that sacrifice is heroic in the Christian traditions.

Also in *Who's Afraid Of Virginia Woolf?* The power of language is clearly presented and showed in the constant verbal games that George and Martha keep playing and each one of them trying to win that fight by mastering words to reply or comment in a witty way. "George and Martha are connoisseurs of verbal dwelling" (Roudané, 2005. p45). "George and Martha are experts in sadomasochistic language" (Cohn, 2005. p217). "Who treat language as a power tool, to be controlled and possessed" (Malk, 1992. p171).

The power is exercised by the powerful speaker over the non powerful ones, Martha and George struggle to dominate the situation using language and control over turn-taking in conversation and the construction and preservation of the reality regardless if it is truth or illusion. The characters are wrestling through language as a tool and weapon; language has the power to destroy as well as to create and reinvent. The play focuses on language as an interaction, on style as identity, face to face language battles are escalated into an act of creativity and self assertion. Within language relationships are developed, through verbal mastery. The characters obsessively discuss their words striving to win the language game. Their lust for verbal control in their communication system is pretty intense.

Language in Albee's plays is often used as a means of communication, the plays rely on the dialogue rather than action, however, the examination of the linguistic procedures is necessary for a better understanding of the play. In his essay, Julian N. Wasserman says: "the idea of language in the plays of Edward Albee, that for Albee, language is a meeting ground which exists between the interior and the exterior worlds of the speaker and the listener" (Bloom. 97).

People judge situations according to their own life experience, according to their sense of word associations. Language is a way to form a bond between people despite the different languages they speak. Yet, language is used both to include people together as well as exclude others. The linguistic exclusion is apparent in *Who's Afraid Of Virginia Woolf*, when Nick asked George if he had any children and George replies: "That's for me to know and for you to find out"; the "finding out" is regarded as the understanding of the whole play, later on Nick discovers that the child that he thought was real is just a product of George's imagination which makes sense to the previous meaningless conversation.

George's language skills make him the superior speaker and Nick is desperately trying to keep up with him, since Nick only deals with concrete language while George and Martha deal with the abstraction. Nick attempting to challenge George saying: "I'll play the charades like you've got 'em all set up... I'll be what you say I am" (II.150). Nick is failing not only because he is not as skillful as George but also because he has no understanding of either the vocabulary or the rules of the linguistic game played by George and Martha.

Thus, the two couples could not settle on a real conversation during their meeting, George and Martha have an exclusive mutual meanings and codes they agreed on using in their lives; their speech shows the semantic and lexical rules of their togetherness and apparent unity, and still there's no such thing between them.

According to Bakhtin's dialogism we are always in dialogue with everything around us, not only with humans, somehow everything 'addresses' us. Each of us is uniquely addressed in our particular place in the world. We see ourselves through the eyes of others. Language is the link between speaker and listener but both parties should be aware of its rules and nature when one of the parties is missing or not aware of the rules, the result is not having a true language; Nick and Honey are manipulated in the play because they are unconscious of the rules and the vocabulary. Martha calls George as the

“phrasemaker” and he calls her “Martha’s a devil with language” this is true and consciously an element of psychological insight by making it sound humorous as a defense mechanism and an evidence of the perception of alienation.

Silence is the biggest fear of George and Martha, their verbalization is to avoid silence because it may reduce them to what Pirandello once called “Naked figures”. So Martha and George behave and speak like infants with their baby talk and games. “The brutal language which escalates with each act, becomes necessary social and psychological dynamic” (Roudané). Bloom says that the ultimate “finding out” as George puts it, is a linguistic rather than an ontological matter. Roudané on the other hand, says that is an ontological operation to restore the spiritual health and accept their lives as they are, George has to go to the marrow to demythologize the child (81).

In Albee’s plays, the ironies and the interviews are designed to prevent intrusions as a way to attract the attention. Irony and precision serve to make the scenes more dramatic, and the honesty which he purposely put in an implicit and chaotic way of the character who do not feel any emotions, the characters are performers who are fully aware of their roles by addressing directly to the audience to involve the audience to be part of the play. We notice this in most of the plays when the characters deploy a precise language and address speeches to the audience to engage them back to the intermission and to remind them about their complicity in the drama and the acts on the stage.

In the American Dream there is a powerful relationship between language and violence, Albee directed language between the characters and they had violent behaviors expressed by language to illustrate that language can affect strongly on the power of the verbally aggressive characters who always won arguments against the characters who are less articulate and not so expert and flexible with the language tricks and words. Language has become an aggressive part of the play; the physical and violent use of the word *Mutilation*

in the murder of Bumble Joy but also in the mutilation of the American Dream and the flourishing of the ideals of the American family. Albee literally turned language into a sadistic tool that the characters used upon each other, words like love and truth are downgraded and deformed to be used in a sadistic violent context.

In both verse and prose, a concise accurate and witty statement that usually criticizing are called Epigrams; they are funny and sarcastic twisted ideas. In the American Dream, the main character “the grandma” mostly speaks epigrams, especially through her epigrammatic talks concerning the elderly. The power of language is expressed through her brief and powerful statements to shape up the reality of the characters; to her age isn't defined by the biological condition or the emotional state, but by the way people treat her and talk down to her.

1.4 Conclusion:

The task of restating how language becomes as power in Albee's plays, for the strategy of portraying the meaningless state of the modern man, giving opinions about the role of language in the absurd plays which is often dislocated and full of repetition and clichés and without consequences. His fascination with the overtones and sounds, precisions, the harmonies of the language is shown through the characters in any conventional sense. In the process of reading Albee's plays, we have noticed some fundamental facts and the employing of the anti- theatrical speech or dialogues that make further development in the direction of an absurd play. Yet, though language is somehow a form of power and manipulation, it is often showed as a reaction to psychological and philosophical ideas.

Chapter Two: Language as a Means of Non-Communication in the Family Play

2.1 Introduction:

Language has been an essential element of communication since the beginning of the human existence. The denotative literary and symbolic functions are essential for ascertaining meaning in communication. However, language can be used as a means of non-communication and alienation if it is used unwisely towards others as a vulgar and obscene status. “Silences” and “Pauses” are other literary devices to express inability of language. Yet, it should be mentioned that “Silences” and “Pauses” are deliberative tools of the playwrights. We take Albee in particular, to engage the readers to enter into the circumstances that the character is going through and the meaningless conversation.

In this chapter we are going to explore the language of the family play and its non-communication use and purpose. The Theatre of the Absurd was always advocating life issues and dealing with the mystery of the existence. It questioned the socio-political and economic matters that marked the period of that time. Those issues pushed the Man to think more about deep matters like his origins, his religious conventions, the common beliefs, the objective and the real purpose of his life.

The lack of communication was one of the issues evoked by the Theatre of the Absurd. It had affected widely the individuals’ lives. It was illustrated by playwrights such as Edward Albee who presented the failure of communication and its necessity.

2.2 Language as a Means of Non-Communication in the Family Play

Albee considers his plays as Family Plays, as most of his plays that explicitly deal with the domestic issues and the family matters, such as *The Zoo Story* (1959), *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf* (1962), *Marriage play* (1987) even his other plays are somehow related to family matters, we take *Tiny Alice* (1965) as an example which was about a priest who eventually lured into a marriage of sorts with Miss Alice.

Albee sees the family as the key element in the western society and it mirrors all the conventions concerning men, women, children and their typical roles in the family. Albee while working on his introduction volume 2 of his collected plays, devoted a few lines to each of his plays in it and rounds off by saying: "As you see, family plays all" (Albee. 2008).

The upper-middle class white Americans is always in the center of Albee's interest, it is the class that is traditionally familiar with the theatre; the class that belongs to the Theatre of the Absurd. Albee's theatrical families represent the typical American Family which is consisting of a father, mother and usually one child or two, but at least one in most cases.

The American parents raise their children to follow their path, teach them the American values and norms and equip them with the necessary tools and potential in order to grow up to be a successful American. The university education is one of the tools that help the young American to be successful. Through the conversations, families strive for the ideal but it can never be attained or achieved.

The Zoo Story portrays the clash between Peter and Jerry who obviously belong to different classes of the American society. Class barrier makes it impossible for them to develop a personal relationship and attain a common interest. Peter and Jerry do not always say what they mean or think. Jerry keeps asking lots of questions in order to know the truth about Peter's life,

whereas, Ruth Meyer believes that “what is truth for one may seem illusion to the other” (Ruth Meyer. 1968). Yet, a true communication is impossible; denotative functions of the language and words largely become devoid of any meaning, creating confusion and misunderstanding among the characters. This usage of language to communication worsens the relationship between the characters.

Peter’s language is more of a mask than a means of communication. His middle-class hypocrite and mediocre speech as if someone is speaking through him, his bourgeois identity is shown by the gap between his words and intentions to be identified as a bourgeois and an intellectual citizen. Peter reacts with the typical middle-class politeness when he is interrupted by Jerry while sitting peacefully reading his book in a Sunday-afternoon, his first response to this disturbance is “I’m sorry!”. However, he wasn’t really sorry, it was only a subconscious reaction. Jerry as an intruder into Peter’s space lights up his pipe and asks Peter: “You’re not going to get lung cancer, are you?”. (Zoo Story, 1958. P11) Politely answered Peter but still annoyed from the behavior and the question and says: “No, sir. Not from this”. Despite the fact that Peter is not comfortable in this situation he keeps responding that he does not mind this conversation and pretends that he is not upset.

Though they are both alienated, Jerry is trying to communicate, because he is convinced that a true communication is important for the survival of the human race and humanity in general. Jerry is constantly reaching to people like Peter who do not realize their need of communication. “People must have someone with whom they can make contact, with whom they can talk and be understood”. (Carolyn E Jhonson,1968. p23).

Jerry is expressing his need of communication: “It’s just that if you can’t deal with people, you have to make a start somewhere. WITH ANIMALS! Don’t you see? A person has to have some way of dealing with something. If not with people... SOMETHING...” (Albee.1959.p13). Also hopelessly says:

“We neither love nor hurt because we do not try to reach each other” (Ibid. p14).

Communication failure and the finiteness of language in Albee’s plays reveal the implicit intention to miscommunication to hide behind a foggy atmosphere that language creates in the dialogues and the theatre spaces at that time. Man lost all his means of communication even the eagerness to reach and connect with others.

The world expanded with a severe hopelessness and frustration, and the political and social paroxysm took place as a consequence to surround the people of that time. People were suffering due to the lack of communication, families were falling apart, friends were getting less and less closer, lovers couldn’t tolerate each other the way they used to and should. Finally, the verbal language collapsed creating an emotional and psychological break down, social and political traumas, selfishness, prejudice and gender biasness. (Modern American Drama. 2000)

There are plenty of causes, the socio-political condition of the American society during the time of Edward Albee was not a peaceful period; World War II left America without any values and hopes, people were suffering from a wide menace of complete hollowness. Also the psychological crisis was a reaction to the social and political crisis since Man is the product of society.

When the religious values like faith and beliefs break down, there is nothing left as an alternative to them so the Man gets isolated from the society. In order to feel less isolated people should communicate and share their feelings with their partners, family members or friends. Communicating and sharing feelings was the task that seemed impossible to most people at that time. Albee’s absurd plays reflected the lack of communication between humans and the breaking up of the American families.

The American society during 1960's and 1970's cared only for money and financial gain, financial security was the main objective "the American Dream"; the dream of all Americans and this is exactly what Edward Albee depicted in many of his plays, *the American Dream* in particular. People were greedy for wealth and the material life and ignored communication and intimate relationships.

The American Dream is story of a family living and striving to live the American Dream, both old and new. The play has been classified as a model of the Theatre of the Absurd. A tenet of this genre is the concept that words are unable to bear genuine meaning and often are empty and repetitious, illustrating the ineffectiveness or lack of communication between even close family members. The play also uses the comedy of illogic, incorporates biographical details from Albee's life. The play stands as an early index to characters and themes that recur in later Albee plays. (The Collected Plays of Edward Albee, 2004. p15)

Albee's *The American Dream* reveals how Mommy and Daddy are not having a proper communication due to psychological factors and this threatens the peace of the family. Both Mommy and Daddy seemed to be determined to disturb each other's peace of mind. The Grandma prefers to be neutral and makes no effort to neither help nor comfort anyone.

Homecoming is another family Play by Albee. It is a play where language and every word is understood in a different way. The words are well thought, premeditated and pre-planned. Everyone of this family is being isolated and not interested in sharing their ideas and issues to the others. The Brothers and their Father have no communication; they think that communication will reveal their strategies since they are constantly in competition. Effective communication is barely existing between the members of this family. The audience and the readers are confused and do not understand the motivation of characters until the end.

In *The Zoo Story* there is a lack of communication between strangers, it shows how the words of a friend and a stranger can have different definitions, and the lack of communication can destroy any relationship. The play opens with Peter sitting peacefully on a bench reading a book and Jerry comments; "...I've been to the Zoo. I said, I've been to the Zoo. MISTER, I'VE BEEN TO THE ZOO". (*Zoo Story*,1958. p113). Obviously the stress on the words implies that Jerry is making efforts demanding to communicate. He is seeking to know if it is possible for him to communicate with a stranger which is the main reason that brought him to the Zoo. The whole story is about an attempt of communication but non-communication takes place instead.

Jerry's intrusion was beneficial for Peter too, since it made him go out of his psychological prison of dignity and pretension, on the other hand Jerry needed a man to whom he can express his thoughts and communicate with. No doubt the two strangers need and complete each in some ways.

Alienation had been Jerry's main problem, he has been alienated from his family and society and had no links with intimate social or physical contact with anyone. He was desperately trying to communicate with anyone or anything, Jerry tells Peter a story about his wild father and immoral mother:

...good old Mom walked out on good old Pop when I was ten and a half years old; she embarked on an adulterous turn of out southern states...A journey of a year's duration ... and her most constant companion ...among other, among many other... was Mr. Bareleycorn. At least that what old Pop after he went down ... came back... brought her body north. We'd received the news between Christmas and New Years. You see, that good old Mom had parted with the ghost in some dump in Alabama. And , without the ghost ... I mean, what was she? A stiff... a northern stiff . At any rate good old Pop celebrated the New Year for an even two weeks and then slapped into the front of a somewhat moving city omnibus. Which sort of cleaned things out family-wise.(*Zoo Story*,1958. p121).

From Jerry's story we realize that he had a troubled time growing up as a disorganized, insecure and psychologically weak individual and he might be unfit for a proper communication but still is trying to reach out to people to communicate with them. Jerry has no one in his life, literally no one, he is leading an empty life; his life is symbolized by his own words "two picture frames, both empty". (Ibid,120). Since no one is existing in Jerry's life and both of his parents are dead, to him it is not important to have pictures of anyone. So the empty frames represent his empty life. He explains why the frames are empty to answer Peter: "...I don't see why they need any explanation at all. Isn't clear? I don't have pictures of anyone to put in them" (Ibid,120).

In the play, Albee gives the causes and the consequences of the communication issues. At the beginning and the first conversation between Peter and Jerry, it is obvious that Jerry needs something that Peter can provide for him which is a descent conversation and a proper communication; Jerry is striving to have a real conversation with long sentences but Peter seems not interested about this and responds in short sentences to remain unknown and mysterious and not reveal too much about his identity and thoughts. therefore, Jerry's wish is impossible to happen.

As soon as Peter is aware of Jerry's intrusion into his space, he reacts by establishing communication. Communication has rules to be followed and the violation of these rules often leads to frustration, disappointment and anger from such a situation. Right from the beginning, Jerry is being extremely personal with Peter but this makes Peter feel uncomfortable and he refuses to get out from his comfort zone and his shell. Communication can't take place until both sides are willing to communicate and the story events and circumstances are not helping at all.

The absurd thing in this situation is that despite the fact that Peter is annoyed and uncomfortable in this situation, he never tries to leave Jerry and

just walk away, this implies that Peter is also in need for a real conversation and wants someone to share and communicate his own feelings and thoughts which is something he has never done. Thus, Peter is confused about the time and the person and he is having some trust issues. Jerry on the other hand could not communicate not because he does not want to but because no one wanted to communicate with him.

When two individuals want to communicate, the two parts should be aware of each other's backgrounds and the circumstances they have been through and the factors and the motives that lead the speaker to express themselves in a given way. Peter and Jerry were completely unaware of their facets which led them to the lack of communication. Though Peter and Jerry go through a number of attempts of communication but at the end Jerry's efforts fail because of Peter's stubbornness to reciprocate, the thing that obliged Jerry to desperately make contact putting his own life on the line as a cost to make his point.

Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf is one of the most well-known plays by Albee. It could gain itself a significant place in the American Culture. It is about a New England professor and his wife. The play explores how people communicate and manipulate each other using language. It has been considered as a secular morality play, an affirmative work and love story. The play succeeded in attracting the critics attention who gave an overwhelming amount of praise but still there were others who condemned the play's objectionable language and content.

The play was selected for the Pulitzer Prize Drama by the Award's Drama Committee, however, it was denied later on because of the play's offensive language and its subject matter. On one hand it was praised for the powerful language, on the other hand, the characters were seen as unbelievable and their language as vulgar. (St. Louis,1988. p08)

The play was shocking for the audience, it upsets them because they were not ready for the radical departure from realism, they objected to the play's language because of its morbid and subversive atmosphere. Yet, the language is seen as a thrilling and mesmerizing by the audience of today.

In *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf*, Albee deals with the lack of communication between lovers and the way they communicate love towards each other and how they fail to communicate the simplest things. There is a huge gap in the thought process between these lovers. Albee's couples in this play seem to love each other like any other typical family but still they are unable to communicate and express themselves and share their true emotions.

The lack of communication is a major factor in conjugal problems, we notice this when we take a closer look into the relationship between George and Martha and their guests Nick and Honey. These two couples are suffering due to their inability to express themselves to each other, and both of them are stuck in a circle of foolish and childish fight against each other just to attain the satisfaction of supremacy and superiority. This problem not only destroyed all links and chances of communication but also made the couples fall apart from each other, which makes us wonder whether these couples got married because they loved each other or just because they wanted to fulfill their personal aims and objectives!

Language in Albee's plays has been a barrier between the characters; in the *Zoo Story* language is not serving its real purpose that is supposed to, language should connect people to establish links between them but it is not the case in this play, it is a barrier to communication. The characters use language only to isolate themselves from others, they pretend to be communicating but in fact they are using it as a veil behind which non-communication is really happening.

2.3. Conclusion:

To conclude, Albee's characters do want to communicate but most of them do not know how and they just avoid others. C.W.E. Bigsby asserted that: "Communication isn't impossible in Albee's world. It is simply avoided as being a threat to complacency and comfortable isolation" (Albee.18).

Humans get used to their isolation and enjoy it and they end up not trying to communicate and they prefer having their own space away from others. This isolation might seem peaceful at some point but if it remains for a long time it turns into a problem that results by the disintegration of the family and friendship and it can lead to psychological frustrations in sudden outbursts and finally occur in a violent way.

Chapter Three: The Vague language, Language of Truth and Illusion

3.1. Introduction:

When reading Edward Albee's plays, so many words appear vague and not easy to comprehend. These words require deep analysis to be understood and most of the times they imply implicit meanings. Words are the most accurate way to express thoughts. However, these words should be clear and precise in order to be influencing and meaningful to create conviction in the mind of the hearer. Words are the first quality that a speaker should master and think deeply of what the speaker wants to say before they say it.

Speech is the responsible for the distribution of the ideas that we have. Thoughts were always expressed in a clear and exact language following some exact rules and forms.

The term vague language means that there is meaning beyond common sense and logic and sometimes above comprehension. The hearer's level of understanding and reaction are important; the positive interpretation help to make the flow of the thoughts, however, a negative interpretation might create a clash of thoughts and a failure to establish a proper interaction.

Black asserts that: "The ways in which we interpret ordinary language use are relevant to the ways in which we interpret literary discourse- which in only the language of the time, written by people who are more adapt at manipulating its nuances than most of us..." She added: "It is to be expected that literary discourse will differ from ordinary conversation and some written discourse since any published work is subject to a process of careful composition and much revision..." (Black, 2006. p80).

The vagueness of language explained by Crystal and Davy calling it the imprecision, they give four reasons of vagueness: (A) A memory loss; the

speaker forgets the correct word. (B) The language has no suitable exact word or the speaker does not know it. (C) The subject of the conversation is not such that it requires precision, and an approximation or characterization will do. The choice of a vague item is deliberate to maintain the atmosphere". (Channel,1994. p08).

In this chapter I am going to present the Vague Language applied by Albee in *the Zoo Story* (1958), and the language of truth and illusion in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*(1962).

3.2. The Vague Language and The Language of Truth and Illusion

In *The Zoo Story*, Jerry is standing in front of Peter and asking plenty of personal questions, an attempt to figure out Peter's reaction. Peter is trying to understand the situation and asked Jerry to clarify the topic for him about the Zoo, however, Jerry is being all vague in his answers and questions, he answers: "the What", making it more vague and unclear for Peter. Jerry is aware of the answer but he prefers to remain vague putting Peter in a puzzled situation. While Peter is desperately trying to understand clearly the things that he hears, Jerry is shifting from a topic to another to distract Peter's attention but still he implies something specific.

There should be relevance between the thought and what words are being said to express it in order to lead the listener to follow. Yet, it is not the case with Albee's characters, they get vague themselves with responses to what is meant to convey.

Peter is not always good at expressing himself: "...I don't express myself too well, Sometimes" (*Zoo Story*, 1958. p30). The use of the word sometimes can be helpful when expressing ideas in some situations and cases. However, using that word regularly and on purpose becomes a habit that makes the speaker appear as someone who is not confident and reveal the questioning attitude.

Jerry is trying to show off in front of Peter and wondering if Peter is the intellect kind of person, so Peter asserts: "Well, I like a great many writers; I have a considerable ...Catholicity of taste if I may say so..." (*Ibid*, p25). Peter's reply that he might know lot of writers and may be more than Jerry knows, makes Jerry feel uncomfortable and somehow offended. The fact that Peter does not define the amount leaves Jerry unable to decide who is the intellect one between them. No doubt that Jerry is a fluent speaker but he is

more often an insincere and a dominator of the conversation, he also talks to be vague on purpose.

Another vague thing which is the “two picture frames” when Peter asks Jerry wondering about them:

Jerry: “two picture frames, both empty”

Peter: “...about those two empty picture frames?”

Jerry: “...interesting that you asked me about the two picture frames...” (Ibid. p30).

So, despite the fact that Jerry is aware of the existence of those empty frames, but he makes it more interesting by stressing on the number of the frames and tries to give details about them.

The vague language in *The Zoo Story* is to be embraced the way it is. In literature, the use of a certain set of words can make the meaning appear either precise and accurate or vague, so the right choice of words often makes a huge difference in the story plot and the purpose behind it. The vagueness of language can be beneficial for the two parties of the conversation, it tickles their thought to make them think beyond the usual to discover the hidden messages.

A deep analysis into Albee’s play makes the reader go through a series of attempts to resolve that vagueness, of course, it can not be resolved immediately but the existence of the vague language should be recognized since the varied significance of vague language is more than enough covering wide aspects of our lives. “One reason for the use of vagueness is the speaker expressing difference to the tutor at the same time as disagreeing with him or her. Hence, vagueness is used as one way of adhering to the politeness rules of a particular culture, and of not threatening face”. (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

Illusion is the only escape that the characters find satisfying in life and existence. It gives them an orgasmic pleasure and the feeling of being alive. The characters who are possessed by the illusion are often alienated from the others and the world.

In *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* Albee's characters are confused between the truth and illusion and sometimes they can not tell the difference between them. In the play George is trying to figure out whether his guest Nick is "stud" or "houseboy". However, his wife Martha pleadingly accuses George that he is unable to judge: "Truth or illusion, George, you don't know the difference" (*Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf*, 1962. p22). By the end of the play the audience is confused too and the contact with the neat distinction between truth and illusion is lost.

No doubt that truth and illusion is a major theme of this play. Robert Brustein gives more perceptive evaluation about this:

Albee seems less interested in the real history of his characters than in the way they conceal and protect their reality:

The conflict is also a kind of game, with strict rules, and what they reveal about each other may not be true. This comedy of concealment reminds me of Pirandello, and even more of Jean Genet. For George and Martha ... shift their identities like reptiles shedding skins. (*Albee and the Medusa Head*, 1962. p29).

Albee uses language as a principal means to achieve the "Comedy of Concealment." The dialogue of the characters not only reveals identity but also establishes the ambiguity between truth and illusion. For example, George's use of clichés reveals a characteristic of his personality; however, it works as a veil that hides his real identity.

Truth should be defined and identified before discussing illusion and exaggeration. Truth is often considered as a verifiable fact that has been

checked and confirmed, however, illusion is a fake imaginary image that we sometimes convince ourselves that it is true, yet, it is unverifiable. It is from definitions as clear cut as these that difficulties arise, because throughout the play there is a constant interpenetration of truth and illusion; similarly, the characters play so many false roles during the night's performance that no definite norm can be established. Though language is the principal means that creates the ambiguity and illusion, it is not the only mean, facial expression and stance also do help to make that even more real and believable.

Albee's ability to create ambiguity is best demonstrated by the scene in which George argues with Honey about her fear of having children. The audience is already aware that Nick married Honey after her false claims that she was pregnant; the audience is also aware that she gets sick occasionally, all by herself. After Honey's admission of "I ... don't ... want ... any ... children. I'm afraid! I don't want to be hurt ... " George sums up the evidence: "I should have known ... the whole business ... the head-aches ... the whining ... the...." He quickly concludes: "How do you make your secret little murders studboy doesn't know about, hunh? Pills?". Honey has admitted fear of having children; she doesn't "want to be hurt.". The use of the word "hurt," ambiguity is already created; which makes us wonder whether she fears the physical pain of giving birth or the psychological pain of that process. George jumps quickly to conclusion furthers the ambiguity; critics consider George's accusation as the revelation of a truth. Alfred Chester, has noted an important fact in this scene: "So the truth is out at last. But what truth?". He adds:

... we realize that, after all, Honey has said nothing, and George's mind has said it all.... But somehow George has hit home ... We begin to realize that the "truth" about Nick and Honey's reproductive di-lemma will never be revealed as an objective fact. (Edward Albee: *Red Herrings and White Whales*,1963. p299).

Right from the beginning of the play, Albee's focus is on the language of the characters. With the first lines, Albee creates a means he will use during

the whole play. Walter Kerr points out that Albee "peppers us with them [Jesus Christ's and God damn's] as a kind of warnings, to make sure that our ears will be attentive when he decides really to burn them with something else". (Along Nightmare Alley, 1963. p119). This is best illustrated by the use of the term Chastity by George referring to his wife Martha Who obviously was attempting to commit adultery with Nick. Calling Martha Chastity does not make her chaste, and referring to her as love does not make her loved neither. Yet, her adultery attempt failed, and there *is* some sort of mutual concern between this couple, a rather unusual kind of love, existing between George and Martha. Albee focuses on the fine difference between truth and illusion by using terms that are in context considered inappropriate and vulgar.

Obviously, the ambiguity between truth and illusion is one of the main concerns of the play and the playwright. The characters' status is relevant: the college professors and their spouses have reached a certain level of education that make them able to use precise and fluent language and also should be aware of the use of clichés. Albee through George's exploits both of these factors.

In the play, the characters are aware that a certain level language belongs to a certain class of people. when George warns Martha not to start in on the "bit" (about their "child", Martha reply to that: "The bit? The bit? What kind of language is that?" and then she adds, "You imitating one of your students, for God's sake?". (Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf, 1962. p21).

Albee had a technique in creating ambiguity between truth and illusion using George's statement to his guests: "I mean, come on! We must know other games, college-type types like us ... that can't be the ... limit of our vocabulary, can it?" (Ibid, 25). George admits the importance of language in their lives because most of their routine is about playing these word games, these games are mostly about hiding truth and creating illusion, and he emphasizes on the importance of "vocabulary" and "games".

George and Martha are completely aware of the language they use, especially George who is constantly searching for the exact and precise words. He often argues with Martha or Nick about words like how to call a bunch of geese, is it “gaggle” or “gangle”?, and is Honey "slim-hipped" or "frail". The exaggerated precision of words becomes a norm for George to differentiate between truth and illusion.

There is contrast between Martha's disregard for precision and George's picky and exaggerated insistence upon the right word. However, sometimes George pretends to slip and throw random words to hide his true intentions. George tells Nick that "since I married ... uh, What's her name ... uh, Martha" (Ibid, 30). Martha, too, did not forget the names but still she uses: "What's their name" referring to Nick and Honey, a way to show disregard and detachment to them. Albee presents a masked truth to express contempt through George's occasional disregard for precision and exaggerated concern for accuracy which makes more ambiguity between truth and illusion.

In the play's dialogue, Albee uses clichés, unlike: “Ionesco who demonstrates inadequacies of language to describe phenomena, Albee demonstrates the adequacy and power of words. These words are the power to reveal and conceal the truth, mostly at the same time” (Language: Truth and Illusion in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*, 1968, p60). In *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf*, Albee uses clichés to reveal a significant side of his characters in order to give a special meaning.

Albee uses clichés in a normal way, however, he attaches great importance to them. They are usually not a consciously thought out expression, they express, because of their spontaneous and random composition, relevant meaning. Identities are revealed by balancing a cliché with a responding literal application of it.

George and Martha wonder about the reason after Honey's sickness but neither of them is aware that the Brandy she's been downing all night might

have something to do with it. Martha insists that George must apologize for making Honey throw up. George denies his responsibility for this:

George: I did not make her throw up.

As Martha continues her nagging: "Well, who do you think did ... Sexy over there? You think he made his *own* little wife sick?"

George: Well, you make *me* sick. (Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf, 1962. p35).

This dialogue implies two ideas, figuratively; George is "sick" of Martha, and literally, Nick might be the real reason after Honey's being ill. Albee presents unambiguous truth by giving specific application to a cliché that often functions as a figurative and general manner.

Despite the fact that Martha is beyond menopause, she still considers herself as the Earth mother, however, George who plays the role of the director who is always setting things in motion yet often remaining detached, he is the symbol of the Creative Force in the play. George assumes his controlling role by warning Martha not to "start in on the bit [about their "son"]". No doubt that he intends to control this meeting and direct the conversation as an outside director, but still sometimes he is unconsciously dragged into the center of the action.

3.3. Conclusion

Language and its meaning can not be separated from the characters, and Albee's manipulation and language games go hand in hand with the overall meaning of his plays. Albee often repeats words to show how little we know about each character and their experiences.

Communication in its varied forms is one of the main themes in Edward Albee's plays in general and *The Zoo Story* and *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* in particular. There is a difference between what the characters say happened and what really happened, also we as an audience are unable to appreciate an inexperienced and situation and circumstances, so Albee is constantly tickling the audience's minds to make them involve deeply with the story events.

Truth can be seen differently by different character; the character who is merely observing of a particular situation might consider it as truth, however, the character who is experiencing it might have another interpretation of such a situation. It depends on the characters and the circumstances and their angle of perception to decide whether a given situation is truth or illusion.

Albee implies explicit interpretations of facts and imagination through vague language and ambiguous meanings that make it pretty difficult for the reader to make precise and clear distinction between the truth and the illusion. Yet, language is an essential means in Albee's plays by which the relativity and the ambiguity of truth are created.

General conclusion

After a careful reading and analysis of some of Edward Albee's plays, I came to the realization that a further reading and deeper analysis is needed in order to answer the questions about Albee's language which opens the door for me to proceed with my further studies and for the other students who are willing to work on this topic.

Albee's language, character, themes, setting and techniques are the perfect combination in creating such a phenomenal work. Albee's language revolutionized the theatre of the absurd because it could go deeper in the reader and the audience's mind.

The language exposes the true American society and the relationship between its citizens. Albee's language gives an image about how people are unable to reach mutual understanding using the irrational characters and the clichés and the meaningless dialogues.

Albee's language is considered as phenomenal because of his dramatic innovation and the realistic situations of the characters and their absurd circumstances. The provocative and sometimes vulgar language and themes that usually used to conceal the truth about the characters give the chance to the illusion instead to reign over the story events. Albee gives more importance to the characters' language and actions, he created a calculated intensity of a dramatic language.

Finally, I can only say that Albee's language and plays aim to reach the universal level which in no doubt he succeeded to achieve, and he could raise a quite revolutionary kind of change in the world in general and in his community in particular.

Bibliography

- Albee, Edward. *Edward Albee's The American Dream: The Sandbox; The Death of Bessie Smith; Fam and Yam*. New York, NY: Dramatists Play Service, Inc., 2009. Print.
- Albee, Edward. "The Zoo Story", *The Collected Plays of Edward Albee*. New York: Overlook Press, 2004.
- Albee, Edward "Which Theatre is The Absurd One?" in Kernan A, B. *The*
- Albee, Edward. *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*. St. Louis, MO: Turtleback Books, 1988. Print.
- Albee, Edward. (1958). *The Zoo Story: A Play in One Scene*. NY: Putnam Publishing Group.
- Als, Hilton. "Just the Folks." *New Yorker* 1 Dec. 2014. Web. 12 Feb. 2016.
- Bailey, L.M.S. "Absurdly American: Rediscovering The Representation of Violence in The Zoo Story" in Mann, B.J., *A Casebook*. New York: Routeledge, 2003, pp. 31-43.
- Baxandall, Lee "The Theatre of Edward Albee" in Kernan A.B. *The Modern American Theatre*. New Jersey: A Spectrum Book, 1967, pp. 80-97.
- Biggsby, Christophe. *A Critical introduction to the twentieth century American Drama*. Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- B.J., Edward Albee: *A Casebook*. New York: Routeledge, 2003, pp. 18-30
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Channell, J. (1994). *Vague Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coles Editorial Board. *The Plays of Edward Albee*. Toronto: Coles, 1981
- Crystal, D. and Davy, D. (1975). *Advanced Conversational English*. London: Longman.
- Dircks, Phyllis T. *Edward Albee: A Literary Companion*. Jefferson, NC.

- Deese, J. (1974). Towards a psychological theory of the meaning of sentences. In *Human Communication: Theoretical Explorations*, A.
- Esselin, Martin. (1961) *The Theatre of The Absurd*. London: Penguin Books, 1978
- Esslin, Martin. "Albee as Absurdist." Kolin and Madison 63-65.
- Finkle, David. "Review. 'The American Dream' and 'The Sandbox'"
- Harris, Wendell V. "Morality, Absurdity, and Albee." Kolin and Madison 117-122.
- Hirsch, Foster. "Evasions of Sex: The Closet Dramas." Kolin and Madison 125-135.
- Kellman, Steven G. *Magill's Survey of American Literature, Volume 6*. Salem, MA: Salem Press, 2007. Print.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Modern American Drama, 1945-2000. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P, 2000.
- Modern American Theatre. New Jersey: A Spectrum Book, 1967, pp. 170-175.
- Paolucci, Anne "Edward Albee; A Retrospective (and Beyond)" in Mann.
- Paolucci, Anne. *From Tension to Tonic: The Play of Edward Albee*. Washington : The Bagehot Council, 2000.
- Rene Wellek and Austin Warrens, *Theory of Literature*, Penguin Books LTD, Middlesex, England, 1956, P36
- Roudané, Matthew C. "A Playwright Speaks: An Interview with Edward Albee." Kolin and Madison 193-199.
- Roy, Emil. "*Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf* and the Tradition." Kolin and Madison 87-94.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1986/ 1995) (rev. edn). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.