LEXICAL VARIETY OF ARTHUR MILLER'S DRAMATIC TEXTS

Iryna Sydorenko,
Lecturer of the subdepartment of English Language for Specific Purposes #1,
Doctoral Candidate of the subdepartment of Theory, Practice and Translation of the English Language
Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute, Ukraine
Orcid 0000-0001-8276-9048
sydiryna@gmail.com

Summary. The present article is devoted to the complex study of the specifics of the language means in the textual corpus of dramatic works by the world-known American writer Arthur Miller. Approximately 750 lexical units from fifteen plays by the playwright were analyzed, selected and processed. As article purpose, the functional-stylistic and semantic-structural features of lexical means presented in the author's dramatic texts are analyzed; expressive possibilities, pragmatic potential and quantitative ratio of the lexical level of Arthur Miller's drama are determined. The methodology grounds of the research are the following: method of theoretical generalization, method of analysis and synthesis, linguostylistic analysis, lexico-semantic analysis, structural-semantic analysis, contextual interpretation method, descriptive method, pragmatic analysis, quantitative analysis. It is established that the lexical level of individual authorial speech of the playwright is objectified by the convergence of neutral vocabulary with the bookish one in the author's remarks, as well as the convergence of neutral, bookish, colloquial and obscene lexemes in the speech of the actors. Vocabulary has been found to be a mean of intellectualization and aestheticization of Arthur Miller's drama. Furthermore, it realizes the author's intention of realistic reproduction of spontaneous speech of the actors, determines the expressive and emotional tone of the writer's plays in whole, exerts the pragmatic and aesthetic influence on the reader, presents personal perception of surrounding reality and worldview. The active interaction of different layers of vocabulary in the textual space of the playwright is considered to be a manifestation of individual literary style. Given approach enables to conclude about the symbiosis of the elements of intellec-

tual, psychological and routine, appeal to the figuratively-sensual dimension of human existence, the closeness of the author's speech to the poetic one as the characteristic features of the Arthur Miller's idiostyle.

Key words: artistic discourse, speech expressiveness, neutral vocabulary, bookish vocabulary, colloquial vocabulary, obscene vocabulary.

1. INTRODUCTION.

The anthropocentrism of the contemporary linguistic paradigm determines the perspective of the literary discourse study. The linguistic form can no longer be considered without taking into account the specifics of the author's worldview, personal perception of the surrounding reality, individual linguistic and aesthetic preferences, communicative and pragmatic intentions. In this regard, the defining tendency of linguistic thought in recent years has become the interpretation of the textual space of a literary work through the prism of verbal expression of the inner world of the writer, which according to today's scientific position corresponds to the concept of the notion of idiostyle.

There is no doubt that the originality of the author's idiostyle is mostly pronounced through the individual features of the word usage and word formation. Numerous functional and semantic variations of lexemes serve as the author's means of aesthetic design of a thought, as a verbal instrument of unique artistic image and individual language creation (Makar, 2010, p. 7; Yurina, 2016, p. 55). Paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations of lexical units provide unlimited opportunities for the artists of the literary word to express their personal intentions through the prism of the new literary reality they create (Perelomova, 2010, p. 73; Yurina, 2016, p. 56). Lexical means determine the functional and stylistic colouring of the literary text, act as the factual subjective content of the latter (Gaidenko, 2018, p. 95).

The research interest of the world scientific community in the figure of Arthur Miller, a writer who is considered to be one of the brightest representatives of American drama of the twentieth century, is undeniable. The creative way and the uniqueness of the playwright's literary method and technique are revealed in numerous literary and critical works. However, the conducted analytical review of scientific sources suggests that the linguistic study of the author's dramatic works at this stage is represented only by fragmentary explorations (A. Ehrlichman 2010, A. Zinkovskaya 2011, M. Roudane 2010). Moreover, there is no thorough linguistic study of Arthur Miller's idiostyle, as well as scientific attempts to determine the specificity and pragmatic potential of the linguistic means used by the writer to create the textual fulfilment of his plays.

The purpose of the article is to elucidate the variety, specifics, structural and functional peculiarities of lexical means in the author's speech of Arthur Miller as

the components of idiostyle. The purpose involves the following tasks: to reveal the lexical richness of the texts of dramatic works by Arthur Miller, to explore semantic and structural features of lexical units in the texts of the author's drama, to establish the pragmatic potential of the selected lexemes, to identify the most representative lexical groups of the author's textual corpus according to the functional and stylistic affiliation. Fifteen plays from different periods of the playwright's work with a total volume of 792 pages serve as the material of the research.

The methodology grounds of the research are: method of theoretical generalization, method of analysis and synthesis, linguostylistic analysis, lexico-semantic analysis, structural-semantic analysis, contextual interpretation method, descriptive method, pragmatic analysis, quantitative analysis.

2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.

The conducted research enabled us to establish that the lexical level of the author's speech is actualized by the active interaction of different layers of vocabulary.

Neutral vocabulary. Arthur Miller's authorial speech is based on linguistic means of the basic vocabulary and the commonly used lexical items of the neutral stylistic tone. We notice that most often the author tends to lexical units of the above mentioned type in remarks. The playwright's remarks are quite expanded and detailed. Every detail, every gesture, every emotion is extremely important for the writer and is described with meticulous precision:

He starts for driveway, but is brought up short by George, who enters there. George is Chris's age, but a paler man, now on the edge of his self-restraint. He speaks quietly, as though afraid to find himself screaming. An instant's hesitation and Chris steps up to him, hand extended, smiling. (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 129).

As O. Perelomova opportunely points out, all stylistically active lexemes stand out against the background of neutral vocabulary. Moreover, it is on the neutral lexical units that the conceived "fabric" of the literary work with all its ideological-thematic and artistic complexity is realized; by skillful use of the neutral lexical layer the writer manages to solve the most complex artistic and creative problems, where the lexeme acquires relational significance and syntagmatic value (Perelomova, 2010, p. 74). Such statement of Ukrainian linguist is convincingly proved by the texts of Arthur Miller's plays where artistic activity, significant stylistic role, noticeable expressive and figurative possibilities of lexical means of neutral type are also fixed in the author's remarks. Adverting to commonly used lexical units of the neutral tone, the playwright not only provides the reader with the nominative descriptions of the interior, household items, appearance of the protagonists, but also verbally draws landscapes, psychologizes his heroes, creates vivid original characters:

… Keller is near sixty. A heavy man of stolid mind and build, a business man these many years, but with the imprint of the machine-shop worker and boss still upon him. When he reads, when he speaks, when he listens, it is with the terrible concentration of the uneducated man for whom there is still wonder in many commonly known things, a man whose judgments must be dredged out of experience and a peasant-like common sense. A man among men. … (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 87).

Along with that, we note that the active use of the house-related vocabulary is the specific feature of writer's speech style. The author tends to describe the houses and household items of his characters rather precisely and in detail. The theme of the polarity of human existence grounded by the routine of everyday life and exalted by deep inner impulses is the one that permeates every author's play:

LEO's living room – kitchen in a nondescript little wooden house on a country back road. A woodburning stove near a handmade plywood dining and drawing table; some canvas folding chairs, one of them repaired with needle and thread; a wicker chair; a couple of short benches; a well-worn modern chair and a lumpy couch … A couple of fine, dusty landscapes on one wall as well as tacked-up photos and a few drunken line drawings of dead friends. … At the big table LEO is carefully lettering with a marker pen on a piece of cardboard, a newspaper open at his elbow. There are a few patches on his denim shirt and his pants are almost nothing but patches. … (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 3).

Bookish vocabulary. The characteristic feature of Arthur Miller's authorial speech is the "bookishness". Following O. Perelomova, we believe that the bookishness of a literary text is generated by the writer's focus on the inner essence of the intellectual person. Complex microworld of the reflecting intellectual, the desire to learn about the surrounding world can be expressed only by appealing to bookish language (Perelomova, 2010, p. 80). We notice that the bookish vocabulary plays the key role in creating the overall sublime tone of Arthur Miller's plays. Along with that, author's bookish lexemes are determined by certain functional and pragmatic characteristics, acting as the artistic expression of personal understanding of the era in which the events unfold. Such linguistic items serve as the tool for creating individualized characters of heroes through the prism of their speech characterization, function as the means of marking the communicative specifics of speech interaction.

We establish that the linguistic means of bookish style that function in the author's texts are presented by foreign vocabulary (barbarisms, exoticisms), poetic vocabulary (archaisms and historicisms), neologisms, literary phraseological units.

We observe that ***barbarisms*** are quite common in the textual space of Arthur Miller's drama. In most cases these are barbarisms of French origin: *chauffeur* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 22), *croissant* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 142), *bourgeoi-*

sie (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 153). Less widespread are barbarisms in Latin: *credo* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 227), *tempo* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 315), *status quo* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 225). We also find examples of author's use of Spanish, Italian and German barbarisms: *vamoose* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 348), *bordello* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 14), *frankfurters* (Miller ,1964-1982, p. 103).

It is noticeable that in author's plays barbarisms are generally used for nominative purposes and do not acquire any stylistic functions. Nevertheless, appealing to the historical and cultural heritage of the source language and marking the specifics of communicative parameters of the speech, they intensify expressiveness of the playwright's texts.

Thus, in the following example the legal term of Latin origin *bona fides* performs a characteristic function in the presentation of the hero, whose language harmonizes with the level of education:

PROFESSOR: Will any of you admit right now that you are carrying forged identification papers? So, in short, you are all bona fide Frenchmen. (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 161).

The historical and cultural contamination of Arthur Miller's dramatic texts is also explained by the use of ***exoticisms.*** The exoticisms that function in the author's plays are presented by lexical units of various origins: 1) Italian*: piazza* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 586); 2) Ukrainian: *borscht* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 443); 3) Russian: *czar* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 485); 4) African: *safari* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 214); 5) Turkish: *harem* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 253); 6) Indian: *ashram* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 470); 7) Mexican: *poncho* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 450).

We note that exoticisms in the language of the writer often play stylistically significant role acting as the constructive elements of appropriate expressive and emotional task. In particular, in the following example the contextual and stylistic coloring of exoticism is actualized due to its use as the signifier for the expressive and evaluative characteristics of the social phenomena:

THEO: Oh no, they're marvelously loyal couples.

LYMAN: No, dear, they have harems – you are thinking of storks. (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 253).

We believe that Arthur Miller's inclusion of ***archaisms*** in the textual canvas of the play has pragmatic grounds: 1) actualizing of the historical coloring of the context; 2) the effect of high language.

It is established that the archaic level of the writer's dramatic texts is represented by the archaisms and archaic forms of the words that exist. Also, we note that the total number of lexemes of archaic semantics and form is rather significant.

Among the archaisms that function in the author's texts we single out two groups: 1) obsolete words: *parlor* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 352), *harlot* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 429), *hearty* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 351), *splendid* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 243); 2) lexical units with archaic meaning: *dungeon* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 442),

tavern (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 443), *gibbet* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 446), *conquistadors* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 75), *vassal* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 117).

The examples of archaic forms of words are rare: *naught* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 398), *hath* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 138), *oft* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 141).

The results of the study suggest that the defining feature of the author's language of Arthur Miller is the prevalence of ***historicisms.*** We establish that the temporal orientation of the reader in the course of described events is realized through the use of lexical units with the semantics related to historical events or realities which are contextually significant: *fascism* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 138), *concentration camp* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 443), *The Vietnam War* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 478). Also, the author does not overlook the historical figures who became the symbols of the time: *Hitler* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 434), *Roosevelt* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 455), *Karl Marx* (Miller, 1964- 1982, p. 459). National coloring and semantic originality are added by contextually introduced axiological information about historical figures who played a certain social role in the life of American society: *Gene Tunney* (Miller, 2001, p. 145), *Jack Benny* (Miller, 2001, p. 1971), *Alfred E. Smith* (Miller, 2001, p. 1973). Along with this, the characteristic feature of Arthur Miller's language is the use of historisms and ideologisms belonging to the Soviet period: *comrades* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 480), *working class* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 480), *Marxist* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 446), *communist* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 15).

Idiostyle is always associated with word formation and creative desire of the writer to enhance speech expressiveness, novelty and emotional freshness of the literary character. It becomes possible due to the use of various neologisms (Yurina, 2016, p. 79).

We establish that in Arthur Miller's authorial speech ***neologisms*** are produced by word-forming structures which are presented by compound and suffixal types.

Compound types are formed by unusual combinations of adjectives with nouns. Due to the variability of peripheral meanings of adjectives, nouns receive a new emotional and figurative assessment actualized through the prism of individual authorial perception. Adjectives, in turn, expand their semantic field and act as epithets:

WILLY: What a simonizing job, heh! (Miller, 2001, p. 1940).

We observe that the suffixal types of lexical innovations of the playwright are produced by combining the proper name with the word-forming noun suffix *-ism.* As the result of such combination, the author verbally models new phenomena differentiated by the personalized content:

LYMAN: … your incurably Protestant cooking; your savoir-faire and your sexual inexperience; your sensible shoes and devoted motherhood, your intolerant former radicalism and stalwart love of country now – your Theodorism! Who can ever take your place! (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 228).

Another characteristic feature of Arthur Miller's language is the saturation of the textual material with ***terminological vocabulary.*** The terminology in the playwright's texts is quite diverse. We fixed the author's use of the following terms: 1) technical: *automatic transmission* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 419), *faucet* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 485), *wire* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 228); 2) economic: *grace period* (Miller, 2001, p. 1968), *income tax* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 437), *stock market* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 435); 3) legal: *jury duty* (Miller, 2001, p. 1990), *penitentiary* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 109), *trial* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 95); 4) medical: *penicillin* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 425), *arthritis* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 443), *blood fluke* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 445); 5) military: *lieutenant* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 126), *colonel* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 126), *combat officer* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 141).

Along with that, we notice that in the textual canvas of the writer's works terminology can acquire stylistic marking and figurative significance, thereby enhancing the expressiveness of the author's speech.

Thus, in the following example we observe the use of terminological vocabulary with the purpose to create the ironic effect:

LYMAN: You are buying immortality, aren't you? – reaching up out of the grave to pay the bills, remind people of your love? It's poetry. The soul was once immortal, now we've got an insurance policy. (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 425).

Arthur Miller's author's speech is also differentiated by the use of ***bookish phraseological units*** that define the "exalted" stylistic coloring of the writer's plays, perform the function of intellectualization of the literary content as evidenced by the following examples:

SOLOMON: What're you in such a hurry? Talk a little bit, we'll see what happens. In a day they didn't build Rome. (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 208);

PETERS: … We tolerate babies only because they are helpless, but the alpha and omega of their real nature is a five-letter word, g-r-e-e-d. (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 425).

Colloquial language. The conducted research enables us to argue that the defining feature of Arthur Miller's dramatic speech is the extensive use of the richness of colloquial language. The saturation of the textual material with colloquial lexical units determines realistic, expressive and emotional nature of the author's dramatic texts. As O. Perelomova notes, the colloquial layer of the vocabulary has a huge potential of various forms and types of its expression, serves as unlimited source of the enrichment of the individual linguistic picture of the world (Perelomova, 2010, p. 104).

We establish that the colloquial vocabulary of the textual corpus of the playwright's works is presented by the following structural-semantic groups:

1) transformation of the lexeme structure with the transition from a neutral tone to a colloquial one using the word-forming model of a suffix: *hearty* (Miller, 1964-1982, p. 304), *girlie* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 627);
2) modification of the anthroponyms: *Hap* (Miller, 2001, p. 1962), B. *(Beatrice)* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 570), *Biffo* (Miller, 2001, p. 1959);

3) exclamations of the non-derivative and derivative types: *Oh* (Miller, 2001, p. 1955), *Heh* (Miller, 2001, p. 1958), *Ah ha* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 414), *Gosh* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 105), *My God* (Miller, 2001, p. 1945), *Almighty God* (Miller, 2001, p. 1947), *Good heavens* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 17);
4) commonly used colloquial lexemes: *booze* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 416), *kidder* (Miller, 2001, p. 1950), *bum* (Miller, 2001, p. 1954);
5) appellative lexemes that mark the communicative situation as unfamiliar one: *kiddo* (Miller, 2001, p. 1955), *pal* (Miller, 2001, p. 1956), *fella* (Miller, 2001, p. 1957), *buddy* (Miller, 2001, p. 1960).
6) phrasal verbs of the colloquial type: *shut up* (Miller, 2001, p. 1954), *crab about* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 99), *tire out* (Miller, 2001, p. 1952).

Along with that, we note that the characteristic feature of Arthur Miller's authorial speech is the frequent use of colloquial phraseological units. The inclusion of such conversational elements determines the increased expressivity and emotionality of Miller's drama, causes humorous and satirical effect:

EDDIE: That's a nice kid? He gives me the heeby-jeebies. (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 591);

HAPPY: Did you knock them dead, Pop? (Miller, 2001, p. 1952).

Obscene vocabulary. The results of the study suggest that one of the notable features of Arthur Miller's literary style is the frequent use of obscene language. The latter intensifies the overall emotional expressiveness of the author's plays, helps to create a bright colloquial coloring of conversations, reduces the emotional distance between the characters of Miller's drama and the reader. Along with that, vulgarisms define a special tragic tone of the writer's dramatic texts, determine its existential sounding.

We establish that the obscene vocabulary in the texts of the playwright is presented in the form of the following structural and semantic models: 1) derivatives of simple and compound exclamations of vulgar coloring: *damn* (Miller, 2001, p. 1955), *Goddamit* (Miller, 2001, p. 1967), *screw* (Miller, 2001, 1972); 2) abusive expressions: *son's of beatches* (Miller, 2001, p. 1977), *rot in hell* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 593); 3) epithets with vulgar connotations: *damned* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 592), *goddam* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 594), *rotten* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 599); 4) obscenely marked nouns: *shit* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 461), *fuck* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 461); 5) invectives of vulgar expression: *idiot* (Miller, 1987-2004, p. 25), *sucker* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 115), *jerk* (Miller, 2001, p. 1961).

It is noteworthy that the vulgar vocabulary is to some extent present in the speech of almost all characters of Arthur Miller's drama. The author tends to vulgarities as indispensable means of vivid expression of emotions and psychological states:

HAPPY: I'll tell you something that I have to say, Biff, but in the business world some of them think you're crazy.

BIFF: Screw the business world! (Miller, 2001, p. 1962);

KELLER: You're a considerate fella, there's nothing wrong in that.

CHRIS: To hell with that. (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 97).

Also, by means of vulgar lexemes the author reproduces the mutual hostility between his characters, describes their attempts to offend and humiliate as much as possible:

WILLY: You vengeful, spiteful mut! (Miller, 2001, p. 2001);

LINDA: Did you have to go to women tonight? You and your lousy rotten whores! (Miller, 2001, p. 1966).

Vernacularisms. Agreeing with O. Perelomova, we believe that the literary aestheticization of the dialectal vocabulary is the feature of the author's creative method. The introduction of dialectal forms into language of a literary text creates a perlocutionary effect, contributes to the expressiveness of the writer's style, serves as a realistic reflection of the ideological and cultural identity of the characters (Perelomova, 2010, p. 101).

The study allowed us to determine the following three types of dialectal lexical units in the texts of dramatic works by Arthur Miller: vernacularisms, slang, jargon.

According to the differential features, we distinguish two groups of vernacularisms that function in the playwright's texts: 1) presented by the vernacular phonetic variants of literary lexemes: *dast* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 103), *gal* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 104), *brung* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 580); 2) represented by assimilated or dissimilated vernacular forms: *gimme* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 94), *lemme* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 153), *dja* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 620).

Jargon and slang identify such characterological parameters as: 1) age: *snappy jacket* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 527), *strudel (girl)* (Miller, 2001, p. 1983); 2) profession: *drummer (salesman)* (Miller, 2001, p. 1992); *submarine* (someone who works illegally) (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 697), *stool pigeons* (Miller, 1944-1961, p. 581); social status: *big shot* (Miller, 2001, p. 2000), *big blow* (Miller, 2001, p. 2000).

The performed quantitative analysis allows to present the ratio of the analyzed lexical means: bookish lexemes – 46.1%, colloquial lexemes– 25.5%, obscene lexemes – 17.8%, dialectal lexemes – 10.6%.

3. CONCLUSIONS.

Thus, in the course of the presented research the analysis of the system of lexical means functioning in the textual space of dramatic works by Arthur Miller is carried out. We establish that the speech expressiveness as well as emotional coloring of the writer's dramatic texts is predetermined by the active use of numerous structural and semantic variations of lexical units of differentiated stylistic marking.

We state that the specifics of the lexical level of individual playwright's speech is objectified by the convergence of neutral vocabulary with bookish vocabulary in the author's remarks, as well as neutral, bookish, colloquial, obscene and dialectal vocabulary in the speech of the actors. Bookish and colloquial lexemes dominate in the artist's language style.

Such variability of the lexical layer serves as a tool for the creative vision embodiment, realizes the author's intention of pragmatic and aesthetic influence on the reader, acts as a verbal sign of inexhaustible energy of the author's word, allows for a full understanding of the peculiarity of the author's worldview.

Taking into account the pragmatic specificity of the Arthur Miller's lexicon, we consider the symbiosis of elements of intellectual, psychological and routine to be the noticeable feature of the author's individual speech. Accordingly, we believe that the peculiarity of Arthur Miller's idiostyle is actualized through the prism of functional-stylistic stratification and expressive potential of lexical means.

References:

1. Gaidenko, Yuliia (2018). Semantic and pragmatic potential of Charlotte Bingham's author's language and author's speech [Semantyko-prahmatychnyi potentsial avtorskoi movy ta avtorskoho movlennia Sharlotty Binhkhem]: *Philology PhD. Diss. Synops:* Chernivtsi, 15 p.

2. Makar, Inessa (2010). Long and his novel "Daphnis and Chloe" [Lonh i yoho roman "Dafnis i Khloia"]: a Monograph, Chernivtsi, Chernivtsi National Univ. Yuri Fedkovych, 389 p.

3. Perelomova, Olena (2010). Idiostyle of Valery Shevchuk [Idiostyl Valeriia Shevchuka]: a Monograph, Sumy, SumDU, 137 p.

4. Yurina, Yullia (2016). The idiostyle of Olena Teliha [Idiostyl Oleny Telihy]: *Philology PhD. Diss.*: Zaporizhzhia, 194 p.

5. Miller, Arthur (2001). *Death of a Salesman.* The Norton Introduction to Literature, edited by Jerome Beaty, Alison Booth, J. Paul Hunter, Kelly J. Mays, Eighth edition, London: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

6. Miller, Arthur (2006). *Collected Plays 1944-1961*. Tony Kushner (ed.), The library of America, New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc.

7. Miller, Arthur (2006). *Collected Plays 1964-1982.* Tony Kushner (ed.), The library of America, New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc.

8. Miller, Arthur (2006). *Collected Plays 1987-2004*. Tony Kushner (ed.), The library of America, New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc.

9. Roudane, Matthew (2010). *Death of a Salesman and the poetics of Arthur Miller.* The Cambridge companion to Arthur Miller. Christopher Bigsby (ed.), Second edition, New York: Cambridge university press.