

Witchcraft or Otherness: An English-Slovene Contrastive Analysis of Tituba's Speech

Tomaž Onič

Abstract

Tituba, a supporting character in Arthur Miller's 1953 play *The Crucible*, can be associated with the concept of otherness in several respects. For one, she is not free like the rest of the population of Salem, Massachusetts, where the play is set, but was brought to the community from the island of Barbados by Reverend Parris as an enslaved woman. Being of Caribbean origin, she is also not an English Protestant like the rest of the village, and despite having accepted her master's church, as was common for the enslaved throughout the British colonial period, Protestantism is not her first religion. Finally, the two most evident and immediately perceivable characteristics placing her in the category of the Other are her skin colour and her language, which also seem to be the main reasons that she was the first person to be accused of witchcraft in Salem. This paper focuses on Tituba's speech, particularly from the point of view of the possibilities as well as difficulties of translating her utterances into Slovene. The contrastive analysis includes Miller's original play, its two Slovene translations, *Lov na čarovnice*, the published one (1964) and the unpublished theatre translation (1997/2019), as well as a brief insight into two theatre productions of the play at the Maribor National Theatre.

Keywords: Arthur Miller, *The Crucible*, Tituba, witchcraft, otherness

INTRODUCTION

As Arthur Miller suggests in “A Note on the Historical Accuracy of This Play”, included in the published version of *The Crucible*, the characters and the plot of the play are heavily reliant on the historical documents of the 1692 Salem witch trials.¹ Tituba, who is given a significant supporting role in this play, had already featured in several 19th-century works such as John Neal’s novel *Rachel Dyer* (1828) and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s play *Giles Corey of the Salem Farms* (1868), as well as appearing – quite prominently – in a more recent novel by Maryse Condé, *I Tituba, Black Witch of Salem* (1986 French original, 1992 in English). D. Quentin Miller claims that the playwright’s decision to increase Tituba’s prominence in *The Crucible* compared to the trial transcripts contributed to giving the enslaved more visibility and a stronger voice.

A comprehensive study attempting to give an overall account of Tituba’s role in the Salem witch trials as well as of her life before and after her arrival to Massachusetts was provided by Elaine Breslaw in her book *Tituba, Reluctant Witch of Salem: Devilish Indians and Puritan Fantasies* (1997). Our study takes particular interest in Breslaw’s comment on the authenticity of Tituba’s voice as recorded in the trial transcripts: “When asked during her examination about the form of the Devil she saw, Tituba replied with the proper use of pronouns and tense: ‘like a man I think’” (162). This reply addresses a crucial language-related issue about the representation of the non-standard language of (frequently) illiterate speakers that has been “improved” or “made appropriate” by the writer(s) or note-taker(s) in various literary and non-literary texts. Breslaw herself doubts that the above-cited reply by Tituba was what she actually said: “But was this really Tituba’s speech pattern or was it that of the transcribers? These words were written down by the literate members of the community and it is possible that the clerks were distorting her syntax to conform to their own use” (162). This issue is tightly connected to the centuries-long exercise in the erasure and exploitation of otherness.²

Even though the insight into the documentary files of the real Salem witch trial transcripts, containing – among other documents – historical records of Tituba’s court testimony, is a closely related issue and a compelling one, this study focuses exclusively on the text of Arthur Miller’s play and the challenges encountered

1 Facsimiled copies of the original witch trial transcripts are available in the online database (see Ray), while a detailed scholarly reconstruction of Tituba’s testimony was provided by Mary Beth Norton in her book *In the Devil’s Snare: the Salem Witchcraft Crisis of 1692*.

2 For more on this topic and a similar case that raises identical questions, see Gadpaille, in the book *The Ethical Atlantic* particularly the chapter on Mary Prince, an enslaved woman from Bermuda. For more on otherness related to Native American women, see Rožman Ivančič.

while rendering Tituba's utterances into Slovene. This study analyses three written texts of *The Crucible*: the Penguin edition of Arthur Miller's original play, the first (and only) published Slovene translation by Janko Moder (*Kondor* book series, no. 65) and the 1997/2019 unpublished theatre translation by Alenka Klabus Vesel,³ commissioned by the Slovene National Theatre in Maribor and used for the 1997 and 2019 productions on the Maribor stage. Additionally, based on a brief insight into these two stage productions of *The Crucible*, accessed via two video recordings of performances (11 Nov 1998 and 26 Apr 2019), some observations referring to Tituba's utterances are included.

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Tituba's stage presence in *The Crucible* is limited to three scenes or, more accurately, their parts. She first appears briefly at the play's opening, yet enough for the audience to notice her speech and to connect her non-standard English with her appearance.⁴ Her most prominent appearance is at the end of Act I when the first accusations take place and the mass hysteria begins. She finally appears at the end of Act IV, again quite briefly, at the Salem town jail. Although Tituba is not a character with many lines, her prominence for the plot is crucial, since in many ways she seems to set the plot in motion.

Tituba's otherness in the play is apparent in several ways, one of the most prominent being her speech. She is not a native speaker of English, which can be seen in her poor command of the language. From the translation point of view, this is a crucial aspect, since the role of her utterances is not merely communicative but also important in terms of characterization and social positioning. This is true for the language of drama in general; however, the more unusual the character – particularly in terms of their speech – the more prominent the stylistic aspect

3 The date on the translation, i.e., 1997/2019, suggests that the same translation was used for the 1997 and 2019 productions. According to Zupan (146), reprinting old translations of various prose works, particularly novels, is still a common practice yet unapproved by many Slovene translation studies.

4 This, of course, depends on the directorial decision whether to cast Tituba as a person of colour – as is suggested in the stage directions at the play's opening: "*The door opens, and his Negro slave enters. Tituba is in her forties. Parris brought her with him from Barbados.*" (*The Crucible*) – or whether to indicate her origin in another way, usually by painting the actor's face to indicate a darker complexion. In the Maribor 2019 National Theatre production that used the second translation, for example, there was no indication of Tituba's darker skin colour. The item to differentiate her from the rest of the cast was a bright orange costume, while all other characters wore the attire in predominantly grey, brown and dark green tones (see photographs in the theatre program (Borin) or the video recording of the 2019 performance).

of the utterances in their characterization.⁵ Since Tituba's language is considerably marked, the stylistic aspect of her utterances is vital for her characterization and, consequently, the plot of the play. The attempts to render the stylistic characteristics of the utterances into the target language must, therefore, be high on the translator's priority list.

This section analyses a selection of non-standard elements in Tituba's utterances and studies the approaches the Slovene translators used in addressing the encountered translation challenges. Most examples are taken from the end of Act I, the scene in which Tituba's stage presence is most prominent. In the following excerpt, Abigail finds herself in the focus of Reverend Parris and Mr Hale's questioning, and in order to redirect attention from herself she accuses Tituba of making her drink blood. The bold font in Tituba's utterances is added to draw attention to the non-standard elements in her language:

ABIGAIL:	She makes me drink blood!
PARRIS:	Blood!!
MRS. PUTNAM:	My baby's blood?
TITUBA:	No, no, chicken blood. I give she chicken blood!
HALE:	Woman, have you enlisted these children for the Devil?
TITUBA:	No, no, sir, I don't truck with no Devil!
HALE:	Why can she not wake? Are you silencing this child?
TITUBA:	I love me Betty!
/.../	
ABIGAIL:	She comes to me every night to go and drink blood!
TITUBA:	You beg me to conjure! She beg me make charm—

There are two marked (and thus foregrounded) elements in Tituba's first utterance "I give she chicken blood": the verb *give* is in the present tense, while the plot implies action in the past, and the pronoun *she* should have taken the form of the indirect object *her*. The Slovene translations are only partially successful in preserving the effects supporting the speaker's characterization:

5 For the stylistic aspect of direct speech to prominently contribute to characterization, its markedness needs not be limited to non-standard discourse – as in the case of Tituba in *The Crucible* or, for example, Old James in Munro's *View from the Castle Rock* (see Mohar). It can also be seen in culturally marked expressions (e.g., Mezeg and Grego), stylistic patterns (e.g., Boase-Beier), ideological characteristics (e.g., Trupej) or manipulative language (e.g., Furlan and Kavalir); the same is true for non-literary discourse as shown by Plemenitaš. Characterization is not limited to genre; however, it is most effective if it stems from direct speech. In drama, this is always the case, while in prose it must happen within quotation marks.

MRS. PUTNAM: My baby's blood?

TITUBA: No, no, chicken blood. I **give she** chicken blood!

Ne, ne, kurjo kri. **Jaz dala** kri piščanca! (1964)

Ne, ne, **piščančja** kri. **Jaz ji dala piščančja** kri! (1997/2019)

The Slovene translation from 1964 introduces grammatical incorrectness by leaving out the auxiliary verb *sem* and omitting the indirect object *ji*. While the former attracts the audience's attention because of the grammar-induced foregrounding, the latter represents a semantic shift that is only evident when compared to the original. As such, it does not highlight Tituba's otherness, which is attributed to her through her speech in the original text. Moreover, this translation fails to preserve the salient repetition⁶ (epiphora) *chicken blood*, because it not only employs two different lexical choices (*kurjo*, *piščanca*) but in the second occurrence inverts the adjective-noun word order and introduces the possessive case *kri piščanca* (i.e., blood of the chicken) expressed through the genitive structure. Additionally, the latter suggests a higher register and tends to imply the speaker's superior expressive ability, which is also not in line with Tituba's character. Even though *piščančji* is a semantically more appropriate translation choice for the expression *chicken* than *kurji* (*kura* is a slightly lower register expression for *hen*), the latter choice still seems preferred because of its more colloquial character, but also because the two-syllable expression creates a more fluent rhythm for the utterance as a whole. In drama translation, the rhythmical aspect of an utterance is often a decisive criterion because of the fluency of the text and, consequently, speakability.⁷ Finally, the use of the nominative (*piščančja*) instead of the accusative case (*piščančjo*) seems a good decision in the 2019 translation, since the incorrect use of noun cases is a common mistake committed by non-native speakers of Slovene and thus an indication of linguistically marked translation, which supports Tituba's characterization in the target language.

Finally, an insight into the density of non-standard language elements in the original and the translation shows that it is higher in the 2019 translation, where there are four such elements, while there are only two in the original and two in the 1964 translation. There is, of course, the additional issue of the intensity of individual elements; however, their number is at least a partial indicator. Considering these observations, a combination of the above versions seems to propose a good translation solution: "Ne, ne, kurjo kri. Jaz dala kurjo kri!"

6 Repetitions suggest a simpler speaking style (see Onič and Prajnc Kacijan).

7 On the issues of speakability of the text on stage, see Podbevšek.

The following excerpt contains double negation, which is a common English language feature of lower register.⁸ In literary texts, its use usually indicates a speaker who is either generally uneducated or simply not well-versed in the English language – as is the case with Tituba, who is a non-native speaker of English. Stylistically, this is a strong characterization element, which, in the context of this study, highlights Tituba's otherness:

HALE: Woman, have you enlisted these children for the Devil?

TITUBA: No, no, sir, I don't **truck** with **no** Devil!

Ne, ne, gospod, **jaz ne spečala** s hudičem! (1964)

Ne, ne, gospod, **jaz nič imeti** s hudič! (1997/2019)

Since in Slovene double negation is not a grammatical anomaly but a feature of proper language use in this type of sentence structure, its effect in the target language utterance would not be equivalent to the original. Therefore, as expected, none of the existing translations features double negation, yet the negation – a single negation element each time – contributes to the non-standard language use, more visibly so in the 1964 translation. Here the correct use of an auxiliary verb (which in such cases takes the negative form) is replaced by the ungrammatical negative particle *ne* (Engl. *no*; in the sense “I *no* deal with the devil”). This non-standard use is further combined with two other ungrammatical elements producing a similar effect: one is the omission of the reflexive particle *se*, which would be needed because the Slovene verb *spečati se* (Engl. *hook up with*, *have dealings with*, pejorative use) is reflexive, and the other is the explicit use of the personal pronoun *jaz* (Engl. *I*) in the subject role, which is a necessary part of standard sentence structure in English, while it is omitted in the neutral use in standard Slovene since the subject is evident from the verb suffix. In this case (in fact, in both translations), however, it is needed, because none of the verb forms is conjugated (*spečala* is a past participle, *imeti* is an infinitive) so as to indicate the first-person speaker and thus replace the pronoun in the subject. This marked syntactic structure of the utterance, combined with other ungrammatical features is thus in accordance with Tituba's language abilities and character; the only potential issue remains the choice of the Slovene verb *spečati se*, which is a rather specific and low-frequency expression that may not be part of a narrow vocabulary of a character such as Tituba and may thus sound slightly artificial.

The 2019 translation is lexically simpler and in this respect appropriate, but there is another linguistic feature that seems unconvincing: the use of the infinitive

8 It is worth noting that the idiomatic expression “to have no truck with” is itself low in register. Tituba's use, in which the noun *truck* has been changed into a verb, makes it additionally marked.

form of the verb (*imeti*) is rather unnatural, since this is a dictionary form that rarely appears in discourse (except, for example, in combination with modals or verbs like *begin* or *stop*, etc.), and is thus less likely for Tituba to have heard and acquired the use of the *-ti* infinitive. This is discussed in more detail in the Theatre Productions section. Finally, there is the nominative form of the noun *budič* (Engl. *devil*), i.e., with the zero ending, in a structure that normally would take the suffix *-em* (i.e., *s hudičem*) required by the Slovene 6th case. This translation choice *per se* is not inappropriate for Tituba's discourse; however, the density of non-standard language elements in this utterance seems to be too high: three salient language flaws, while the original contains only one. This issue is further debated in the discussion section.

The density of non-standard language elements is again higher in the two translations, three in the 1964 and four in the 2019 translations, while there are only two in the original. It should be acknowledged that the markedness of *jaz* in both translations depends on the interpretation of the utterance since it could also be stressed and thus not non-standard. Therefore, again, a translation solution combined from the existing translations seems to appropriately address the issue of Tituba's characterization: "Ne, ne, gospod, jaz nič imela s hudičem!".

Although relatively short, the following utterance continues to display Tituba's non-standard discourse with the use of a possessive pronoun that takes the low-register variant *me* instead of the standard *my*:

HALE: Why can she not wake? Are you silencing this child?

TITUBA: I love **me** Betty!

Jaz rada imela moja Betty! (1964)

Jaz rada moja Betty! (1997/2019)

In such cases, the possessive pronouns are omitted in the Slovene translation (cf. examples like "Eat your vegetables!" or "I pay my taxes." become "Pojej zelenjavo." and "Plačujem davke."), yet the existing translations preserve it in the ungrammatical form of the ordinary possessive pronoun *mojo*, while the standard use would require the reflexive possessive pronoun *svoyo*. These two elements, if isolated, could probably be considered sufficient to preserve the equivalent to the original low-register *me*, but the translations contain more marked elements: both feature the explicit use of the personal pronoun *jaz*, while the 1964 translation uses past participle *imela* instead of the simple present form *imam*, and the 2019 translation completely omits the verb *imeti*, and uses the nominative (*moja Betty*) instead of the accusative form (*mojo Betty*) of the possessive pronoun. A more moderate version with fewer but still sufficient non-standard elements could thus be "Jaz rada moja Betty!" or even "Jaz rada Betty!".

Later in the same scene, Abigail continues to accuse Tituba, who still primarily defends herself but also claims that she was asked by Abigail to perform charms. In the first part of the utterance, she addresses Abigail directly, then turns to Mr. Hale and Mr. Parris:

ABIGAIL: She comes to me every night to go and drink blood!

TITUBA: You **beg** me to conjure! She **beg** me **make** charm—

Ti me **prosila klicati** duhove! Ona mene **prosila** coprati — (1964)

Ti sama me **prosila**, da **jaz čarala**! Ona me **prosila**, da **jaz** delam **uroki** — (1997/2019)

In her utterance, Tituba is referring to the event of the girls dancing in the forest, which is in the recent past, so the appropriate tense to use would be Past Simple. In both sentences in this utterance, she uses the present tense of *beg* – or rather the bare infinitive, the form which matches that of Present Simple. It is, however, unlikely that Tituba's utterances are the result of a planned speech act, so both uses can be considered improper and imply a lower competence in English.

Both Slovene translations imply the reference to the past tense by using the past participle, while the speaker's lower linguistic competence is suggested by the omission of the auxiliary verb. After the main verb (reduced to past participle), the 1964 translation uses the infinitive in both sentences (following the English pattern), but the 2019 translation replaces it with a subordinate clause featuring yet another past participle without the auxiliary verb in each sentence. Syntactically, the latter version seems appropriate owing to closer consistency in the use of language structures without varying them (past participle + infinitive), while the 1964 version is closer to the original semantically. The combination preserving the best of both versions would be "Ti me prosila, da jaz klicala duhove! Ona me prosila, da copram —". Both *ti* and *jaz* must remain explicitly included in the utterance, since none of the verb forms is conjugated, and without the pronouns the referent is unclear.

DISCUSSION

An insight into Tituba's utterances in the Slovene translations shows that both translators used stylistically marked language to indicate the character's lower linguistic ability. Some of the significant low-register discourse markers can be found in both translations; some, however, are limited to one or the other.

In both cases, the non-standard discourse is created predominantly and most notably by omitting auxiliary verbs, so that the character is communicating with

“dangling” past participles (e.g., “Ti mene ubogala, Tituba, in jaz tebe osvobodil”, or “Bila črna noč”, where *boš*, *bom* and *je*, consequently, are omitted). This phenomenon almost invariably co-occurs with the explicit use of personal pronouns in the subject role, mostly referring to the speaker herself. Such use is neutral in English but not in synthetic languages such as Slovene since the subject is normally indicated by the verb suffix. If for any reason the conjugated (in this case auxiliary) verb is eliminated, the sentence without the subject is ambiguous. For example, “Ti mene ubogala” needs the subject *ti*, since “Mene ubogala” is too vague and would cause ambiguity, but also the audience might need too long to work out the relations, particularly in a sequence of quickly moving sentences – even in a concrete dramatic scene where the context should be clear, even more so since Tituba is incriminating herself. The grammatically correct sentences “Mene boš ubogala” or “Ubogala me boš”, on the other hand, can function without the pronoun in the subject as it has the conjugated verb. Since the explicit use of pronouns in the subject is not standard in Slovene, it becomes – together with the omitted auxiliary – an additional element of markedness, which in Tituba’s speech is, in fact, welcome.

Another marker of non-standard discourse, also skilfully employed by both translators, is the use of the particle *ne* (or occasionally other ones such as *nič* or *nikoli*) in negative sentence forms (e.g., “Jaz ne imela nobena moč nad tem otrok, gospod,” “To jaz ne vedela, gospod,” “Gospod Parris nič dober človek”). The effect of such use is a considerably strong indication of poor language ability – and is thus appropriate for Tituba.

The use of uninflected nominative-case nouns where the syntax would require other noun cases predominantly features in the 2019 translation. These are formulations like “Jaz ne sovražim tega človek”, where *človek* should be in the genitive case (*človeka*). This whole structure is not completely cognate with Tituba’s linguistic ability, since the demonstrative pronoun *tega* is, surprisingly, in the correct genitive case form, often incorrectly replaced by the accusative case even by native speakers of Slovene. This could, however, be interpreted as a coincidental correct use, of which the speaker is unaware. Another example of such use is the sentence “Jaz ne imela nobena moč nad tem otrok”, where *nobena moč* should be in the dative (3rd) case and *otrok* in the locative (5th) case.

Other more sporadic intentionally non-standard language uses include the speaker referring to herself with her name, e.g., “Bog varoval Tituba”; the use of numerals as premodifiers to nouns, e.g., “ponoči ena nevihta”; or incorrectly conjugated verb as a consequence of repeating the verb form from Mr. Hale’s question, e.g., “In ljubiš Boga, Tituba?” “Jaz ljubiš Boga z vsem srcem.”, where *ljubiš* in her answer needs to be *ljubim* (1st person), yet the used form is an appropriate decision. These uses occur only once or a few times only but illustrate what can

be seen as useful translation strategies. The latter, i.e., partial repetition of Parris's and Hale's questions, is particularly believable when they ask Tituba a series of questions in a manner that resembles interrogation scenes that – owing to its hastiness – deprives Tituba of sufficient time to think about the answer, let alone formulate her utterances properly.⁹

The comments provided so far all refer to Tituba's individual utterances, or even to individual linguistic elements within them. This paragraph, however, will look at the overall effect of Tituba's discourse. This perspective of the synergic effect of individual non-standard translation choices shows that even though individual elements are in line with Tituba's character, their joint effect is stronger than that in the original. As shown in the above commentary on selected examples, the density within individual utterances is higher in the translations than in the original. In other words, Tituba makes more language mistakes in the translations than in the original. The observation can be generalized to the whole play: in the original Act I, there are 51 such elements, 65 in the 1964 translation and 81 in the 1997/2019 translation. In Act IV, the situation is reversed (25, 14, and 18) but primarily owing to the 8 cases where the pronunciation in the original is indicated as non-standard (e.g., *goin'*) and some deletions of the original non-standard words in the translations (e.g., *pleasure-man*). We can thus conclude that non-standard language elements are slightly excessive in the 1964 translation and considerably excessive in the 1997/2019 translation.

We can see from the analysis of Tituba's utterances, particularly if we look at their progression through each of the scenes in which she appears, that the number – or rather density – of the non-standard language elements she uses is lower in shorter utterances and gets higher when her utterances grow longer. Also, in Act I, her language mistakes tend to grow more frequent when she is under more pressure. Both observations are in line with Tituba's characterization.

In recreating Tituba's speech in translation by means of non-standard language elements, achieving the appropriate measure is just as important as finding each individual translation solution. It is unlikely that the translator would be able to preserve the type or the exact number of the original non-standard elements, but equivalence in individual utterances and the overall effect of the speech in the scene should be aimed at. For the audience, it is usually enough that the character's linguistic limitations are implied (after all, dramatic discourse is to a considerable degree a convention), since the text must still ensure pronunciation fluency.

⁹ The linguistic characteristics of utterances generated under pressure in interrogation scenes are dealt with in more detail by Onič and Prajnc Kacijan.

THEATRE PRODUCTIONS

A brief insight into the two stage productions of *The Crucible* by the Slovene National Theatre in Maribor (1997 and 2019) turned out to be a surprise as far as Tituba's speech is concerned. The 1997 production, based on the translation by Alenka Klabus Vesel, opted for substantial changes in Tituba's utterances: most of the past participles, analysed in the sections above, became infinitives (e.g., "Ti sama me prositi, da jaz čarati!"). This choice is problematic for at least two reasons. Firstly, such distorted discourse was used in children's games (such as "Cowboys and Indians" or "Tarzan and Jane") as a stylized convention for depicting Native American peoples or "uncivilized" and underdeveloped individuals.¹⁰ This was a way of setting up a language-based division between the (core and right(eous)) entity and otherness, which today is a political correctness issue, but at the time the awareness of the concept was minimal or non-existent. Many members of the audience would have remembered such games from their own childhood, and these can still be found in Slovene youth fiction or young adult movies from the 1960s and 1970s (e.g., *Sreča na vrvi*). Secondly, such use of infinitives in place of conjugated verbs in Slovene is unnatural, since it suggests that the speaker is familiar with basic grammar concepts. Obviously, this is an unrealistic assumption, since characters like Tituba acquire a new language through live language use and not from textbooks, where learning grammatical structures enables the learner to know concepts such as the infinitive. A better and more naturally sounding stylized non-standard discourse is achieved by dropping auxiliary verbs (e.g., "Ti mene ubogala"), as has been done in both Slovene translations. The 2019 Maribor production, however, offered a different kind of surprise: although the same translation as in 1997 was used, Tituba's speech was changed to impeccable standard Slovene. This directorial decision neutralizes one of the most noticeable indications of Tituba's otherness. With no evidence of her different skin colour, the question arises whether Tituba's pivotal role as the main factor that sets the plot in motion is still liable to this interpretation. This observation opens the issue of introducing (more or less substantial) changes in the final versions of the translation, which is addressed by Zlatnar Moe et al., although not specifically for the theatre, where there are other specifics. Further research into this issue and the two theatre pieces was, unfortunately, impossible owing to the limitation of space,

10 For translation issues connected to racial discourse, see Trupej (2015 and 2017).

CONCLUSION

As the selected examples and the pertaining comments demonstrate, the Slovene translators were frequently successful in rendering Tituba's individual utterances into Slovene. The most visible issue seems to be overly intensive use of non-standard language elements in this otherness-marked character's speech in the 1997/2019 translation, while other minor shifts include individual cases of structural or lexical inconsistency and lexical choices that appear too sophisticated or too high-register for a non-native speaker with little linguistic and general training. Tituba's otherness is an essential element in *The Crucible* that provides the main drive for the fatal chain of events to launch, and – apart from her appearance – her language is the main channel through which her otherness is communicated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boase-Beier, Jean. "Translating Patterns of Style in 'Hour of the Wolves'." *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2021, pp. 139-149, <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.18.1.139-149>. Accessed 3 Jul. 2023.
- Borin, Maja, ed. *Lov na čarovnice*. Theatre Program. Slovene National Theatre Maribor, 2018.
- Breslaw, Elaine G. *Tituba, Reluctant Witch of Salem: Devilish Indians and Puritan Fantasies*. New York, University Press, 1996.
- Furlan, Teja, and Monika Kavalir. "I am not what I am': Corpus-Based Analysis of Shakespeare's Character Iago from *Othello, the Moor of Venice*." *Acta Neophilologica*, vol. 54, no. 1-2, 2021, pp. 69-86, <https://doi.org/10.4312/an.54.1-2.69-86>. Accessed 17 Jul. 2023.
- Gadpaille, Michelle. *The Ethical Atlantic: Advocacy Networking and the Slavery Narrative 1830-1850*. Cambridge, Scholars Publishing, 2019.
- Gadpaille, Michelle. "Trans-Colonial Collaboration and Slave Narrative: *Mary Prince* Revisited." *ELOPE*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2011, pp. 63-77.
- Mezeg, Adriana, and Anna Maria Grego. "La villa sur le lac de Boris Pahor en italien et sa traduction indirecte en français: le cas des realia." *Acta Neophilologica*, vol. 55, no. 1-2, 2022, pp. 305-321, <https://doi.org/10.4312/an.55.1-2.305-321>. Accessed 18 Jul. 2023.
- Miller, Arthur. *The Crucible*. London, Penguin, 1995.
- Miller, Arthur. *Lov na čarovnice*, translated by Janko Moder. Ljubljana, Mladinska knjiga, 1964.

- Miller, Arthur. *Lov na čarovnice*, translated by Alenka Klabus Vesel. Neobjavljeni prevod. Slovene National Theatre Maribor, 1997, 2019.
- Miller, Arthur. *Lov na čarovnice*. Video recording. Slovene National Theatre Maribor, 1998.
- Miller, Arthur. *Lov na čarovnice*. Video recording. Slovene National Theatre Maribor, 2019.
- Miller, D. Quentin. "The Signifying Poppet: Unseen Voodoo and Arthur Miller's Tituba." *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, vol. 43, no. 4, 2007, pp. 438-454, <https://doi.org/10.1093/fmls/cqm065>. Accessed 12 Jul. 2023.
- Mohar, Tjaša. "A Migrant 'Malgre Soi': Munro's Ancestor Old James in Slovene Translation." *Translation and Migration*, edited by Ada Gruntar Jermol, Mojca Schlamberger Brezar, and Vlasta Kučič, Ljubljana, Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, 2019, pp. 140-151.
- Norton, Mary Beth. *In the Devil's Snare: The Salem Witchcraft Crisis of 1692*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 2002.
- Onič, Tomaž, and Nastja Prajnc Kacijan. "Repetition as a Means of Verbal and Psychological Violence in Interrogation Scenes from Contemporary Drama." *Ars & Humanitas*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2020, pp. 13-26. <https://revije.ff.uni-lj.si/arshumanitas/issue/view/698/516>. Accessed 22 Jul. 2023.
- Plemenitaš, Katja. "Framing Violence in Presidential Discourse: A Study of Barack Obama's Speeches." *Ars & Humanitas*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2020, pp. 139-155, <https://doi.org/10.4312/ars.14.1.139-155>. Accessed 16 Jul. 2023.
- Podbevšek, Katja. "Lektoriranje govorenega (gledališkega) besedila." *Jezik in slovnstvo*, vol. XLIII, no. 3, 1998, pp. 79-88.
- Ray, Benjamin, project director. *Salem Witch Trials: Documentary Archive and Transcription Project*. University of Virginia, 2018, <https://salem.lib.virginia.edu/home.html>. Accessed 5 Jul. 2023.
- Rožman Ivančič, Nejc. "The Image of a Woman of Colour and Native American Woman in Two Kerouac Novels: A Double Otherness." *ELOPE*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2019, pp. 117-33, <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.16.2.117-133>. Accessed 28 Jul. 2023.
- Trupej, Janko. "Ideological Influences on the Reception of Karl May in Slovenia." *Annales, Series historia et sociologia*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2020, pp. 35-50.
- Trupej, Janko. "Strategies for Translating Racist Discourse about African-Americans into Slovenian." *Babel*, vol. 63, no. 3, 2017, pp. 322-342, <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.63.3.02tru>. Accessed 28 Jul. 2023.
- Trupej, Janko. "Recepcija štirih ameriških romanov in njihovih slovenskih prevodov v luči ideologije rasizma." *Primerjalna književnost*, vol. 38, no. 2, 2015, pp. 213-235.

- Zlatnar Moe, Marija, et al. "Who Determines the Final Version?: The Roles of Translators, Language Revisers and Editors in the Publishing of a Literary Translation." *Across Languages and Cultures*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2021, pp. 14-44.
- Zupan, Simon. "Ernest Hemingway in Slovenia since 1990: Scandal, the Soča and Six-Toed Cats." *Acta Neophilologica*, vol. 53, no. 1-2, 2020, pp. 133-151. <https://doi.org/10.4312/an.53.1-2.133-151>. Accessed 16 Jul. 2023.

Tomaž Onič

University of Maribor, Faculty of Arts
tomaz.onic@um.si



Čarovništvo ali drugost: angleško-slovenska kontrastivna analiza Titubinega govora

Titubo, stransko osebo iz igre Arthurja Millerja *Lov na čarovnice* (*The Crucible*) iz leta 1953, lahko povežemo s konceptom drugosti v več pogledih. Prvič, Tituba ni svobodna kot ostali prebivalci Salema v Massachusettsu, kjer se drama odvija, temveč jo je pastor Parris pripeljal v skupnost z otoka Barbados kot sužnjo. Poleg tega v angleškem protestantskem okolju izstopa zaradi svojega karibskega porekla, in čeprav je sprejela veroizpoved svojega gospodarja, kot je bilo to običajno za sužnje v britanskem kolonialnem obdobju, protestantizem ni njena prva vera, kar jo ločuje od skupnosti. V kategorijo drugosti jo uvrščata tudi barva kože in jezik, ki se poleg dejstva, da je ženska, zdita glavna razloga, da je prav ona kot prva v Salemu obtožena čarovništva. Prispevek se osredotoča na Titubin govor, predvsem s prevodoslovnega vidika. Kontrastivna analiza njenega govora osvetljuje možnosti in težave prevajanja njenih replik v slovenščino, pri čemer vključuje izvirno Millerjevo dramo, dva njena slovenska prevoda, objavljenega (1964) in gledališkega (1997/2019), na kratko pa se ustavi tudi pri Titubinem govoru v dveh slovenskih uprizoritvah drame v SNG Maribor.

Ključne besede: Arthur Miller, *Lov na čarovnice*, Tituba, čarovništvo, drugost