

world he used in live does not give him the truth of the true significance of being human, he then finds out what it means to exist as a human being, to make meaning for himself by reaching out other human beings, either with love, or hurt, with kindness, or cruelty.

Jerry's long journey has brought him not only to new findings in human relationship, but more importantly to a renewed confidence in the significance of being human. Once he failed and went back to his free passage in solitude. He found himself unable to deepen the meaning of his life; his alienation nevertheless is the source of the absurdity of life.

Jerry's and Peter's way of life, however, is a phenomena we often see nowadays that people prefer to disengage themselves from making contact; preventing danger that might arise in human relations, creating the barriers of individualism, and so living in their zoos. The question is, can this play enable the readers to see such things while we realize that the phenomena are indeed unavoidable? Let's take one example from Tom F. Driver's critical essay about *The Zoo Story*; he confessed that "the only sense I could draw from it is the

conviction that one shouldn't talk to strangers in Central Park" (Kolin 44). He plainly justified Peter's first attitude toward Jerry, whereas it is supposed to agree with Jerry's viewpoints in human relationship; at least that is what Albee hopes from the play's impact upon the readers. So, let's bring it back to each of us to justify or to judge the nature of human interaction in mankind.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**  
**SYNOPSIS**  
**THE SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR**