

MATURATION OF SHAVIAN WOMEN: A STUDY OF THE
MATURATION PROCESSES OF FEMALE PRATOGONISTS IN
GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S *PYGMALION* AND *MRS WARREN'S*
PROFESSION

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

FUNDA DÖRTKULAK

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF
ENGLISH LITERATURE

MAY 2009

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Wolf König
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez-Caro
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez-Caro (METU, ELIT) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut (BAŞKENT, AKE) _____

Dr. Sevil Onaran (METU, FLE) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Funda DÖRTKULAK

Signature:

ABSTRACT

MATURATION OF SHAVIAN WOMEN: A STUDY OF THE
MATURATION PROCESSES OF FEMALE PRATOGONISTS IN
GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S *PYGMALION* AND *MRS WARREN'S
PROFESSION*

Dörtkulak, Funda

M.A., Department of English Literature

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro

May, 2009, 112 pages

George Bernard Shaw is a celebrated playwright for his depiction of emancipated women. His women, regardless of the conditions they are in at the beginning of the play, experience a maturation process in the flow of the events and especially discussions which direct the change in his characters. In this thesis, the maturation processes Vivie Warren and Eliza Doolittle experience are analyzed in the plays *Mrs. Warren's Profession* and *Pygmalion*, respectively. Vivie is a typical Shavian heroine who is educated and free-spirited even at the beginning of the play. At the end, she chooses to start a professional life breaking with the domestic and social boundaries by rejecting to see her mother or marry Frank. Likewise, Eliza, who is a simple flower girl at the beginning of the play, seems to bear the free spirit Vivie has because she earns her living and makes her own decision of taking phonetics courses, which causes the events in the play to take place. At the end, she rejects marrying to support her life and chooses to pursue phonetics as a profession to earn her living. As a result, her free-spirited personality leads her to her maturation process. In this study, it is concluded that no matter what their starting point is, both Shavian women bear the characteristics of New Woman at the beginning of the play which facilitates their progress into New Women at the end of the plays.

Keywords: New Woman, Maturation, Emancipation, Shavian Women

ÖZ

SHAW'UN KADINLARININ OLGUNLAŞMASI: GEORGE BERNARD
SHAW'UN *MRS. WARREN'S PROFESSION* VE *PYGMALION*
ESERLERİNDEKİ KADIN KAHRAMANLARIN OLGUNLAŞMA SÜREÇLERİ
İLE İLGİLİ BİR ÇALIŞMA

Dörtkulak, Funda

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı

Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro

Mayıs, 2009, 112 Sayfa

George Bernard Shaw, özgürlüğünü kazanmış kadın betimlemeleri ile ün yapmış bir oyun yazarıdır. Onun kadınları, oyunun başlangıcındaki durumlarından bağımsız olarak, olaylar ve özellikle tartışmalar aracılığıyla oyun boyunca bir olgunlaşma süreci deneyimlerler. Bu tezde *Mrs. Warren's Profession* ve *Pygmalion* oyunlarındaki, sırası ile, Vivie Warren ve Eliza Doolittle'in geçirdikleri olgunlaşma süreci incelenmektedir. Vivie oyunun başında bile eğitilmiş ve özgür ruhlu tipik bir Shaw kahramanıdır. Oyunun sonunda ise toplumsal ve ailesel sınırlamalara karşı çıkarak Frank'in evlenme teklifini ve annesi ile görüşmeyi reddeden bir Modern Kadın olarak olgunlaşma sürecini tamamlamıştır. Benzer şekilde, oyunun başında basit bir çiçekçi kız olan Eliza, o zaman bile Vivie'nin sahip olduğu özgür ruha sahiptir, çünkü o oyundaki olayların olmasını sağlayan sesbilim dersi alma kararını kendisi vermiştir. Oyunun sonunda, hayatını devam ettirmek için evlenmeyi reddedip sesbilimi bir meslek edinerek bu yolla hayatını kazanma kararı almıştır. Yani özgür ruhu onun olgunlaşma sürecinde katkıda bulunmuştur. Sonuç olarak, başlangıç noktaları ne olursa olsun her iki Shaw kadını da oyunların başında, modern kadın olmaları sürecini sağlayacak kişilik özelliklerini taşımaktadırlar.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Modern Kadın, Olgunlaşma, Özgürlük, Shaw Kadınları

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez-Caro without whose guidance this work would not be what it is now. Her trust and friendship will be always remembered and valued.

I also wish to express my gratitude to Assistant Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut and Dr. Sevil Onaran for their valuable comments and guidance in the preparation process of my thesis.

Also, I would like to thank my dear friend Zübeyde Durna for being an unconditional friend in the busy library hours I spent while preparing this thesis as well as in every difficult phase of my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii	
ABSTRACT	iv	
ÖZ.....	v	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi	
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii	
CHAPTER		
1. INTRODUCTION: GEORGE BERNARD SHAW AND HIS BACKGROUND SHAPING HIS IDEAS ABOUT WOMEN		
1.1 The Aim Method and the Scope of the study.....	1	
1.2 George Bernard Shaw’s Life, Philosophical Background and Ideas about Women.....	2	
1.3 George Bernard Shaw as a playwright.....	9	
2. VIVIE’S CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT IN <i>MRS. WARREN’S PROFESSION</i>		25
2.1 Background about the play.....	25	
2.2 Early Stages of Vivie’s Maturation.....	35	
2.3 Later Stages of Vivie’s Maturation.....	52	
3. ELIZA’S CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT IN <i>PYGMALION</i>		65
3.1 Background about the play.....	65	
3.2 Early Stages of Eliza’s Maturation.....	68	
3.3 Later Stages of Eliza’s Maturation.....	92	
1. CONCLUSION.....	97	
2. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	101	

**CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION: GEORGE BERNARD SHAW AND HIS
BACKGROUND SHAPING HIS IDEAS ABOUT WOMEN**

1.1 AIM, METHOD AND THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY

George Bernard Shaw depicts new type of women who achieve to emancipate themselves in the course of the plays. His women characters are round characters who achieve their freedom from the domineering patriarchy or patriarchal rules.

In this study, George Bernard Shaw's women in their way to emancipation will be discussed in two of his plays in the light of his ideas about woman put forward in his articles "Our Attitude about Woman" and "The Womanly Woman".

The plays dealt with in this study have different women characters starting their way to emancipation in different corners but end up as free self-satisfied women at the end. Vivie, who is already a New Woman, asserts her freedom breaking with family boundaries and society's rules. Similarly, Eliza, a fake duchess originated from a flower girl, ends up as a professional woman earning her life without being dependant on a man.

In this study, the plays *Mrs. Warren's Profession* and *Pygmalion* will be discussed regarding their women characters.

1.2 GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S LIFE PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND AND POLITICAL IDEAS

Bernard Shaw is one of the most celebrated and controversial men in England today. He is very well known not only as a playwright but also as a philosopher, thinker and an activist. Dr. Bernard Fehr defines the writer as “the red-haired Mephistopheles, the socialist, the vegetarian, humanitarian, Nietcharian, Ibsenite, art critic, Wagnerian, phonetician and spelling reformer” (qtd. in Wilde 144). He has world famous novels, plays and essays. He lived in the second half of the nineteenth century till the middle of the twentieth century. His early life had a great effect on his career; therefore, it is important to consider Bernard Shaw in the family and social context he grew up in.

He was born in Dublin, on July 26, 1856, as the third child and the first son of an unhappy marriage. His mother, Lucinda Elisabeth Gurly, was the daughter of a “country gentleman” and had been educated in a genteel way (Hardwick 175). She married George Carr Shaw, who was twenty years older than herself with a pension of 60 pounds a year. He was a man without any talent in business as well (Minney 10). Because his income was low, the family was already in poverty. Moreover, George Carr Shaw was a chronic drunkard, which resulted in the shift of all the household responsibilities on the shoulders of Lucinda Elisabeth Gurly (Valency 2). This shift in Bernard Shaw’s domestic cycle showed him how successfully a woman could tackle huge responsibilities, as well. What Lucinda achieved was against the gender defined roles of her time. Hers was a rebellious nature, rejecting gender defined roles and behaving according to her personal judgment of what was right or wrong (Peters 6). Lucinda succeeded in her responsibilities so well that this caused Shaw to earn an admiration not only towards his mother but also towards the female gender, witnessing their potential to succeed.

The family Shaw was brought up in was not a happy one. Her mother, like most of the married women in her time, was not educated for any job. They were living in poverty without much love and affection in the household. In the later years of his life, he could never “get the chill of poverty out of his bones” (Ervine 17). Before Shaw was 19 years old, his mother left her husband taking with her their two daughters. She moved to London and worked as a music teacher there. She was musically gifted. Shaw owed his musical talent to his mother. In her absence, Shaw learnt how to play the piano in order not to feel deprived of music for good. His talent in music was a formative factor in Shaw’s career path. In addition to her mother’s musical talent, he inherited his independence, hard work and strong will from his mother. He owed his comedy to his father. Shaw accepts this inheritance saying, “All my comedy is a Shavian inheritance” (Hamlyn 667).

In his school years, he started studying music and reading literature. Both of these subjects contributed to his future career as a music critic, dramatist and stage director. Shaw was never a success at school and he did not believe in the role the school played during the processes of cultural formation of a student. He was more cultured than other students but he could never succeed in courses. “In music alone, he was superior to [the other students]” (Ervine 27).

At the end of my schooling I knew nothing of what the school professed to teach; but I was a highly educated boy all the same. I could sing and whistle from end to end leading works by Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Rossini, Bellini, Donizetti, and Verdi. I was saturated with English Literature from Shakespeare and Bunyan to Byron and Dickens (qtd. in Ganz 10-11).

When Shaw was nineteen years old, he left Dublin and moved to London to her mother. Revealing why he actually moved to London, he confessed: “I left Ireland because I had no apparent future there... Dublin was an art Sahara” (qtd. in Williamson 105). Moving to London was the start for an extravagant change in Shaw’s life. After his arrival in London, for almost four years, Shaw tried many different jobs such as working at the British Museum and later as a telephone

operator at Edison Telephone Company. However, his nature was too undisciplined to suit him in office work. After four years of trial, he left office jobs for good and his mother supported him for a long while.

During the time when his mother supported him, he spent most of his time in the British Museum reading the French translation of Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* as the book did not have an English version then. Pearson wrote about the effect of Marx on Shaw:

Das Kapital had a tremendous effect on him there is not the smallest doubt; it converted him to Socialism, turned him into a revolutionary writer, made him a political agitator, changed his outlook, directed his energy, influenced his art, gave him a religion, and, as he claimed, made a man of him (68).

Shaw's interest in reading directed him to writing. In 1885, he started working as a book reviewer and art and music critic at different magazines- *The Pall Mall Gazette*, *The Star*, *The World*, *Our Corner*, *The Hornet* and *The Saturday Review*. In these professions, he got more acquainted with literary works and he started to see the theater as a means to convey his ideas. (Mishra 28) According to Shaw, theatre was "a factory of thought, a Prompter of Conscience, an elucidator of Social Conduct, an armory against despair and dullness, and a temple of the Ascend of Men" (Shaw, *Our Theatres* 90).

Before and during his years of journalism and playwriting, Shaw wrote five novels- *Cashel Byron's Profession* (1886), *An Unsocial Socialist* (1887), *Love among the Artists* (1900), *The Irrational Knot* (1905), and *Immaturity* (1931) - none of which provided his breakthrough. His books were rejected by the publishers because they were "sordid" and "perverse". His failures in novel writing stimulated him to improve his writing skills. After the completion of his first novels, he studied very hard to make his expressions better and become a good writer.

The social, cultural and economic structure in Victorian era shaped Bernard Shaw's ideas and his political focus as well as his ideas about women. The Industrial Revolution had an enormous effect on the Victorian age. It affected social classes in different ways. "Victorian period was a time when rich became richer, poor became poorer. In John Morley's words, Victorian England was a paradise for the well-to-do, a purgatory for the able, and a hell for the poor" (qtd in Buckey 5). Since the Industrial Revolution caused dramatic changes in the production system, from farming to fabricated mass production of goods, people who had the capital and could follow the changes in economy succeeded. Those who were working at farms and did not own the capital became the slaves of the industry. As only few people enjoyed the outcome of the production, they were living in prosperity. The rest of the population suffered from inhumane living conditions. Workers worked for long hours for a small amount of money; they lived in slums in hard living conditions. Unequal working conditions created by the Industrial Revolution stimulated the idea of equality in Shaw's world. Especially women who were a cheaper work force were the poorest in this new system whose corruption disturbed Shaw.

Women, being already the second class citizens, started to produce at least as much as men, but they could not earn half as much as man did. Considering the inhumane working conditions the lower class people had to live in, it can easily be said that women became the poorest of the poor. The new capitalist paradigm was raising on women's shoulders by suppressing her more than ever. Shaw, seeing this inequality, believed that women can only emancipate themselves by equal distribution of income.

In this age, people's knowledge of technology increased. This knowledge is applied to industry, agriculture, commerce and communications. Thus, the Industrial Revolution created immense changes in social life which women were included in, too. Due to the fact that capitalist profits were of the greatest importance, cheap labor provided by women and children were preferred.

Clearly, working women's and children's conditions were very harsh. They could hardly earn enough to satisfy their hunger in return for their whole day's effort. They got old and died earlier than it should be because of hard work. Women, in addition to being exploited by the capital, were exploited by their families at home, too. Though they worked more than men outside the home, they still carried all household responsibilities including child rearing. Observing this unequal and inhumane approach towards women, Shaw could see how women failed to gain an identity in their private as well as public life.

In his adult years, Shaw experienced the state of two world wars. This naturally increased his interest in political affairs. Directly or indirectly, he wrote political plays. Even in his social plays, there is a touch of politics which represents itself as a Shavian feature. He supported his idea about the necessity of women in social life by keeping a Marxist viewpoint of production. For Marx, women are natural sources to be used in production. Shaw, regarding woman as a valuable natural source, reminded that people engaged in great wars to protect a natural source, oil. Sarcastically comparing the society's attitude to women with other natural sources like oil which cause great wars, he added:

But *some* looking closely at *how* our society functioned –looking more critically- some will say, “But *why* weren't those Americans as fierce and as passionate about their greatest resource, their people?

Especially, why...why...why... did they abuse women- in principle and in fact? Why? (Shaw, *Our Attitude about Women* 246)

He also claimed that there was a global competition and in order to win the competition, all countries should work hard. Later on he expressed his concern, “But ladies and gentleman, we are not putting on the field all our players. Nor are all those players being rewarded fairly...Sexism is a poison we have been drinking for too long” (Shaw, *Our Attitude about Women* 246).

As one may infer, George Bernard Shaw was a supporter of women's rights because he believed that woman had many aspects to contribute to our life and economy in the process of production. The equality between man and woman could only be achieved by equal distribution of wealth according to Bernard Shaw. In the Victorian age, in which Shaw gained much of his knowledge and experience shaping his values and beliefs, there were few women who had a say in private and in public; however, this could only be achieved by woman's surpassing man. Women had to surpass man to have equal rights. Furthermore, men had very little danger of losing their respectability and they did not work for it. On the contrary, woman had to work hard to gain honor and keep it. That is, honor and respectability is hard to gain but easy to lose for woman. Summarizing his point, Shaw stated:

Ladies and gentlemen, we must change so that those who study what we did, correctly conclude that our society matured and affirmed that a woman does not have to out-man a man to be respected- and respectable" (Shaw, *Our Attitude about Women* 247).

After 1881, George Bernard Shaw participated in debating communities. He became a member of Zeletical Group, Dialectical Society, Hampstead Historic Club and British Economical Association respectively. In these communities, he met Sidney James Webb, with whom he would lead the Fabian Society. In the meetings, Shaw improved himself as a debater, public speaker and economist (Minney 33).

Fabian society was formed by a group of people who were disturbed by the social ills and wanted to change the corrupted system. "Fabians called themselves Fabians, because, like Fabius in the struggle with Hannibal, they saw the wisdom of waiting for the right moment to action. They wished to destroy the old forms, but without violence, in an entirely peaceful way" (Wilde 141). The term Fabian meant gradualism and concern with specific social reforms, equality and commitment to education (Ganz 16). The motto for Fabians was to educate and organize. The objective of this group was to create a gradual change into the

improvident, unqualified and corrupt institutions and morals towards the highest morality possible.

Shaw was among the first members and forerunners of Fabian Society, which provided him the opportunity to practice his ability in writing and speaking to an audience. The society had a lot of influence in his political ideas and he also contributed much to the improvement of Fabian Society. Through his studies in Fabian Society, he had the opportunity to work with Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Sidney Oliver, William Clarke, Graham Wallas, H.G. Wells, Annie Bessant and many other colleagues from whom he benefitted in his intellectual improvement process.

Fabian Society constitutes a very important part of George Bernard Shaw because in this society his socialist ideas have been reinforced. His socialism is also of importance because his political stance makes him realize that women are abused. With his socialism and Fabianism he claims that men and women have contribute to the act of production equally and they have to paid equally.

During his 94 years of life, Shaw wrote over 50 plays. He went on his playwriting career even in his 90s. Some of his most famous works are *Man and Superman* (1903), *Major Barbara* (1905), *The Doctor's Dilemma* (1906) and *Pygmalion* (1912). Upon his death on November 2, 1950, *The Times Literary Supplement* commented: "The passing away of Shaw marks the end of an institution. The life of England will seem changed in his absence... he was one of the bravest, and most brilliant, and most incongruous bequests of an era already receding into the legendary and strange" (qtd in Mishra 20).

This study aims to portray the maturation processes of Shavian heroines with the help of Shaw's own ideas about social life, politics and women in his articles "Our Attitude about Woman" and "The Womanly Woman". In this study, it is concluded that no matter what their starting point is, both Shavian women bear

the characteristics of New Women at the beginning of the play which facilitates their progress into adorable New Women at the end of the plays.

1.3 GEORGE BERNARD SHAW AS A PLAYWRIGHT OF WOMEN

Shaw's career as a playwright started with the publication of seven plays he had written between the years 1892 and 1897 in two volumes: *Plays Pleasant* and *Plays Unpleasant*. *Plays Unpleasant* are *Widower's Houses* (1892), *The Philanderer* (1893) and *Mrs. Warren's Profession*(1893). These plays are unpleasant because of the fact that they make the audience face the disturbing reality they are involved in. Shaw condemned the values of the bourgeois class in *Widower's Houses*. The play depicts corruption in the form of slum landlordism. *The Philanderer* was a criticism towards the Capitalist norms and laws of marriage. Similarly, the last play, *Mrs. Warren's Profession* depicted prostitutes as the victims of the corrupted society rather than the villains. As the play put the blame on the society, it was considered as an immoral play and censored for a long time.

Plays Unpleasant were followed by *Plays Pleasant*. In *Plays Pleasant*, Shaw aimed to appeal to the producers' and audiences' attention. His portrayal of real life was still eminent in the *Plays Pleasant*, but this time he put forward his ideas in a more comic way. "By laughter only, can you destroy evil without malice and affirm good fellowship without mawkiness" (qtd. in Minney 68) Different from *Plays Unpleasant*, *Plays Pleasant* touch similar themes with a comic tone. *Arms and the Man* (1894), *Candida* (1894), *The Man of Destiny* (1895), and *You Never Can Tell* (1897) are listed as the *Plays Pleasant*. *Arms and the Man* was a criticism of romantic love and martial glory. *Candida* was about the communication between sexes in the example of a reverend's wife stuck between two men, her husband and a poet. *The Man of Destiny* is a one-act comedy about the genius of Napoleon and a woman disguised as a man. *You Never Can Tell* discussed the conflicts in marriage with the representation of a happy marriage.

Shaw was born in the Victorian era. This is important while talking about the traditions of the age. The era “owed its peculiar character to women” (Wilson 1). A woman, Queen Victoria was on the throne and the morals and manners were shaped by lady novelists (Wilson 1). Their target was also mainly women. This target group expected three volume novels which were romantic and inoffensive. It had to have the kind of hero saying “Miss Mohun, I wonder if I might be permitted to offer you the use of my carriage?” and a heroine who replied, “Captain Farquenson, I fail to understand how anything in your conduct can have merited you assumption of familiarity?” (qtd in Wilson 1)

Bernard Shaw was innovative not only in his ideas but also in his style of representation. He contributed the conventional theatre with two important innovations. The first revolution is on the stage: He changed the tradition of well-made plays and created another plot structure in a discussion play. The second innovation is in print. Bernard Shaw believed that people’s indifference for the drama in print was because of the fact that the published plays were not reader friendly. He gave descriptive and explanatory materials like detailed stage directions in his published plays and made them be printed on qualified paper so that people would want to read them. As a result, he succeeded in increasing the number of the target readers of drama (Ward 37).

According to Bernard Shaw, modern British drama was deprived of ethics and philosophy. His main and most important contribution to modern drama was the exposure of social ills, hypocrisies, illusions and misconceptions. For him, art served as a way to express his ideas and philosophy, and penetrate into people’s minds. Shaw declared his motive behind writing social plays:

I am not an ordinary playwright in general practice. I am a specialist in immoral and heretical plays. My reputation has been gained by my persistent struggle to force the public to reconsider its morals. [...] I write plays with the deliberate object of converting the nation to my opinion in these matters. [...] I should cease to write for the theatre and propagate my views from the platform and through books (Hamlyn 410-411).

Shaw's drive was to leave the happily ending love stories and turn the corpus of his plays into social issues. This shift was "from a romantic to an intellectual drama, from a well made play to a problem play" (Mishra 29). His drama appealed to the minds of the audience rather than to their hearts.

For Shaw, theatre was a social institution serving for the benefit of the society. He said: "The theatre is growing in importance as a social organ. Bad theatres are as mischievous as bad schools or bad Churches; for modern civilization is rapidly multiplying the class to which the theatre is both school and Church" (Hamlyn 31). Therefore the social role of the dramatist was to mirror the real life in its real form. That is, he portrayed life as it was, not as it should be. The playwright was to write on social, economic, moral, religious and political problems of his/her time, dealing with the corrupted institutions and concepts like Capitalism, Socialism, women, marriage and wars.

In his plays, he portrayed a social problem through his characters going through dilemmas, which lead them to the main discussion. However, the dilemmas he put forward were not similar to Victorian dilemmas like cliché love stories, mysteries, letters sent to incorrect addresses. His shift from romantic drama which dealt with love and romance to intellectual drama which dealt with social issues created a renovated type of drama called after his name: "Shavian Drama". The term defined an interest in ideas rather than events in a dramatic form.

Conflicts are the backbones of Shavian drama. He claimed that in drama conflict was "indispensable: no conflict, no drama" (Hamlyn 729). Different from Victorian romance in which the conflict is based on misunderstandings, adultery or so on, in Shaw's plays, the conflict is constructed on the difference between two ideas. The clash of these two ideas constructs the conflict of the discussion, namely, the heart of the play. Sometimes, the discussion creates the event and then the event is discussed; but some other times discussion penetrates into the

event and they go hand in hand. Ward summarizes his style in playwriting as “His drama is the drama of the thinking man, challenging the drama of the lusty man” (38). Shaw defined drama as “the art of expressing ideas about life in such a manner as to render that expression capable of interpretation by actors and likely to interest an audience assembled to hear the words and witness the actions” (qtd. in Nicloll 35).

According to the article “George Bernard Shaw” by Archibald Henderson, there are two types of plays written. On the one hand, there is a vast majority of the dramatic works of serious drama, comedy, melodrama, farce which are written in accordance with the established traditions of playwriting. On the other hand, there are few plays which reject the old traditions and establish new formulations to present their theme. The first group of plays is founded on universal themes like emotions, life, death, destiny, age and time. They are infatuated by universal enduring themes rather than topical or impermanent aspects of human life. However, in the second group of plays, there are works which aim to understand the human nature in its permanent aspects with the help of a light on the transitory social events of the contemporary. They try to portray the present and reach the universal via the specific issues of their time. “It is a characteristic of Bernard Shaw that he belongs to the second class” (Henderson *George* 298).

While talking about the themes in his plays in an interview with the Vienna “Zeit” he said, “In my plays, you will not be teased and plagued with happiness, goodness and virtue, or with crime and romance, or indeed with any senseless thing of that sort. My plays have only one subject: life; and only one attribute: interest in life” (Henderson *George* 301). His aim was to depict real conflicts in real life.

The conflict is not always between right and wrong. Indeed, it is difficult to point the rights and wrongs in Shaw’s plays as he did not propose biased simple answers to the arguable problems. This is why he is controversial. He does not

have black and white; there can be gray shades in between. “The clash of competing ideas and of opposing standards of human values can provide highly acceptable, absorbing and entertaining dramatic material” (Ward 38). The representation of conflicts is provided via the discussions between the characters who are neither evil villains nor angelic heroines. “The genius of Shaw is his creation of character conflict which meshes perfectly with his conflict of ideas, as each character has his/her point of view.” (Crane 30) In this clash of ideas, some or none of the characters may represent Shaw’s viewpoint; and actually, he does not accept the responsibility for his characters’ thoughts. To illustrate, the inquisitors in Shaw’s *Saint Joan* are expected to be depicted as ignorant, pragmatist villains who cause a successful commander and a saint die at the stake. However, Shaw shocked his audience by giving a tolerant and merciful personality to the inquisitor. In the same play, the so-called Angelic figure Saint Joan had some flaws as well, such as being too arrogant.

Shaw does not take sides in order not to get lost. For example, in the discussion of act IV in *Mrs. Warren’s Profession*, both Mrs. Warren and Vivie have very concrete and touchable points to advocate their ideas. He does not depict stage heroines. For instance, Vivie Warren is not a heroine but a human being with controversial problems and inabilities to solve them.

One of his plays he actually sub-entitled: “A Discussion in three Acts.” And yet, with consummate shrewdness, Mr. Shaw fully realizes that if the dramatist takes sides in a dramatic wrangle, he is lost. A sense of the most absolute fairness and impartiality pervades and dominates his plays. Every character has his say without let or hindrance; and the whole play is signaled by the honesty of its dialectic (Henderson *George* 303).

He believed that art is for society’s sake. What made him one of the greatest philosophers and playwrights of his time was his total commitment to his purpose. He considered himself “to be an instrument of the evolutionary force” (Wilson 16). This belief led him to be “a realistic and reforming playwright who addressed himself to the problems of modern life and introduced genuine *discussion* in his

dialogue.” (Maynard 1711) He started writing plays in 1890s. He wrote political plays of ideas developed with Shavian discussions. His detailed discussions along with his witty sense of humour brought him a public demanding his plays to be performed. His plays are complex and witty. They are deceptive because they seem to be very easy to comprehend at first but they are not as explicit as they seem to be. They are philosophically deep.

The startling feature of his plays is their argumentative and controversial character. They are expository lectures, in dramatic form, on the “Shavian philosophy.” He comments “I created nothing; I invented nothing; I imagined nothing; I simply discovered drama in real life” (Shaw *Our Theatre* 38). He did not present his own opinions directly via his characters. He believed that ideas without characters did not mean anything as “What interests people in the theatre are stories of possible real lives, discussion of possible real characters in talk, laying bare of souls, discovery of pitfalls, in short illumination of life” (qtd Dukore *Bernard* 11).

The vividness of the plays is also constructed with the real like portrayal of the characters. Shaw gave his characters religions, politics, professions and human nature. He believed that it was the characters who were to create the flow of events not a mechanical plot style (as in well-made plays) or an external force (including the writer himself).

In his career and personal development, Shaw was influenced by Goethe, Mozart, Beethoven Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Dickens, Ibsen, Maupassant and Wagner. In his dramas, the greatest influence on Shaw was of Wagner (author of *Erewhon* and *The Way of All Flesh* and the satirist of Victorian life and thought), Chekov and Ibsen. He was influenced by Chekhovian free, episodic structure in his plays. He diverged from the well-made play structure in his plays.

Shaw was also deeply influenced by Henrik Ibsen. In order to understand Shavian plays, Ibsenite plays should be mentioned as well. Ibsen (1828-1906) was one of the most important playwrights of the nineteenth century. He was rebellious against the society's norms which limited the personal growth of individuals. He believed that many institutions in the society were diseased and they had to be cured immediately. By choosing domestic power struggles to depict, Ibsen revealed the ills in the social order which was preferably kept hidden. This is why Henrik Ibsen was much of the time harshly criticized by the society and his contemporaries.

Henrik Ibsen's rebellion was what attracted George Bernard Shaw. Also, Shaw appreciated Ibsen's focus on questions of public morality and firm characterizations. Similar to Ibsen, Shaw conveyed his message on the corruption of the society through his dramas. Shavian drama stated unconventional realities of the time and achieved to shock his audience by the disturbance he created on them. "Shaw attacks the conventional institutions and calls them the cancer-region of the society. To give vent to his craze to review and renovate the social institutions which were badly crippled by Victorian morality, sentimentality and idealistic notion, Shaw lashes out at all their false coats and creams" (Valakya 90). Despite the similarities between Ibsen, Chekhov and Shaw, what made Shaw's plays more "Shavian" was his comic tradition and political approach instead of serious personal approach Ibsen used. Shaw added humour to his serious public matters with a vision specific to him. To achieve this combination, he created a unique dramatic rhetoric: combination of discussions in forms of long speeches and use of rhymes and voices. This technique was inimitable as no playwright in his time had so much knowledge in both music and social matters.

A very common point in both Ibsenite and Shavian plays is the attitude towards women. For them, it was not possible to find cures to the new problems with the old devices at hand. Therefore, they created and portrayed the New Woman in

their plays to solve the problems the new professional Victorian woman experienced.

Shaw's fundamental purpose as a dramatist is a moral purpose. With Shaw to dramatize is to disillusionize. As a lecturer and debater he wants to change the opinions of the audience. The dramatic structure is really that of a debate. On the one side are the conventional types of people; on the other side are the people who express the ideas of the author and come out victorious in the debate (Henderson *The Real Bernard* 187).

In the early 20th Century, many male writers became interested in women's movement. This provided them with an insight into their attitude towards their female characterizations in literature. Before the effect of woman's movement, there used to be two stereotypical female roles in theatre: positive roles which depict independent and intelligent heroines and negative roles which depict villains like bitches or witches. Shaw preferred the first model and depicted women in their best traits. However, his main characters were not stereotypical because they had characteristics specific to themselves and they changed in the course of the discussion constructing the heart of the play. "Shaw's characters are not simply ideas dressed up to look like people; instead, the characters embody the ever-changing and often arbitrary flow of ideas as these come to life in real, quirky, individual human beings, embroiled in verbal duels" (Damrosch 2093). Shaw's characters were real human beings having positive and negative sides. They were real enough to conflict with Shaw's own belief and ideas. To illustrate, though Shaw was against capitalism, his plays were full of successful and knowledgeable capitalist characters. "There are no outright villains, and no pure heroes or heroines, in a Shaw play: for example, while ruthless capitalism is a social evil in Shaw's universe, his plays are full of capitalist *characters* who are wise and winning" (Abrahams 2214). According to Arthur Ganz, "his contribution had been to give his characters human nature" (3).

As he started reading Karl Marx, he gained almost an obsession about equality, especially equal distribution of wealth among social classes, as well as among

sexes. This idea of equality when combined with his familial experiences made him realize that woman could be included in the social life as well as men could. Reading Karl Marx provided him with an insight into the fact that woman was needed in economy as well. He believed that woman could contribute to social life and economy more than she did. In one of his lectures, he criticized that society did not value woman in the way she deserved. Also he criticized the very same society for witnessing the corruption in the institutions and watching the problem without even verbalizing it. According to Shaw, the most dangerous element in the society was not the person who accepted limitations as they were, but the “idealist” person who felt that the conventional ideas and institutions were corrupted but was frightened to act against them and affirmed the truth of them just not to disturb the system.

Bernard Shaw’s works are shaped in relation to his political approach. After reading *Das Kapital* in 1882, he wrote *Cashel Byron’s Profession* and *An Unsocial Socialist*. Especially, his ideas, in different transformations permeated into all his plays. His socialist ideas and action in his real life turns out to be the commitment to human existence in the world in his plays. Shaw was not devoted to Marxism. He believed that Marx was a social critic and a moralist rather than an economist and if socialism was to come, it needed a new economic foundation as Marx’s insistence on socialism was not dependable. Only socialism could create wealth and distribute it equally, which could cure the greatest ills in the society creating more self satisfied and emancipated people, especially women.

The last decades of 19th Century and 20th Century observed a dramatic increase in women’s rights movement. One of Shaw’s greatest supports was that women were social beings which gave them a qualification of humanity.

Shaw supported women who fought for their rights. Shaw defined woman in the following terms:

[...] woman is the repository of vitality... She is the major force in Creative Evolution. It is through her that Life Force comes to assume meaning. Biologically speaking, a woman has the fulfillment of Nature's highest purpose and greatest function to increase multiply and replenish the earth; a man is just an instrument for letting life emerge the womb. (qtd. in Valakya 86)

Also, Shaw emphasizes the place and importance of women saying;

there is no such species as "Woman, lovely woman", the woman being simply the female of the human species, and that to have one conception of humanity for the woman and another for the man, or one artistic convention for woman and another for the man is...unnatural., and ...unworkable... (qtd. in Watson 49)

In a time when suffragists worked hard to demand their right to vote, Bernard Shaw as a man of both thought and action felt the need to choose a stance. Observing that women were capable of running a home and being involved in politics in the example of his mother and Fabian friends respectively, he chose to support women. He believed that when given equal opportunity, women could be at least as successful as men in every aspect of life. For this reason, in his plays, Shaw either depicted the world of women giving them equal opportunities with men or criticized the inequality of opportunities between the sexes. Shaw focused on women's

[...] emancipation from man's dominance in social, political, economic, sexual and family relationship is second to none. He remains silent nowhere in exposing the fact that men's dominance over women is not only undemocratic, unpsychological and inhuman but is also a threat to the progress of human race. He questions the so-called double standard of morality and regards man-made laws and conventions as grossly unfair and unjust. He ridicules the cult of womanly woman and tries his best to banish the notions of helpless innocence and docility, associated with femininity for all the time (Valakya 99).

After Bernard Shaw's ideas about woman matured, he wrote *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism* in 1928. This book was like a manifesto for women to learn about and join in politics. "It was to the unconverted, the large audience of English women who were curious, intelligent, fair-minded, but generally undereducated" (McCormack 209). In the book, he focused on the equal distribution of property because all the other inequalities were going to be diminished with the power of wealth women were to gain. What

he means by “equal distribution of wealth” is “what you do for your income and what you do with your income” (Burns 109). Shaw believes that the lack of economic and social security for woman is the cause of woman’s inability to free herself. Fabian society is also organized to “release man from woman, free woman from herself and to encourage the Life Force in strengthening its primary...function, the production of the greatest good” (Pettet 109).

To Shaw, this inequality caused a problem in virtue and morality. Thus, economic practices defected the moral facts in public sphere. According to Burns who wrote a book review on Shaw’s *The Intelligent Woman’s Guide to Socialism and Capitalism* “The great value of Mr. Shaw’s book was its close contact with the facts of daily life” (110).

For Shaw, it was a misconception to consider theatre as a place of recreation, romance or entertainment. Theatre had to serve to educate the society. Therefore, Shaw tried to clarify the theatre from emotion and “make room for thought” (Bentley The theory 176). His approach showed itself in his characterizations. His characters were vividly pictured. However, his characters, especially female ones, were harshly criticized for their personality.

[...] it is not surprising that our society, being directly dominated by men, comes to regard Woman, not as an end in herself like Man but solely as a means of ministering to his appetite. The ideal wife is one who does everything that the ideal husband likes and nothing else. Now to treat a person as a means instead of an end is to deny that person’s right to live. And to be treated as a means to such an end as sexual intercourse with those who deny one’s right to live is insufferable to any human being. Woman, if she dares face the fact that she is being so treated, must either loathe herself or rebel (Shaw, *The Womanly Woman* 58).

Being a means for the comfort of the masculine sex makes woman dependant on man. She is acceptable to the society only when she is pronounced with a man- be it her father or husband. This dependence makes her lose her voice totally because she cannot complain. “If she complains, he, the self helper can do without her; whilst she is dependent on him for her social position, her

livelihood, her place in the society, her home, her name, her very bread” (Shaw, *The Womanly Woman* 58). Here, Shaw had a descriptive attitude towards the ill constructions of the society. Woman could gain a social status only by doing the chores and being the wife of some men. Shaw believed in the falsity of this idea and clarified what woman should do with the symbol of a parrot.

If we have come to think that the nursery and the kitchen are the natural sphere of a woman, we have done so exactly as English children come to think that a cage is the natural sphere of a parrot; because they have never seen one anywhere else... There may... be idealist parrots who persuade themselves that the mission of a parrot is to minister to the happiness of a private family by whistling and saying “Pretty Polly”... Still, the only parrot a free-souled person can sympathize with is the one that insists on being let out as the first condition of making itself agreeable...If it persists, you will have either let it out or kill it (Shaw, *The Womanly Woman* 61).

In other words, if women do not give up their conventional mood of womanliness and reject their duties in the household and public sphere towards their children, husbands, law and actually to everyone except for herself, she can never emancipate herself. One cannot tie herself to a center while trying to fly higher.

According to Shaw, woman is not directly the slave of man. She is the slave of her duties. As she has many obstacles and limitations in her way to success, she needs to clear her path first, which slows her progress down. On the contrary, man has fewer obstacles most of which are clarified by women. Therefore, men become more successful and their success is attributed to themselves while in fact belonging to the women. Such heavy responsibilities and expectations create an “ideal” code of behavior for woman in Victorian morality. The ideal woman with Victorian morality does not coincide with Shavian ideal woman. Shavian ideal woman is the one who is strong and out-going. She is educated and aware of her rights. She rebels for her rights as well. She has the power to change the society. Shaw believed that “a whole basketful of ideals of the most secret quality will be smashed by the achievement of equality for woman and man” (Shaw, *The Womanly Woman* 62). Apparently, Shaw believes that traditional ideals about the place of men and women will be destroyed in near future. New

ideas are about to replace the ideals and he contributes to the flourishing of these new ideas in his plays with the help of his characterizations and themes.

In *Shaw's Daughters: Dramatic and Narrative Constructions of Gender*, J. Ellen Gainor deals with how Shaw represents his female characters. The book explores "Shaw's position in a society fascinated by issues of sexuality and gender identity at a moment when intellectual and scientific discoveries profoundly affected views about human relations"(132). Though Shavian feminism is very far from 21st Century understanding of feminism, Shaw can be said to have a feminist approach in his attitude to women. He supports women's rights and imagines a world where men and women live equally.

Shelia Stowell writing a criticism on the book *Shaw's Daughters: Dramatic and Narrative Constructions of Gender* by J. Ellen Gainor does not agree that Shaw is a feminist. For her, Shaw cannot be considered as a feminist because his plays do not carry the characteristics of feminist drama. He does not call women to action in his plays. Rather, he depicts the process the New Woman of his age goes through. His main interest is not feminism. He writes about women for women with women in the plays (Stowel 558). Shaw's plays are not feminist; rather he writes socialist dramas with strong women figures in them because he believes that the key problem is not the inequality between sexes but the inequality of the distribution of wealth among social classes as well as sexes. If the inequality of income is balanced, the equality between the sexes will have been achieved.

The maturation of Shavian women is very important in his plays especially when his political ideas and belief in women's emancipation is taken into consideration. His heroines emancipate themselves and show the audience the potential women bear. They depict the boundaries forced by the society and they set an example to how to overcome them.

According to Holroyd's article "George Bernard Shaw: Women and the Body Politic", women have two ways in their lives to follow for Shaw. These ways are being domestic or professional women. Most women do not have a choice in between. Their choice is done by a domineering man because they do not have the economic power to fight for their rights. (14) For women, there sometimes is no difference between serving at home and serving at work if there is no way for emancipation. For Shaw, the only way to provide women with the natural right to choose is via the equal distribution of wealth. When women are given this right, which they already have to have, they can make their own choice. Shaw favours women in both domestic and public sphere and includes them into his works; however, he "established himself as the champion of the domestic woman rather than the professional woman, who he thought could take care of herself without his help" (Gainor 4). An example of the sympathy for domestic women is his sympathy towards Candida. Candida is a married woman who is hesitant between two men, her husband and a poet. Both men love her and try to win her. Forgetting that she has her own identity, they want to have her. Michael Holroyd summarizes Shaw's viewpoint as "The ingenious exercise of protecting women against their protectors appealed to Shaw... He believed that society changed only when women wanted it to (Holroyd 18-22). Thus, Shaw protects his women against men, who are supposed to be the protectors, and he holds women responsible for the improvement of the society.

The term "The New Woman" describes a late Victorian woman who is fighting for personal freedom and equality between sexes. The New Woman wants independence and freedom, and she refuses to act in a male determined way of behavior. She does not accept being legally and socially inferior. This rebel shows itself in a masculine female model: women who smoke cigarettes and reject feminine code of behavior like adornments and decoration. They wear suitable for an active lifestyle rather than for a typical Victorian woman. In both private and public sphere, they are outspoken. Some of these new women reject

domesticity and focus on their careers while some others try to balance maternity and professional life.

Shaw is drawn toward certain qualities of New Women, especially their sexual aggression and/or expression of emotional interest or desire, he appropriates these qualities for his characterization of much more conventional women, creating a crossbreed better suited to his own philosophy of the life force, but which undermines the integrity of the New Woman by masking a traditional figure with the former's more obvious attributes (Gainor 23).

New Woman and the ideal woman do not only differ in terms of behaviors and appearance. New Woman is an intellectual being. Shaw creates his "Unwomanly Women" who are educated and emancipated individuals fighting for their individual rights and having as much social and political existence as man. His unwomanly woman is assertive and strong especially against men when it comes to their independence. He feels sympathy towards these women because they do not represent Victorian ideals; on the contrary they represent their own ideas.

Shaw is criticized by feminist critics because of the fact that his women are not depicted exquisitely enough to be considered as realistic woman characters. Barnicoat claims that Shaw portrays the New Woman but in a stereotypical form of it emerging in the late Victorian Age. Barnicoat's main criticism stems from the lack of instructive woman in Shawian theatre. According to Barnicoat, it is the artist's responsibility to set an example to the society (51). However, Shaw's aim in his characterization is far from being prescriptive. He is more descriptive and he aims at photographing the woman of his age.

Another criticism of Shaw's women is that they are not actual women. They behave in a masculine manner. They lack human emotions. According to Clark, "the characters in Shaw's plays are merely puppets, without life and emotions set in action by a clever thinker and craftsman" (257). They have ideas; they express thoughts. Actually, they are the portraits of human thought not the emotions. Shaw accepts the truth and says that he does not have woman characters in his plays as women do not exist in real world, either. They are non-existent in public

sphere as well as private sphere. They diminish their identity to support that of men's. Women are not existent as a being but they have a place only in service to some men in the Victorian society.

Shaw did not only depict unwomanly women. He has many conventional characters or characteristics in his protagonists as well. These "Womanly Women" serve to help the audience see the contrast between the two types of women and their approaches to the social problems tackled.

All in all, Shaw's purpose in creating his controversial women and making them speak in either agreement or disagreement with Shaw himself was to point out some social defects and immoralities in the society. Shaw was well aware of the Victorian conventions of female behavior and the deviations from the conventions brought about with women's movement. New Woman served Shaw to explore and portray the norms of masculinity and femininity in the Victorian Society Shaw lived in.

Shavian women differ among themselves. Candida, Vivie, Mrs. Warren, Eliza and actually all the female characters have different traits despite having very Shavian characteristics in common. Candida was a domestic woman dealing with household chores while Shaw portrayed Mrs. Warren with a free will but as a very conventional mother urging her daughter to marry. As opposed to the conventional mother figure of Mrs. Warren, her daughter was a sample of the New Woman with a cigar in hand and with a masculine use of language. She also chose to remain single pursuing the career path she had decided before.

Despite all these differences, most Shavian women have some characteristics in common as well. Mostly, they are the main characters in his plays and they experience a process of maturation from the beginning of the play through the end. They start as having stereotypical characteristics in their own genre but gain a more specific and recognizable characteristic at the end. The most important

virtue a Shavian heroine has is the independence she gains progressively in the flow of the plot.

CHAPTER II: VIVIE'S CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT IN *MRS WARREN'S PROFESSION*

2.1 BACKGROUND ABOUT THE PLAY

In 1893, Janet Achurch, an actress whom Shaw was very fond of, “suggested Maupassant’s *Yvette*, an absurd story about the virtuous daughter of a courtesan, as the subject for a play” (Wilson 116). Maupassant had a masculine attitude towards his heroines in the story, which resulted in Yvette’s struggle between life and death because of her idea of morality. At the end of the story, Yvette chose death because of the shame her mother’s profession caused. Shaw’s answer to Achurch’s suggestion was: “I will work out the truth about that mother one day” (Wilson 116). He did not pay much attention to the events experienced by the women in the story. Rather, he cared about the reasons leading them to their tragic end as well as how these experiences affected them.

What we can do, and not what happens to us, is the basic issue in moral philosophy. Therefore, according to his own morality, Shaw looked for the real story behind the choice the woman made in Maupassant’s story; and as a result, he wrote *Mrs. Warren’s Profession*. Shaw turned Yvette into a Shavian heroine with a mind of her own. “Yvette becomes Vivie Warren, a typical Shaw heroine—common-sensible, unsentimental and businesslike, with a handshake that makes men wince and a taste for cigars. The aristocratic courtesan becomes the dynamic Mrs. Warren, a vulgar but presentable woman” (Wilson 116). And the heart of the play is the inevitable clash between the two. The power struggle between the two leads Mrs. Warren declares how she has started her business. The power which Vivie holds at the beginning of the discussion switches to Mrs. Warren as the former is the shaken one this time seeing the severe conditions her mother had to go through.

Shaw was enthusiastic to describe the real miserable conditions of women in labor market in the personal experiences of Kitty Warren to be able to show how she starts her way of emancipation. Kitty Warren's rise from the position of being the exploited to the exploiter with the income she gained through prostitution can be likened to the story of many middle or upper class businessmen's rise from rags to riches with the help of exploiting the ones in need. The exploited ones are the working class people who can afford neither the education for professional life nor someone to provide for them. Working class was already in a position to be exploited. Women, as the second sex, in this class were even in more miserable conditions because they were lower of the lowest in status. In all situations, they were exploited by the capital or by some other men, be it their husbands or fathers.

In the context of the play, Shaw's preface clarifies his attack on social corruption strengthening through the constructions of capitalism. His attack on social norms is of importance as he believes that it is the society which imprisons women in the domestic sphere. The social norms indicate the starting point of Shavian women to initiate their way to emancipation. Therefore, *Mrs. Warren's Profession* turns out to be a play not about prostitution but on prostitution caused by the so-called moral institutions and practices in society:

Mrs. Warren's Profession was written in 1894 to draw attention to the truth that prostitution is caused, not by female depravity or male licentiousness, but simply by underpaying, undervaluing, and overworking women so shamefully that the poorest of them are forced to resort prostitution to keep body and soul together. Indeed all attractive unpropertied women lose money by being infallibly virtuous or contracting marriages that are not more or less venal. If on the large social scale we get what we call vice instead of what we call virtue it is simply because we are paying more for it. NO normal woman would be a professional prostitute if she could better herself by being respectable, nor marry for money if she could afford to marry for love (qtd. in Hamlyn 219).

Clearly, Shaw is not blaming individuals as the cause of this "dirty business". He believes that it is the society as a social construction which bears the whole guilt

in its personality. Society, not any individual, is the villain of the piece (Hamlyn 235). Most probably his target of attack is the reason why the reaction from the public has been so fierce.

Shaw believes that “fine art is the subtlest, the most seductive, the most affective instrument of moral propaganda in the world” (qtd. in Berst, *Bernard* 5). Therefore; he is motivated to use his art as moral propaganda. In the play, he aims to help every single individual in British public realize that they also have a part in the profession they consider to be immoral. There is no visualization or depiction of the profession in the play except for its title. It is not the profession but the characters and their discussion which is the focus of the play.

This play is important also for the way it portrays Shavian women with their womanly and unwomanly aspects and conflicts. The rising popularity of the New Woman shows itself in the play. “The first full-length portrait of unwomanly woman is found in 1984 *Mrs. Warren’s Profession*” (Lorich 100). Shaw declared that he created Vivie and Kitty upon the wish of his Fabian friend Beatrice Webb. She believed that with his wisdom and interest in the improvement of women condition in that time, Shaw needed to create a sample New Woman, a “real lady” not a theatrical one. Bernard Shaw later added: “I did so and the result was Miss Vivie Warren” (qtd in Hamlyn 219). It goes without saying that Shaw both compared and contrasted Vivie and Kitty in the same play with similar characteristics and different upbringings but one important similarity: an independent spirit. These two women are independent but also interdependent as the provider and the provided.

Mrs. Warren’s Profession (1893) is a “dramatized study, in part at least of the economics of prostitution with a busy self satisfied madam in place of the usual repentant magdalen” (Ganz 73). It can be considered as the follow up of *Cashel Byron’s Profession* written by Bernard Shaw many years before. In *Cashel Byron’s Profession*, the corruption in the society is depicted via the profession of

slum landlordism. Similar to *Cashel Byron*, Mrs. Warren pursues slum landlordism as a profession in addition to her past as a prostitute. The immorality of the professions is the same but the causes differ. Different from *Cashel Byron's Profession*, *Mrs. Warren's Profession* has another central theme: women, which is a very common theme in most of Bernard Shaw's works.

Mrs. Warren's Profession, which Bernard Shaw claims to be the most moral play ever written, is a mirror reflecting how immoral the corruption in the society is to spoil the morality of innocent girls, abuse them and then, throw the guilt on them. For Shaw, "No normal woman would be a professional prostitute if she could better herself by being respectable, nor marry for money if she could afford to marry for love" (qtd. in Valayka). With this awareness, Shaw aims to disturb the audience with their involvement in some others' suffering. He also shakes the idea of morality with his depiction of the exploitation the so-called moral ones do or engage in with the help of the characters Reverend Samuel, Crofts's brother who is a member of parliament and aunt Liz who lives close to a cathedral, which indicates her respectable place in the society.

"The 'fallen' woman was a theatrical staple by the time Shaw wrote *Mrs. Warren's Profession*, but the magdalens of the nineteenth century drama bore little resemblance to Kitty Warren" (Ganz 92). Shaw did not write the play to depict the situation Mrs. Warren was in. He wrote it to show the reasons behind her choice. "Incidents are less interesting than the motives that create them and the people involved in them" (qtd. in Dukore 12). This is why the characters and their motives are more important than the profession of prostitution in the play. Similar to *Widower's Houses*, *Mrs. Warren's Profession* deals with the issues of slum landlordism and prostitution. It is, however, not the theme or topic of discussion but Shaw's stance near the prostitute is what makes the plays unpleasant.

The most dangerous element in the society, Shaw argues, is not the ordinary well meaning Philistine who amiably and thoughtlessly accepts things as they are but the “idealist”, the person who in his heart feels the falsity of conventional ideas and institutions but frightened by this recognition, all the more desperately affirms their truth and sanctity (Ganz 65).

Another unpleasantness in the play is that the respectable society derives (not earns) its income from dirty ways as in the example of Mrs. Warren’s ex-prostitute sister. She earned her living with prostitution but now she is living close to a cathedral and she leads a prosperous and respectable life. Although she does not directly appear in the play as a character, she seems to be a Shavian woman who is strong enough to earn her living and respectability with the help of the profession she has chosen.

Though finished in 1893, *Mrs. Warren’s Profession* was not licensed until 1925, for 32 years. “*Mrs. Warren’s Profession* was not performed because Grein disliked it; and because with its subject of prostitution and its hints of incest, it was sure to be banned by the Lord Chamberlain” (Ganz 23). There is nothing sexually sincere in the play except for its title. There is not even a touch of sexuality or eroticism. “It is not a play of passion” said Harris (416). The play is a mere social and political play. All the characters, plots and ideas Bernard Shaw put forward can be regarded as false and wicked; however, there is one historical truth that cannot be denied: Although they center on a similar theme, *Cashel Byron’s Profession* was not censored while *Mrs. Warren’s Profession* could not be performed for thirty two years due to its topic of discussion centering around a female protagonist. Even this shows that the society’s approach to genders is different. It is apparent that this difference shows itself as the abuse of female gender.

William Mackintire Salter mentions the play as “one of the most impressive, one of the most moral plays in [...] literature” in his article “Mr. Bernard Shaw as a Social Critic” published in *International Journal of Ethics* (452). Mackintire goes so far that he stated “one might be tempted to think that it was the respectable

keepers of immoral houses that hounded on the critics and the papers against the play” (452). According to Mackintire, selling one’s belief as many doctors, lawyers and clergymen do, is a much worse act than selling one’s body as Mrs. Warren does.

The corruption in the society is reflected in many characters. Shaw, himself was not a devoted supporter of Church. Therefore, it is not surprising that Reverend Samuel, the Village rector turned out to be a man of hypocrisy and worldliness. The Reverend is a loveable character who seems to have a good family life and a clean past. He gives importance to social position and wants his son to make a good marriage. Ironically, he happens to be a former client of Mrs. Warren’s. Mrs. Warren was engaged in the dirty business because she had to. However, Reverend and the like were involved just for adventure which contaminates Reverend’s past more than Mrs. Warren’s. Moreover, Frank exemplifies the more acceptable counterpart of prostitution in social life. He wants to marry Vivie just to be able to continue his idleness with the help of her money. That is, he prostitutes himself though he had the opportunity to work, different from Mrs. Warren. The existence of other possibilities or the fact that they did not need to choose the “dirty” way, spoils both the Reverend’s and Frank’s morality more than Mrs. Warren’s.

Mrs. Warren’s Profession can be regarded as one of the most realist plays by Shaw. Mrs. Warren, Sir George Crofts and Vivie Warren are Shaw’s characters (Wilson 256). His characters are convincing ones who are full and special to themselves. They are less typical and more serving to the issue he wants to dramatize. One cannot claim that his characters are mere representatives for his own views because we hear different voices through different characters. For example, “the voice of Vivie Warren is not that of Candida Morell, nor the voice of Jack Danner” (Ganz 3).

“Shaw’s characters are true to themselves, even when their truths conflict with the accepted morality” (Dukore 71). Different from a Victorian heroine who accepts idealized rules of the society, Mrs Warren is a round character who is both conventional and unconventional at the same time. She is conventional in heart but unconventional in mind (Dukore, 72). She is a woman with wisdom and ability to see both sides of her situation and most importantly, she has a say about it. Mrs. Warren and Vivie learn both about each other and about themselves with the discussion they are involved in.

Shavian characters are not only representations of Shaw’s ideas or Victorian stereotypes. They are human because they sometimes represent opposite ideas to Shaw’s and they have very reasonable and acceptable supports for their ideas. For example, *Mrs. Warren’s Profession* is a very controversial play due to the politics it includes. In the play, both the capitalist and the worker, that is, both the exploiter and the exploited are the same person, which depicts the wicked side of human nature. Shaw, in a way, ennobles his capitalist characters. His characters contradict with his political intentions as he depicts them as they are. They have their own minds and ideas shaped by their experiences. For example, Mrs. Warren is exploited in her first role as a prostitute but in her second role she is exploitive. She does not quit her job because she has experienced and observed that the profession is the only one suitable for poor girls who refuse to let their bodies and souls be abused without getting anything in return. In this job, at least they earn money and a comfortable life in return. Instead of selling themselves to a man by a marriage bow, they rent their body to several men. Despite her dignity about her decision of profession, Mrs. Warren can be considered as a conventional “Womanly Woman” because of her acceptance of the “ideal” and “rules” of the society. Her daughter, Vieve, calls her “a conventional woman after all” (Ganz 73).

Mrs. Warren is one of the most well-known characters created by Bernard Shaw. She is well known because of the choice she made among the exploitation types she was provided by the society. She was born into a poor family of three sisters.

One of her half-sisters chose to marry a poor man and spoilt her youth with eighteen shillings a month and a drunkard husband. The other half-sister worked in a factory in inhumane conditions and died at a very early age because of poisoning. Mrs. Warren followed her sister's example and prospered in business life using the only capital she has: her body and womanhood.

One of the most important criticisms to Mrs. Warren's characterization is by Elsie Adams. In his book *Female Stereotypes in Shaw*, he claimed "Shaw is much more traditional in his creation of women than his feminist politics might indicate" (24). He states that Mrs. Warren is an affectionate mother who comforts her little daughter Vivie and wants her to be a respectable woman, which she could not achieve to be. She accepts her job's immorality and wants to have a conventional parent-child relationship with her daughter.

Vivie is a self-reliant, self assertive and businesslike woman. She is uninterested in art, unfeminine and aspirated for her freedom. Vivie, despite her respectable upbringing, is illegitimate. Her mother used to be a prostitute and now she is still in the business as a manager; that is, all the money used for her respectable upbringing came from the "dirty business".

Contrary to the strong woman characters, the male characters are more passive in Shaw's plays. Praed has no practical job at hand. He is like a parasite to his father who is a parasite on his workers. He also aims at living on Vivie's well-being like a parasite. He is another representation of hypocritical man. Judith Evans defines him as an "art for art's sake man" (33). He talks about the joy he got from his travels to other countries mentioning Brussels, which reminds Vivie of her mother's business. The reason why he is in the play is not because of his acquaintance with Mrs. Warren but the fact that he opens the world of art and beauty to Vivie who rejects this offer. This rejection highlights Vivie's unconventionality as a woman. The only person in the play who really has a job is Mrs. Warren, who "once earned her living by selling herself to men, and who

specifically says at one point that all she had were her appearance and charm to do it with” (Hornby 298).

Mrs. Warren’s performance was not a breakthrough because of its lack of a romantic hero and heroine relationship and a happy ending. At the end, the “New Woman” of the play, Vivie, reaches the expected decision which is to break with her mother and pursue her career rejecting marriage. Both the problem and the solution are realistic, depicting the social ills and the process of woman emancipation in late 19th and early 20th century in the same context. The penniless Frank and his need for Vivie’s money to support him portray men’s need for women and how emancipated Vivie achieves to become:

The thrust of the play is thus strongly didactic, but as with Ibsen’s social plays, the social is never mere sermonizing. Vivie’s idealism is counterpointed by her iconoclasm; she may reach a conventional decision but she does so by unconventional means. Her mother is not a stereotyped prostitute with heart of gold, nor an equally stereotyped whore with heart of steel, but rather a practical woman with good business sense (Hornby 300).

Shaw does not solve the problem at the end of the play. Neither does he provide a light for the reader to foreshadow that the problem is solved. The curtain closes with the negative atmosphere created.

At the end of the play, Vivie turns out to be a more mature woman making her own decisions as well as respecting other’s decisions. She does not claim the morality of prostitution but does not continue to blame her mother for her choice as well. She is shocked by the decent society and wants to break with the dirty business. She leaves the garden; she finds a job and she says:

VIVIE. I am sure that if I had the courage I should spend the rest of my life in telling everybody—stamping and branding it into them until they all felt their part in its abomination as I feel mine. There is nothing I despise more than the wicked convention that protects these things by forbidding a woman to mention them. And yet I can’t tell you. The two infamous words that describe what my mother is are ringing in my ears and struggling on my tongue; but I can’t utter them: the shame of them is too horrible for me. (284)

Mrs. Warren's Profession is a discussion play which has the main discussion between the mother and the daughter as the center. The discussions in the play, especially the main discussions with her mother in acts II and IV, turn Vivie into a more mature woman standing on her own feet.

The play does not have a traditional exposition, rising action, falling action and resolution parts in their traditional sense. Shaw has a Shavian touch to introduce his characters to the audience and create tension on the part of the audience.

Mrs. Warren's Profession like *Widower's Houses* seems to have finished by the end of act II. However, different from well made plays and more importantly in Shavian plays, the upcoming acts deal with the main discussion. In the discussion in his "discussion plays" Mr. Shaw is really successful at portraying Mrs. Warren's past and her very moral reasons to choose the immoral profession she is engaged in.

Also, the play, like *The Philanderer* and *Arms and the Man* attacks the Victorian concept of womanly women. The main characters in the play are the representatives of different classes of women: a prostitute and a respectable Cambridge graduate, benefiting from the same source of capitalism. Therefore, the play can be considered as a "dramatized study of the economics of prostitution" (Ganz 73) or the prostitution of economics.

Mrs. Warren's Profession directly attacks contemporary economic issues, slum landlordism and abuse of female gender especially on the basis of prostitution. The harshness and awkwardness of the subject matter and the directness of its presentation of these *Plays Unpleasant* help the reader see the very obvious social issues that are not directly seen at first sight. He portrays the wrongs in a society which left Kitty no alternative except for letting her work or body be abused.

The play is a morality play touching parent-child relationships, conventionality and the abuse of labor in a capitalist society. Shaw does not defend the morality of his characters. The audience should focus on the main causes of immorality. Because the stem of immorality is the “moral” society, Shaw achieves to disturb the audience by showing their own doing in the “dirty business”. This is why the play seems “unpleasant” and disturbing. “Shaw is indeed systematically and truly examining society’s habit of pretending one thing in order to hide something else” (Stafford 4).

2.2 EARLY STAGES OF VIVIE'S MATURATION

Vivie Warren appears to be an educated young lady belonging to the middle class with uncommon manly behavior. The picture Shaw draws for the very first moment of the play is a young lady, Vivie, in a hammock in a cottage garden, "reading and making notes ...with a pile of serious looking books and a supply of writing paper on it" (213). She is interrupted by Mr. Praed who will open the doors of a world of art for Vivie, who does not have any interest in such issues. By the help of this, Mr. Praed helps the depiction of unwomanly traits of Vivie.

Though having the characteristics of New Woman, Vivie is still an immature person as she has not come to learn about the society she lives in and the mother she has. "Shaw's portrait of a New Woman in *Mrs. Warren's Profession*; for Vivie Warren, remote from the grim circumstances that shaped her notorious mother, must in the end be classified with the bigots and inexperienced girls" (Powell 81). This classification fits Vivie at the beginning of the play but not at the end of it because Vivie changes during the discussions she is engaged in and becomes a more mature woman at the end of the play.

Vivie's words and gestures are the representatives of the New Woman who is confident, fully emancipated, self possessed, and strong. When Praed informs her about the arrival of her mother, Mrs. Warren, Vivie sees that her mother comes without informing so as to control what the daughter is doing when she is away. This disturbance of the emancipated daughter about the conventional mannered mother foreshadows the upcoming conflicts and problems to be experienced between the two. Vivie expresses her disturbance saying, "My mother has rather a trick of taking me by surprise- to see how I behave myself when she's away, I suppose. I fancy I shall take my mother very much by surprise one of these days, if she makes arrangements that concern me without consulting me beforehand"

(214). It is obvious from the very first scene that Vivie thinks and behaves in a way in contrast with the typical Victorian woman. Not only her ideas and words, but also her closing “*the gate with a vigorous slam*”, her handshake “*with a resolute and hearty grip*” and her offering “*the chair with one swing*” (214) portray how unconventional and uncommon she is in comparison to typical Englishwomen of the time. She is an unconventional woman even at the very beginning of the play, however, she starts a journey from naivety to maturity with the discussions she is involved in in the flow of the play.

Praed behaves as a typical gentleman towards Vivie throughout the play with the conventional codes of behavior towards women. Although he considers himself as a “born anarchist” (215), his manners are totally compatible with the established rules of the society. He repeatedly calls Vivie “Miss Warren” or “Miss Vivie” and he tries to be polite to her. For example, when Vivie attempts to bring a chair, he proposes to carry it and also he wants to sit on the harder one. However, Vivie, different from the type of women he knew, rejects his politeness considering it unnecessary. When Vivie attempts to bring the chair, he says “Oh, pray, pray! Allow me [*He lays hands on the chair.*]”(215). He also adds “Oh now, do let me take that hard chair. I like hard chairs” (215). However, Vivie with self confidence and decisiveness says “So do I. Sit down Mr. Praed” (215). Vivie’s bluntness and outspokenness are not the codes of traditional understanding of femininity. Spellbound by Vivie’s unconventional manners, the middle aged man, Praed says:

PRAED. It was so charming of you to say that you were disposed to be friends with me! You young ladies are splendid: perfectly splendid!

VIVIE. [*dubiously*] Eh? [*watching him with dawning disappointment as to the quality of his brains and character*]

PRAED. When I was your age, young men and women were afraid of each other: there was no good fellowship. Nothing real. Only gallantary copied out of novels, and as vulgar and affected as it could be. Maidenly reserve! Gentlemanly chivalry! Always saying no when you meant yes! Simple purgatory for shy and sincere souls.

VIVIE. Yes I imagine. There must have been a frightful waste of time. Especially women’s time.

PRAED. Oh, waste of life, waste of everything (216).

In the exchange above, the audience observes the admiration Vivie creates on the part of Praed as well as the negative outcomes of hypocrisy especially forced on women. Women lived according to the rules of public morality and wasted not only their time but also their lives in vain.

Another portrayal of the change in the situation of women is Vivie's having the same grade with the third best highest score in honors examination and being an honors student. Vivie is a genius in maths and she is much more successful than an average math student. To understand why she does not have a title despite being such a genius, one should understand the university life in those times. In the article "Who was Phillipa Summers? Reflections on Vivie Warren's Cambridge", Conolly depicts the university environment Vivie Warren was educated in. In the times when Vivie was a student at Cambridge, there were almost no women at Cambridge. Conolly explains:

Women students in Cambridge were there at that time more or less on sufferance. We were allowed to take the Tripos examinations, but we had no status as undergraduates and were not granted a degree. We were given certificates to show that we had passed the Tripos examination and had resided in College the required number of terms, so that if and when degrees were granted we should be qualified to receive them. Many members of the University disapproved of women's colleges and of higher education for women generally, so the authorities of Newnham and Girton liked us to be as unobtrusive as possible. We did not take much part in the life of the University, and we suffered many restrictions. We were asked always to wear gloves in the town (and of course hats!); we must not ride a bicycle in the main streets, nor take a boat out on the river in the daytime unless accompanied by a chaperon who must be either a married woman or one of the College dons. In the May Term we could be on the river in the early morning without chaperon, [but only] between the hours of six and nine. (93)

Most universities in those times were male universities. Although women could attend courses in universities like Cambridge or Oxford, they could not get a degree or full membership. Only women whose genius outraged men's could attend courses and learn subjects. That is, when Vivie completed her Cambridge tripos in maths she could not receive a B.S. like her male counterparts did. However, her success in mathematics and her educational history set an example for her contemporaries.

Vivie was an honour student who was equivalent to the third best student in her department, which was an extravagant success for a woman of her age and her time. This social injustice to which women were subjected is depicted with the conversation of Praed and Vivie, in which Praed praises Vivie.

Of course, Vivie's masculine education caused her to gain some masculine characteristic in her business life as well such as being logical and materialistic. She evaluates her own success in terms of the material outcome of it.

VIVIE. Yes. Fifty pounds! [...] But I wouldnt do it again for that. £ 200 would have been nearer the mark.

PRAED. [*much damped*] Lord bless me! Thats a very practical way of looking at it.

VIVIE. Did you expect to find me an unpractical person? (217)

Praed is shocked by the practical and materialist view with which Vivie approaches events. When he expresses his shock to Vivie's comparing her success to 50 pounds, Vivie thinks that he is shocked by the smallness of the amount of money. Typical to a man, she does not question why he is shocked; instead she goes on talking about money more.

Vivie is an unwomanly woman even at the beginning of the play. She does not share the hobbies of the Victorian women of her age. She said her interest was "Outside mathematics, lawn-tennis, eating, sleeping, cycling, and walking, [she is] a more ignorant barbarian than any woman could possibly be who hadn't gone in for the tripos" (218). She was interested in mathematics and almost nothing else especially nothing about womanhood. Praed, having seen the masculine face of Vivie, is devastated by the image:

PRAED [*revolted*] What a monstrous, wicked, rascally system! I knew it! I felt at once that it meant destroying all that makes womanhood beautiful!

VIVIE. I don't object to it on that score in the least. I shall turn it to very good account, I assure you. [...] I shall set up chambers in the City, and work at actuarial calculations and conveyancing. Under cover of that I shall do some law, with one eye on the Stock Exchange all the time. I've come down here by myself to read law: not for a holiday, as my mother imagines. I hate holidays.

PRAED. You make my blood run cold. Are you to have no romance, no beauty in your life?

VIVIE. I don't care for either, I assure you. [...] I like working and getting paid for it. When I'm tired of working, I like a comfortable chair, a cigar, a little whisky, and a novel with a good detective story in it. (218)

Vivie's image with a "cigar", "whisky," and a "detective story" portrays a masculine woman. She directly states that she does not care about romance or beauty. Even at these early moments of the play, Vivie knows what she wants to do. That is, not only her outlook and manners but also her ideas and worldview are compatible with New Woman. Vivie's ideas on this issue are reinforced by her first appearance on the stage with a "plain business-like dress, but not dowdy [...] a chatelaine at her belt, with a fountain pen and a paper knife among its pendants" (214). According to Praed, womanhood is associated with romance and beauty. Therefore, for him it is disturbing that these traits are diminished in the new era. However, for Vivie, the absence of womanhood in its Victorian sense facilitates women's independence.

Vivie's masculine characteristics are also typical of New Woman as stated by J. Ellen Gainor:

The New Woman was noted for independence of spirit and action; she refused to conform to the conventional, male determined code of feminine behavior or to accept an inferior status legally, intellectually or socially. This personal adventurousness manifested itself externally in such "unwomanly" activities as cigarette smoking and in the rejection of traditional, purely decorative and cumbersome feminine attire in favor of a more practical wardrobe that suited in an active lifestyle. (15)

Vivie, as a representative of New Woman who has got male education and has acquired masculine behaviors, knows what independence is. She has her own free will and decisions. She is irritated by the idea of being dominated by someone, including her mother:

PRAED. [...] you are so different from her ideal.

VIVIE. Her what?!

PRAED. Her ideal.

VIVIE. Do you mean her ideal of ME?

PRAED. Yes.

VIVIE. What on earth is it like? (219)

Vivie does not want her mother to have an ideal image of her because of her free spirited personality. Also, she is shocked because of the apparent huge distance between the two women. Vivie claims that she does not know her mother much because she had grown up at school or college in London while her mother was working in Brussels and Vienna. Although she does not know her mother very much, she can easily guess the conventionality Mrs. Warren bears in her mind and heart. She predicts that Mrs. Warren will not let Vivie pursue the business she wants in Chancery Lane:

For the time being, Vivie is unaware of what the mysteries about her mother may be. She has just understood from Praed's words that there is a mystery: "Now your mother's life has been - er - I suppose you know-" (219). Instead of a feminine curiosity, Vivie uses her secret to gain power over her. Her manners portray a masculine woman not only in behavioral but also in mental sense as well.

The long dialogue between Praed and Vivie reveals Vivie's personality and the image of New Woman who has aspirations, education and stance. Vivie is at least as educated as a man; she has her own ideas and also wishes she wants to achieve. Both Vivie and Mrs. Warren want emancipation but their ideas of emancipated women are different. Mrs. Warren is the representative of the emancipated; however, still a conventional women. She has been emancipated from capitalist slavery but she is still the slave of the conventions.

While Vivie and Praed are carrying out their dialogue, Mrs. Kitty Warren, Vivie's mother, enters the stage through the door of the garden. She "*is between 40 and 50, formerly pretty, showily dressed in a brilliant hat and gay blouse fitting tightly over her bust and flanked by fashionable sleeves. Rather spoilt and domineering, and decidedly vulgar, but, on the whole, a genial and fairly*

presentable old blackguard of a woman" (220). Even at first sight, the way Mrs. Warren dresses creates a conflict with the way Vivie dresses. This can be interpreted as a foreshadowing for the upcoming dilemmas between the two women's tastes and world views.

Apparently, Vivie and her mother have not seen each other for a long while; however, the reunion scene does not depict the expected warmth between the two women. They are cold and unknown to each other. On the other hand, from the first minute on, the approach of Kitty towards Vivie is that of a stereotypical mother: overprotective and (seemingly) affectionate. She says, "Vivie: put your hat on, dear: you'll get sunburnt," (221) or "my little Vivie" (221) as she was talking to her in front of her visitors. Another indicator of the non-common mother-daughter relationship between Vivie and Kitty is Vivie's definition of their previous relationship. As declared by Vivie, she went to school in London all through her childhood while her mother was at work in Brussels and Vienna. However, Vivie has no sadness about this. She adds: "I don't complain: it's been very pleasant; for people have been very good to me; and there has always been plenty of money to make things smooth. But don't imagine I know anything about my mother. I know far less than you do" (219). Vivie's words here give the audience what kind of an image she has about her mother. Her mother mostly means "plenty of money" to be taken care of politely. Mrs. Warren also boasts of being able to provide Vivie with a comfortable life in which she does not have to make a choice between two types of abuse as her mother did. She seems to boast about Vivie's success when she is absent, as well. For example, it is apparent that Mrs. Warren has told about how successful her daughter is because when Crofts meets Vivie for the first time he says: "May I shake hands with a young lady whom I have known by reputation very long as the daughter of one of my oldest friends?" (221). She shakes his hand firmly as she has done Praed's. This cold greeting makes Crofts feel unhappy because he has been trying to arrange a marriage between himself and Mrs. Warren's "little Vivie". His foolish look "*with the handle of his stick in his mouth*" (222) depicts how strongly the two women

affect the men in the play. Mrs. Warren is very patronizing not only towards Vivie but also towards everybody around her. She dominates Crofts by saying: “Come! Sit up George; and take your stick out of your mouth” (222). Crofts “*sulkily obeys*” (222). Mrs. Warren, though being uneducated and motherly towards Vivie, represents many characteristics of the New Woman though it would be too sharp to claim that she is one of them.

It is clear that Mrs. Warren’s dominant manners are backed with the fear she creates on the ones who know her and her past. Praed informs the audience about her dominance on the ones around her by saying to Vivie: “Your mother is not to be trifled when she is angry” (220). Also when he wants to warn Mrs. Warren about her manners towards Vivie, he is extremely careful not to hurt her:

PRAED. [...] we had better get out of the habit of thinking of her as a little girl. You see she has really distinguished herself; and I'm not sure, from what I have seen of her, that she is not older than any of us. [...] But young people are particularly sensitive about being treated in that way.

MRS WARREN. Yes; and young people have to get all that nonsense taken out of them, and good deal more besides. Don't you interfere, Praddy: I know how to treat my own child as well as you do. (222)

At that moment, Crofts claims that Mrs. Warren is afraid of Praed. She says she is not but it is clear that she is. She might be afraid of the fact that what Praed has said is true or she might be afraid of some other reasons like the possibility of Praed’s declaration of her business. In the following exchange between Mrs. Warren and Praed she declares how eager she is to preserve the mother-daughter relationship with her daughter. When Praed reminds her that Vivie is a grown up woman who needs to be treated with respect, Mrs. Warren protests: “Respect! Treat my own daughter with respect! What next, pray!”(223). This stereotypical mother, Kitty Warren owns the daughter in return to giving her birth and paying for her expenses while she was growing up. Andrina Gilmartin comments on the possessive motherhood of Mrs. Warren: “Nor does introspection trouble Kitty. She assumes that the act of childbirth automatically makes a woman a mother, and she is confident that mothers know the best. Children, like chairs, belong to

the people in whose house they live” (145). Later on, the audience learns that Mrs. Warren does not even give a hint about who Vivie’s father might be. This is most probably because she wants to “keep the child all to herself” (225) and does not want to share her with a man. Her determination causes both Crofts and Praed feel insecure about themselves. They discuss who the father might be but they cannot even find a hint about it.

In the middle of their conversation, Frank Gardner comes in. He is a “*young gentleman*” who is “*pleasant, pretty, smartly dressed, cleverly good-for-nothing, not long turned 20, with a charming voice and agreeably disrespectful manners*” (225). Frank has come with a rifle to teach Vivie how to shoot. Shooting is also associated with man and again it seems that Vivie has another masculine habit. However, the relationship is not limited to this teacher-pupil relationship between Frank and Vivie respectively. They also have some sexual attraction which is revealed via the sexual game they play in the woods. Frank claims that Vivie loves him. However, in the play, as Arthur Ganz states, there is no “indication from Vivie that justifies Frank’s advances by pushing him away and saying she is ‘not in a humour for petting her little boy this evening’” (226) which shows a mother-child relationship between Vivie and Frank respectively and nothing more.

After Frank, his father, Reverend Samuel Gardner, comes onto the stage, “*pretentious, booming, noisy*” (226). He is another controversial character who represents the share of even religious institutions and people in the existence of the “dirty business”. As he is a clergy man, he is supposed to be clean, giving, tolerant and truthful. However, he is one of Mrs. Warren’s ex clients, which makes him a share holder in the business. Also, he wants to hide the reality which could damage his honesty.

Actually, as both a common man and a clergyman in authority, he is one of the victimizers of Mrs. Warren. His superficial idea of morality is reflected in his

criticism of Vivie because he has not “seen her at church since she came” (227). Though he is one of the causers of the “dirty business”, he can claim to have the right to criticize a woman for not visiting the church. His son, Frank mocks his situation saying: “Of course not: she's a third wrangler. Ever so intellectual. Took a higher degree than you did; so why should she go to hear you preach?” (227). Reverend Gardner is not even respected by his son, so he hides behind the title he carries as a Reverend.

Charles A. Berst states that what Frank said “would be insolent and shallow were it not so insolent and true” (*Bernard* 13). Reverend Gardner is a symbol to show “a Church incapacitated by its worldly representatives” (Berst *Bernard* 13). The more information is revealed by Reverend, the more corruption is observed in the society with the help of his characterization. He is a practical man using religion to hide behind. Moreover, he advises his son practical ways to abuse a woman in the following exchange:

FRANK. [...] What you actually said was that since I had neither brains nor money, I'd better turn my good looks to account by marrying someone with both. Well, look here. Miss Warren has brains: you can't deny that.

REV. S. Brains are not everything.

FRANK. No, of course not: theres the money—

REV. S. [*interrupting him austere*ly] I was not thinking of money, sir. I was speaking of higher things. Social position, for instance.

FRANK. I don't care a rap about that.

REV. S. But I do, sir. (227)

This dialogue reveals much about the two men in terms of their approach to women both in private and public sphere. Reverend Samuel thinks that a woman should bring money, intellect and social status to marry his “*good for nothing*” (228) son. Though Vivie has all these qualities, he objects to the affair claiming that her social status is corrupted because of her mother’s profession. However, actually, her social status is higher than anyone in the play because she is a Cambridge-educated-young-woman. Her social status is defected only because of her mother’s profession in which Samuel Gardner is also included. This conversation also reveals Frank’s real intentions in his wish to marry Vivie. It is

not out of love, interest or admiration. Frank wants to have a comfortable life in the future with the help of Vivie's money. He has been a parasite on his father all through his life. He wants to use Vivie's money in return for sharing her life and her bed with her. This is the exact male counterpart of female prostitution. Actually, this could be considered even worse because he sells not only his body but also his soul. Rather, what a prostitute does is just renting her body to be able to protect her independence. Frank chooses his way while a woman is forced to prostitution by the immoral institutions in the society.

In the relationship between Vivie and Frank both genders are far from the assigned gender roles. All the masculine descriptions of Vivie with whisky and cigars contradict with the adjective "pretty" used for Frank (Ganz 96).

Also, one secret about Reverend is revealed in the following dialogues between Frank and Samuel Gardner:

FRANK. Oh, come: I haven't been so very extravagant. I live ever so quietly; I don't drink; I don't bet much; and I never go regularly to the razzle-dazzle as you did when you were my age.

REV. S. [*booming hollowly*] Silence, sir.

FRANK. Well, you told me yourself, when I was making ever such an ass of myself about the barmaid at Redhill, that you once offered a woman fifty pounds for the letters you wrote to her when—

REV. S. [*terrified*] Sh-sh-sh, Frank, for Heaven's sake! (228)

The letters were written to Mrs. Warren by "an error" Reverend claimed to have "repented" all through his life. Therefore, it would not be unjust to claim that Reverend and Frank as well as the Duke of Wellington, who is mentioned to have an affair with one of the prostitutes clarify that people from all layers of society are, in one way or another, responsible for the profession Mrs. Warren is involved in.

The album of letters is important because it indicates that Mrs. Warren is able to manipulate men and gain power over them with her wit and foreseeing ability.

When she is offered money for the album of letters, she rejects and says “Knowledge is power...and I never sell power.” (229)

Mrs. Warren, despite the unconventional life she has chosen to pursue, is a conventional woman in the way she approaches life and her experiences. For example, she gave birth to Vivie as an unmarried woman. This seems to be a very unconventional behavior. However, she also must have been disturbed by this because she calls herself with the title Mrs. ;and she has created a new surname for herself.

REV. S. [*miserably confused*] Miss Vavasour, I believe.
MRS WARREN [*correcting him in a loud whisper*] Tsch! Nonsense! Mrs Warren:
don't you see my daughter there? (230)

Mrs. Warren's conflict about her choice and her ideals is not represented in a biased way in the play. In the following acts, the audience sees that her dilemmas are represented in both edges, which adds to the reality of the theme.

Act II opens with an awkward scene between Mrs. Warren and Frank. They are sitting in the garden while Mrs. Warren is complaining about her boredom there because of lack of anything to do. Meanwhile, there occurs a physical closeness between Frank and Mrs. Warren while she is putting off her shawl. Frank “helps her to take off her shawl, gallantly giving her shoulders a very perceptible squeeze as he does so” (232). Mrs. Warren notices the attraction but “she goes to the hearth to be farther from temptation” (232). Her following utterances, however, opens her mind to the audience about the attraction she feels towards Frank. She says, “I know you through and through by your likeness to your father, better than you know yourself. Don't you go taking any silly ideas into your head about me. Do you hear?” (232). Frank gives the answer Mrs. Warren desires to hear: “Can't help it, my dear Mrs Warren: it runs in the family.[...] *She pretends to box his ears; then looks at the pretty laughing upturned face of a moment, tempted. At last she kisses him, and immediately turns away, out of patience with herself*”. (232)

Afterwards, she adds “Never you mind, my dear: it's only a motherly kiss. Go and make love to Vivie.” (232)

This scene is of importance to interpret the moral understanding of Mrs. Warren. On one hand, she is a morally corrupted woman to seduce a “young boy” in her own words. On the other hand, she actually tries to keep away from the temptation because in her mind she knows that it is a wicked behavior. Namely, similar to overall flow of her life, she again knows that she does something against the morality of the society, which does not stop her from doing so.

Her word to Frank saying “Go and make love to Vivie” is not an intentional utterance meaning that they really should have an affair. She just wants to remind that he is at an age suitable to be her son. Also, her so-called “motherly kiss” shows that despite what she does a few minutes before, she wants to conserve her respectable status. When she comes to learn that Vivie and Frank are “ever such chums” (232), she reasserts her position as the conventional mother. She warns him that “Now see here: I won't have any young scamp tampering with my little girl. Do you hear? I won't have it” (232). Both this statement and the preceding ones about how little a boy Frank is, in addition to her negative approach to Vivie when she goes to the hill with Praed without asking her permission and staying there after dark, indicate the conventional idea that children can never be grown ups for parents. Her stereotypical figure of motherhood does not change from the beginning of the play to the end though the reasons of the conflicts she experiences are shed light on to some extent.

For Mrs. Warren, it is her right to treat Vivie as a little girl. On the other hand, she believes that Vivie is a grown up woman to make her own mind about marriage. In a way as many conventional mothers, she might even be pleased with the idea of her daughter's marriage. At first Mrs. Warren does not object to the marriage because Reverend Samuel objects to the possible marriage due to her profession and this cannot be a reason for Mrs. Warren. However, when Crofts makes her

realize that Frank does not have any qualifications of a husband because he does not have money to keep a family on, Mrs. Warren directly objects to the marriage. For Mrs. Warren this marriage is impossible not because of her past with Frank's father but because she believes that Frank is not worth of her daughter.

Another proposal to Vivie comes from Crofts, who has all the qualities that Frank lacks as a husband. He offers a cheque to Mrs. Warren on which she can "name any figure" (239) in return for her daughter. He, in a way, wants to buy Vivie from Mrs. Warren. Like the former suitor, Crofts cannot make Mrs. Warren happy. She immediately refuses the marriage because she does not want her daughter to marry this "stingy" and "vicious" man (240).

The proposals of these two men to Vivie, portray Bernard Shaw's approach to the marriage institution. Frank and Crofts symbolize two opposite edges of types of men in marriage. Frank represents the type of Womanly Woman who marries to gain an affluent life. In other words, he is the representative of women who sell their body to live comfortably using the name of the institution of marriage. On the contrary, Crofts represents the type of men who have all the economic welfare to present to a woman but no love or affection. Moreover, both of these men are the samples of parasites living on other people's efforts and hard work. Frank lives on his father without anything to do. Similarly, Crofts lives on his employees. To marry one of these parasitic men is not what is expected from an Unwomanly Woman like Vivie.

After the men leave the stage, Vivie and Mrs. Warren engage in a discussion which can be considered as the heart of the play. This discussion causes Mrs. Warren and Vivie to make some decisions and mature via their struggle to be able to make up their minds. After the men leave, Vivie learns that her mother plans to live with her until she gets married. Vivie suddenly rejects this idea claiming that she has her own way of life. However, for a conventional mother like Mrs. Warren, it looks odd that a young woman like Vivie has a personal way of life.

Vivie's self esteem and confident voice drive her mother crazy and she gets a very stereotypical parental criticism because of that.

MRS WARREN. You and your way of life, indeed! What next? [...] Your way of life will be what I please, so it will. [...] Do you know who you're speaking to, Miss?
VIVIE [*looking across at her without raising her head from her book*] No. Who are you? What are you? (242)

The last question turns Mrs Warren into a Victorian woman with her vulnerable and fragile identity ready to cry at any time. In contrast, Vivie, not only with her words but also with her manners and body language sets the example of an Unwomanly Woman. She changes the topic of the argument very sharply and she does not utter emotional impulses. She talks directly, without implied phrases or sentences. Most importantly, typical to a man, when Mrs. Warren starts crying, she gets angry and warns her that if she cries, she will go out of the room. The scene is visualized not like an argument between two women who are closest in relation but like an argument between a vulnerable woman and her indifferent husband. The indifferent husband, Vivie, wants her freedom while the symbolic wife, Mrs. Warren tries to rule her man with her tears. This very stereotypical atmosphere underlines how unwomanly Vivie is in terms of her behavior and manners.

Moreover, Vivie is not a typical daughter for her mother concerning her questions about her father. She asks "Who was my father?" (244). The use of past tense here indicates that she does not care about having a father or not at that moment. She does not seem to be much interested in who the father could be. She just needs to be assured that she does not "have the contaminated blood of that brutal waster [Crofts] in [her] veins" (245).

Up to this point, in Act II, in the power struggle between the Shavian unwomanly heroine and womanly heroine, the winner seems to be the former, Vivie. Vivie, uses the superiority her education provides her with in her quarrel with her

mother. At this point Mrs Warren gets really upset about how the daughter she has brought up could be so hard on her. She says:

MRS WARREN. You! you've no heart. [...] Oh, I won't bear it: I won't put up with the injustice of it. What right have you to set yourself up above me like this? You boast of what you are to me—to *me*, who gave you a chance of being what you are. What chance had I? Shame on you for a bad daughter and a stuck-up prude!
VIVIE [*sitting down with a shrug, no longer confident; for her replies, which have sounded sensible and strong to her so far, now begin to ring rather woodenly and even priggishly against the new tone of her mother*] Don't think for a moment I set myself above you in any way. You attacked me with the conventional authority of a mother: I defended myself with the conventional superiority of a respectable woman.
(242)

This exchange towards the end of Act II carries the play to a climactic point. At this point, the power switches from Vivie to Mrs. Warren and then Mrs. Warren to Vivie respectively. This shift does not indicate a shift of power between the conventional and the unconventional woman. Rather it indicates the shift in the character of Mrs. Warren herself. Mrs. Warren in her womanly manners loses the battle with her daughter; however, when she is armed with her logical supports and decisive manners concerning her past, her daughter, Vivie is spellbound. Vivie also realizes that Mrs. Warren has very meaningful points as well. As a very important step in her maturation process, another world with very difficult and different conditions for women is opened to Vivie:

MRS WARREN. My own opinions and my own way of life! Listen to her talking! Do you think I was brought up like you? able to pick and choose my own way of life? Do you think I did what I did because I liked it, or thought it right, or wouldn't rather have gone to college and been a lady if I'd had the chance?
VIVIE. Everybody has some choice, mother. The poorest girl alive may not be able to choose between being Queen of England or Principal of Newnham; but she can choose between ragpicking and flowerselling, according to her taste. People are always blaming circumstances for what they are. I don't believe in circumstances. The people who get on in this world are the people who get up and look for the circumstances they want, and, if they can't find them, make them. (246)

Though Vivie believes that everyone has an opportunity of choice in life, after she hears what the choices Mrs. Warren had, she supports her mother's decision. She experiences the climax of her relationship with her mother. Although most modern readers claim that the climax of the play can be regarded as the moment

Vivie learns about her mother's profession, the moment she learns about how harsh the world is on woman can be regarded as a more important climactic point in this play because it carries Vivie a step further in her maturation process.

MRS WARREN. [...] Would you like to know what *my* circumstances were? [She plants her chair farther forward with brazen energy, and sits down. Vivie is impressed in spite of herself]. D'you know what your gran'mother was? ... She called herself a widow and had a fried-fish shop down by the Mint, and kept herself and four daughters out of it. Two of us were sisters: that was me and Liz; and we were both good-looking and well made. ... The other two were only half sisters: undersized, ugly, starved looking, hard working, honest poor creatures ... They were the respectable ones. Well, what did they get by their respectability? ... One of them worked in a whitelead factory twelve hours a day for nine shillings a week until she died of lead poisoning ... The other was always held up to us as a model because she married a Government laborer in the Deptford victualling yard, and kept his room and the three children neat and tidy on eighteen shillings a week—until he took to drink. That was worth being respectable for, wasn't it? (247)

The choices presented to Mrs. Warren made this conventional woman take an unconventional step and turn to the oldest profession because as presented in the quotation above, prostitution is the most moral of the immoral choices presented to her. Actually it was the only way to survive for a woman in a society in which a respectable woman was the one who let her body and soul be exploited by some men either by marriage or by inhumane conditions of work.

This discussion represents some of the main conflicts in the play. It depicts the conflicts “between the self deceived and those who perceive themselves accurately; between seeking truth and attempting to preserve illusions by concealing it, between conventional and unconventional behavior- and from the several reversals of the parent and child roles” (Crane 34).

According to Crane, “Vivie's progression from ignorance to knowledge is temporarily detoured by Mrs. Warren's disarming her into believing that she has given up prostitution.” (Crane 37). Vivie's awakening to social realities start with this discussion; however, is not complete yet because of her ignorance about the continuity of her mother's profession.

This very “unpleasant” speech is the most unpleasant attack on the society and social institutions by Bernard Shaw because of the correctness and bitterness of the utterances. Vivie, who had the chance to be educated and to have a “way of life” (246) with the help of the money coming from the dirty business, has no idea about the choices provided to her mother or to her sex in some other parts of her country or the world. Mrs. Warren realizing that her daughter is really ignorant and naive about the harshness of the society on poor women who have no other way than letting themselves be spoilt in one way or the other, tells the stories of her sisters. These stories aim at diminishing the ignorance of not only the Cambridge graduate Vivie but also of the common man who see or read the play. Being respectable brings evil to poor women. Therefore, these poor women have to gain their own respectability by choosing unconventional jobs, as Aunt Lizzie and Mrs. Warren did.

2.3 LATER STAGES OF VIVIE'S MATURATION

Now that she has learnt about the circumstances leading Mrs. Warren to her profession, Vivie is ready to hear her mother's story. As an alternative to what her half sisters have experienced, Mrs. Warren goes on telling what has happened to her sister Lizzie and herself.

Lizzie like Mrs. Warren has a mind in business. She goes to the same school and after a while she leaves it. She starts the business. Also, she is the one introducing the business to Mrs. Warren. They have raised capital and set up their own businesses.

In addition, the economic truth that Mrs. Warren puts forward about how little women are paid serve as a tool to criticize another ill-constructed institution in the society. Women are exploited not only in private but also in public sphere by being underpaid and overworked. Vivie, still on the way of illumination, asks "but why did you choose that business? Saving money and good management will succeed in any business" (247). However, when Mrs. Warren reminds her that to save money one should *have* it first, she is "certainly quite justified—from the business point of view" according to Vivie (247).

Another disturbing figure in the play is another woman, aunt Liz. Despite her indirect involvement in the play, she introduces another important "unpleasantness" to the play. Aunt Liz, who started the job first and introduced it to her sister Kitty is "living down at Winchester now, close to the cathedral, one of the most respectable ladies there. Chaperones girls at the country ball, if you please" (247). Namely with the tainted money she could get out of the dirty business; she could have bought a very clean and respectable place in the society. In other words, honor and respectability are for sale in the society and they can be

bought no matter how the money is earned. Different from Kitty, Aunt Liz quit the job after she bought the house near the cathedral and the honor she wished.

Vivie experiences a kind of epiphany after she learns that her mother really had to choose the business; and she and her mother were quite alike in the sense that they had a mind in business. Her mother was good at not only in saving money but also good in making her choices because what she has chosen seems to be the most meaningful of all. However, she is still not sure whether her mother really does not regret what she has done or she would suggest the same to her if she were in the same situation as her mother was when she was young.

Mrs. Warren is so sure of her choice that she gives a very self-confident answer to Vivie. She even stresses that every mother loving her daughter could and should suggest her path to their daughters. When Vivie asks if she would suggest to stay in Waterloo bar or marry a laborer if she were in the same circumstances, Mrs. Warren replies without hesitance

MRS WARREN [*indignantly*] Of course not. What sort of mother do you take me for! How could you keep your self-respect in such starvation and slavery? And what's a woman worth? what's life worth? without self-respect! Why am I independent and able to give my daughter a first-rate education, when other women that had just as good opportunities are in the gutter? Because I always knew how to respect myself and control myself. Why is Liz looked up to in a cathedral town? The same reason. Where would we be now if we'd minded the clergyman's foolishness? Scrubbing floors for one and sixpence a day and nothing to look forward to but the workhouse infirmary. Don't you be led astray by people who don't know the world, my girl. The only way for a woman to provide for herself decently is for her to be good to some man that can afford to be good to her. If she's in his own station of life, let her make him marry her; but if she's far beneath him she can't expect it: why should she? it wouldn't be for her own happiness. Ask any lady in London society that has daughters; and she'll tell you the same, except that I tell you straight and she'll tell you crooked. That's all the difference. (248)

Mrs. Warren, as can be concluded from the speech above, believes that prostitution is not a way to lose her self respect. On the contrary, she believes that choosing to pay all one's effort on some other people's benefit can cause the loss of self-respect. Making her own choice and being a successful business woman were the way to keep her self-respect for Kitty and the other women who believed

in a so-called honorable life could never be honorable in the slavery and starvation they had to live in. With her choice, she not only saved her own respectability and life but also provided a very comfortable and honorable one to her daughter. As Bernard F. Dukore states, Mrs. Warren just hired her body to some men in return to a comfortable life instead of selling both her body and soul to one man in return for starvation and exploitation (75). Her contempt for the institution of marriage is very obvious in her words “What is any respectable girl brought up to do but to catch some rich man's fancy and get the benefit of his money by marrying him?—as if a marriage ceremony could make any difference in the right or wrong of the thing! Oh, the hypocrisy of the world makes me sick!” (250) Namely, the most important difference between what she does and what a respectable woman does is the signature procedure. This is again a very unacceptable and rebellious idea not only for late 19th century reader but even for the early 21st century reader, as well.

With no capital or education and with independent mind and soul, prostitution was “far better than any other employment open to her” (250). At this point, in Mrs. Warren’s voice Bernard Shaw’s protesting ideas to this corrupted hypocrisy is felt: “I always thought that it oughtn't to be. It *can't* be right, Vivie, that there shouldn't be better opportunities for women. I stick to that: it's wrong” (250).

In this wrong system, Mrs. Warren gains a place by hard work and business wisdom. She goes on as the exploiter in the system she was once exploited as a prostitute. However, she does not believe in the wickedness of managing a brothel because she believes that “The house in Brussels was real high class: a much better place for a woman to be in than the factory where Anne Jane got poisoned. None of the girls were ever treated as [she] was treated in the scullery of that temperance place, or at the Waterloo bar, or at home.” (248) That is, the exploitation she provides to her employees is still a much better choice for them as they can have a much better-off life there than anywhere else including their homes. The mention of home here is another criticism to private patriarchy, the

patriarchy exposed on women in private sphere. Namely, women are not and cannot be satisfied in their own homes as well. She is in a way happy and proud to provide employment to her own sex in such a high-class house in Brussels.

Absolutely, Mrs. Warren does not glorify prostitution. She only tries to support her choice presenting the unjust economic paradigms of the society. She also says that no woman would choose prostitution as a job for pleasure (250). Also she adds that the girls doing this business have to “bear with disagreeables and take the rough with the smooth, just like a nurse in a hospital or anyone else” (250). The mention of nurses indicates the difficult nature of the job and how all professions, both acceptable and unacceptable ones, are similarly exploitative in the existing capitalist paradigms. When it is considered that being a nurse is a gendered job specific to women, one can also conclude that the exploitive nature of jobs unique to women set a harsher sample. Other examples of such difficult jobs are mentioned in the play via the work experiences of Mrs. Warren. Working as a barmaid or in a factory does not pay enough to survive and they exploit the laborers, especially women.

With Mrs. Warren’s story and explanations, Vivie sees another world in which she was not involved in thanks to her mother’s decision and hard work. After having been informed about how her mother has achieved to raise in the social ladder, she appreciates her mother and sympathizes with her. She praises her mother by saying how strong her mother is to choose her life line herself even in such miserable conditions mentioned by Mrs. Warren. Act II closes just after the audience observes Vivie’s admiration of her mother and saying “My dear mother: you are stronger than all England” (251).

This scene in which the daughter learns about her mother can be regarded as the heart of the play. According to Arthur Ganz this scene has economic, psychological and theatrical resonances (92). In the 19th century, the fallen woman was a very commonly used theme but Mrs. Warren is very different from

the other examples with her sensibility and plenty of character. She is a convincing woman “practical and hard-headed in her business, peevish and possessive with her daughter, sensual but realistic with the daughter’s young man, proud of her success but commonplace in mind, vulgar but easy-going enough” (Ganz, George 92). In addition, she is very convincing in her explanation of her reasoning about her business.

Act II opens in the old rectory garden, Reverend Samuel and Frank waiting for Mrs. Warren for breakfast. Praed is the first to arrive and Vivie and Mrs. Warren are the second. They come the way with Vivie’s right hand on her mother’s waist. Disturbed by the scene Frank mocks Mrs. Warren saying “Ever so delighted to see you, Mrs. Warren. This quiet old rectory garden becomes you perfectly.” (257) This mockery is understood by Vivie who is more affectionate about her mother at that very moment than she has ever been:

VIVIE. No. I want to give you a warning, Frank. You were making fun of my mother just now when you said that about the rectory garden. That is barred in the future. Please treat my mother with as much respect as you treat your own.

FRANK. My dear Viv: she wouldn't appreciate it: the two cases require different treatment. But what on earth has happened to you? Last night we were perfectly agreed as to your mother and her set. This morning I find you attitudinizing sentimentally with your arm around your parent's waist.

VIVIE [*flushing*] Attitudinizing!

FRANK. That was how it struck me. First time I ever saw you do a second-rate thing.

VIVIE [*controlling herself*] Yes, Frank: there has been a change: but I don't think it a change for the worse. Yesterday I was a little prig.

FRANK. And today?

VIVIE [*wincing; then looking at him steadily*] Today I know my mother better than you do. (258)

This exchange is of importance as it clarifies that the change in Vivie’s personality is both realized by Frank and assured by Vivie, herself. From a “prig”, she turned out to be a more knowledgeable grown up woman knowing more about both her mother and life:

FRANK. Viv: theres a freemasonry among thoroughly immoral people that you know nothing of. You've too much character. *That's* the bond between your mother and me: that's why I know her better than youll ever know her.

VIVIE. You are wrong: you know nothing about her. If you knew the circumstances against which my mother had to struggle— (258)

[...]

FRANK [*gracefully*] [...] It's no use, Viv: your mother's impossible. She may be a good sort; but she's a bad lot, a very bad lot.

VIVIE [*hotly*] Frank—! [*He stands his ground. She turns away and sits down on the bench under the yew tree, struggling to recover her self-command. Then she says*] Is she to be deserted by the world because she's what you call a bad lot? Has she no right to live? (259)

In the speech above, she wants to give the reasons why her mother had to make such a decision. However, Frank is so much obsessed with the mother's past and the sexual temptation they have experienced towards each other that he cannot bear thinking of Vivie and Kitty together.

Towards the middle of Act III, another climactic point changing the course of action takes place. Vivie and Crofts have a conversation in private. First, Crofts proposes to Vivie and Vivie turns down his proposal decisively. However, Crofts is insistent and he explains how good a husband he can become because of his well being. Also, as he is still a business partner with Mrs. Warren, it will turn out to be a family business and it will be a very practical marriage, too.

Vivie is devastated to learn that the business is still going on. She wishes to learn the details from Crofts and she does. As she says she does not want to be involved in the business, Crofts reminds her that actually she has always been in the business. This awakening is another turning point in Vivie's maturation process, which is also a very important factor in her final decision.

More bewilderingly, Vivie realizes that she was also a shareholder in the business. All her respectable upbringing and education was provided by the money coming from prostitution. However, she still goes on defending her mother because of the empathy she could establish the day before:

VIVIE [*conscience stricken*] You might go on to point out that I myself never asked where the money I spent came from. I believe I am just as bad as you.

CROFTS [*greatly reassured*] Of course you are

[...]

VIVIE. My mother was a very poor woman who had no reasonable choice but to do as she did. You were a rich gentleman; and you did the same for the sake of 35 per cent. You are a pretty common sort of scoundrel, I think. That is my opinion of you. (264)

Though she seems to be right in her defense of her mother, there is one point Vivie is able to catch yet. “In the process of beating the system at its own game Mrs. Warren has herself become the personification of the capitalist, exploiting both the desperation of poverty and the conflict between sexuality and social mores, thereby having a vested interest in perpetuating the idealism of Victorian prudery” (Whitman 194).

Although Vivie is still immature in some aspects of her understanding of the business, she is matured enough to accept her own presence in the business. By not asking where the money she lived on comes from, she is also contaminated. Her ignorance brings wickedness on her side. Not only the money she got from her mother but also her scholarship is tainted as the Crofts scholarship was provided by Crofts’s brother, the MP. By giving Crofts an MP brother who is also exploitive in his business life, exploiting girls in inhumane conditions in his factories, George Bernard Shaw broadens the target of his accusation. Not only the clergymen as in the personification of Reverend Samuel but also intellectual people like Vivie or politicians like Crofts the MP are involved in the business. Crofts multiplies the examples:

CROFTS [...]you wouldn't refuse the acquaintance of my mother's cousin the Duke of Belgravia because some of the rents he gets are earned in queer ways. You wouldn't cut the Archbishop of Canterbury, I suppose, because the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have a few publicans and sinners among their tenants. Do you remember your Crofts scholarship at Newnham? Well, that was founded by my brother the M.P. He gets his 22 per cent out of a factory with 600 girls in it, and not one of them getting wages enough to live on. (265)

As is clear, the society is both the cause of the dirty business and the one damning it. Crofts is bitter enough to go on saying that there is almost no one living on moral principles in the society. He adds:

CROFTS If you're going to pick and choose your acquaintances on moral principles, you'd better clear out of this country, unless you want to cut yourself out of all decent society.[...] As long as you don't fly openly in the face of society, society doesn't ask any inconvenient questions; and it makes precious short work of the cads who do. There are no secrets better kept than the secrets everybody guesses. In the class of people I can introduce you to, no lady or gentleman would so far forget themselves as to discuss my business affairs or your mothers. (265)

At this point Vivie comes to a full realization that her mother turned out to be the victimizer or the abuser in the society in which she was once the abused and victimized. Her empathy and understanding towards her mother is replaced by disgust and she expresses her feelings saying “When I think of the society that tolerates you, and the laws that protect you! when I think of how helpless nine out of ten young girls would be in the hands of you and my mother! the unmentionable woman and her capitalist bully—“ (266). What drives Vivie crazy is not her mother’s individual choice but her being incapable of knowing the social meaning of what she is doing. Vivie is angry with the hypocrisy Mrs. Warren carries despite her claim to hate it. At first Vivie understands her mother because she sees that her mother had to free herself from poverty. However, after her conversation with Crofts she realizes that her mother has chosen to be a part of the system which urged her to the business.

Another point in Act III, attracting much attention by the critics is the hint of incest put forward by Crofts. It was previously revealed that there was an affair between Vivie and Frank. The possibility of Reverend Samuel’s fathering Vivie is really disturbing for the audience as it turns the affair between Vivie and Frank into incest. Though this is an emphasized point in many resources, it is not given importance to by either the main characters in the play or Bernard Shaw himself. This possibility only serves as an excuse for Vivie to leave Frank and go on her own way at the end of Act III. However, in the play this excuse is not emphasized and clearly Vivie and Frank do not care about this possibility very much. Vivie rejects marrying Frank both because of the possibility of a kinship and also because she wants to remain single.

VIVIE. Goodbye. [*She makes for the gate*].
FRANK [*jumping up*] Hallo! Stop! Viv! Viv! [*She turns in the gateway*] Where are you going to? Where shall we find you?
VIVIE. At Honoria Fraser's chambers, 67 Chancery Lane, for the rest of my life.
(267)

Vivie's leave is to create not only a physical but also a social distance with the people in the cottage. She leaves the people behind as well. Her abandonment underlines her attempt to break social immoralities she was offered to be involved.

Act IV starts in Vivie's office when Frank comes to visit her. Frank still approaches to her with affection but Vivie is very determined to reject "love's young dream"(272) personified in the character of Frank. She is not definitely influenced by the suggested incest; however, she still believes that "brother and sister would be a very suitable relation for [them]" (271). This is because she decides to remain unmarried in a "typical New Woman fashion" (Gainor 35). Similarly, Vivie rejects romance and beauty by rejecting Praed because Vivie is not a romantic woman. She does not want to be involved in unproductive activities which are a waste of time. Also, the places Praed invites Vivie are the ones in which her mother is pursuing her profession. Therefore, Vivie's rejection might also have stemmed from her desire to be distant from the business she does not want to participate in. As Vivie is very insistent on her decision, she stops the men who persist on their proposals saying "there are two subjects I want dropped, if you dont mind. One of them [*to Frank*] is love's young dream in any shape or form: the other [*to Praed*] is the romance and beauty of life [...] I must be treated as a "woman of business, permanently single [*to Frank*] and permanently unromantic [*to Praed*] (274). Such words are indicators of her maturation as well because she apparently had an affair with Frank and her answer has been shaped during the play not before it. According to Berst, Frank, with his laziness and tendency to abuse, is no different from Crofts (*Propaganda* 396).

In Act IV, Mrs. Warren and Vivie meet again which is expressed with the metaphor of “steam roller” (274). Vivie, according to Praed, is going to be as dangerous as a steam roller for her mother. At first Mrs. Warren goes on with her motherly attitude without the knowledge of her daughter’s final decisions. After Mrs. Warren and Vivie are left alone, Vivie makes it clear that she is to “go [her] own way in [her] own business and [her] own friends. And [Mrs. Warren] will go [hers]” (280). This is not only a physical separation as Vivie rejects the monthly allowance she used to get from her mother.

This scene is not about the economic paradigm or criticism of the business. This scene is a severe criticism of the hypocrisy created by the society. In the course of the play, Vivie comes to a realization of people who believe in one life but live in another with the examples of her mother, Crofts or Reverend Samuel. Her decision is the rejection of the institutions of hypocrisy in the person of her mother. “If I had been you, mother, I might have done as you did; but I should not have lived one life and believed in another. You are a conventional woman at heart. That is why I am bidding you goodbye now. I am right, am I not?” Her decision is not an emotional but a conscious one. She follows her unwomanly path in her decision as she makes up her mind to survive on her own leaving her mother’s hypocrisy behind. Her main concern is the reason why her mother pursues the job:

VIVIE. [...]Tell me why you continue your business now that you are independent of it.

MRS WARREN. Oh, it's all very easy for Liz: she likes good society, and has the air of being a lady. Imagine *me* in a cathedral town! Why, the very rooks in the trees would find me out even if I could stand the dulness of it. I must have work and excitement, or I should go melancholy mad. And what else is there for me to do? The life suits me: I'm fit for it and not for anything else. If I didn't do it somebody else would; so I don't do any real harm by it. And then it brings in money; and I like making money. (274)

Mrs. Warren is very forthright in this conversation due to her self-awareness. As mentioned before, Mrs. Warren is not a stereotypical womanly or unwomanly woman. She is conventional in some aspects of her life as in motherhood. Her

conventionality is what disturbs her daughter who has gained all the high privileges like education money and thus a higher social status. On the other hand, she is an unconventional woman in her business life. She is also aware that she cannot hide her former business from the others. She feels that the job really suits her. When all these reasons are taken into consideration, it can be inferred that she gets pleasure out of her job and actually out of having a job. She is a powerful unwomanly woman with ambition and passion for work.

Later in the conversation Mrs. Warren explains that she “can't give it up—not for anybody. But what need you know about it? I'll never mention it. I'll keep Crofts away. I'll not trouble you much: you see I have to be constantly running about from one place to another. You'll be quit of me altogether when I die.” (284).

She openly states that she is never going to quit her job for Vivie. Though it does not change Vivie's mind, it is obvious that what parts Vivie and Kitty is the similarity between them. Both of them want to be independent and they want a life of work. They cannot imagine themselves without anything to do. Vivie puts this similarity into words saying “I am my mother's daughter. I am like you: I must have work, and must make more money than I spend. But my work is not your work, and my way is not your way. We must part. It will not make much difference to us: instead of meeting one another for perhaps a few months in twenty years, we shall never meet: that's all” (284).

There is an irony in the fact that Mrs. Warren is aware of the social conventions and what is right or wrong. She also believes that it would be more accurate to quit her job and pursue a more acceptable life because she does not need the job any more. She praises her sister Liz for the life she chooses; however, her nature is not suitable to quit being a woman of business. Nonetheless, this biological and genetic bond between the two women is not effective in keeping them together as the unconventional spirit Vivie achieves and the decision she makes is because of the realization she gains in the play.

At the end of the play, the two women bid good-bye to each other. This goodbye makes Mrs. Warren angry because she thinks that her investment for more than twenty years has been in vain. She says that if she had the chance again she would bring up her daughter as a different woman. She says:

MRS WARREN. Do you know what I would do with you if you were a baby again? [...]
No: I'd bring you up to be a real daughter to me, and not what you are now, with your pride and your prejudices and the college education you stole from me: yes, stole: deny it if you can: what was it but stealing? I'd bring you up in my own house, I would. (285)

Here, Mrs. Warren makes a very realistic statement about the devotion she makes. She believes that she has done her best as a mother while Vivie does not fulfill her duties as a daughter. This is true in a conventional sense because Vivie chooses her independence over her mother. However, as an unwomanly woman Vivie possesses neither the heart nor the mind to follow such conventional ideas.

Vivie seems to have accomplished her maturation process. Furthermore, Mrs. Warren's last words serve directly to blame the target of the play, which is society and hypocrisy. These lines seem to belong not only to Kitty but also to Bernard Shaw, as well.

MRS WARREN. Vivie: the big people, the clever people, the managing people, all know it. They do as I do, and think what I think. I know plenty of them. I know them to speak to, to introduce you to, to make friends of for you. I don't mean anything wrong: that's what you don't understand: your head is full of ignorant ideas about me. What do the people that taught you know about life or about people like me? When did they ever meet me, or speak to me, or let anyone tell them about me? the fools! [...]
Oh, the injustice of it! the injustice! the injustice! I always wanted to be a good woman. I tried honest work; and I was slave-driven until I cursed the day I ever heard of honest work. I was a good mother; and because I made my daughter a good woman she turns me out as if I were a leper. Oh, if I only had my life to live over again! I'd talk to that lying clergyman in the school. From this time forth, so help me Heaven in my last hour, I'll do wrong and nothing but wrong. And I'll prosper on it. (285)

As can be understood from the speech above, Mrs. Warren and Vivie are both aware of the fact that Mrs. Warren's choice is the most moral one among the other

possibilities. Both women are capable of seeing the reality without illusions. Different from Mrs. Warren, who prefers to be a part of the already existing system, Vivie, as the representative of unwomanly woman, chooses to reject what is presented by this system and succeeds in doing so. She achieves to gain her independence, which is difficult even to attempt for many of her sex. Her life is not full of daughterly and womanly issues.

To sum up, Vivie is irritated by knowing very little about her mother at the beginning of the play. She reacts in a rebellious way. After a short while, she sympathizes with her mother learning about the difficult conditions she had to struggle with. She even adores her mother as she thinks that her mother is a very strong woman. However, in Act III, she learns that the profession still goes on. Moreover, Crofts claims that Vivie is also guilty as she shares the profit of the business. Vivie decides to part from her mother as she doesn't want to be a partner in their business. This thought culminates her in her final decision, which is the separation of the mother and the daughter.

Vivie, throughout these experiences, turns out to be a mature woman from a naive one keeping her unwomanly characteristics. The play starts with a Cambridge graduate unconventional woman still in need of her mother's financial support. She, at the end, manages to emancipate herself from her mother and the social boundaries for a woman, like marriage. This shows that Vivie is a representative of New Woman dreamed and depicted by Bernard Shaw.

CHAPTER III: ELIZA'S CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT IN *PYGMALION*

3.1 BACKGROUND ABOUT THE PLAY

George Bernard Shaw was inspired by two main legends in writing his play *Pygmalion*. Pygmalion is a character in Greek mythology. According to Ovid's interpretation of the poem (43 B.C- A.D. 18) named *Metamorphoses*, Pygmalion is a sculptor who is determined not to fall in love. "He [lives] in preference, for many years unmarried" (Ovid 79). He devotes all his life to his art. The sculptor carves the figure of a woman. He is so successful in carving the woman that he finally falls in love with the woman he has created. He expresses his passionate love in his prayers. Venus, the goddess of love, pities him and turns the sculpture into a real human being. Pygmalion cannot believe his eyes at first but later on he feels the warmth of the ivory lady and understands that his wish has been granted. He names his woman as "Galatea". They get married and

"...a lovely boy was born;
Paphos his name, who grown to manhood, wall'd
The city Paphos, from the founder call'd" (wikipedia)

Moreover, Shaw owes to the legend of "King Cophetua and the beggar maid". In this legend the King does not have interest in woman. However, one day he falls in love with a beggar-girl and takes her to educate and be his queen (wikipedia). Shaw, owing to these two legends, wrote his play *Pygmalion* with Higgins as the King or Pygmalion and Eliza as Galatea or the beggar-girl-originated Queen.

Despite the differences, there are many similarities between the legend's and Shaw's *Pygmalion*. The legendary Pygmalion creates a sculpture but he fails to create the soul for her. Therefore, she only fits to be the queen. Likewise, Higgins

in Shavian *Pygmalion* creates a new woman out of a flower-girl and similar to his predecessors he fails to help her be fit for something. Eliza, the new version of the statue is a lady-like behaving woman without a profession to pursue.

In spite of the inspiration Shaw has got from these legends, the works bear a lot of difference in both theme and plot. The main difference between these legends and Shaw's *Pygmalion* is the lack of a heartbreaking emotional love and a happy ending. Although "it is labeled as a 'romantic comedy', it ought to be termed as an 'intellectual comedy'" (Valayka 68). Also in his 1916 preface, he added that the word "Romance" in the title meant to suggest the romance of "Eliza's social transfiguration" (qtd in Gibbs 334). It is a romance "because it is the story of a poor girl who meets a gentleman at a church door and is transformed by him like Cinderella, into a beautiful lady" (Dukore 63). The Pygmalion of the Shavian story is Henry Higgins, who is turned into a realistic character with his thoughts, manners and shortcomings. The sculpture or the beggar girl happens to be Eliza, who does not fall in love with Higgins and avoids the possible happy ending similar to the legendary ones.

The Edwardian age showed huge differences between the rich and the poor due to the effect of the industrial revolution. There were many indicators of status, of course; however, there was a sign that was difficult to change: the accent. The rigid division of social classes also reflected itself in daily speech. For Shaw, the difference between a flower girl and a duchess was a matter of education and accent and not, as romantics held, one of birth and breeding" (Alexander 20). Therefore, the main focus in Shaw's *Pygmalion* is that it depicts how important dialect is in deciding the social classes. In his play, Shaw depicts the class distinctions and the importance of language in creating an identity as well as the relationship between men and women as a teacher-pupil or parental sense.

In his version of *Pygmalion*, Shaw encounters a very "Shavian theme" which is the clash between social institutions with the people living with them and for

them. In the play *Mrs. Warren's Profession*, Vivie claims that everyone has a choice in life. Even the poorest woman in the world has a choice between rag-picking and flower-selling. So does Eliza. She makes her choice and chooses to sell flowers and begs rather than choosing Mrs. Warren's profession. She has a real job which provides her. She is a flower girl. Her only aspiration in life is to sell flowers in a flower-shop.

3.2 EARLY STAGES OF ELIZA'S MATURATION

The very first scene takes place in Covent Garden with many people from the different social classes under the same rain. This place bears importance as it is one of the few places where people from different social layers come together due to the church and theatre. At the moment taken as a start by Shaw, there are two ladies, a note taker and some bystanders near the flower girl, Liza. The ladies are a mother and a daughter waiting for Frank to find them a cab. The ladies, Eynsford-Hills seem lady like because of their dressing style and the fact that they can afford a taxi. The daughter's attitude to Frank, the man who goes to catch a taxi, is very harsh. At first, the man can be interpreted as the servant of the ladies. However, shortly after the curtain opens, the audience learns that Frank is the girl's brother and the woman's son. This fact is significant as the women feel the right to get angry with the man when he cannot get the cab. According to the social codes of behavior, as a man, he is responsible to care about the women around him and do whatever they like in a gentlemanly manner. The women are supposed to be at home and be as elegant and lady like as possible. Frank seems to disappoint his family by not being able to find a cab. As he is returning to find one, he comes into collision with a flower girl whose flowers fall into the mud. The flower-girl shouts "Nah then, Freddy: look wh' y' gowin, deah" (Now then Freddy, where you are going dear) (11). The flower girl is "*perhaps eighteen, perhaps twenty, hardly older*" (10).

The flower girl, Eliza, is described in detail regarding her physical appearance as her physical description signals her social status which leads her to the experimental story she is involved in:

She wears a little sailor hat of black straw that has long been exposed to the dust and soot of London and has seldom if ever been brushed. Her hair needs washing rather badly: its mousy color can hardly be natural. She wears a shoddy black coat

that reaches nearly to her knees and is shaped to her waist. She has a brown skirt with a coarse apron. Her boots are much the worse for wear. She is no doubt as clean as she can afford to be; but compared to the ladies she is very dirty. Her features are no worse than theirs; but their condition leaves something to be desired; and she needs the services of a dentist. (10)

Her unfashionable clothes and uncleanness show that she is a very poor girl. She is not less beautiful than the ladies in Covent Garden; however, her dirty outlook makes the difference. This stage direction does more than directing the actress about how to visualize the character. This information is again an underlined criticism of hypocrisy in the society similar to one of the central themes in *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. The flower girl, despite her equal beauty, is considered less valuable as a woman because of her uncleanness.

Reynolds claims that “the poor are stereotyped as morally weak” (23). Eliza, as a poor flower girl can easily be regarded as the target of such an attack. When she drops her flowers because of Frank, She calls him “Nah then, Freddy: look wh' y' gowin, deah” (10) mostly because she heard his mother or sister calling him with his name or as she claims she uses the name because it is a common one. However, as she is among the ones to be considered morally weak, she is questioned by the mother most probably because she thought that Eliza was a prostitute. The girl does not care about what the mother thinks. She even reproaches her because the mother could not teach her son manners to be polite as a gentleman should. Frank makes the flower girl drop her flowers and goes without paying for them, which is a very ungentle behavior. The flower girl believes that ladies and gentlemen have specific type of manners; therefore, her criticism is very much to the point. However, the mother does not care about the dirty flower girl's opinions. She wants to learn how the flower girl knows his name. To satisfy her curiosity, she, in a way, bribes Eliza by paying her for the flowers. However, she is still unable to learn because Eliza claims to call him with his first name by chance. This scene is considered as a signal Shaw used to indicate the class distinction. On the other hand, the very same scene can be regarded as an example of gender discrimination. Just because she is a woman,

Eliza has to defend herself proving that she is not a prostitute. Also, Eliza, no matter what, tries to be polite towards Frank, who causes her flowers to fall, and the other people around her. This scene can be interpreted as women's consistent trial of politeness against the rudeness of men. Frank, as a gentleman is very rude towards Eliza while she is insistently trying to be polite calling him "sir". Being both poor and a woman makes Eliza very vulnerable to accusation.

Another scene underlining a similar theme even more harshly is when Eliza tries to sell flowers to an old gentleman. The gentleman does not buy flowers from her but gives her three halfpence. At that moment a bystander warns Eliza that she has to "be careful: give him a flower for it. There's a bloke [there] behind taking down every blessed word [she is] saying" (12). Eliza, accepting the possibility of being regarded as guilty of talking to a gentleman because she is among the morally weak ones for being poor, cries with self-defense " [*springing up terrified*] I ain't done nothing wrong by speaking to the gentleman. I've a right to sell flowers if I keep off the kerb. [*Hysterically*] I'm a respectable girl: so help me, I never spoke to him except to ask him to buy a flower off me. (12)

Eliza still needs to defend herself even when she has done nothing wrong as she is a woman. Her social status makes her weak but her being a woman adds to this weakness. A man in a similar situation most probably would not need to defend himself for the very same situation. Contrary to stereotypical expectation, the gentleman, believing that the note taker might be a detective, starts protecting the flower girl. He states: "Really, sir, if you are a detective, you need not begin protecting me against molestation by young women until I ask you. Anybody could see that the girl meant no harm." (13)

In addition to the gentleman, the bystanders start protecting the flower girl against the note taker. They start talking to the note taker in their own dialects and the note taker, without taking the content of what they say into consideration, starts a

game of guessing where the people are from. While he is playing this game, Eliza, still unaware of what he is trying to do, says:

THE FLOWER GIRL [*appalled*] Oh, what harm is there in my leaving Lisson Grove? It wasn't fit for a pig to live in; and I had to pay four-and-six a week. [*In tears*] Oh, boo--hoo--oo--

THE NOTE TAKER. Live where you like; but stop that noise.

THE GENTLEMAN [*to the girl*] Come, come! he can't touch you: you have a right to live where you please.

A SARCASTIC BYSTANDER [*thrusting himself between the note taker and the gentleman*] Park Lane, for instance. I'd like to go into the Housing Question with you, I would. (12)

In this scene the topic of discussion switches from the poor girl to people's hometowns. However, the poor girl is obsessed with reminding people that she is "a good girl" (12) because the only thing she has is her honesty and the quality of being "good" in her own understanding. Similar to many scenes written down by Shaw, this scene is a social criticism as it depicts the right to live wherever one likes as if a girl in Eliza's shoes had the option to live a much different life. Very similar to Mrs. Warren, Eliza seems to have a choice and she makes one among the possible ones she has. Although the choices they make differ, the force that leads them in their way seems to be exactly the same: poverty. Eliza reminds the audience that her "character is the same to [her] as any lady's" (16).

The note taker is very much disturbed by the accent used by the flower girl. He warns her to stop making such sounds saying that her "native language is the language of Shakespear and Milton and The Bible" (16- 17); he also claims that in three months he "could pass that girl off as a duchess at an ambassador's garden party. I could even get her a place as lady's maid or shop assistant, which requires better English. In his ongoing insulting manner, Higgins makes it clear that he is not a detective but a phonetician. He also claims to turn such a flower girl into a lady by changing her speech.

After this long lasting misunderstanding between the characters and Eliza's exaggerated self-defense, the audience learns that the old gentleman and the note

taker are Pickering and Higgins, respectively. They share a common interest: phonetics: “The Science of speech” (17). They realize that Pickering came from India to meet Higgins while Higgins was about to go to India to meet him (19). It becomes clear that Higgins was taking notes and guessing where people were brought up because he was a successful phonetician doing research. When they come to realize each other, Eliza is forgotten all of a sudden. This scene is the first but not the last one that negligence about this girl will be observed. While they are leaving, Higgins leaves some money to the flower girl’s basket. Happy to have more money than she has imagined, Eliza takes the cab Frank brings for his mother and sister who have already left.

Clearly, what Higgins claims to achieve sounds like a dream for the flower girl. She dreams of being able to sell flowers in a shop and she is not aware of the fact that the project she is to involve in surpasses her dreams. This is why, without hesitation, the next day she goes to Higgins’s laboratory so as to apply as a student of phonetics.

Act II opens in Higgins’ laboratory. When his house keeper Mrs. Pearce tells him that a woman with a different accent wants to see him, Higgins gets excited to take notes about a new accent. However, when the visitor turns out to be the flower girl, he does not need to hide his disappointment. He says “Why, this is the girl I jotted down last night. Shes no use: Ive got all the records I want of the Lisson Grove lingo; and I’m not going to waste another cylinder on it. [*To the girl*] Be off with you: I dont want you” (26). Higgins is a scientist and when this is taken into consideration, it seems normal that he does not want to waste his cylinders for the same dialect. However, his manners to the girl he made use of for his scientific research foreshadow the ending of his experiment, as well. As he is done with her, he claims the right to dismiss her in such a rude manner. However, Eliza is not there to be a scientific experiment. She is there to learn how to “talk more genteel”(26). She says “I want to be a lady in a flower shop stead of selling at the corner of Tottenham Court Road. But they wont take me

unless I can talk more genteel. He said he could teach me. Well, here I am ready to pay him--not asking any favor--and he treats me as if I was dirt" (26).

In this scene, Eliza seems to be very much aware of the worth of money despite her ridiculous ignorance about how much she has to pay for the course she demands. Even in the first scene, as a poor girl, she wants to be polite to the others. She seems to have accepted the rules put forward by the society. She cannot be considered as a Shavian New Woman at this point. She is a typical woman who made her choice on flower-selling among the possible ones available. However, she has her aspirations which are to accompany her on her way of emancipation. Different from what is expected from an ideal woman, she wants to have a job, a better one. She wants to earn her living and she is very determined to keep her honor on her way. She is also courageous and outgoing as she can go to the laboratory of a man to whom she may be considered guilty to talk to.

Eliza offers a shilling per hour because she believes that he is going to teach her English, her own language. She calculates the price saying "A lady friend of mine gets French lessons for eighteen pence an hour from a real French gentleman. Well, you wouldnt have the face to ask me the same for teaching me my own language as you would for French; so I wont give more than a shilling. Take it or leave it" (28). She is very sure that she offers enough money so she behaves like a businesswoman. However, she is conscious about neither the nature of the course nor the possible cost of it. In her point of view, she is paying a good deal of money. Realizing the differences between the viewpoints, Higgins sarcastically says "By George, it's enormous! it's the biggest offer I ever had" (28). Higgins compares the money with Eliza's income. As "Two-fifths of a millionaire's income for a day would be somewhere about £60", Eliza's offer is a very generous one and Higgins, considering this, accepts the offer.

The relationship between Higgins and Eliza is of great importance in the play as it is the representative of a relationship in which both class and gender inequality is

involved. In this relationship Higgins switches between being an authoritative father and an insulting husband. Though his wish to create an ideal woman turns him into Pygmalion or the King, in this sense, he can be regarded as far different from his mythological counterparts. Instead of an emotional King, the audience observes a bullying teacher ordering Eliza to “Sit down” (27) when she wants to speak or warning her to “Hold [her] tongue”(28). His warnings sometimes turn into threatening remarks. He even implies physical violence when he says “Somebody is going to touch you, with a broomstick, if you dont stop snivelling. Sit down” (27). In the stage directions, the personality of Higgins is described as “*careless about himself and other people, including their feelings...His manners vary from genial bullying when he is in a good humour to stormy petulance when anything goes wrong*” (qtd in Dukore *The Director* 33)

Though it will be too enthusiastic to claim that Shaw wants to exemplify the relationship between sexes in the personalities of Higgins and Eliza, there are some points to be generalized like the superiority of men. Eliza, choosing what to do, comes to the laboratory; however, what is to become of her is decided by Higgins from that moment on. Moreover, Mr. Pickering, who seems to be in better terms with women, has a genuine compassion towards the flower girl. However, his compassion does not stop him from putting Eliza in an object position in the experiment. Like Higgins, he does not care what will become of her after the experiment. He wants to satisfy his curiosity about Higgins’s abilities as a teacher.

In return for these degrading manners, Eliza is “bewildered” and “stares helplessly at him” (28). She is as helpless as any other woman of her social status. However, she is too determined to give up. Pickering reminds Higgins of the speech between them the previous day:

PICKERING. Higgins: I'm interested. What about the ambassador's garden party? I'll say youre the greatest teacher alive if you make that good. I'll bet you all the expenses of the experiment you cant do it. And I'll pay for the lessons.

LIZA. Oh, you are real good. Thank you, Captain.
HIGGINS. [*tempted, looking at her*] It's almost irresistible. Shes so deliciously low-
-so horribly dirty— (29)

For Higgins Eliza is unbearably dirty. Therefore, he wants her to be cleaned up as a part of her transformation for the garden party. Higgins calls Mrs. Pearce and orders to “take all her clothes off and burn them” (30). Burning the clothes also indicates the irreversible changes to come in the being of Eliza. However, Eliza, still ignorant of what is to become of her, misunderstands the order and protests “Youre no gentleman, youre not, to talk of such things. I'm a good girl, I am; and I know what the like of you are, I do” (30). Her insistance on being “a good girl” and attempt to protect herself shows how insecure women are made in a society governed by men. This also reminds the audience that a woman has to protect herself against sexual harassment of some men. Pickering also seems to have some doubts about this issue; therefore, he asks directly:

PICKERING. Excuse the straight question, Higgins. Are you a man of good character where women are concerned?
HIGGINS. [*moodily*] Have you ever met a man of good character where women are concerned?
PICKERING. Yes: very frequently.
HIGGINS. [*dogmatically, lifting himself on his hands to the level of the piano, and sitting on it with a bounce*] Well, I havnt. I find that the moment I let a woman make friends with me, she becomes jealous, exacting, suspicious, and a damned nuisance. I find that the moment I let myself make friends with a woman, I become selfish and tyrannical. Women upset everything. When you let them into your life, you find that the woman is driving at one thing and youre driving at another. (38)

From the exchange above, it can be interpreted that Higgins is not actually much interested in having an affair with a woman including Eliza. He has a very masculine point of view about the relationship between a man and a woman. Therefore, similar to the legendary Pygmalion, he is determined not to let any woman in his life. Pickering cannot get the assurance he wants, so he repeats his question. Higgins assures him that he has no such intentions. Higgins seems to be a professional teacher who has no intentions of a sexual involvement. He exclaims:

HIGGINS. What! That thing! Sacred, I assure you. [*Rising to explain*] You see, she'll be a pupil; and teaching would be impossible unless pupils were sacred. I've taught scores of American millionairesses how to speak English: the best looking women in the world. I'm seasoned. They might as well be blocks of wood. I might as well be a block of wood . (38)

“Not only by self-portraiture but also by self-betrayal can a character be defined for the audience. Higgins for instance reveals himself unconsciously” (Dukore 33). Higgins is very rude and blunt in his manners. He behaves very rudely to all characters in the play especially to women characters including Eliza, Mrs. Higgins and Mrs. Pearce. Most probably his bluntness is a tactic in his teaching. He goes on with his bullying manners while ordering Mrs. Pearce to “Put her into dustbin” (30) in case of any problems. Both Mrs. Pearce and Mr. Pickering protest against his words. They warn Higgins about the fact that he “cant walk over everybody like this” (30). However, both they and the audience learn that Higgins has a viewpoint in his behavior. He wants to be open in order not to “hurt her delicacy or [theirs]” (30). He does not want to disturb himself trying to differentiate between openness and rudeness.

Moreover, Higgins misses a point made by Mrs. Pearce. The girl might have parents or even a husband. Therefore, she cannot be picked up like a “pebble on the beach” (30). Eliza declares that she is single asking “Whood marry me?” (31). Her reply underlines her self-perception. She sees herself unworthy of marriage to any man. At this stage in the play, Eliza is still a conventional woman considering marriage a social status of which she is not worthy. Moreover, the audience learns that Eliza does not have a family. She has a step mother and surely a father. However, they are not involved in her life. The number of stepmothers which is six also indicates the indifferent and unsuccessful father figure in Eliza’s life. The lack of parental care shows that Eliza is a woman to survive on her own. Therefore, one can claim that despite the conventional ideas she bears, her achievement in surviving on her own is an unconventional success for a woman of her age. Despite her struggle to remain a “good girl”, Eliza can be likened to Mrs. Warren in her trial to survive. Vivie also chooses to survive on her own.

However, different from Vivie and Kitty, it is not Eliza but her parents who decide that she is “big enough to earn [her] own living and turned [her] out” (31). Eliza’s lack of a family seems to be an advantageous issue for Higgins as he is to construct authority on her more easily and she is to become a better object for him. “The girl doesn’t belong to anybody--is no use to anybody but me” (31).

Although Eliza objects to Higgins many times, she does not express her feelings or causes of her objections. Only after Pickering reminds Higgins that “the girl has some feelings” (32), she repeats the phrase saying “I got my feelings” (32). She seems to have been taught to be silent about her emotions to be considered as a “good girl” (47). As a woman, she needs to be reminded of the fact that she has some feelings. According to Berst, Eliza “is manifestly incapable of expressing herself or of conceptualizing her state other than in simplistic alternatives, and, in turn, her feelings have shallow definition because she has neither the language in which to express them nor the perspective or experience to objectify them” (*Pygmalion* 67). This may be because of the fact that she has perhaps never needed to express her feelings simply because nobody cared for them. Also as a woman, being as silent as possible is considered good manners.

It seems impossible for Eliza to turn back to Covent Garden as the flower girl again because her manners as well as her language are going to change. Eliza is not aware of the upcoming change; however, her “sculptor”, Higgins, is conscious about the situation. When Mrs. Pearce asks him about the future of the girl, he does not care about it. He says, “Well, when I’ve done with her, we can throw her back into the gutter; and then it will be her own business again; so that’s all right” (32).

He foresees that he is about to create an unconvertible change in Eliza’s position but he does not care what is to become of her when he is finished with her. Eliza whose ultimate dream is to be selling flowers in a shop rather than a corner in a park is so much irritated that she decides to quit the experiment. However,

Higgins tempts her with chocolate and promises her more chocolates, and taxis and gold, and diamonds” (33). Eliza objects to have gold and diamonds. With this objection, she rejects the seduction because it will be like prostituting herself and she is dedicated to remain a “good girl” (33). Because she is a conventionally brought up woman, Eliza is very well aware of the possible dangers of the men on her.

Different from Vivie Warren, Eliza is shaped with social conventions. She is not a rebel against the social institutions at the beginning of the play. She is obedient to her male master who seems to be more knowledgeable and talented than her, which results in his authority on her. Eliza obeys her master as she needs him to raise her social status.

The first step of the upcoming transformation of Eliza is the bath scene. Eliza heartily rejects the bath scene for many reasons. First of all, she does not want to take her clothes off. In her naive world, being naked is something to be ashamed of for a decent girl. She still insists on the norms of the society. Besides, she is not accustomed to being clean or to washing up her body. Moreover, she is afraid of the cold as in her room with a “broken pane in the window [...] mended with paper” (35), she would “catch [her] death” (35) if she takes a bath. In addition, Eliza confesses why she is so much afraid of having a bath:

LIZA. You expect me to get into that and wet myself all over! Not me. I should catch my death. I knew a woman did it every Saturday night; and she died of it. [...] [*weeping*] I couldnt. I dursnt. Its not natural: It would kill me. I've never had a bath in my life: Not what youd call a proper one. (36)

After the bath, Mrs. Pearce and Higgins discuss the fact that the transformation Eliza is to engage in is not only a phonetic one. Eliza is about to shift her place in the society which needs great care to think about. Higgins does not care about the issues concerning the girl while both Mrs. Pearce and Pickering seem to be worried about what is to become of her. Eliza is about to be educated about manners as well as phonetics:

MRS. PEARCE. [...] you're not at all particular when you've mislaid anything or when you get a little impatient. Now it doesn't matter before me: I'm used to it. [...] You swear a great deal too much. [...] We shall have to be very particular with this girl as to personal cleanliness. [...] Then might I ask you not to come down to breakfast in your dressing-gown, or at any rate not to use it as a napkin to the extent you do, sir. And if you would be so good as not to eat everything off the same plate, and to remember not to put the porridge saucepan out of your hand on the clean tablecloth, it would be a better example to the girl. You know you nearly choked yourself with a fishbone in the jam only last week. (40)

Higgins seems to be an upper class scientist but it is obvious that he is not a very tidy and a clean person though he humiliates Eliza for her uncleanliness. Eliza announces his state saying "You're no gentleman, you're not, to talk of such things" (40). Despite Higgins's lack of genteel manners, Higgins is treated in a respectful way simply because he is a man and he has money. His being a man is one of the most important factors by which he could succeed in being a scientist. His lack of manners does not prevent him from insulting his inferiors like Eliza and the dustman at the door.

The relationship between the genders is depicted in its harshest form when the dustman, Alfred Doolittle, comes to Higgins's laboratory. He first pretends to be a protective father and he says that he wants his daughter back. When Higgins lets him take her, he clarifies his real intentions for visiting him. He feels as if his possession has been stolen and he goes to the laboratory to claim his right over his possession, Eliza. In this context, Eliza is reduced to a worthless being who is possessed and sold by her father to Higgins, to her new master. Mr. Alfred Doolittle summarizes his point saying:

DOOLITTLE. [...] Well, the truth is, I've taken a sort of fancy to you, Governor; and if you want the girl, I'm not so set on having her back home again but what I might be open to an arrangement. Regarded in the light of a young woman, she's a fine handsome girl. As a daughter she's not worth her keep; and so I tell you straight. All I ask is my rights as a father; and you're the last man alive to expect me to let her go for nothing; for I can see you're one of the straight sort, Governor. Well, what's a five pound note to you? And what's Eliza to me? (46)

When compared with Eliza, her father has no claim of morality. He says he cannot afford morals. He describes himself as an “undeserving poor” (45). Using his social status as an excuse for his immorality, he succeeds in selling her daughter to the price he wants. Even more bitterly, Doolittle confesses that even if Higgins’s intentions were not honorable, he would agree to sell her but to a higher price. That is, it is not of importance what their intentions are; the ones who pay for the women are the ones who own them:

PICKERING. I think you ought to know, Doolittle, that Mr. Higgins's intentions are entirely honorable.

DOOLITTLE. Course they are, Governor. If I thought they wasnt, Id ask fifty.

HIGGINS. [*revolted*] Do you mean to say, you callous rascal, that you would sell your daughter for £50? [...]

PICKERING. Have you no morals, man?

DOOLITTLE. [*unabashed*] Cant afford them, Governor. Neither could you if you was as poor as me. Not that I mean any harm, you know. But if Liza is going to have a bit out of this, why not me too? (47)

Thinking that her daughter has become rich, Doolittle argues about the right of a father, which sounds logical to Higgins. After the bribery, Doolittle leaves the laboratory for good. However, before his leave, he makes an astonishing remark about the relationship between men and women. He mentions his lover to exemplify how men are used when the couples are not married. If the woman is not his wife, he has to show that he loves her by buying her presents and trying to make her happy. His viewpoint is like a criticism to how women prostitute themselves by expecting men to take care of them. However, when looked at from a woman’s perspective, his words can be considered as Shaw’s criticism to the institution of marriage. Shaw shows that marriage reduces or diminishes men’s responsibility to try to make women happy:

DOOLITTLE. It's me that suffers by it. Ive no hold on her. I got to be agreeable to her. I got to give her presents. I got to buy her clothes something sinful. I'm a slave to that woman, Governor, just because I'm not her lawful husband. And she knows it too. Catch her marrying me! Take my advice, Governor: marry Eliza while shes young and dont know no better. If you dont youll be sorry for it after. If you do, she'll be sorry for it after; but better you than her, because youre a man, and shes only a woman and dont know how to be happy anyhow.

(47)

This is why Doolittle suggests that Higgins should marry Eliza and make her the slave instead of being her slave. Also, Doolittle represents the clichés about women. He chooses an unknown man over his own daughter as “shes only a woman and don’t know how to be happy anyhow” (47).

While leaving, Doolittle comes across “*a dainty and exquisitely clean young Japanese lady*” (47). The lady happens to be his daughter, Eliza. The bath scene seems to uncover her beauty and all the three men, Higgins Pickering and Doolittle are shocked by the change she has. After her father leaves, Eliza talks a little bit about her father. Although, naturally they come from the same social rank, Eliza is much superior to her father in moral sense as well as in business one. She has a real job by which she earns her living. She also saves money and has aims in life. On the contrary, her father seems to have no occupation rather than being a drunkard. He himself accepts that he did not bring his child up (47). On the contrary, Lisa is a prude. She is even ashamed to look at her naked body in the mirror. Also Eliza, whose morality is astonishing, insists on remaining a “good girl” (47) while her father excuses his immorality due to his social rank. This relationship depicts that no matter what the social status are, men feel less responsible for moral issues than women and women are even more useful in society than men are.

Act III opens in Mrs. Higgins’s house. It is “*Mrs. Higgins's at-home day*” (55); however, nobody has arrived yet. Her visitors are familiar to the audience: the mother and daughter in the Covent Garden. Before her visitors, Higgins arrives and informs her that he has picked up a flower girl to be presented in the ambassador’s garden party. He also informs her that she is coming to visit her to practice for the garden party.

Before Mrs. Higgins has the chance of to object, the Eynsford Hills arrive. They look like a combination of “*the bravado of genteel poverty*”(56). These two

women come onto the stage with internal conflicts they bear. They have the genteel manners belonging to upper class though they do not have the economical background necessary for the very same rank. “Mrs. Eynsford Hill is plagued with manners and social pretensions beyond her means. She is a misfit” (Borst *Pygmalion* 70). Both Mrs. and Miss Eynsford Hills can be considered as a foreshadowing to the end of the experiment when Eliza turns out to be a woman fit for nothing with genteel manners as well as no real occupation to provide herself the genteel life.

Moreover, Mrs. Higgins is much disturbed by her son’s manners. He attacks Victorian hypocrisy so harshly that he becomes rude towards the women who act on the rules of it. He says:

HIGGINS You see, we're all savages, more or less. We're supposed to be civilized and cultured—to know all about poetry and philosophy and art and science, and so on; but how many of us know even the meanings of these names? [*To Miss Hill*] What do you know of poetry? [*To Mrs. Hill*] What do you know of science? [*Indicating Freddy*] What does he know of art or science or anything else? What the devil do you imagine I know of philosophy? (58)

Ironically, he, who protests against hypocritical rules, is the one trying to educate Eliza according to these rules to be able to present her in the garden party as he promised to succeed. Even more ironically, though he might be using a correct language phonetically, his language is very unsuitable content wise. He represents the clash of ideals and realities people bear in Victorian society. Higgins is not polite while he wants Eliza to be so. Also, he is not successful in having conversation in upper-class environments; ironically, he prepares Eliza for those conversations.

His harsh argument is interrupted by the entrance of Eliza, “*who is exquisitely dressed, produces an impression of such remarkable distinction and beauty as she enters that they all rise, quite flustered.*” (60). She seems to have accomplished her transformation perfectly at first sight. After the greetings and formal “How do

you do” questions, there occurs a long pause. Mrs. Higgins trying to break the silence starts a conversation about another cliché:

MRS HIGGINS [*at last, conversationally*] Will it rain, do you think?
LIZA The shallow depression in the west of these islands is likely to move slowly in an easterly direction. There are no indications of any great change in the barometrical situation. (60)

On the surface level, this piece of dialogue can be considered as Higgins’s achievement as Eliza seems to have acquired the perfect accent. However, what she talks is not English content-wise. She talks in a bookish standard English which is not encountered in daily life. This is why Freddy finds it “awfully funny” (60).

Then the topic turns to influenza, which causes emotional excitement on the part of Eliza as her aunt passed away because of this disease. Her emotional outburst uncovers her background and she starts speaking in her old accent:

LIZA. [*darkly*] My aunt died of influenza: So they said. [...] But it's my belief they done the old woman in.
MRS HIGGINS. [*puzzled*] Done her in?
LIZA. Y-e-e-e-es, Lord love you! Why should she die of influenza? She come through diphtheria right enough the year before. I saw her with my own eyes. Fairly blue with it, she was. They all thought she was dead; but my father he kept ladling gin down her throat til she came to so sudden that she bit the bowl off the spoon (60).

Higgins is successful in covering her failure by saying “Oh, thats the new small talk”(60). Although his excuse sounds reasonable to the women, Higgins and Eliza determine to end the practice and leave. Eliza, who understands her mistake, turns back to her lady-like manners. She speaks in a perfect accent with Freddy who offers to accompany her on her way. She replies, “Walk! Not bloody likely” (60).

Eliza’s failure can be still credited to Higgins who also has a good accent but incorrect vocabulary use for social occasions. As every child learns his/her

mother tongue from their mothers, Eliza learns it from Higgins. As a natural result, the vocabulary choice and use of language Eliza possesses is very similar to that of Higgins. The word “bloody” is a rude word that should not be used in that at-home; however, Eliza cannot know this because the very same word is used commonly by Higgins as warned by Mrs. Pearce:

MRS. PEARCE [*not to be put off*—but there is a certain word I must ask you not to use. The girl has just used it herself because the bath was too hot. It begins with the same letter as bath. She knows no better: she learnt it at her mother's knee. But she must not hear it from your lips. (39)

The lack of manners in Eliza, which might have resulted from Mr. Higgins's lack of manners, is also stated by Mrs. Higgins who repeatedly criticizes Higgins like a small boy who does not know what to do in social occasions. Higgins's relationship with his mother is also a signifier of gender relationship in the play. Higgins, like an immature child, needs to be reminded of his manners in society. He does not depict a compassionate relationship with his mother but his admiration of her can be observed in his words:

HIGGINS. Oh, I can't be bothered with young women. My idea of a loveable woman is something as like you as possible. I shall never get into the way of seriously liking young women: some habits lie too deep to be changed. [*Rising abruptly and walking about, jingling his money and his keys in his trouser pockets*] Besides, they're all idiots. (56)

Also, his perception about young women is an association with mythical Pygmalion. Like Pygmalion, he is determined not to fall in love. Similar to Pygmalion, he creates a lady but the difference is the lack of a romantic love between them and the possible marriage.

Higgins is proud of his experimental subject's success in phonology at first; however, when Eliza switches to her old accent, he immediately stops her. Later on having been asked if Eliza is presentable Mrs. Higgins answers:

MRS HIGGINS. You silly boy, of course she's not presentable. She's a triumph of your art and of her dressmaker's; but if you suppose for a moment that she doesn't give herself away in every sentence she utters, you must be perfectly cracked about her. (57)

Similar to the play *Mrs. Warren's Profession*, *Pygmalion* attacks Victorian hypocrisy as well. When Higgins tries to cover the incorrect speech uttered by Eliza, he claims that this is a new fashion in speaking among upper class people. Miss. Eynsford Hills acts as if the "new small talk" is familiar to her and she even imitates Eliza with her words "Such bloody nonsense!" (63). The at-home scene of the play depicts the ladies and gentlemen Eliza is preparing for. Freddy, Mrs. and Miss. Eynsford Hills are superficially polite people who do not seem to have any occupation except for the at-homes they go to frequently indicated in Clara's words "we have three at-homes to go to still" (64). The only woman in this context who has a real job is Eliza, which saves her from superficial Victorian values. Moreover, Eliza tells the story of her aunt, which is a real story for her and tells about something. Except for her aunt's story, there is no indication of communication among the women. Their communication is limited to greeting words and cliché sentences like "How do you do?" and "Goodbye" (64).

Mrs. Higgins acts as the voice of reason in this part of the play. As a woman, she is much concerned about Eliza's future. However, neither of the men seem to understand the problem. Both Mrs. Higgins's awareness of Eliza's situation and the men's indifference to the problem depict the male and female relationship in the private cycle. Eliza is fit for selling flowers or doing any work that she finds. However, after the education, she is to become a lady who is supposed not to be earning money. In a way she would be like Eynsford Hills who have the lady-like manners but not the money to support their manners. Higgins and Pickering are ultimately indifferent to what kind of problems she might experience. They only care for what they are to get in return, which is the result of the experiment in this context. Higgins, considering only the material value of the things and the accent he provided to her, claims that she is in an advantageous position. However, Mrs.

Higgins clearly states that Eliza is disadvantageous as she loses her old status without being able to totally gain a new one:

HIGGINS I don't see anything in that. She can go her own way, with all the advantages I have given her.

MRS HIGGINS The advantages of that poor woman who was here just now! The manners and habits that disqualify a fine lady from earning her own living without giving her a fine lady's income! Is that what you mean? (66)

The indifference of the two men do not seem to be changed by Mrs. Higgins's words. Higgins and Pickering leave the stage with Mrs. Higgins's words "Oh, men! Men!! Men!!!" (66).

Act IV opens in Higgins's laboratory on a summer night. The audience learns that the ambassador's garden party has been over that day. The garden party is not shown to the audience while the details are conveyed through the conversation between Higgins and Pickering. As Ganz puts it:

The traditional Cinderella motif recurs in *Pygmalion*, but here, after Cinderella passes the test at the ball and demonstrates her nobility, it turns out that the Prince is too much interested in his profession and his mother to care very much whether or not she continues to live in his castle. (Ganz 33)

Higgins seems angry because he cannot find his slippers. Eliza silently brings them. For Pickering, Eliza was a great success in the party. He says "But you've won your bet, Higgins. Eliza did the trick" (70). He also asks:

PICKERING Were you nervous at the garden party? I was. Eliza didn't seem a bit nervous.

HIGGINS Oh, she wasn't nervous. I knew she'd be all right. No, it's the strain of putting the job through all these months that has told on me. It was interesting enough at first, while we were at the phonetics; but after that I got deadly sick of it. If I hadn't backed myself to do it I should have chucked the whole thing up two months ago. It was a silly notion: the whole thing has been a bore.

PICKERING Oh come! The garden party was frightfully exciting. My heart began beating like anything.

HIGGINS Yes, for the first three minutes. (10)

What is striking in this dialogue lies in the stage directions. The speech takes place as if there were only two people in the room; however, Eliza is there, too. It is not only Higgins but also Eliza who has won the bet and succeeded in the experiment. Interestingly neither Pickering nor Higgins talk about her. She is like an experimental subject who is thrown away because the experiment has finished. The two men ask each other's feelings in the party but Eliza who undertook the difficult part of the job is the one whose feelings are ignored. Higgins claims that Eliza was not nervous but Eliza is still absent in the conversation.

Eliza's success is depicted in their conversation like a fairy tale. Similar to the princesses in the fairy tales, Eliza was very attractive with her clothing, jewelry and beauty in the party. Also she was considered as "a princess" (72) coming from Hungary. According to Nepommuck, an ex-student of Higgins and an expert on phonology, she cannot be English because she speaks English "too perfectly" to be an Englishwoman.

Eliza's success makes Higgins very happy because the result of the experiment has been the only consideration for him. But for Eliza, there is a more important issue to be tackled with: "What's to become of [her]?" (72) As Pickering puts it, Eliza has achieved something "lots of the real people can't do" (71); however, as he implicitly states Eliza is no more a real person. She is an "artificial duchess" (71) according to Higgins. Realizing what she is not any more, Eliza searches what she really is now. She breaks the silence she kept all night by "*snatching up the slippers, and hurling them at him one after the other with all her force*" (72). With her astonishing awareness of the situation, Eliza says "Nothing wrong—with YOU. I've won your bet for you, haven't I? That's enough for you. *I don't matter, I suppose*" (76). Now she sees more clearly that she is nothing more than an experimental subject for both of the men. She changes her position from a submissive pupil to a rebel. She now protests against her creator.

Eliza goes on asking her heartbreaking question: what will happen to her? It is clear that Higgins still does not care about the answer to this question. He does not feel responsible either for what will happen to her following his experiment:

HIGGINS How the devil do I know what's to become of you? What does it matter what becomes of you?

LIZA You don't care. I know you don't care. You wouldn't care if I was dead. I'm nothing to you—not so much as them slippers.

HIGGINS [*thundering*] THOSE slippers.

LIZA [*with bitter submission*] Those slippers. I didn't think it made any difference now. (76)

As can be inferred, Higgins openly states his indifference about Eliza's future because still his one and only source of curiosity is linguistics. Eliza throws the slippers onto his face and says that she would like to kill him. This is an ironical wish because it is Higgins who kills Eliza in that context by ignoring her presence. Also, it is again Higgins who kills the flower girl and creates this woman who is fit for nothing. He kills the identity and the existence of Eliza. Eliza's efforts and talent in the experiment are undermined, which drives her crazy. The flower girl at the beginning of the play seems to have transformed into a mature woman who is about to seek for her rights.

Up to the discussion part between Higgins and Eliza, Eliza remains as an object of the experiment, but after she starts questioning what to do next, she starts questioning her new relationship with the society. She turns out to be her own decision maker.

She is freed from the experiment finally, but actually she is not free. Higgins says "Now you are free and can do what you like" (77). However, her freedom of choice reminds the sarcastic bystander who mocked her right to choose where to live at the beginning of the play:

THE GENTLEMAN [*to the girl*] Come, come! he can't touch you: you have a right to live where you please.

A SARCASTIC BYSTANDER [*thrusting himself between the note taker and the gentleman*] Park Lane, for instance. I'd like to go into the Housing Question with you, I would. (15)

Here the sarcastic bystander reminds that a person's freedom is restricted with the choices he or she has. Eliza, who had the right to choose where to live at the beginning of the play, has the right to do what she likes now. However, she cannot see any choice available. She used to have a social status as a flower girl but now she has neither a status nor a job to earn her living. She feels that she is fit for nothing.

LIZA [...] What am I fit for? What have you left me fit for? Where am I to go? What am I to do? What's to become of me?
HIGGINS [*enlightened, but not at all impressed*] Oh, that's what's worrying you, is it? [...] I shouldn't bother about it if I were you. I should imagine you won't have much difficulty in settling yourself, somewhere or other, though I hadn't quite realized that you were going away. [...] You might marry, you know. (78)

As can be understood, Higgins finally finds what to do with Eliza. As she is a good looking girl most of the time, it is possible that Mrs. Higgins finds a good husband for her according to Higgins. According to Gainor, she is beautiful when she behaves "in a feminine fashion" (232). When she is temperamental, she is not herself because showing feelings is not suitable for a woman according to the social conventions of the time.

Eliza's answer restates the "unpleasant" theme in *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. She says "We were above that at the corner of Tottenham Court Road. [...] I sold flowers. I didn't sell myself. Now you've made a lady of me I'm not fit to sell anything else. I wish you'd left me where you found me" (78). Similar to the theme of prostitution in *Mrs. Warren's Profession*, the Shavian heroine, Eliza believes that marrying a man to support oneself is much lower than selling flowers in Tottenham Court Road. She now regrets participating in the experiment.

Eliza's character development can be observed in her approach to marriage as well. Eliza, who desperately asked "Whoo marry me?" (31) six months ago, said this because she did not find herself worthy of any men. On the other hand, after the experiment, she does not want to marry a man just to support herself because it is only a way of prostitution for her. This example shows that Eliza not only learned manners but also gained a broader Shavian view of looking at the facts.

After the experiment Eliza returns to her own social status because now that the experiment is over, she turns out to be the "common ignorant girl" (79) again. She also throws the ring Higgins gave her and goes to her room. In her room she looks in the mirror for the last time and "puts out her tongue at herself" (81). This scene underlines an important change in Eliza's new being created by Higgins. Gainer defines her feeling as "disenchantment with the image of herself created by Higgins" (229). After the mirror scene, she leaves the laboratory "*giving the door a considerable bang behind her*" (81). Her banging the door shows how much she wants to escape from the position of an experimental subject.

Leaving her creator behind, a love affair flourishes between Freddy and Eliza. The curtain falls with the impression that Eliza will not go much far from Higgins as she decides to ask Mrs. Higgins what to do now.

Act V opens in Mrs. Higgins's house. Higgins is calling the police supposedly because he "has lost something" (85). Higgins informs both his mother and the audience that Eliza "was bolted" (85). He gives the details:

HIGGINS Frightened her! Nonsense! She was left last night, as usual, to turn out the lights and all that, and instead of going to bed she changed her clothes and went right off: her bed wasn't slept in. She came in a cab for her things before seven this morning; and that fool Mrs. Pearce let her have them without telling me a word about it. What am I to do?

MRS HIGGINS Do without, I'm afraid, Henry. The girl has a perfect right to leave if she chooses.

HIGGINS [*wandering distractedly across the room*] But I can't find anything. I don't know what appointments I've got. I'm—
(86)

Here the Shavian idea of women's independence in contrast with man's dependence on women is reflected. Eliza can find a way without Higgins; however, he does not know what to do without her as she arranges his life for him. This looks like a typical marriage with the only difference of lack of sex in it. In this relationship, man is nurtured and fed while woman is looked down upon and subjected. Mrs. Higgins, who acts as the voice of reason at this point as well, reminds the two men, Pickering and Higgins, that the girl has a right to choose what to do.

In the middle of their discussion, a gentleman, Mr. Doolittle arrives. Mr. Doolittle looks like a gentleman who “*is brilliantly dressed in a new fashionable frock-coat, with white waistcoat and grey trousers. A flower in his buttonhole, a dazzling silk hat, and patent leather shoes complete the effect*” (88). The striking change in his appearance astonishes everyone. He talks to Higgins in a reproaching manner.

Apparently, the “silly joke” made a fortune for Mr. Doolittle. He has become a gentleman however “It's making a gentleman of [him] that [he] [objects] to” (89). He claims that in the past he was free and happy. He even freed himself from the moralities excusing himself for his social position. However, being a gentleman brings hypocrisy with it. People touch him for money and he is really disturbed by this. He has neither the manners nor the language to fit his new social position. He is very much like Eliza at this point as his life has been changed by Higgins. They both rose in social class from working class to a point where they do not really belong. Mr. Doolittle expresses causes of his unhappiness:

DOOLITTLE. Who asked him to make a gentleman of me? I was happy. I was free. I touched pretty nigh everybody for money when I wanted it, same as I touched you, Henry Higgins. Now I am worried; tied neck and heels; and everybody touches me for money. [...] Same with the doctors: used to shove me out of the hospital before I

could hardly stand on my legs, and nothing to pay. Now they finds out that I'm not a healthy man and can't live unless they looks after me twice a day. In the house I'm not let do a hand's turn for myself: Somebody else must do it and touch me for it. A year ago I hadn't a relative in the world except two or three that wouldn't speak to me. Now I've fifty, and not a decent week's wages among the lot of them. I have to live for others and not for myself: that's middle class morality. (89)

Now that Mr. Doolittle has a good deal of money to support Eliza, Eliza can feel secure according to Mrs. Higgins. However, Higgins objects as Eliza belongs to him in return to the five pounds he paid for her:

HIGGINS [*jumping up*] Nonsense! he can't provide for her. He shan't provide for her. She doesn't belong to him. I paid him five pounds for her. Doolittle: Either you're an honest man or a rogue.
DOOLITTLE [*tolerantly*] A little of both, Henry, like the rest of us: A little of both.
HIGGINS Well, you took that money for the girl; and you have no right to take her as well. (90)

In this dialogue, it can be clearly seen that Eliza is reduced to an object to be bought and sold. Her ideas, wishes and decisions are out of discussion in this context. Mrs. Higgins as both a reasonable person and a woman is well aware of this rudeness.

Actually, Higgins and Pickering are not even aware of the fact that they have been rude to her. Pickering confesses that “[They] hardly said a word to her”(90). This means that they do not care about her existence. On the contrary, Higgins claims that she has been rude to him because she threw his slippers at him. However, Mrs. Higgins says “you were surprised because she threw your slippers at you! I should have thrown the fire-irons at you” (91).

Mrs. Higgins tries to explain the main reasons of Eliza’s change of manners. Eliza has been attached to the two men. She worked for them and succeeded in the task she has undertaken. However, she has not been praised, appreciated or thanked by them. For Higgins, rather than a human being, Eliza is the success of his creation. She is an artificial being.

3.3 LATER STAGES OF ELIZA'S MATURATION

Eliza's external metamorphosis is the signifier of her internal transformation. She has transformed from a flower girl into a lady. Also, she is "good girl" who has turned out to be a woman making her decisions and rebelling against her creator.

At the end she states:

LIZA I know. I am not blaming him. It is his way, isn't it? But it made such a difference to me that you didn't do it. You see, really and truly, apart from the things anyone can pick up (the dressing and the proper way of speaking, and so on), the difference between a lady and a flower girl is not how she behaves, but how she's treated. I shall always be a flower girl to Professor Higgins, because he always treats me as a flower girl, and always will; but I know I can be a lady to you, because you always treat me as a lady, and always will. (95)

Here Eliza makes a very important point about hypocrisy. She claims that the value of a person is decided not by the person but by the ones around. Higgins openly states that Eliza used to act like his servant and a servant cannot expect the kindness and care she demanded. He adds "I think a good deal more of you for throwing them in my face. No use slaving for me and then saying you want to be cared for: Who cares for a slave?" (100). Instead of slavery, he suggests some other options of being together. He suggests she should marry Pickering or he could adopt her as a daughter. In all cases, Eliza is to be deprived of her freedom. She is to choose among living with her father, being adopted by Higgins and marrying Freddy because she is not able to sell flowers any more. In all these options, her independence is ruined by a man. For a woman, these are legal relations to provide themselves. In a way, they can be considered as legitimized prostitution. Higgins, thinking that she has no other way except for turning back to his laboratory, bullies Eliza. Eliza replies:

ELIZA. But don't you be too sure that you have me under your feet to be trampled on and talked down. I'll marry Freddy, I will, as soon as he's able to support me. [...] If I can't have kindness, I'll have independence. [...] I'll let you see whether I'm dependent on you. If you can preach, I can teach. I'll go and be a teacher [...]

teach phonetics. [...]You said I had a finer ear than you. And I can be civil and kind to people, which is more than you can. [...]I'm not afraid of you, and can do without you. (102-3-4)

Eliza makes her decision in such a determined way that Higgins does not have much to reject. Eliza makes up her mind to be the assistant of another professor whom Mr. Higgins competes with. Eliza also wants to marry the person who loves her not prostituting herself. She is decisive about supporting her husband. Such an idea seems very unconventional in Victorian morality.

The climactic point in Eliza's character development, takes place via the conversation when Eliza emancipates herself from both her creator and Victorian morality urging her to prostitute herself though. Her power is observed by Higgins as well. He says "Five minutes ago you were like a millstone round my neck. Now you're a tower of strength: a consort battleship." (105)

The play ends in an ironic manner which has been interpreted in different ways. Eliza says goodbye to Higgins while he seems to understand this "goodbye" in a literal sense:

LIZA Then I shall not see you again, Professor. Good bye. *[She goes to the door.]*
MRS. HIGGINS *[coming to Higgins]* Good-bye, dear.
HIGGINS Good-bye, mother. *[He is about to kiss her, when he recollects something.]* Oh, by the way, Eliza, order a ham and a Stilton cheese, will you? And buy me a pair of reindeer gloves, number eights, and a tie to match that new suit of mine, at Eale & Binman's. You can choose the color. *[His cheerful, careless, vigorous voice shows that he is incorrigible.]*
LIZA *[disdainfully]* Buy them yourself. *[She sweeps out/]*
MRS HIGGINS I'm afraid you've spoiled that girl, Henry. But never mind, dear: I'll buy you the tie and gloves.
HIGGINS *[sunnily]* Oh, don't bother. She'll buy em all right enough. Good-bye(106).

Higgins is sure that Eliza will do what he wants; however, the ending is open to different interpretations. Whatever the interpretation is, it is clear that Eliza, starting her journey as a flower girl begging to a gentleman to buy flowers, ends

up as an unwomanly woman making up her decisions, starting a profession and supporting a man rather than being supported.

Higgins wants to stop Eliza while she is trying to gain her independence because Higgins needs her. This is a general problem of the Victorian woman as well as the 21st century woman. Even though they choose their own way, women are either interrupted or backed by some men. In this sense it can be claimed that Mrs. Warren is again a much more conventional woman figure than Eliza. Eliza's career pattern can be likened more to Vivie as she also accomplishes her emancipation at the end of the play.

Higgins has Eliza experience many transformations through the steps in the social ladder. She turns out to be a lady out of a flower girl. However, as a lady she is not fit for working. As she has to support her living, she makes her final decision and she decides to give up being a lady of garden parties to be a professional, earning her living teaching phonetics. In this way, Shaw frees his Queen from being dependant on a man or a provider and makes her independent by giving her a profession.

Eliza is not a prototype in teacher – pupil or father – daughter relationship because of her active involvement in this situation. She is the one who chooses to be the pupil rather than being subjected to an education. Moreover, different from the conventional teacher-pupil pattern, Eliza grows into a woman who has the potential to turn out to be the teacher. In a way, she replaces her creator.

The ending of *Pygmalion* has been interpreted in different ways. In its latest publication, the play ends with Eliza's decisive farewell. Higgins, unable or unwilling to comprehend the rebellious nature of Eliza, orders her to buy ham and cheese, gloves and a new tie. Eliza reacts, "Buy them yourself" and "*sweeps out*" (106). Even after the first performances, the conclusion was changed by either the players or the directors. Tree, the first actor performing Higgins

sometimes gave a rose to Eliza to sentimentalize the end or got furious with the mother to make Higgins's feelings more explicit. These endings were far from the main goals of Shaw in writing *Pygmalion*. Shaw thought that the play would be about "a young woman finally emancipating herself from the domination of her male mentor" (Gibbs 332-3). To emphasize this theme in the play, Shaw writes, "Now comes the most important point of all. When Eliza emancipates herself- when Galatea comes to life- she must not relapse. She must retain her pride and triumph to the end" (qtd in Gibbs 333).

The resolution of the play resolves the main dramatic question: Will Higgins win the bet? Or Will Eliza be successful in the garden party? However, the resolution does not resolve but intensifies the dramatic questions about human problems leaving it to the audience to think about. The heart of the play occurs when the questions "What am I fit for? What have you left me fit for? Where am I to go? What am I to do? What's to become of me?" (84) are put forward by Eliza and the resolution does not solve Eliza's problems.

Eliza seems to have three fathers each of whom have a different teaching on her and a different way to keep her "in her place" (Gainor 230). She learns the new language, English, from Higgins. Colonel Pickering teaches nice manners and behavior to her. Alfred Doolittle is the one who supposedly brought her up until she is eighteen and taught her to be a "good girl". All these three men have their own patriarchal stances. None of them consider Eliza's importance except for the ironic scene Doolittle sells her for 5 pounds to Higgins. Eliza who chooses to say goodbye to all these men, asserts her freedom by doing so.

Whether Eliza returns to Higgins as he signals or she marries Freddy as she asserts does not matter. The important point is that she is the one who chooses whether to stay or to leave. Though Higgins succeeds in making a lady out of a flower girl, it is Eliza who accomplishes her final transformation through emancipation. She surpasses her creator and gains her identity similar to Galatea.

Pygmalion is a play of the transformation of a flower girl into a lady and the transformation of the lady into a real professional New Woman. Eliza and Higgins are in a daughter- father relationship at the beginning of the play, but towards the end, with the effect of Eliza's maturation, they turn out to be mother-son.

Clearly at the end of the play, the legendary Galatea comes to life as a real woman, Eliza. However, different from Galatea, Eliza ends up as an emancipated woman gaining her independence without being a slave to a man either as a wife or as a daughter. Her foreshadowed marriage to Freddy cannot be considered as slavery because she chooses a man who is inferior to her in many aspects and she makes the decision to marry in contrast to the passive Galatea.

CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSION

George Bernard Shaw, whose dream is a better society in which no discrimination can find a place, believed that this dream can only come true if a classless and sexless society can be created. Shaw's idea of a classless and sexless society is one in which equality can be observed in every layer from the public to the domestic sphere. That is, this equality has to be in workplace as well as in the distribution of income. To beat the poverty which causes the most important problems in the society, men and women has to be equally included in the production.

Shaw's championship for women's emancipation from man's dominance in social, political, economic, sexual and family relationship is second to none. He remains silent nowhere in exposing the fact that man's dominance over women is not only undemocratic, unpsychological and inhuman but is also a threat to the progress of the human race. (Valayka 99)

Shaw also questions the double standards in the society concerning women. This is why in his plays he aims to disturb the audience by depicting the unequal and corrupted institutions they also live in. In his works, the conflict shifts between the social issues and personal issues regarding women questions. Actually, it is not always very easy to make a distinction between the two. Therefore, he depicts both in his plays to awake the audience about their part in the corruption. He does not use alienation techniques as he believes the intellectual audience who can understand the underlying themes he uses.

Corruption stems from inequality in society. However, the corruption in the society is so much that the moral and immoral are interwoven. The so-called morality of the Victorian age bears the most immoral acts in social life while the so called immoral ones are the victims of the corruption.

Victorian and Edwardian English society have observed the start of a women's movement. This movement in this age constructs significant pillars of the feminist movements of the upcoming age. This is why it is important to carefully analyze the features of the women Shaw has pictured as a playwright shedding light on the type of woman as she should be. For him, gender discrimination is no better than class distinction which corrupts the society by the inequality and unhappiness it brings along.

Shaw has strongly argued against discrimination between sexes as for him women are no different from men except for their appearance. According to him women are "men in petticoats" (qtd in Ganz 71). He believes that women have to be included in both social and economic life to be able to save the future of mankind.

Clearly, Shaw believes in the mutual contribution of both sexes in the public sphere and rejects the idea that women's place is only the domestic sphere. He does not reject marriage but he rejects marriage as a means to support women.

Shaw's belief in the New Woman and the progress she has to make is clearly observed in his depiction of the female characters that are not static but dynamic. They are not submissive even at the beginning; however, the discussions in the plays turn them into fully matured, self possessed and self satisfied women. Whether they get married or not, they can support themselves. They gain their own place in the society by choosing a profession to pursue and by emancipating themselves from the boundaries imposed on them. Both Vivie Warren and Eliza are rescued from the Victorian ideal of "Womanly Women" by their education and wish for emancipation. They fight against predetermined social roles of women. For example, in the discussion between Mrs. Warren and Vivie, when Mrs. Warren approaches Vivie with conventional sentimentality, she is weakened. However, when she approaches with economic facts, she gains power. Although their personality traits and ways of emancipation are different in many respects, both of these heroines succeed in freeing themselves at the end of the play.

Shavian women are not typical angelic figures. “His woman does not fall into the bitch-goddess, virgin mother, whore, ingénue, nor castrating neurotic formula. When asked how he came to write roles for *real* women, he responded that he had never imagined women as different from himself” (Gainor 3). Rather, they have a stance and identity in life. He makes his characters gain their independence by providing them with economic independence. “He feels that a woman cannot emancipate herself until she repudiates her womanliness, her duty to her husband, to her children, to society, to the law, to everyone but herself.” (Valayka 100)

Similar to the Pygmalion legend he uses, he creates his female ideals at the beginning and makes them gain their independence throughout the plays. Different from lifeless ideals, his women have the capacity of emancipation even at the beginning of the plays.

The Shavian heroines Mrs. Warren and Eliza can be compared and contrasted in many ways. Mrs. Warren and Eliza start their lives in a gutter and they try to find a way to survive. Although they both succeed in emancipating themselves, the way they achieve emancipation differs a lot. Eliza, half by determination half by chance, finds a way for education and through her education she turns out to be a new woman still having the traces of Victorian conventions. Her choice among the possible ones is still an acceptable one for the society. When compared to Mrs. Warren, she is a very conventional girl in her choice. Her motto “I am a good girl” reminds the audience that Eliza is a supporter of conventional morality. Different from Eliza, Mrs. Warren chooses to pursue prostitution as a profession; and she finds her emancipation and gains respect via this profession. That is, Mrs. Warren and Eliza have different worldviews about morality. Eliza’s morality is closer to Vivie’s. Vivie, who is persuaded that the profession her mother has chosen has been the most moral choice provided for her, is disturbed by the fact that the profession is still going on. She believes that the money is

tainted and rejects it. Vivie is a luckier character as the mother's trial for economic freedom helps her gain a Cambridge education which is an outstanding quality for a woman of her time. She chooses to remain unmarried and frees herself from the social boundaries. At the end of the plays, Vivie and Eliza start to pursue their careers; and Mrs. Warren goes on with her profession as a brothel keeper. Namely, none of these women give secondary importance to their profession.

At the end of the plays, Vivie rejects her mother just as Eliza rejects her father-like creator, Higgins. This similarity is of importance as both Shavian heroines gain enough strength to get rid of their creator. These creators provide the necessary conditions like the opportunity of education; however, it can be claimed that it is the women who create themselves contrary to the beliefs of their so-called creators. These women are strong enough to refuse any patronage or tainted money to survive. Similarly, both of these women reject marriages in which they are supposed to be the inferior. Vivie's decision to remain single and Eliza's decision to marry an inferior one are also a common way to assert their independence.

In conclusion, Shaw creates his New Woman in the late 1800s and early 1900s to show the way to the women of the modern era. The women Shaw depicts are self possessed, self-respectful individuals fighting for their independence. His women fight against the system and achieve their emancipation as a final reward.

As can be observed, Shavian protagonists turn out to be emancipated women at the end of his plays. They start as poor or ignorant women; however, they end up as mature women who can make their own decisions and get rid of limitations. Eliza and Mrs. Warren beat poverty with their unwomanly trait, which is the ability to choose while Vivie beats her ignorance about life and set up a new life for herself with her intelligence and the free spirit. They gain their own identity with the decisions they make; and their identity is far different from stereotypical

Victorian Woman's. They make up their minds with self awareness knowing that they have a right to be respected and valued in their society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Shaw, B. *Plays Unpleasant: Widower's Houses, The Philanderer, Mrs. Warren's Profession*. London: Penguin, 1946

Shaw, B. *Pygmalion*. London: Penguin, 2003.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abrahams, MH. *Norton Anthology of English Literature*. General Ed: Stephen Greenblatt. 7th edition Volume II London: WW Norton Publishing, 1999

Barnicoat, Constance A. "Mr. Bernard Shaw's Counterfeit Presentment of Women." *Fortnightly Review* (New York) 85 (March 1906): 516–27. Reprinted in *Living Age* (14 April 1906).

Berst Charles A. *Bernard Shaw and the Art of Drama*. London: U of Illinois Publications, 1973.

Berst Charles A. "Proganda and Art in Mrs. Warren's Profession" *ELH*, Vol 33, No. 3 (Sep., 1966), 33 390-404 JSTOR. Bilkent University Library. Ankara. 25 Dec. 2008 < <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2872114>>.

Berst, Charles A. "Pygmalion: A Potboiler as Art." Bloom. *Modern Critical Interpretations: George Bernard Shaw's Pygmalion*. 57- 76

Burns, Delisle. Rev. of *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism* by Bernard Shaw. *International Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 39 No:1 (Oct 1928), pp 109-110. JSTOR. Bilkent University Library. Ankara. 25 Dec. 2008

< <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2377933>>.

Clark, B.H. *A Study of the Modern Drama*. New York: Appleton, 1925.

Conolly L.W., “Who was Philippa Summers? Reflections on Vivie Warren’s Cambridge” pp. 90-95 JSTOR. Bilkent University Library. Ankara. 25 Dec. 2008
<<https://www.linccweb.org/eresources.asp>>.

Crane Gladys M, “Directing early Shaw: Actig and Meaning in *Mrs. Warren’s Profession*” ed. Leary D. *Shaw’s Plays in Performance*. University Park: The Pensilvannia State University Press, 1983 (29) (34-7)

Damrosch,David. ed. *The Longman Anthology of British Literature*. New York: AddisonWesley, 1999

Dukore, Bernard F. *Bernard Shaw, Playwright: Aspects of Shavian Drama*. Colombia: University of Missouri Press, 1973.

Dukore Bernard F, “The Director as Interpreter: Shaw’s *Pygmalion*” ed. Leary D. *Shaw’s Plays in Performance*. University Park: The Pensilvannia State University Press, 1983 (29) (34-7)

Ervine, St. John. *Bernard Shaw: His Life, Work and Friends*. London: Constable, 1956.

Evans J. *The Politics and Plays of Bernard Shaw*.London: McFarland&Company, 2003

Gainor, Ellen J. *Shaw’s Daughters: Dramatic and Narrative Constructions of Gender*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1991.

Ganz, Arthur. *George Bernard Shaw*. Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1988.

Hamlyn, Paul, ed. *The Complete Bernard Shaw Prefaces*. London: Paul Hamlyn, 1965.

Hardwick, Michael, and Mollie Hardwick. *The Bernard Shaw Companion*. London: Murray, 1973.

Henderson, A. "George Bernard Shaw", *North American Review*, 185 (1907: May/Aug) pp. 203 JSTOR. Bilkent University Library. Ankara. 25 Dec. 2008 <<https://www.linccweb.org/eresources.asp>>.

Henderson, "A. The Real Bernard Shaw", *Virginia Quarterly Review*, 3:2 (1927: Apr.) pp. 177 JSTOR. Bilkent University Library. Ankara. 25 Dec. 2008 <<https://www.linccweb.org/eresources.asp>>.

Holroyd, Michael G. "George Bernard Shaw: Women and the Body Politic." *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Autumn 1979), pp. 18-22. JSTOR. Bilkent University Library. Ankara. 25 Dec. 2008 <<https://www.linccweb.org/eresources.asp>>.

Hornby, R. "Mrs. Warren's Profession", *Hudson Review*, 39:2 (1986: Summer) p. 298 JSTOR. Bilkent University Library. Ankara. 25 Dec. 2008 <<https://www.linccweb.org/eresources.asp>>.

Lorichs, Sonja. "The "Unwomanly Woman" in Shaw's Drama" *Rodelle Weintraub* 99-111

Mack, Maynard. *Norton Anthology of Masterpieces*. 4th edition London: WW Norton Publishing, 1979

McCormack, Thelma. Rev of *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism* by George Bernard Shaw. *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 91, No. 1 (Jul 1985), pp. 209 [JSTOR](#). Bilkent University Library. Ankara. 25 Dec. 2008 <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2779907>>.

Minney, R.J. *The Bogus Image of Bernard Shaw*. London: Leslie Frewin, 1969

Mishra, M.N. *George Bernard Shaw: A Study in His Dramatic Criticism*. New Delhi. Radha, 1990.

Nicoll, A. *The Theory of Drama* Delhi: Doaba, 1969

Ovid, *Metamorphoses*. Trans. Frank Justus Miller. Vol. 2 London: William Heinemann, 1960

Pearson, Hesketh. *Bernard Shaw: His Life and Personality*. London: Collins, 1942.

Pettet, Edwin Burr. "Shaw's Socialist Life Force" *Educational Theatre Journal*, Vol 3, No.2 (May 1951), pp. 109 [JSTOR](#). Bilkent University Library. Ankara. 25 Dec. 2008
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3203937>.

Powell. K. "New Women, New Plays and Shaw in the 1890s". *The Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw*. ed. Innes C. London: Cambridge University Pres, 1998

"*Pygmalion: the Play*." www.wikipedia.org. 01 Jan 2009
<[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pygmalion_\(play\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pygmalion_(play))>.

Salter, William M. "Mr. Bernard Shaw as a Social Critic" *International Journal of Ethics*, Vol 18, No.4 (Jul., 1908), pp.446-458 [JSTOR](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2376799). Bilkent University Library. Ankara. 25 Dec. 2008
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2376799>.

Shaw, Bernard. "Our Attitude Towards Women" London Lectures on Public Issues Series, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, November 20 1992. 246 247

Shaw, Bernard. "The Womanly Woman" *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*. London: Walter Scott, 2008

Shaw, B. *Our Theatres in the Nineties*. Vol. 3. London: Constable, 1948

Stafford, Tony J. "Mrs. Warren's Profession in the Garden of Respectability" ed. Weintraub. *The Annual of Bernard Shaw Studies* Vol.2, University Park: The Pensilvannia State University Press, 1982

Stowell, Shelia. Rev of *Shaw's Daughters: Dramatic and Narrative Constructions of Gender* by J. Ellen Gainor. *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 45, No. 4, Disciplinary Disruptions (Dec, 1993), pp. 558 [JSTOR](https://www.linccweb.org/eresources.asp). Bilkent University Library. Ankara. 25 Dec. 2008 <<https://www.linccweb.org/eresources.asp>>.

Valayka, Singh A.C. *Social and Political Ideas of George Bernard Shaw*. New Delhi: Radha Publications, 1993

Valency, Maurice. *The Cart and the Trumphet: The plays of Bernard Shaw*. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.

Ward, A.C. *Bernard Shaw*. London : The British Council, 1951

Watson, B. *A Shavian Guide to the Intelligent Woman*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1964.

Whitman, Robert F. *Shaw and the Play of Ideas*. London: Cornell UP, 1977.

Williamson, Audrey. *Bernard Shaw: Man and Writer*. New York: Crowell-Coller, 1963.

Wilde, J. F. "Something about Bernard Shaw". *Neophilologous*, 2:2 (1917) pp. 140 [JSTOR](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2376799). Bilkent University Library. Ankara. 25 Dec. 2008 <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2376799>>.

Wilson, Colin. *Bernard Shaw: A Reassessment*. London: Hutchinson. 1969