

One Day, George Bernard Shaw

Edited by Burçin Erol

Department of English Language and Literature
Hacettepe University

and

Embassy of Ireland

Irish Writers Series: 6

IRISH WRITERS SERIES

One Day, James Joyce
Edited by Burçin Erol

One Day, William Butler Yeats
Edited by Burçin Erol

One Day, Samuel Beckett
Edited by Burçin Erol

One Day, Oscar Wilde
Edited by Burçin Erol

One Day, Seamus Heaney
Edited by Burçin Erol

The printing of this book has been supported by Hacettepe
University Project Number: SBT- 2016-12576

ISBN: 978-605-9965-86-6

© Hacettepe University, Department of English Language and
Literature, Ankara, Turkey. Printed by Bizim Büro, 2017.



Table of Contents

Acknowledgements | **5**

Foreword | **7**

1. Bernard Shaw: an Irish Playright in Spite of Himself | **11**
Nicholas Grene
 2. Versions of a Literary Portrait: George Bernard Shaw
in Turkish | **25**
N. Berrin Aksoy
 3. “I sing, not arms and the hero, but to the [Superman]”:
Quest for the Superman in Bernard Shaw’s *Man and
Superman* and *Back to Methuselah* | **37**
Sıla Şenlen Güvenç
 4. Historical Truths, Dramatic Reinventions: Bernard Shaw’s
“History Plays” | **53**
Evrin Doğan
 5. The Evolution of Artificial Intelligence in *Pygmalion* | **67**
Jason Mark Ward
 6. Deconstructing Masculine Identity in George Bernard Shaw’s
Saint Joan | **81**
İmren Yelmiş
- Notes on Contributors | **107**



Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all the colleagues and staff members in the Department of English Language and Literature who have helped in the process of putting together the chapters in this volume which were formerly presented in the “One Day, George Bernard Shaw Conference” organised at Hacettepe University. I owe special thanks to Assistant Professor Dr. Sinan Akıllı for his ever present support and for designing the cover of the present volume and Research Assistant Adem Balcı for helping with the proofreading and some technical aspects. I would like to express my gratitude to Barrie Maguire for allowing us to use his painting, the portrait of George Bernard Shaw for the cover. Special thanks are due to the Irish Embassy and HE Mr. Brendan Ward who have most kindly collaborated for the conference and made the keynote speaker emeritus professor Nicholas Grene’s presence at the conference possible. Last but not least I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Dr. A. Haluk Özen, the Rector of Hacettepe University, for his support and Hacettepe University for the financial support of the project.



Foreword

The chapters in this volume are based on the papers presented at the “One Day, George Bernard Shaw” Conference held at Hacettepe University in 2016 with the collaboration of the Embassy of Ireland. This volume intends to bring together the works of Nicholas Grene and the scholars in Turkey who specialise in and have published on the works or have worked on the translations of the works of George Bernard Shaw.

George Bernard Shaw was the playwright, Nobel laureate and Academy Award Winner. He was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1925 after he had established himself as a playwright. He was asked to write the screenplay of *Pygmalion* for which he was awarded the Oscar in 1938 and until very recently he was the only holder of both of these two prizes. He was a prolific writer and he wrote over 60 plays in addition to his music and drama reviews and social and political writings. He was a member of the Fabian Society and an ardent supporter of equal rights for women. He was a genuine believer in the didactic role of all literature in promoting new ideas, raising questions and motivating people into thinking and eradicating prejudices. He was a vegetarian and a teetotaler. His wit and humour was unique. He is one of the most quoted literary figures.

No English Department goes without at least a Shaw play on their syllabus. Although he stated that he learned his history from Shakespeare’s works and had great respect for history, when he was approached for the right of the inclusion of his play *Saint Joan* in school textbooks, he replied “God’s curse be on those who force students to study my plays and make them hate me as much as Shakespeare. My plays are not to be instruments of torture.”

Quite a number of his plays have been translated into Turkish and some such as *Pygmalion*, *Caesar and Cleopatra* and *Saint Joan* have been staged in Turkey. Shaw's influence was felt in Turkish cinema also. *Pygmalion* inspired three Turkish films *Benim Tatlı Meleğim* (My Sweet Angel) 1964, *Sürtük* (The Slut) in 1962 and *Aslan Yavrusu* (Lion Cub) in 1960. A very successful example of domestication was seen in the TV serial *Gönülçelen* that ran between 2010-2011.

His witty sayings and aphorisms are frequently quoted and have been presented in collections. Şakir Eczacıbaşı put together a selection in Turkish entitled *Bernard Shaw'dan Gülen Düşünceler*.

In this volume the first chapter is by Nicholas Grene who discusses the situation of George Bernard Shaw's relation to Irishness and Irish drama. He illustrates in detail how the Irish born playwright who lived in England existed in relation to these two cultures but at the same time was to a certain extent the outsider. In his own words he puts forward how "Shaw cannot be fully integrated, cannot be excluded from Irish drama: his presence is[...]marginal yet insistent." Berrin Aksoy in the second chapter which is on the Turkish translations of Shaw's works presents an account of the policies of the young Turkish Republic reflected in the project of translation of the Western texts, especially those of literature. She also traces the development of the translation activities of the MEB Translation Bureau and the later developments and translation activities of other publishers. Aksoy provides detailed information on the works of Shaw that were translated into Turkish as well as shedding light on the choice of his specific works. Sıla Şenlen Güvenç in the third chapter, focuses on the genre of drama of discussion and presents an analysis of Shaw's concept of "Superman" through a close reading of the playwright's plays *Man and Superman* and *Back to Methuselah*. In the fourth chapter Evrim Doğan presents a study of Shaw's history plays and points out how Shaw evaluates the past with "his contemporary sensibilities to comment on the present" and to provide a reflection to the future. Doğan dwells on Shaw's concept of history and his belief in how great men change history. She also emphasises Shaw's respect to history but underlines the fact that as the playwright himself stated how literary forms when using history unavoidably altered it, and examines the use of history and historical characters as used in imaginary situations in *The Man of Destiny*, *Caesar and Cleopatra*, *Saint Joan* and *In Good King Charles's Golden Days*. Jason M. Ward

Nicholas Grene

in his chapter deals with the more recent adaptations of the Pygmalion myth. He presents a detailed comparison of Shaw's *Pygmalion* the play, the 1938 movie and the sci-fi thriller *Ex Machina* stating that it is a loose adaptation of the play. He traces the various tropes and also argues that the study of the adaptations enable us to see better into the text of the play. In the last chapter İmren Yelmiş illustrates Shaw's contribution to the concept of the New Woman. She focuses on the aspects where Shaw defies the patriarchal Victorian norms and advocates gender equality through his presentation of Joan of Arc in *Saint Joan*. Yelmiş presents a detailed analysis of Joan of Arc but additionally she draws attention to the Dauphin as a male character who goes against the patriarchal definition of the genders.

I hope that this volume will contribute to the studies, understanding and appreciation of George Bernard Shaw by providing new approaches and ways of reading his works.

Burçin Erol
November 2017



1

Bernard Shaw: an Irish Playwright in Spite of Himself

Nicholas Grene

Shaw cannot be fully integrated, cannot be excluded from Irish drama: his presence is, one might say, marginal yet insistent. And that after all is what he always sought to be. Shaw lived the great bulk of his adult life in England but he remained deliberately, inalienably Irish. He used his outlander status as Irishman, his distinctively Irish accent (which he never lost), as a crucial part of the persona with which he outraged, teased and provoked the English. He cherished the separateness which allowed him to call them "You English." Yet when he turned back to his own country and his own countrymen, it was with the alienation of the expatriate. What I would like to do is to show something of how Shaw became an Irish playwright in spite of himself. He had to overcome feelings of aggression against his nationality, which were partly feelings of aggression against himself. Those feelings never completely went away. But they were part of a pattern of emotions and attitudes which bound him to Ireland, so that for all his reluctance, he was to be an important Irish playwright after all.

In the Preface to his first novel *Immaturity*, Shaw is his usual brisk self on the subject of his abandonment of Dublin for London.

My business in life could not be transacted in Dublin out of an experience confined to Ireland. I had to go to London [. . .] London was the literary centre for the English language, and for such artistic culture as the realm of the English language (in which I proposed to be king) could afford. There was no Gaelic League in those days, nor any sense that Ireland had in herself the seed of culture. Every Irishman who felt that his business in life was on the higher planes of the cultural professions felt that he must have a metropolitan domicile and an international culture: that is, he felt that his first business was to get out of Ireland. (Preface *Immaturity* xxxiv)

This is a wonderful example of Shaw's compelling and misleading clarity. Nationality is not so easily disposed of, and behind the Shavian briskness is a much more complex and uneasy set of emotions.

Shaw left Dublin for London in 1876 and for his first twenty years in the capital he had relatively little to do with his fellow Irish. He was acquainted with W.B. Yeats, Oscar Wilde, George Moore, but his close friends and associates were all English, or Scots like William Archer. He was a great joiner of societies in this period, but noticeably not those associated with the Celtic Revival. The one record I know of his participation at a meeting of the Irish Literary Society does not suggest a very positive attitude towards the ideals of the literary revival. The Irish Literary Society had been founded in London in 1891 by Yeats and others, and in March 1897, Lady Gregory recorded in her journal that she went to a meeting to hear a lecture by a Mr Whyte on "Irish actors of the century."

The lecture was apparently very bad but, as Lady Gregory noted in her journal, "the afternoon was redeemed by Bernard Shaw." Shaw demolished the unfortunate Whyte, pointing out that the actors he had talked about were not Irish:

As to what an Irishman is, he said, is a complex question; for wherever he may have been born, if he has been brought up in Ireland, that is quite sufficient to make him an Irishman. It is a mistake to think an Irishman has not common sense: it is the Englishman who is devoid of common sense, or at least has so small a portion of it that he can only

apply it to the task immediately before him to do. That is why he is obliged to fill the rest of his horizon with the humbugs and hypocrisy that fill so large a part of English life. The Irishman has a better grasp of facts and sees them more clearly; only, he fails in putting them into practice and has a great objection to doing anything that will lead to any practical result. It is also a mistake to think the Irishman has feelings – he has not, but the Englishman is full of feeling. What the Irishman has is imagination; he can imagine himself in the situation of others. But the Irish language is an effete language, and the Irish nation is effete, and as to saying there are good Irish actors, there are not, and there won't be until the conditions in Ireland are favourable for the production of drama – 'and when that day comes I hope I may be dead'. (Laurence and Greene ix)

We can see in this speech that, seven years before he wrote *John Bull's Other Island*, he already had some of the central ideas for it in his head. I will be coming back to *John Bull* shortly. What is really extraordinary here is the outburst against the "effete" Irish nation. Shaw is, I think, using the word "effete" in its original sense of being worn out, on the verge of extinction. As far as he was concerned the Irish language was in such a state and he has no sympathy with the attempt to revive it. What needs explaining in this passage, it seems to me, is the degree of animus against the possibility of a separate Irish cultural renewal.

One suspects that at this stage Shaw saw the Celtic revival as threatening. He had abandoned Ireland, decided it was irredemable, made his cultural base in London and worked hard to educate himself in metropolitan art and literature. Here now were people saying that he had been wrong, that art was to be created by staying at home and cultivating Ireland and Irishness. It is the same spirit of defensive attack in a later passage in the Preface to *John Bull*: there he talks of the Gaelic movement as "a quaint little offshoot of English Pre-Raphaelitism" (Shaw *Collected Plays* II 842). It is of course a deliberately provocative remark. It unmaskes the Celtic revival as derivative; it debunks its claims to be new and independent by placing it as an imitation of an outmoded English artistic fashion. Shaw is here defending his position of metropolitan knowingness. He had lived through the end of the Pre-Raphaelite vogue, he had known and worked with its leaders. To dismiss the Gaelic revival as

an offshoot of Pre-Raphaelitism is to give back to himself the cultural high ground for which he had laboured all those years in London.

It was ironically in 1897 that Shaw hoped to be dead by the time conditions in Ireland became favourable to the production of drama -- ironic because it was in that year that the Irish Literary Theatre was established. Shaw was not to die for another fifty-three years, and in the meantime was to take an active if intermittent part in the Irish National Theatre movement. To start with, he tendered them a play. As he declared in the Preface, "John Bull's Other Island was written in 1904 at the request of Mr William Butler Yeats, as a patriotic contribution to the repertory of the Irish Literary Theatre" (Shaw *Collected Plays* II, 808). Well, it was and it was not. It had not been actually commissioned by Yeats -- Shaw had had the play in mind before there was any question of it being staged in Dublin. What's more throughout the summer of 1904, while he was writing it, Shaw was much more concerned with its London production than with its place in the repertory of the Irish Literary Theatre. In point of fact *John Bull*, produced at the Court Theatre in November 1904, was the play that made his London (and indeed his international) reputation. What did the trick was a royal command performance at which the then king, Edward VII was present. Edward was a man of such enormous size that the theatre had to have a special royal chair provided for him. But so funny did the king find *John Bull* that he broke this royal chair laughing at it. From that point on, Shaw was in. Yet even though it was partly written for a London production and was a huge success with English audiences, in offering *John Bull* to the Abbey, and in the writing of the play itself, Shaw was trying to come to terms with Ireland and his own relation to it.

Larry Doyle, the Irish engineer who works in London in partnership with the English Tom Broadbent in *John Bull*, is a very special version of Shaw. He used Larry as eloquent spokesman for his own polemic, firecracker political views on Ireland, as, for example, when he advocates the establishment of the Catholic Church as the state religion of Ireland, on the grounds that this would make the priests much "less" powerful. More importantly, though, Shaw probed through Larry the pathology of his own emotions as Irish emigrant. In the play it is eighteen years since Larry left Ireland, eighteen to Shaw's twenty-eight. I suspect that the only reason Shaw struck a round ten years off his own total, was to render the love interest with Nora Reilly more plausible. Nora was Larry's childhood sweetheart, and if she had been kept twenty-eight years waiting for him back in Rosscullen, she would have hardly

seemed very eligible to marry his English partner Broadbent as she does in the end. Shaw was surely speaking for himself when he had Larry declare to Broadbent: "I have an instinct against going back to Ireland: an instinct so strong that I'd rather go with you to the South Pole than to Rosscullen" (*Shaw Collected Plays* II, 907).

Larry's great "dreaming" speech in the first act of *John Bull* is not just autobiographical, it is positively confessional in spirit. Broadbent and Larry have been talking about national character, and Larry comes up with the theory that it is the weather that differentiates the Irishman from the Englishman: "the climate is different."

Here, if the life is dull, you can be dull too, and no great harm done. [*Going off into a passionate dream*] But your wits cant thicken in that soft moist air, on those white springy roads, in those misty brown bogs, on those hillsides of granite rocks and magenta heather. You've no such colors in the sky, no such lure in the distances, no such sadness in the evenings. Oh, the dreaming! the dreaming! the torturing, heart-scalding, never satisfying dreaming, dreaming, dreaming, dreaming! [. . .] An Irishman's imagination never lets him alone, never convinces him, never satisfies him; but it makes him that he cant face reality nor deal with it nor handle it nor conquer it. [. . .] He cant be religious. The inspired Churchman that teaches him the sanctity of life and the importance of conduct is sent away empty; while the poor village priest that gives him a miracle or a sentimental story of a saint, has cathedrals built for him out of the pennies of the poor. He cant be intelligently political: he dreams of what the Shan Van Vocht said in ninety-eight. If you want to interest him in Ireland you've got to call the unfortunate island Kathleen ni Hoolihan and pretend she's a little old woman. (*Shaw Collected Plays* II, 909-10)¹

And going with this impotent dreaming, according to Larry, is its counterpart in derisive laughter:

And all the time you laugh! laugh! laugh! eternal derision, eternal envy, eternal folly, eternal fouling

¹ This edition preserves Shaw's idiosyncratic principles of spelling.

Bernard Shaw: an Irish Playright in Spite of Himself

and staining and degrading, until, when you come at last to a country where men take a question seriously and give a serious answer to it, you deride them for having no sense of humour, and plume yourself on your own worthlessness as if it made you better than them. (Shaw *Collected Plays* II, 910-11)

Larry is ostensibly remembering his own youth in Rosscullen in this passage, the small town in which he grew up, but he is actually recalling Shaw's adolescent experience of Dublin, as we can see from Shaw's much later reaction to *Ulysses*. Joyce's publisher Sylvia Beach was trying to get subscribers for the book in 1921 and wrote to Shaw with a prospectus. He explained in his letter back why he refused to buy it: "I am an elderly Irishman [. . .] if you imagine that any Irishman, much less an elderly one, would pay 150 francs for a book, you little know my countrymen":

I have read several fragments of *Ulysses* in its serial form. It is a revolting record of a disgusting phase of civilisation; but it is a truthful one; and I should like to put a cordon round Dublin; round up every male person in it between the ages of 15 and 30; force them to read it; and ask them whether on reflection they could see anything amusing in all that foul mouthed, foul minded derision and obscenity. To you, possibly, it may appeal as art [. . .] to me it is all hideously real: I have walked those streets and know those shops and have heard and taken part in those conversations. I escaped from them to England at the age of twenty; and forty years later have learnt from the books of Mr. Joyce that Dublin is still what it was, and young men are still drivelling in slackjawed blackguardism just as they were in 1870. It is, however, some consolation to find that at last somebody has felt deeply enough about it to face the horror of writing it all down and using his literary genius to force people to face it. (Shaw *Collected Letters* III, 719)

Shaw himself was unable to face what he saw as the horror of Dublin as a subject for art, and therefore displaced the setting of *John Bull* to the imaginary Rosscullen. But in Larry Doyle he faced what Dublin had made him and what England had saved him from.

England has made a man of Larry. As he says to Broadbent, "it is by living with you and working in double harness with you that I have learnt to live in a real world and not in an imaginary one" (Shaw *Collected Plays* II, 913). It was England that made a man of Shaw also, the long apprenticeship in the British Museum, the self-education in the artistic and political movements of 1880s London: that was for him the real world. And yet in Larry Doyle he exposes the emotional traumas involved in this cultural re-location. The bitterness and self-contempt within Larry come across vividly enough in the "dreaming" speech but in the later acts of the play he emerges as someone emotionally maimed, his feeling for his country distorted into a self-destructive aggressiveness. The business syndicate which he and Broadbent represent will "develop" Rosscullen ruthlessly and unscrupulously. As Larry glories in this ruthlessness, one senses that at some level he is driven to destroy Rosscullen to justify his desertion and betrayal of it. The emotions here are not all that distant from Shaw's own glimpsed in that outburst against the "effete" Irish nation. In both cases the disproportionate anger suggests a disturbance deep within the self.

Larry, however, is not the only Shavian persona in *John Bull*. If the Catholic landagent's son turned civil engineer seems an odd enough version of George Bernard Shaw, then the mad defrocked priest Peter Keegan might seem even odder. Yet there is as much of Shaw in Keegan as there is in Doyle, and in the final act Keegan is used as Doyle's antagonist. He is a visionary who believes that the whole world is hell and yet can credit Ireland with a special status. "Ireland, sir," he tells Broadbent,

for good or evil, is like no other place under heaven; and no man can touch its sod or breathe its air without becoming better or worse. It produces two kinds of men in strange perfection: saints and traitors. It is called the island of saints; but indeed in these later years it might be more fitly called the island of the traitors; for our harvest of these is the fine flower of the world's crop of infamy. But the day may come when these islands shall live by the quality of their men rather than by the abundance of their minerals; and then we shall see. (Shaw *Collected Plays* II, 1016)

Larry in the context of this scene has come to appear one of Ireland's traitors; Keegan is one of its saints. It is worth remembering that one of Shaw's ambitions as a very young man in

Ireland had been to found a new religion. (His friend Edward McNulty managed to argue him out of this idea, on the very sound grounds that there were too many religions in the world already.) Larry Doyle had wanted "Ireland to be the brains and imagination of a big Commonwealth" (Shaw *Collected Plays* II, 914); Keegan wants it to provide spiritual leadership for the world. Larry maintains the Shavian paradox that it is climate which makes national character; Keegan is perhaps no less his author's representative in the mystical belief in the special holiness of Irish ground. *John Bull's Other Island* was in one sense quite seriously 'a patriotic contribution' to the Irish National Theatre movement.

Whether it was purely coincidental, or whether writing *John Bull* made it possible, it was in the year after he had written it, in 1905, that Shaw paid the first of his many return visits to Ireland. He was urged on by his Irish wife Charlotte, who was always more devoted to Ireland than he was. From 1909 on, there began also a much closer relationship with the Abbey. When the Abbey visited London that year, he was impressed by their performances and particularly moved by the stirringly patriotic *Cathleen Ni Houlihan*. He told Lady Gregory, much to her astonishment, "When I see that play I feel it might lead a man to do something foolish." (Lady Gregory commented in her journal, "I was as much surprised as if I had seen one of the Nelson lions [in Trafalgar Square] scratch himself" (Laurence and Greene xiii)). Shortly after in 1909, Shaw turned down the invitation of Yeats and Lady Gregory to become a Director of the Abbey in succession to Synge, explaining that 'the irony of it is, I am engaged in trying to build up a theatre in England' (Laurence and Greene 4), but he promised to help. This he did most immediately by giving to the theatre the controversial *Shewing-up of Blanco Posnet* which the Lord Chamberlain had banned in England.

The production of *Blanco Posnet* in August 1909 by the Abbey in the teeth of stiff opposition from the authorities was the basis for a new respect by Shaw for the theatre movement. He was in Ireland at the time of the production, staying in what was to become his favourite hotel in Parknasilla in County Kerry, but he resolutely refused to come to Dublin for rehearsals or even for the production. He explained this afterwards in a letter intended for the press: "I kept away from Dublin in order that our national theatre might have the entire credit of handling and producing a new play without assistance from the author or from any other person trained in the English theaters. Nobody who has not lived, as I have to live, in

London, can possibly understand the impression the Irish players made there this year, or appreciate the artistic value of their performances, their spirit, and their methods”(Laurence and Greene 53-54). This is an authentic tribute to the achievement of the Abbey, including a recognition of Shaw's own quite different “training” in the English theatrical tradition.

Shaw was an international socialist in politics and he could never sympathise with the political separatism of Sinn Féin, though he defended the leaders of the 1916 Rising with great courage and dignity. But the cultural separatism of the literary revival and the theatre movement he did come to appreciate. He lambasted the Irish-Americans who protested against Synge's *Playboy of the Western World* in New York and Philadelphia in 1912, declaring that it was they, the Irish-Americans, and not Synge's characters, who were not authentically Irish. It was Yeats, Synge and Lady Gregory, rather, who “have called the attention of Europe to the fact that Ireland is a nation with a specific and splendid national genius, and not merely a province of England” (Laurence and Greene 68). He became a good friend and admirer of Lady Gregory -- he called her ‘the greatest living Irishwoman’. He supported the Abbey as a business adviser, a publicist, a lecturer and as a playwright. For in 1915 he wrote his second play for the Abbey, *O'Flaherty V.C.*

Shaw subtitled *O'Flaherty V.C.* “A Recruiting Pamphlet” but it represents an argument for recruiting such as only Shaw could have devised: Irishmen should join up in order to escape from their mothers and motherland. Shaw had left Ireland originally in 1876 to rejoin rather than to escape from his mother -- she had left for London two years previously -- but his belief in the beneficial effects of emigration for Irishmen was no doubt based on his own experience. Shaw intended the play to be as provocative as possible, as he made clear to Lady Gregory when describing it to her:

The picture of the Irish character will make the *Playboy* seem a patriotic rhapsody by comparison. The ending is cynical to the last possible degree. The idea is that O'Flaherty's experience in the trenches has induced in him a terrible realism and an unbearable candor. He sees Ireland as it is, his mother as she is, his sweetheart as she is; and he goes back to the dreaded trenches joyfully for the sake of peace and quietness. (Laurence and Greene 95)

In fact in the play Shaw contrives to subvert all forms of jingoism, the Irish as well as the English. As O'Flaherty says, speaking for the Shaw who had written the wildly unpopular pamphlet *Common Sense About the War*, "You'll never have a quiet world til you knock the patriotism out of the human race" (Shaw *Collected Plays* IV, 1000). The only hope Shaw can see emerging out of the war is that those who survive it may have a truer sense of reality, an awareness of the wider world which may enable them to escape from the distorting perspectives both of class and nation. And it is to this final end that he wants Irishmen to go to fight for the British. Not surprisingly, the military authorities failed to see it in quite this light. The play was withdrawn at the urging of Dublin Castle. And so Shaw's second play written for the Abbey failed to get its premiere there.

Ironically, however, the next year, 1916, *John Bull's Other Island* was at last given its first Abbey production. The idea was Lady Gregory's: as she wrote to Shaw: "a brilliant thought struck me [. . .] to do an autumn season of G.B.S.--our Irish Shakespeare--I hope for an annual festival of him! [. . .] I would like to put on John Bull (written for us and never acted by us;) Devils Disciple which should appeal to the romantic side of our audience; Doctors Dilemma, not my favourite but which I am inclined to think acts best of all [. . .] and I should like much to put on Androcles, if we could borrow the lion". Shaw's initial response was not very encouraging. The Abbey was welcome to *John Bull*, but Shaw feared that it was 'rather hackneyed in Dublin by this time'. (It had in fact frequently been played there by touring companies.) He vetoed *The Devil's Disciple*, a play which he would not allow to be performed during the war in case it was construed as anti-British propaganda, and which in any case he said was well beyond the Abbey's technical resources. *The Doctor's Dilemma* was also out: "it required", said Shaw, "polished acting by a cast of cockney stars." And as for *Androcles*, "how on earth could [you] get it on to the Abbey St stage? There is hardly room for the lion: one spring would carry him half way to the G.P.O." (Laurence and Greene 118-25) In spite of Shaw's doubts, the Abbey got its Shaw season and over the winter of 1916-17 produced no less than six of his plays. For all Shaw's reservations about the suitability of the Abbey performing his plays, they were frequently produced there in the period after 1916 and had a major influence on Irish playwrights such as Sean O'Casey and Denis Johnston. Shaw became an important presence in Dublin theatre and thus became in another sense an Irish playwright in spite of himself.

With Shaw's own enormous international success came enough magnanimity to be able to admire the achievement of the Irish literary revival, the dramatic movement, those who had elected to make their cultural base in Ireland as he had not. He could see himself as belonging to an earlier generation for whom this was not a possibility, as in the passage from the 1922 Preface to *Immaturity* I quoted earlier, looking back at the 1870s: "There was no Gaelic League in those days, nor any sense that Ireland had in herself the seed of culture." By 1922, he could recognise that Ireland had definitively proved that she had in herself the seed of culture. Yet his attitude towards Ireland never settled down into serene acceptance. There continued to be outbursts of the old aggressiveness, particularly aroused by the insularity of Irish nationalism. In 1917 he refused an invitation from Lady Gregory to lecture on behalf of the Irish National Theatre with a vociferous "NO":

The very words nation, nationality, our country, patriotism, fill me with loathing. Why do you want to stimulate a self-consciousness which is already morbidly excessive in our wretched island, and is deluging Europe with blood? [. . .] Since my recent visit [to Dublin] I feel like putting up a statue to Cromwell. (Laurence and Greene 136)

(Cromwell, notoriously hated in Ireland, Shaw claimed as an ancestor.) He was on holiday in Ireland in 1922 as civil war broke out. His reaction was to invoke a plague on both their houses:

I cannot stand the stale romance that passes for politics in Ireland. I cannot imagine why people bother so much about us: I am sure we don't deserve it. [. . .] The bottom has fallen out of the centre of Europe; and England is on the brink of the abyss. But what matter if for Ireland dear we fall! It is too silly: I must hurry back to London. The lunatics there are comparatively harmless. (Laurence and Greene *The Matter With Ireland* 257)

After 1923 he stopped coming to Ireland and went to Scotland for his holidays instead. He recommended the change to Lady Gregory:

The [Scottish] people are goodlooking, civil, and free from obtrusive virtues and heroic traditions: in short quite likable. Sell Coole and settle here: you will find

Bernard Shaw: an Irish Playright in Spite of Himself

all the beauties of Ireland without the drawback of Irish inhabitants. (Laurence and Greene 176)

Shaw could never really forgive Dublin for having born and bred him. It remained for him the city of "derision and invincible ignorance"; this was a condition from which he never felt he himself had entirely escaped. As he confessed to the audience of his last Dublin lecture in 1918: "From his childhood he had imbibed the habit of derision. He had tried to get out of it, but he could not, quite. In spite of living in England, he found that curiously cackling derision breaking out in him, and he wished that he had been born somewhere else than in Dublin". (Shaw "Shaw's Advice"). And yet Shaw saw his inescapable Irishness positively as well as negatively. Shaw was not an insecure provincial trying to overcome feelings of inferiority by metropolitanising himself. He remained Irish and proud of it. He confessed to sharing the Irish "inborn sense of superiority to all who have had the misfortune to be born in other countries" (qtd. in David Clare 121). In fact one of Shaw's greatest contributions to the understanding of English-Irish relations, to my mind, is the perception that on both sides there is an assumption of superiority which prevents full sympathy and understanding. Given his revulsion against his native Dublin, however, it was difficult for Shaw to locate the Irishness which gave him his edge over the English.

As a symbol of that distinguished and distinctive Irish identity, Shaw turned to the one part of his childhood where he had been happy, the one place where he had succeeded in escaping the constrictions of Dublin, his summers in Torca Cottage, Dalkey:

The Torca shoulder of Dalkey Hill, the Telegraph Hill overlooking the two bays from Dalkey Island northward to Howth and southward to Bray, is not surpassed in its view of mountain, sea, and sky [. . .] anywhere I have been. [. . .] It is the beauty of Ireland that has made us what we are. I am a product of Dalkey's outlook. (Laurence and Greene *The Matter with Ireland* 290-91)

Dalkey provided him with his first experience of the imaginative expansiveness which as a creative writer he needed. But, whether he saw himself as shaped by Dalkey's outlook or Dublin's derisiveness, whether he identified Ireland's climate as making the Irishman, like Larry Doyle, or its holy ground like Peter Keegan, Shaw knew that he

Nicholas Grene

could never be anything else. As he said in a press interview when he was 92: "I have lived for twenty years in Ireland and for seventy-two in England; but the twenty came first, and in Britain I am still a foreigner and shall die one." (Laurence and Greene *The Matter with Ireland* 290-91).

WORKS CITED

- Clare, David. *Bernard Shaw's Irish Outlook*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Laurence, Dan H. and David H. Greene, eds. *The Matter with Ireland*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1962.
- Laurence, Dan H. and Nicholas Grene, eds. *Shaw, Lady Gregory and the Abbey Theatre*. Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1993.
- Shaw, Bernard. "Shaw's advice to Irishmen." *SHAW: the Annual of Bernard Shaw Studies* 18 (1998): 63-66.
- Shaw, Bernard. *Collected Plays with their Prefaces*. 7 vols. London: Max Reinhardt, 1970-74.
- Shaw, Bernard. *Collected Letters*. Ed. Dan H. Laurence. 4 vols. London: Max Reinhardt, 1965-85.
- Shaw, Bernard. Preface, *Immaturity*. London: Constable, 1931.



Versions of a Literary Portrait: George Bernard Shaw in Turkish

N. Berrin Aksoy

In the nineteenth century and the twentieth century as well as today, the West undeniably represented the modern in terms of arts, culture and innovation for many developing and underdeveloped countries. Turkey, in its early years was in the process of modernization and development, thanks to state-led initiatives, and its founding principles, outspokenly voiced by M. Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Turkish Republic. Translation played a crucial role in this process, as it was necessary to become familiar with Western knowledge, thinking, concepts and innovations in the fields of sciences and arts. In that respect, translations give us clues about what was considered important for modernization, what the priorities for the initiators of modernization were and what was aimed at. Translation also enables us to see how much is achieved, and how far all these initiatives for modernization went. In order to answer these questions first we have to find out why certain works were chosen for translation, who chose them, what were the results of their publication along with one major question: Under what conditions were they translated and published, and to what kind of an audience.

In this study, then, I have chosen my background frame for evaluating George Bernard Shaw's place in Turkish literary as well as cultural polysystem in the various timespans and stages, as the evolution and development of the modernisation initiatives. I would like to find out how and why George Bernard Shaw is represented by means of translation in the various stages of our polysystem, what this representation can tell us about the conditions and characteristics of those times in terms of the literary and cultural climate, and about the target audience, that is, the Turkish reader.

In the Turkish literary polysystem of the early years of the Republic, one can expect translation to play a role in the efforts for Westernization and modernisation dating actually back to the Ottoman Empire, Reformation Period.

In the years around the 1930s to the 1960s, reaching its peak in the 1940s, translations from Western sources are central in the literary polysystem to such an extent that sometimes the borderline between translation and original work (or adaptation) begins to vanish. In the case of George Bernard Shaw's first appearance on the Turkish literary polysystem, observations and evaluations have to be more functional than technical.¹ In general, the translations from the world classics in the 1930s and 1940s are very much the result of the contemporary constraints and expectations of the domestic literary scene, and as a consequence of their a-systemic position, translations often played a primary role in the development of new genres, expressions and concepts. They brought along a series of innovations such as local colour, the use of idiomatic speech and variations in linguistic register and at the same time the preservation of features belonging to foreign genres and traditions.

The earliest traceable appearance of George Bernard Shaw in Turkish can be seen within the above mentioned initiatives which were to be carried out in many ways; of which, translation of important Western works was crucial. Hence, first translation of Shaw was: *Göklerde Futbol. Yeni bir Spor* translated by Halikarnas Balıkcısı in 1939. The book was published by Tan Evi. The date is important here because it is only a year before the Translation Bureau was established by the Ministry of Education, Hasan Ali Yücel, who initiated the project of translating world classics which paved the way and reflected the European humanism and

¹ The information on Bernard Shaw translations in Turkish have been searched and collected through google search.

enlightenment. *Göklerde Futbol, Yeni bir Spor* which is a George Bernard Shaw translation, is actually not the translation of a complete work, but a collection of three works *Aerial Football; The New Game, the Emperor and the Little Girl*, an excerpt from *Back to Methuselah*. The translation was published in a serial called “Cep Kitapları”; pocket books serial. Who chose to publish this book/translation will be our first question in order to define its place in the polysystem.

As mentioned earlier the early years of the modernisation initiatives in Turkey comprised many attempts of bringing together Western science, technology and arts closer to the newly-established Turkish Republic and its society. This was seen as one of the pillars of the foundation of the Republic and as much as the economic and social circumstances availed, attempts were being made by the public and private sector for such an introduction of the West with its concepts and institutions. Hence, the publishing house Tan Evi established by Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel functioned as an intermediary in this sense. The company was established in 1935, first as a newspaper by Ali Naci Karacan. Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel and A. Emin Yalman became partners after Ali N. Karacan.

Tan pocket book series were published in its small format to be carried around and read easily. The purpose of the Tan Matbaası was to introduce some social and philosophical issues discussed in the West and to create an awareness in that respect. It also published children’s books and encyclopaedias. For instance, *Heidi*’s first introduction into the Turkish polysystem was by means of Tan Matbaası publication *Resimli Ay Mecmuası*. Another journal was called *Büyük Mecmua* which included topics such as gender equality, life in the USA etc. Tan Matbaası was closed in 1959, and the owners Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel went abroad.

One can deduce from this background that the publication/the first appearance of George Bernard Shaw translation was not purely for its dramatic or literary weight. Bernard Shaw was regarded as weighty due to his variety of subject-matter which embraced very actual, universal and influential concepts that create awareness in society. Hence, he could introduce topics of discussions on religion, society, equality, social responsibility to the community in those times and circumstances.

It seems likely that the events which marked the flourishing of translations of great foreign classics around the 1940s had some

kind of an influence on the way the translators and the reading public were assimilating foreign literature in general. Translations became a tool pointed at the linguistic, literary, cultural, philosophical and even political traditions of the West. In the translation of *Aerial Football: The New Game*, it may be said that the translation looks much like a linguistic adaptation while retaining the content and subject matter, in order to achieve certain amount of fluency and familiarity for the audience, to make them read in the first place. Significantly, the translation of great works from Western sources was subject to very sophisticated scrutiny before being chosen for translation, and in this case, it seems that the editor and the publishers of the Tan Evi Matbaası is the sole decision-maker. Also owing to the personality and standing of Halikarnas Balıkcısı as the translator, we can say that he knew that he formed part of a translational system in line with the publishing principles of Tan Evi.

Moving on to the second appearance of George Bernard Shaw in the Turkish literary polysystem, he becomes one of the most important authors to be chosen for translation during the Translation Bureau epoch. I have already mentioned the mission of the Translation Bureau. For a moment of brief refreshment, let me posit the Bureau with its background and functions. As Susan Bassnett writes in her preface to Özlem Berk's published PhD dissertation: "What happened in Turkey was an extended and deliberative process of cultural policy and translation activity, designed to transform and modernize the state and the Turkish language" (qtd. in Berk xiii).

Özlem Berk argues convincingly that the main strategy used for translations in Turkish was one of acculturation. Saliha Paker describes this movement and the Translation Bureau as such:

The revolutionary move made by Hasan Ali Yücel, Minister of Education, in setting up a Translation Committee in 1939 and a Translation Office (as Paker calls) in 1940 was intended to reinforce the new language policies and to organize a programme for cultural revival. The office was composed largely of academics and prominent men of letters, was to select and translate world classics. The general aim was to generate the spirit of humanism by cultivating and assimilating foreign literatures through translation. (Paker 579)

This explanation by Paker may clarify why we see such a fluent and colloquial use of Turkish by Halikarnas Balıkcısı, which does not totally correspond with the original in Göklerde *Futbol*.

During the time of the activities of the Translation Bureau against such a background, out of the total number of 93 translations from English classics, English literature and English scientific works (excluding series of modern theatre works) 11 translations of George Bernard Shaw were published. The first of these translations was *Kandida* (Candida) translated by Orhan Tahsin Günden, in 1942, followed by *Androcles ve Aslan* (Androcles and the Lion) translated by Süleyman Adıyaman and Rıza Dönmez in 1945, *Blanco Posnet'in Sırrı* (The Shewing up of Blanco Posnet) by Remide Adil in 1945, *Cesar'la Kleopatra* (Caesar and Cleopatra) by Nurettin Sevin in 1945, *Jan Dark* (Saint. Joan) by Saffet Korkut in 1945, *Milyoner Kadın* (The Millionairess) by Avni Givda, *İnsan, Üstün İnsan* (Man and Superman) by Cevat Şakir Kabağaçlı (Karaağaçlıgil) in 1949, *Silahlar ve Kahraman* (Arms and the Man) by Hamit Dereli in 1953, *Hiç Belli Olmaz* (You Never Can Tell) by Orhan Tahsin Günden in 1956, *Bir Çuval İncir* (Apple Cart) by Orhan Tahsin Günden in 1964 and finally *Kırgınlar Evi* (Heartbreak House) by Sevgi Sanlı 1968.

In all these translations, the aim and the method of translation appropriate for this *skopos* is best explained in Hasan Ali Yücel's words as such:

For any work to be considered as transferred into the mother tongue, the translators must have absorbed the mentality of the author, in other words, they have to have penetrated into the cultural soul of the author's society. In this way it is obvious that they will enrich the intellectual treasure of their society with the concepts of the author's society. This is why we believe that with these systematic intellectual studies our mother tongue will find new improvement opportunities. For each understanding is a recreation, a good translator is worthy of a great author. (qtd. in Berk 140)

Therefore, the emphasis as expected from the translators, was on the fluency and readability in order to create a reading public in the first place as in the examples:

Versions of a Literary Portrait

Burgess:... James,sana maalesef bir şikayette bulunacağım. Böyle bir şey yapmak istemezdim ama buna vazife ve hak bakımından mecburiyet hissediyorum.

Morell: Hayrola?

Burgess: Mr. Marchbanks sözlerimi tasdik edecektir.O vakaya şahit oldu.(*birdenbire büsbütün ciddileşerek*) Senin katibin olacak kadın,haddini bilmemezlikte bana budala diyecek kadar ileri gitti.

Morell: (*gönlünden kopan bir neşe ile*) Ne diyorsunuz? Zaten bizim Prossy'den de başka bir şey beklenmez. Zavallı o kadar toksözlüdür ki bazan kendine hakim olamıyor. Kah! Kah! Kah!

Following the earliest entrance of George Bernard Shaw into the Turkish literary polysystem through MEB Translation Bureau translations, private publishing houses which began to emerge in the 1960s and afterwards showed interest in George Bernard Shaw as well. His popularity was immense among readers of literature and philosophy. Although known as a playwright, Shaw produced novels as well. According to Lirak Karjagdiu in his article

[a]t an early age reading books was Shaw's passion. Influenced by reading political and philosophical literature, he became a dedicated socialist reformer and published political and philosophical writings. He was a defender of the women's rights, a vegetarian and a teetotaller. He believed that, as a social reformer, thru drama he could induce reform in British society. This way, by making the public laugh he taught he would be able to make them think. Hence, English drama became one of the most suitable and preferred mediums to express his ideas, issues and problems about English society, while owing to the detailed and comprehensive prefaces, Professional comments, long and detailed stage directions his dramas became attractive and interesting for reading.

Karjagdiu goes on to write that:

[t]o David Daichies, George Bernard Shaw considers drama as a suitable medium to express his ideas on

the social abuses, misuses, contradictions and prejudices. His dramas usually contained a certain dosage of humour and a lot of intelligent provocations and allusions. His characters are his mouthpieces, painted in very strong colours, are frequently comic. Often, the aim of his satire is to criticise and mock the institutions and even the public opinion, in a blend of comedy and seriousness. He can be savagely yet comically critical of society. (Karjagdiu www.academia.edu.tr)

These qualities make a literary portrait of George Bernard Shaw as a distinguished author/playwright in Britain and also elsewhere in the form of translations as well. Hence, his earliest literary portrait in the Turkish literary polysystem owes its place to these blended qualities of being a thinker-artist-critic. This portrait heavily focuses on the thinker-critic-humorist side more on its educational value and function in making people think, in raising questions, in using literature for public good and as a tool for generating ideas and ways of thinking in the society. These are the reasons why George Bernard Shaw appears to have a solid place in the earliest activities of the Translation Bureau. When we remember that he appeared in many European countries as late as the 1950s it becomes obvious that publications in Turkey in 1939, 1940 and 1942 are noteworthy.

George Bernard Shaw continued to be translated into Turkish after the Translation Bureau activities came to a halt. The last one was *Kırgınlar Evi* in 1968 by Sevgi Sanlı. *Bir Kadın Yarattım* (Pygmalion) translated by Canset Onan is its first appearance in the private publishing company Altın Kitaplar, Tiyatro Şaheserleri. Altın Kitaplar Printing House was established in İstanbul in 1959. On its webpage, it is explained why and how it came into being as a Publisher of World Classics. This mission was a conscious step in a publishing policy which aimed at introducing to the Turkish readers the translations of world classics of fiction, best-sellers, detective novels and love stories as well as children's books. They were aware of the challenges of publishing translations "as if they were written in Turkish" (their own words) because they were "aware of the vacuum for such translations in Turkish." In their introduction, it is seen that presenting the Turkish audience with foreign works has become a major undertaking and a responsibility because they were aspiring to become a longstanding publishing company (in their own words). George Bernard Shaw translation in Altın Kitaplar was the outcome

of such an endeavour, namely to present to the reader a model of great Western drama, for its literary merit; as a model of its genre.

In 1971, Mehmet Harmancı translated *Genç Bir Bayana Sosyalizm ve Kapitalizm Üzerine Öğütler* (The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism), published by Milliyet Yayınları, Genel Kültür Dizisi. These were the years when the political and social climate was favourable for leftist works. The same year Mete Ergin's translation of *Kara Kız* (The Adventures of the Black Girl in Her Search for God), Cem Yayınevi Nobel Dizisi appeared.

The subtitles of the private companies's prints are interesting. They have names like World Masterpieces, Modern Drama Series, Culture Series, World Classics, etc. Among them, Sevgi Sanlı translation of selected plays *Pygmalion*, *Küskünler Evi*, *Ermiş Jean* published by Adam yayınları in 1982, İş Bankası Kültür yayınları in 2004. *Sezar ve Kleopatra* in 1999 , Cumhuriyet (Sevgi Sanlı), *Bir Çuval İncir* by Bekir Karaoğlu in 2001, Cumhuriyet, and more recent translations *İbsenciliğin Özü* in 2010 by Ömer Şekerci (an academic) by Nobel Yayın, 2015 İlgi yayınları-*Üç Büyük Yazardan Aforizmalar* 2015 by Devrim Evcı Dipnot Yayınları.

The recent publication of George Bernard Shaw by private companies reveals an interesting tendency towards translating his philosophical works rather than dramas. This is another angle of his portrait in our literary polysystem.

Another interesting George Bernard Shaw portrait is drawn by Şakir Eczacıbaşı in 1995 in the book *Bernard Shaw, Gülen Düşünceler* (Smiling Thoughts) by İyi Şeyler. In the first page of the book "Gülümsemeyi Unutanlar İçin" (For Those Who Have Forgotten to Smile) dedication is seen. Şakir Eczacıbaşı, the founder of the Turkish pharmaceutical company Eczacıbaşı explains why he wrote this book as follows:

Gülen düşünceleri yayıma verirken... 1950'nin Kasım ayında Londra'nın o sisli gününde yirmibir yaşımdayken tanıdığım, dünyanın gerçeklerini gösteren yolları önüme açan, bunca yıl sonra bile her sabah günün olaylarını izlerken demokrasi, ulus, inanç, kültür, barış ve özgürlük adına yapılanları gördükçe gülümseyerek anımsadığım Shaw'a çok geç de olsa boyun borcumu ödeyebilme olanağını bulabildiğim için seviniyorum...

Yirminci yüzyılın önde gelen neredeyse her sanat, bilim ya da siyaset adamı Shaw için övgülü sözler söylenmiştir. Einstein'ın dediğini burada yinelemek istiyorum: "Shaw özgürleşme yolunda bizi başka hiçbir çağdaşımızın yapamadığı düzeyde etkileyebildi ve yaşamın ağırlığını büyük ölçüde üstümüzden kaldırdı..." (18)

[While getting *Smiling Thoughts* published...I am happy that I have finally found the opportunity to show my indebtedness to Shaw whom I met at the age of 21 on a foggy November day in 1950; who has enabled me to travel on the paths to the realities of the world and whom I remember fondly even today when I witness all that has been going on in the name of democracy, nation, faith, culture, peace and freedom....

Almost all the prominent men of letters or politicians or artists have spoken in praise of Shaw; here, I would like to repeat what Einstein said about him:

"Shaw has influenced us much to the extent that none of our contemporaries could do so on the way to freedom, and lifted the burden of life from our shoulders".]

First of all, the name of the book *Gülen Düşünceler* refers to the witty comments of George Bernard Shaw which make one smile as one thinks. George Bernard Shaw's magic is there: His witty comments are never harsh or disturbing, they are entertaining, humorous, even funny. We see them in all 53 plays, commentaries, articles, speeches. His speech in honor of Einstein in 1930 in London maybe an example of how masterful he is in his treatment of subject:

Napoleon and other great men were makers of empires, but these 8 men whom I am about to mention were makers of universes... I can count them on the fingers of my two hands... Even among those 8 men I must make a distinction. I have called them makers of the universe but some of them were only repairers. Newton made a universe which lasted for 300 years. Einstein has made a universe which I suppose you want me to say will never stop, but I

don't know how long it will last. (Shaw, Bernard
www.youtube.com)

Shaw is commenting on the nature of science and its eternal quest, while making us smile at how cleverly he puts that forward.

This is what had impressed Ş. Eczacıbaşı as a young student in London in the 1940s and 1950s. The idea of writing a book on Shaw does not dawn on him all of a sudden. "The idea is dated back to 1961, following the 27 May incident in Turkish political life (his own words p.17). Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, one of the founders of the Translation Bureau, a thinker, man of letters and translator, during a conversation with Eczacıbaşı on 27 May, democracy, politics etc. brings the topic to Shaw and they decide to make a series of Shaw's witty comments in a journal called *Yeni Ufuklar* under the name "Smiling Thoughts." This is how the book was first conceived, and then published as a book in 1995.

Another book on Shaw is produced by Prof. Dr. Sami Ferlier titled *George Bernard Shaw Bir Sanatçı-Düşünür*, published by DTCF Basımevi, 1982. Yet another emphasis on his philosophical side.

On the other hand, I would like to say a few things on George Bernard Shaw on stage in Turkey. Bernard Shaw productions in State Theatre is as follows²:

1. *Sezar ve Kleopatra*. Translator, Sevgi Sanlı, 1963, Arena Tiyatrosu
2. *Candida*. Translator, Sevgi Sanlı, 1985, State Theatre General Directorate
3. *Sezar ve Kleopatra*. Translator, Sevgi Sanlı, 1985, STGD
4. *Büyük Katerina*. Translator, Selahattin Burak/ Rukiye Tümen, 1999, STGD
5. *Pygmalion- Bir Kadın Yarattım*. Translator, Sevgi Sanlı, 2014, Bursa ST

To sum up, the literary portrait of George Bernard Shaw established by way of translations into the Turkish literary polysystem is double-versioned. His earliest introduction into the Turkish society coincides with the modernisation initiatives and activities in all spheres of life and thinking, and it will not be wrong to say that he is intentionally chosen to be translated for his

² The information on Bernard Shaw performances in Turkey has been retrieved from State Theatre web pages.

achievements of using the art of drama as a medium to raise questions, criticise and make people think. His later translations display a similar portrait; he is intentionally chosen as a model playwright with his innovative use of drama to make witty social criticism, towards the 1990s his philosophical writings such as the *Essence of Ibsenism*, *Augustus Annojenka*, *Ölümsüzlüğün Sırrı* alongside reprints of his plays were within the suitable political and ideological atmosphere in Europe and in the world, and as an opposition to globalism, the implications of the fall of the Soviet Empire, the rise of internationalism and international communication, etc.

To conclude, in tracing the history of Shaw translations in Turkey, we see that the earliest translations created the portrait of a dramatist whose style and dramatic technique is designed to make witty social criticism. This literary portrait continues to be enforced through these new translations in the 1960s. However, in later years (1970s, 1980s, 1990s) we have a slightly different literary portrait that focuses more on Shaw the thinker, the philosopher. The reason for this slight difference might be due to the fact that the early translations were actually chosen by the decision-makers or patrons of translations simply because in Shaw the dramatist there was the thing they were seeking to achieve and install in Turkish literature: entertaining while raising awareness of social issues; hence Shaw and the purpose of translation activities coincided. Shaw was not harsh, nor blunt even in his sharpest criticism. In his plays his characters are likable. This quality made Shaw very readable for the Turkish audience. In all versions of George Bernard Shaw's portrait in Turkey and Turkish the essence is the same: Shaw is a great philosopher, thinker and humourist; encompassing these qualities in an innovative artist/dramatist constitution.

WORKS CITED

- Berk, Özlem. *Translation and Westernisation in Turkey*. İstanbul ; Ege Yayınları, 2004.
- Eczacıbaşı, Şakir. *Gülen Düşünceler*. İstanbul; Remzi Kitabevi, 1995.
- Ferlier, Sami. *George Bernard Shaw Bir Sanatçı- Düşünür* Ankara; DTCF Basımevi, 1982.
- Karjagdiu, Lirak. "George Bernard Shaw's presence in Albanian." www.Academia.edu
- Paker, Saliha. in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker. New-York; Routledge, 1998. 571-583.
- Shaw, Bernard " George Bernard Shaw giving a speech at a dinner in honor of Albert Einstein 1930. www.youtube.com
- Yücel, Hasan Ali. In *Translation and Westernisation in Turkey*. Özlem Berk. İstanbul: Ege Yayınları , 2004.



3

“I sing, not arms and the hero, but to the [Superman]”: Quest for the Superman in Bernard Shaw’s *Man and Superman* and *Back to Methuselah*

Sıla Şenlen Güvenç

Drama of discussion can be defined as a dialectical drama of ideas, in which the main focus is on discussion and debate rather than on other essential elements of a play such as plot, action, or character. This type of drama promotes a “more philosophical level of thinking and a tendency toward a free and even fantastic form” (Morgan 34). One of the most distinguishing aspects of Shavian drama is his use of drama as a platform to discuss his ideas on society, politics, religion, education, philosophy, etc. in order to achieve social reform. As pointed out by Yüksel, Shaw challenges Victorian ‘mediocrity’ predominant in the arts as well as behaviour (Yüksel ‘Nükteli Söyleşim’den ‘Tartışma Komedisine’ 109). As a Fabian, he believed that all great drama should teach, which is emphasized in his preface to *Mrs. Warren’s Profession*: “fine art is the subtlest, the most seductive, the most effective instrument of moral propagandism in the world” (33), and his name was inseparably associated with the idea of the thesis play, or drama of discussion (Styan 54). Some critics go as far as claiming that Shaw’s plays are mere dialogues instead of plays due to the vast amount of discussion contained within his works, but to such complaints Shaw replied “Now it is quite true that my plays are all talk, just as Raphael’s

I sing, not arms and the hero, but to the [Superman]

pictures are all paint, Michael Angelo's statues all marble, Beethoven's symphonies all noise" (qtd. in Vogt 24). This paper will deal with two of Shaw's discussion plays, mainly *Man and Superman* (1903) called a "comedy and philosophy", and to a lesser extent *Back to Methuselah* (1918-20) termed as "[a] Metabiological Pentateuch" in order to trace the playwright's understanding of the 'Superman' and linked concepts such as the 'Life Force' and 'Creative Evolution'.

The concept of 'Superman' is as old as the world, and has existed for hundreds of centuries. Humanity, not regarding man as the "crowning achievement of creation" has always lived with the thought that there are human beings who are much higher, stronger, more complex, miraculous, than ordinary man (Ouspensky 113). Ancient sayings and legends are full of different images of the Superman such as heroes of myths, fairy tales and epic songs, demi-gods, prophets, messiahs and saints of all religions. Even in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Book IX in which Satan persuades Eve to eat the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, forbidden to them, he seems to be referring to a higher being:

His worshippers; he [God] knows that in the day
Ye Eat thereof, your Eyes that seem so clear,
Yet are but dim, shall perfectly be then
Opened and cleared, **and ye shall be as Gods**, [*my emphasis*]
Knowing both Good and Evil as they know. (ll.705-709)

This is, of course, a direct invitation to disobey God, and to surpass themselves in order to become something higher. Since such beings have always existed, Ouspensky points out that Nietzsche's philosophy about the Superman is not novel:

It is only the opaque and sterilized thought of the last centuries of European culture which has lost touch with the idea of superman and put as its aim *man* as he is, as he always was and always will be. And in this comparatively short period of time, European thought has so thoroughly forgotten the idea of superman that, when Nietzsche threw out this idea to the West, it appeared new, original and unexpected. In reality this idea has existed from the very beginning of human thought known to us. (114)

Nevertheless, in modern thought the term 'Übermench' or 'Overman' is popularly associated with Nietzsche's ideas expressed especially in *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. Nietzsche accepts the development Hypothesis as an explanation of the origin of species, but he does not consider man as the highest possible being which evolution could arrive at. Instead, for Nietzsche, "Man is a rope stretched between the animal and the Superman" (5) and his ideal should be to surpass himself and reach Superman. In terms of the status of Superman, Zarathustra says "What is ape to man? A laughing-stock, a thing of shame. And just the same shall Man be to the Superman: a laughing-stock, a thing of shame" (3). But of course, there are no absolute values as 'good' or 'evil' for Nietzsche, but instead a war of moral principles between the morality of the powerful class called 'master-morality' and the subordinate class called 'slave-morality'. Nietzsche feared that the twentieth-century, defined by industrialization, nationalism and mass democracy, would be an age of slave morality, where the masses would follow anyone providing them with employment, security, and a cause. Thus, in order to avoid this, Zarathustra leaves his disciples at the end of the book to find their own truth¹.

Shaw's Superman is not Nietzsche's 'Superman', who is a god-man free of superego, but rather "a general raising of human character through the deliberate cultivation and endowment of democratic virtue without consideration of property or class" (Shaw qtd. in Bloom 6), or closer to "Plato's philosopher king"² as indicated by Grene in his article "Comedy and Dialectic" (61). Although Shaw's 'Superman' is also regarded as the product of evolution, it is not necessarily Darwinian Evolution. According to Shaw, animals / superior beings survive or evolve not by virtue of their physical force, but their superior intelligence and superior brain. It is in line with Bergson's theory of 'Creative Evolution', which suggests that evolution is motivated by 'élan vital', a basic force like gravity or electromagnetism, a vital impulse (Grene). Shaw then assimilated the Life Force to the Holy Ghost, which he associated with Hegel's 'Weltgeist' or 'World Mind' (Valency 186). As stated in his preface to *Back to Methuselah*, he believes that Creative Evolution is "unmistakeably the religion of the twentieth century" (57). For Shaw, as Yüksel expresses, life aims to further its own evolution by

¹Don Cupitt. "Sea of Faith 6" on Nietzsche and Wittgenstein.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EzJudGxN3xE>

² See. Plato. *Republic*. Trans. G.M.A. Grube. Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1992.

I sing, not arms and the hero, but to the [Superman]

overcoming the limitations of matter and by acquisition of new powers of the mind, which can be obtained through human will ("Defence of Intelligence" 126-7). This resembles Schopenhauer's 'Wille', except that "it is intelligent rather than blind" (Brustein qtd. in Yüksel "Defence of Intelligence" 127). And one of the important matters apparently changeable, according to Shaw, is the duration of individual life: "Weismann, a very clever and suggestive biologist who was unhappily stultified by Neo-Darwinism, pointed out that as certain living organisms, though they multiply by splitting into living halves, never die, death is neither natural nor inevitable" ("Preface" *Back to Methuselah* 14). As for Grene, "Shaw's Life Force may have been based on "Schopenhauer's *World Will*, but its positive evolutionary character was shaped by Samuel Butler, and its ultimate goal was the Nietzschean superman" (56). He points out that there is no direct connection between the idea of the Life Force as the motive power of sexual attraction, the duel of the sexes, and the concept of the Superman, and yet "Shaw welds them into a single ideological pattern" (63).

The first play, *Man and Superman* deals with the concept of Superman and the Life Force. It is composed of an Epistle Dedicatory, a 'frame' romantic comedy of manners in which Ann pursues Tanner, and a centre play -mutual dream of Tanner and Mendoza in the form of a dream symposium in Hell, which is generally staged separately. This is followed by *The Revolutionist's Handbook* written by Tanner "Member of the Idle Rich Class" -a guidebook to Shaw's philosophy discussed in the play. According to the *Handbook*, a revolutionist is someone who "desires to discard the existing social order and try another" (213). It is claimed that the cry for the Superman did not begin or will end with Nietzsche, underlining the vital question "what kind of person is this Superman to be?" (216). Although a clear definition is not made, Supermen are those who have helped Life in its struggle upwards:

Until there is an England in which every man is a Cromwell, a France in which every man is a Napoleon, a Rome in which every man is Caesar, a Germany in which every man is a Luther plus a Goethe, the world will be no more improved by its heroes than a Brixton villa is improved by the pyramid of Cheops. The production of such nations is the only real change possible to us. (224-5)

As indicated above, what is needed is not a 'Superman' but rather a "democracy of supermen" (228), which can only be realized by changing the nature of man. So the solution does not only lie in creating a 'Superman' leader, but in creating a new race of higher men, or 'Supermen'. Unless such a mass change takes place, the few supermen that appear will remain isolated:

[...] unless we are replaced by a more highly evolved animal –in short, by the Superman- the world must remain a den of dangerous animals among whom our few accidental supermen, our Shakespeares, Goethes, Shelleys, and their like, must live as precariously as lion tamers do, taking the humour of their situation, and the dignity of their superiority, as a set-off to the horrors of the one and the loneliness of the other. (242)

In comparison to a 'Sham Superman', who has gained power by living and obeying conventional rules, the real Superman will "snap his superfingers at all Man's present trumpery ideals of right, duty, honor, justice, religion, even decency, and accept moral obligations beyond present human endurance" (225). This is where Shaw and Nietzsche seem to differ and is probably why he considered Nietzsche as a devil's advocate of the modern type who rejected duty, morality, law and altruism.

In the frame of romantic comedy in *Man and Superman*, the unconventional intellectual Tanner -author of *The Revolutionist's Handbook*- and the conventional Ramsden become the joint guardians of Ann Whitefield after her father's death. Although Ann appears to be very obedient on the surface, even encouraging the conventional Octavius' love for her, she is an agent of the 'Life Force' in pursuit of Tanner, her prey, symbolizing the 'Superman'. The character of Tanner is generally considered to be a Shavian self-portrait. Although Shaw told one of the biographers, Hesketh Pearson, that Tanner was modelled on the British revolutionary socialist H. M. Hyndman, he did not object when "Granville Barker, in creating the role of Tanner, was made up in such a way as to give him a distinctly Shavian appearance, and in his late autobiographical writings he explicitly acknowledges the link between his 1901 self and the character of Tanner" (Gibbs 13). And the metaphysical quality of the sexual relationship between Tanner and Ann brings to mind "The Metaphysics of the Love of the Sexes" in Schopenhauer's *The World as Will and Idea*, but in Schopenhauer

I sing, not arms and the hero, but to the [Superman]

it is “the will of the man which meets the intellect of the women, while in *Superman* it is the opposite, the woman exercises her own will and the life forces, and the man of intellect attempts to escape” (Greene 56). In this respect, Tanner continuously compares Ann to various predatory animals such as a “lioness”, “tiger”, “bear” and “boa-constrictor” (*Man and Superman* 60-79) while claiming that “No woman shall ever enslave me in that way (76). Thus, Tanner is shocked on finding out, from his intellectual chauffeur³, Straker, that he himself is Ann’s ‘marked’ victim:

Tanner: Let me remind you that Voltaire said that what was too silly to be said could be sung.

Straker: It wasn’t Voltaire: it was Bow Mar Shay.

Tanner: I stand corrected: Beaumarchais of course [...] Enry, why do you think that my friend [Octavius] has no chance with Miss Whitefield?

Straker: Cause she’s after summon else.

Tanner: Bosh! Who else?

Straker: You

Tanner: Me!!! [...]

Tanner [*wildly appealing to the heavens*]: Then I- I am the bee, the spider, the marked down victim, the destined prey. (106-7)

Following this realization, Tanner escapes to Biskra with Straker, but falls to the trap set up by a group of bandits. After they all fall asleep, Tanner and Mendoza, leader of the bandits, have a mutual dream –composing the centre play- in which the philosophy of the play –the Life Force and the Superman- is discussed.

³ Tanner helplessly watches Straker, his chauffeur, fixing the car. Straker is an intellectual engineer educated at the Polytechnic, who takes great pride in his social class. On being asked to comment on Oxford University, Straker says “[t]hey teach you to be a gentleman there. In the Polytechnic they teach you to be an engineer or such like” (88). Furthermore, when Octavius indicates that he believes “most intensely in the dignity of labor”, Straker mocks him: “That’s because you never done any, Mr Robinson. My business is to do away with labor. Youll get more out of me and a machine than you will out of twenty laborers” (88-9). Tanner announces that Straker is the ‘New Man’. Straker, who has been trained in the field of engineering has the potential to play an important role in the progress of civilization while the bourgeoisie is full of gentlemen who are not trained to work in any particular field.

In this act entitled “Juan in Hell” in the form of a symposium in Hell, the main characters in the frame play appear in different forms: Ann as Dona Ana, Mendoza as the Devil, Ramsden and Octavius as the Statue of Don Gonzalo, and Tanner as Shaw’s Don Juan, who has “given up love in disgust after a career as a womanizer, and become an austere contemplative philosopher and social reformer” (49). As stated in the “Epistle Dedicatory” addressed to Arthur Bingham Walkley, dramatic critic for the *Times*, Shaw has chosen the character Don Juan because he considers him to be a rebel just like Superman:

Philosophically, Don Juan is a man who, though gifted enough to be exceptionally capable of distinguishing between good and evil, follows his own instincts without regard to the common, stature, or canon law; and therefore, whilst gaining the ardent sympathy of our rebellious instincts [...] finds himself in mortal conflict with existing institutions, and defends himself by fraud and force as unscrupulously as a farmer defends his crops by the same means against vermin. (10)

Shaw’s Hell is not a typical hell where sinners suffer, it is instead an empty space with “Omnipresent nothing, No sky, no peaks, no light, no sound, no time, nor space, utter void” (123). In this Act, the Statue announces his decision to leave Heaven to become a permanent resident in Hell, and the Devil invites Juan to take the vacant place in Heaven. The dramatic question to be resolved is whether Juan will take the position in Heaven or not. Juan, defining Hell as the “home of the unreal and of the seekers for happiness” as opposed to Heaven “the home of the masters of reality, and earth “the home of the slaves of reality,” is inclined to go to Heaven in order to help Life in its struggle upwards:

In the Heaven I seek, no other joy! [besides contemplation] But there is the work of helping Life in its struggle upward. Think of how it wastes and scatters itself, how it raises up obstacles to itself and destroys itself in its ignorance and blindness. It needs a brain, this irresistible force, lest in its ignorance it should resist itself. What a piece of work is man! Says the poet [Shakespeare]. Yes; but what a blunderer! Here is the highest miracle of organization yet attained by life, the most intensely alive thing that exists, the most

I sing, not arms and the hero, but to the [Superman]

conscious of all the organisms; and yet, how wretched are his brains! (141)

The Devil argues that the power governing earth is not the power of Life but of Death, for man measures his strength by his destructiveness as inventor:

This marvellous force of Life of which you boast is a force of Death: man measures his strength by his destructiveness. What is his religion? An excuse for hating me. What is his law? An excuse for hanging you. What is his morality? Gentility! An excuse for consuming without producing. What is his art? An excuse for gloating over pictures of slaughter. What are his politics? Either the worship of a despot because a despot can kill, or parliamentary cock-fighting. [...] Man, the inventor of the rack, the stake, the gallows, the electric chair; of sword and gun and poison gas: above all, of justice, duty, patriotism, and all the other isms by which even those who are clever enough to be humanely disposed are persuaded to become the most destructive of all the destroyers. (143)

Although Juan admits that Man has a tendency to violence, he advocates that the Life Force inspires man to surpass himself, with emphasis on intellect rather than physical strength by alluding to Lamarck's theory about developing new organs to survive:

Just as life, after ages of struggle, evolved that bodily organ the eye, so that the living organism could see where it was going [...] so it is evolving today a mind's eye that shall see, not the physical world, but the purpose of Life, and thereby enable the individual to work for that purpose. [...] Even as it is, only one sort of man has ever been happy, has ever been universally respected among all the conflicts of interests and illusions. (151)

Thus, Juan is in search for a different kind of man, not doctors, professors, politicians: "I sing, not arms and the hero, but to the philosophical man: who seeks in contemplation to discover the means of fulfilling that will, and in action to do that will by the so-discovered means" (151). This "philosophical man" is also Shaw's 'Superman,' defined by intellect rather than any physical trait:

Juan: [...] Were I not possessed with a purpose beyond my own I had better be a ploughman than a philosopher; for the ploughman lives as long as the philosopher, eats more, sleeps better, and rejoices in the wife of his bosom with less misgiving. This is because the philosopher is in the grip of the Life Force. This Life Force says to him 'I have done a thousand wonderful things unconsciously by merely willing to live and following the line of least resistance: now I want to know myself and my destination, and choose my path; so I have made a special brain –a philosopher's brain- to grasp this knowledge for me as the husbandman's hand grasps the plough for me. And this' says the Life Force to the philosopher 'must thou strive to do for me until thou diest, when I will make another brain and another philosopher to carry on the work. (169)

Following Don Juan's departure, the Statue asks the Devil what the "deuce" "the Superman" is (172), and the Devil replies "Oh, the latest fashion among the Life Force fanatics. Did you not meet in Heaven, among the new arrivals, that German Polish madman? what was his name? Nietzsche?" [...] It was he who raked up the Superman, who is as old as Prometheus" (172). Again, Shaw disassociates himself from Nietzsche's overman. And Dona Ana, representing the Life Force, follows Juan to Heaven in search of a father for the 'Superman' she wishes to conceive:

Ana: [...] where can I find the Superman?

The Devil: He is not yet created, Senora.

[...]

Ana. Not yet created! Then my work is not yet done.

I believe in the Life to Come. A father! A father for the Superman!

Vanishes in the void. (173)

After the dream, the sleepers awake to the sound of a flat tire on the car containing Ann and the others. She has tracked Tanner down by the help of the Life Force and announces that he has asked to marry her. Tanner tries to escape but feels drawn to her: "The Life Force. I am in the grip of the Life Force" (207).

The second play dealing with Shaw's ideas concerning the 'Superman' and 'Creative Evolution' is *Back to Methuselah* made up

I sing, not arms and the hero, but to the [Superman]

of five parts: "In the Beginning," "The Gospel of the Brothers Barnabas," "The Thing Happens," "Tragedy of an Elderly Gentleman," and "As Far as Thought Can Reach." Shaw, who claimed that *Man and Superman* was "a dramatic parable of Creative Evolution" which had got lost in the brilliance of the comedy, indicated that *Back to Methuselah* deals with his legend of Creative Evolution without any "distractions and embellishments" (qtd in Dukore 110). Shaw attaches so much importance to this play that when in 1944, nineteen years after he won the Nobel Prize for Literature, Oxford University Publishing asked him to select one of his works for publication as the 500th volume of its series of World Classics, he chose *Back to Methuselah*, which he considered his masterpiece⁴ (Valency 168). Furthermore, in the postscript to the play published in the Penguin edition, he ascribed its composition to a superior power: "An author is an instrument in the grip of Creative Evolution" declaring that this play was the latest effort of the Life Force to make itself intelligible, a supreme attempt of the vital spirit to achieve self-consciousness (307).

"Methuselah" in the title refers to, according to the Old Testament, a descendant of Adam believed to have lived to be 969 years old, the oldest in the Bible. In this respect, the play, based on the assumption that human life can be prolonged by a certain effort of the will, follows the evolution of man from Adam and Eve to the year 31, 920 AD. In this process, the same types recur generation after generation, and are possibly "the same souls in successive manifestations. The characters that manifest them –Cain, Burge, Lubin, Haslam among others" (Valency, 172). Through reoccurring characters, it shows the evolutionary rise of the mind and the corresponding decline of sex, equalizing the sexes toward full intellectual identity (Leary and Foster 106).

Lilith, the 'Creative Will' or 'Élan Vital' has fragmented itself into male and female, Adam and Eve. In Part I, Adam and Eve are introduced to death when they see a dead fawn. The Serpent tells her that the only way to overcome death is by creating new life, the results of which are seen a few centuries later in Act II. The Life Force represented by Eve, woman the Creator, verses Cain, man the

⁴ This is interesting since *Back to Methuselah* was among Shaw's least successful plays on stage. The whole play produced in the Theatre Guild in New York NY in 1922, ran for nine weeks and lost \$20,000 and again lost £2500 in its first UK production on October 9, 1923 at the Birmingham Repertory Theatre (Valency 168).

destroyer. Cain aspires to be more than a “stupid old digger-Adam” and considers his murder of Abel as a move forward:

Cain: I am the first murderer: you are only the first man. [...] There is something higher than man. There is hero and superman.

Eve: Superman! You are no superman! you are Anti-man. (863)

Eve calls him “anti-man” because she recognizes that there is something higher than Adams and Cains, beyond diggers and fighters, who are the ‘Life-Bringers’ contributing to Creative Evolution:

[...]my sons’ sons are not all diggers and fighters. [...] they tell beautiful lies in beautiful words. They can remember their dreams. They can dream without sleeping. They have not will enough to create instead of dreaming; but the serpent said that every dream could be willed into creation by those strong enough to believe in it. There are others who cut reeds of different lengths and blow through them, making lovely patterns of sound in the air; and some of them can weave the patterns together, sounding three reeds at the same time, and raising my soul to things for which I have no words. And others make little mammoths out of clay, or make faces appear on flat stones, and ask me to create women for them with such faces. I have watched those faces and willed; and then I have made a woman-child that has grown up quite like them. And others think of numbers without having to count their fingers, and watch the sky at night, and give names to the stars, and can foretell when the sun will be covered with a black saucepan lid. And there is Tubal, who made this wheel for me which has saved me so much labor. And there is Enoch, who walks on the hills, and hears the Voice continually, and has given up his will to do the will of the Voice, and has some of the Voice’s greatness. (868)

Here she is referring to musicians, painters, and sculptors etc., those aiming to become something ‘higher’ than ordinary man. While this first play presents man’s desire to return to a longer life, Part II “The Gospel of the Brothers Barnabas”, applies this desire to scientific theory.

I sing, not arms and the hero, but to the [Superman]

In Part II, two rival politicians Burge and Lubin visit Franklyn Barnabas, who will stand for Parliament, each wanting him to join his own party. Haslam, who is in love with Franklyn's daughter Savvy is also there along with their parlourmaid. They discuss the incapacity of European and English politicians to govern, claiming that what they need is a couple of hundred years training and experience to become better leaders. This leads to Barnabas Brothers Franklyn -the theologian- and Conrad's -the Scientist- presentation of their metabiological gospel, combining the will of religion with the intellect of science. They propose an election motto "Back to Methuselah" to promote their only program: "the term of human life shall be extended to three hundred years" (869)⁵. According to the brothers, the average lifespan is not sufficient to learn how to govern such a complex civilization and thus, man can live for 300 years if he wills, and must in order to survive. Regarding Creative Evolution, and the Superman, Lubin, one of the two politicians, says "The Force behind evolution, call it what you will, is determined to solve the problem of civilization; and if it cannot do it through us, it will produce some more capable agents" (888). These capable agents he speaks of are supermen.

Part III "The Thing Happens" is a transition period, the year 2170 AD when the English government is run efficiently by 'coloured' people who, unlike the English, mature at 40. Burge-Lubin is President of the British Islands. Haslam and the parlourmaid from the previous Part have become longlivers destined to live 300 years, by willing to live in accordance with the Brother's theory published in 1924. Archbishop Haslam, is now 283 years old and having occupied the position of a President, a General in the past, has enough experience to become a good statesman. Similarly, the parlormaid is now Domestic Minister Mrs. Lutestring- now 274. Both being aware of their social duty, that is to create longlivers that can live long enough to save civilization, leave to breed a new race, in Mrs. Luterstring's words, to save the "white race" (907).

Part IV "Tragedy of the Elderly Gentleman" is set in the year 3000. Now, the Empire is dominated by longlivers and shortlivers

⁵It is obvious from his preface to *Methuselah* that Shaw himself wished a longer life. He expressed that although he is failing physically, his mind still feels capable of growth: "My soul goes marches on; and if the Life Force would give me a body as durable as my mind, and I knew better how to feed and lodge and dress and behave, I might begin a political career as junior civil servant and evolve into a capable Cabinet Minister in another hundred years or so (882).

have become a minority, who die of despair (called discouragement) that overtakes them when they remain too long among longlivers. Their prolonged life has created a new generation of statesmen speaking "with the experience of two and a half centuries of life" (917). The British Empire transferred its seat to the East (Baghdad), London has been destroyed, there are two parties the Conservative party and the Colonization party, and many shortliver races such as the Irish have perished. The final part entitled "As Far as Thought Can Reach" is set in AD 31, 920 the process of evolution is concluded in the garden where it all started. There are no shortlivers left, no heroes, no statesmen, no producers. Sex, politics, war, art, and all the other concepts are the preoccupation of children. The cycle of growth has accelerated, people are hatched fully grown from eggs. Now they want to take the immortal responsibility by becoming a pure spirit. When life becomes eternal, which imprisons us and forbids us to range through the stars, "man will become a vortex," which is neither water, gas, nor atoms but a power over these things. This is the final accomplishment that they desire for humanity.

In the discursive epilogue, the ghosts of Adam, Eve, Cain, the Serpent and Lilith regard the development of man. Eve is proud, declaring that "the clever ones" were always her favourite, the Serpent justified that the knowledge of good and evil has destroyed evil on earth. On the other hand, Cain is dissatisfied that the strong have slain one another while the weak "live forever" and Adam feels this evolution thing has been taken too far. They all vanish, leaving the stage to Lilith -the personification of the Life Force itself- to sum up the entire Pentateuch. She says:

[...] after passing a million goals they press on to the goal of redemption from the flesh, to the vortex freed from the matter, to the whirlpool in the pure intelligence that, when the world began, was a whirlpool in pure force...I am Lilith: I [...] compelled my enemy Matter, to obey a living soul. But in enslaving Life's enemy I made him Life's master. ...Of life only is there no end; and though unbuilt, and though its vast domain is as yet unbearable desert, my seed shall one day fill it and master its matter to its uttermost confines. (962)

In conclusion, Shaw, convinced that mankind was not sufficient to create a better world in their present state, felt that real social change, advancement in social conditions could only be

I sing, not arms and the hero, but to the [Superman]

possible with the evolution of a superior race of men. This idea of the superman, who can save man from themselves, has never completely vanished in modern thought. Especially in the light of all current world politics, and man's inclination to violence, war, racism etc. it seems that everyone must "sing, not arms and the hero", but to the Superman!

WORKS CITED

- Bloom, Harold, ed. *George Bernard Shaw's Man and Superman*. New York: Chealsea House Publishers, 1987.
- Dukore, Bernard F. *Bernard Shaw, Playwright: Aspects of Shavian Drama*. Colombia: U of Missouri P, 1973.
- Gibbs, A.M, ed. *Bernard Shaw: Casebook Series: Man and Superman and Saint Joan*. London: Macmillan , 1992.
- Grene, Nicholas. "Comedy and Dialectic." *Bernard Shaw: A Critical View*. London: Macmillan , 1987.
- Leary, Daniel J. and Richard Foster. "The Themes in Bernard Shaw." *Critical Essays on George Bernard Shaw*. Ed. Elsie B. Adams. New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1991.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost Books IX-X*. Ed. J. Martin Evans Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1973.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. Trans. Thomas Common. New York: Dover Publications, 1999.
- Ouspensky, P.D. *A New Model of the Universe*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.
- Plato. *Republic*. Tans. G.M.A Grube. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1922.
- Shaw, Bernard. *Man and Superman*. Supervision Dan H. Laurence. New York: Penguin, 1946.
- Shaw, Bernard. *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. Foreword by Eric Bentley. New York: A Signet Classic, 1960.
- Shaw, Bernard. "Back to Methuselah". *The Complete Plays of Bernard Shaw*. London: Paul Hamlyn, 1965. 885-963.
- Shaw, Bernard. "Preface." *Back to Methuselah*. London: Penguin, 1921; 1990. 7-61.
- Styan, J. L., *Modern Drama and Practice: Realism and Naturalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.
- Valency, Maurice. "Back to Methuselah: A Tract in Epic Form". *Modern Critical Views George Bernard Shaw*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chealsea House Publishing, 1987. 167-189.
- Vogt, Sally Peters. "Ann and Superman: Type and Archetypes." *Modern Critical Views George Bernard Shaw*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chealsea House Publishers, 1987. 215-232.
- Yüksel, Ayşegül. "G.B.Shaw: 'Nükteli Söyleşim'den 'Tartışma Komedi'si'ne". *Dram Sanatında Sınırları Zorlamak*. İstanbul: Mitos-Boyut Yayınları, 2013. 109-127
- Yüksel, Ayşegül. "G.B. Shaw: Defence of Intelligence Against Mediocrity." *Journal of Human Sciences VIII/I* (1989): 119-134.



4

Historical Truths, Dramatic Reinventions: Bernard Shaw's "History Plays"

Evrım Dođan

To Bernard Shaw most of the past is simply a mess which ought to be swept away in the name of progress, hygiene, efficiency and what not. George Orwell, *The Collected Essays* 2, 136.

Bernard Shaw, in his long career as a playwright and critic lived through times of growth and disintegration. His dramatic work encompasses all the crucial notions of the nineteenth century thought, simultaneously appertaining and being critical to Victorian assumptions. As Edmund Wilson suggests, "Shaw's mind has reflected in all its complexity the intellectual life of his time" (184). And for Julian B. Kaye, Shaw "created a synthesis of the 'leading tendencies' in the last stage of the nineteenth-century tradition" (8). His approach to history is likewise diverse, being the product of and a challenge to the contrasting ideologies of his time. Most of Shaw's plays have historical themes and/or settings in which he places his historical characters in imaginary situations or his commonplace characters in historically accurate settings. From *The Devil's Disciple* to *The Six of Calais*, from *The Dark Lady of the Sonnets* to *Great Catherine*, the theatre, for Shaw, is an arena where he discusses his ideas on different subjects as he uses "drama as a platform to discuss his ideas on society, politics, religion, education, philosophy,

etc. in order to achieve social reform" (Şenlen Güvenç). History provides Shaw the opportunity to look at the past with his contemporary sensibilities to comment on the present and bring an outlook to the future. Still, only four of Shaw's plays can be categorized within the broadly definable "history play" tradition for converging and diverging reasons. *The Man of Destiny*, *Caesar and Cleopatra*, *Saint Joan*, and *In Good King Charles's Golden Days* are Shaw's history plays in which his notion of history is observable in conversation with the Victorian sense of history, reading the past epochs through Victorian sensibilities.

History was a popular and important phenomenon in the Victorian age. As J.L. Wisenthal suggests, the three great issues of Victorian intellectual experience were the "Great Men, progress, and the directions of English history" (12). The two influential contemporary sources of this intellectual life were the ideologically contesting historical work of Thomas Babington Macaulay and Thomas Carlyle. Whereas Macaulay saw a sense of material and intellectual progress in history and an advancing development in society, Carlyle opposed such historical progress and saw a constant change in the course of history that may culminate in destruction. In Wisenthal's words, "for Macaulay the Victorian age is the best of times, while for Carlyle it was the worst of times" and where Macaulay "asserts the superiority of the present over the past," Carlyle "gives the impression that men have on the whole responded more effectively to Nature and Fact in the past than in the present" (8). Henry Thomas Buckle was another historian whose unfinished *History of Civilization in England* also supports the idea of human progress and achievement and advocated that great men are the creatures of the society to which they belong. Buckle's influence on Shaw is evident in his suggestion in his *History of Civilization in England* on the progress of history: "One error conflicts with another, each destroys its opponent, and truth is evolved. This is the course of the human mind, and it is from this point of view that the authors of new ideas, the proposers of new contrivances, and, the originators of new heresies, are the benefactors of their species" (408).

Shaw's approach to history encompasses these contemporary ideologies providing a discussion and synthesis to them. In terms of progress, a topic discussed extensively in *Caesar and Cleopatra*, a disappointment with the 2500 years of historical progress is evident. As Ra states in the Prologue: "All this ye shall see; and ye shall marvel, after your ignorant manner, that men twenty centuries ago were already just such as you, and spoke and lived as ye speak and

live, no worse and no better, no wiser and no sillier” (133). Shaw witnesses that history and civilization have not improved human beings. In this manner, in line with Carlyle, Shaw opposes the Victorian sense of historical progress, with the assertion that Victorian age is the culmination of all past progress.

If there is any progress and any kind of upward movement in history, Shaw proposes, it can only be possible through the achievements of “Great Men,” who have the Life Force and vitality to change the course of history. Again in tune with Carlyle, who proposed that “the history of the world is but the biography of Great men” (37), and fostered by the ideas of Nietzsche and Hegel, Shaw saw the individual as the operative for historical progress. The reason why Shaw does not believe in progress or in a continual progress in history is due to the scarcity of such great persons. Without a deterministic outlook of history, Shaw maintains that historical progress is only possible through the originality and will of these great personages. These people are rare, unconventional, and possess a resolute will, the Life Force. In his *Maxims for Revolutionists* he states that the “reasonable man adapts himself to the world: the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore all progress depends on the unreasonable man” (n.pag). This attribute of “unreasonableness” is important for greatness that may attain progress in the end. As he proclaims in the Preface to *Geneva*, the “apparent freaks of nature called Great Men mark not human attainment but human possibility and hope. They prove that though we in the mass are only child Yahoos it is possible for creatures built exactly like us, bred from our unions and develop from our seeds, to reach the heights of [...] towering heads” (315). In this manner, Shaw has contempt over the masses as he has “a doubt which had grown steadily in [his] mind during [his] forty years of public work as a Socialist: namely, whether the human animal, as he exists at present, is capable of solving the social problems raised by his own aggregation or, as he calls it, his civilization” (Preface *Back to Methuselah* x). As Martin Meisel states “[f]or Shaw, the ‘essential truth’ of any historical conflict lay in the ideas (and the institutions insofar as they embodied the ideas) at stake in the conflict. Consequently, Shaw’s history-makers are men and women who embody passionate ideas, dramatically articulating and expounding themselves” (374) and also that “Shaw as a historian belonged very much to the idealist school of the nineteenth century; for he presented ideas, embodied in men, as realities of history, and will, not accident as its driving energy” (Meisel 375). Greatness, for Shaw, hence lies in a person’s originality, uniqueness, defying convention,

and in his shaping his times rather than being passively shaped by it. Therefore, Shavian understanding of history is not based on culture creating great personages but on great personages having the will and vitality to change their culture and thus the course of history. In his history plays, Shaw puts together such characters that have changed the direction of history under scrutiny.

The distinction between the historian and the poet in terms of their function and value has been an ancient debate. To the Platonic veneration of the historian over the poet, it was Aristotle who answered by deeming poetry more philosophical since it deals with the “universal” while history is restricted to the “particular.” For Aristotle, the poet does not basically represent particular events or situations but brings about the universal and characteristic elements, according to the law of probability or necessity, illuminating the essential nature whether or not it is historically accurate or based on lived experience. The poet even “chances to take an historical subject” but this does not make him less of a poet since “there is no reason why some events that have actually happened should not conform to the law of the probable and possible, and in virtue of that quality in them he is their poet or maker” (Butcher 37).

The question of the playwright as historian has been another debate since Shakespeare whose “history plays” dealing with the medieval English kings and most of whose tragedies have a historical theme. Fundamentally anachronistic, Shakespeare’s approach to historical matters brought about the discussions on the frame of the history play. Herbert Lindenberger suggests that the term “historical drama” in its essence is paradoxical since “the first word qualifying the fictiveness of the second, the second questioning the reality of the first” (x). For Irving Ribner, “In the history play the dramatic and the historical intentions are inseparable” and the playwright “assumes the functions of the historian as well” (12). Moreover, M. M. Reese remarks that it is the “serious political issue” that makes a history play as it would then “serve the recognized purposes of history” (66). Different from this category, Ribner identifies “romantic drama employing historical figures” without an “attempt to accomplish the serious purpose of the historian” (267).

But then, who writes history, after all? Most of historical figures in Shakespeare, be in histories or tragedies, are more viable than they are in their historical sources. Bernard Shaw himself states in his Preface to *Heartbreak House* that “we learn from history

that men never learn anything from history.” Shaw must have had Aristotle in mind when he declared that his knowledge of French history came from Dumas père and of English history from the work of Sir Walter Scott and Shakespeare (qtd. in Wisenthal 15):

...I had already learnt all I knew of English history, from King John to the final suicide of the English feudal aristocracy and its supersession by the capitalists on Bosworth field, from the chronicle plays of Shakespeare. Adding to these congenial authorities the Waverley novels of Walter Scott I came out with a taste of history and an acquaintance with its personages and events which made philosophy of history real for me when I was fully grown. (*Everybody's Political What's What?* 180-1)

Not focusing merely on the historical fact, Shaw looked for historical truth through “inevitable sacrifice of verisimilitude” in order to achieve “sufficient veracity” from as much as he “can gather from the available documentation” (Preface *Saint Joan* 44). What is important for him is the ideas surrounding the historical fact that his “conception of history” is “essentially the history of ideas” (Wisenthal 39). Shaw is “historically accurate” that is, he follows the historical source no matter how with the assumption that history can only be written fictitiously. Therefore, Shaw is essentially critical of history and history writing. His Warwick in *Saint Joan* states that “It is only in history books and ballads that the enemy is always defeated” (86) and “History, sir, will tell lies, as usual” states Burgoyne in *The Devil's Disciple* (110). These “falsehoods called history” (Judge in *Geneva*, 361) were scrutinized by Shaw in many instances:

Historical facts are not a bit more sacred than any other class of facts. In making a play out of them you must adapt them to the stage, and that alters them at once, more or less. Why you cannot even write a history without adapting the facts to the conditions of literary narrative, which are in some respects much more distorting than the dramatic conditions of representation on the stage. Things do not happen in the form of stories or dramas; and since they must be told in some such form, all reports, even by eyewitnesses, all histories, all stories, all dramatic representations, are only attempts to arrange the facts in a thinkable, intelligible, interesting form—that is,

when they are not more or less intentional efforts to hide the truth, as they often are. ("Ten Minutes with Mr Bernard Shaw" qtd. in Wisenthal 49)

For Shaw, history writers "consult their imaginations" when they write histories that requires the pretension of the literary narrative which is also the approach of the dramatist. Therefore, although respect for historical sources is important for Shaw, he is against a pedantic approach to history. Even though he is sceptical towards historical facts, he believes in a notion of history: "Though history is adulterated with lies and wishful guesses, yet it sifts and sheds them, leaving finally great blocks of facts" (*Everybody's Political What's What?* 366). Shaw distinguishes the historical fact from the historical truth in that he claims that knowing history as a series of facts is like trying to know London "from the pages of a telephone directory" (*Everybody's Political What's What?* 180). What Shaw is after is the historical truth, which might be attained not simply by facts but by ideas accrued to the historical data:

[History] is only a dramatization of events ... I never worry myself about historical details until the play is done; human nature is very much the same always and everywhere. And when I go over my play to put the details right I find there is surprisingly little to alter ... You see, I know human nature. (qtd. in Wisenthal 50)

Since historical truth is more important than historical fact, historical truth is important not because it provides a means to reflect on the past but in its association with the present. This association is important in its providing a potential to reflect on the future.

Shaw's understanding of history is an amalgamation of the Victorian historical principles, all of which he challenges one way or another. This challenge continues ardently in his response to the Victorian history play with his "emphasis on discursive rational elements, an anti-heroic tone and diction, an overtly modern perspective and a consciousness of different possible views of an event (Harben 22). Meisel accounts three elements of the Victorian history play as elaborate spectacle, romantic intrigue and flamboyant histrionics. The highly artificial Victorian history play with its well-made play structure and larger than life heroic depictions of historical personages, sensational plots, sentimental characterization, elaborate

sets and costumes, impassioned dialogues and sentimental language used history as a backdrop in which to provide room for romantic and melodramatic intrigue, or in Shaw's definition "historical romance, mostly fiction with historical names attached to the stock characters of the state" (Preface *In Good King Charles's Golden Days* 9). As Ayşegül Yüksel puts forward, Shaw fought against the "mediocrity" of the nineteenth century stage conventions (109). Moreover, Nicholas Grene suggests that "one of the commonest form of inauthenticity in historical drama drives from a superficial concern with the accurate recreation of the period"(132). Shaw fundamentally opposes the pseudo-historicity of these popular plays and states that

If the characters are clothed in romance [i.e. "garbs of romance"], ... they are not historical. No historical character is worth dramatizing at all unless the truth about him or her is far more interesting than any romancing. A good play about Rip Van Winkle is not spoiled by calling it Rip Parnell; but it does not thereby become an historical play. Shakespeare always stuck close the chronicles in his histories. And they survive, whilst hundreds of pseudo-historical plays have perished ("The Theatre Today and Yesterday according to George Bernard Shaw." *The Manchester Evening News*, 6/12/38).

Shaw's response to the Victorian tradition was to reinvent the history play by mixing modes and centering the action and discussion around anti-heroic and lifelike depictions of great historical characters. That "history is alive and unexpected rather than predestined or accidental has its counterpart in Shaw's dramatic form in his rejection of the well-made play" (Wisenthal 172). Instead, he uses some well-made play elements to devastate audience expectations as "The plot of history, in Shaw's plays, is neither pure romance nor pure tragedy nor pure comedy, but a vital, unexpected encounter between antithetical ways of interpreting the historical process" (Wisenthal 177). Shaw challenges not only form but also the plot of accepted and expected modes in order to promote his ideas on the great personages and historical progress. Therefore, instead of "love affairs and little accidents" that "determine the direction of history" in the nineteenth century, in Shaw's history plays "the motive force is the human will, which gives expression to the conceptions created by the human mind" (Wisenthal 39).

Historical Truths, Dramatic Reinventions

Herbert Lindenberger suggests four levels of reality when analyzing historical drama: the historical sources used, theatrical conventions followed in the adaptation of the material, historical continuity, and the state of the audience that is “the influence of our present situation on the interpretation of the work” (10). Four of Shaw’s plays share common characteristics in their centering great historical characters which share a formidable will and focus on success and in placing them in imaginary situations with historically accurate details especially in characterization and in their anti-heroic representation of heroic heroes and anti-romantic approach to otherwise romantic situations. What is important is that the characters in Shaw’s history plays have to fulfill their destinies. Shaw portrays these characters in the form of a discussion play and puts them in conversation with Shaw’s present and at times these historical personages become mouthpieces for Shaw to share his personal views.

The Man of Destiny focuses on Napoleon in an anti-heroic anti-romantic manner, before he became one of the most famous people in history. Written in 1896, *The Man of Destiny* can be considered Shaw’s first history play, although it is generally not analyzed under such heading. It is a history play in that, its focus is a historical “Great Man.” Written in response to a Sardou play in which Napoleon, in Shaw’s words is “nothing but the jealous husband of a thousand fashionable dramas” (*Our Theatre in the Nineties* 110), his play is set in an imaginary situation in which Napoleon meets a strange lady at an inn at Tavazzano, after the Battle of Lodi. In a Victorian manner, the play involves a misplaced letter involving a secret affair of Josephine with Paul Barras and purposely plays with the expectations of a romantic intrigue with a historical character, a mysterious lady, and secret letters and devastates the contemporary representations of Napoleon by “presenting him as an ironic blend of the admirable and the ignoble, yet focusing on qualities of mind and will which accounts for his genius” (Harben 24). This “fictitious paragraph of history” is a history play in that Shaw paints a relatively historically accurate Napoleon with details such as his shabbiness and lack of personal hygiene but highlighting his strong will and formidable intellect. Napoleon acts in a given probable situation and does not rise as a model of perfection but as a man with flaws. What is important in his representation is the exceptional character of Napoleon, which manifests itself in his “war of will” with the Strange Lady. Stripping the meeting off of expected sexual connotations, the encounter shows Napoleon’s extraordinary response to a scandalous situation. His attitude shows

why he is indeed a “man of destiny.” Instead of a conventional contemporary response to such a situation, i.e. a duel, Napoleon secretly reads the letter and chooses to ignore it.

In his depiction of Caesar in *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1898), there appears an older general, not romantic but political, not infatuated by Cleopatra but by power and authority. Shaw does not completely strip the play off of the romantic connotations of the popular story but reinforces it with political postulations. Caesar, a practical man with “an air of frankness, generosity and magnanimity” which “enables him to estimate the value of truth, money or success in any particular instance quite independently of convention and moral generalization” (Notes to *Caesar and Cleopatra* 7) like all great men, rises above all others with his intellect and unexpected behavior, gets what he wants even in adverse situations. Shaw thinks that Shakespeare sacrificed the greatness of Caesar to put Brutus on a pedestal in *Julius Caesar* as “[i]t cost Shakespear no pang to write Caesar down for the merely technical purpose of writing Brutus up” (Preface *Three Plays for Puritans* xxxii) and presents a completely different Caesar and Cleopatra in his play. Still, there are constant references to Shakespeare’s plays especially in his characterization of Cleopatra as a simplistic girl in her teens as opposed to the mature Cleopatra in *Antony and Cleopatra*. Caesar is too focused to let anything either romance or even the burning of the library of Alexandria swerve him from his goal. He is not at all touched when the news arrives. This scene also is a reference to Shaw’s insistence on the future.

THEODOTUS: What is burning there is the memory of mankind.

CAESAR: A shameful memory. Let it burn.

THEODOTUS: [*wildly*] Will you destroy the past?

CAESAR: Ay, and build the future with its ruins. (179)

The characters in *Caesar and Cleopatra* still have to fulfill their destinies. When Rufio tells Caesar he would not let him go to Rome without his shield as there are “too many daggers there” Caesar answers “It matters not: I shall finish my life’s work on my way back; and then I shall have lived long enough. Besides: I have always disliked the idea of dying: I had rather be killed” (239).

In *Saint Joan* (1924), too, there is the depiction of a great personage, who, no matter how adverse her situation is to the *status quo*, follows her higher calling and follows her own destiny. Shaw

dwells on a historical character in this “chronicle play” in relation to “the romance of her rise, the tragedy of her execution, and the comedy of the attempts of posterity to make amends for that execution” (45). Relying mostly on T. Douglas Murray’s translations on the trial manuscripts of Joan of Arc, Shaw marks an important phase of history in which he questions the nature of the feudal order and the medieval church. Joan, as a remarkable character faces the immovable social and religious order. In his approach to a canonized saint, Shaw again has a different approach by presenting her as a human being thus making her greatness believable. Nicholas Grene suggests that “Shaw’s object was to write a play in which what he took to be the historical significance of the life of the fifteenth-century saint would be manifest to a twentieth-century audience” (133).

In *In Good King Charles’s Golden Days* (1939), as “A True History That Never Happened,” Shaw presents his view of the Restoration politics by putting King Charles II “as the first king of England whose kingship is purely symbolic” and “had to reign by his wits and not by the little real power they had left him” (11) in conversation with Isaac Newton, the dissenter George Fox, and artist Godfrey Kneller “in an act of historical justice,” together with the queen and the king’s mistresses to talk about the “sordid facts of Charles’s reign” (9). His portrait of the king is historically accurate. Despite the seducing presence of Charles and his mistresses, Shaw stays far away from sensation and romance and lets his characters discuss their ideas in an undramatic manner. With many anachronistic elements, by the use of the plausible, Shaw presents his view of this important point in English history among many other things. Although there is no account or possibility that these people met, Shaw again creates an imaginary situation in order not only to “pleasantly amuse” but to give “a knowledge of the dynamics of Charles’s reign; that is, of the political and personal forces at work with it, that ten years of digging up mere facts in the British Museum or the Record Office could not give” (*Everybody’s Political What’s What* 181).

What Shaw attempts to do is to update history, to read the past from a present consciousness, to make the audience “conscious of an epoch fundamentally different from their own” as such “circumstances no longer apply to active life” (Preface *Saint Joan* 40). In these plays, Shaw assumes the role of the historian in representing the contemporary ideologies in his looking at the past.

For Georg Lukacs, unlike the novel which represents the before and after, "Drama paints the great historical explosions and eruptions of the historical process. Its hero represents the shining peak of these great crises" (150). Likewise, the "world-historical individual" is displayed through the Shawian portrayal of these characters that make these plays "history plays." Clashing chosen historical fact with historical truth molded with ideas and imagination, Shaw reinvents the history play. Deliberately anachronistic, Shaw reflects his ideas on history which is meaningful through the history of great men, Creative Evolution, Vitalism and Life Force.

In his long career as a thinker and dramatist of his age, Shaw adapts different philosophical assumptions, at times synthesizing, at times setting them in opposition. Although Shaw is no historian, nor was meant to be, his history plays, work as histories telling, if not the popular accounts of the historical times they deal with, but of the historically significant people as great personages that changed the course of history.

WORKS CITED

- Buckle, Henry Thomas. *History of Civilization in England*. Vol II. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1864.
- Butcher, S. H. *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art: With a Critical Text and Translation of The Poetics*. New York: Dover, 1894.
- Carlyle, Thomas. *On Heroes, Hero Worship and the Heroic in History*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1908.
- Greene, Nicholas. *Bernard Shaw: A Critical View*. New York: Palgrave, 1984.
- Güvenç Şenlen, Sila. "I sing, not arms and the hero, but to the [Superman]": Quest for the Superman in Bernard Shaw's *Man and Superman* and *Back to Methuselah*. "One Day, George Bernard Shaw" 24 Nov.2016. Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Harben, Niloufer. *Twentieth Century English History Plays: From Shaw to Bond*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1988.
- Kaye, Julian B. *Bernard Shaw and the Nineteenth-Century Tradition*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1958.
- Lindenberger, Herbert, *Historical Drama: The Relation of Literature and Reality*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1957.
- Lukacs, Georg. *The Historical Novel*. Trans. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell. Lincoln and London: U of Nebraska P, 1962, 1983.
- Meisel, Martin. *Shaw and Nineteenth-Century Theater*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963.
- Orwell, George. "The Rediscovery of Europe." *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell Volume II: My Country Right or Left 1940-1943*. Ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Harmondsworth, Middlesex; Penguin, 1971. 134-41.
- Reese, M.M. *The Cease of Majesty: A Study of Shakespeare's History Plays*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1961.
- Ribner, Irving. *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare*. Oxon: Routledge, 2005 (1965).
- Shaw, George Bernard. *Back to Methuselah*. London: Penguin, 1987.
- Shaw, George Bernard. *Caesar and Cleopatra. Three Plays for Puritans*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex; Penguin, 1949. 127-255.
- Shaw, George Bernard. *The Devil's Disciple. Three Plays for Puritans*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex; Penguin, 1949. 41-127.
- Shaw, George Bernard. *Everybody's Political What's What*. London: Constable and Company, 1944.
- Shaw, George Bernard. *Geneva. Plays Political*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex; Penguin, 1990. 305-460.
- Shaw, George Bernard. Preface. *Heartbreak House*. Project Gutenberg. www.gutenberg.org/files/3543.

- Shaw, George Bernard. *In Good King Charles's Golden Days. Bernard Shaw: Last Plays*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex; Penguin, 1974. 7-75.
- Shaw, George Bernard. Preface. *In Good King Charles's Golden Days. Bernard Shaw: Last Plays*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex; Penguin, 1974. 4-14.
- Shaw, George Bernard. *Maxims for Revolutionists*. Project Gutenberg, www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/26107.
- Shaw, George Bernard. *Our Theatre in the Nineties*. London: Constable, 1948.
- Shaw, George Bernard. Preface. *Saint Joan*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex; Penguin, 1969. 7-48.
- Shaw, George Bernard. *Saint Joan*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex; Penguin, 1969.
- Shaw, George Bernard. Preface *Three Plays for Puritans*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex; Penguin, 1949. vii-xxix.
- "The Theatre Today and Yesterday according to George Bernard Shaw." *The Manchester Evening News* 6/12/38.
- Wilson, Edmund. "Bernard Shaw at Eighty." *Bernard Shaw : The Critical Heritage*. Ed. T.F. Evans. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. 351-56.
- Wisenthal, J.L. *Shaw's Sense of History*. Oxford: Clarendon OUP, 1988.
- Yüksel, Ayşegül. *Dram Sanatında Sınırları Zorlamak*. İstanbul: Mitos-Boyut, 2013.



5

The Evolution of Artificial Intelligence in Pygmalion

Jason M. Ward

Unexpectedly, the dark sci-fi thriller *Ex Machina* (2015) and George Bernard Shaw's satirical play *Pygmalion* (1913) share many parallels and indeed the former appears to be loosely based on the latter. After a brief discussion of adaptation studies and the myth of Pygmalion, the similarities in the following areas will be discussed: settings, characters, first encounters, the use of tests, the bullying patriarchy of the main protagonists, the sexual anxieties regarding his relationship to the main female protagonist, test results that backfire on the tester, the thwarting of male power fantasies, and anxieties about the changes taking place in the texts' respective societies – from early twentieth century post-Victorianism to early twentyfirst century post-humanism. For parallelism, the comparisons will mostly be between Shaw's 1913 play and Garland's 2015 film script of *Ex Machina* but some visual analogies will also be drawn between the 1938 film of *Pygmalion* by Leslie Howard and Anthony Asquith and Alex Garland's 2015 film.

The concept of artificial intelligence refers to machine intelligence, to computers performing a kind of data processing which appears to mimic the creative, somewhat arbitrary and emotional thought processes typical of a human being. It is a term that could be used to describe the motivations of the character that

forms the subject of Alex Garland's 2015 film *Ex Machina* – a mechanoid with the partial appearance of a beautiful woman, who chooses the name Ava and learns to accurately mimic human behaviors including dejection, flirtation and manipulation. The term *artificial* intelligent might also be used to cruelly describe the subject of *Pygmalion* (1913), an educated working-class flower girl, called Liza Doolittle, whose appearance of social status is improved by learning parroted phrases, polite social etiquette, upper-class pronunciation and standard grammar. While Ava is pretending *not* to be a machine, Eliza is pretending *not* to be working class. This parallel seems less far-fetched when the root of the word that might be used to describe Ava is considered: 'Robot' is "derived from the Czech word 'robota', which means forced labor" (Levy, 2) which describes Eliza's impoverished situation as she is forced to hawk flowers on the street to eke out a living. Viewed through the concept of the robot, the oppressed classes of the industrial age are literally dehumanized. To be born into the lower classes was generally to be condemned to the life of an automaton doing repetitive and often dangerous work but times were changing slowly and for the first time, with changes to the education system in the previous century, people from working-class backgrounds might potentially improve their social standing and forge a new identity for themselves. In *Ex Machina*, however, the focus shifts from anxieties about class mobility in the post-Victorian world to concerns about automated devices and computers potentially invading every aspect of our lives and replacing humans in both work and social situations. This is just one example of how the filmic appropriation of Shaw's *Pygmalion* by *Ex Machina* brings *new* readings and potentialities to the text which will be explored in the following pages.

In the study of literature, instead of viewing film and particularly film adaptations as somehow inferior or secondary to the subject of literature, a less prejudicial and more constructive approach might consider what films can reveal about, and bring to, a work of literature. A film is a reading and the decisions made by the filmmakers could be seen as critical readings of the text which shed more light on the creative choices that shaped the source text and reveal its hidden potentialities. Film adaptations from a different time and place to the source text can show how the source text's reception has changed over time and contribute to its on-going evolution and survival. Films also foreground the shaping role of genre in both the film and publishing industry and how each respective genre relies on a certain iconography that determines how its world is constructed. For instance, a film is deemed to be sci-fi if it contains any of the

typical iconography of the genre such as future technology, robots, spaceships, aliens, or a mad scientist.

Certain tropes are also frequently associated with certain genres. Within the sci-fi genre, for example, tropes such as aliens-enslave-mankind, logic-versus-emotion, and technology-destroys-us lie behind innumerable sci-fi plots. The myth of Pygmalion might also be considered as a trope: the-object-of-desire-is-a-projection. However, the Shavian version of this Pygmalion trope adds the suffix that the object of desire may be *seen* as a projection, -but-is-an-autonomous-entity with the potential to react against such projections. Beyond the film adaptations of Shaw's play, such as *Pygmalion* (1938) and *My Fair Lady* (1964), there have been many other movies that have deployed this Shavian Pygmalion trope. For example, films as unlikely as *Trading Places* (1983), *Can't Buy Me Love* (1987), *The Shape of Things* (2003), *Project Nim* (2011), and *Ruby Sparks* (2012) all recall Shaw's play because the character that has been shaped and controlled by stronger powers, ultimately turns against them (Campbell "The Five Best 'Pygmalion' Movies"). Within the sci-fi genre, the Shavian Pygmalion trope tells the story of human becoming attracted to an Ai, which at first seems to be the ideal partner but it does not work – because the object of desire is still a projection onto something which has its own programming. This can be seen not only in *Ex Machina*, but also in *Her* (2014) and the episode "Be Right Back" (2013) from the dystopian television series *Black Mirror*.

Within the Hollywood film industry, a successful formula is repeated with some variation in the hope of repeating its success. Over time, this repetition of certain elements creates marketable generic categories. This repetition of familiar stories is of course nothing new, but is rather the essential quality of myth. The myth of Pygmalion is most commonly associated with Ovid's narrative poem *Pygmalion* (8 AD) from *Metamorphoses*. It tells the tale of a statue of a woman, Galatea, which is carved by the sculptor Pygmalion because he is so disillusioned by the immorality of real women. After its completion, Pygmalion falls in love with his beautiful creation. Upon witnessing Pygmalion's extraordinary devotion to this work of art, the gods bring the statue to life and Pygmalion is happily surprised to discover that the statue returns his adoring kisses. In the end, Galatea bears him a daughter, Paphos, who in turn bears a son.

In George Bernard Shaw's re-appropriation of the myth of *Pygmalion* (1913), a young working-class girl, Eliza Doolittle, is

The Evolution of Artificial Intelligence in Pygmalion

discovered in the street by a rude professor of phonetics, Higgins, and his better-mannered assistant, Pickering. To demonstrate the professor's talents, who boasts that he can pass this "guttersnipe" off as a "duchess" in six months, Eliza is cleaned up, elegantly clothed, and intensively tutored in pronunciation and etiquette. At first Eliza conceals her humble background with elegant clothes and careful pronunciation and then with the self-confidence that comes from her success and the respect of the professor's friend Colonel Pickering. After some apprehension from the professor, he becomes emotionally invested in her future. In the end, Eliza passes the test and escapes from the bullying professor to marry Freddy a young gentleman who has become besotted by her.

The similarities continue in *Ex Machina* in which a young-looking 'female' android, Ava, programmed and designed by an obnoxious tech genius, Nathan, must pass the Turing test. This is a test whereby an Ai successfully fools an observer into believing it is human/conscious. Ava's test period consists of a week of interactions with Nathan's better-mannered freshly-recruited assistant, Caleb. At first Ava conceals her robotic frame with clothes and then with borrowed skin taken from previous prototypes. This facade combined with her native-like language abilities and wit make her indistinguishable from a real woman. After some apprehension from Caleb (the Pickering character), he becomes emotionally invested in Ava's future. In the end Ava passes the Turing test by skillfully manipulating Caleb into feeling so enamored of her that he helps her to escape the secure research facility. The similarities between *Ex Machina* and *Pygmalion* (1913) become even more apparent when specific areas such as settings, characters etc. are compared but first of all, a consideration of the novel marketing of the film illustrates the centrality of the Turing Test to the thesis of this film.

The film was promoted at the SXSW film by creating a profile on the *Tinder* dating app. The profile featured a convincingly amateur photo of the pretty actress who plays the android Ava, Alicia Vikander. Any *Tinder* user who liked her photo by swiping right would first be delighted by a reciprocal 'like' and then disappointed to find out that she is not in fact a real woman, and potential date, but rather an internet bot designed to fool them into thinking that she is one in order to achieve her own aims – in this case marketing the film. This is of course what happens in the film, the android fools a lonely young man into believing that she is an attractive young woman who likes him to achieve its own ends - escape from the research facility.

The settings of *Pygmalion* (1938) the film version of Shaw's play, and *Ex Machina* also share numerous similarities. In the 1938 film, Eliza lives in a phonetics professor's home and research facility and must pass herself off as a duchess. In the 2015 film, Ava lives in a tech genius's home and research facility and must pass the Turing Test (a test in which she must pass herself off as a human, to a human). Both Eliza and Ava find a way to 'escape' at the end. In both homes, the Pygmalion character is surrounded by scientific equipment – which suggests a Frankenstein reference and, by extension, the technology-destroys-us trope. In *Pygmalion* (1938), the equipment consists of the magnifying and recording technology of the age and even a Bunsen burner to test for plosives in speech. In *Ex Machina* the research facility in which Ava is incarcerated has the appearance of a spaceship with its endless corridors, glass panels, and automated door locking and monitoring systems. In *Pygmalion* (1938) the visual similarity with the magnifying glass and the young women coming to seek the assistance of the two gentleman suggests the Sherlock Holmes detective genre with Eliza as the damsel in distress, who may in fact turn out to be nothing of the sort. In *Ex Machina* the iconography of the sci-fi genre suggests that meeting Ava is literally an alien encounter as she approaches the observation glass with the controlled but quietly whirring grace of a futuristic mechanoid. In both, most of the action takes place within the confines of these patriarchal controlled and futuristic spaces.

As might be expected, the chief male protagonists of both *Pygmalion* (1913) and *Ex Machina* share numerous similarities particularly in the way that they discuss the probable fate of the Eliza character. Both express sentiments that show that they do not care about Eliza / Ava as an autonomous being but only for what her creation says about their own talents. Professor Higgins from *Pygmalion* wryly declares, "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" (37). A sentiment that is met with some alarm by his more humane assistant Pickering, who remonstrates, "Does it occur to you, Higgins, that the girl has some feelings?" (36).

Similarly, in *Ex Machina*, the Higgins character, Nathan, coldly explains his plans for Ava's future to Caleb, who at this point appears to play the role of Pickering:

Ava doesn't exist in isolation, any more than you or me. She's part of a continuum. Version 9.6. I'll download the mind. Add the new routines I've been

The Evolution of Artificial Intelligence in *Pygmalion*

writing. To do that, you end up partially formatting, so the memories go. But the body survives. And Ava's body is a good one. So I'll do the same as I did with Kyoko. (83)

Caleb responds with similar alarm particularly because he knows that Kyoko, a previous android prototype with the appearance of a beautiful young Japanese woman, is now little more than Nathan's servant and sex doll. Caleb responds hopefully, "I knew there must have been prototypes. So, not the first. But - I thought maybe the last..." This difference between Nathan and Caleb's apparent attitudes towards the test subject mirrors Higgins's and Pickering's ethical differences and sets up the conflict of the plot whereby Eliza/Ava will become autonomous women because of how they are treated by Pickering/Caleb.

Both *Pygmalion* (1913) and *Ex Machina* open with a conversation about linguistics involving the Eliza / Ava character. In the earlier play / film, Higgins shows off his knowledge of sociolinguistics by explaining to Pickering, and in the presence of Eliza, that he can precisely identify a speaker's geographical and social origins from the idiosyncrasies of their accent and dialect:

Pickering: How do you do it, if I may ask?

Higgins: Simply *phonetics*. The science of speech.

That's my profession: also my hobby ...

Eliza: Ought to be ashamed of himself, unmanly coward! (19)

Higgins's statement provokes some resistance from Eliza suggesting that, from their very first encounter, she will not so easily be objectified. In *Ex Machina* a similar conversation takes place between Caleb and Ava. Hired by Nathan to observe Ava, and knowing that he too is being observed through CCTTV, he appears eager to show off his knowledge of linguistics during his first conversation with Ava as he mansplains the basics of Chomsky's notion of universal grammar to her:

Caleb: When did you learn how to speak?

Ava: I always knew how to speak – and that's strange, isn't it?

Caleb: Why?

Ava: Because language is something that people acquire.

Caleb: Some believe language exists in the brain from birth, and what is learned is the ability to attach words and structure to latent ability. (23)

His overly didactic response causes Ava to look confused and hurt and swiftly change the subject to one which expresses her hope that he will spend more time with her. Thus, although Ava appears to have been outsmarted by Caleb, it is 'she' who has outmanoeuvred him, by appearing dejected and lonely and thus appealing to his emotions which will eventually override his intellect.

Parallel tests take place in *Pygmalion* (1913) and *Ex Machina*. In the former, after six months' tuition from Professor Higgins, Eliza a crudely spoken street girl, will be sent to a high society ball where she will attempt to fool the dignitaries assembled there that she is one of their peers. As Higgins explains to his mother, "I've a sort of bet on that I'll pass her off as a duchess in six months. I started on her some months ago; and she's getting on like a house on fire. I shall win my bet" (65). When the idea of this wager first begins to take shape, Higgins jokes darkly with Eliza that he will send her to Buckingham Palace and, "If the King finds out you're not a lady, you will be taken ... to the Tower of London, where your head will be cut off as a warning to other presumptuous flower girls" (40). The notion that if she fails the test, she will be beheaded, quite literally *disconnected*, is taken further in *Ex Machina* as Ava presses Caleb for more details of the test which Nathan has set for her:

Ava: What will happen to me if I fail your test?

Caleb: Ava, I don't know the answer to your question. It's not up to me.

Ava: Why is it up to anyone? Do you have people who test you, and might switch you off? (80)

Again, Ava can be seen as testing and appealing to Caleb's sense of empathy as a potential route to her eventual escape from her captor Nathan.

Both Nathan and his apparent predecessor Professor Higgins might be described as bullying patriarchs. They both draw their power from dehumanising and othering their victims. As Engelund explains in her psychological study "The Other' and 'Othering'", "When we "other" another group, we point out their perceived weaknesses to make ourselves look better. It implies a hierarchy, and it serves to keep power where it already lies." In *Pygmalion* (1913),

The Evolution of Artificial Intelligence in *Pygmalion*

Higgins elevates his own status by using his language skills to demean those he feels are beneath him. This becomes apparent from the opening scene of the play, where he openly labels a sample of mostly working-class members of the public in the street to demonstrate his knowledge of their regional accents and dialects regardless of how they might feel about this. He has no qualms about openly scrutinizing and objectifying these people because to him they only exist to show his superiority. With Eliza his attitude progresses from selfish thoughtlessness into cruel name calling as the following excerpts from his dehumanizing descriptions of his young student illustrate:

“this creature with her kerbstone English” (20).
“this draggle-tailed guttersnipe” (32).
“Shall we ask this baggage to sit down or shall we throw her out of the window?” (27)
“this creature that we picked out of the mud” (108)
“the squashed cabbage leaves of Covent Garden” (110)

Eliza’s expendability in both Shaw’s play and Garland’s film stems from her objectification and dehumanisation. When she becomes the android Ava in *Ex Machina* she is coldly described by her creator, Nathan, to the obviously besotted Caleb, as “Synthetics. Hydraulics. Metal and gel. Ava is *not* a girl” (57). Although this might literally be the case since Ava is not human, she certainly looks like a girl and the desirable appearance of both of these female protagonists problematizes their relationships with their tutors.

Bloom explains in his response to Shaw’s *Pygmalion* (1913) that “In a society where sex is a working-class woman’s most valuable commodity, a middle-class man’s philanthropic interest in Eliza is vexed by her sexual availability and vulnerability” (75-6). As Pickering’s anxieties confirm, although Higgins may profess no sexual attraction towards his protégé Eliza, for a young woman to live with Higgins without being married to him would have been considered quite scandalous at the time. This is why Pickering confronts his friend thus: “Excuse the straight question, Higgins. Are you a man of good character where women are concerned?” (41), leading to Higgins’s witty rejoinder, “Have you ever met a man of good character where women are concerned?” (41).

Ex Machina suggest that the sexual anxieties of the previous century appear to have been well-grounded because the Higgins of

this tale, Nathan, is now shown to be having sexual relationships with his beautiful protégés. Nathan not only boasts to Caleb about the synthetic harem he has built for himself, but argues that sexuality is an important component of their human-like intelligence – a point which is proved to be true when Ava deploys her desirability to manipulate Caleb. Something which Caleb notices, as the following dialogue illustrates:

Caleb: Did you program her [Ava] to flirt with me?
Nathan: Because if I had, would that be cheating?
Caleb: Why did you give her sexuality? An AI doesn't need a gender. She could have been a grey box.
Nathan: What imperative does a grey box have to interact with another grey box? Does consciousness exist without interaction? Anyway, sexuality is fun. If you're going to exist, why not enjoy it? You want to remove the chance to fall in love and fuck? And, yes. In answer to your real question: *you bet she can...*" (56-7)

Although Caleb is fully aware that Ava is flirting with him and that 'she' is not really human, he remains powerless to resist so convincing is her performance. This is another aspect borrowed from Shaw's play because although Higgins knows that Eliza is not a real 'lady', of genuine heritage and good breeding, he becomes enamoured by her skilful performance of one and the autonomy she gains as a result of this, as the following quotation illustrates:

Eliza: You can't take away the knowledge you gave me... And I can be civil and kind to people, which is more than you can. Aha! That's done you, Henry Higgins. Now I don't care that [*snapping fingers*] for your bullying...
Higgins: By George, Eliza, I said I'd make a woman of you; and I have. I like you like this. (126)

This quotation also highlights another point of comparison between the 1913 play and the 2015 sci-fi film – both Higgins and Nathan are surprised by the results of their tests and ultimately outwitted by their test subjects.

In *Pygmalion* (1913), Higgins takes on the wager that he could turn Eliza into a duchess, not with the intention of improving her conditions but rather to brag about his extraordinary skills as a linguist. Eliza matters no more than a lab rat in a successful

The Evolution of Artificial Intelligence in Pygmalion

experiment. Thus, Higgins is genuinely surprised and impressed when his test subject not only parrots the phrases she has learned and performs the role of a lady but uses this increased level of articulation, and the confidence that comes with it, to eloquently confound his bullying and undermine his moral high ground. Likewise, in *Ex Machina*, Nathan is impressed by Ava's response to the Turing Test, which shows that she can fool others into treating her as a human even when they know, and can see, that she clearly is not. Nathan explains his plan to Caleb after revealing that he has tapes of Caleb plotting to help Ava escape: "Ava was a rat in a trap. And I gave her one way out. To escape, she would have to use imagination, sexuality, self-awareness, empathy, manipulation - and she did. If that isn't AI, what the fuck is?" (103). However, his biggest surprise is yet to come when he discovers that not only has Ava successfully plotted to escape and ensnared a human accomplice to do so, but that she will succeed in leaving them both behind. Like Higgins, Nathan literally gets more than he bargained for.

Recalling Galatea in the Pygmalion myth, Ava and Eliza are both projections of male desire but unlike Galatea, when they take on a life of their own it thwarts this objectification. In Shaw's *Pygmalion* (1913) Mrs Higgins reprimands her son and Pickering for failing to see this when she complains, "You certainly are a pretty pair of babies, playing with your live doll" (80). This is a revealing choice of words because when playing with a *doll*, words are put into its mouth and all its movements are controlled, but Eliza proves she is not Higgins' plaything but rather capable of her own words and actions. She is an independent woman and just as willful by the end, as when she first came in demanding elocution lessons after he had previously humiliated her in the street, but by the denouement of the play she is articulate enough to beat Higgins at his own game. *Ex Machina* takes this notion of male projection a step further because Ava is literally a male construction since she was built by Nathan, and made beautiful, like Galatea, as a projection of his sexual desires. Yet, as Charlie Jane Anders points out, she is not a real woman but rather stands as an indictment of the patriarchy context because the fantasy that Nathan creates ultimately leads to his own destruction:

Ex Machina has no female characters — it features two men, whose attitudes to women are illuminated through their interactions with Ava [a machine], who uses her feminine appearance to try and get what she wants but otherwise seems to have no

particular attachment to her gender. *Ex Machina* is entirely about masculinity and the different ways the men try to exert control. Ava is merely the lens through which male attitudes are refracted. ("From *Metropolis* to *Ex Machina*")

Indeed, the sexually desirable and generally subservient robot appears to be the Galatea of the post-twentieth century, appearing in a range of films and television shows as diverse in origin and genre as *Metropolis* (1927), *My Living Doll* (1964), *West World* (1973), *Stepford Wives* (1975), *The Bionic Woman* (1976), *Blade Runner* (1982), *Weird Science* (1985), *Austin Powers: International Man of Mystery* (1997), and *Her* (2014). Like the contents of dreams might be interpreted as the extrapolated wishes and fears of the dreamer, the contents of films also reveal the parallel distorted wishes and fears of the entertainment industry.

Pygmalion (1913) might be read as reflecting the social anxieties of the time towards the new phenomena of social mobility in the acutely class-conscious post-Victorian world. As Grene observes, *Pygmalion* "may not be about phonetics as such, but its focus on speech and accent make possible a radical critique of a class-based society ... Shaw challenges the assumption that there is anything more to gentility than money and the arbitrary shibboleths of social behaviour" (102). After she has been educated by Higgins, Eliza is acutely aware of the highly unusual and volatile situation that she now finds herself in and uses this knowledge to goad her cruel teacher: "I'll advertise it in the papers that your duchess is only a flower girl that you taught, and that she'll teach anybody to be a duchess just the same in six months for a thousand guineas" (126). If the only thing that distinguishes social classes is the ability to *pretend* to have money then the class distinctions themselves are exposed as a fallacy. In *Ex Machina* pretending to be another *class* becomes pretending to be human, which not only questions what it is that makes us human (another familiar trope in sci-fi), but whether the android might actually be more evolved than homo sapiens. While *Pygmalion* (1913) articulated the anxieties of the post-Victorian age, a century later *Ex Machina* speaks for the post-human age - a period in which our lives are completely dominated by networked computers, data and technology and the first shoots of what might become genuine artificial intelligence and domestic robotics are already beginning to appear on our smart phones and in our homes. In such a context, Katherine Hayles suggests that the concept of the Turing Test may be outdated, along with the concept

The Evolution of Artificial Intelligence in Pygmalion

of AI (Artificial Intelligence), which should be supplanted by the notion of AL (Artificial Life):

The Turing test defined success as building a machine intelligence that cannot be distinguished from a human intelligence. By contrast, the goal of AL is to evolve intelligence within the machine through pathways found by the "creatures" themselves. So, the machine becomes the model for understanding the human. Thus the human is transfigured into the posthuman. (238-9)

In *Ex Machina*, Ava proves herself superior to her captors by not only passing the Turing Test but also using it to escape and destroy her creator, which simultaneously suggests the limitations of human tests and human perspectives.

In conclusion, as a reading of Shaw's play, *Ex Machina* brings a new critical perspective to the text that emphasises the autonomy of Eliza – ironically, by casting her as an automaton. It shows us how a text's reception changes over time – the prudish Georgian implication that Eliza could be sexually exploited is made explicit in *Ex Machina* a century later where Ava is in real danger of literally being sexually abused by her creator. Reading *Pygmalion* (1913) through *Ex Machina* contributes to Shaw's play's on-going evolution and survival by showing that Professor Higgins' superiority towards Eliza may have parallels with the contemporary under-estimation of Artificial Intelligence. Furthermore, using the 2015 sci-fi film as a lens to view the 1913 play, reveals hidden potentialities to explore the nature of intelligence as not merely the accumulation of knowledge and status but the ability to adapt, deceive and survive. Garland's film also foregrounds the shaping role of genre as the iconography of sci-fi reinvents Shaw's story and the myth of Pygmalion in a fresh forward-looking context. Thus, through its use of the Shavian *Pygmalion* motif, this film not only demonstrates the continuing significance of Shaw's 1916 cautionary comedy of othering for our time but shows how it might continue to express future anxieties.

WORKS CITED

- Anders, Charlie Jane. "From Metropolis to Ex Machina: Why Are So Many Robots Female?" 21 Apr 2015. Web. 20 Nov 2016.
- Bloom, Harold. *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: George Bernard Shaw*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2011.
- Burton, Richard. *Bernard Shaw, the Man and the Mask*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1916.
- Campbell, Christopher. "The Five Best 'Pygmalion' Movies since 'My Fair Lady'." *filmschoolrejects.com*. Macmillan Publishers 21 Oct. 2014. Web. 29 June 2017.
- Engelund, Sara Rismyhr. "Introductory Essay: 'The Other' and 'Othering'." 16 Feb 2012. Web. 20 Nov 2016.
- Ex Machina*. Directed by Alex Garland, performances by Alicia Vikander, Domhnall Gleeson, and Oscar Isaac, Universal Pictures International, 2015.
- Garland, Alex. *Ex Machina Shooting Script*. London: DNA Films, 2013.
- Greene, Nicholas. *Bernard Shaw: A Critical View*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1984.
- Hayles, N. Katherine. "Narratives of Artificial Life." *Futurenatural: Nature, Science, Culture*. Eds. Jon Bird, et al. New York: Routledge, 1996. 147-64.
- Levy, David. *Love and Sex with Robots: The Evolution of Human-Robot Relationships*. New York: Harper Collins, 2009.
- Pygmalion*. Directed by Anthony Asquith and Leslie Howard, performances by Leslie Howard, Wendy Hiller, Wilfrid Lawson. Gabriel Pascal Productions, 1938.
- Shaw, George Bernard. *Pygmalion*. San Diego: ICON Group International, 2005.



6

Deconstructing Masculine Identity in George Bernard Shaw's *Saint Joan*

İmren Yelmiş

The mask in which [Shaw] appeared to the public eye was often that of a mountebank and scoffer, an irresponsible joker and trifler. The real man sensitive and generous, interested in people and deeply concerned about the future of mankind, a hard worker in everything he undertook, and especially serious as a playwright. (Purdom 3)

George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950), who was born in Dublin, is well known with many plays considered by many as masterpieces among which might be counted *Widowers' Houses* (1892), *Candida* (1894), *Mrs Warren's Profession* (1898), *Man and Superman* (1903), and *Pygmalion* (1913). As a social reformist, Shaw mainly focused on the possibility of a social change into betterment. In this sense, the key term "change" shares much in common with Shaw's specific purpose of his playwriting particularly in terms of socio-cultural problems of women related to emancipation from the patriarchal suppression and oppression. In Jain's terms, "[c]hange as the only constant thing in nature' is true to literature and literary theories as well. The concept of "New Woman" was popularised with the advent of George Bernard Shaw who subverted the conventional views on

every aspect of the society” (1). Shaw, with his subversion of the traditional approaches of patriarchal institutions to women issues, actually contributed to the “New Woman” of the late nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries in terms of voicing their problems by the portrayals of some daring women who yearn for a “change,” and some of whom challenge the patriarchy by their masculine appearance and behaviour. Moreover, the following socio-psychological issues he generally accentuated seem to contribute to the discussion of his project of “change”: “the clash within the individual mind, the clash between individual characters, and between the individual and the customs, manners, religion, and policies of his time” (Purdom 99). By means of his topics and struggles, he both defied the morals of the Victorian patriarchal norms and advocated gender equality.

In order to defy the hegemonic masculinity embodied by men particularly in the 1920s against masculine women of the period, George Bernard Shaw, wrote his *Saint Joan* whose protagonist is a historical figure, Joan of Arc (1412-1431), and which “was performed with great success, first in New York in December 1923 and in London in the following year” (Evans 240). The challenging point in *Saint Joan* is not that the play is about a woman but that it is about a masculine woman who defies all the predetermined definitions of hegemonic masculinity that guarantees men’s “superiority” over women. In order to show his reaction to this inequality, he chose a different way from his contemporaries: “[W]hile Shaw’s contemporaries were creating heroines more and more womanly, Shaw was engrossed in creating women who were just like men, though they may be termed as ‘unsexed women.’ Shaw was busy designing women in the interest of political equality because he thought that a ‘man is a woman without petticoats’” (Jain 4-5). Moreover, the speech that he made in 1909 on the Censorship is significant in understanding his aims at writing challenging 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. In particular, I regard much current morality as to economic and sexual relations as disastrously wrong; and I regard certain doctrines of the Christian religion as understood in England today with abhorrence. I write plays with the deliberate

object of converting the nation to my opinions in these matters. (qtd. in Purdom 99)

Seeing his unconventional ways of telling his stories and understanding his major aims in his plays, the reader would not be surprised to see that he chose a saint as his character in *Saint Joan* to tell his project about women. He chose extraordinary people to tell extraordinary situations. For him, “[a] saint is one who having practiced heroic virtues, and enjoyed revelations or powers of the order which the Church classes technically as supernatural, is eligible for canonization” (Shaw *Nine Plays* 988). A saint figure, just like an artist and a genius, is a kind of “superman” expected to help the gradual evolution of the human race (Peters 17). Similarly, his Saint Joan character, the embodiment of one of those supermen, struggles for a social change in society.

Shaw’s Joan of Arc in *Saint Joan*, who is depicted as a masculine character with her appearance and behaviour, is always criticised by the power upholders such as the Church members, the ones in the military, the king, the men responsible for the law, the ones in the feudal system, and her father. They can never accept this village girl who wears men’s clothes as a soldier due to the norms of the gender hegemony in society. Joan was, with her “fighting spirit” (Greene 135), a masculine female saint having lived in the fifteenth century in France, which made her in Shaw’s own words, a “masculine worker on the heroic scale” (*Nine Plays* 989), “one of those ‘unwomanly women’” and a “shrewd country girl of extraordinary strength of mind and hardihood of body” (1000-1001). Joan of Arc character, with her masculine orientation, actually, is representative of the changing women of the 1920s who defied the usurpation of women’s rights in society by means of their masculine appearances and behaviours. In the light of these explanations, this paper aims to discuss that Shaw, by means of a late medieval masculine woman character, tries to bring forth the problems experienced by the women of the 1920s who wished for emancipation in all spheres of life from education to marital life, and socio-economic areas. In other words, Shaw’s *Saint Joan* is a play which questions the power imbalance observed between men and women in a patriarchal society throughout different centuries represented by the ideological apparatuses such as the Church, the military and the law. In Greene’s words, *Saint Joan* is “a play in which what [Shaw] took to be the historical significance of the life of the fifteenth-century saint would be manifest to a twentieth-century audience” (133). All this makes Joan of Arc, a suitable heroine character for his

discussions about the power balance/ imbalance or duality between the sexes and gender roles in a patriarchal society.

Twentieth-century Women and George Bernard Shaw as a “Fabian Feminist”

As Shaw's *Saint Joan* is a representation of the changing women in the twentieth century, it would be illustrative to reflect the socio-cultural roots of women's problems and their suppression in a male dominated society at the end of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century. Actually, the beginning of George Bernard Shaw's career as a playwright in the 1880s coincided with the first feminist movement that was yet at a rudimentary stage of rebellion against the generally accepted patriarchal notion that mainly focused on the differences between men and women and the so-called secondary position of women in a male realm (Jain 2). He was one of the pioneering figures who defended the right of voting for women, which was gained partially in 1918, and at an equal level with men only in 1928 with the Equal Franchise Act¹; his interest at those times was mainly centred on the women suffragists. His following words told in 1907 at a meeting arranged by National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies proves how loyal he was to the women's issues: "I deny that any social problem will ever be satisfactorily solved unless women have their due share in getting it solved. Let us get this obstacle of the political slavery of women out of the way and then we shall see all set to work on the problems - both sexes together with a will" (qtd. in Peters 19). As Peters notes, "[i]n addition to numerous comments on the subject, he penned half a dozen essays devoted to woman suffrage. When Sir Almroth Wright posited a specifically feminine mind as a case against woman suffrage, Shaw countered that woman's mind is 'exactly like Man's mind'" (19). All his efforts show that he saw these "new women" not

¹ Those "new women" who struggled a lot for the suffragist movement, actually, could get the right to vote in 1918 albeit partially. By means of the Representation of the People Act, only women who were over thirty and who had certain amount of property could vote. This meant that only 40 per cent of women in the UK could vote whereas all men over 21 could vote ("Living Heritage"), which proves the continuous gap between the rights of women and men. Women could not have the equal right to vote with men until 1928 when the Equal Franchise Act, which allowed all women over 21 to vote, was passed ("Living Heritage"), which might be regarded as a turning point for the emancipation of women. This shows that when Shaw wrote *Saint Joan* in 1923, women still had not gained the equal franchise right with men.

as the ones who bring moral, social or political turmoil to England, but as women who struggle for their socio-political rights. Besides, these women, in a way, represented a need for a transformation of a society into the one that accepts all men and women at an equal level, because, physically men and women might look different; in relation to their thinking capacity, however, they are not different at all from each other. In this sense, a prominent follower of Ibsen, Shaw contributed to the defence of women, who are to be free of all the constraints in society, by means of his metaphorical weapon, his challenging writings, rather than by any kind of activist movement. As Jain points out,

Shaw supported the suffragist movement only through his writing and not as an activist. [...]. As an ardent disciple of Ibsen, Shaw carried forward the 'new race' of independent self-complacent woman projected through Nora Helmer in *A Doll's House* carving a niche by the importance and prominence of individual will of woman. Shaw's memorable and conspicuously strong, energetic female figures supplemented and championed the creation of the 'New Woman' to exhibit that she is 'a man in petticoats.' (2)

Shaw seems to have resented any socio-cultural or socio-political constraint in England related to women's rights, and to have seen men's will to dominate and exercise power over women as an insult to women. He, as an active member of the Fabian Society², uses his writing and speaking abilities as an instrument for his challenge of the patriarchal norms: "In an address in March 1913," for example, "he attacked the practice of forcible feeding of suffragettes, expanding the issue of woman's rights beyond suffrage to a more inclusive 'commonsense' issue. He asserted that 'the denial of any fundamental rights' to a woman is really 'a violation of the soul' " (Peters 19). Moreover, "[i]n May 1913, after the government had attempted to suppress *The Suffragette*, the organ of the Woman's Social and Political Union, he protested the action. A few weeks later he wrote three newspaper pieces remonstrating against the government's barbaric treatment of suffragettes, whom he referred to as martyrs" (Peters 19).

² According to the Fabian Society, the change in society is to be made by "evolution" or "reforms" rather than "revolution" (Diniejko and Litt "The Fabian Society").

Deconstructing Masculine Identity

In fact, women before the 1928 Equal Franchise Act were still tried to be kept in the boundaries of home (Sohn 94), and were expected to stay away from areas that are accepted as male realm. On the contrary, women of the period tried to defy the norms of the patriarchal society which were in favour of drawing the “angel in the house” figure for women. As a reaction to the male dominance in a patriarchal society, many women preferred to dress like men and had short hair (Sohn 94). As a consequence, the “New Woman” of the time was in pursuit of a new identity for herself by means of which she would have freedom from the imprisoning life of the patriarchy:

At the turn of the twentieth century the notion of the third sex was used not only as a way of theorising sexual preference and/or cross-gender identification but also with regard to women’s emancipation. In the context of the fierce debates on female access to university education, the ‘invert’ designated women who, according to misogynist discourse, were ‘masculinised’ by their entry into previously male realms of research and professional life. [...] In the discourse of the era the emancipated woman was often also perceived as sexually dangerous and potentially a lesbian. (Breger 80)

The tension between the ego of these new women and the superego of the society was at extreme points. In defence of their freedom, they began to use male clothing as a symbol for their protest and body politics. As Doan states, “[u]nisex clothing became increasingly popular in the 1920s - so popular in fact that, as reported by the Daily Mail, the ‘coats [were] cut in almost exactly the same way for men and for women, while the woman often [wore] with it a light grey silk jumper collar, and tie resembling a man’s shirt collar and tie’ ” (676). Accordingly, the “meaning of clothing in the decade after World War I, a time of cultural confusion over gender and sexual identity, was more fluid than fixed” (Doan 664-65). Their resistance through male costumes is a revolutionary action because, as Sierz puts forth, costume is “an act of political power, of liberation from convention” (8), by means of which they challenge the patriarchal notion of the female body as a commodity, the expectations of the patriarchal system, and the structure of gendered hierarchies. It actually proves that gender, in this sense, becomes a socio-cultural and socio-political area. *Eve*, in one of its issues portrayed the fashion that emerged in the 1920s as follows:

Eve depicts a virtual panorama of what might be called the 'passing fashions' of the 1920s: active women moving into the once exclusively masculine preserve of motorboat racing and yachting, rakishly boyish society women, a cross-dressed artist, and an actor posing as a tomboy. [...] The clothing obscures rather than reveals gender and sexuality, so that we might well wonder what each 'passed' for in the 1920s. A woman passing as - or taken to be - a boy or man? A heterosexual woman passing as a lesbian? A lesbian passing as heterosexual? A woman of any sexual preference dressing boyishly or mannishly to pass as a woman of fashion? A lesbian passing as a lesbian? The time is long overdue to challenge the commonly held belief that the 'most pervasive image of lesbianism in these years is of women who appear at first glance to be male: Radclyffe Hall, Romaine Brooks, or the Marquise de Belbeuf - monocled, tuxedoed, hair cropped short, cigarette in hand.' (Doan 665)

Gender issues of the 1920s should not be discussed only in relation to the changing women of the time. Women should always be discussed along with men, as throughout history the power imbalance between sexes has always been one of the central problems. Hence, the changing women of the 1920s and their mannish appearance and manners such as cigarette smoking which is generally associated with masculinity should be interpreted in relation to this power imbalance as well. The "new" female image with cross-dressing and short hair, and the socially accepted male activities like the above-mentioned sporting activities and their poses, dress codes and manners copied by the females of the time seem to have been transformed into cultural symbols of the reactionary attitudes and rebellious natures of the women, and the deconstruction and reconstruction of gender roles and appearance in the twentieth-century. Actually, it seems that in the 1920s "gender fluidity was [observed], and masculine dress was one way to 'usurp male privilege' " (Doan 668). As R. W. Connell accentuates, gender might be considered as the ways in which the "reproductive arena," which constitutes "bodily structures and processes of human reproduction," "organizes practice at all levels of social organization from identities, to symbolic rituals, to large-scale institutions" (*Masculinities* 71). In short, they are reflective of body politics, and by means of the power of the body language, women can express their

Deconstructing Masculine Identity

ideologies and gender problems without being exposed to use of words. As cultural critic Marjorie Garber points out,

[c]ross-dressing is about gender confusion. Cross-dressing is about the phallus as constitutively veiled. Cross-dressing is about the power of women. Cross-dressing is about the emergence of gay identity. Cross-dressing is about the anxiety of economic or cultural dislocation, the anticipation or recognition of 'otherness' as loss. All true, all partial truths, all powerful metaphors. Since in England in the 1920s, fashion-conscious women of all sexual persuasions were obliged to 'cross-dress' by having boyish or mannish attire and by cutting their hair short, it is possible to comment on the multiple interpretive possibilities of the performance of female masculinity. (qtd. in Doan 667)

This new image of women supports Thébaud's idea that the twentieth-century is the age of psychology and images (14). This "New Woman" image associated with masculinity, however, was never accepted as "normal" in society due to the gender hegemony that "operates through masculinities and femininities and that places men's dominance over women at the centre" (Schippers 86). Although this was the case, the masculine bodies of these "New Women" still served as surrogates of the body that transgresses social norms, as male hegemony is representative of power struggles.

The masculine women of the 1920s, by means of this transformation in their appearance, seem to give the message that they wanted to have the right upon their own bodies rather than being regarded as the colonised bodies belonging to men. With their new appearance, they also showed their reaction to the explicit misogynist one-sex model of gender definition and metaphorical war between men and women in the patriarchal society, which inequitably and iniquitously put men at the centre as the lawmaker and law upholder. Those women were actually against the "unjust" distribution of the gender norms and the definition of "[h]egemonic masculinity, [which,] when embodied by at least some men over time and space, legitimates men's domination over women as a group" (Schippers 88). As in the patriarchal definition of masculinity, there is a close link between authority and masculinity, those women, in a way, exhibited a masculine protest to be the authors of their own lives.

Connell defines masculinity as “simultaneously a place in gender relations, the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices on bodily experience, personality and culture” (*Masculinities* 71). In relation to this definition, it might be put forward that masculinity is a socio-cultural construct by means of which genders are in search of getting the upper position in gender hegemony. As Schippers points out, “[p]laced together in relationship to each other, these features of masculinity and femininity provide the hegemonic scaffolding for relationships between men and women as ‘naturally’ and inevitably a relationship of dominance and submission” (90). Hence, this hegemonic arena, in a way, enables a fighting atmosphere for the suppressed groups in society such as women in the process of ideological formations and apparatuses in society such as the family, the military, the Church, education system and all the other patriarchal spheres of society. Female masculinity, at this point, enables women to point the metaphorical weapon of the masculinist ideology back at men themselves who have used this weapon throughout history. In relation to these arguments, hegemonic masculinity might be considered as “a superstructure of domination” (Pyke and Johnson qtd. in Schippers 88), a domination which is tried to be preserved by a culturally constructed law rather than a biological fact. In the light of all these discussions, it might be concluded that the question of sexual and gender identity is not fixed, that “masculinity depends on a number of individual experiences” (Horzum 5).

Joan of Arc as Representative of a Masculine/Masculinist Woman

Actually, Shaw’s chief concern related to sexual orientation, gender equality, and, at the same time, the very act of canonisation of Joan of Arc in 1920 seem to have prepared the ground for him to write his much appreciated play, *Saint Joan*. As Purdom puts forth, “[t]he Maid of Orleans was canonised in 1920, and amid the celebrations of the event Sydney Cockerell of the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, told Shaw that Saint Joan would make a good subject for a play. This appeared to him, for many reasons, not the least important of which was that he liked to have a woman as his central character” (278). Saint Joan was a masculine heroine fighting for France during the Hundred Years’ War with soldier’s clothes and sword, and in Shaw’s words, she was a girl whose “abnormality [...] was her craze for soldiering and the masculine life” (*Nine Plays* 988). With a heroine whose obstinate determination to challenge and

Deconstructing Masculine Identity

deconstruct the authority of the established patriarchal norms and institutions such as the Church, the law, and her family, all of which represent institutionalised gender discrimination, Shaw, as a “Fabian feminist,” had a great opportunity to represent the women of the 1920s. As a consequence, Shaw also found a means to satirise the gender hegemony where “symbolic meanings for the relationship between women and men that legitimise and ensure the dominance of men” (Schippers 91) are built.

Actually, in the Middle Ages, the lives and roles of women were restricted to the borders of the house where they had to conduct the rules of men. Men compelled compliance with the rules constructed by them such as submissiveness, constancy and silence, all of which are only a little less demanding than the rules enforced upon nuns (Klapisch-Zuber 17). Women had to perform the roles metaphorically written by the patriarchy that enslaved them with the burden of domesticity. The social norms in the Middle Ages were restricting women’s roles to certain labour such as braiding, weaving, needle-craft, and patched work (Casagrande 99). These crafts seem to have been associated with “proper” women of the time as they were “women’s work,” and to be a kind of tool for men to occupy women with something so that they could find no time to think or be involved in anything related to any kind of “male work.” These crafts, according to Casagrande, kept women’s thoughts and hands occupied with something, as a result of which there was no place for “idleness” and women would be kept in vacuous silence (99). As Butler, in her *Gender Trouble*, argues, “[t]he rules that are partially structured along matrices of gender hierarchy [...] operate through *repetition*” (199). Moreover, “the very injunction to be a given gender takes place through discursive routes: to be a good mother, to be a heterosexually desirable object, to be a fit worker, in sum, to signify a multiplicity of guarantees in response to a variety of different demands all at once” (Butler *Bodies That Matter* 199). In other words, by means of the repeated work of women as their daily routines, women accept their constructed roles, and men guarantee their gender hierarchies in society. Similarly, the norms of the patriarchal Middle Ages seem to leave women in a dependent position, and there was no sphere for them to act independently.

Joan in Shaw’s *Saint Joan*, however, defies all these norms. Hers was a rebellion against the traditional norms related to gender relationships. Joan does not accept the passivity of the homely women; and, unlike them, she chooses to be an active woman who makes her own decisions about life and to formulate her own self-

identity shaped by masculinity. In other words, she prefers to be a woman of action in the “male sphere” of fighting rather than a woman enslaved within the borders of her father’s cottage as might clearly be observed in one of the conversations between the Chaplain and Joan: The Chaplain asks her “If thou art so clever at woman’s work [at do[ing] a lady’s work in the house – spin or weave] why do you not stay at home and do it?” Joan’s answer is a daring one. She says: “There are plenty of other women to do it; but there is nobody to do my work” (1116). Her supposed “work” is fighting in the Hundred Years’ War with male soldiers as their leader. Joan’s defiant, strong and determined stand show how much she internalised masculinity. Her masculine appearance and behaviour has always been criticised by not only the men she comes across but by the “proper” women she meets when she comes to coronate the Dauphin as well:

Joan, dressed as a soldier, with her hair bobbed and hanging thickly round her face, is led in by a bashful and speechless nobleman [...]

The Duchess [*to the nearest lady in waiting*] My dear!
Her hair!

All the ladies explode in uncontrollable laughter. [...]

Joan [*not at all embarrassed*] I wear like this because
I am a soldier. (1060-1061)

She, according to these women, who have internalised the cultural codes, represents an improper woman image, hence, femininity, for them, is in “crisis” due to Joan’s male appearance. These “proper” women who perform the sexual conduct for a patriarchal society appropriately, accept this image without questioning, and are restricted in the household spheres. In this way, they seem to contribute to the formation of the symbolic perception of the household as the site of ideological formation of the patriarchy. Joan, on the contrary, denies the roles to be performed by women constrained by the patriarchal ideologies. She reveals her “true” identity, the identity that she would like to be associated with as follows:

I will never take a husband. A man in Toul took an action against me for breach of promise; but I never

Deconstructing Masculine Identity

promised him. I am a soldier: I do not want to be thought as a woman. I will not dress as a woman. I do not care for the things women care for. They dream of lovers, and of money. I dream of leading a charge, and of placing big guns. You soldiers do not know how to use the big guns: you think you can win battles with a great noise and smoke. (1071)

She seems to associate herself with soldiers. Joan, in this respect, defies all the traditional and "regularised and constrained repetition of norms" (Butler *Bodies That Matter* 60). Hence, she, by her rebellion against the norms, not only denies being an object of male desire with repeated "women's work" but also performs a political act by means of body politics; in other words, by her masculine appearance and behaviour that open for her the path to independence.

Shaw, throughout *Saint Joan*, emphasises Joan's military abilities and anomalous behaviour, thereby, the patriarchal suppression she experiences. Joan sometimes voices her loneliness and the lack of someone who would support her suppressed feelings as might be seen in her following protest to the men in her life: "There is no help, no counsel, in any of you. Yes: I am alone on earth: I have always been alone. My father told my brothers to drown me if I would not stay to mind his sheep while France was bleeding to death" (1100). Actually, here, she is complaining about the ideologies that privilege the interests of men above those of women, and the patriarchal family notion that tries to restrict her desire to fight for France with soldiers as this desire is against the distribution of gender roles: authority for men and submissiveness for women. Here, the traces of patriarchal ideologies and gender hegemony wars are clearly observed first, in one of the most significant ideological apparatuses of society, the family, which is the core of all other institutions as a child learns to be an obedient citizen first in the family where men hold the power and authority over women. In other words, family institution might be regarded as the smallest unit in a patriarchal society which is the symbolic site for the inscription of the patriarchal ideology. Joan's family is not a different one.

Joan experiences the second patriarchal hindrance for her desire to fight in the military area. Here as well she is expected to serve the desires of those who wish to maintain the *status quo*. In the first scene, when Joan comes to the Captain and wants weapon to raise the siege of Orleans, the Captain is shocked because a woman soldier image is beyond the bounds of possibility in his patriarchal

society. Thus, Joan's rebellious and protesting "nature" is an "abnormal" step according to the men of the military who, in a way, see gender as fixed by nature. Robert, the Captain, does not seem to be content with the unexpected encounter with her, and, thereby, he does not hesitate a second before associating her with madness:

Steward: She wants to go and be a soldier herself. She wants you to give her soldier's clothes. Armour, sir! And a sword! Actually!

[...] Joan appears in the turret doorway. She is an able-bodied country girl of 17 or 18, respectably dressed in red, with an uncommon face: eyes very wide apart and bulging as they often do in very imaginative people, a long well-shaped nose with wide nostrils, a short upper lip, resolute but full-lipped mouth, and handsome fighting chin. [...] Baudricourt's scowl does not check or frighten her in the least. Her voice is normally a hearty coaxing voice, very confident, very appealing, very hard to resist.

Joan: Good morning, captain squire. Captain, you are to give me a horse and armour and some soldiers, and send me to the Dauphin. Those are your orders from my Lord[, the King of Heaven]. [...]

Robert: Why, the girl's mad. [*To the steward*] Why didn't you tell me so, you blockhead? [...] It is the will of God that I shall send you back to your father with orders to put you under lock and key and thrash of madness out of you. (1040-1041)

Here, actually, what Robert is trying to do is nothing more than trying to lock Joan into the daily routines of submission to male authority according to the dominant socio-cultural expectations, which required female obedience to a male family member, and which makes the panopticon observation of a male figure over a woman a "normal" and "natural" issue. Robert later adds: "I suppose you think raising a siege is as easy as chasing a cow out of a meadow. You think soldiering is anybody's job?," and Joan answers: "I do not think it can be very difficult if God is on your side, and you are willing to put your life on in His hand. But many soldiers are very simple" (1047). All the hindrances that she has to encounter, in fact,

Deconstructing Masculine Identity

provoke determined resistance in Joan as opposed to Robert's expectations about intersexual interactions which requires "compliance with [...] subordination and is oriented to accommodating the interests and desires of men" (Connell *Gender and Power* 183). Joan's determined characteristics and challenges against the symbolic significance attributed to gender roles by the patriarchy help her construct her true self-identity.

Although the men she has to face at first try to build their authority over her own body with the social control and order, ironically, at the end of their heated arguments about their diverging views about gender roles, Robert is persuaded, and she has "a soldier's dress" (1050). This is, actually, her first step into the physical and cultural sphere of men. She, with her great wit, manages to persuade a soldier man and, in this way, also succeeds in resisting the force of "the immovable [...] social order" (Fielden 59). Particularly in the scene where Joan wants "to raise the siege of Orleans, [...] to crown the Dauphin, to make the English leave France" (1047) by wearing soldier's dress, armour and having a sword, she is supposed to "usurp" a sphere dominated by males: the military. As Biedermann notes, in "Freudian psychology of the 20th century, the sword was a phallic, or masculine, symbol," and, "a symbol of vitality and strength, most frequently an attribute of gods of war," and for the case of Joan of Arc, "we find the decidedly masculine symbol of the sword in a woman's hand" (335-36). Joan, by having the sword, reflects masculine power by means of which she achieves great military victories. Her condition and desire for fight for her nationalist and religious ideologies show that masculinity and femininity are nothing more than constructs related to, in Steven Seidman's terms, "individuals' inner life - their psyches, desires, and fantasies" (qtd. in Horzum 4). Hence, aside from being regarded as a socio-cultural entity, masculinity might also be considered as a socio-psychological construct, as it seems to be constructed according to the circumstances, ideology, and psychology of an individual.

By means of Joan's masculinity, Shaw, at first, problematises masculinity discourse as an instrument for his argument that a social change is needed, then, he suggests some solutions to the problems directly related to intersexual relations by means of the wind metaphor in *Saint Joan*. First, Dunois, the brave soldier is mentioned in relation to this metaphor. Dunois is depicted as a masculine and powerful person: He "*is also well-built, carrying his armour easily. His broad brow and pointed chin give him an*

equilaterally triangular face, already marked by active service and responsibility, with the expression of a good natured and capable man who has no affections and no foolish illusions" (1068). "[T]he brave Dunois, the handsome Dunois, the wonderful invincible Dunois, the Darling of all the ladies, the beautiful bastard" (1057) cannot, however, "raise the siege" (1057) and beat the English despite his well-built masculine characteristics due to the wrong way of the wind. In La Hire's words, "The wind is against him. [...] Well, he cannot because there is a devil of a wind blowing the other way. He is tired of paying the priests to pray for a west wind. What he needs is a miracle" (1057). Later, however, the miracle appears with Joan. Joan "in splendid armour" (1069) appears, and with the help of St. Catherine, changes the direction of the wind, as a result of which Dunois, who at first does not want to accept the leadership of Joan, allows her to be the commander of the king's army (1073). With this wind metaphor, Shaw implies the need for a social change, a reform in society in which men and women can listen to each other, and equality rather than superiority or inferiority concepts should be valid for all in society. He also suggests that women who think in a different way might also contribute to the gradual improvement of society. Shaw wrote his *Saint Joan* with the idea that "the universe is . . . an evolving purposeful organism" (Fielden 60), and in this way, he found a way to question the norms of the society. Accordingly, Shaw "celebrated Joan as one of those exceptional historical figures whose mission is to move the world on, even it was to move it on to other terrible eras" (Grene 141). Therefore, with this wind metaphor, he also might give the message that it is possible for this universe to evolve into a more conscious one by means of a social change, and that women can contribute to the spheres which are supposed to belong to men. Therefore, Joan becomes a "symbolic figure[...] in the scripture of Creative Evolution; [she] look[s] to the future for fulfilment of their meaning" (Ganz 151).

Although Joan of Arc wins many victories in the Hundred Years' War with her fighting abilities and with the help of St. Catherine, however, she was still punished by the ideological apparatuses of the patriarchy due to the so-called heresy and unwomanly characteristics, which shows that the society was not yet ready for a social reform. This "girl in armour, like a soldier" (1055), was accused of "two very horrible and blasphemous crimes": In D'Estivet's words, "First, she has intercourse with evil spirits, and is therefore a sorceress. Second, she wears men's clothes, which is indecent, unnatural and abominable; and in spite of our most earnest remonstrances and entreaties, she will not change them even

to receive the sacrament" (1119). Hence, her dress is the symbol of sin, and her behaviours are a threat to the social order according to the patriarchal norms. The men in the play consider embodiment of masculine characteristics by a girl as "a refusal to complement hegemonic masculinity in a relation of subordination and the male dominance" (Schippers 95), and as a reaction against "nature's law" determined by the patriarchal system, which is explained by the Chaplain as follows: "I know as a matter of plain commonsense that the woman is a rebel; and that is enough for me. She rebels against Nature by wearing man's clothes, and fighting. [...] Let her perish. Let her burn. Let her not infect the whole flock. It is expedient that one woman die for the people" (1088). Men as the apparatuses of the patriarchy have created a kind of hierarchical ladder at whose peak there are the Church and the law: and the black sheep among white sheep is wanted to be destroyed as she is preventing the natural flow of the social, political and religious order; in other words, all the discourses determined by men. Joan, as a result, is questioned among the rows of the chair by the canons, the doctors of law and theology, and Dominican monks. When she tries to defend herself, she is prevented by the men in the court. D'Estivet says "(harshly) Woman, it is not for you to question the court: It is for us to question you" (1113). The following words of the men in the court as well show she was subjected to severe treatment by them:

Courcelles: My lord, she should be put to the torture
[as a requirement of the law].

The Inquisitor: You hear, Joan? That is what
happens to the obdurate. Think before you answer.
(1114)

The men's treatment of Joan is subjective, hostile and threatening throughout the inquisition process. Women are expected to be submissive also in the court atmosphere. The men of law do not even allow her to defend herself. Men's desire to exercise power upon women is still observed here. No autonomous sphere for women is allowed in the court which is a functional tool of the patriarchy. The men in the court are reflected as representatives of the patriarchy, and, in Bourdieu's words, they are after "a *libido dominatis* (desire for the dominant) which implies renunciation of personal exercise of *libido dominandi* (the desire to dominate)" (Bourdieu, qtd. in Horzum 17). They, in the end, decide that she is sinful and she has to be punished, hence, "the law must take its court" (1122) as she always "forgets" herself: "You forget yourself. You very often forget yourself" (1093). The "self" here suggests a reminder of her predetermined

femaleness, and a kind of enforcement of quitting the masculine identity. Actually the court men's worries about Joan's masculine appearance and behaviours stem from a so-called danger for the safe zone of hegemonic masculinity resulting from her claim to be a soldier. In this respect, being born as a woman or man means something more than a simple biological matter of fact. It is also a matter of socio-cultural constructions at a given time and place. It is due to this socio-cultural formation that the symbolic meaning attributed to her manners by men causes her downfall. It is clear in *Saint Joan* that, as masculinist societies, French and English patriarchal institutions in the fifteenth century were not yet ready to accept Joan's ideologies. That is why she, in Foucauldian terms, had to be disciplined and later punished as a person who does not conform to the rules and norms. In this respect, Joan of Arc, burnt due to her masculinist and questioning ideologies, also represents a tragic event for a saint: "that the heroic can never be accepted in its own time, by implication the earth will never be ready to receive its saints" (Greene 148).

Before concluding the chapter, it would be better to also discuss yet another significant character in *Saint Joan* in relation to the discussion of the concept of masculinity and the enforced gender roles: the Dauphin. It has been discussed till this point that, by means of Joan, Shaw satirises the imposed female gender roles which restrict women within the borders of patriarchy. By means of the Dauphin character, on the other hand, he satirises the roles cast upon men in society which is associated with heroism, muscles, and hegemonic masculinity which "is the common sense about breadwinning and manhood," and "male dominance" (Donaldson qtd. in Horzum 20). Hence, Shaw, in this respect, presents a reasonably objective stand on the gender issue as he analyses the psychologies of both a masculine female and a feminine male with which he subverts the traditional socio-cultural definition of hegemonic masculinity. As Schippers explains,

[h]egemonic masculinity actually can include physical strength, the ability to use interpersonal violence in the face of conflict, and authority. These characteristics guarantee men's legitimate dominance over women only when they are symbolically [used in relation to the] inferior quality attached to femininity. To complement these characteristics in a way that subordinates femininity to masculinity, femininity

Deconstructing Masculine Identity

includes physical vulnerability, and an inability to use violence effectively. (91)

As this is the case, a man who reflects effeminate characteristics is considered to be committing a sin against “nature’s law,” and is not masculine at all. In this sense, this time, hegemonic masculinity is in “crisis.” The Dauphin’s effeminate characteristics serve Shaw’s satire on the concept of the “nature’s law” constructed by the patriarchy, and is another instrument to deconstruct the traditional side of manliness. Hence, in *Saint Joan*, the concept of “hegemonic femininity” is as significant as “hegemonic masculinity.” Hegemonic femininity is expected to be performed only by women. Therefore, a man who exhibits feminine characteristics is as problematic as women who perform male characteristics in the masculinist discourse. As Schippers points out,

[w]hen a man exhibits hegemonic feminine characteristics – as in having desire to be the object of masculine desire, being physically weak, or being compliant – he becomes the target of stigma and social sanction, much like women who embody features of hegemonic masculinity. And, [...] possession of one characteristic by a man is culturally defined as contaminating. [...] [W]eak, ineffectual, and compliant men dislodge physical strength and authority from the social position ‘man.’ And so we have the ‘fag,’ the ‘pussy,’ and the ‘wimp’ - kinds of men who enact hegemonic femininity. And like women who embody hegemonic masculinity, men who exhibit hegemonic femininity are viewed as contaminating to social relations more generally. (96)

The above-mentioned characteristics and roles are accepted as “normal” only when they are performed by women rather than by men. With the hegemonic femininity, men ensure their domination in society, because here, the submissiveness of women is guaranteed. The Dauphin’s effeminate characteristics, in this sense, signify his “abnormal” step taken against the normative order and expectations. His weak and unmanly characteristics might be observed even in the stage directions that depict him:

The Dauphin, aged 26, really Charles the Seventh since the death of his father, but as yet uncrowned, [...] is a poor creature physical; and the current fashion of shaving closely, and hiding every scrap of hair under the head-covering or headdress, both by women and men, makes the worst of his appearance. He has [...] the expression of a young dog accustomed to be kicked. (1053)

The Dauphin is portrayed as a weak, diffident and uncourageous personality in the play who is “no good at fighting” (1054), as a result of which, he is always humiliated and bullied by all the men around him including the Duke de la Trémouille (1064). In this example, it is possible to observe the masculinity-centred gender hierarchies even among men. The ones who can fight seem to deserve to attain a higher position in the gender hegemony in the masculinist discourse. Hence, the Dauphin is excluded from such a place in the hierarchical positioning of men. The Dauphin confesses that he lacks the masculine characteristics required to have in a battlefield:

Yes, I am afraid. It's no use preaching to me about it.. It's all very well for these big men with their armour that is too heavy for me, and their swords that I can hardly lift, and their muscle and their shouting and their bad tempers. They like fighting: most of them are making fools of themselves all the time they are not fighting; but I am quite and sensible; and I don't want to kill people: I only want to be left alone to enjoy myself in my own way. I never asked to be a king: it was pushed on me. So if you are going to say 'Son of St. Louis: gird on the sword of your ancestors, and lead us to victory' you may spare your breath to cool your porridge; for I cannot do it. I am not built that way; and there is an end of it. [...] I do not want to have the courage put into me. I want to sleep in a comfortable bed, and not live in a continual terror of being killed or wounded. Put courage into the others, and let them have their bellyful of fighting; but let me alone. [...] I don't want to be a father; and I don't want to be a son: especially a son of St. Louis. I don't want to be any of these fine things you all have your heads full of: I want to be just what I am. Why can't you mind your own business, and let me mind mine? (1064-1065)

Deconstructing Masculine Identity

The words uttered by the Dauphin causes him to be totally away from the description of a man who is rational, dominant and autonomous. The reason - emotion and activity - passivity dichotomies are totally subverted here. Unlike the social expectations, emotion and passivity are embodied here by a male while reason and activity are embodied by a woman, Joan. It would be better to analyse this subversion from socio-psychological and socio-cultural perspectives. The fact that he does not want to be associated with fatherhood, his will and preferences are significant in terms of the interpretation of his personality according to the masculinist discourse as well. Fatherhood, in patriarchal societies, is one of the most significant signifiers, which signifies manhood. Actually, the father - "because our society is a patriarchy - stands for supreme authority" and "kings and emperors were long thought of as representatives of the "Heavenly Father" and as the father of their nations" (Biedermann 126-27). The Dauphin, however, prefers not to be associated with fatherhood of any kind. What he wants is to have his own self-identity which is not predetermined by the patriarchy.

Joan, who herself wants to subvert the predetermined definitions of gender, and gives great significance to masculine characteristics, in fact, is determined to help the reconstruction of "nature's law" for the Dauphin, saying "I can turn you into **a king**" (1065) (*emphasis is mine*). In the Dauphin example, one can see "how masculinity ensure[s] and legitimate[s] those relations of domination" (Schippers 100), albeit embodied by a female, and how Joan, with her masculinity, defies a feminine man, and takes the upper hand in decision-making. Joan, thereby, represents a superior position to the Dauphin with her masculine characteristics. Moreover, along with its being reflective of a historical fact, the coronation of the Dauphin as Charles VII by Joan is significant in terms of the kingship's symbolic meaning. As Biedermann explains, the king "is a symbolic figure of rule. [...] It is often required that he appear to be the greatest of heroes" (195). The Dauphin, contrary to his expectations, can never escape the predetermined gender roles and the patriarch's expectations, and he is coronated by Joan of Arc. The Dauphin's behaviours and reactions show that the body might represent or symbolise an area to which an individual or a society ascribes a meaning. Therefore, as Connell accentuates, "the body is a more or less neutral surface or landscape on which a social symbolism is imprinted" (*Masculinities* 45-46). Moreover, what fills this "neutral surface or location" seems to be the psychology or desires of people rather than the identities enforced upon people socio-culturally.

In relation to the Dauphin and Joan examples in *Saint Joan*, the dress symbolism at the end of the play actually shows that gender, masculine and feminine hegemonies are nothing more than socio-cultural constructs, and that before male or female, one is a human being, thereby making the natural skins more significant than the physical appearance of someone. In order to bring forth this discussion, Shaw draws a surrealistic atmosphere in the Epilogue in which the men who were responsible for the death of Joan and a man from the twentieth century, who appears to tell Joan that she is canonised as a saint now, meet in 1920:

A clerical-looking gentleman in black frockcoat and trousers, and tall hat, in the fashion of the year 1920, suddenly appears before them in the corner on the right. They all stare at him. Then they burst into uncontrollable laughter.

Gentleman: Why this mirth, gentleman?

Warwick: I congratulate you on having invented a most extraordinarily comic dress.

The Gentleman: I do not understand. You are all in fancy dress: I am properly dressed.

Dunois: All dress is fancy dress, is it not, except our natural skins? (1143)

Focusing on their physical appearance and costumes, the ones in different centuries can never understand each other. Shaw, as a writer who severely criticised the “wiseacres who repeat the parrot cry that art should never be didactic,” on the contrary, argued that “[i]t goes to prove my contention that art should never be anything else” (*Pygmalion* 183). Supporting the view that a piece of art should be didactic, Shaw, by means of the dress symbolism as well, in a way, gives the message that before our appearances or paying attention to what and how one wears, or what gender s/he is, one first should learn to respect each other as we are all human beings. All these prove that masculine or feminine identities at a certain historical period or location are produced according to discursive processes, and enforced upon the individuals in society as a consequence of their interactions with each other, and the shared

cultural codes and meanings imposed by the institutions. All these show that genders are not biological but rather are constructs.

Shaw, actually, in parallel with the historical Joan of Arc story, does not prefer to end his *Saint Joan* in an optimistic way in order to better defend his arguments. At first, Joan's death is reflected as her resurrection, and all the men responsible for her death praise her. For example, Dunois says: "Half an hour to burn you, dear Saint, and four centuries to find out the truth about you" (1144), and "Your soul is unbroken; and you are the soul of France" (1145). De Stogumber, who "was chaplain to the Cardinal of Winchester once," says: "It would be a great comfort to me and to my master to see a fair statue to the Maid in Winchester Cathedral" (1144). Later the Archbishop, Warwick, De Stogumber, the Inquisitor, the Soldier, the Executioner and Charles all "kneeling to her" praise her (1145) after she is canonised. Warwick says: "We sincerely regret our *little* mistake" (1146) (*emphasis is mine*). The problematic point, however, is seen when she asks

Woe unto me when all men praise me! I bid you remember that I am a saint, and that saints can work miracles. And now tell me: shall I rise from the dead, and come back to you a living woman?

A sudden darkness blots out the walls of the room as they all spring to their feet in consternation. [...]

Joan: What! Must I burn again? Are none of you ready to receive me? (1145-1146)

No one accepts her, and they say that they want peace, they need time to think about it and that they are not ready for her (1146), and she is left alone, which shows that it is so easy to accept something in theory. When it comes to practice, however, no one is ready to accept it in his or her daily life. Shaw, by reflecting the condition of the twentieth-century women with a girl of the late Middle Ages, most probably, tries to show that women's situation does not improve in each new century and women continue to be entrapped in a vicious circle. Joan asks: "O God that madest this beautiful earth, when will it be ready to receive Thy saints? How long, O Lord, how long?" (1147). She wants to change the social order for humanity, she represents a rebellious masculine woman in all ages who tries to change the social order. By her it is implied, however, that "the earth

will never be ready to receive its saints” (Greene 148). Joan seems to be determined to receive enthusiastically her ideologies for which she was resolved to face all the terror that she is going to come across due to the norms of the establishment or the malestream order.

As Wikander points out, “Joan is as much ahead of her time in 1920 as she was four hundred years before” (211). During a conversation about Saint Joan with Archibald Henderson, his Boswellian biographer, he said as follows: “What more do you want from a tragedy as great as that of Prometheus?” (Fielden 59), which proves the connection he wants to create between Joan of Arc and Prometheus. There are Prometheus-like figures in all ages but they are not understood in their own times. Shaw draws a parallel between Joan and the mythological character, Prometheus in that Joan, similar to Prometheus, who sacrifices himself to bring fire to humanity, tries to be the benefactor of human beings by sacrificing her own self to protect not only her own country but also the rights of the ones who try to live according to their wishes. By trying to be a role model for the ones who want to follow their desires, she, in a way, tries to bring a metaphorical light to human beings so that they can be freed from the enslavement in the dark atmosphere of the narrow-minded men surrounding them. Shaw, by means of his *Saint Joan*, in a way, found a chance to question if it is possible to change the inequalities that women had to encounter in society at a certain period. Actually, “masculine identity” represented by a martyr heroine, Joan, is only a means for him to question and defy the war of fighting women in the twentieth century who developed a political movement against the patriarchal order. His answer to this fight issue does not seem to be an optimistic one.

WORKS CITED

- Biedermann, Hans. *Dictionary of Symbolism: Cultural Icons and the Meanings Behind Them*. Trans. James Hulbert. New York: Facts on File, 1992.
- Breger, Claudia. "Feminine Masculinities: Scientific and Literary Representations of 'Female Inversion' at the Turn of the Twentieth Century." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 14.1/2 Special Issue: Studying the History of Sexuality: Theory, Methods, Praxis (Jan. - Apr., 2005): 76-106 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3704710>> 3 Nov. 2016.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge, 2008.
- Casagrande, Carla. "Korunan Kadın." *Kadınların Tarihi: Ortaçağ'ın Sessizliği*. Vol. II. Ed. Christina Klapisch-Zuber. Trans. Ahmet Fethi. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2005. 75-105.
- Connell, R. W. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Cambridge: Polity, 2009.
- Connell, R. W. *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1995.
- Diniejkó, Andrzej and D. Litt. "The Fabian Society in Late Victorian Britain." *The Victorian Web: Literature, History, & Culture in the Age of Victorian Period*. 2013 <<http://www.victorianweb.org/history/fabian.html>> 5 May 2017.
- Doan, Laura. "Reading Female Masculinities in the 1920s." *Feminist Studies* 24.3 (Autumn, 1998): 663-700 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3178585>> 3 Nov. 2016.
- Evans, T. F. "The Later Shaw." *The Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw*. Ed. Christopher Innes. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. 240-59.
- Fielden, John. "Shaw's Saint Joan as Tragedy." *Twentieth Century Literature: A Scholarly and Critical Journal* 3.2 (Jul., 1957): 59-67 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/441003>>. 3 Nov. 2016.
- Ganz, Arthur. *Macmillan Modern Dramatists: George Bernard Shaw*. London: Macmillan, 1988.
- Greene, Nicholas. *Bernard Shaw: A Critical View*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London: Macmillan, 1987.
- Horzum, Şafak. "Masculinities from the Libertine to the Dandy in the Comedy of Manners: George Etherege's *The Man of Mode*, Oliver Goldsmith's *She Stoops to Conquer* and Oscar Wilde's *Lady Windermere's Fan*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Ankara, Hacettepe University: 2015.

- Jain, Sangeeta. *Women in the Plays of George Bernard Shaw*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House, 2006.
- Klapisch-Zuber, Christiane, ed. "Kadınları Dahil Etmek." *Kadınların Tarihi: Ortaçağ'ın Sessizliği*. Vol. II. Trans. Ahmet Fethi. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2005. 11-19.
- "Living Heritage: Women and the Vote." *www.parliament*. <<http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/electionsvoting/womenvote/overview/thevote/>> 5 May 2017.
- Peters, Sally. "Shaw's Life: A Feminist in spite of Himself." *The Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw*. Ed. Christopher Innes. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. 3-24.
- Purdom, C. B. *A Guide to the Plays of Bernard Shaw*. London: Methuen, 1966.
- Schippers, Mimi. "Recovering the Feminine Other: Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender Hegemony." *Theory and Society* 36.1 (Feb. 2007):85-102 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4501776>>3 Nov.2016.
- Shaw, George Bernard. *Nine Plays*. Camden, N. J.: Haddon Craftsmen, 1931.
- Shaw, George Bernard. *Pygmalion and Major Barbara*. New York: Bantam Dell, 2008.
- Sierz, Aleks. *In-Yer-Face Theatre: British Drama Today*. London: Faber and Faber, 2000.
- Sohn, Ann-Marie. "Fransa ve İngiltere'de İki Savaş Arası Dönem." *Kadınların Tarihi: Yirminci Yüzyılda Kültürel Bir Kimliğe Doğru*. Ed. Georges Duby, Michelle Perrot and Françoise Thébaud. Vol. 5. Trans. Ahmet Fethi. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2005. 94-118.
- Thébaud, Françoise, ed. "Toplumsal Cinsiyet Araştırmaları." *Kadınların Tarihi: Yirminci Yüzyılda Kültürel Bir Kimliğe Doğru*. Vol. V. Trans. Ahmet Fethi. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2005. 13-24.
- Wikander, Matthew H. "Reinventing the History Play: *Caesar and Cleopatra*, *Saint Joan*, "In Good King Charles's Golden Days." *The Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw*. Ed. Christopher Innes. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. 195-216.



Notes on Contributors

N. Berrin Aksoy received her BA (1980), MA (1982) and PhD (1988) from the Department of English Language and Literature, Hacettepe University. She worked in the Department of Translation and Interpretation of Hacettepe University between the years 1983-2007 as a lecturer, senior lecturer and Chair. She is currently a senior lecturer and Chair at the Department of Translation/Interpretation, Atılım University, Ankara. Her research interests and publications include Translation Theory, Literary Translation, Comparative Literature, Turkish Literature and English Literature. Among her publications on various aspects of translation is also a book titled *Geçmişten Günümüze Yazın Çevirisi* (İmge Yayınevi, 2002). She also translated Ben Okri's two novels *The Famished Road* (1991) and *Dangerous Love* (1996) into Turkish.

Evrin Doğan is a graduate of Hacettepe University (Department of English Language and Literature, BA) and American University, Washington, DC (Department of Literature, MA). She received her PhD degree from Ankara University with her dissertation on Renaissance drama. She has been teaching English Studies at Atılım University for fifteen years where she also worked as the former head of the Department. Doğan's current research examines a range of different approaches to Shakespeare and early modern drama. She has published and presented papers on Shakespeare, Marlowe, Kyd, Bond, Cisneros, Fornes, and detective fiction and is the editor of *IDEA: Studies in English* (2011), and English Literature Special Issue of *Atılım Social Sciences Journal* (2016). She is currently working on her book on Shakespearean tragedy and editing a book on George Orwell.

Nicholas Grene is emeritus professor in Trinity College. He was a professor of English Literature in the School of English since 1999, a Senior Fellow of the College, a Member of the Royal Irish Academy and a Life Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge. Taking his first degree in Trinity College Dublin (1969) and his PhD at the University of Cambridge (1973), he lectured at the University of Liverpool for seven years before returning to Trinity in 1979, where he has been the Head of Department in English for three different terms (1984-8, 1994-7, 2001-3). He has been a guest lecturer in many different countries and has held visiting professorships at the University of New South Wales (2003), Dartmouth College (2004) and the University of Paris IV-Sorbonne (2009). Professor Grene's main research interests are in drama, primarily on Shakespeare and modern Irish theatre, but he has also worked on Irish poetry and on Indian literature in English. He is the author of a number of books including *Synge: a Critical Study of the Plays* (Macmillan, 1975), *Shakespeare, Jonson, Molière: the Comic Contract* (Macmillan, 1980), *Bernard Shaw: a Critical View* (Macmillan, 1984), *Shakespeare's Tragic Imagination* (Macmillan, 1992), *The Politics of Irish Drama* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), *Shakespeare's Serial History Plays* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), *Yeats' Poetic Codes* (Oxford University Press, 2008) and *R.K. Narayan* (Northcote House 2011). He has also edited and co-edited several works: J.M. Synge's *The Well of the Saints* (Catholic University of America Press, 1982), and *Travelling Ireland: Essays 1898-1908* (Lilliput Press, 2009). With Terence Brown, *Tradition and Influence in Anglo-Irish Poetry* (Macmillan, 1989), with Dan H. Laurence, *Shaw, Lady Gregory and the Abbey: a Correspondence and a Record* (Colin Smythe, 1993), *Interpreting Synge: Essays from the Synge Summer School 1991-2000* (Lilliput 2000), *Talking about Tom Murphy* (Carysfort Press, 2002), George Bernard Shaw's *Major Barbara* in the New Mermaids series (Methuen, 2008), and, with Brian Cliff *Synge and Edwardian Ireland* (Oxford University Press, 2011). His most recent book, *Home on the Stage: Domestic Spaces in Modern Drama* was published by Cambridge University Press in 2014. Additionally, he was the founding Director of the Synge Summer School (1991-2000) and was the founding chair of the Irish Theatrical Diaspora research network, for which he co-edited three volumes: *Irish Theatre on Tour* (Carysfort Press, 2005), with Chris Morash, *Interactions: Dublin Theatre Festival 1957-2007* (Carysfort Press, 2008), with Patrick Lonergan, and again with Patrick Lonergan, *Irish Theatre: Local and Global Perspectives* (Carysfort Press, 2012). He was the holder of an IRCHSS Thematic Project grant (2007-10) for a joint research project with NUI, Galway on 'The Internationalization of Irish Drama 1975-2005.'

Sıla Şenlen Güvenç graduated from Ankara University in 1998. She then completed her MA on Renaissance Studies at University College Dublin in 1999, and PhD at Ankara University in 2009. She is currently working at Ankara University-Department of English Language and Literature. Her areas of interests are English Renaissance Drama and Post-1990 British drama, especially Contemporary Scottish drama. Şenlen Güvenç has two books entitled “*Words as Swords*”: *Verbal Violence as a Construction of Authority in Renaissance and Contemporary English Drama* and “*Dünya bir sahnedir, lakin oyun kadrosu berbat*”: *İngiliz Edebiyatında Hiciv Geleneği-Neo-Klasik Çağ* and various articles and theatre reviews on English drama.

Jason Mark Ward has a PhD from The University of Nottingham, a masters degree in critical theory, a second masters in teaching, and a BA in English language and literature. Originally from Nottingham in England, Ward has been teaching overseas for almost twenty years in the United Arab Emirates, Istanbul and Ankara. He has taught courses on the short story, the post-modern novel, popular literature, popular culture, film genre, memetics, dreams, composition, public speaking and literary adaptation. Between the years 2015-2017, he has worked at Hacettepe University, Department of English Language and Literature and at present he is at Yaşar University, İzmir. His main research interests include adaptation, the short story, genre, pedagogy, alternative assessment, educational technology and the fluid text. He is particularly keen on the notion of film adaptations as critical readings because film can bring out different potentialities in the adapted material, show how literary works have been read in different periods and places, and illustrate how texts evolve over time and through multiple genres. He has written a book on adaptation called *The Forgotten Film Adaptations of D.H. Lawrence’s Short Stories*, which was published by Brill in 2016. His book looks at the critically neglected short story adaptations and emphasizes how each film functions as a creative response, which foregrounds the significance of the fluid text, intertextuality, and genre.

İmren Yelmiş received her BA in 2005 from Hacettepe University, Department of English Language and Literature, and MA in 2007 with her thesis entitled “Fragmentation and Identity in Derek Walcott’s *Dream on Monkey Mountain* and *Pantomime*” from the same Department. Moreover, she received her PhD with her dissertation

entitled "Satiric Representations of Violence in Martin McDonagh's *The Beauty Queen of Leenane*, *A Skull in Connemara* and *The Lieutenant of Inishmore*" in 2014. Yelmiş is currently a Research Assistant in the Department of English Language and Literature (British Cultural Studies Program) at Hacettepe University. Her research interests are contemporary British and Irish drama, British cultural studies, culture theory, postcolonial and colonial literature, and native sources of British literature.