

CLASS CONFLICTS IN JAMES SHIRLEY'S THE LADY OF PLEASURE AND BERNARD SHAW'S PYGMALION

**Pamukkale University
Institute of Social Studies
Master of Arts Thesis
Department of Western Languages and Literatures
Department of English Language and Literature**

Serap IŐIK

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali ELİKEL

February, 2016

DENİZLİ

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ ONAY FORMU

Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları anabilim dalı, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı bilim dalı öğrencisi Serap Işık tarafından Doç. Dr. Mehmet Ali Çelikel yönetiminde hazırlanan “Women Identity and Class Conflicts in James Shirley’s *The Lady of Pleasure* and Bernard Shaw’s *Pygmalion* (James Shirley’nin *The Lady of Pleasure* ve Bernard Shaw’un *Pygmalion* Oyunlarında Kadın Kimliği ve Sınıfsal Çatışma)” başlıklı tez aşağıdaki jüri üyeleri tarafından 12.02.2016 tarihinde yapılan tez savunma sınavında başarılı bulunmuş ve yüksek lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Jüri Başkanı

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mural Göç



Jüri-Danışman

Doç. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL



Jüri

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ayla Oğuz

Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulu’nun 03/06/2016..tarih ve ..12/13.... sayılı kararıyla onaylanmıştır.



Prof. Dr. Kenan ÇOŞYAN

Enstitü Müdürü

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

Signature: 

Name, Last Name: Serap IŞIK

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor Associate Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL, for his endless support. I believe, being ‘rich’ means having kind-hearted people around you. He is one of the most affable person that I am grateful for having met. He is an important person in my life not only because he supported me during this process but also he is the only one who made me academically self-confident. I am proud to dedicate this dissertation as he taught me “Ever tried. Ever failed. No matter. Try again. Fail again. Fail better” (Beckett, 1983: 7). If my wish of having an academic career comes true one day, he will be the one to make it possible.

I would like to thank my father-in-law, Attila IŞIK, who shared his knowledge and experiences while writing this dissertation. As a booklover, he supported me with his broad perspective on life. Thanks to his help, I was able to analyse the plays better. Also, I would like to thank my mother, father and mother-in-law for their support through this process. Without their faith in me, I would not be such self-confident.

I would like to thank my beloved husband, Onur IŞIK, not only for his support for this dissertation, but also for making my life much more meaningful. His value cannot be explained with words. He makes me feel like the luckiest woman on earth.

Lastly, I believe it is a miracle that we are going to have a baby. I also would like to thank her/him for making us such happy and lively.

ABSTRACT
CLASS CONFLICTS IN JAMES SHIRLEY'S THE LADY OF PLEASURE AND BERNARD SHAW'S PYGMALION

IŞIK, Serap
M.A. Thesis in English Literature
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali Çelikel

February, 2016 81 Pages

James Shirley's The Lady of Pleasure and George Bernard Shaw's Pygmalion are significant plays of English Literature to analyze class struggles. In The Lady of Pleasure, Shirley tells a story of an oppressor upper class couple who soon realize the importance of human values. There are also people from different social classes through which Shirley exemplifies class conflicts in the society. On the other hand, in Pygmalion, Shaw tells a story of a flower girl, Liza and her transformation into an upper class woman with the help of Prof. Higgins and Pickering. As there are also people from different social classes, class struggles are also reflected in this play. In this dissertation, class struggles, the gap between the social classes, complexities in society and women identity will be analyzed from the perspective of Marxism. Also, Brechtian Drama and Stanislavsky's perspective of acting are discussed to show how modern drama has developed.

The first chapter gives information on the historical and social backgrounds of the 17th and the 20th centuries, Marxism, Brechtian Drama and Stanislavsky's system. The second chapter discusses class struggles and women identity in James Shirley's The Lady of Pleasure. The third chapter discusses class struggles in Bernard Shaw's Pygmalion. Lastly, the fourth chapter compares and contrasts the plays.

The aim of this dissertation is to analyze James Shirley's and Bernard Shaw's plays according to Marxist theory. The Lady of Pleasure by James Shirley and Pygmalion by Bernard Shaw will be studied in terms of class struggles and women identity.

Key Words: Class struggles, Social Oppression, Marxism, Brechtian Drama, Stanislavsky System

ÖZET

JAMES SHIRLEY’NİN THE LADY OF PLEASURE VE BERNARD SHAW’UN PYGMALION OYUNLARINDA SINIFSAK ÇATIŞMA

IŞIK, Serap

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Anabilim Dalı,
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı
Danışman: Doç. Dr. Mehmet Ali Çelikel

Şubat 2016, 81 sayfa

James Shirley’nin The Lady of Pleasure ve Bernard Shaw’un Pygmalion oyunları sınıfsal çatışmaları incelemek için İngiliz Edebiyatının önemli oyunlarıdır. The Lady of Pleasure oyununda Shirley sonunda insani değerlerin önemini anlayan baskıcı bir üst sınıf çiftinin hikayesini anlatır. Ayrıca, oyunda Shirley’nin toplumdaki sınıfsal çatışmaları örneklediği farklı sosyal sınıflardan kişiler de vardır. Öte yandan, Pygmalion oyununda, Shaw çiçekçi bir kız olan Liza’nın ve onun Prof. Higgins ve Pickering’in yardımlarıyla bir üst sınıf kadınına dönüşme hikayesini anlatır. Oyunda farklı sosyal sınıflardan kişiler olduğundan, bu oyunda da sınıfsal çatışmalar yansıtılmaktadır. Bu tezde, sınıfsal çatışmalar, sosyal sınıflar arasındaki uçurumlar, toplumdaki farklılıklar ve kadın kimliği Marksist açıdan incelenecektir. Ayrıca, Brechtien tiyatro ve Stanislavsky’nin oyunculuk bakış açısı modern tiyatronun nasıl geliştiğini göstermek adına tartışılacaktır.

İlk bölüm 17. ve 20. yüzyılların tarihi ve sosyal geçmişi, Marksizm, Brechtien Drama ve Stanislavsky sistemi hakkında bilgi verir. İkinci bölüm James Shirley’nin The Lady of Pleasure oyunundaki sınıfsal çatışma ve kadın kimliğini tartışır. Üçüncü bölüm Bernard Shaw’un Pygmalion oyununda sınıfsal çatışma ve kadın kimliğini tartışır. Dördüncü bölüm oyunları karşılaştırıp farklılıkları belirtmektedir.

Bu çalışmanın amacı James Shirley ve Bernard Shaw’un oyunlarını Marksist teori kapsamında incelemektir. James Shirley’nin The Lady of Pleasure ve Bernard Shaw’un Pygmalion’ı sınıfsal çatışmalar açısından incelenecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sınıfsal çatışma, Toplumsal Baskı, Marksizm, Brechtien Tiyatro, Stanislavsky Sistemi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENT.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1

CHAPTER ONE

HISTORICAL AND THEORITICAL BACKGROUND	7
--	---

CHAPTER TWO

<u>THE LADY OF PLEASURE</u> BY JAMES SHIRLEY	22
---	----

CHAPTER THREE

<u>PYGMALION</u> BY G.BERNARD SHAW	37
---	----

CHAPTER FOUR

COMPARISON OF <u>THE LADY OF PLEASURE</u> AND <u>PYGMALION</u>	61
---	----

CONCLUSION.....	74
REFERENCES	77
C.V.....	81

INTRODUCTION

James Shirley and Bernard Shaw are two of the most prominent playwrights from two different periods of English Literature. James Shirley was born in 1596 in London. He is famous for his plays and poems. He began his career with poems and then he wrote plays. He admired Beaumont and Fletcher whose effects are seen in his comedies and tragedies. He had difficulties when Parliament closed theatres in 1642. He could not go on with his writing career for a while and he worked as a schoolteacher during that time. He started writing again in 1646 and published a book of poems. He died in The Great Fire of London (Nason, 1915:3).

He was born into a century of great dramatists. The 16th century was the age of Shakespeare, Thomas Kyd, Christopher Marlowe, Johnson and Webster. Therefore, it was inevitable for Shirley to be affected by their works and styles. He was also one of the last of the great dramatists of that time. What made him different is that he was able to write in his own style although he was affected by the others. Charles Lamb comments on him:

Shirley claims a place among the worthies of this period, not so much for any transcendent genius in himself, as that he was the last of a great race, all of whom spoke nearly the same language and had a set of moral feelings and notions in common. A new language and quite a new turn of tragic and comic interest came in with the restoration (1840: 66).

Shirley did not write similar works to his contemporaries and he added new perspectives. He dealt with class conflicts and the social oppression in his plays. He reflected the century and the British society. He also represented the understanding morality in his time and reflected the corruption in the society. Power was in the hands of the upper class and morality was shaped through their perspectives. The poor were oppressed by the rich and they did not have a proper place in the society. Shirley combined all these in his plays and he showed how moral values were used for upper class people's benefits.

George Bernard Shaw was a dramatist and critic of the 20th century. He was born in Dublin in 1856. His interest in literature began in his childhood because his mother loved reading books (Henderson, 1911:7). He went to grammar school but throughout his educational life he hated schools and teachers. He believed that:

Schools and schoolmasters, as we have them today, are not popular as places of education and teachers, but rather prisons and turnkeys in which children are kept to prevent them disturbing and chaperoning their parents (qtd. in Jones, 2012: 60).

He did not believe in education because he thought that it lost its meaning. School was just a prison for him in which people were oppressed. He couldn't think freely. When he started his writing career, he had financial difficulties and publishers rejected his works. He had to live under difficult conditions and he saw the oppression of the society upon the poor. Not surprisingly, he became interested in socialism and Marxism after he faced with the reality that the economic and political power was controlled by the rich (Henderson, 1911:151). He was interested in class conflicts and social oppression. He became one of the members of Fabianism which was a socialist organization suggesting that the world was changing and the social classes should also change. There must be equality among the classes and people must be aware of the realities of the century. Shaw believed in social justice and wanted people to improve themselves in the changing world (Henderson, 1911:89).

He was awarded with The Nobel Prize in Literature in 1925 "for his work which is marked by both idealism and humanity, its stimulating satire often being infused with a singular poetic beauty" ("The Nobel Prize in Literature 1925").

James Shirley's The Lady of Pleasure and Bernard Shaw's Pygmalion were chosen to represent the 17th and the 20th centuries in terms of class conflicts. They are chosen because there are similarities such as the representation of class conflicts, social oppression and the role of women in society. Although there are some different points of views, they both show the class society which oppresses the poor. Besides reflecting the society and individuals in the society, this thesis suggests that class distinctions and the social oppression do not only belong to a particular century. Throughout the history, there were social classes and the poor have always been oppressed. There was always an upper class in each century that ruled the society and held the power. Poor ones had to live under their rules and could not live through their own choices

There are four chapters in this thesis. In the first chapter, theoretical and historical backgrounds of the plays are discussed. The effects of the Renaissance and

Reform are explained in detail because they affected the understanding of the century. Society changed and the individuals' perspectives towards life also changed. They began to see the life and the things happening around them from different perspectives.

There were social classes and it was the upper class who kept the power and used them on the lower class. Also, trade and commerce grew and formed a basis for Industrial Revolution in England in 18th century. Women in England did not have a notable place in the society and they were mostly housewives. Only rich women were able to receive education but they could not have jobs as doctors or lawyers.

Drama in the 17th century is also discussed. Before the 17th century, plays were written for the court but in the 17th century writers began to put the individuals and society in the centre of their plays ("Daily Life in the 17th Century England", 2014). Problems in the society and human relations were discussed in the plays.

In the 20th century, there were also social classes and the oppression of the upper class was obvious. The effects of World Wars and Industrial Revolution are seen in literary works. The corruption in the society is also discussed. Individualism gained importance in that century because especially after World Wars there appeared an age of scepticism. People lost their connections with their own selves and the others. Although women were still oppressed by the society, they began to find a place for themselves. Unlike in the 17th century they could get jobs that women could not get in the previous centuries ("Daily Life in the 17th Century England", 2014).

Class distinctions and social oppression presented in these plays invite powerful analyses in terms of Marxist theory. It is a theory which requires the individuals, especially working class to be aware of the power they have and that they can end the class system in the society. It suggests communism in which there is equality for everyone and suggests that workers should unite against the system in order to reach the worker's paradise (Marx, 2008:48). People should see the reality that the capitalist system makes them alienated to their individuality by oppressing them. The upper class holds the power because in Marxism it is believed that modes of production determines one's social class.

Although Marxist theory had not come into being by the time The Lady of Pleasure was written, this theory is still functional in the analyses of the texts from different periods of history because in Marxism it is suggested that: "The history of all

hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles” (Marx, 2008:14). Marx and Engels believe that throughout the history there is always an oppressor and an oppressed and they are always in contrast to each other. As the class conflicts are historical facts, Marxist theory is functional while analysing The Lady of Pleasure.

Bertolt Brecht and Constantine Stanislavsky and their perspectives to drama should be discussed at this point. They are important critics of the 20th century because they change the traditional understanding of drama and acting methods. Brecht introduced ‘epic theatre’ which is a new understanding of drama. He did not approve the Aristotelian catharsis and purification. On the contrary, he believed that drama should teach its spectators how to find new perspectives for specific situations. There must be a distance between the stage and the spectators. Yet, this distance must be emotional. The spectators must not forget that it is a play, it is not real. So, the aim is not to purify their emotions. They must think over the serious issues of the century and face with the reality that they live in a chaos in which they are alienated to themselves. In traditional drama, there is a distance between the spectators and the actors. There is an invisible fourth wall which makes it impossible for the spectators to face with the realities. They are alienated from the real world. They are like in a fantasy world in which they are just purified emotionally and do not think about the world around them. So, it can be said; there must be a distance emotionally but the fourth wall must also be destroyed so that the spectators would be able to face with the realities.

Stanislavsky is known for his acting method. For him, an actor must act like a teacher who awakens the spectators to the realities of the 20th century. The most important things for Stanislavsky are work discipline and ethics. Actors must use their personal memories in order to internalize the character of the play, because without internalizing it is not possible to act through the character’s motivation. They must observe daily life well as it helps them while internalizing the character. Also, they must combine their inner characterization with external characterization in order to portray the character properly. They are all important because there is not a place for disconnected actions, mimed or gestures on the stage.

The second chapter aims to analyse The Lady of Pleasure by James Shirley. It is a comedy of manners which deals with the moral values and human relations based on class struggles. There are people from different social classes and the attitudes of the

upper class towards the lower class are represented through Aretina, Bornwell and Celestina. They are rich upper class people and they do not respect the lower class people. They make benefits from them and the lower class people are not portrayed as individuals. The women characters are also important to see the role of the women in the century. Although they seem powerful, they are seen as tools to give pleasure. They are not respected by men. That situation reflects the spirit of time. There is also transformation of Aretina in terms of moral values. Until the end of the play, she does not respect the poor ones and her only aim is to reach the court and she tries to keep her fame and social status. Thanks to her husband Bornwell, she understands the real meaning of life at the end of the play. She understands that money should not be in the centre of one's life because true happiness comes from spiritual happiness. She realizes that her soul is corrupted as she does not care for the other people. She does not live for herself and that makes her unhappy. So, class struggles and social oppression are analysed and criticised through morality in this play.

In the third chapter, Shaw's Pygmalion is analysed. It is the story of Liza, who is a poor flower girl and her transformation by Higgins and Pickering. The title addresses to the Myth of Pygmalion in which a sculptor named Pygmalion falls in love with the statue, Galatea that he makes and prays Gods to give her life. Higgins and Pickering function as Pygmalion who curves and shapes Liza's speech and character. Liza does not have a proper English accent to work at a florist's shop and wants to improve her accent. Higgins is a professor of phonetics and she wants to take private lessons from him. Higgins and Pickering agree on a bet and Pickering wants him to make a duchess out of her. So, Liza's life completely changes. Higgins and Pickering never care for Liza's feelings and emotions. They do not consider her as an individual. Higgins believes that he is a creator and Liza must be grateful. The society and the upper class' oppression on the poor are reflected through Liza because no matter how much she tries to stand against them, they never care for her in a real sense. Although she improves herself both physically and spiritually, she is not happy at the end because when she was poor she was happier but when she becomes an upper class lady she feels herself as stranger to her identity and she faces with the artificial world of the upper class. Shaw criticises the society and the oppression upon the poor in the play and the role of the women in the century is represented through Liza. Class distinctions and the relations of social classes are also exemplified in the play.

The fourth chapter discusses the similarities and the differences between the two plays. There are similarities in terms of class distinctions. The upper class people do not care for the poor and they hold the power. They have the power to shape even people's identities as they are rich in both of the plays. Also, it is seen in both of the plays that the value of a person is determined by the others' perspective. It is not important whether a person is poor or rich; his value is determined by the society. So, one's being is in the hands of the other people and how they perceive is more important than who they really are. The different point is the perspective towards education. It is praised in Pygmalion and people care for how cultured a person is but in The Lady of Pleasure it is not regarded as important. Universities are represented as places of corruption, because social status, appearance and fashion are more important than academia for the upper class in the play. It is criticised through Frederick who comes back from the university with old-fashioned clothes, which makes Aretina furious. His appearance and soul is corrupted according to her.

So, Pygmalion and The Lady of Pleasure are analysed through Marxist reading in order to show that class struggles and social oppression are historical facts rather than belonging to a particular century and society. Written in different centuries, the plays exemplify these issues successfully.

CHAPTER I: HISTORICAL AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The 17th century Britain witnessed great changes which affected both the society and the perspectives of individuals. English Renaissance and Reform were significant reforms that lasted in the early the 17th century. It made people change their point of view towards life. Society was reformed completely and the 17th century was the age of changes in many aspects. These changes were in industry, trade, politics and inevitably, the society and human relations.

In the first half of the 17th century English colonization gained a momentum which included the outcasts' sail to the New World. The ones, who went there, became leading figures of the new landing. Most of the pioneers were Puritan people. Puritans believed to have a separated area which was just kept for the sake of them. So, they decided to start a new life there.

On the other hand, in England the clash between Protestants and Catholics was a big problem for James VI of Scotland. The religious problems continued in the time of Charles II and James II. Yet, it is clear that throughout these decades, religious choices of kings and the society were always decision-making elements in the political area ("Daily Life in the 17th Century England").

Trade and commerce began to develop and they became the most important parts of the economy. Iron, coal mining and glass industries expanded and economy grew. These developments were the bases for the industrial revolution in the following century. Britain became stronger but these economic developments resulted in a marked difference between social classes. As the upper class got richer, the lower class began to get poorer. Also, the middle class grew stronger as a result of trade and commerce. So, there were mainly three social classes but the upper class had the power in the society. The economic and the political power were in their hands. The upper class began to oppress the lower ones and this ended up in corruption. Money and power were in the centre of life and human relations were shaped according to these issues.

Women did not have a notable place in the 17th century society. Although there were important improvements like women actresses acting on the stage for the first time, they were still not accepted as individuals. They could not get important jobs such as lawyers or doctors. They could only get simple jobs and they were mostly housewives. However, as housewives, they were supposed to know basic things about

medicine and illnesses because in case of a medical emergency, most people could not afford to see doctors, only the rich upper class people were able to see doctors. Upper class women were luckier because only rich women could go to school while poor women were just mothers and housewives (“Daily Life in the 17th Century England”).

Drama was also affected by these changes. Before Shakespeare, it was for the kings and queens. Plays were written in order to praise them. There were characters from upper class and only upper class people could read them. Shakespeare was a milestone for British drama. He wrote plays including characters from different classes. There were kings and queens as well as people from lower classes. His new ideas affected the writers of the 17th century. Feelings and emotions became more important for them and they began to sever all their ties with court and courtly issues. Unlike the previous century, bourgeoisie was not in the centre of the plays. They were not just for the upper class people. Plays began to discuss about lives and problems of middle class. The issues in the play also changed. As a result of the discriminations between social classes, plays dealt with the social oppression, exploitation and the corruption in the society.

Everything changed in the 20th century. There were remarkable developments and events in the previous centuries. Especially, The Industrial Revolution in the 18th century and World Wars resulted in radical changes. Britain became an ‘empire’ after The Industrial Revolution. Thanks to growing technology, mass production was possible. Companies expanded and international trade became the most important part of economy. Britain began to colonise and there were British colonies in different parts of the world. That is why Britain was called ‘the empire on which the sun never sets’. As an imperialist country, Britain was one of the most powerful empires and it made them to think that they had a divine origin and they ruled the world. Their patriotic feelings grew stronger (“Daily Life in the 20th Century England”, 2014).

The effects of World Wars were also important to better understand the 20th century Britain. They faced the realities after the wars and the absurd and meaningless condition of human beings as they all became mechanized and their existence became conventional. Sartre comments on the issue:

We are left alone without excuse. That is what I mean when I say that man is condemned to be free. Condemned, because

he did not create himself, yet is nevertheless in liberty and from the moment that he is thrown into this world he is responsible for everything he does (Sartre, 2001:32).

They saw that they lived in a chaos and thought over what was the point and aim of life and existence. Because, after that, there was a growth of hopelessness, scepticism and melancholy and the humanity was shocked by an uncontrollable and destructive power. They became senseless and godless when they lost their future hopes especially after crowds of people died and the cities were destroyed. So, individuals questioned life and themselves much more than the previous centuries. They searched for their place in this world and their value as individuals.

Women became more visible in the society when compared to previous centuries. They were able to take important jobs which were closed to women before. They were able to be lawyers and doctors. Married women also could work. These developments were thanks to Sex Discrimination Act in 1975 (“Sex Discrimination Act”). It supported women rights and helped them find a place in society. It became illegal to discriminate women in education and employment. They also began to be paid equally by this act. So, their place in the society was accepted compared to the previous centuries. Sarah Jane Deutsch comments on the 20th century women:

Our images of the 1920s, when we have images, are filled with young women with short hair and short skirt. They are kicking up their legs and kicking off a century of restrictions. They smoke. They dance. They read racy literature. And they do it all in public (qtd. in Cott, 2004:413).

However, these developments were mostly for the upper class women. They could afford to go to school and work. Poor women were still housewives and they did not have a place in the society as individuals. They were still oppressed by both men and the society.

Literature was also affected by these developments and scepticism of the century. Literary works, especially drama aimed to create an awareness of the realities after the wars and the absurd and meaningless condition of human beings as they all became mechanized and their existence became conventional. They mirrored the miserable condition of individuals towards the absurdity. Postmodernism affected both life and literary works. Writers cut all their ties with the traditional writing because the reality lost its essence. Rules were not effective any more. People could not decide

whether something is true or not. Harold Pinter comments on the concept of reality in the 20th century:

There are no hard distinctions between what is real and what is unreal, nor between what is true and what is false. A thing is not necessarily either true or false; it can be both true and false (qtd. in Gauthier, 2009:104).

Writers aimed showing the corrupted and alienated society. They reflected individuals who were strangers both towards themselves and others. Writers wanted people to understand that what they saw as reality was just a shadow, a deception. Human beings were so unaware of the fact that they did not even think about the nonsensical situation and the oppression upon them.

Social oppression is the major concern of this thesis and it is seen in both plays which are written in different centuries. It shows that although social oppression has changed its point of view, it affected people through centuries. Also, mostly it is the lower class that is oppressed by the rich. Although the rich were also oppressed and had to live through the rules of society, poor ones were much more humiliated and ignored.

Thus, Marxism should be discussed at this point. As it focuses on the class distinctions, capitalism and their effects on the individuals, analyses of the plays have a Marxist point of view. Firstly, as a literary approach, Marxism sees literature and art as the products of historical powers. According to Marxism, works of literature should be examined according to the authentic conditions of the time. Traditional historical approach is accepted in Marxism. It is believed that literary texts must be analysed through their own time and the social situation. The author's background, the political and economic relationships are all important while analysing a text. The situation in the century is important for a critic because from Marxist point of view literary texts reflect the society. They mirror the society and human relationships. Literary works demonstrate the upper class and how they oppress and control the working class. Also, they show the results of this oppression. It is significant to reflect the class struggles because through literature the social change is possible. It is believed in Marxism that all the texts are ideological and they can be used to challenge the social order.

Marxist ideology is based on the Marxist perspective which is defined as the domination of the ruler class over the other classes. Marxism focuses on the clash

between oppressed classes and the oppressors. Marxist approach requires a work which should study not only the surface but also the hidden meaning of the target text. Marxist literary theory suggests that literature is able to change the perspective of the society. As it reflects the century, authors might make the readers aware of the system and how it oppresses them. Bressler claims that:

Although Marxists asserts that a text must be interpreted in light of its culture, how they define a text and its web-like social relationship provides us with an array of Marxist literary theories and differing methods of analyses. There exists, then, not one Marxist theory of literature, but many, each hoping to change society (2007:203).

Marxism came out as an alternative form which stands against capitalism and its effects on society. It developed in the 20th century but its roots date back to the 19th century. The social critic and philosopher Karl Marx supported the reality that although the world develops itself day by day, class inequality also increases. The rich get richer but the poor ones are always poor, furthermore, they get poorer. The social classes in the society are determined through economic functions. Money is able to dominate others and rule the poor ones. The rich ones treat the poor as their possessions and poor ones have to live under their dominance. They have to ignore that they are individual human beings and their characters are shaped according to the society. It is believed in Marxism that even the history of a society depends on the production of goods. The formulation of Marx consists of base and structure. To him, mode of production forms socio-cultural attitudes. So, the economic situation and the relations determine their collective memory. Terry Eagleton, the author of *Why Marx Was Right*, comments on the importance of material production according to Marxism:

The first historical act, Marx writes in *The German Ideology*, is the production of the means to satisfy our material needs. Only then can we learn to play the banjo, write erotic poetry or paint the front porch. The basis of culture is labour. There can be no civilization without material production. (2011:107)

Marx and Engels wrote *Communist Manifesto* together to make especially proletariat see that the capitalist world oppresses them and they must rise against bourgeoisie. They believed a ‘worker’s paradise’ was possible and they must find a way to reach it. That paradise was communism for Marx and Engels. They supported it as a

new form of government in which there is a classless society and there is not a social authority. All people are equal in all ways. They criticized private ownership and believed that there must be common ownership. Their comment on the issue makes it clear that they believe in communism in order to construct an equal society: “A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of communism“ (qtd in Monleon, 1990:60). They believed communism is the saviour of proletariat. They want them to see the power they have and unite against the system in order to get their rights. They suggest it at the very end of the work:

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working Men of All Countries, Unite! (qtd. in Sarker, 1994:54)

The upper class is harshly criticized because they are the ruling class which determines the social consciousness. They believed that workers need to acknowledge the fact that they live and work with ‘chains’ and they must get rid of those chains to win and the only way is to unite from all over the world to ask for their deserved rights. As it is a world of hatred and inequality, everyone must be aware of this fact and unite in order to form a classless and equal society. Society oppresses people in the way that men’s existence is shaped through its rules. Marx and Engels claim that “It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being; but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness” (qtd. in Farganis 1996:23). Their identities, social status, lifestyles are all determined by the society and people have to obey all the rules in order to survive.

Dialectical materialism is the basis of Marxism. It is a way of understanding the realities of the world and nature. It tries to foresee how the society will change and develop itself. There are complexities in the nature and by using them one should be able to find the reality in order to understand how the future must be. Class struggle is the main contradiction according to Marx and Engels. It is argued that: “When we examine our society, declares Marxism, we discover that its structure is built upon a series of ongoing conflicts between social classes” (Bressler, 2007:202). Marxism focuses on the gaps between classes and how their relationship effect form of society.

According to Marxism, humans define themselves rather than the society. They must be aware of the fact that they have the ability to change both themselves and the system which oppresses and makes them alienated from themselves.

Marxism portrays the society as the struggle of base and superstructure. Base is “the economic means of production” (Bressler, 2007: 193) and it determines cultural lifestyle and art. Working class is the base of the society and it controls all the ideologies. Superstructure is a society’s culture, all the legal and human institutions, politics, education and religion. So, base determines and shapes superstructure. Superstructure is mostly the upper class which holds the power and determines everything in the society. Marxism believes base is able to control the superstructure because the economic relationships are in their hands. Actually they manage the economy because they produce but it is the upper class who rules them.

Marxism wants especially poor working class to be aware of the fact that they are powerful. If they unite against the system they are able to cause a class war and find an alternative social order, which is communism. So, they must be aware of the power they have. However, this war is not with guns, but with literature. Literature must reflect the superstructure and how it oppresses the base. Working class should make their own culture and literature in order to revolt against the upper class. Marxism is against the reality that literature is only the reflection of superstructure. From Marxist point of view, it should reflect not only the superstructure but also the economic base because it is the only way to change the system.

Marxism does not just deal with the financial equality. It is believed that such a capitalist system makes workers forget their own selves and forget that they are also like other people both physically and spiritually. So, Marxism also helps workers to expand their points of view about life and their individualities. This is called false consciousness according to Marxist point of view. It is believed that besides financially, workers must also be equal as human beings. Workers must ‘be’ individuals and have an equal social status.

Morality is also criticized in Marxism. It is believed that values and morality are for the ones who are rich and who can afford them. Also, the concept of morality is in the hands of upper class and poor ones have to live through their rules. They are not

able to live through their own values and own choices. Marx believes that ideas are just material relationship in this capitalist system. He claims that:

The dominant ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas, and thus of the relationships which make one class the ruling one; they are consequently the ideas of its dominance (qtd. in Cohen, 1981:5).

The rich usually use morality for their own benefits. It is because social status and economic conditions determine what we believe and how we perceive it. So, morality is defined through social and economic conditions according to Marxism. One who has the financial power dominates others and they are able to enforce the concepts.

Bertolt Brecht is a German playwright, critic and director of the 20th century. He was a very important figure of his time because he added new perspectives to drama. He is well-known for his understanding of drama called as 'epic theatre'. He first used the concept in 1927 and it came out after the First World War. It reflects the chaotic situation of the world and the alienation of mankind towards themselves and the others. The word epic does not mean heroic because plays deal with political issues. The main target is to change the perspective of theatre from dealing with and addressing to upper class into taking lower class people's problems and lives into consideration.

Brecht was affected mostly by Marxism and Leninism. Like them, he also focuses on working class and their problems and he addresses to them. He puts Marxism on the stage theoretically and practically. He believes that class struggles should be presented on the stage through a new perspective of drama because traditional drama was not enough to divert the spectators to think over alternative perspectives for capitalist and class society by criticising the system. His understanding of drama is much more detailed and developed compared to the traditional drama. Willett comments on him: "Brecht believed in a new age, an age of new ideas and technologies when everything would be subject of change and nothing would be left unquestioned, an age of productive doubt" (1998:225). Brecht believes that theatre should not be deceptive, it should be descriptive. The readers should see the realities of their time. Writers should reflect the society and the human relations in order to make people think solutions for the corruption in the society.

He believes theatre needs radical changes because the real meaning behind the images cannot be portrayed through traditional drama. The reason is that spectators should be determinist while analysing the text. Brecht believes that traditional Aristotelian drama dealt with particular class and it focused on catharsis and purification. It did not have an aim of awakening them to see the realities or the problems of mankind. So, it was not creative for him. Also, Aristotelian drama consisted of chains of events which are told from just one perspective. Actions were depended on others. However, there are episodes in which there are different events in epic drama. They are connected as a whole but in each episode there are different characters who become prominent. The reason is that Brecht tells a story but in each episode he wants the spectators to see the same event from a different character's perspective. So, each episode is a different point of view through which spectators are able to think over the events and reach the best conclusion. Although all the functions of theatre affect each other to construct an effective impression on spectators, the story is the most important part of it. Brecht comments on the importance of the story:

Everything hangs on the story. It's the heart of the theatrical performance. For it's what happens between people that provides them with all the material that they can discuss, criticize, and alter. ...The story is the theatre's great operation, the complete fitting together of all the gestic incidents, embracing the communications and impulses that must now to go to make up the audience's entertainment (qtd. in Prentki, 2013:31).

Story gathers all the functions together and when all of them are combined successfully, it means they are given materials that they can use while criticising the things that are happening in the society. Story is the basis of the play because the message will be given through the events which are taken from the society. Story must be in parallelism with the situation of the society as the reason is not to revel the spectators in emotions but to make them do something about the system, the class struggles. Bressler comments: "In the hands of Brecht, the epic theatre became a tool for expressing the bourgeois ideology that had permeated the arts." (2007:198). So, the first aim must be to reflect the class struggles and how the bourgeois oppress the working class, which is the writer's task. However, just reflecting the society is not enough to change the system. Through an effective story, actors should be able to force the spectators to think over and do something to change the system.

Spectators are observers and must come into conclusions at the end of the play. They should not be overwhelmed and caught up in the play because in that case they would not be able to think over the serious issues. So, there must always be a distance between the play and the spectators because they must never forget that it is just a play and they are supposed to take lessons from it. Brecht suggests that: “Don’t read the things into the role, read out of the role, until in your mind you are standing beside the character...so that people think about it.” (qtd in Patterson, 1981:170) However, Brecht also suggests that the stage must not be regarded as a different world for the spectators. In traditional drama, actors act like there is no one watching them. They never stop being that character and they ignore the spectators. Yet, in epic drama actors can stop in order to make comments about the event or if a spectator comments on something they can stop in order to talk to them. As the reason is to make the spectators change their perspectives, actors are free to talk and ask questions to the spectators when needed. So, while writers and the actors should keep the distance in order not let them daydream, they should also destroy the “invisible fourth wall” between them. It is called the alienation effect. Brecht is affected by Marx’s theory of alienation. Marx suggests that the capitalist mode of production makes working class alienated from them. They are not aware of their power and let the upper class decide on their lives. They cannot live through their own choices; they even cannot reach the products that they produce. So, the capitalist society makes them strangers to themselves and loses their ability to determine their future. Affected by his theory, Brecht believes that alienation effect helps making the spectators aware that they are strangers to themselves and chained by the upper class. He portrays the complexities, class struggles and how the upper class oppresses the working class by not giving any rights. A-effect also helps the spectators not to forget that the actions on the stage are not real and they must not lose their critical attitude towards it. Brecht comments on the spectators:

... and make My curtain half high, don’t seal off the stage!
 Leaning back in his chair, let the spectator Be aware of busy
 preparations, made for him Cunningly; he sees a tinfoil moon
 Float down, or a tiled roof Being carried in; do not show him
 too much, But show him something! And let him notice that
 you are not wizards, Friends, but workers... (qtd in Esslin,
 1984: 126)

As he claims, he wants writers to show the spectators the realities rather than keeping them busy. Drama must be enlightenment for them. So, catharsis and

purification are not welcomed in Brechtian drama. The aim of the play should not be purification of feelings; the spectator should question himself and the system he is in. Brecht wants them to see that the capitalist system made them strangers to themselves and they are oppressed by the class society but he does not want them to look at the events from his own perspectives. On the contrary, he wants them to create their own point of views towards the difficulties. Alienation effect can be regarded as a part of dialectical materialism which aims to make the readers aware of the facts. Alienation effect also tries to awaken spectators to the changing world and possible outcomes of the capitalist system.

Brechtian drama puts the society in the centre of the plays rather than the individual characters. Actors do not have to be aesthetic on the stage because they have functional reason. They need to teach the spectators how to widen their world-views. They usually spend time with the ones who belong to their social class in order to show the class distinctions. They are more like storytellers rather than characters. Actors avoid exaggerated acting because spectators should not be taken from real world into a fantasy world which would detain them from the realities of the society. They should liven up their characters on the stage but they should not drive the spectators into a pure excitement. In a broad sense, spectators are supposed to find out alternative ways for specific situations. There will always be hardships in life and the theatre should teach them how to think of the best solutions for the situations. Bunge gives a good example for this. He claims that spectators need to learn how to find alternative ways for radical solutions:

Character should not be regarded like a stain of grease on a pair of trousers, which, however much you try to rub and wipe it away, will always come up again. In actual fact the question is always how a given person is going to act in a specified set of circumstances and conditions. (qtd in Esslin, 1984:118)

Another important method of epic theatre is to historicise the plots. Brecht believed that the events in the stories should belong to previous centuries which can be connected to the contemporary age. It is also related to the alienation effect. It aims to make the spectators connect the issues of the past to the contemporary ones in order to see their effects in their age. If they are shown a story from their own age, they would

not be able to make a good criticism but if the plot is from history they can make more reliable inferences by connecting the events.

Actors are like teachers for the spectators and they have a very important function. They are never fully integrated with the characters because spectators should regard them as actors rather than that character. The reason is that if they perceive them as characters, the distance between them would collapse and they would lose their critical perspective. They should never forget that it is not a real event. The characters of the plays are not individuals; they are mostly stereotypes representing members of particular social classes. They dress, act and behave through the social class they represent.

Gestus is an important term in epic theatre. It is not just about the gestures, it also contains clothing, behaviours and body language as a whole. Brecht believes that all these things are more important than the words. Actors should dress, behave and treat others parallel with the social class that they reflect. However, they must be careful about keeping the distance from the spectators. But this distance does not mean making themselves the stars. It means that spectators should never think of actors as characters that they act. For instance, they should not think how well the actor acts the role of a doctor because that would make the spectators daydream about the events. So, actors should keep the distance between the character and the spectators. They can sometimes ask questions to the spectators in order to awaken them and challenge them to think over the issues. They should reflect the class not with just mimes but as a whole but the spectators should not forget that he is just an actor who tries to make spectators question the social class that he represents.

All these show that actors are significant to make the plays successful, which means making spectators think over the serious issues of the century for Brecht, and their training must be carefully planned in every detail. Constantine Stanislavsky is an important stage director who is famous for his 'Stanislavsky System' which focuses on acting techniques. He supported realism before Russian Revolution but after the revolution he supported socio-realism. He believes theatre is a cultural and moral institution. It portrays the society and all the things related to culture must be put on stage. Not only the upper class and its lifestyle, the working class, but also class struggles and complexities in the society must be considered important as sources. He

was affected by Brecht and his epic theatre and he focused on acting techniques in order to reach the aim of the play by showing spectators different points of views. To him, besides reflecting the realities, art must offer new ways to change the situations. He says: “Art is not a mirror to reflect reality, but a hammer with which to shape it”(qtd. in Brabazon, 2008:99). So, art is a power to teach the spectators how to find new ways and broaden their perspectives.

He focuses on more actors and their acting styles. The very first thing that he wants from the actors is that they must reflect the realities. They are not ‘stars’ of the plays, they are like storytellers and workers of art and reality. They have only one aim which is to make the spectators be aware of the facts. For him, the events are not so important because he believes the attitude that the spectators choose for a particular situation is much more important than the event. The actor should never forget it and act through this understanding. Discipline and ethics are also important for him because he believes creativity and ability do not mean anything if the actor is not disciplined and does not care for moral values. Actors must be believable but that does not mean taking the spectators in a fantasy world. While showing the realities of the society, they must be able to persuade the spectators that they are the realities of life. His system is not set of rules for how to act. On the contrary, he believes that an actor first internalizes and then externalizes the character well, and then he does not need rules because rules prevent them from being believable. After a good internalization, actors do not need to think about the next steps. The reason is that in traditional drama actors have strict rules and they use exaggerated mimes and gestures on the stage. This makes them non-realistic figures and through a performance like this, spectators would not believe its reality and that would prevent them from thinking the events as realities of the society. That is why Stanislavsky does not believe in strict rules. He believes in realistic acting through a good internalization.

According to him, to regard an actor as successful, he must be creative rather than be one using clichés and traditional acting methods. Also, all the single mimes and gestures on the stage must have a purpose. He believes there is no place for the things that are not connected with the play’s purpose. He suggests in his book *Building a Character* that:

There should never be any soulless or feelingless words used on the stage. Words should no more be divorced from ideas

there than from actions. On the stage it is part of the word to arouse all sorts of feelings, desires, thoughts, inner Images, visual, auditory and other sensations in the actor, in those playing the opposite him and through them together in the audience (2013:97).

Each word and action is so powerful in his understanding of acting because even a word is able to arouse different feelings. So, all the things on the stage are related to each other to form a unity and there must not be any disconnected function.

The way of keeping everything connected is that an actor must internalize the character and enlarge his imagination. Stanislavsky considers actors' psychology as the most important thing while they are preparing for their character. They must be able to make use of their personal experiences in a creative way. He even thinks that if an actor cannot use his imagination properly, he must give up acting because without imagination he is not able to internalize the characters. He believes there is a magical word 'if'. While preparing for his role, the actor must constantly ask himself the question of 'What would I do if I were this character'. At this point he should think about his own experiences in order to portray the character as it should be. He must observe the real life in order to internalize the characters and by asking this question he would be able to understand how to use his mimes and gestures. So, observation becomes significant at this point. He should also question the character's motivation for his actions. It is important because he could fully understand the reasons behind the actions and he would be able to form his acting through character's motivation.

Objective is also another important point for Stanislavsky. As he believes that there is no place for disconnected things on the stage, the actor should first understand the goal of his character. He should ask himself "What does he want?" This objective should not be personal; it should be the character's objective. It is not always necessary for the character to achieve his goal but the actor should not the objective in order to make a good internalization. There are units, which are small objectives and a super objective, which is the goal of the entire play. These objectives must be combined in order to form a unity and actor must be able to create a unity of them. Also, there are always obstacles for the characters while they are trying to achieve their goals. At this point, the actor should have the ability to show how the character struggles to find a way of overcoming the obstacles. As in the epic theatre, Stanislavsky also believes that theatre should teach the spectators to find new alternatives for the different situations.

That is why the obstacles are significant points as it is reflected how people can find different solutions for them.

Personal memory of the actors is important for Stanislavsky because he believes that actors should go through their personal memory to find the most proper attitude for that character. He suggests that art is not possible without personal memory and a successful actor is the one who can go through his inner world while analysing the character. He explains its importance as follows:

Most frequently, especially among talented actors, the physical materialization of a character to be created emerges of its own accord once the right inner values have been established. (2013:1)

An actor first must be disciplined and be aware of the realities. Then, he must analyse the characters well and by going through their personal memories, he must internalize the character to find the most proper attitude. He should not adapt the character to himself; on the contrary, he must adapt himself to the character. Although it is important to make use of his personal experiences, he should do it just for the purpose of understanding the motivation of the character. He should not add his own perspective depending on his personal experience. So, self-control is important for the actor and this is a foregrounding ability for Stanislavsky. The actor makes use of his memories without being effected by them.

After he analyses the character and the motivations behind his actions, he must combine them with his body. He must find the best mimes, gestures and body postures. Only with a discipline like this, a play can be successful and could be able to affect the spectators and make them think about the real situation of society. He comments on the importance of external characterization:

Without an external form neither your inner characterisation, nor the spirit of your image will reach the public. The external characterisation explains and illustrates and thereby conveys to your spectators the inner pattern of your part (2013:1).

So, both the inner and external characterizations are important to reach the spectators. External characterization is possible through a good inner characterization

and all the message is given through the external illustrations. Actors must have the ability of combining all the functions in order to reach the spectators.

CHAPTER II: THE LADY OF PLEASURE

James Shirley's The Lady of Pleasure focuses on class conflicts, social oppression and human relations. The society of the 17th century is reflected throughout the play and it exemplifies how society is corrupted because of the over-pride and passion of the upper class people. The poor's social status and their difficulties as individuals are also questioned both in the play and in this chapter. The analysis is going to be through a Marxist point of view. Although it came to being after this play was written, for Marx, the history of the world is depended on class conflicts. In order to exemplify his perspective of history based on class struggles, Shirley's play is chosen because it is possible to present class struggles, complexities in the society, the upper class's attitude towards lower class and how they struggle to live under the rules of society through the examples in the play.

James Shirley was born in London, in 1596 when English Literature was in its most powerful years. His language was the same of his contemporaries and the great dramatists of the 16th century but his style made him different from them. According to Thorndike:

No earlier dramatist presents so many reminiscences of Shakespeare ... and he often imitates Jonson. ... But his plays in their main characteristics naturally adapt themselves to the models of Fletcher and Massinger. ... He is almost as close to the heroic play, the tragicomedy and the comedy of manners of the Restoration as to the romances and comedies of Fletcher (1975:236).

He was able to use his own creativity while constructing his plots. So; although he was born into the time of the greatest dramatists of the British Literature, he could differentiate his plots rather than just imitating them. Juliet McGrath says: "Since he does not usually define character through language, but through action, we perceive characters' natures by seeing that they are not what they profess to be" (1966:333). So, he handled the sources freely and he let his characters 'speak' through their actions, rather than language.

Shirley wrote melodramas, tragedies, comedies and tragicomedies. He was more interested in writing comedies in which he mostly centred his plots on town and country life, the society and the differences between the classes. The Lady of Pleasure is one of his most famous comedies. He deals with the themes of honour, morality, and upper-class lifestyle and class differences. He reflects London and the society of the 17th century. He discusses social classes and the human relations according to the classes. He also points out the corruptions in the society. He shows how especially the rich people are corrupted because they forget their own personalities in the hands of social rules and are oppressed by the society. Martin Butler comments on this: “In several Caroline plays, the country is indeed ridiculed in a figure who has come to London and failed to reproduce society's good manners.” (qtd. in Schafer) Shirley also treats the subjects of town life and how the rich people lose their moral values and live through the social rules. He questions these issues in his play The Lady of Pleasure. He puts forward his ideas through Aretina and Bornwell. They move to London with the hope of feeling their nobility within town's facilities but it turns out to be a corruption for them. They face the reality that they have lost their moral values and become slaves in the hands of their passions.

Shirley constructed his plot in three-level form. There are three plots in combination with each other. The first one is about an upper-class couple, Sir Thomas Bornwell and his wife Lady Bornwell, Aretina. They have moved to the town from the country because Aretina is an extravagant woman who likes spending money and giving parties to show her luxurious lifestyle. She is ‘The Lady of Pleasure’ of the play. She is also bored with the people in the country and she wants to be among the town people. Bornwell is worried about this situation because although he always obeys her decisions she is never satisfied and her situation is getting uncontrollable day by day. He decides to ‘reform’ her. First, he tries to make her jealous with Celestina, a beautiful sixteen-year-old widow. He makes love with her and he praises Celestina to Aretina openly but she does not seem to be interested. Actually she cares for it but she just does not want to express her feelings and she orders her gentlemen to take revenge by humiliating Celestina. So Bornwell's first plan fails. Later, he pretends to have gambled and lost all the money they have. He suggests her to go back to county and Bornwell is successful with this plan as Aretina understands the miserable situation she is in. At the end of the play she is transformed spiritually.

The second level is about Aretina's nephew, Frederick, who has come back from the university. Frederick does not dress like a nobleman and Aretina is not happy with his appearance, clothing and lifestyle and she thinks that university corrupted him. She feels it as a duty to erase all the things that university has given him. She orders Littleworth and Kickshaw, who like doing favours and get benefit from rich people, to change Frederick's appearance and teach him how to live like nobles. They find new clothes for him and they employ new people to do all the jobs for him, they even serve him as his pimplers. Frederick feels sorry at first to say goodbye to his books but he is aware of the fact that he must change in order to be accepted by his aunt.

The third level includes Celestina, whose one-year-mourning after her husband has passed. There are many suitors for her as she is beautiful and rich. She rejects them kindly because she is aware that they see her as an object, not as an identity. She pursues pleasure for herself but she is limited by the morals of society and class. Actually she struggles to live in the way she wants but there are always obstacles. There is also a Lord who openly suggests her to be his mistress but Celestina refuses him kindly.

There are also Madam Decoy, the bawd, Haircut, the barber of the Lord, Stewards, the servants, Littleworth and Kickshaw. They are not main the characters of the play but they are important to highlight to show the social system of the time the play was set. Madam Decoy is a rich bawd and she battens on the upper class people. Haircut, besides being a barber, is also one of the suitors of Celestina and he lies to her by saying he is a nobleman but his lie is exposed later. Littleworth and Kickshaw are two gentlemen who are so close to Aretina and they do all the things she wants. All these characters are not respected by their superiors no matter what they achieve because they are just tools for the upper class society to make their lives easier.

The title mostly refers to Aretina but from alternative points of views it can also be related to Celestina. The things that make Aretina happy and satisfied are spending money, luxurious furniture, expensive clothes and glamorous parties. She can be called as 'The Lady of Pleasure' but the significant question is whether she does all the things to give pleasure to herself or the others. It is seen throughout the play that all her efforts aim to preserve her social power which is equal to her honour according to her. In this sense, she does all the things to give pleasure to the other people. She gives parties to

entertain them; she even does her hair before the guests come to look beautiful. Although she seems so powerful and confident, actually she is forced to it by the society. In order to have a place in the upper class and to hold it, she has to do all these things. If she does not, no one will respect her that much. So, she becomes 'The Lady of Pleasure' who aims to please the other people not to fail in the society.

If Celestina is considered to be 'The Lady of Pleasure', there might be found some resemblances with Aretina in terms of her lifestyle. She also likes luxury and expensive parties and show-offs but unlike Aretina, she is brave enough to decide on her own life. She rejects her suitors although she is indirectly forced to be with a man by the society. While Aretina puts the same effort to hold her fame, Celestina does it for her own pleasure. Whenever there is something she does not like, she tells it; thus, nothing bothers her. By this way, Celestina, as 'The Lady of Pleasure', pursues pleasure to please herself without thinking much about the other people.

The names of the characters are also important in the play. They reflect their social status and give clues about their characters. Bornwell is an upper class gentleman and his name is suitable for his social position and class. He is 'well' from birth as he is a noble gentleman. His wife's name Aretina is derived from the Greek 'arete' which means virtue. In this sense, her name is ironical because she does not care for moral values and virtues. She does not care for other people around her. So, Shirley chose an ironical name for her character to stress her non-virtuous side. Celestina means 'heavenly' and her name is parallel with her character because mostly she is virtuous and cares for moral values. She does not allow people to take advantage of her.

Littleworth, Kickshaw and Scentlove's characters are also parallel with their meanings. They are all humiliated by the upper class and rich people take advantage of them. Littleworth, whose meaning is obvious, does not have value in the eyes of the upper class. Kickshaw also means, little thing and it also shows that he is not important for the others. They do not have identity and they are just tools for the upper class. Scentlove is also an ironical name because it seems like he searches for love and cares for feeling but on the contrary he cares for money rather than emotions. He tries to flirt with Celestina when there are other suitors. He does not respect her because he does not love her, he just wants to marry her as she is a rich widow. So it can be questioned whether he scents love or money and through his attitude towards Celestina it is

understood that he is interested in money. So, some of the names in the play are chosen to give clues about their characters and they are hints about their social status.

The play clearly shows that there is a class-ridden society. The base and superstructure relationships can be seen through the relationship between oppressed and oppressor. There are three classes. At the bottom, there are peasants who are denigrated by the middle and upper classes and they do not have any rights. In the middle class, there are stewards, tradesman and people like Littleworth and Kickshaw who try to get benefit from the rich by doing favour for them. At the top there are lords and the rich people like Bornwell and Celestina. The lower class is always ignored by the upper class. Sometimes it is not easy to guess a person's social class. For example; Madam Decoy is from upper class although she is a bawd. She has much money and jewels. On the contrary, Frederick is not rich but thanks to his aunt he is from upper class. So, one's job and background do not always affect the social class, through wealth his/her social class is decided.

Also, there is not persistency between the classes. One can either rise to the upper class or go down to the lower class. So, holding one's position becomes the most important thing in the play; even more than honour and values.

Mostly Aretina looks down on lower class people in Lady of Pleasure. The opening scene of the play makes it clear when Aretina is talking to her Steward:

Stew: Be patient, madam; you may have your pleasure.

Are: 'Tis that I came to town for. I would not endure again the country conversation, to be the lady of six shires! The man so near the primitive making they retain a sense of nothing but the earth, their brains (Shirley, 1934:1579).

Aretina clearly states that she is in the town in order not to be among the peasants who make her bored. Her attitude shows the perspective of upper class towards the lower class from Marxist point of view. She represents the oppressor who does not respect the poor. She thinks their lifestyle is limited with their jobs. She has moved to the town to take advantage of the town life. At the same time, when Steward answers her wisely, she says:

Are: You do imagine, no doubt you have talked wisely, and confuted London past all defense. Your master should do

well to send you back into the country, with the title of superintendent-bailly (Shirley, 1934:1580).

Aretina thinks that if he is so wise, he is able to be the head of the peasants in the country. Here, she insults the people in the country again. Although being a servant, Steward is offended by this offer and says: "I am a gentleman, though now your servant." (Shirley, 1934:1580) Steward even thinks that it is offensive to be with the peasants in the country. He is also brave enough to say "Y're a woman of ungoverned passion, and I pity you" (Shirley, 1934:1580) when Aretina goes on boasting.

Sir Thomas Bornwell is fed up with Aretina's vanities and accuses her of "quitting the country life and removed the hope of our return" (Shirley, 1934:1580). He is worried about the future as she spends money without thinking and she is ignorant to the people around her. She just thinks about her parties, balls and show-offs. He does not see himself as her husband, rather he feels like he is "employed to serve your vast expenses" (Shirley, 1934:1580).

Aretina is so ostentatious that nothing stops her to think of the world around her. She does not mind smothering around with her coach. She does not care if there are people in the street who are dust-choked. By doing this, she feels her superiority and it is a kind of show-off for her. She also likes giving big and expensive parties to show her power and lifestyle, which Bornwell is fed up with. He is also concerned about the money that she spends on these parties. He says: "You make play not a pastime but a tyranny and vex yourself and my estate by 't.'" (Shirley, 1934:1581). He thinks that Aretina does not think about the future of themselves as she spends a huge amount of money.

While Bornwell openly criticises Aretina about her love of luxury, her full wardrobe and jewels, Aretina does not seem to be ashamed. Rather, she asks "Have you done, sir" (Shirley, 1934:1581)? These conversations are like "homilty of thrift" (Shirley, 1934:1581) for her and she does not care. Seeing her uninterested, Bornwell gets more worried and says: "...the truest wealth shines from the soul, and draws up just admirers" (Shirley, 1934:1581). The meaning of 'value' is different for Aretina and Bornwell. Unlike his wife, Bornwell is more interested in values but, on the contrary, only fame and power matter for Aretina. The following conversation makes it clear:

Are: A narrow-minded husband is a thief to his own fame, and his preferment too; he shuts his parts and fortunes from the world, while, from the popular vote and knowledge, men rise to employment in the state.

Born: I have no great ambition to buy preferment at so rear date.

Are: Nor I sell my honor by living poor and sparingly (Shirley, 1934:1582).

To Bornwell the position in the society is not as important as Aretina thinks but being rich and superior means honour for Aretina. Being poor is the same as selling her honour. Living in luxury is a way of rising in the state and holding her status in the society. She does everything to hold the fame she has. Everything that she buys, expensive parties and luxurious furniture are caused by her fears of losing fame. As she does not respect the lower class, she tries to seem powerful. Aretina is a good example of the society of the time. Power means everything and if a person tries to hold his/her position, the things that Aretina does become significant. She even does not want to meet her guests before she does her hair, she never wants to be seen unprepared. What makes her different from Celestina is that she does all these things for the other people. She does not act through her wishes. While Celestina tries to stand against the social oppression and the rules, Aretina obeys all the rules of it. Aretina lives for the others but Celestina lives for herself regarding the society. Aretina represents how the upper class became slaves of their own desires. Marx claims:

“If money is the bond binding me to human life, binding society to me, connecting me with nature and man, is not money the bond of all bonds? Can it not dissolve and bind all ties? Is it not, therefore, also the universal agent of separation?” (qtd in Wells, 2002:98).

He believes the human relationships in the society are all depended on financial issues. Money determines and shapes people’s destinies. People have already given up their identities and freedom into the hands of “money” and it keeps the society together. All the relationships are based on self-interest. Aretina exemplifies this as she has an uncontrollable desire for fame and money. She believes she is powerful and free, actually she is a slave of her desires.

Celestina, the sixteen-year-old widow, is also an upper class woman who tries to hold her fame and status. She does not feel free enough to make her own choices. Although she is sixteen years old, she is already a widow. Also, she is not educated. This shows that women in this century are characterised as women who should marry and live under the rules of her man. They do not need to study. So, Celestina reflects this type of women in the 17th century.

She is also an example of rich people's insulting poor ones. In scene two, she insults her servant because of the "cheap stuff" (Shirley, 1934:1585) perfume and the furniture he has chosen. She criticizes him for being stingy and being tasteless. In that scene she is checking the preparations for the ball she is going to have and she wants all the things to be expensive and magnificent so as to make all the ladies admire her. She is the oppressor and feels that she can direct the ones beneath her as she wants. She does not respect her servant. Although it seems that it is mostly Celestina who cares for morality and virtues, sometimes she also treats people like Aretina. She sometimes makes use of moral values to direct people as she wants, especially when she rejects her suitors. She also loves showing-off like Aretina. It is exemplified when she does not like the arras that the servant has chosen, she says:

"Impudence! I know 't. I will have fresher and more rich... You had best wrap all my chambers in wild Irish, and make a nursery of monsters here, to fright the ladies comes to visit me" (Shirley, 1934:1585).

As it is clear, she makes her preparation not just for her pleasure but to impress the visitors. She wants to be regarded powerful. For her, the sign of being rich is showing it. When her Steward says "Sure, my lady's mad!" (Shirley, 1934:1587), she strikes him and this also shows how the rich people consider themselves superior to others.

Not only the lower class is insulted in the play but also the women are ignored. Throughout the play Aretina and Celestina are clearly abused by men. As Celestina is a widow there are many suitors for her. In the society, she seems like she has to marry someone. Although she seems to choose her own lover, she is actually forced to do it by society. Her gentlewomen also object to the issue of her suitors: "But shall we not, madam, expose ourselves to censure this freedom" (Shirley, 1934:1591)? Her freedom is restricted by the social norms. Being widow becomes her biggest obstacle for her to

stand against. One of her suitors, the Haircut comes to her house and the conversation makes it clear:

Cel: Speak it freely, sir.

Hair: You are a widow

Cel: So?

Hair: And I a bachelor (Shirley, 1934:1587).

As it is seen, for Haircut it is natural to be her suitor because she is a widow. Haircut does not even lead in. Although it is a serious subject, he does not hesitate to say it directly. He does not feel that there is a reason for it. It is so ordinary that there is no need to dwell on it. Even when Celestina asks for the reason, he does not explain, he thinks it must be enough to say that he is a bachelor. This shows how Celestina is insulted as she is not able to go on her life by her choices. She is forced to be with a man by the society. Haircut also lies to her by saying he has an important position in the court. Actually Celestina is suspicious whether or not he is noble. She says: “You may be some young lord, and, though I see not your footmen and your groom, they may not be far off, in conference with your horse” (Shirley, 1934:1587). Upon this, it can be inferred that being a noble means having lots of gentlemen around to support. So, Celestina questions the situation. He continues telling lies her because he wants to be regarded as an important person and court means upper class and superiority.

Another example is when Haircut and Scentlove try to flirt with Celestina at the same time. Although they flatter her with compliments, actually they do not respect her by doing it like a competition. Celestina is aware of the situation and she likens it to a badminton game. She is like a ball between Haircut and Scentlove, neither of them cares for her.

Lord is another suitor who is brave enough to say “Consent to be my mistress, Celestina, and we will have it springtime all the year” (Shirley, 1934:1621). This offer clearly shows that Celestina is not significant as a woman, she does not have much value, and she can just be a mistress. He is a typical nobleman who always boasts about his social status and wealth and also his servants always flatter him. Being noble is the most important thing in his life and he sees it equal to his honour. It becomes clear when Celestina asks him to sell his arms which are the signs of his nobility, he objects it

harshly by saying: "I'll sooner give these arms to th' hangman's ax. My head, my heart, to twenty executions, than sell one atom from my name" (Shirley, 1934:1622). As it is seen, for noblemen these kinds of signs are as important as their lives. They psychologically effect the lower class and see themselves superior. Losing them means losing their power.

Aretina is also insulted when Madam Decoy suggests her as a prostitute to the Lord. At first Decoy praises Aretina by talking about her nobility but Lord does not want anybody. Decoy talks to the Lord in a way that Lord cannot resist her. His question shows how these kinds of women are unimportant for him: "What is the lady of pleasure you prefer" (Shirley, 1934:1597)? So, that woman will be just for pleasure, nothing more. After hearing that it is Aretina, again he does not accept it first but then sends a letter to her although he knows that she is married. Lord is also aware of the fact that Decoy is trying to take advantage of her. He begins his letter by saying: "Write – 'Madam, where your honour is in danger, my love must not be silent'" (Shirley, 1934:1598). He actually warns her about the danger, Madam Decoy. After all, no matter how noble and powerful Aretina is, she becomes a prostitute in their eyes. So, although the main women characters of the play seem powerful, they are not respected by the society. It is because how a person considers himself does not determine his value in the society. It is determined by externals, mostly by the other people's opinions about him. No matter how much he tries, other people specify his value.

Education is also insulted through Frederick, Aretina's nephew. He is back from the university and Aretina is shocked when she first sees him. She says: "The boy is undone!" (Shirley, 1934:1589). Aretina does not like Frederick's dressing and she thinks he does not seem noble enough. His clothes are not old but they are not fashionable. She openly criticises university while she is talking to Celestina in the third act: "I beg your pardon madam, to excuse the dress and the rude behaviour of my kinsman. He has but lately comes from the university where they completely corrupted him" (Shirley, 1934:1602). She believes that he needs a transformation both physically and spiritually. She orders Littleworth and Alexander to change him totally. They will find him new clothes and will change his lifestyle to a more upper class one. The way they dress is very significant to them because it is their social label. Littleworth and Steward comment on it while talking to Frederick. Their conversation shows that dressing well is the first step for nobility.

Littleworth: That must have a new motion, garb, and posture too. Or all your pride is cast away; it is not the cut of your apparel makes a gallant, but the geometrical wearing of your clothes.

Stew: Mr. Littleworth tells you right. You wear your hat too like a citizen (Shirley, 1934:1608).

Women are again abused openly by Steward's words: "If you find sir, the operation of the wine exalt your blood to the desire of any female delight, I know your aunt wo'not deny any of her chambermaids to practice on" (Shirley, 1934:1602). Frederick will even have girls for pleasure, which shows that women are seen as an object for pleasure.

There are many examples showing how the upper class people take advantage of the weaker ones. Mostly it is Aretina who does it. She always looks down on them and she is never kind to them. When Decoy brings the letter from the Lord she says: "I wanted such an engine" (Shirley, 1934:1600). Decoy is a tool for her to reach Lord and most importantly, the court.

Bornwell also uses Celestina as a tool to make Aretina jealous. He is so bored with his wife's love of luxury and show-off that he decides to give her a kind of moral lesson and to make her aware of the miserable situation she is in. He cheats on her and makes love with Celestina and he thinks that would make Aretina furious. So, Celestina becomes a tool for him. He also invites her to the party in their house to make her more jealous. When he comes back home from Celestina's house the conversation makes it clear how his plan fails:

Are: You are merry as you came from kissing Celestina

Born: Feel her yet warm upon my lips; she is most excellent company. I did not think there was that sweetness in her sex. I must acknowledge 'twas thy cure to disenchant me from a dull husband to an active lover

.....

Are: Although it shame myself, I must be jest, and give her all the excellency of woman... (Shirley, 1934:1611).

Bornwell is shocked as Aretina is not jealous of Celestina. Actually, Aretina does not want to show her feelings and pretend to be calm. She plans to do something

about it as her honour is in danger by Celestina and she orders Littleworth and Alexander to humiliate her at the party as revenge. Aretina again takes advantage of the two men, they become her tools. She does not want to do it by herself as she must be kind to everybody around her. However she wants to take revenge and that is why she uses Littleworth and Kickshaw to do it for her. Throughout the play she does not hesitate to do it because she does not respect the ones beneath her. She takes advantage of the ones who are from lower classes and does not take offence. It is something natural for her. She does not consider them as spiritual human beings and does not care for their opinions.

Littleworth and Kickshaw are the ones who are deprived of class consciousness. They do whatever the noblemen want disregarding their own feelings and emotions. Although Littleworth is attracted by Celestina, he humiliates her just because Aretina orders him, and he successfully does it with Kickshaw even though Celestina is not affected by their humiliation. Kickshaw can also do everything for the sake of money and power. Although Madam Decoy is an ugly, old woman, he makes love with her as she offers him money and jewels. Decoy also takes advantage of Kickshaw for her pleasure and their relationship shows the power of money. They both regard their feelings for the sake of money. Aretina realises Kickshaw's physical change as he is rich. However she does not care about their relationship. They are from the lower class and it is useless for her to give value to the issue of these relationships based on having benefit.

In The Lady of Pleasure, the hierarchical system shows how people try to take advantage of the ones beneath them. The middle class is a tool for the upper class and the lower class is a tool for the middle class. Littleworth's comment on this issue makes it clear:

An emperor may give his office to a duke; a king may give his viceroy to negotiate for him; A duke may use a lord; the lord a knight; a knight may trust to a gentleman; and when they are abroad and merry; gentlemen may pimp to one another (Shirley, 1934:1609).

Noblemen always use the people beneath them to indulge their wishes. Professor Knights says: "For nowadays most men live above their callings, and promiscuously step forth vice-versa into one another's ranks. The countryman's eye is upon the citizen:

the citizen's upon the gentleman: the gentleman's upon the nobleman” (qtd. in Bendel, 1996:117). The rich treat the poor ones however they want. When Bornwell orders something to the servants he says: “Do ‘t ye drudges” (Shirley, 1934:1615). They are their slaves to do everything for them. If one is a nobleman, he has the power to make all his wishes come true. They have private carters, servants, caretakers, and even pimplers. People from middle or lower class may even serve as pimplers if they wish. Yet the people who are employed for these jobs, especially women, are never respected. Littleworth describes the woman who will be found for Frederick as “piewench that carries her intelligence in white pots” (Shirley, 1934:1609). They are openly described as prostitutes and they are regarded as objects for physical pleasure.

Everything in the society is connected to each other and it effects mostly all the people. Societies also affect each other throughout the history. Each society imposes its own rules to the next ones and Marx believes “The economic structure of capitalist society has grown out of the economic structure of feudal society.” (qtd in Beehler, 2006:122). This perspective also provides basis for his understanding of history. As he believes that history is the history of class struggles, it is inevitable that feudal system affect the capitalist system of the 20th century, which is like a domino-effect.

One of the most significant issues in the play is Aretina’s transformation. At the end, she becomes a totally different person. Until the end of the play, she is characterized as a pretentious person who humiliates and ignores the ones beneath her. When her husband Bornwell’s first plan fails, he decides on another plan. He pretends to have gambled and lost a big amount of money. He wants her to be afraid of losing their nobility and going back to the country, which might be a nightmare for Aretina. He says:

I’d rather be lord one month of pleasure, to the height and reapture of our senses, than be years of consuming what we have in foolish temperance, live in the dark, and no fame wait upon us (Shirley, 1934:1616).

Bornwell sees measure for measure as the best way to make her wife see the realities. He is successful this time and Aretina understands her miserable situation. In this case the scene that she is looking in the mirror is significant: Are: (Looking in a mirror) Tis a false glass; sure I am more deformed. What have I done? My soul is miserable (Shirley, 1934:1620). She begins to see herself as corrupted and she is aware

of the fact that she is responsible for her situation. She can understand the true meaning of honour and virtue. She has understood that love of money and fame dominates her life and this makes her unhappy. She cannot feel her individuality and she is aware that no one actually cares for her personality. People respect her just because she is a powerful woman

Upon this, she decides to offer her husband to go back to the town. This offer is important because she feels that she will find the true happiness in the country with the ordinary people. The following conversation shows how they betray their real emotions:

Are: Heaven has dissolved the clouds that hung upon my eyes, and, if you can with mercy meet a penitent, I throw my own will off, and now in all things obey yours. My nephew send back again to th' college, and myself to what plave you'll confine me.

Born: Dearer now than ever to my bosom, thou sha't please me best to live at thy own choice. I did but fright thee with a noise of my expenses... (Shirley, 1934:1623).

All the things are clear now and although Bornwell lies, he is successful and thanks to his plan, Aretina is able to see the realities. She feels pure and cured. She says: "Already I feel a cure upon my soul, and promise my after-life to virtue. Pardon heaven, my shame, yet hid from me the world's eye" (Shirley, 1934:1623). From that moment, she decides to live not through the rules of the society but true real, pure values. She blames one but herself and she is happy with her new, pure soul.

In consequence, Shirley depicts the time and society in a successful way. As a good example of comedy of manners, The Lady of Pleasure questions morality, virtue and honour through people from different social classes. Aretina and Celestina are chosen to reflect the different perspectives upon the issue of pleasure and virtue. While Aretina does not care about moral values and is able to do everything to keep her social status, Celestina represents the opposite. She tries to object the social oppression and keep her morality although society represses her. They both love pleasure but differently, Aretina wants pleasure for the others but Celestina wants pleasure for herself. It also shows how upper class people take advantage of the people beneath them and how the rules of society make people's lives restricted. The rich ones in the play always order the ones beneath them and the poor ones do not have any rights to

object. As Bornwell describes, they are “drudges” (Shirley, 1934:1615). They are not individuals as they are not upper class.

Even upper class people have to struggle for their position in the society. The reason is that the others’ give a person’s value in the society and if the rich ones seem less powerful, they lose their fame. They do everything to make the other people think they are powerful and rich in order not to lose their social title, which means everything for them.

The role of the women in the century is also discussed in the play. It is reflected mostly through Aretina and Celestina that women are not respected much in the society. Although they seem wise and powerful, actually their power is ironical in the play. Aretina is praised all the characters in the play but at the same time she is offered to the Lord as a prostitute. On the other hand, Celestina is humiliated by her suitors and she feels like a ball between them. No one actually cares about their ideas and feelings.

So, The Lady of Pleasure points out the class conflicts, human relations and the role of the women successfully and it is concluded that the social oppression causes social corruption which makes people forget about their identities and moral values.

CHAPTER III: PYGMALION

George Bernard Shaw is an Irish playwright born in 1856. He was born into a poor family and he faced difficulties through his life due to financial problems. He was mostly influenced by his mother who was interested in literature. Raised in poverty, he got close to socialism. That is why he discussed mostly class conflicts and social oppression in his plays. He wanted people to be aware of the realities of the 20th century and the corruption in the society. He was a leading figure of the 20th century because he influenced modern British theatre by his new-realism. As Innes comments: “Shaw defined modernism in a way that became standard for mainstream British theatre” (2002:5). He was mostly impressed by Ibsen and he added new perspectives to drama. He began to focus on more serious, social issues rather than just romances. He was also a critic who successfully observed and reflected the society in his works. He says: “I deal in the tragic irony of the conflict between real life and the romantic imagination.” (qtd. in Innes,2002:15). He could combine his dramatic ability with his critical point of view well. His works are like mirrors of their time.

Pygmalion, written in 1912 and first staged in 1914, mainly focuses on class distinctions, human relations, language, communication and social oppression. Unlike his contemporaries, Shaw’s understanding of comedy has nothing to do with slapstick. On the contrary; he took familiar ideas with alternative points of views. He wrote didactic plays that should teach people the realities of life rather than merely entertaining them. He says:

The theatre is growing in importance as a social organ. Bad theatres are as mischievous as bad schools or bad Churches; for modern civilization is rapidly multiplying the class to which the theatre is both school and Church (Shaw, 1965:31).

He believed it would be useless if the audience or readers do not think about the important issues of society and contemporary life. For example, Pygmalion is like a modern version of Cinderella without a happy ending, since, for Shaw, a play should impose new and serious ideas upon the audience. Some critics argued the way Shaw ended his play. As Alan Jay Lerner asserts, "Shaw explains how Eliza ends not with Higgins but with Freddy. And Shaw and Heaven forgive me! I am not certain he is right" (qtd. in McHugh, 2012:203). Most of the people wanted it to have a happy ending but Shaw did not want it to be just a romance. He thought the reader must be awakened to the realities. Shaw points out the issue:

I loved the actors; copied all their ways; but oh! I got so tired of plays, always the same...Not one of them a bit like real life... Just think! In real life what is it touches us? Stories about ourselves, not about duchesses (qtd. in Lowenstein, 1950:19).

Yet, it must also be stated that the full title is Pygmalion: A Romance in Five Acts. Although Shaw did not want to write a romance in which readers just see a love story, some critics argued that the play is a romance. Shaw comments on the point and explain why it might be called a romance "because it is the story of a poor girl who meets a gentleman at a church door and is transformed by him like Cinderella, into a beautiful lady (qtd. in Singer, 2010:80). Besides man-woman relationship, from Shaw's point of view, there were some other important issues to consider. The stage is like a school for the audiences to learn or be aware of some serious facts. Rather than just entertainment, they should indirectly be lectured. That's why the play has both funny situations and serious issues at the same time. His style in this play is clear, lively with a powerful effect on the audience and the reader. While reading, the reader can easily grasp the details of characters and setting as Shaw makes detailed explanations.

Shaw draws attention to the issue of class distinctions in the play. In the period when the play is written, the rich upper-class governed the society with the effect of industrial revolution and there were sharp differences between the upper, middle and lower classes. Shaw believed that individuals could change and transform themselves.

An individual who transforms himself could also transform the society. It is a political movement called Fabianism, which suggests that social classes might change as the world is changing and transforming itself. They also believed in equality in the society. Wilde says:

Fabians called themselves Fabians, because, like Fabius in the struggle with Hannibal, they saw the wisdom of waiting for the right moment to action. They wished to destroy the old forms, but without violence, in an entirely peaceful way (1917:141).

They suggested education and organization in order to transform the society. Eric Bentley wrote that "Fabianism begins and ends as an appeal emotionally based for social justice" (1946:3). Being one of the first members of Fabianism, Shaw is an important figure and he believes that individuals have to develop themselves in order for the society to improve. In the play, he puts his idea through Liza, who transforms herself. Berst comments on her successful process, pointing out that "a soul awakens to true self-realization" (Busiel, 1997:2).

Pygmalion tells the story of a flower girl, Liza and her transformation. Liza, the flower girl, Prof. Higgins and Colonel Pickering who transform Liza into a lady are the main characters of the play. There is also Mrs. Higgins, Higgins' mother, Alfred Doolittle, Liza's father, Mrs. Pearce, the woman working in Higgins' house. They are also significant in Liza's transformation. The Eynsford-Hills family, whom Liza meets in the first scene of the play, become important in Liza's life.

The play consists of five acts and the plot is mainly on Liza and her physical and psychological alteration. Shaw reflects the society taking Liza, a female character, into the centre. He is affected by Marx and the reflections of Marxism are seen in the play. He deals with the gaps between the social classes, class conflicts and how the base and superstructure relationship affects the society. Especially through Higgins and Liza, he portrays that there is an oppressor, the upper class and there an oppressed, the working class. His choosing Liza as the main character is significant because in Marxism it is believed that "Social progress can be measured by the social position of the female sex" (qtd. in Freeman, 2014:84).

Each act in the play handles the events from different characters' perspective, which is a characteristic of Brechtian Drama. Brecht is against the traditional drama in

which the events are all told through one perspective. He believes that kind of writing would prevent the spectators from thinking over the issues from different points of views. In epic theatre, there are episodes in which the events are shown from different points of views. Pygmalion does not only talk about Liza and her problems. Taking her at the centre, Shaw reflects the society and in each episode he shows different opinions of the characters. The spectator is able to think about Liza's transformation from not only Liza, but also Higgins, Pickering, Mrs. Pearce and Mrs. Higgins. It helps the spectators to think over the issues both from a working class and upper class perspective.

Liza is an ordinary flower girl at the beginning of the play and she meets Prof. Higgins and Colonel Pickering by chance. Prof. Higgins is working on phonetics and Liza wants to take private lessons as her way of speech is not appropriate to work at a florists' shop, which is her dream. Higgins and Pickering turn it to a bet. They wonder if they can make a duchess out of her. Liza becomes an experiment and Higgins and Pickering do not care about her feelings. Mrs. Pearce and Mrs. Higgins are the ones trying to help Liza. Alfred Doolittle is not an efficient parent and he makes profit over his daughter. Higgins works on her speech for six months and at the end people think that Liza might be a princess. The bet is over but it is not what Liza wants. She feels that she does not belong to anywhere as Higgins and Pickering do not care about her. So, she leaves the house and at the end she marries Freddy, who is Mrs. Eynsford-Hills' son.

The title is taken from a well-known mythical story of a sculptor named Pygmalion who makes a sculpture of a woman for himself. He falls in love with the statue and he prays to Aphrodite to give life to it. Aphrodite makes his wish come true and thus his own creature becomes alive. The statue that turns into a living woman is named Galatea whom Pygmalion marries. In Shaw's play, Higgins, who transforms Liza, refers to Pygmalion and Liza symbolizes Galatea. In terms of her speech, behaviour and appearance, Higgins gives life to her. He treats her as if she was an object and sees her like a raw material out of which he creates a beautiful woman. But unlike the mythical story, they do not get married in the end.

As well as the myth of Pygmalion, the play has parallelism with the old fairy tale "Cinderella". Eliza Doolittle, who lives in the ashes at first and then transforms into a

lady, is Cinderella of the play. Liza's room is described in the last scene of the first act and there are some points to make parallelism with Cinderella. Her house is just a miserable room. It is dirty; there is just a table and a bed. She lives alone and there is nobody to care for her, like Cinderella. There is also a birdcage but the bird inside is dead. That birdcage can be likened to society and the dead bird to Liza and her identity. That class-ridden society makes her live like a bird in a cage. She has boundaries that she cannot get out of and even if she tries to get out, she cannot manage. Now, that birdcage is just for a memorial. Higgins and Pickering are like the fairy godfathers to help her but unlike the story they cause much pain rather than happiness for her. She has new clothes, a new kind of lifestyle but unlike the fairy tale the most important part of her transformation is her way of speech. At the beginning of the play her speech is not appropriate for the social standards and Prof. Higgins teaches her to speak properly. According to Shaw, this is the most significant part. Eliza's father functions as an inefficient parent who cannot give her a shelter. Yet the Prince Charming of the play is open to discussion because if it is Higgins, they should marry but they do not. Eliza marries Freddy but in the play he does not include the characteristics of a handsome and charming prince. In general, the play has direct resemblance to the fairy tale but Shaw does not include all the details of the tale in the play and modifies some of them. He does not want the reader to read a story that they already know. Rather he wants them to have a different perspective. Life is not always a fairy tale in which all the people who try for the best reach happiness.

Phonetics is an important issue to discuss in the play. Shaw gives much importance to phonetics in the play, because he intends to emphasize how pronunciation determines people's social class. "He regarded phonetics and the proper use of pronunciation of the English language as an instrument of social change and as a hope for achieving the aesthetic state" says Salama (2000:227). People could easily decide whether a person is from an upper, middle or lower class by just paying attention to that person's way of speech. The very first example is in the first scene of the first act. In the first act Eliza appears for the first time. She is a poor flower-girl whose age is between eighteen and twenty. Her social position is reflected through her appearance. Her clothes reveal that she is not an upper class girl. She has dirty clothes, worn shoes but she is a cheerful girl. She tries to sell flowers to Colonel Pickering and she finds out that while she speaks to Pickering, someone writes down whatever she says because her

speech is different. He is Prof. Higgins. At first she is terrified because she thinks he is a policeman. Even if he shows what he has written, it makes no sense to her and he reads it exactly with her accent. Shocked by her speech he says “Heavens! What a sound” (Shaw, 1997:20)! It is remarkable here that even if she is a poor girl she is able to defend herself, she fears being arrested and says:

Oh, sir, don't let him charge me. You dunno what it means to me. They'll take away my character and drive me on the streets for speaking to gentlemen. They— (Shaw, 1997:14).

She clearly states that she is afraid of losing her character as her identity is the only thing that she owns. She believes that “He's no right to take away my character. My character is the same to me as any lady's (Shaw, 1997:18). Although she is not an upper class lady, she believes that she also has an identity and identity is not something to be related with any social class. She also believes that she is equal to any other woman, she does not classify people. This scene also represents Higgins's character. He does not care for people's feelings. He just thinks about his job. Whenever he speaks to Eliza, he is rude and he looks down on her. It is clear in his words.

A woman who utters such depressing and disgusting sounds has no right to be anywhere—no right to live. Remember that you are a human being with a soul and the divine gift of articulate speech: that your native language is the language of Shakespeare and Milton and The Bible; and don't sit there crooning like a bilious pigeon (Shaw, 1997:20).

It is reflected in the play that one's value is related with his wealth and social status. Before Higgins and Pickering go together at the end of the first act, Higgins gives Eliza some coins. As she has money, she uses a cab to feel like an upper class as being able to afford a taxi meant luxury at that time. Another important point is that the reader learns her name right after she gets money and uses a cab. Before she has money she is just a “flower girl” but then she becomes “Liza”. It refers to the situation of the society. If people have money, they have identity. Others are just ordinary flower girls or workers. Before Liza gets money, she does not have a name and an identity. She feels more confident even if she has little money. Also, Frederick is kind to her and he asks questions about herself. This makes her feel important. She feels much more confident and this confidence gives her an identity, a name.

The reader learns Higgins and Pickering's name also right after they introduce their jobs. Before it is revealed that they are authors and Higgins is a professor, they are named as note taker and bystander. So, identity is related with the titles in the society. People are treated according to their social background and profession. This is also one of the characteristics of theatre. The characters are not introduced until they are called by another character by their names.

Liza is not an important figure according to Higgins as she does not have an ordinary speech and she is not from upper class. He is not kind to her from the beginning and when she goes to his house to take private lessons he does not treat her properly. Actually, he is not kind to anybody. Before she goes, she tries to be as clean as she can be and devotes too much importance on her appearance for an ordinary meeting. She does not want to be looked down on again. When she enters the room, she is not Liza for Higgins; she is still just an ordinary flower girl. He treats her like a dog, does not talk to her, and just gives orders like "sit down", "hold your tongue". But she defends herself: "Well, if you was a gentleman, you might ask me to sit down, I think. Don't I tell you I'm bringing you business" (Shaw, 1997:30)? As she has some money she believes that she is as powerful as any lady.

The bet that Pickering offers Higgins also shows how unimportant Liza is to them. Even if Liza goes there for a business, they want to have more fun. He asks Higgins if he could manage to teach Eliza how to speak, dress and behave properly in six months and make people believe that she is from a royal family. Higgins accepts the bet and from that moment Eliza becomes like a baby doll to play with. Their attitude towards Liza shows the attitude of men towards women in the 20th century. Higgins sees her like a stone to curve and shape, in a similar fashion like in the myth of Pygmalion. He says: "Somebody is going to touch you, with a broomstick, if you don't stop snivelling. Sit down (Shaw, 1997:33). From Marxist point, he is the oppressor one who feels like a master who can make her does whatever he wants. He dominates her and considers her as his possession. He feels he has right to shape her as he wants and Liza does not have the right to disobey. Like the rich people's deciding on everything about the social system by ignoring the needs of the working class, he also does not consider her opinions and wishes. Eliza is just a raw material in his hands. Although she is against the idea of being oppressed, she cannot stop him. She tries not to forget her own

identity. Also, Higgins' point of view towards people is shown. He does not care about people, especially women, in general. He does not mind what they feel or what difficulties they undergo. He just thinks about his job.

Higgins treats Liza as if she did not have any feelings or opinions to express. She is like a motionless robot to him and when he decides that she should stay at his home and learn to live like a lady, he never asks her what she wants. Higgins wants Mrs. Pearce to take away all her clothes and burn them. He wants her to be clean and neat. Now, Higgins is like a small child with a new toy. Until new clothes have been found, he wants her to be wrapped in a brown paper, like a doll that he has bought from a shop. But Eliza does not want new clothes and says: “[almost in tears] I didn't want no clothes. I wouldn't have taken them [she throws away the handkerchief]. I can buy my own clothes” (Shaw, 1997:37). Even if she objects, Higgins never listens to her. He even goes too far when Mrs. Pearce says there is not a place to put her, Higgins offers the dustbin. He does not care about her feelings, as she is just a flower girl; there is no need to ask her anything.

Even if Pickering offers the bet, he is not as rude as Higgins to Eliza. Pickering treats her like a lady and he even calls her with her last name and when Higgins goes too far he is concerned and he draws attention to it:

Pickering: [in good-humored remonstrance] Does it occur to you, Higgins, that the girl has some feelings?

Higgins: [looking critically at her] Oh no, I don't think so. Not any feelings that we need bother about. [Cheerily] Have you, Eliza?

Liza: I got my feelings same as anyone else (Shaw, 1997:38).

Liza shows her feminine emotions again. She cannot stand being humiliated as a woman. Also Marxist perspective of social classes is presented in this quotation. Marx says: “In bourgeois society capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality.”(qtd in Bailey, 2002:842). It is always the upper class who is able to determine its life but the working class always depends on the upper class without any social rights. They do not have identity. It is clear in this quotation that no one is able to stop Higgins to think about Eliza herself. He just thinks

about his new “project” and ignores what could happen to Eliza’s psychology. He even plans her future without asking her:

You shall remain so, Eliza, under the care of Mrs. Pearce. And you shall marry an officer in the Guards, with a beautiful moustache: the son of a marquis, who will disinherit him for marrying you, but will relent when he sees your beauty and goodness—(Shaw, 1997:40).

Higgins does not treat her like a pupil. He represents the bourgeoisie who dominates the working class. Yet, Shaw’s choice of Higgins to represent the upper class is significant because he shows another side of upper class understanding. One might consider an upper class professor to be a kind gentleman but although Higgins is an educated man, he is rude to people. He thinks it is right because he believes he treats everyone in the same way, so it does not matter if he is rude, it is enough that he is equal. He thinks he is able to determine her destiny and Liza, representing the oppressed working class, does not have any right to stand against him. Actually, he treats everyone in the same way. His character is described as follows: “careless about himself and other people, including their feelings...His manners vary from genial bullying when he is in a good humour to stormy petulance when anything goes wrong” (Shaw, 1997:27). While teaching Liza he feels like he is teaching an animal. It is clearly seen when Eliza has her first speaking lesson. While Higgins tries to teach her how to pronounce the letters, she cannot do it properly for the first time and Higgins describes her as an animal that “has been locked up for nine years in school at our expense to teach her to speak and read the language of Shakespeare and Milton. And the result is Ahyee, Ba-yee, Ca-yee, Da-yee” (Shaw, 1997:63). For him Eliza is like an animal to teach how to speak, she is not even a human being. Higgins is just considering her way of speech but these lessons make her unhappy. In the third act, Liza gets better after some lessons, but even if she is getting to know how to speak, she does not totally know what to say. She is like “Galatea” in the myth of Pygmalion; nobody cares about her opinions, only her appearance matters. She is just considered as a body but she struggles to show that she is also an individual woman.

Actually, Higgins has not got a problem with Eliza herself. He has problems with women in general. He believes women upset everything and they should not be treated well. They are just like tools to help man. He thinks that if a man becomes

friends with a woman, that man becomes selfish and tyrannical. He is indifferent to them and he does not think he is rude as he treats everyone in the same way. When Pickering wants an example about that, he says:

[coming off the piano restlessly] Oh, Lord knows! I suppose the woman wants to live her own life; and the man wants to live his; and each tries to drag the other on to the wrong track. One wants to go north and the other south; and the result is that both have to go east, though they both hate the east wind (Shaw, 1997:45).

Mrs. Pearce's character should be discussed as she is the only one who is concerned about Eliza's feelings. Shaw refers to the fact that, men never considers woman as real persons with identity at the age the play is set. It is Mrs. Pearce who can foreshadow what would happen when they finish their "project" with Eliza. She is brave enough to object Higgins: "Well, the matter is, sir that you can't take a girl up like that as if you were picking up a pebble on the beach" (Shaw, 1997:36). It is also notable that even if she is a worker in the house she is able to express herself clearly to Higgins. She reflects the woman type who begins to realize her own identity and freedom in the 20th century. Although they are not so powerful yet, it is important as a starting point. She knows that the girl's failures are not her fault actually; they are the society's faults. She is aware of the fact that she will be unhappy because she knows Higgins well. Her opinions about Higgins are significant: "...but when you get what you call interested in people's accents, you never think or care what may happen to them or you" (Shaw, 1997:41). She is worried about her social position. Although Higgins and Pickering think that Liza will have a good life thanks to them, Mrs. Pearce knows that they do not care for her feelings. She also warns Higgins to be careful about his speech and daily eating habits in front of Eliza if he wants to be a good role model.

The scene when Mrs. Pearce goes to bath Eliza reflects the lifestyle of the lower class people. She finds out that she has never bathed, never took off her clothes all at once and never changed her clothes before going to bed. She is shocked to see Liza frightened of being undressed. While Liza thinks "it is not natural" (Shaw, 1997:43), Mrs. Pearce tries to convince her by saying "you know you can't be a nice girl inside if you're a dirty slut outside" (Shaw, 1997:43). Liza is afraid of changing her clothes before going to bed because she has never had a hot room as they have. It shows her upbringing. She never had much opportunity and she does not feel safe when she is

undressed. It is also her personal choice. On the other hand, the difference is significant here. While the upper class people are used to bath every day and change their clothes before going to bed, it is something frightening for the poor ones. Although they live in the same city, they are like from different worlds. Not all of the people have the opportunities to reach the things which the rich people consider natural.

Alfred Doolittle, Liza's father, represents the corruption in the society. He is not a good parent to take care of her daughter and he even tries to make profit over her. When he learns that Eliza is with Higgins and he thinks that Higgins has immoral purposes. He goes to his house but it is clear that he is not there because he cares for his daughter; he indirectly wants money if Higgins wants her to stay there. He wants twenty-five dollars but Higgins offers fifty dollars. Higgins looks down on him because he is not from the upper class and says: "[revolted] Do you mean to say, you callous rascal, that you would sell your daughter for 50 pounds?" (Shaw, 1997:55). He calls him "rascal" which shows that he does not respect him. Alfred refuses it as fifty dollars would ruin him, he would drink much. He tries to make profit over his daughter and he thinks this is his right as her father. He is a man who does not care for others' opinions. He feels free to make his own choices without thinking of the society. From this point of view Doolittle and Higgins are alike because they do not think what others think about them. They feel free to say and do whatever they want. They treat everyone equally; no matter they are rude or kind.

Alfred Doolittle can also be likened to Falstaff in Shakespeare's play Henry IV. Falstaff is a knight who always borrows money to drink. Falstaff says in the play: "What is honour, a word." (2006:154) Alfred Doolittle asks the money just to drink and he clearly states his wish. Although he says he has come for his daughter, he tries to turn the situation into his own advantage. He seems to care for moral values but it is seen that he does not care about them. He even cannot recognize his own daughter when she appears after bath. She wears a kimono as there is nothing that Mrs. Pearce can give to her and when she wears it everyone calls her "a Japanese lady". It is significant here because she is not there with her identity. She is judged by her appearance and when his father does not recognize her, she says: "Garn! Don't you know your own daughter (Shaw, 1997:58)?" She finds it strange not to be recognized by her father who has

brought her up. At the end she does not want to see him again as he is not a real father to have a right about her life and says:

Liza: Not me. I don't want never to see him again, I don't. He's a disgrace to me, he is, collecting dust, instead of working at his trade.

Pickering: What is his trade, Eliza?

Liza: Talking money out of other people's pockets into his own. His proper trade's a navy; and he works at it sometimes too—for exercise—and earns good money at it (Shaw, 1997:61).

Mrs. Higgins, Henry's mother appears for the first time when she is making preparations to have some guests. She is an important figure because, like Mrs. Pearce, she is also concerned about Liza's future throughout the play. Higgins comes to her house to say that he has also asked Liza to come. Pickering also arrives with the guests, The Eynsford-Hills. This is the family in the first scene that was waiting for a cab when it rained heavily. This meeting is like a test for Eliza because this is the first time she is among people from upper class and she is like a robot, just speaking about weather and daily issues, sometimes she goes off the subject but Freddy, Mrs. Hill's son, enjoys when Eliza speaks, he is attracted by her speech. Higgins is not happy being there as he does not like the family and even if they try to be friends with him, he is not interested. This family is significant as they can be seen as a possible future for Eliza. The family is an upper class family but lately they do not have upper-class income. So, it foreshadows Eliza's future about what would happen if someone behaves like an upper class but later on everything might change and he/she does not earn to live like one.

When The Eynsford-Hills leave, Mrs. Higgins warns Higgins and Pickering that they are like small children: "You certainly are a pretty pair of babies, playing with your live doll" (Shaw, 1997:81). As she is also a woman, she is able to understand how Eliza feels.

Higgins harshly objects because he believes he is doing a difficult and big job. Higgins and Pickering defend themselves:

Higgins: She regularly fills our lives up; doesn't she, Pick?

Pickering: We're always talking Eliza.

Higgins: Teaching Eliza.

Pickering: Dressing Eliza.

Mrs. Higgins: What!

Higgins: Inventing new Elizas (Shaw, 1997:80-81).

They call the situation as an invention and Higgins sees Eliza as a pastime that makes him occupied. They're trying to change her into a girl which fits the society but just in terms of appearance and speech. She is like an invented robot to act according to their wish and at some point Higgins calls her "problem" (Shaw, 1997:83) to be solved. Mrs. Higgins is worried about her future after they have finished their teaching but Higgins and Pickering do not see that problem. They believe that she can find a job for herself and Higgins believes that she gets whatever she wants thanks to him. He does not appreciate Eliza's efforts. He just thinks about his 'experiment' and by giving her a new speech she will be able to change her social class. It is a reference to the situation at those times. The way of speech determines a person's class and the usage of language is like a bridge between social classes.

One of the significant points is that although Higgins regards women as lower creatures, he never treats his mum badly. Mrs. Higgins talks to him as if he were a child but Higgins believes all the young women are like "idiots" (Shaw, 1997:67) and he likes women who are like his mum. It can be related to Oedipus complex. One of the reasons that he is not married and does not like the women who are not like his mother is that he is strongly attracted by her mum. And also Mrs. Higgins is not an emotional mum who exhibits her love towards her son clearly, which has also an oedipal relation.

Higgins and Pickering plan to take Eliza to a Shakespeare exhibition that night and they believe that it will be a great fun to hear her remarks in the last scene of the third act. Higgins says: "She'll mimic all the people for us when we get home" (Shaw, 1997:84). He just seeks for enjoyment and it is still clear that from the first act to the end he is not interested in Eliza's ideas. They do not ask her anything while planning something because especially for Higgins it is nonsense to ask for a woman's opinions.

The two men are in their evening dresses and Eliza is in a very elegant appearance, she has a nice evening dress, diamonds and jewellery. At the exhibition they come across with a former pupil of Higgins, Nepommuck, and as always Higgins does not behave friendly. At first he does not remember him and when he introduces himself Higgins calls him 'Pandour', an armed soldier in Hungary who is known for his cruelty and plundering. Again, Higgins classifies people according to their appearances. When he gets to know that he is not noble by birth and thanks to his teaching he is in that position, he deliberately teases him. Thus Nepommuck believes that he can tell a person's background by paying attention to his/her way of speech.

The exhibition scene is significant as Eliza does not seem enjoying herself as she feels like a stranger among those people. Until that time she was transformed externally; her spiritual world remained the same. Yet, when she sees herself among other people, she understands that she will never be like them and also she will never be able to go back to her previous life. She cannot be a flower girl working in a shop and she feels that she belongs nowhere. She is uncomfortable when all the people are staring at her and says to Pickering:

Liza: I don't think I can bear much more. The people all stare so at me. An old lady has just told me that I speak exactly like Queen Victoria. I am sorry if I have lost your bet. I have done my best; but nothing can make me the same as these people.

Pickering: You have not lost it, my dear. You have won it ten times over (Shaw, 1997:91).

This scene can be likened to the midnight scene of the fairy tale, Cinderella. Because when Nepommuck talks to her, he says that she is a Hungarian princess. Now, the clock strikes twelve and the ball is over. As the bet is over, Liza feels miserable. Berst wrote that "while Pickering is generous, Eliza is shoved into the wings by Higgins. The dream has been fulfilled, midnight has tolled for Cinderella, and morning reality is at hand" (1973:214). Eliza thinks she has lost the bet but she is unaware of the fact that she has actually won it because all the people there thought that she is a noble lady and that was what Higgins and Pickering have been trying to do for months. So, that means the bet is over and Higgins and Pickering have made it at last. Pickering says: "Anyhow, it was a great success: an immense success" (Shaw, 1997:94). This

shows that Eliza just means 'success' for them, she is just a 'triumph'. They do not consider how she feels among those people. And also, they just consider it as their success. They do not consider Eliza's efforts. The two men are happy at the end but Eliza is worried about her future as the bet has ended.

Even if Eliza tries to stay calm, in the fourth act, she has a nervous breakdown. This indicates that Eliza begins to feel that she is a human being and she wants to be respected. When they return home at Wimpole Street, Higgins and Pickering discuss the events as if Eliza were not there. Higgins seems relaxed as everything is over. He says he has been bored for the past two months. Hearing these conversations, Eliza gets nervous because they do not even think that Eliza might hear them. They make her feel like a ghost whom nobody sees and cares for. She cannot hold her feelings anymore when Higgins orders Eliza tea for breakfast. She throws herself onto the floor. Her reaction is emotional because she cannot stand being ignored anymore. She has turned into an elegant woman but Higgins still treats her in a rude way. As a woman, she wants to be respected or at least she wants Higgins to consider her as a human rather than a pet. Although she does not love him, she feels humiliated as a woman. She knows that they have turned her into a creature that does not belong anywhere now. She asks Higgins what is to become of her and rather than paying attention to Eliza, he is just trying to find where his slippers are. Higgins' attitude shows that he does not care what she feels. Higgins thinks that something must be wrong with her for the first time when Eliza finds and throws them on his face. This also shows how indifferent he is. Even if Eliza has asked that question many times, he has never cared. The conversation makes it clearer:

Higgins: What does it matter what becomes of you?

Eliza: You don't care. I know you don't care. You wouldn't care if I was dead. I'm nothing to you-not so much as them slippers (Shaw, 1997:96).

She just wants to be considered important. Her reactions are sometimes due to her feminine emotions. She wants to be considered as a woman and Higgins' attitude makes her annoyed. Higgins still does not care much for her emotions and just suggests her to sleep: "Nobody's hurting you. Nothing's wrong. You go to bed like a good girl and sleep it off. Have a little cry and say your prayers: that will make you comfortable"

(Shaw, 1997:97). Here Higgins portrays the model of a girl according to him. Like a good girl, she should not be that much angry and just go to bed if she wants to cry because she looks ugly when she cries and no one should see her, she should pray to feel comfortable. He kindly says she is not bad looking and she can get married and be happy but Eliza thinks her dream was to work at a florist's shop, she wanted to sell flowers but now that Higgins transformed her into a person, she has to sell herself and find a man to marry to survive. She feels miserable because she thinks she has lost her identity, her dreams in this process and there were the only things she owned. This is clear when she says: "I sold flowers. I didn't sell myself. Now you've made a lady of me I'm not fit to sell anything else. I wish you'd left me where you found me" (Shaw, 1997:99). She is not happy although she has a better lifestyle. Her reaction is the reflection of how the upper class oppresses people to obey its rules. Brecht says: "Sometimes it's more important to be human, than to have good taste" (qtd in Mitchell, 2012:210). She is against upper class' understanding of life as she just wants to be a natural person who is free although she is poor.

Eliza's leaving the house is significant because she shows that she is able to do whatever she wants freely. It presents her self-confidence. She meets Freddy, who is in love with her, and they spend the night riding around in the taxi all the night. In the morning she wants to go to Mrs. Higgins for advice. Her leaving is important as it indicates her psychological transformation. She has understood that Higgins will never care for her feelings and she does not know what to do for her future. She believes in herself but in that society she cannot find a place for her. For Shaw "Galatea comes to life when Eliza emancipates herself from Higgins" (qtd. in Innes, 2002:32). Eliza completes her process by leaving the house because the real transformation is in her mind. She knows that she wants to be a spiritual human being, rather than a 'slave' in Higgins' house. She trusts Mrs. Higgins because she has always cared for her. She feels miserable but her unhappiness does not result from the fact that she loves Higgins. The only thing that she has been expecting is 'thank you' but Higgins always ignored her efforts. She does not love Freddy, either but Freddy is the opposite of Higgins. He is kind and cares for her, he always tells how splendid she is and he puts Eliza in the centre of his life. So, Eliza feels happy when she is with Freddy after Higgins has ignored her all the time.

Throughout the play, Higgins never understands what Liza feels no matter how many times she tries to explain. He always ignores her identity. After she leaves, he seems to be worried and for the first time he thinks that there might be a problem with her. They go to Mrs. Higgins's house with Colonel. Mrs. Higgins wants Eliza to stay upstairs until she tells her to come downstairs. Higgins and Pickering call the police to report that she is missing and Higgins is in a great excitement. Mrs. Higgins tries to understand if Higgins is aware of the fact that there is something wrong with Eliza but Higgins does not understand the real problem. He is worried not for Eliza but just for his own situation as Eliza has been keeping up with his appointments and that morning he has problems about that. It is again clear that Higgins still does not care for Eliza, he is just worried about himself and he acts as if something that belongs to him was lost. Eliza is not important as an individual for him; she is just an assistant in his life.

Mrs. Higgins tells that Eliza is there in the house and she says the problem about her is Higgins and Pickering did not behave her as it should have been. She believes that they did not respect her but Higgins and Pickering object that. The following conversation makes it clear:

Mrs. Higgins: You didn't thank her, or pet her, or admire her, or tell her how splendid she'd been.

Higgins: Let us put on our best Sunday manners for this creature that we picked out of the mud (Shaw, 1997:114).

The base and superstructure relationship is reflected in this quotation. Although it is actually the base which shapes the superstructure, in the capitalist world it is the superstructure which tries to control and possess everything. The upper class oppresses the working class. Higgins believes that Liza's current situation is just due to his efforts. He does not need to thank or admire her as she is a poor girl. Class conflicts are also notable. While Mrs. Pearce thinks that he should say thanks at least, Higgins' reaction is the opposite. He does not believe it is necessary to thank a girl like Liza whom he considers as a "creature living in mud". Even if he seems worried about her, he is still disrespects her and he wants to stress that they "created" her. Again there is a reference to the myth of Pygmalion. Higgins believes that Eliza was an object living in mud and thanks to his efforts, she turned out to be "Galatea". Eliza is his own creature and that's

why she must respect and care for him. According to him, Eliza owes her life to him, he is her creator.

When Eliza comes, she is indifferent to Higgins but she greets Pickering warmly. As Pickering has always treated her more like a lady, she is not angry with Pickering. On the contrary, she believes that she owes her self-respect to him. She states it clearly:

But do you know what began my real education? Your calling me Miss Doolittle that day when I first came to Wimpole Street. That was the beginning of self-respect for me. The difference between a lady and a flower girl is not how she behaves, but how she's treated. I shall always be a flower girl to Professor Higgins, because he always treats me as a flower girl, and always will; but I know I can be a lady to you, because you always treat me as a lady, and always will (Shaw, 1997:118-119).

Eliza makes the point clear that the problem she faces is Higgins' behaviours. No matter how much she tries, nothing will be enough to change his ideas about her because for Higgins, she is a poor flower girl living in mud and she is the person who would never be in that position without him. But on the contrary, Pickering treats her like a lady ignoring her status. She explains that attitude is important for her as her self-confidence and character is shaped through other people. That makes it clear how people in that century classify people according to their social background, rather than their characters. It is not important if a woman is a real lady or a flower girl, people personalize her according to their wish, so it does not matter who she is, but how she is treated. Then, she wants Pickering to call her "Eliza" and Higgins to call her "Miss. Doolittle". This also makes it clear that she feels intimate towards Pickering. She feels like an individual person with him and wants to be called by her name but as Higgins always labels people she wants him to call her by her last name. The differences in Higgins's and Pickering's characters are also important in Liza's transformation. Pickering treats her in the same way he would treat a lady but Higgins is always rude to her. Dukore comments on the point that "a member of a particular social class is revealed not only by his speech and behavior, he is revealed also by the way in which he is treated" (1973:288). So, Liza has understood at the end that, no matter how much she tries, her social class will be determined by other's attitudes. Another critic, MacCarty agrees on Dukore's comment but also adds that "The self-absorption of Higgins's makes

his behaviour as inconsiderate as lack of education makes Eliza's, but at least he treats everyone alike. He may be rude, but his rudeness is not discriminating" (1951:112). It is undeniable that Higgins is rude to Liza but it is also true that he is rude to everyone in the play.

Liza's reactions are sometimes due to gender-based problems. Actually she does not love Higgins but she wants him to consider her as a woman who can make her own decisions and who is equal to the others. Through her, the perspective of women in the 20th century is reflected. As gender is a socially-constructed term, it is also one of the results of social oppression. Judith Butler says: "...gender is culturally constructed: hence, gender is neither the casual result of sex nor as seemingly fixed as sex" (qtd in During, 1999:345). Women are not considered as dominant figures and Shaw actually presents the struggle of them through Liza. She is brave enough to claim that she is as free as any other women although she is a poor girl. She has to struggle with both gender problems and class conflicts. So, she has to stand out the complexities more than anyone else.

Eliza claims that Higgins has made her a girl who does not fit anywhere now. She feels like she has lost everything that constitutes her identity. It is clear when she speaks to Higgins:

Liza: You told me, you know, that when a child is brought to a foreign country, it picks up the language in a few weeks, and forgets its own. Well, I am a child in your country. I have forgotten my own language, and can speak nothing but yours. That's the real break-off with the corner of Tottenham Court Road. Leaving Wimpole Street finishes it (Shaw, 1997:119).

Eliza clearly accuses Higgins. She believes that she is not able to return to her previous life. He has made her forget everything she believed to be true and now she belongs nowhere. But on the contrary, Higgins believes that she is the victim of Eliza because her behaviours are far beyond his teaching. He calls her "a thing" that he created but she transformed into a human being, which Higgins did not expect. She has ideas, abilities that Higgins did not teach. Liza is just a way of fun for him. He confesses that he wants her back but just for fun and for his own sake. The fact that he wants just an amusement for himself becomes clear when Eliza asks the reason for her homecoming:

Liza: What am I to come back for?

Higgins: For the fun of it. That's why I took you on (Shaw, 1997:127).

This conversation also shows the importance that Liza has in Higgins's life. No matter how much she has struggled, she is just a way of fun for him. Nothing is able to change his opinions about her. She was just a flower girl and it is the only thing that she will be.

It should also be discussed who "Pygmalion" is in the play; Prof. Higgins or Colonel Pickering. If spiritual development is considered, Pickering is a milestone in Eliza's life because he is the first one who called her "Mrs.," who treated her as a lady and who has been kind to Eliza most of the time. Actually he is the one who helped Eliza to be a lady and who widened her world-view. Yet Bernard Shaw considers Higgins more important because at those times, a person's speech indicated that person's social class and how he/she was treated. So, Higgins' job becomes much more important in the play as individuality was ignored.

Liza is not the only one who undergoes a change in the play. Her father, Alfred Doolittle also faces big changes in his life. When he appears again in act five, everyone is surprised as he looks like a real gentleman rather than a garbage man. A moral-minded American woman left Alfred a great amount of money because of a joke that Higgins made in one of his letters to her. Alfred is rich now and he is traveling around the country but he is not happy. He accuses Higgins of making his life harder and says: "See here! Do you see this? You done this" (Shaw, 1997:108). He is not happy because when he was a poor man borrowing money from other people, he had nothing to think about but now, with money he feels under pressure. It is clear when he complains about the situation:

Who asked him to make a gentleman of me? I was happy. I was free. I touched pretty nigh everybody for money when I wanted it, same as I touched you, Henry Higgins. Now I am worried; tied neck and heels; and everybody touches me for money.- Same with the doctors: used to shove me out of the hospital before I could hardly stand on my legs, and nothing to pay. Now they finds out that I'm not a healthy man and can't live unless they looks after me twice a day. - I have to

live for others and not for myself: that's middle class morality
(Shaw, 1997:110-111).

Capitalist world and class conflicts are presented through his transformation. Upper class is like a different world for him because he realizes that it is a world of pragmatic relationships due to financial benefits. There is no place for emotions, moral values. As he clearly states, when he was a poor man everybody ignored him but now as he is rich everybody seems to care for him. He knows that they do not respect him; they respect the middle class man that he has become. So, like his daughter, he is not happy to become a new person. Even if he has money and reputation, he knows that people try to make use of his money. He has to behave according to the social rules, he has to hold his reputation to survive, and he has to deal with more people who are not actually respect his identity. He has to live in the frames of society. He even sees his upcoming wedding as a consequence of his middle-class morality. He believes that he is forced to marry because of the social rules.

Because of her current situation, Eliza, like his father, misses her previous life. Even if she had just a basket of flowers, she was happy and most importantly she has her individuality. She feels like a slave in those fine clothes, she accuses Higgins and Pickering of taking independence of her and making her dependent on men.

Liza and Doolittle's unhappiness is clearly portrays the class conflicts. Although they live in the same environment, the gaps between the social classes result in complexities. While working class has no social rights, the bourgeoisie controls everything. Working and upper class have such different lifestyles that when Liza and Doolittle become upper class, they cannot fit their identities into their lifestyle. They become strangers to themselves.

The last scene of the play is important as Eliza and Higgins are alone at home since everyone left for Alfred Doolittle's wedding. So, they are able to talk about their relationship freely as there is nobody to interfere. Higgins wants Eliza to return to house, he confesses that he would miss her if she should not return. But that is not what she wants. Eliza clearly states what she wants from Higgins:

[much troubled] I want a little kindness. I know I'm a common ignorant girl, and you a book-learned gentleman; but I'm not dirt under your feet. What I done [correcting

herself] what I did was not for the dresses and the taxis: I did it because we were pleasant together and I come—came—to care for you; not to want you to make love to me, and not forgetting the difference between us, but more friendly like (Shaw, 1997:129).

She wants to be treated politely but Higgins refuses that as he treats everyone in the same way. So, he does not make a sacrifice. Actually Eliza does not mind his being rude and being ignored by him. She cannot bare the fact that Higgins has no feelings for her. She does not want him to love her; she just wants him to regard her as a human, which Higgins refuses. Eliza wants to hear that he needs and cares for her but although Higgins wants her back, he does not want to pay the price. He does not want to change and most importantly he does not want her as a wife in the house, he wants her to company him and run the house. But on the contrary, Liza believes that she is an independent woman and she does not need him anymore, she is a woman with the power to live freely.

Through Higgins' speech, the role of the woman in that century can be inferred. Higgins believes that if Eliza wants to be a lady, she must learn to be neglected by men. She must not expect any romantic relationship as she imagines. He claims that if she wants something like that she must stay away from him because she does not appreciate what she has, which makes her a 'common idiot' as he believes.

When Eliza tells Higgins that she will marry Freddy and will give phonetics lessons to earn money, not surprisingly, Higgins makes fun of her because he believes Liza is not capable of making her own living without his support. He wonders the reason of her choosing Freddy because he does not take this relationship serious. He says:

Higgins: Can he MAKE anything of you? That's the point.

Liza: Perhaps I could make something of him. But I never thought of us making anything of one another; and you never think of anything else. I only want to be natural (Shaw, 1997:128).

It is clear what Eliza wants in a relationship. Although she does not love Freddy, she believes they can have a natural relationship and Freddy does not try to change her, so she knows that he will not treat her like an object unlike Higgins. The act ends with Higgins' laughter as he finds her idea of marrying Freddy funny. Higgins' reaction also

shows the pragmatic relationships in the 20th century. The most important question for him is whether Freddy could make anything out of her. Being natural does not mean anything to him, which reflects the perspective of bourgeoisie towards human relations. They give value to things and people according to their benefits.

There is a concluding essay at the end of the play in which Shaw explains what happens to the characters at the end of the play. Eliza does not marry Higgins, he marries Freddy. With the financial support of Pickering, Eliza and Freddy opens a florist's shop but because of their inexperience, they have to give up. This concluding essay is also a characteristic of Brechtian Drama. Unlike traditional drama, Shaw does not end his play in a dramatic form. He comments:

The rest of the story need not be shewn in action, and indeed, would hardly need telling if our imaginations were not so enfeebled by their lazy dependence on the ready-mades and reach-me-downs of the ragshop in which Romance keeps its stock of 'happy endings' to misfit all the stories" (Shaw, 1997:133).

As a characteristic of Brechtian Drama, Shaw comments on the characters, their choices and also the spectators. He wants to awaken them to the realities of the society which he portrays in the play. He does not want them to revel in emotions at the end of the play. He thinks spectators are used to be shown the actions till the very end, which makes them 'lazy' to think over the issues. Liza and Higgins have a long conversation in which they express all their feelings and Shaw wants the spectators to come into a conclusion about the situation. That is why he does not want them to daydream about the possibility of a happy-ending and goes on telling the rest by him.

In consequence, Higgins' and Pickering's 'experiment' was successfully finished but Eliza has become a woman far beyond their imagination. Higgins can be likened to Dr. Frankenstein as he sees himself as a creator. He says to Mrs. Higgins:

You have no idea how frightfully interesting it is to take a human being and change her into a quite different human being by creating a new speech for her. It's filling up the deepest gulf that separates class from class and soul from soul (Shaw, 1997:81-82).

He feels that he creates a human being but does not think about what to do with it afterwards. Higgins clearly says that he is "Inventing new Elizas (Shaw, 1997:80)"

but even if Mrs. Higgins and Mrs. Pearce have always asked what would happen to her, he ignores it and when he finishes his work and at last, Eliza becomes an individual woman, which Higgins did not expect from her.

Eliza's transformation reflects the 20th century society. When she was just a flower girl, she did not have a place in the society. No one cared for her but she was happier because she was free and able to make her own decisions. She could live for herself, not for the others. Now, she has to obey the rules of the society and forget her identity. George Gissing points out that:

The London work-girl is rarely capable of raising herself, or being raised, to a place in life above that to which she was born; she cannot learn how to stand and sit and move like a woman bred to refinement, any more than she can fashion her tongue to graceful speech (Gissing, 2009:123).

Eliza was not treated like an individual human being at first because she was just an ordinary girl with bad speech. Her dream of working at a florist's shop was not possible with that speech. So, proper speech was a bridge to reach the upper class and when she learned how to speak and behave properly, she was able to find a place for herself. At this point it must be stressed that those proper behaviours and speech was determined by society. Eliza had to change her soul to earn respect and she had to give up her roots. At the end of the play she has become a stranger to herself. Except Higgins, people respected her, she developed her speech and manners but she was not happy because she was happier when she was a flower girl. Even though she was neglected, she did not have social boundaries, she was integrated with her personality but at the end, she was someone else.

In his preface, Shaw states that: "It is impossible for an Englishman to open his mouth without making some other Englishman hate or despise him" (Shaw, 1997:3). It shows how people of the century classified people according to their usage of language. The way of speech was the most important thing which determined the social class. The differences between the classes are clear. They do not come together, they have different lives. For example; the very beginning of the play shows that it is only nature which is able to make them stay together. As it is raining heavily, they have to wait under a shelter together, no matter from which social class they are.

In conclusion, Shaw successfully points out the characteristics of the society of the century in Pygmalion. Liza's transformation from the cockney-girl into a duchess is an example for class distinctions. Society classifies people according to their appearances and social background. People do not respect Liza at the beginning of the play but when she is transformed, she is treated kindly. The play also shows how social classes were determined by language and the fact that developing speech was the most important way to move up the social ladder. The importance of language is shown through Higgins who is obsessed with people's way of speech. He believes that British people have a divine language and they must speak it properly. He suggests that the more a person speaks English well, the more respect that he deserves. That is why he does not respect Eliza as her accent is not appropriate. He is interested in her speech throughout the play because he knows that only when she is able to speak well, she will be able to find a place in society.

Eliza, represents the people who try to find a place for themselves and the things that they have to give up for this. The role of the women in the century is also discussed. They remained under the pressure of man-ridden society and they are just like tools to make men's lives easier. Men usually do not regard them as freethinkers and they humiliate them. Women have to live for the others; they are not able to shape their identities according to their wishes. But Eliza is an important figure who tries to stand against that pressure. She objects Higgins and his attitudes towards her. She rejects being ignored and leaves Higgins. She chooses to live through her way. Through Higgins, Shaw represents the society and how it classifies people according to their social status and how people treat the others who are not like themselves, who always push people to change, clearly representing the century and the society.

CHAPTER IV: COMPARISON OF PYGMALION AND THE LADY OF PLEASURE

This chapter aims to show the differences and the similarities between the plays Pygmalion and The Lady of Pleasure. The analysis is going to be through class struggles, social oppression and transformation of the main characters. It is argued that class conflict, the rich's attitudes towards the poor and the oppression of society have parallelisms in the two centuries. Actually, as societies affect each other throughout the history, class conflicts are historical facts. Two of the plays are analysed from the perspective of Marxist theory, which considers history as a history of class struggles.

Examined in the second and the third chapters, the pressure upon the lower class is seen both in the 17th and the 20th centuries. The poor ones are not respected by the rich ones and they are their tools. They do the most difficult and tiring jobs and not paid well. They cannot find a place for themselves in the society. The classes are not persistent in both of the plays but moving up the social ladder can only be achieved through money and physical transformation. Moral values are not considered important. The way people dress; talk, live and the money they earn are significant to determine one's social class.

All these issues are pointed out in the two plays. Both of them represent the society of their time. There are various characters from different classes in both plays. They mirror the society of their time.

Especially Higgins and Aretina can be compared in terms of their perspectives on lower class. They reflect the injustice between the classes because throughout the plays they look down on the ones beneath them and do not respect them. Their lifestyle also shows that just the upper class people are able to luxuriate. They have rights to do whatever they want but the poor ones do not have any rights. They are treated as slaves who do everything for them and have to live in frames of society's rules.

Higgins exemplifies the upper classes' point of view towards the lower class in Pygmalion. Throughout the play he does not care for and respect Liza and no matter how Liza tries to change herself, Higgins thinks she is the same girl but with a better speech and appearance. He believes he "created this thing out of the squashed cabbage leaves of Covent Garden" (Shaw, 1997:116). Liza is never a freethinker woman whose ideas should be considered important. He always ignores her efforts in this process.

Although Liza makes great effort, Higgins believes it is his and Pickering's success. According to him, he is "Inventing new Elizas" (Shaw, 1997:81). He feels like a creator who shapes Liza's character. Pickering says: "Anyhow, it was a great success" (Shaw, 1997:94). Liza is just a success for them and they never congratulate her after all is over. She is not significant in their lives as a human being. He does not hesitate to say "She regularly fills our lives up; doesn't she, Pick" (Shaw, 1997:80)? She is just a tool to keep them busy.

Higgins also ignores Liza's father, Doolittle and he always humiliates him as he is an ordinary man. His calling Doolittle "callous rascal" (Shaw, 1997:55) shows what he thinks of him. Doolittle is not a kind person to respect because he does not work and he wants to make profit over his own daughter. Although he is rich at the end of the play, Higgins still believes he is not a man to be considered important.

Comparably, Aretina, in The Lady of Pleasure, treats people like Higgins. As an upper class woman, she does not regard the ones beneath her as important people. She uses them as tools and she humiliates them throughout the play. Her Steward describes her as "a woman with an ungoverned passion" (Shirley, 1934:1580). Her moving to town also shows her ideas about the country people. As she cannot stand their ordinary conversation, she forces her husband to move to the town. Town means upper class and she is able to be with the rich people.

So, Higgins and Aretina are significant characters to reflect the attitudes of the rich people towards the lower class. They are both indifferent to them as human beings and they do not treat them in the way they deserve. They do not hesitate to humiliate them openly and they do not care about their lives. The poor are just tools to do the most difficult jobs for the upper class.

There are also characters like Mrs. Higgins and Mrs. Pearce in Pygmalion and Bornwell in The Lady of Pleasure who have warmer attitudes towards the lower class people. They also humiliate them in some parts of the play but in general they are more polite compared to Higgins and Aretina. Mrs. Pearce and Mrs. Higgins are important in Liza's transformation as they warn Higgins and Pickering about the possible outcomes of their bets on her. Although they feel superior to the others in the society, they do not treat them like Higgins and Pickering. Mrs Higgins criticises them as "You certainly are a pretty pair of babies, playing with your live doll" (Shaw, 1997:81). She sees them as

two small children playing with dolls and shaping her however they want. They do not care what would happen after everything is over. Although Higgins and Pickering consider Liza's transformation as the problem they have, Mrs. Higgins thinks the problem is "the problem of what is to be done with her afterwards" (Shaw, 1997:83). No matter how many times Mrs. Higgins try to warn them about the real problem, Higgins and Pickering think that there is nothing to worry about. Higgins believes Liza is lucky as she is learning what she needs from them, he says: "She can go her own way, with all the advantages I have given her" (Shaw, 1997:83). This shows that he feels superior because he thinks Liza is not capable of achieving something without his teaching.

Mrs. Pearce also helps Liza and sometimes warns Higgins about Liza. She is also aware that he does not care for her feelings and she is also worried about her future like Mrs. Higgins. She is brave enough to stand against Mr. Higgins and Pickering even from the very beginning of their bet. When Mr. Higgins wants her to put her into a bin if she cannot find a place, Mrs. Higgins is worried and says: "You must be reasonable, Mr. Higgins; really you must. You can't walk over everybody like this" (Shaw, 1997:35). Her attitudes show that Mr. Higgins treats everybody in the same way. He does not care for them and considers them as objects. Mrs. Pearce believes that Liza "should think of the future" (Shaw, 1997:39). She is not worried about her transformation process but she questions the outcomes of it. Although Mr. Higgins and Pickering do not consider it as a problem, Mr. Pearce wants them to think over it. She asks "whats to become of her? Is she to be paid anything" (Shaw, 1997:37)? So, she is aware of the danger but she is not able to persuade Higgins and Pickering. According to them, she will have a better life without any problems. However, she keeps asking questions about her title in the house

Will you please keep the point, Mr. Higgins. I want to know on what terms the girl is to be here. Is she to have any wages? And what is to become of her when you've finished your teaching? You must look ahead a little (Shaw, 1997:38).

She is interested in her title in the house and this shows that one's title determines the social class. Also, the value and respect that a person has are related to his/her title.

Holding one's social class is also as important as climbing the social ladder. As the classes are not persistent, the rich always try to hold their status. The more famous they are, the more they are powerful. So, they always show how powerful they are. There are differences in terms of this issue in the two plays. The upper class people in The Lady of Pleasure care about it more than the ones in Pygmalion. Aretina and Celestina mostly show it by their show-offs, luxurious lifestyles and gorgeous parties. They are afraid of losing their fame and do everything in order to preserve their social position. On the contrary, characters like Higgins, Pickering and Mrs. Higgins do not care for the others' opinions. They are confident in themselves and are not afraid of losing their status.

The social pressure upon the weaker ones is the same in both plays. Poor people are ignored, humiliated and they are treated rudely in both of them. Upper class people think that they are superior to the ones beneath them. No matter how they try to find a place for themselves, they are always ignored. Bornwell calls the servants as "drudges" (Shirley, 1934:1615). They are just slaves of the upper class people. Also, the upper class people in Pygmalion do not respect the ones beneath them. The very first scene of the play makes it clear. Liza, as a poor flower girl is ignored by the others. Higgins notes down her different accent and he is rude to her. While talking about her he says: "You see this creature with her kerbstone English: the English that will keep her in the gutter to the end of her days" (Shaw, 1997:21). He classifies people mostly according to their way of speech. So, Liza is never a girl to respect. Although she transforms herself, she is still the same girl for him.

Money determines a person's social class and they have to live through the social rules in both plays. However, upper class people are more under pressure in The Lady of Pleasure. It can be inferred from the characters' lifestyles. People like Higgins, Pickering and Mrs. Higgins are not afraid of losing their fame and status. They believe that they hold the power and are not interested in show-offs as much as the ones in the latter play. However, people like Aretina and Celestina always try to show their wealth and power. They do everything to hold their fame. To exemplify, Higgins treats everyone in the same way, he does not care whether one is a noble or not, he openly expresses his ideas about that person. The conversation makes it clearer:

HIGGINS. About you, not about me. If you come back I shall treat you just as I have always treated you. I can't change my

nature; and I don't intend to change my manners. My manners are exactly the same as Colonel Pickering's.

LIZA. That's not true. He treats a flower girl as if she was a duchess.

HIGGINS. And I treat a duchess as if she was a flower girl

LIZA. The same to everybody (Shaw, 1997:123).

So, he is the same to everybody. He does not care about people's backgrounds. He makes remarks without any fear of being misunderstood.

On the other hand, Aretina treats people according to their classes. She is rude to the ones beneath her but she is polite to the upper class people. It is clear at the very beginning of the play. She moves to the town just to be far away from the country people. She does not respect them and does not care for them. But when she is among the rich people, she is much more polite and elegant.

There is transformation in both plays. It is Liza in Pygmalion and it is Aretina in The Lady of Pleasure who change completely at the end of the plays. Yet, there are some differences. Liza's transformation is both physical and spiritual. Although Higgins and Pickering think that just her appearance has changed, Liza feels that she has become a totally different person both physically and psychologically. She does not lose her moral values through this process but she is more aware of the system and the people around her. She is much more innocent at the beginning of the play but as she has learnt more about the upper class people, she has changed her perspective towards life. Her clothing and lifestyle also change. She goes from lower to upper class. Although she has a better lifestyle, she is not happy because she has become a person who does not fit anywhere. Higgins and Pickering have made a duchess out of her, not an ordinary girl to work at a florists' shop. Liza's confession about the issue is important:

Oh! if I only COULD go back to my flower basket! I should be independent of both you and father and all the world! Why did you take my independence from me? Why did I give it up? I'm a slave now, for all my fine clothes (Shaw, 1997:127).

She confesses that she was happier when she was a flower girl. The reason is that she feels she has become a slave of the society because of this lifestyle. She did not

have to explain anything to anyone in the past but now, she has to live in the frames of the society and its rules. She has to care for her behaviours, clothing and speaking in order not to be ashamed before people. Her complaint also reflects the society of its time. She believes that Pickering and Higgins have taken away her independence. As an upper class person, she feels she is a slave in her fine clothes. It can be inferred that upper class people have to live according to the rules of the society which makes them nothing but modern slaves. They have to live not for themselves but for the others. That is why Liza believes she does not have an identity as she cannot live as she wants; she has given it up, which makes her regretful.

Aretina is transformed psychologically. Her lifestyle and physical appearance are the same but she changes her point of view in terms of moral values and virtues. The common point of Aretina and Liza's transformation is that they both become aware of the pressure of the society upon them. They understand that they ignore their identities and they are slaves of the society.

The difference in their characters is that, Aretina is ignorant of everybody around her; even her husband until the end of the play. She is aware of her power and does not want to lose it. She treats people according to their titles and classes. She ignores the country people and humiliates them. She wants to be more with the town, upper class people in order to hold her social status. Bornwell is able to see her miserable situation and helps her to change her point of view towards people and life. Thanks to her husband, she is able to see the realities of life, the essence of life at the end of the play. She is transformed from a person who always does something for the others into someone who is aware of the importance of virtues.

There are scenes in which Liza and Aretina looks in the mirror in both plays. They are significant because 'mirror' represents their souls. They both see two different women who do not resemble themselves. They face with the reality that the society has changed them into different personalities. Liza looks in the mirror before she leaves Higgins' house and the stage direction is significant at that point:

She makes for the door. Every movement expresses her furious resolution. She takes a last look at herself in the glass. She suddenly puts out her tongue at herself; then leaves the room, switching off the electric light at the door (Shaw, 1997:102).

By looking in the mirror, she actually looks at the girl who has changed from an innocent, pure flower girl into a woman who has to give up her identity in order to be accepted by the upper class. That is why she puts out her tongue at herself; she does not like the woman in the mirror. She wants the old girl back and by switching off the light she might represent her wish of going back to her past life. She does not want to see that woman again.

There is also a scene in which Aretina looks at herself, actually her soul. She is able to see her corrupted soul and she says: "Tis a false glass; sure I am more deformed. What have I done, my soul is miserable" (Shirley, 1934:1620). She has understood that she is the one who is responsible for her situation. She can see the woman who has become a slave of society. She knows that she is not innocent now and she feels miserable.

So, both scenes have a significant point in common. Both Liza and Aretina are able to see the reality. The women they see in the mirror are not their real identities. They are just the women who give up their identities and live through the social rules without questioning. Also, they are both unhappy with those women they see in the mirror and both of them try to find their own identities. Liza does it by leaving the house because she wants to be away from Higgins to be happier. Aretina does it by talking to her husband and expressing her wish of going back to the country in order to have purity and happiness.

Higgins and Bornwell can also be discussed from the point of their contributions to Liza and Aretina's transformation. There is a common point that they both make Liza and Aretina aware of the society's oppression. Thanks to their help, they are able to see how the society has made them ignore their identities. However; there are differences. Higgins considers Liza as a doll and does not care for her feelings. He is just interested in Liza's physical appearance and the way she behaves among other people. The most important difference is that Higgins' transformation makes Liza unhappy. Although she lives under better conditions, she loses her identity and purity in her soul. She thinks "I sold flowers. I didn't sell myself. Now you've made a lady of me I'm not fit to sell anything else" (Shaw, 1997:99). So, she regrets all the process because her situation is the result of class conflicts. The gap between the social classes is so big that she could not adapt herself psychologically. Upper class is like a different world for her and she

could not fit her new identity. Although she was able to behave like them, she did not feel that she was really one of them. When she was a poor girl, she did not have to behave like another person but now society oppresses her and she has to obey the rules of upper class lifestyle, which she thinks she fails at.

On the contrary, Bornwell is interested in Aretina's behaviours and attitudes towards people. He also criticises her expensive clothing and lifestyle. On the other hand, he knows that if Aretina changes her perspective towards life, she will be able to see the realities and will not care appearance that much. He wants her to care for values and human relations in terms of morality. As Aretina treats people according to their titles, Bornwell tries to help her to see her corrupted soul. Aretina is a happier woman at the end of the play because she has understood that she has been a slave in the hands of society. So, Bornwell's contributions in Aretina's transformation make her happier.

The role of women in the two plays can also be discussed. They are always ignored and humiliated in the two plays. Although it seems as if women rule the society, actually it is the opposite. The men in the play always praise Aretina and Celestina. For instance, Littleworth greets Aretina like "The morning rises from your lady's eye; If she look clear, we take the happy omen of a fair day" (Shirley, 1934:1583). She is not respected as a lady, but as an upper class person. Also, Celestina seems that she chooses her own suitor, she decides on her life. However, the two women are under the pressure of society. Although Aretina seems powerful, she is offered to Lord as a 'lady of pleasure'. Celestina is also humiliated because her suitors do not respect them, they consider her as an object for pleasure and although she is able to choose her own suitor, actually she is forced to marry someone by the society. She cannot go on her life by her own decisions.

Women, especially Liza, are also ignored and humiliated in Pygmalion. Unlike in The Lady of Pleasure, it is done openly. Especially through Higgins, the role of women in the 20th century is reflected. As explained before, he does not care for Liza. He openly humiliates her among people. Actually he has problems not with Liza herself but women in general. While talking about women, he comments "they're all idiots" (Shaw, 1997:67). Also Higgins' and Pickering's attitudes towards Liza show how women are unimportant to them. They consider her a "bet" to be won. Mrs Higgins thinks that they "are a pretty pair of babies, playing with your live doll" (Shaw,

1997:81). Liza does not have an identity according to them; they just use her to pass time.

As exemplified above, the social status and title are important for the characters in two plays. However, it is also discussed that it is not what a person considers the self but what others consider him to be. No matter how a person considers himself as noble, they gain value through other people's opinions. The society determines a person's value. That is why the people do something for the sake of other people, not for themselves.

Aretina and Celestina consider themselves as upper class and noble women but they are treated as prostitutes in some parts of the plays. Madame Decoy offers Aretina to Lord as a fancy lady and Lord answers her "what is The Lady of Pleasure you prefer" (Shirley, 1934:1597)? According to Lord, the women are just for pleasure. He does not care for their identities. No matter if they are upper class or not, they are not appreciated or respected.

Celestina is also labelled as a 'widow' throughout the play. There are many suitors for her as she is a widow and she cannot decide about her life. Although she seems like the decisions maker, actually she is forced to do it by the society. She feels the pressure that she cannot go on her life being a widow. She is also humiliated as a widow when Kickshaw praises him. He talks about her beauty and elegancy but the others are surprised when they learn that she is a widow. The following conversation makes it clearer.

Lit: Is she married?

Al: No.

Are: A virgin?

Al: Neither

Lit: What! A widow? Something of this wide commendation might have been excused. This such a prodigy (Shirley, 1934:1584)?

It is clear that Celestina is humiliated because they believe as a widow she should not have been praised that much. They think she is a married or a virgin woman. It is also inferred that married and virgin women are considered more important but

widows are not appreciated much. They should marry in order to be accepted by the society. So, it is not important if Celestina is a rich, elegant woman caring for moral values. Her value is determined by the others. She is just a widow in other people's eyes.

Liza's social status is also determined by others. She cannot make her own decisions and others ignore her identity. After her transformation, she feels much more oppressed because she has to live in social rules. Although she tries to make Higgins understand that she is an independent human being, her value is determined through Higgins' and the society's opinions. She defends herself from the very beginning of the play. She believes "my character is the same to me as any lady's" (Shaw, 1997:18). She does not want to be looked down on just because of being a flower girl but Higgins never respects her and calls her "creature" (Shaw, 1997:21). Her character is not shaped through her identity but through Higgins' perspective. He never regards her as an independent woman.

It is as well the same for Mr. Doolittle. Higgins, representing the society, labels him throughout the play and he also gains his value through his perspective. Although he rises from lower to upper class, he is the same "drunk" and "mad" (Shaw, 1997:109) man. His clothing, new and modern lifestyle is not enough to change Higgins' mind. So, his social status is determined by Higgins.

Likewise, the situations of Aretina, Celestina, Liza and Doolittle show that what a person achieves is never enough to make him choose his social status; he cannot shape or create his own social identity. It is decided by others. A person's identity is formed by others' perspectives. No matter how much he tries, he will be the person that the society considers him to be, not the one he considers himself to be.

Moral values are also discussed in the two plays. They are also determined by the society. Morality is handled through Aretina and Celestina in The Lady of Pleasure. Aretina represents the corruption in the society. She does not care for moral values and human relations. She is only interested in her social status and her luxurious lifestyle. She uses people to make them deal with her jobs without thinking of them. It is clear when she says "I wanted such an engine" (Shirley, 1934:1600) about Decoy. She thinks of using her to be able to close to court and nobility. She ignores her identity and moral

values in order to keep her position in the society and does not hesitate to humiliate the other while doing this.

On the contrary, Celestina tries to live through her own moral values. She struggles to make her own decision in that class-ridden society because she is under the pressure of the social rules. Being a widow is her biggest challenge. She is oppressed to marry someone and her suitors humiliate her, they do not care for her identity. She refuses all her suitors and tries to stand against the rules.

Moral values are also criticised in Pygmalion. Middle class morality is discussed through Doolittle. He goes up to middle class and his life changes. When he was a poor dustman, he has lived through his own way and do not care for others' opinions. However, when he has become a middle class man, everyone has begun to care for him but he knows that it not real. According to him, they care for him not because he is Doolittle but because he has money. That makes him unhappy and he reflects the situation by saying: "I have to live for the others and not for myself; that's middle class morality" (Shaw, 1997:111). This shows that society forces people forget their own identities and live according to its rules. He even considers his marriage as a result of social oppression. He has to be a good model and should have a family according to the society. Even if he does not want it, he has to do it. He says: "Middle class morality claims its victim" (Shaw, 1997:120). He considers himself as a slave in the hands of the society because he is not able to go on his own life by his choices. He has to live for the society not for himself. He accuses Higgins of his unhappiness and the conversation reflects the society and how it changes people's feelings.

Mrs. Higgins: But what has my son done to you, Mr. Doolittle?

Doolittle: Done to me! Ruined me. Destroyed my happiness. Tied me up and delivered me into the hands of middle class morality (Shaw, 1997:109).

This conversation shows that the understanding of morality makes him unhappy. Even if he was poor, he was able to make his own decisions but he feels tied under the rules of middle class morality. This reflects the corruption in the century and how society ruins people. They are forced to give up their identities and obey the rules determined by others.

Therefore; the understanding of morality in the two plays has parallelisms. It is a set of rules which are determined by mostly the rich people and usually it is the poor ones who suffer from the oppression. People generally do not care for moral values and the corruption in the society is criticized in both plays.

Education is also another issue to compare in the two plays. Characters have different points of views towards education. It is praised in Pygmalion but on the contrary it is humiliated and not respected in The Lady of Pleasure.

There is not a direct comment on education and its importance in Pygmalion but it can be inferred that it is respected and in the society people care about it. Higgins and Pickering who are the characters that shape the main woman character of the play are educated people. Higgins is a professor and Pickering is also an educated, well-read person. They are both authors, which also show that they believe in education. They are interested in Liza's appearance also but mostly they try to change her way of speech and to widen her perspective. They take her to theatre and they go to a Shakespeare exhibition. These show that they like cultural activities and it can be indirectly inferred that education is important to them. The reason that Higgins always humiliates Liza and Doolittle is their level of education. He does not respect them. Higgins and Pickering are mostly interested in people's way of speech. Higgins comment on the importance of phonetics when he hears Liza's speech for the first time:

A woman who utters such depressing and disgusting sounds has no right to be anywhere—no right to live. Remember that you are a human being with a soul and the divine gift of articulate speech: that your native language is the language of Shakespear and Milton and The Bible; and dont sit there crooning like a bilious pigeon (Shaw, 1997:20).

He believes that to be respected and accepted by the society one must know his 'divine' language and speak it appropriately. That is why he does not respect Liza as she speaks "kerbstone English" (Shaw, 1997:21). Her speech is not appropriate for the society and she has to improve it in order to work at a better place. So, education is a very important and respected issue in the play.

On the contrary, when it is compared with The Lady of Pleasure, it is clear that education is humiliated through universities and Frederick. Aretina comments on Frederick's appearance when he comes back from the university: "The boy is undone!"

(Shirley, 1934:1589). It clearly shows that according to Aretina, education has ruined him. She is very upset because although his clothing seems nice, it is not fashionable; which means he is not appropriate for the upper class. Her wish of changing him also indicates that she does not respect the university and the things that he has learnt there. She believes she has to erase all the things related with university life and Frederick must again turn to his roots. It is also inferred that the upper class does not believe in education at that time and according to them nobility and education do not have parallelism, unlike in Pygmalion. Aretina even begs Celestina because of Frederick's appearance and 'rude' behaviours. She believes that "the university where they completely corrupted him" (Shirley, 1934:1602). She accuses the University of corrupting him and resulting in these rude behaviours. These all show that education is not considered important, furthermore it corrupts people.

It is seen that there are different point of views about education in the two plays. It is important to find a place in society in Pygmalion but it is the opposite in The Lady of Pleasure, they do not respect universities.

To conclude; the similarities and the differences between the plays Pygmalion and The Lady of Pleasure are analysed in this chapter. It is argued that there is social oppression in both plays. The poor ones are ignored and humiliated by the rich, upper class. They cannot find a place for themselves in the society. If they want to go up to the upper class they have to give up their characters and identities. Liza and Aretina exemplify this as they have to act through the social rules and ignore themselves to be accepted by the society. They are also important characters to reflect the role of the women in the society in their own centuries. Although it seems the opposite in The Lady of Pleasure, women are neglected by men and their characters are ignored. They have to change themselves according to the needs of the society. Most important of all, the 'society' is mostly constructed by the rich, upper class. Although there are various kinds of people with different social backgrounds in the society, it is the upper class by which the rules are set and decided. It can be applied to both of the plays. The rich ones have all the rights to do everything they want and they can use the ones beneath them as tools. They decide on everything. Also, everything is shaped according to society's perspectives. Identities are ignored and people are valued by others' eyes. It is not the person that shapes his own character but the society who shapes it. As exemplified above,

it is the same in both of the plays and this shows that; throughout the centuries the social oppression has never changed and it is the society that makes the human 'being'.

CONCLUSION

This study aims to discuss social oppression and the class struggles as historical facts. Two plays are analysed to reflect the societies. The Lady of Pleasure was written in the 17th and Pygmalion in the 20th century. They are from different centuries to show that social oppression cannot be related to just one century. It is an historical fact.

The plays are analysed through Marxist reading. It regards literature as the product of historical power. Literary works are analysed through their social conditions and century. The life of the author, political and economic relations in the society are all taken into consideration. It is because Marxism suggests that literature reflects the society, so, all the things related to that century are important while analysing the texts. Authors deal with the dominant upper class who rules the society. Also, upper class' attitudes towards the poor are discussed. They do not consider the ones beneath them as free individuals. They believe that they possess them and they have the right to decide on everything about them. Middle and lower class people cannot live through their own choices. They have to obey all the rules which are decided by the upper class if they want to survive. Although they do all the things for the upper class, they are not respected by them.

Pygmalion and The Lady of Pleasure reflect these facts. There are social classes in both of the plays and it is the upper class who dominates the society and the others' lives. They regard themselves as the ruling class and benefit from the ones who are not like themselves. Actually, it is the money who dominates the society, even the upper class. While the poor ones struggle with their hardships in life, the upper class struggle in order not to lose what they have, mainly their fame and social status.

Social classes are not permanent in both plays. There can be shifts from top to down or the opposite. These shifts are possible mostly by having lots of money or losing of wealth. There are also other characters whose social classes change but shifts are exemplified mostly through Aretina, Liza and The Eynsford-Hills Family. Aretina, in The Lady of Pleasure, does not change her social status but she struggles not to lose her fame and wealth, which shows the shifts in social classes. Liza, in Pygmalion, is a good example for people moving up the social ladder. She is a poor flower girl at the beginning but she turns out to be an upper class lady at the end. It is shown through her process that with fashionable, expensive clothing, a good appearance and money can

make the others' respect a person, which leads to corruption in the 20th century. They do not care for people's moral values, just the appearance matters. Liza's speech is the most important thing for her to be accepted as a lady because through her speech people think she is a princess. The way people speak is an important function in the 20th century for people to determine one's social class. The Eynsford-Hills is also significant to show that upper class is not permanent. They exemplify the ones who are rich at first but goes down after losing their wealth. When they lose their fame, they also lose their place in society. So, class shifts and upper class' attitude towards the others are exemplified through the plays.

Women come forefront in both of the plays and class struggles are mostly reflected through them. Aretina and Celestina in The Lady of Pleasure and *Liza* in Pygmalion are important female characters to represent the women of the 17th and the 20th centuries. They are similar characters because they are not able to reveal their characters in the society. They are not regarded as individuals who must be respected for their opinions and personalities. The society tries to shape their character and makes them obey their rules. They are able to work and earn money like men and men do not care for their inner world, ideas and emotions.

Brecht and Stanislavsky's understanding of theatre are also discussed because thanks to their new perspectives, drama has changed its focus and it became more realistic. Rather than traditional theatre, as they suggested, theatre should make spectators see the facts of the century and the society. It should be descriptive rather than a tool for purification. Actors function as teachers who must be careful with their every single act on the stage because spectators should get the right message. They should see that people live in chaos and the society is corrupted. It aims to teach them to find different perspectives for these situations in order to reach a solution.

Finally, this study has shown that no matter which century it is, there is always a ruling, dominant class in the society. It is only the modes of production which determines one's social class and status. Morality does not have any importance to determine a person's human values. Morality is also materialized and the one who is powerful financially, is able to determine all the things in the society. The poor are always humiliated and ignored by the dominant one. They cannot live through their beliefs and perspectives. They must obey the rules in order to find a place for

themselves. It is also shown in this study that women are not respected by men and they are not able to form their personalities through their ideas. So, whether people are powerful or not, their value is determined by the others. Social oppression and class struggles resulting from the oppression make all the people, no matter rich or poor, alienated to themselves and their inner worlds. They have to forget about their real identities, they have social identities which are determined through the others' perspectives. So, all these realities are historical facts. They cannot be associated to a particular century. Although the way sometimes may change, the reason and the results are always the same. Throughout the history, money is the ultimate power and it resulted in social classes and together with the different lifestyles and perspectives, class struggles are obvious and inevitable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Shaw, Bernard. (1997). *Pygmalion: And Related Readings*. Evanston, IL: McDougal Littell.
- Shirley, James. (1934). *The Lady of Pleasure. (Elizabethan and Stuart Plays)*. New York: H. Holt and Company.

Secondary Sources

- Bailey, A. (2002). *First philosophy: Fundamental problems and readings in philosophy*. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press.
- Beckett, S. (1983). *Worstward Ho*. New York: Grove Press.
- Beehler, R. (2006). *The theory, not the theorist: The case of Karl Marx*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Bendel, M. (1996). *Can You Relate?* Boston, MA: Everglory Pub.
- Bentley, E. (1946). *The Playwright as Thinker: A Study of Drama in Modern times*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Berst, C. A. (1973). *Bernard Shaw and the art of drama*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Brabazon, T. (2008). *Thinking popular culture: War, terrorism and writing*. Farnham, England: Ashgate.
- Bressler, C. E. (2007). *Literary criticism: An introduction to theory and practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Busiel, Christopher (1997). "Pygmalion and Shaw's Other Great Works" Drama for Students Vol. 1. Gale Cengage.
- Cohen, A. (1981). *The politics of elite culture: Explorations in the dramaturgy of power in a modern African society*. Univ of California Press.
- Cott, N. F. (2004). *No small courage: A history of women in the United States*. Oxford University Press, USA.

- Daily Life in the 17th Century England. (n.d.). Retrieved October 26, 2015, from <http://www.localhistories.org/stuart.html>
- Daily Life in the 20th Century England. (n.d.). Retrieved October 26, 2015, from <http://www.localhistories.org/stuart.html>
- During, S. (1999). *The Cultural Studies Reader*. Psychology Press.
- Eagleton, T. (2011). *Why Marx Was Right*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Esslin, M. (1984). *Brecht, a Choice of Evils: A Critical Study of the Man, His Work, and His Opinions*. London: Methuen.
- Farganis, S. (1996). *Social reconstruction of the feminine character*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Freeman, Iam, ed. (2014). *Seeds of Revolution: A Collection of Axioms, Passages and Proverbs Volume 2*. Bloomington, IN: IUniverse; World Harvest.
- Gauthier, B. (2009). *Viva Pinter: Harold Pinter's spirit of resistance* (Vol. 30). Peter Lang.
- Gissing, G. (2007). *New grub street*. Broadview Press.
- Henderson, A. (1911). *George Bernard Shaw, His Life and Works*. London: Hurst and Blackett.
- Innes, C. D. (2002). *Modern British Drama: The Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Jones, L. (2012). *Kristen's Rites of Passage*. Place of publication not identified: Jonestown Publishing.
- Lamb, C. (1840). *Rosamund Gray, Essays, &c*. London: Edward Moxon.
- Loewenstein, F. E. (1950). *The Rehearsal Copies of Bernard Shaw's Plays, a Bibliographical Study*. London: Reinhardt & Evans.
- MacCarthy, D. (1951). *Shaw's plays in review*. New York: Thames and Hudson.
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (2008). *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Radford: Wilder Publications.
- McGrath, J. (1966). *James Shirley's Uses of Language*. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 323-339.
- McHugh, D. (2012). *Loverly: The Life and Times of My fair lady*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Mitchell D. O. & Boyd, A., (Eds.). (2012). *Beautiful trouble: a toolbox for revolution*. Or Books.
- _____, J. B. (1990). *A specter is haunting Europe: A sociohistorical approach to the fantastic*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Nason, A. H. (1915). *James Shirley, Dramatist; a Biographical and Critical Study*. New York: B. Blom.
- Patterson, M. (1981). *The Revolution in German Theatre, 1900-1933*. Boston: Routledge & K. Paul.
- Prentki, T., & Preston, S. (2013). *The applied theatre reader*. Routledge.
- Priest, S. (2001). *Jean-Paul Sartre: Basic Writings*. London: Routledge.
- Salama, Mohammad R. "The Aesthetics of 'Pygmalion' in G.B. Shaw and Tawfiq Al-Hakim: A Study of Transcendence and Decadence." *Journal of Arabic Literature* 31.3 (2000): 222-37. Web.
- Sarker, S. K. (1994). *The Rise and Fall of Communism*. Atlantic Publishers & Dist. Sartre, J., &
- Schafer, E. (n.d.). *The City Wit: Critical Introduction*. Retrieved November 12, 2015, from <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/brome/viewOriginal.jsp?play=CW&type=CRIT>
- Sex Discrimination Act 1975. (n.d.). Retrieved October 12, 2015, from <http://www.inbrief.co.uk/discrimination-law/sex-discrimination-act.htm#>
- Shakespeare, W. (2006). *Henry the Fourth, Part One*. Hartford, CT, USA: Yale University Press.
- Shaw, B. (1965). *The Complete Bernard Shaw Prefaces*. London: Paul Hamlyn.
- (1973). *Playwright: Aspects of Shavian Drama*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Singer, I. (2010). *Cinematic mythmaking: Philosophy in film*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Stanislavsky, K. (2013). *Building a Character*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- The Nobel Prize in Literature 1925. (n.d.). Retrieved November 26, 2015, from http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1925/
- Thorndike, A. H. (1975). *English comedy*. Rowman & Littlefield.

- Travers, M. (Ed.). (2001). *European literature from Romanticism to Postmodernism: a reader in aesthetic practice*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Underwood, D. (1957). *Etherege and the Seventeenth-Century Comedy of Manners*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wells, S. (2002). *Shakespeare survey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilde, J. F. (1917). Something about Bernard Shaw. *Neophilologus*, 2(1), 140-144.
- Willett, J. (1959). *The theatre of Bertolt Brecht: a study from eight aspects*. London.
- Willett, J. (1998). *Brecht in context*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

C.V.

Name and Surname : Serap IŞIK

Mother's Name : Mefharet

Father's Name : Azim

Birth of Place and Date : Bornova / 11.04.1990

B.A. : Pamukkale University

Faculty of Letters

Department of English Language and Literature

Graduation Date : 2012

M.A. : Pamukkale University Social Sciences Institution

Western Languages and Literatures

Department of English Language and Literature