

---

## The Characterization of Andrew Undershaft in Bernard Shaw's Major Barbara: A Cognitive Stylistic Approach

Ghada Muhammad Ahmad Nouby<sup>1</sup>  
MA Candidate in Linguistics, Department of English,  
Helwan University, Egypt.  
Corresponding email: ghada\_ahmed@arts.helwan.edu.eg

Nahwat Amin Al Arousy<sup>2</sup>  
Professor of Linguistics,  
Department of English,  
Helwan University, Egypt.

Mona Eid Saad<sup>3</sup>  
Lecturer of Linguistics,  
Department of English,  
Helwan University, Egypt.

---

### ARTICLE DATA

**Received:** 10 January 2022  
**Accepted:** 28 Feb. 2022  
**Volume:** 2  
**Issue:** Winter 2022  
**DOI:** 10.54848/bjtll.v2i1.17

---

### KEYWORDS

stylistics, characterization,  
cognitive approach, Major  
Barbara, Bernard Shaw,  
impression formation

---

### ABSTRACT

Characterization is a compelling way that enables authors to express their views and convey their messages indirectly through the characters they create as well as the way they create them. This paper presents a stylistic analysis of the characterization of Andrew Undershaft in Bernard Shaw's Major Barbara from a cognitive approach. The study attempts to examine how Shaw voices his view about morality, religion, and power, and the conflict that might arise among these if one has to choose one over the other(s), as represented by the main character, Andrew Undershaft, a wealthy manufacturer of weapons, who symbolizes the power emanating from the possession of both money and arms, and the titular Barbara, who symbolizes the religious power represented in a religious organization, the Salvation Army. The aim of the study is to show how Bernard Shaw's characterization of the protagonist succeeds in voicing his own opinions as to true morality. The study also aims to examine how the reader's impression is gradually formed about the character in question. The theoretical framework for the study is based on Culpeper's cognitive model of characterization in play texts, and employs the tools of categorization, impression formation, the explicit cues of self-presentation and other-presentation, the implicit cues of a character's company and setting, the authorial cue of stage directions, and the speech act theory. The study concludes that through his vivid portrayal of the protagonist and the reader's gradually formed impression about him, Shaw adroitly succeeds in conveying his vision.<sup>1</sup>

---

### 1. Introduction

When it comes to conveying an authorial message through a piece of literature, characterization emerges as a key, handy instrument at the author's disposal. Be it a play text, a novel, or a short story, the way in which characters are portrayed serves a crucial function in using them as a medium to deliver the intended message(s). For that reason, characters in general, and protagonists in particular are often considered to be reflecting their creators' visions and voicing their opinions. How successful authors manage to express their views before the readership through their fictional characters is, to a great extent, decided upon

---

<sup>1</sup> This study is part of an unpublished MA dissertation.

the reader's impression about those characters and understanding of the implied meanings articulated through the propositions expressed by and the dialogues exchanged between the characters in a fictional world.

This does not suggest, however, that readers have no role to play, for "the role of the reader is that of an interpreter, not a mere passive recipient" (Black, 2006, p. 2). Such 'interpretation', as Black puts it, "involves an important contribution from the reader, who brings along background knowledge and processes for inferring meaning" (Short, 1996, p. xi). Consequently, the interpretation of a text differs from one reader to another, partly because readers exert a cognitive effort with varying degrees, and partly based on the extent to which their background knowledge relates to the text at hand. In fact, it is hardly imaginable that one would read a work of literature without 'interpreting' the characters one reads about and even interacts with at times, for "whilst fictional characters have a passive existence in texts or in people's minds, it is only in the interaction between texts and minds that they attain actual existence" (Culpeper & McIntyre, 2010, p. 176).

Studying the readers' interaction with literary texts, a process that entails using their mental resources and working their minds throughout the reading process; interpreting what they read and forming impressions, falls within the scope of cognitive stylistics, a sub-branch of stylistics that is concerned with cognition and the mind. The term 'cognitive', Freeman (2014) notes, refers conventionally to the conceptual process of human mind, which is based on distinguishing between what is true and what is not, and thinking rationally of things. Yet, with the prominence of cognitive science and cognitive psychology, "conceptual reasoning itself can be seen to be both motivated and affected by processes and phenomena that include bodily sensations, emotions, feelings, memory, attention, imagery, metaphor, and analogous thinking" (p. 313). The major concern of cognitive stylistics, Jeffries (2010) remarks, is formulating hypotheses on what happens when we read and how this affects our interpretations about the texts we read. She continues to point out that cognitive stylistics "has drawn considerable influence from work in areas such as cognitive science generally, psychology, computing and artificial intelligence" (p. 126).

In this vein, the present study adopts Culpeper's cognitive model of characterization (2001, 2002) in order to analyze the characterization of Andrew Undershaft, the central character in Bernard Shaw's *Major Barbara*. Culpeper introduces "a cognitive linguistic model of characterisation that can be applied in the analysis of a diverse range of characters" (2002, p. 252). He adopts an approach towards characterization that is middle ground between two extreme approaches, the humanizing approach, whose upholders argue that characters represent or imitate real people, or more radically that characters are in fact real people, and the dehumanizing approach, whose advocates believe, in stark contrast to the humanists, that characters only "have a purely textual existence". Culpeper's proposed model intermingles these two opposing views, for on the one hand, one has to "admit that characters result from our interpretations of texts", and "on the other hand, the extreme humanizing view that characters are actually real people, is, of course, naïve" (pp. 255-256).

In the same vein, "[c]haracterization essentially involves the manifestation of inner states, desires, motives, intentions, beliefs, through action, including speech acts" (Downes, 1988, p. 226). It follows then that the analysis of a character's speech acts can be a useful mechanism in probing that character. Therefore, the current study also employs Austin's speech act theory in analysing the protagonist's speech acts, particularly those of self-presentation.

## 2. Questions of the Study

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. How is Andrew Undershaft delineated in Shaw's *Major Barbara*?
2. What is the Shavian vision embodied by this delineation?
3. How do the power relations make such vision prominent?

### 3. Theoretical Background

#### 3.1 Culpeper's Model of Characterization

The crux of Culpeper's model (2001, 2002) is the argument that "characters arise as a result of a complex interaction between the incoming textual information on the one hand and the contents of our heads on the other" (2002, p. 251), which therefore requires a characterization analysis that considers both cognitive and textual aspects. The model is concerned with how impressions about fictional characters are formed in the mind of the reader and focuses specifically on characters in drama, as "play characters are not typically filtered through narrators" (2002, p. 252), and is built on van Dijk and Kintsch's (1983) cognitive model that can be used in studying social interaction, drawing on a number of theories from pragmatics, cognitive psychology, social psychology, and stylistics. Culpeper observes that in order to understand anything in the world, one employs two sources of information: the external "stimuli", i.e., raw text, and "prior knowledge", both of which are employed to arrive at an interpretation.

The reader in van Dijk and Kintsch's (1983) model is an 'active comprehender', who is able to use mental resources with varying degrees at different levels of representation, which, according to the model, are three: the surface or verbatim representation, text representation and situation model. The surface representation is a reflection of the surface structure of the text; the text representation is the propositional content of the text. The situation model is the level where the new information retrieved from the other two levels is integrated with one's own old information obtained from memory.

In Culpeper's model, comprehension is a twofold process that combines top-down processes and bottom-up processes. The former is stimulated by prior knowledge, and the latter by textual elements. Comprehension is cyclic; what one sees influences what one knows and the other way round. The entire comprehension process is governed by the Control System, which "regulates the level of processing required and the degree of coherence, according to (in particular) the goals of the reader" (Culpeper, 2002, p. 270).

#### 3.1.1 Prior Knowledge

When reading for character, the reader activates a subset of prior knowledge in the long-term memory that contains information relevant to the understanding of character. The reader then assigns the character into a certain class/category that possesses certain attributes, based on both what the text provides as to the character (e.g., what the character says) and the information already in the reader's mind.

##### 3.1.1.1 Schema Theory

The most notable theory on the activation of prior knowledge is schema theory. As readers read and interpret a text, they bring along their own schemata, but because these schemata "may not be identical with those of other people, this is one of the ways in which we can see that both shared meaning and different meanings might be extractable from the same text" (Short, 1996, p. 231). Schemata are generally presumed to be extracted or triggered by the experiences we undergo, which are episodes of the episodic memory. Stockwell (2002) notes that "one of the key factors in the appeal of schema theory is that it sees these knowledge structures as dynamic and experientially developing" (p. 79). The importance of schema theory as to characterization is that "[f]irst impressions of characters are guided by schemata, which, once activated, offer a scaffolding for incoming character information" (Culpeper, 2002, p. 262).

##### 3.1.1.2 Categorization and Prototypes

Once a certain schema is activated in one's mind about a character, one attempts to place the character into a proper class or category. Classification is an act that one performs almost on a daily basis. The mental process of classification "is commonly

called **categorization**, and its product are the **cognitive categories**, e.g. the colour categories RED, YELLOW, GREEN and BLUE, etc.” (Ungerer & Schmid, 2006, p. 8, emphasis in original). The best examples of categories “are typically referred to as the **prototypes** or **prototypical members** of the category” (Croft & Cruse, 2004, p. 77, emphasis in original).

Categorization of people and characters, in particular, is sensitive to context and function, and the context itself is not stable and thus needs also to be interpreted. The classical model of categorization suggests that it is possible to define categories in terms of a group of necessary and sufficient features, but it has many flaws, which prompted proposing new theories, notable among which is prototype theory that by and large concerns single categories or simple hierarchies of categories, and the process invoked when applying category or concept labels to the phenomena one experiences.

With respect to categorization of characters, Culpeper (2001) holds that people often see others as members in social groups, rather than individuals. These groups presumably form the basis for the cognitive categories perceived to have structures similar to prototypes. He suggests three main groupings, based on the information that constitutes these groups: personal categories, which include information about people’s traits; preferences; interests, etc., social role categories, which include knowledge about the social functions of people, such as kinship roles; occupational roles; and relational roles, and group membership categories, which include knowledge about social groups, such as class, age, sex, religion, etc.

### 3.1.1.3 Attribution Theories

Placing a person/ character into a certain group prompts one to “make inferences about that person or character”, and arrive at the reason why that character behaves in a certain way. Whether in real life or in fiction, “the causes of a person’s actions have to be inferred from observable behaviours, including conversational behaviour” (Culpeper, 2001, p. 115), a process referred to in social psychology as “attribution”. Culpeper refers to two classical theories in the literature: the **correspondent inference** theory and the **covariation** theory. The basis of the correspondent inference theory is attempting to identify the circumstances that help draw inferences based on a degree of correspondence between an individual’s behavior and their disposition, hence the name. As one makes a correspondent inference, one can transfer one’s description of a person’s behavior to their description of that person’s disposition. Thus, an aggressive behavior, for example, is arising out of an aggressive disposition. There are key factors to consider when making a correspondent inference as to the observed person: intentionality, absence of external pressures, causal ambiguity, and unusual behaviors that do not fit the expectancies of the perceiver.

Along similar lines, Kelley’s Covariation theory, Culpeper (2001, pp. 126-28) explains, is based on deciding whether the cause of a person’s behavior is located in the person or in the environment. This results in three possible attributions: a *person* attribution, a *stimulus* attribution or a *circumstance* attribution. The ‘covariation’ of cause and effect, according to the theory, helps us determine where to make the attribution. Variation can be assessed through three basic dimensions: *distinctiveness*, *consistency* and *consensus*. Distinctiveness is to what extent the target person reacts distinctively to different stimuli. Consistency is to what extent the target person reacts to the same stimulus in the same way at different times and in different situations. Consensus is to what extent other persons react similarly to this stimulus. Hence, reacting with low distinctiveness, high consistency and low consensus means that the attribution is a person attribution, and this is the attribution type relevant to characterization.

### 3.1.2 Textual Cues

The second part of character comprehension is the bottom-up processes, which rely on using the new information gained from a text through the textual cues. Culpeper (2001, pp. 167-231) divides textual cues into three types: explicit cues, implicit cues and authorial cues. Explicit cues are those where we can find characters presenting themselves or presenting others explicitly by making statements about themselves (i.e., self-presentation) or about other characters (other-presentation). It should be noted one

needs to be cautious about the credibility of the presenting characters and the validity of what they present, as we tend to take what others say at face value and underestimate the contextual factors.

Implicit cues are those cues in which we need to infer character information from linguistic behavior. There are many examples of implicit cues, including lexis, social markers (e.g., terms of address), accent and dialect, visual features (e.g., facial expression), appearance features, and character company and setting. Authorial cues are those in which information about a character is given directly by the author, which includes stage directions in plays or narrative descriptions in novels. Authorial cues are described as ‘authorial’, since characters have no power of choice over them, and are rather more closely associated with the author.

### 3.2 The Speech Act Theory

Austin’s (1962) Speech Act (SA) theory suggests that our interactions are not mere words uttered and accompanied by sounds but acts being performed through utterances and driven by an illocutionary force, which could be one of asking, commanding, naming etc. Austin’s theory was based on the ‘performative hypothesis’, i.e., utterances that perform actions and contain performative verbs. The interpretation of an SA depends mainly on the context. Therefore, the change of the circumstances in which an utterance is made affects the communicative meaning intended by the speaker and its recognition by the hearer. SAs are understood in three senses: the locutionary act (the act of saying something), the illocutionary act (the act performed by saying something, such as ordering, threatening etc.), and the perlocutionary act (the consequential effects of the illocution on the hearer). The current study adopts Searle’s (1969, 1979) classification of SAs into: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations in analyzing Undershaft’s SAs.

## 4. Literature Review

Studying the dialogical relationship between author and character, Abou El Hassan (1999) makes a comparative study of five of Shaw’s plays and five by Tawfik Al-Hakim. Through the analysis of the selected plays of the two playwrights in comparison to each other, the study attempts to conclude whether a character’s behavior always expresses the writer’s intention. He writes that “[t]he character should be himself. Although he is motivated by the author’s intention, what should appear on the scene is the character not the author” (p. 12). For *Major Barbara*, the object of the study, however, is not Undershaft, but Barbara. The researcher analyzes Barbara’s character to see if her conversion from the Army cause to her father’s is plausible. According to him, Barbara’s speeches tinged her character with the imprint of a preacher, through her utterances, eloquent speeches, and lengthy turns. What Abou El Hassan holds is that the character is not necessarily a voice of its creator, and in the case of *Major Barbara*, Undershaft does not necessarily echo the Shavian moral values.

Berg (1998) states that Shaw’s plays are generally dominated by the ‘triangle’ structure, which allows the Nobel laureate to introduce his views in a manner that is both entertaining and educational. Baker (2011) espouses this account, noting that “[o]ne of Shaw’s favorite devices is a triad of characters representing a range of approaches to a particular ethical or social problem” (p. 92). For *Major Barbara*, Barbara Undershaft, Adolphus Cusins, and Andrew Undershaft constitute the three sides of this triangle. Further, it is Undershaft, not the eponymous Barbara, who emerges as the central character of the play, and has attracted the attention of most critics, being a representation and a symbol of the Shavian vision and philosophy. Baker also comments that the play has several digressions and extraneous details, but remains coherent nevertheless, and that the purpose of the play is ‘to show us the path to heaven’, which might not be visible to idealist eyes. The play, he illustrates, means to show ‘the spiritual and moral contest between father and daughter’, each of whom symbolizes an ideological camp. Yet, Baker argues that what appears as a father-daughter conflict is not real, for they are two obverses of the same coin; he writes that:

they are ... two manifestations of the same spirit. The apparent conflict between the two is a misunderstanding, the result of Barbara's youth and inexperience. In this parable, Barbara stands for religion, spirit, and morality; her father for matter, wealth, and destructive power. (Baker, 2011, p. 101)

The real conflict in *Major Barbara*, Baker (2011) continues to contend, is not between Barbara and Andrew Undershaft, but between realism and idealism.

*Major Barbara* is the subject of a linguistic study by Abdul Qadir and Jum'a (2018), in which they employ Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) to examine how humor is effected in the play through analyzing the instances where the CP maxims are not observed in all the humorous conversations, identifying the forms of humor, and specifying the maxims broken with the aim of creating a humorous effect. The study adopts a quantitative methodology based on calculating the number of instances where any CP maxim is non-observed, and selecting the type of humor created accordingly. A qualitative analysis is also conducted in order to "view how the humorous conversations break the basic rules [that] should be obeyed in frank conversations" (p. 48).

The statistical findings of the study show that the total number of non-observance instances is 229, distributed differently throughout the play between major and minor characters. Moreover, all the four CP maxims are non-observed, and all forms of the non-observance (flouting, violating, opting-out, infringing and suspending) are in use. Nevertheless, the maxim of Quantity is the most non-observed maxim (104 instances), and the maxim of Manner is the second non-observed one (86 instances), whereas the Quality maxim is the least non-observed, due to reasons related to the snobbery of some of the Undershafts. In terms of humor, Abdul Qadir and Jum'a note that all forms of humor are at work in the play with varying proportions. For example, wit is the most prevailing form representing 56.768%, followed by irony, satire and lastly pun. They remark that besides using all forms of humor, "[b]oth intentional and unintentional humour are found in the play throughout the analysis of data" (p. 56). Moreover, employing the Gricean principle in the analysis provides a new interpretation of the play, and breaking the CP maxims in the play is one of the mechanisms employed to create humor.

## 5. The Characterization of Andrew Undershaft

### 5.1 Initial Observations

One of Shaw's most controversial characters, Andrew Undershaft emerges on the whole as a powerful character, whose power comes as a product of the dangerous nature of his profession as a manufacturer and merchant of arms, who, along with his partner Lazarus "positively have Europe under their thumbs" (1907/2003, p. 76). Undershaft's unparalleled power is epitomized not only by defeating Barbara in the bargain they make, which ends with her converting to his cause, but through his success in reaching all the goals he strives for throughout the play. However, Undershaft's power is not the problem; it is the controversy surrounding his (im)morality'. For the most part, a maker of weapons, Undershaft is seen as a man of no morals in the eyes of almost all the other characters, which is generally consistent with the category-based schema about armorers, given that they make a living basically through a *métier* linked to death and destruction. Indeed, Undershaft's self-presentation does not help alter this schema, if not firming it up. However, Undershaft's revealing of the motivation for taking that perilous course near the end of the play relatively changes this schema, edging it towards a more personal category schema.

It is important to note that while the play was published and performed almost a century and a quarter ago, the issues it raises (as to morality, the role of religious organizations, and/or poverty as a societal issue) remain generally valid for today's audience and readership, though the details may change. Undershaft is an arm maker, and it does not make a real difference whether an arm maker is making a medieval spear, a twentieth century grenade, or a ballistic missile. After all, it is not about the type of weapon used in war, but the consequences that that weapon brings about. Undershaft represents the power and wealth gained

from war, Barbara represents religion, the Salvation Army represents religious organizations or charities, and Cusins represents idealism. All of these are established facts that might have changed in details but continue to exist as part of any age. Hence, the study attempts to analyze the impression formed about Undershaft from both the present-day reader's perspective and the reader's perspective at Shaw's time.

## 5.2 First Impression and Initial Categorization

### 5.2.1 Characterization Through Other Presentation

Explicit cues in *Major Barbara*, particularly the other presentation, give the first glimpses about Andrew Undershaft, and whether reliable or not, readers have to take, though with caution, the information given about him through others, so that they could form an initial impression. The first scene of the play witnesses a conversation between Lady Britomart and Stephen, which makes a major contribution to providing the reader with basic pieces of information about the central character, though sifted through how Undershaft's estranged wife, son, and almost everyone else look at him. When Undershaft is referred to for the first time, Stephen stops speaking and cannot make an explicit reference to his father:

**STEPHEN** [troubled] I have thought sometimes that perhaps I ought; but really, mother, I know so little about them; and what I do know is so painful—it is so impossible to mention some things to you—[he stops, ashamed].

**LADY BRITOMART.** I suppose you mean your father. (p.72)

By 'things', Stephen means his father, an allusion which Lady Britomart grasps and articulates in the next turn. Stephen's inability to make a direct reference to his father raises a question about why a mere explicit reference stirs that obvious hesitance. Moreover, the use of 'ashamed' coupled with the aforementioned implicit reference and followed by Stephen's 'almost inaudible' response to his mother signifies that the father-son relationship is a strained one. From this dialogue, one learns a number of basic facts about the character. First, none of the family mentions Undershaft, as shown by Lady Britomart's declaration: "We can't go on all our lives not mentioning him". Furthermore, the reader knows that Lady Britomart was married to Undershaft and shares with him three children: Stephen, Sarah and Barbara. Barbara is engaged to Adolphus Cusins, an impecunious Greek professor, and Sarah to Charles Lomax, who is expected to inherit a large fortune but not soon. The reader also learns that Barbara is a member in the Salvation Army, an act that does not seem favorable to Lady Britomart, who did not expect or agree with this from her most promising child.

Additional bits and pieces about Undershaft are revealed, including the reason why Lady Britomart mentioned him in the first place, that is, asking him to provide for Barbara and Sarah after their marriage. Most significantly, the reader knows that Lady Britomart and Undershaft have been separated for years, and that his role in his family is limited to providing for the family all those years, a fact that comes as a shock to Stephen. The shocking impact itself indicates that Stephen is averse to be supported by his father, another sign of a troubled relationship. In response, Lady Britomart explains that her own father could only secure them a high status, but it is absurd for him to provide for the children of a man 'rolling in money', who "must be fabulously wealthy, because there is always a war going on somewhere" (1907/2003, p. 75). Attributing the reason behind his wealth to wars never stopping somewhere or another in the world instantly eggs on the reader to establish a link between war and the man's wealth, particularly that 'war' often brings to one's mind such schematic elements as death, devastation, displacement and many other sinister thoughts. Stephen's response lets the reader know that Undershaft, whose his name and weapons frequently make headlines in nearly every newspaper, is notorious for making arms, and there seems to be a publicly shared view that he is a 'death dealer', along with his partner, Lazarus. Stephen's indignation against his father's business is reflected in his complaining from being always subject to fawning of others only because of his father's wealth, which he created by selling cannons, and

shows a high consensus on Undershaft's image as a powerful man who is deferred, rather than respected, by many. Here, one can assign Undershaft into the social category of 'an arm merchant and manufacturer'.

The first allusion to Undershaft's power is when Lady Britomart asserts that his power is not only limited to his business, but extends to other domains, and is even exercised over statesmen and prominent figures, none of whom dared to challenge him.

**LADY BRITOMART.** ...Do you think Bismarck or Gladstone or Disraeli could have openly defied every social and moral obligation all their lives as your father has? They simply wouldn't have dared. I asked Gladstone to take it up. I asked The Times to take it up. I asked the Lord Chamberlain to take it up. But it was just like asking them to declare war on the Sultan. They WOULDN'T. They said they couldn't touch him. I believe they were afraid. (p.77)

Another critical piece of information is revealed; Undershaft is born out of wedlock, yet this is not why he and Lady Britomart separated, for she admits that this was known to her. They took different paths because of their 'moral' disagreement: "[Y]ou know the Undershaft motto: Unashamed. Everybody knew" (1907/2003, p. 77). Using 'unashamed' as a motto provides a significant trait about Undershaft's character; he is a man who has no regrets whatsoever about his acts. It is little wonder then that he puts the tradition of his ancestors, namely, leaving the foundry to a foundling rather than his own son, before anything else, though such a tradition may be unreasonable and unfavorable to Stephen, something that Lady Britomart could not accept.

Lady Britomart reinforces the impression she has already created about Undershaft's power, as she recounts a confrontation between Undershaft and her father, where Undershaft compared the Undershaft establishment to the Roman Empire and the Undershafts to the Antonines. This is an interesting analogy indicating that Undershaft is overconfident in his and his ancestors' power and capacity. Lady Britomart discloses another side of Undershaft's character, which is his cleverness and irrefutability when it comes to wickedness, and awkwardness and sullenness when it comes to sensibility and decency. He is an immoral man, as she puts it, who does not feel ashamed by owning so and by practicing immorality openly, but he is attractive, though partly. Lady Britomart is averse to saying so directly, and for that reason, she opts to put it as "I did not dislike him myself" instead of "I liked him myself".

The exchange between Lady Britomart and Stephen can help the reader arrive at a set of schematic elements and place Undershaft into certain categories that sum up the first impression gained about him. Furthermore, judging by Lady Britomart's age, who is described in the stage directions as a woman of fifty or so, one can guess that Undershaft is also fifty- or sixty-something. As to his goals, Undershaft's goal, as could be understood from Lady Britomart, is to disinherit his own son and bequeath the firm to a foundling in observance of his ancestors' tradition. This initial impression is refined with Undershaft's self-presentation and the author's cues (i.e., stage directions).

### 5.2.2 Stage Directions and Self-Presenting Acts

*Major Barbara* is an obvious example that Bernard Shaw's plays "contain such lengthy opening stage directions that they begin to look distinctly novel-like" (Culpeper, 2001, p. 231). The stage directions in the play give a vivid description of Undershaft when he appears on stage, which completes the missing information about his physical appearance and some of his character traits. Undershaft's first appearance when he comes to visit the family in response to Lady Britomart's invitation is preceded with the following description:

*Andrew is, on the surface, a stoutish, easygoing elderly man, with kindly patient manners, and an engaging simplicity of character. But he has a watchful, deliberate, waiting, listening face, and formidable reserves of power, both bodily and mental, in his capacious chest and long head. His gentleness is partly that of a strong*



*man who has learnt by experience that his natural grip hurts ordinary people unless he handles them very carefully, and partly the mellowness of age and success. He is also a little shy in his present very delicate situation. (p.92)*

The authorial description is particularly important, as the first impression was obtained from other characters, whose portrayal might or might not be credible enough. Undershaft is described as stoutish, which suggests social power. His easy-going nature, kindly patient manners and the engaging simplicity of character may partly account for his attractiveness, referred to before by Lady Britomart, and might also be attributed to his capacity for attention to others, as embodied by the “watchful, deliberate, waiting, listening face”. Undershaft’s power, referred to before, is now asserted by the authorial cue stating explicitly that the man possesses “formidable reserves of power, both bodily and mental” and a “natural grip that hurts”.

Undershaft is not generally shy; one cannot add this to his character traits, but he is shy amid the current circumstances. Why his current situation is ‘very delicate’ is presumably understood, given that no contact has been made between him and his children for years, something that becomes quite clear when Undershaft does not remember the exact number of his children or cannot recognize his own son in the three young men before him, causing a state of confusion that only ends when Cusins explains to him the identity of everyone in the room. Explaining the difficulty of his situation, Undershaft admits that for his family, he is a stranger: “My difficulty is that if I play the part of a father, I shall produce the effect of an intrusive stranger; and if I play the part of a discreet stranger, I may appear a callous father” (1907/2003, p. 95). Hence, he is relieved when Lady Britomart asks him to act naturally, to which he responds by asking “what can I do for you all?”, a direct question indicating that he has no time to waste or that he was not in the first place interested in coming if it were not for Lady Britomart’s invitation.

Undershaft’s self-presentation can be looked into through his SAs. The play is replete with self-presenting acts, notably assertives. For example, when Lady Britomart reprimands Barbara for an unladylike behavior, Undershaft assures her that: “I am not a gentleman; and I was never educated”. Therefore, though the authorial cues describe him as a ‘gentle’ man, according to his own reference to himself, he is not a ‘gentleman’. This also places him in the ‘uneducated’ group. A few turns later, Undershaft declares that “I am particularly fond of music”, which adds another quality to the classification of interests. The meaning of Undershaft’s motto ‘unashamed’ manifests itself when he tells them frankly that he used to earn pennies and shillings in his youth by dancing in the streets; he is a self-made man who led a hard life. The fact that he is now the man who has Europe under his thumb demonstrates that he also possesses gritty determination.

Lomax regards the cannon business as an act that defies religion, and an act only committed by people who are ‘downright immoral’. Lomax is therefore hinting that Undershaft is immoral, which, along with Barbara’s reference to him within the same conversation as a sinner, nearly synonymous with immoral in this context, makes up a relatively high consensus on his immorality. In fact, Undershaft does not seem to exert any effort to refute the dominant idea about him, self-presenting as a ‘manufacturer of mutilation and murder’. Boasting that his foundry succeeded in making a gun, which used to kill only thirteen, capable of taking the lives of twenty-seven, i.e., double the number, Undershaft is setting another goal: business prosperity. Furthermore, many of Undershaft’s remarkably lengthy propositions are comprised of a succession of SAs in a single proposition, constituting what Short (1996) refers to as an ‘overarching macro speech act’. To exemplify, when Undershaft responds to Lomax’s attempt at finding an excuse for his aforementioned bragging, his response includes 9 direct acts that make up one macro SA, analyzed as below:

**UNDERSHAFT.** Not at all. The more destructive war becomes the more fascinating we find it. No, Mr Lomax, I am obliged to you for making the usual excuse for my trade; but I am not ashamed of it. I am not one of those men who keep their morals and their business in watertight compartments. All the spare money my trade rivals spend on hospitals,

cathedrals and other receptacles for conscience money, I devote to experiments and researches in improved methods of destroying life and property. I have always done so; and I always shall. Therefore your Christmas card moralities of peace on earth and goodwill among men are of no use to me. Your Christianity, which enjoins you to resist not evil, and to turn the other cheek, would make me a bankrupt. My morality—my religion—must have a place for cannons and torpedoes in it. (pp.99-100)

**Table 1**

*Example 1 of Undershaft’s Self-presenting SAs*

Locution	Illocutionary Act	Classification
The more destructive war becomes the more fascinating we find it.	Expressing belief	Assertive
I am obliged to you for making the usual excuse for my trade;	Thanking	Expressive
I am not ashamed of it.	Stating/declaring	Assertive
I am not one of those men...in watertight compartments.	Self-presenting	Assertive
All the spare money...destroying life and property.	Stating/declaring	Assertive
I have always done so; and I always shall.	Pledging	Commissive
your Christmas card...of no use to me.	Stating/declaring	Assertive
Your Christianity...make me a bankrupt.	Stating/declaring	Assertive
My morality...torpedoes in it.	Declaring	Assertive

With 9 individual acts comprising one macro SA, Undershaft is presenting himself as one who practices what he preaches, be it moral or immoral. The propositional content of this declaration makes it plain that he is quite candid about his doctrine, prioritizing business over religion and war over peace, as is made clear by his reference to the biblical saying ‘turn the other cheek’, which urges people to follow a nonviolent course.

Undershaft shows interest in the Salvation Army the instant he knows that Barbara is a Major there. His direct assertive of “I am rather interested in the Salvation Army” marks the first indication of this interest, and is emphasized by a directive act of asking: “May I ask have you ever saved a maker of cannons?” Together, the assertive statement and the directive question might lead the reader to think that Undershaft considers joining the Army, but soon this proves wrong when the instrumental event that sets the play in motion and sets a new goal for Undershaft unfolds. It is the deal that he makes with Barbara by promising to go visit her in the Army if she will visit him in his foundry afterwards, with each of them confident in drawing the other into his/her camp. The sword sign marking the way to the Undershafts’ foundry is the perfect example of his philosophy, whilst the directive act of ‘directing’ Barbara to “ask anybody in Europe” about Perivale St Andrews signifies his over-confidence in his capacity and the limits of his power.

At this point of the play, some of Undershaft’s traits remain dubious, including, but not limited to, his claimed immorality, despite his reference to himself as a “manufacturer of mutilation and murder”. Barbara, who speaks on behalf of an acclaimed religious organization, the Salvation Army, challenged her father to convert him, and he challenged her to do the same. Thus, the party who succeeds in winning the battle of ideologies, that is to say, manages to reach his/her goal, will prove that the entity he or she represents is the more powerful. As such, based on both other-presentation and self-presentation of Undershaft, his schematic elements can be summed up as follows:

**Table 2***First Impression and Initial Categorization of Undershaft*

	Habit	Clever and unanswerable when defending wickedness, awkward and sullen when it comes to sensibility and decency
	Interests	Music
Personal	Goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grow the business</li> <li>• Pick up a foundling to inherit the firm</li> <li>• Convert Barbara into his cause</li> </ul>
	Trait	Candid, unashamed, fabulously wealthy, powerful, above the law, overconfident, immoral, very attractive, gentle, patient, easy-going, self-made, successful businessman, practical
Social Role	Kinship	Father of Barbara, Stephen, and Sarah
	Occupational	Arm merchant and manufacturer
Group membership	Age	Fifty or sixty-something
	Sex	Male
	Salient features	Stoutish, with watchful, listening face

**5.3 Buying the Salvation Army****5.3.1 Explicit Cues: Self-presentation**

At this point, the father-daughter relationship between Undershaft and Barbara is still beginning to take form. Having hardly known him, Barbara surmises that he is a secularist, and introduces him as such to one of the Army converts, Mr. Shirley, so that they could “comfort one another”, but Undershaft’s response shows that Barbara’s guess is wrong: “A Secularist! Not the least in the world: on the contrary, a confirmed mystic” (1907/2003, p. 128). This places Undershaft in the group of the “mystic” in terms of beliefs. Moreover, when asked directly about his religion, he gives a relatively vague answer, i.e., ‘a millionaire’: “My religion? Well, my dear, I am a Millionaire. That is my religion.” “Millionaire” is not the word one expects to be the answer to a question about someone’s religion, but the fact that Undershaft uses it to describe his religion highlights the importance of money to him.

The tête-à-tête between Undershaft and Cusins is another instrumental exchange. This is because Cusins, who represents the third side of the triangular structure, could be seen as a match for Undershaft. Unlike Barbara, who looks at him as a soul that needs saving, Cusins’s power lies in his ability to reason. More importantly, both men share the same goal, namely, winning Barbara, though their means might not be the same. Consequently, each participant uses his own linguistic as well as paralinguistic means to overpower the other, giving way to more aspects of Undershaft’s character to be disclosed before the reader through his self-presenting propositions. At the beginning of conversation, Cusins asks Undershaft if he has “any religion”, and Undershaft’s answer is not what Cusins expects:

**UNDERSHAFT.** Only that there are two things necessary to Salvation.

**CUSINS** [disappointed, but polite] Ah, the Church Catechism. Charles Lomax also belongs to the Established Church.

**UNDERSHAFT.** The two things are—

**CUSINS.** Baptism and—

**UNDERSHAFT.** No. Money and gunpowder.

Cusins's 'category-based expectancy', in the Correspondent Inference theory terms, is that Undershaft would say something like "Catholic", for example, though the use of 'any' suggests that Cusins has certain 'target-based' expectancy about Undershaft, which is the possibility of belonging to no religion at all. Hence, the word "Salvation" in Undershaft's answer activates certain schematic elements in relation to the Catholic faith. It follows then that what occurs to Cusins (and the reader) is that he refers to the sacraments of initiation, according to the Church of England catechism. Accordingly, Cusins mentions "Baptism" and is on the verge of saying "Communion" when Undershaft interrupts him. Wealth is Undershaft's gospel; it is little wonder then that the 'sacraments' of such gospel are money and gunpowder. When asked whether "honor, justice, truth, love, mercy" have any place in his religion, Undershaft describes them as "the luxuries of a rich, strong, and safe life", and declares that if he would have to choose between them and money and power, he would choose the latter.

Undershaft is a businessman and has no time to waste in much ado, so he gets straight to the point and asks Cusins about the income he and Barbara will live on after their marriage, and whether Cusins considers himself a good match for Barbara. When Cusins's reply evinces that he would do whatever is necessary to marry Barbara, it becomes certain that winning Barbara is a goal they both share. The fact that Cusins and Undershaft are 'allies' is confirmed by Undershaft's reference to himself and Cusins using "we" in more than one instance: "we can win Barbara", "we have to win her", and "we are neither of us Methodists." As their conversation progresses, Cusins reveals further aspects of Barbara's character, admitting that she is "quite original in her religion". This direct assertive of declaration makes Undershaft expand his goal, so that it becomes not only limited to winning his daughter, but also making her a preacher of his own gospel, especially that Barbara, presented as a preacher, can serve his goals by means of her remarkable preaching skills. Undershaft's expansion of goal is made clear by the two commissive acts of resolving in his response:

**UNDERSHAFT** [in towering excitement] It is the Undershaft inheritance. I shall hand on my torch to my daughter.

She shall make my converts and preach my gospel.

In their long conversation, Cusins fiercely defends the Army, though he would not go so far as to become a Salvationist himself. Undershaft, on the other hand, states his belief that "all religious organizations exist by selling themselves to the rich", and that the Salvation Army is no exception, for "it draws their [the poor's] teeth". More significantly, he thinks that he can buy the Army, and by this, he will be able to win Barbara. Seeking to achieve the goal, Undershaft transforms any an example of the Army's virtues provided by Cusins into a 'weapon' that can ultimately be used to his business benefit. The following excerpt from their dialogue portrays Undershaft not only as a man of business, or even a purely pragmatic man, but as Cusins subsequently addresses him a 'Machiavellian':

**UNDERSHAFT.** Oh yes I do. It draws their teeth: that is enough for me—as a man of business—

**CUSINS.** Nonsense! It makes them sober—

**UNDERSHAFT.** I prefer sober workmen. The profits are larger.

**CUSINS.** —honest—

**UNDERSHAFT.** Honest workmen are the most economical.

**CUSINS.** —attached to their homes—

**UNDERSHAFT.** So much the better: they will put up with anything sooner than change their shop.

**CUSINS.** —happy—

**UNDERSHAFT.** An invaluable safeguard against revolution.

**CUSINS.** —unselfish—

**UNDERSHAFT.** Indifferent to their own interests, which suits me exactly.

**CUSINS.** —with their thoughts on heavenly things—

**UNDERSHAFT** [rising] And not on Trade Unionism nor Socialism. Excellent.

**CUSINS** [revolted] You really are an infernal old rascal.

The excerpt above is an obvious marker of Undershaft's power. Talk, Herman (1995) notes, "may be a source of pleasure in drama, but it can also be a form of power" (p. 111). Speakers who "have the most turns, have the longest turns, initiate conversational changes, control what is talked about and who talks when, and interrupt others" (Short, 1996, pp. 206-207) are considered conversationally powerful. In addition to his unmistakably long turns throughout the play, which might arguably be attributed to his being the central character, interruptions in this dialogue are certainly an act of exercising conversational power over the other participant. That Cusins is overpowered is realized by calling Undershaft "an infernal old rascal", a bold on-record face-threatening act in pragmatics terms.

Cusins, who could not stand up to Undershaft's argumentation, expresses a view that is akin, though not identical, to Lady Britomart's: "clever and unanswerable when he was defending nonsense and wickedness: always awkward and sullen when he had to behave sensibly and decently" (1907/2003, p. 81). Despite their different characters, Lady Britomart, Cusins and Stephen all agree that Undershaft is an immoral man. With the fact that Undershaft's replies and beliefs are overall 'indistinct' in different contexts, but have 'consistently' the same influence, wit and power to convince, with low consensus on how others may react to the same stimuli in other situations, one might say that Undershaft is a man who, at least, places business, money and power above morals.

### 5.3.2 Authorial Cues: Stage Directions

Buying the army could be deemed a sub-goal, which, if achieved, will certainly help Undershaft reach the principal one. The opportunity comes to him when he meets Mrs. Baines, an Army Commissioner, who earlier expressed wish to see him. The conversation between Mrs. Baines and Undershaft evinces his high sense of irony and exceptional rhetorical ability, already demonstrated through the dialogue with Cusins, particularly when Mrs. Baines declares that the Army shelters would not be open before the poor if it were not for Lord Saxmundham's promise to donate five thousand pounds in case additional five were given by other gentlemen to make it up to ten thousand. Knowing that the Army is saved by a distiller, Barbara is completely shocked. Undershaft in turn enumerates Saxmundham's 'noble' deeds, which have earned him a number of titles until no more titles remained in store for him, which urged Undershaft to suggest that Saxmundham's generous offer to help the Army is 'to save his soul'. In other words, the man is literally 'buying his salvation'. Mrs. Baines prompts Undershaft to follow Saxmundham's example and donate the remaining sum, which offers Undershaft the opportunity he has been waiting for to prove Barbara that the Army 'draws the poor's teeth', and so reach his goal.

Undershaft's pretension that he donates the money only in response to Mrs. Baines's emotional appeal to save his soul is shown to be a mere charade by the stage directions, which describe the gallantry of the act as "sardonic". To consummate the act, Undershaft pretends to sign a cheque of donation, but tears it, as though he changed his mind. This, in combination with the "relentless" speech he makes, addressing Mrs. Baines (and Barbara), serves to ensure the achievement of his (sub)goal:

**UNDERSHAFT** [tearing out the cheque and pocketing the book as he rises and goes past Cusins to Mrs Baines] I also, Mrs Baines, may claim a little disinterestedness. Think of my business! think of the widows and orphans! the men and lads torn to pieces with shrapnel and poisoned with lyddite [Mrs Baines shrinks; but he goes on remorselessly]! the oceans of blood, not one drop of which is shed in a really just cause! the ravaged crops! the peaceful peasants forced, women and men, to till their fields under the fire of opposing armies on pain of starvation! the bad blood of the fierce

little cowards at home who egg on others to fight for the gratification of their national vanity! All this makes money for me: I am never richer, never busier than when the papers are full of it. Well, it is your work to preach peace on earth and goodwill to men. [Mrs Baines’s face lights up again]. Every convert you make is a vote against war. [Her lips move in prayer]. Yet I give you this money to help you to hasten my own commercial ruin. [He gives her the cheque].

(1907/2003, p. 160)

The stage directions in this instance demonstrate to what extent Undershaft’s character is powerful, his rhetoric ability is unrivaled, and his sense of irony is sharp, reinforcing the initial authorial description of the protagonist’s “natural grip”. Effortlessly, Undershaft manages to pull the Army’s strings by producing the effect he wants; when “Mrs Baines’s face lights up again”, he gives her the cheque. As such, he has won over Barbara, making her eventually realize the sort of delusion under which she has been. It follows then that Barbara refuses to join the Army’s march and “begins taking off the silver S brooch from her collar”, and then pins the Army’s badge on her father’s collar, a symbolic gesture of her silent confession of defeat and of her father’s ultimate victory. Undershaft’s delight to have achieved his goal is embodied by saying, addressing Cusins: “My ducats and my daughter!”, whilst Barbara’s defeat is culminated when she says: “Drunkenness and Murder! My God: why hast thou forsaken me?”

#### 5.4 Undershaft as a Leader

The professional aspect of Undershaft’s character is only shown through his self-presentation after his second appearance before the family. Cusins previously referred to Undershaft as ‘Prince of Darkness’, or the devil. This reference, in addition to the other characters’ presentation of him as well as his own presentation of himself as a man of no morals are all likely to create a target-based expectancy that he is a haughty manager, who keeps issuing orders and always expects to be obeyed by his subordinates. Barbara articulates this expectancy in this turn:

**BARBARA.** I have always thought of it as a sort of pit where lost creatures with blackened faces stirred up smoky fires and were driven and tormented by my father? Is it like that, dad?

In response, Undershaft is ‘scandalized’, as shown in the stage directions, asserting that this completely contradicts the reality, and that it is “a spotlessly clean and beautiful hillside town”. Cusins, on the other hand, is not surprised; in fact, he expects the town to contain a chapel, undoubtedly to preach the owner’s gospel. What might come as a surprise is that it contains two chapels and an (secular) Ethical Society. Cusins’s target-expectancy stems from his deep understanding of Undershaft’s ‘Machiavellianism’ that should have impact upon all his acts. Undershaft’s *modus operandi* of running the business is explained in a set of consecutive SAs that create one macro self-presenting SA:

**Table 3**

*Example 2 of Undershaft’s Self-presenting SAs*

Locution	Illocutionary Act	Classification
Of course they all rebel against me, theoretically.	Acknowledging	Assertive
Practically, every man of them keeps the man just below him in his place.	Explaining	Assertive
I never meddle with them.	Self-presenting	Assertive
I never bully them.	Self-presenting	Assertive
I say that certain things are to be done; but I don’t order anybody to do them.	Self-presenting	Assertive
I don’t say, mind you, that there is no ordering about and snubbing and even bullying.	Self-presenting	Assertive
The men snub the boys and order them about	Describing	Assertive

the carmen snub the sweepers	Describing	Assertive
the artisans snub the unskilled laborers	Describing	Assertive
the foremen drive and bully both the laborers and artisans	Describing	Assertive
the assistant engineers find fault with the foremen	Describing	Assertive
the chief engineers drop on the assistants	Describing	Assertive
the departmental managers worry the chiefs	Describing	Assertive
the clerks have tall hats and hymnbooks and keep up the social tone by refusing to associate on equal terms with anybody.	Describing	Assertive
The result is a colossal profit, which comes to me.	Explaining	Assertive

Contrary to Barbara's (and possibly the reader's) expectations, Undershaft is not a controlling leader, but one who establishes rapport with his subordinates by ensuring that the social differences among them are ascertained through their wages, and by letting the workers manage their duties on their own, allowing every one of them to exercise power over his subordinates without trying to interfere. Undershaft's skills are not limited to his phenomenal success and enormous wealth, but they also include remarkable leadership abilities, given that he can control the workers without even giving them any orders and by preserving the harmony between him and them. Accordingly, one can add "successful leader" to his character traits, and update the list of his schematic elements as follows<sup>2</sup>:

**Table 4**

*Updated Schematic Elements of Undershaft's Character*

	Habit	<b>Heavily ironic and sardonic, with unparalleled rhetorical ability</b>
	Interests	Music
Personal	Goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Make Barbara preach his gospel instead of the Army's</b></li> <li>• Grow the business</li> <li>• Make profits and retain power at any expense</li> <li>• Choose a foundling as an heir to the foundry</li> </ul>
	Trait	Candid, unashamed, fabulously wealthy, powerful, above the law, overconfident, immoral, very attractive, gentle, patient, easy-going, self-made, successful businessman, <b>Machiavellian, successful leader and employer</b>
Social Role	Kinship	Father of Barbara, Stephen, and Sarah
	Occupational	Arm merchant and manufacturer
Group membership	Age	Fifty or sixty-something
	Sex	Male
	Salient features	Stoutish, with watchful, listening face
	Religion/Belief	<b>A confirmed mystic</b>

<sup>2</sup> Newly-added or updated elements are printed in bold.

### 5.5 Implicit Cues: Company and Setting

The significance of a character's company and setting is exemplified by the authorial description of Perivale St Andrews, the headquarters of Undershaft's 'empire', when compared to the depiction of the Army's premises in Act II. The clear differences between the two settings illustrate the Shavian view of both entities and of what they both symbolize. Shaw's depiction of Undershaft's town appears as somewhat a Utopian community, which comes as a contradiction to whatever perception one might have about the place where war and death are created. Thus, in lieu of the "old place" and "old warehouse", at which the Salvation Army is located, what the family finds when they go to visit the foundry is "an almost smokeless town of white walls, roofs of narrow green slates or red tiles, tall trees, domes, campaniles, and slender chimney shafts" (1907/2003, p. 192). "Beautifully situated and beautiful in itself", the town bewilders the entire family members, all of whom list one or two of its charming qualities, such as the libraries, ballroom, banqueting chamber, the Insurance Fund and the Pension Fund.

Among the setting examples that highlight the differences between the Army and Perivale St Andrews are the scanty bread and treacle meal given to the Army converts, compared with the "cake and jam and cream" given to Undershaft's family for three pennies only. Interestingly, Lady Britomart's poor opinion about her former husband as well as his (im)morality does not keep her from wondering at his well-built, well-managed and well-organized business.

Probably, it is at this point in the play when one starts to question Lady Britomart's credibility as to presenting Undershaft as immoral, with herself turning a blind eye to that immorality, having seen its fruits:

**LADY BRITOMART.** It is not. Your ridiculous cannons and that noisy banging foundry may be the Undershaft inheritance; but all that plate and linen, all that furniture and those houses and orchards and gardens belong to us. They belong to *me*: they are not a man's business. I won't give them up. (p.199)

Although Lady Britomart stated that she and Undershaft separated because of their 'moral disagreement', she did not find anything wrong or objectionable with inviting him to play a greater (financial) role in the family, and it is through her that the reader obtained the first impression about Undershaft as an immoral, wicked man. Now her credibility needs reconsideration after the proposition above, which contains two remarkable direct SAs: the assertive "they belong to *me*" and the commissive "I won't give them up".

### 5.6 Achieving Last Goals

Set upon following the Undershafts' tradition, Undershaft is looking for a foundling to be the heir of the foundry. Cusins comes to the rescue, confessing that his parents' marriage is not deemed legal within England. Undershaft, who admitted previously that he could not find an eligible candidate to be the heir, agrees to have Cusins as the new Undershaft, which enables him to achieve one of his pursued goals, but places Cusins in a moral dilemma. Being now the new Undershaft, Cusins cannot shut eyes to, to say the least, the problematic nature of the arms business. Lady Britomart suggests what she believes to be a simple solution—selling cannons to friends and denying them foes, but Undershaft rejects this, requiring Cusins to sell arms to whoever offers an honest price for them.

Like Cusins, Barbara is in a difficult situation. She thought that belonging to the Army made her in "the power of God", but when Undershaft succeeded in buying the Army, she has become skeptic about her beliefs. Like her father, Barbara practices what she preaches, and as such, she cannot preach his gospel, which will leave one of Undershaft's much sought-after goals unachieved. In response, Undershaft explains that he kept her from falling into poverty by saving her from what he refers to as the 'seven cardinal sins': food, clothing, firing, rent, taxes, respectability and children, arguing that "[i]t is cheap work converting



starving men with a Bible in one hand and a slice of bread in the other” (1907/2003, p. 214), a point he made clear when he showed her that he could buy the Army. For Undershaft, poverty is a ‘crime’, if not “the worst of crimes”, and the root cause of all the society blights. He has shown in more than one instance that he disdains poverty, and already stated in his conversation with Cusins that he places money and power before anything else, but only at this point the causal ambiguity as to the motivation behind this is lifted:

**UNDERSHAFT** [his energetic tone dropping into one of bitter and brooding remembrance] I was an east ender. I moralized and starved until one day I swore that I would be a fullfed free man at all costs—that nothing should stop me except a bullet, neither reason nor morals nor the lives of other men. I said “Thou shalt starve ere I starve”; and with that word I became free and great. I was a dangerous man until I had my will: now I am a useful, beneficent, kindly person. That is the history of most self-made millionaires, I fancy. When it is the history of every Englishman we shall have an England worth living in.

The propositional content of the turn above gives another example of the macro SAs the play abounds in. Overall, this is an SA of recounting which reveals the driving force that has shaped Undershaft’s character and views. Within the macro SA, there is a group of ‘micro speech acts’, mostly assertives, which in their totality, provide a critical piece of information that removes the ‘causal ambiguity’ and completes the ‘textbase’ for the reader. Probably the commissive “Thou shalt starve ere I starve” is the most significant, for it defines the watershed moment when Undershaft decides which path to choose. The stage directions that illustrate how the protagonist’s “energetic tone” drops into a bitter one as he evokes the unpleasant memories make it clear why Undershaft would be bound by nothing “except a bullet”. Lady Britomart, Stephen, and even Barbara’s opinions as to morality are all formed as such, as none of them experienced poverty the way in which their ‘family provider’ did.

By settling the heir issue, negotiating the price with Cusins, and succeeding to draw Barbara into his camp, Undershaft ultimately achieved all his goals and won not only his battle with Barbara, but with the entire family, including its *mater familias*, Lady Britomart. Now that Undershaft achieved his interim goals, which are naming an heir who must also be a foundling and making Barbara carry the torch of his gospel, and based on the cognitive analysis of the play, slight changes can be made to the schematic elements extracted thus far, with only Undershaft’s lifetime objectives remaining to pursue:

**Table 5**

*Last Impression of Undershaft’s Character*

	Habit	Heavily ironic and sardonic, with unparalleled rhetoric abilities
	Interests	Music
Personal	Goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grow the business</li> <li>• <b>Avert poverty and maintain power at any expense</b></li> </ul>
	Trait	Candid, unashamed, fabulously wealthy, powerful, above the law, overconfident, <b>debatably</b> immoral, very attractive, gentle, patient, easy-going, self-made, successful businessman, Machiavellian, successful leader and employer, <b>disdains poverty</b>

Social Role	Kinship	Father of Barbara, Stephen, and Sarah
	Occupational	Arm merchant and manufacturer
Group membership	Age	Fifty or sixty-something
	Sex	Male
	Salient features	Stoutish, with watchful, listening face
	Religion/Belief	A confirmed mystic

## 6. Findings

Aside from the traditional view of immorality (i.e., Lady Britomart's), Undershaft is also immoral from the moralist's perspective. For Cusins, Undershaft is 'Machiavellian', 'Prince of Darkness' and so on. But Cusins himself was not only overpowered by Undershaft, he eventually yielded to him, accepting to be part of his empire and to conform with the Undershafts' laws and principles. Furthermore, the initial consensual agreement on Undershaft's immorality has ultimately turned into rather approbation of his accomplishment. Additionally, when the reader understands that Undershaft's dogged determination to avert poverty at any cost is driven by tasting its bitter taste, the reader is likely to sympathize with him, particularly that any reader will most likely share the sentiment with him. Looking at Undershaft in light of that last piece of information and the others' altered attitude towards him is rather edging him towards the moral category. Yet, morality is relative; what one person deems moral could be immoral to another, and that is why the impressions formed about the character are conflicting.

Another important point to consider is that most of the arguments that Undershaft presents are valid, and not only within the historical context of the play, but in any historical context. For example, he argues that poverty is a crime, whose impact upon society is worse than any other crime, and while one would not necessarily refer to poverty as a crime, the gist of the argument is generally accepted. What might be disputable however is Undershaft's prompting to "kill them [poverty and slavery]." Are the poor to be killed because "they poison us morally and physically"? This is a serious flaw in the argument. Another argument is that religious organizations work towards cajoling the poor into satisfying with their status quo by appealing to their religious sense, which is also valid to some extent, and he proved this point through the exchange with Mrs. Baines. It does not, however, mean that this is necessarily the general rule.

It is true that being an arm maker does not contradict with any moral standards, but to "give arms to all men who offer an honest price for them, without respect of persons or principles ... all nationalities, all faiths, all follies, all causes and all crimes" *does* (1907/2003, p. 207). In one of his early references to himself, Undershaft self-presented as "a manufacturer of mutilation and murder", a direct plain statement that sums up the atrocities of war, of which he is obviously aware and to which he is a major contributor, and not to achieve a noble end, but to stave off poverty by fair means or foul. This in a way means that Undershaft remains a 'death dealer' and leads directly to the flagrant contradiction in choosing a death dealer to talk sense and lecture on morality, and presenting the place where war is made as a Garden of Eden.

This contradiction manifests itself in the majority of Undershaft's SAs. "My morality—my religion—must have a place for cannons and torpedoes in it" is to name but a few (1907/2003, p. 100). This juxtaposition of war making with morality and/or religion is no less unconventional than the character himself, and it certainly bears on the plausibility of the arguments he offers, the power of the messages he conveys, and above all the moral vision he is meant to provide. Looking back at all of Undershaft's exchanges with the others, one would find that he managed to prove his point in every exchange primarily through the exercise of power rather than proving them wrong.

## 7. Conclusion

This study aimed to analyze how Shaw presents his moral vision in *Major Barbara* through the depiction of its main character, Andrew Undershaft, and how the power relations make such vision prominent. In order to answer the research questions, a cognitive analysis was made using Culpeper's characterization model and Austin's Speech Act theory. Understanding how the reader's impression is gradually formed depended on the illustrative authorial cues, including the stage directions and the character company and setting, the others' presentation of Undershaft, and Undershaft's self-presentation. The protagonist's propositions, particularly those that state his different philosophies and views, provide a great deal of the textbase for the readers, helping them form a final impression.

The analysis shows that through the characterization of Undershaft, Shaw propounds that (many) religious organizations principally work towards taming the poor and luring them into the satisfaction with their current conditions, rather than revolting against or trying to change these conditions. Another major argument that Shaw puts forward and puts into words through Undershaft's propositions is that poverty is not a mere society problem but a crime that can only be counteracted by eradicating it entirely. The arguments which Undershaft puts forward are partly plausible and partly controversial, hence the controversy about the character himself. Shaw addresses this difficulty adroitly by presenting the protagonist as an unmistakably powerful character. Accordingly, there is a plethora of markers of power in the play, operating at all linguistic levels, as embodied by Undershaft's ability to achieve all the goals he sets and pursues, counter the arguments of all the other characters, gain victory in the symbolic contest between him and Barbara, and eventually alter the others' view about him.

## References

- Abdul Qadir, I. A., & Juma', T. R. (2018). Breaking Grice's Cooperative Maxims in Humorous Interactions: A Pragma-Stylistic Study of Shaw's "Major Barbara". *Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences*, 43(1), 42-59. Retrieved from <https://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=article&aid=147035>
- Abou El Hassan, G. A. (1999). *The Dialogical Relationship between Author and Character: A Comparative Study on George Bernard Shaw and Tawfik Hakim*. (PhD Dissertation) Cairo University, Giza, Egypt. Retrieved from [http://lis.cl.cu.edu.eg/search~S0\\*ara?/Xmajor+barbara&SORT=D/Xmajor+barbara&SORT=D&SUBKEY=major%20barbara/1,1,1,B/frameset&FF=Xmajor+barbara&SORT=DZ&1,1,?save=b1082991](http://lis.cl.cu.edu.eg/search~S0*ara?/Xmajor+barbara&SORT=D/Xmajor+barbara&SORT=D&SUBKEY=major%20barbara/1,1,1,B/frameset&FF=Xmajor+barbara&SORT=DZ&1,1,?save=b1082991)
- Baker, S. E. (2011). Major Barbara. In H. Bloom (Ed.), *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: George Bernard Shaw* (pp. 87-109). Infobase Publishing.
- Berg, F. (1998). Structure and philosophy in Man and Superman and Major Barbara. In C. Innes (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw* (pp. 144-161). Cambridge University Press.
- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic Stylistics*. (A. Davies, & K. Mitchell, Eds.) Edinburgh University Press.
- Croft, W., & Cruse, D. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J. (2001). *Language and Characterisation: People in Plays and Other Texts*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Culpeper, J. (2002). A Cognitive Stylistic Approach to Characterisation. In E. Semino, & J. Culpeper (Eds.), *Cognitive Stylistics: Language and Cognition in Text Analysis* (pp. 251-277). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Culpeper, J., & McIntyre, D. (2010). Activity Types and Characterisation in Dramatic Discourse. In J. Eder, F. Jannidis, & R. Schneider (Eds.), *Characters in Fictional Worlds: Understanding Imaginary Beings in Literature, Film, and Other Media* (pp. 176-207).
- Downes, W. (1988). King Lear's Question to His Daughters. In W. Van Peer (Ed.), *The Taming of the Text: Explorations in Language, Literature and Culture* (pp. 225-257). London: Routledge.
- Freeman, M. H. (2014). Cognitive Poetics. In M. Burke (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics* (pp. 313-328). Routledge.
- Herman, V. (1995). *Dramatic Discourse: Dialogue as interaction in plays*. London: Routledge.
- Jeffries, L., & McIntyre, D. (2010). *Stylistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaw, G. B. (1907/2003). *Major Barbara*. Project Gutenberg.
- Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. London and New York: Longman.
- Stockwell, P. (2002). *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ungerer, F., & Schmid, H.-J. (2006). *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Longman.