

51-Minor literature and oriental outlook in George Bernard Shaw's *Getting Married*

Faruk KÖKOĞLU¹

APA: Kökoğlu, F. (2020). Minor literature and oriental outlook in George Bernard Shaw's *Getting Married*. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (Ö8), 658-666. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.816918.

Abstract

Deleuze and Guattari's concept of 'minor literature' has three basic characteristics: the use of a deterritorialized language, having an inherently political content and the call for the creation of a people to come with a collective and revolutionary enunciation. Shaw's play *Getting Married* written in 1908 has all three characteristics. Firstly, it is critical of the writing rules of English language and does away with the apostrophe in its dialogues. Secondly, it launches an attack on both the marriage system of Christianity and the current civil marriage act in Shaw's time in Britain from a political stance as the "will of the world". Finally, the play ends with a conclusion shocking for both other characters and the reader. It turns out to be a defence of a reformed Islam against Christianity in its call for the creation of a people to come. In this final enunciation, the play reinforces its minor literature outlook already prevalent in its long preface but undermined by most critics and reviewers. In this study, I will analyse the play within the framework of minor literature with a "minor literature" outlook which can be defined as an immanent approach to encounters between the West and the East based on the presence of any positive, prospective, symbiotic, evolutionary and unconscious lines of flight.

Keywords: Minor literature, marriage, orientalism, Christianity, reformed Islam

George Bernard Shaw'un *Evlenmek* oyununda minör edebiyat ve oryantal bakış açısı

Öz

Deleuze ve Guattari'nin 'minör edebiyat' kavramlarının üç temel özelliği vardır: yersizyurtsuzlaşmış bir dil kullanımı, özünde politik olan bir içeriğe sahip olma ve mevcut olmayan geleceğe ait bir halkı yaratmayı amaçlayan kolektif ve devrimci bir söyleme yer verme. Shaw'un 1908 de yazılan *Getting Married* (*Evlenmek*) oyunu bu üç karakteristiğe de sahiptir. Birinci olarak, oyunda İngilizcenin yazım kurallarına eleştirel yaklaşılır ve diyaloglarda iki kelimeyi birleştirmeye yarayan apostrof kullanılmaz. İkinci olarak, Kilise evliliğine ve o tarihlerde yürürlükte olan medeni evliliğe karşı "geleceğin isteği" anlamında politik bir duruşla bir atak başlatır. Son olarak oyun beklenmedik bir sonuçla biter ve geleceğe ait henüz mevcut olmayan bir halka davet söylemi olarak Hristiyanlığa karşı reform edilmiş bir İslam'ın savunuculuğunu yapar. Bu son söylemiyle oyun, benim "minoryantal" olarak isimlendirdiğim ve oyunun uzunca olan önsözünde de baskın olarak hissedilen ancak batılı eleştirmenler ve yorumcular tarafından göz ardı edilen bakış açısını daha da pekiştirir. Bu çalışmada, *Getting Married* oyunu minör edebiyat çerçevesinde ve daha sınırlayıcı bir anlamda Batının Doğu ile karşılaşmalarında müspet, beklenen, ortak yaşamsal, gelişimsel ve bilinç

¹ Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı ABD (Muğla, Türkiye), farukk@mu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-3054-7448 [Makale kayıt tarihi: 13.09.2020-kabul tarihi: 20.11.2020; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.816918]

ötesi kaçış hatlarının varlığını temel alan içken bir yaklaşım olarak tanımlayabileceğim “minoryantal” bir perspektifte analiz edilmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Minör edebiyat, evlilik, oryantalizm, Hristiyanlık, reform edilmiş İslam

Introduction

Getting Married is one of Shaw's least known and little discussed plays produced and performed in 1908. The play is variously dubbed by critics and reviewers as “one of the more important items in Shaw's catalogue judged for its intellectual significance” (Burton, 1916, p. 141), an exemplary “discussion play” (Innes, 2004, p. 166), a “comedy of manners that's little known” (Vineberg, 2019), “a multi-voiced debate in the form of a comedy” (Hoile, 2008), a “philosophical and moral debate-turned-dramatic play” (Maga, 2019), “a talkfest in the Shavian manner of taking a main subject and expanding the conversation into numerous byways” (Karas, 2019), “a provocative tale of creative couplings,” (Gans, 2017), a “lampooning of sexual mores of the very early 20th century” (Meigs, 2008), “a play where five women and seven men discuss marriage for a couple of hours (Kelley, 2019). And finally, “a playground for Shaw's outrageous ideas about the legal relationship between a husband and a wife” (Cobbe, 2008).

The three-hour play is preceded by a long preface of almost the same length written by Shaw and added to the play in its following edition. The ideas for and against marriage analysed with minute detail in the preface, which are dubbed as “outrageous” by Cobbe, do not belong to Shaw but are those ideas which prevail in England and all around the world. Shaw only tries to do justice to all of them by “giving the devil fair play” (Shaw, 1920, p. 119). About a dozen different ideas about marriage debated in the preface can be listed as romantic marriage, sentimental marriage, marriage for children, Protestant marriage, Catholic marriage, marriage by contract, Pauline celibacy, free love, polygyny, polyandry, civil marriage (the Marriage Act of 1857 which was still current in Shaw's lifetime) and finally the marriage as an “institution”. Shaw also distinguishes between “marriage as a fact” which is always defective and the myth of “marriage as an ideal” (p. 43). Shaw concludes his preface that the British “marriage law is inhuman and unreasonable” leading to all kinds of revolt against marriage. Yet, Shaw indicates “Marriage remains inevitable” all around. We only need to improve “its conditions” by making it “decent and reasonable” (pp. 7-8). Finally, Shaw claims that divorce “is not the destruction of marriage, but the first condition of its maintenance” (p. 70). Hence, divorce should be made “as easy, as cheap, and as private as marriage” (p. 89) even “without asking why” (p. 91).

The play begins with the slow gathering of guests in the Kitchen of the Bishop's palace for the wedding of his daughter Edith with Cecil both of whom do not show up until late refusing to get married upon reading an alarming pamphlet on marriage titled “Do you know what you are going to do? By a woman who has done it” (p. 139). Cecil is alarmed at limited grounds for divorce in the “wicked” civil law: “if Cecil commits a murder, or forges, or steals, or becomes an atheist, I cant get divorced from him” (p. 140). And Cecil's motive against marrying Edith was, in his words, “I should be legally responsible if she libelled anybody, though all her property is protected against me as if I were the lowest thief and cadger” (p. 133).

Twelve people gathered in the kitchen are all pretexts for the dozen different ideas about marriage discussed in the preface. Each person represents one or the other idea and the Bishop Mr. Bridgenorth is the moderator and referee representing the narrator of the preface and Shaw in real life with his life-

long marriage to Charlotte Payne-Townshend (Peters, 2004, p. 16). Shaw has another representative in the play: Hotchkiss who is an eccentric, a polygamist, a philanderer and a snob, just like Shaw in his youthful years (p. 12).

When the attempt to form an alternative marriage contract which would satisfy everyone with the participation of all the guests fails, Hotchkiss offers his revolutionary response with a reformed outlook with the assistance of the Mayoress Mrs. George, a clairvoyant and femme fatale who represents all women and feminine power. There is an irony about voluptuous Mrs. George that although she is invited to help them complete the contract, she is no help to it, and in her memorable trance she tells nothing about the future. Yet, in the final part of the play, she assists Hotchkiss to reform his morality and to contest the Church and Pauline celibacy represented by Saomes, a solicitor and the Bishop's Chaplin. In the play we see her blowing a poker to hit Mr. Hotchkiss in anger, but the play ends with Mrs George leaving the room in Mr. Hotchkiss's arm.

Literature review and methodology

Most of the analyses and reviews of the play are either feministic or have a deconstructive nature. Shelangoskie (2011) presents a feminist reading of the play in her essay. She concentrates on the spiritual aspects of Mrs. George's trance of speaking for all the women of the world, and emphasises her authority in taming Hotchkiss in the last part of the play. Most of the other readings and reviews of the play can all be grouped as deconstructive due to Shaw's use of the Hegelian dialectic of *Aufhebung*, which can be defined as uplifting something while trying to abolish it. In *Getting Married*, it is the marriage law which is attempted to be abolished without success. A deconstructive reading can best allow us to see that marriage law is unavoidable but some personal arrangements can be added to it. That is what Edith and Cecil secretly do with some arrangements with an insurance company and get married. But the play does not end there: It has a futuristic aspect, too. A deconstructive reading, in short, fails to see the revolutionary aspect of *Getting Married*.

In this essay, I'll offer a Deleuzo-Guattarian reading with a wider yet minor scope, or more selectively, a "minoriental" reading of the play. I define the latter coinage of my own from "minor-oriental" if not "anti-oriental" as a constructive symptomatology and an immanent approach to literary and cultural encounters between the East and the West. Thus, a "minoriental reading" based on Deleuze and Guattari's minor literature, aims to trace any positive, active, prospective, symbiotic, evolutionary and unconscious lines of flight toward the Orient in western thought, art and literature. The western authors of a minoriental thought and fiction can best be described as retroactive immigrants of thought reterritorialising themselves in the distant Orient, not as crusaders, colonizers, missionaries, travellers with their cultural baggage or secret missions or financiers of terror, chaos and war in the East, but the seekers of a true peace and friendship. This "minoriental" outlook will always be present in this reading but I will proceed on safer grounds of Deleuze and Guattari's minor literature.

In their cooperative work *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, Deleuze and Guattari (1986) develop their concept of minor literature with three basic characteristics (pp. 16-9). Firstly, minor literature deterritorialises a major language with a minor treatment. The second characteristic of minor literature is that, everything in it will be political. Thirdly and finally, in minor literature "everything takes on a collective value" with a "collective, and even revolutionary, enunciation" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986, p. 17) giving voice to "a people to come" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986, p.17; 1996, p. 176). Such a revolutionary enunciation requires an author to be always "in the margins or completely

outside his or her fragile community” (1986, p. 17). Giving voice to a minority which cannot voice themselves is not limited to minor literature but is valid for all writing for Deleuze (1987):

[W]riting always encounters a minority which does not write, and it does not undertake to write for this minority, in its place or at its bidding, but there is an encounter in which each pushes the other, draws it on to its line of flight in a combined deterritorialization. Writing always combines with something else, which is its own becoming. (p. 44)

Shaw's minor literature as “the will of the future”

A deterritorialized use of English can be seen in *Getting Married* to some extent as the first characteristic of minor literature. Shaw is critical of the discrepancy between the orthography and pronunciation of English as a major language and asks for a “spelling reform” (Gibbs, 2001, p. 191). And uniquely in *Getting Married* he calls attention to the use of apostrophe in abbreviations. He omits apostrophes in his dialogues (as in “cant” and “theyll”) retaining only those which will lead to ambiguity (such as “its” and “it’s”) or to a different meaning with a change of pronunciation (such as “I’ll” and “ill”). The apostrophe in the English spelling can be read creatively as what connects two different words without annulling the identity of each word although the second word is cut short in both appearance and pronunciation. In the context of the play, the apostrophe can be seen analogous with the marriage bond connecting two people. As with many abbreviations and/or unions of two people the presence or absence of apostrophe and/or marriage bond does not make any difference, as in “theyll” with the same pronunciation and with no second meaning, and as most couples do especially in the West. But the apostrophe, like marriage for Shaw, is inevitable in some cases. But in some other cases, without apostrophe and/or marriage bond, *she’ll* become *shell*, *he’ll* become *hell* and *I’ll* become *ill*. Shaw also uses a syntagmatically parallel utterance in his preface ascribed to the French dramatist Brieux in *Les Hanneçons* that: “an avowedly illicit union is often found in practice to be as tyrannical [“hell”] and as hard to escape from [“shell,” to mean a container] as the worst legal one” (Shaw, 1920, p. 6, my interpolations).

Secondly, everything in *Getting Married* is political. In the preface, Shaw (1920) clearly indicates his uniquely political stance without any feelings in his discussion of marriage: “let us put our feelings aside for a moment, and consider the question politically” (p. 35). This is one detail which might be undermined by Cobbe in her dubbing the ideas Shaw discusses as “outrageous”. Shaw uses a persona without feelings in his dramatic analysis, and wants the reader have the same outlook. Personal interests and feelings do not give us freedom from all prejudices and tendencies to evaluate. Political stance, in Shaw’s case, is solely “devising of the best ways of fulfilling the will of the world” (p. 30). This requires, for Shaw, a “public, farsighted, and impersonal” “democracy as to the thing to be done”, not a “narrow, personal, jealous and corrupt” “democracy as to the way to do it” which “is like letting the passengers drive the train: it can only end in collision and wreck” (p. 31). Such a farsighted libidinal politics, for instance, cannot remain indifferent to the fact that “the population declines” in inverse proportion to economic development and freedom especially in the West (p. 33).

Finally, revolutionary, collective and minoritarian enunciation with an outsider’s outlook as the third characteristic of minor literature is attempted by Shaw in the form of a discussion play for the first time in *Getting Married*. Shaw’s being a member and a spokesman of the revolutionary socialist Fabian society had already put him outside his majoritarian community, and with his own “municipal socialism” he was also a marginal Fabian. In *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* Shaw describes the

revolutionary aspect of his writing which he borrows from Ibsen with an immanence of relatedness to our lives and a futuristic outlook:

Ibsen supplies the want left by Shakespear. He gives us not only ourselves, but ourselves in our own situations. The things that happen to his stage figures are things that happen to us. One consequence is that his plays are much more important to us than Shakespear's. Another is that they are capable both of hurting us cruelly and of filling us with excited hopes of escape from idealistic tyrannies, and with visions of intenser life in the future. (Shaw, 1913, p. 151)

The desire to “escape from idealistic tyrannies” end up in unknown lands and in unknown encounters which make both the self and the encountered other revolutionized. After that encounter neither the self nor the other remain the same: they both push the other to their limits, and this process for Shaw is both painful and hopeful. And those “visions of intenser life in the future” are the revolutionary outcome of “fulfilling the will of the world” in Shavian politics which must not be confused with any ideology. Thus, “the introduction of the discussion” (p. 152) into the drama is a post-Ibsen technical novelty which Shaw first uses in *Getting Married*, to such an extent that “the play and discussion [become] practically identical” (p. 153).

In *Getting Married* we witness three immanent stages of becoming-minor as a result of multiple encounters. The first one is the technical encounter of action and discussion. The second one is the contextual encounter of real-life situations in a revolutionary and collective way giving a glimpse of an “intenser life in the future”. In this second encounter the lifestyle and the writing style of a “great” minoritarian writer become indistinguishable. And this is perfectly valid for Shaw. Finally, and “as a consequence” of former encounters, Shaw aims to take it outside the text for a real or realistic encounter between the play and the spectator by “making the spectators themselves the persons of the drama, and the incidents of their own lives its incidents” (153). And this makes the stage and the spectator, the real and the dramatic or fictional indistinguishable from each other leading to a realism which is more real (“intenser”) than the real asking for a reformed outlook in a Fabian silence and patience.

Four characters in *Getting married* are noteworthy about their engagement in a Shavian politics of “the will of the world” with their hopes and worries about the future signalling to various revolutionary encounters. The first one is Lesbia who wants to have children but no man in her house. She has a futuristic message to the British government which did not allow single parents in Shaw's time:

LESBIA. I ought to have children. I should be a good mother to children. I believe it would pay the country very well to pay me very well to have children. But the country tells me that I cant have a child in my house without a man in it too; so I tell the country that it will have to do without my children. If I am to be a mother, I really cannot have a man bothering me to be a wife at the same time. (Shaw, 1920, p. 105)

... I dont want you enough to make the very unreasonable sacrifices required by marriage. And yet that is exactly why I ought to be married. Just because I have the qualities my country wants most I shall go barren to my grave ... (p. 178)

Lesbia with her strong “maternal instinct” has a message to a community which has a headstrong and inflexible marriage ideal, such as not allowing a loose relationship between sexes including polygamy. She believes she will be a better mother than most mothers who are bad examples of their sex without strong will and intelligence and cannot defend their honour against men (p. 178). Yet, she does not reject men completely. She wants to have a man, preferably a man with the best qualities of his own sex equal to her own, not as a husband whom she will have to see every day but as the father of her

children whom she will see when she must only, let us say once in nine months. Lesbia is the complete opposite of voluptuous Mrs. George or Polly, which stands for polyandry. Lesbia does not desire a polyandrous relationship with more than one man like Mrs. George, but if permitted, on the contrary, her strong "maternal instinct" will tolerate polygyny:

Experience shews that women do not object to polygyny when it is customary: on the contrary, they are its most ardent supporters. The reason is obvious. The question, as it presents itself in practice to a woman, is whether it is better to have, say, a whole share in a tenth-rate man or a tenth share in a first-rate man. Substitute the word Income for the word Man, and you will have the question as it presents itself economically to the dependent woman. The woman whose instincts are maternal, who desires superior children more than anything else, never hesitates. She would take a thousandth share, if necessary, in a husband who was a man in a thousand, rather than have some comparatively weedy weakling all to herself. It is the comparatively weedy weakling, left mateless by polygyny, who objects. (Shaw, 1920, 36):

Shaw distinguishes between two different polygamies preferring the second one: "In the British empire we have unlimited Kulin polygamy, Muslim polygamy limited to four wives" (p. 7). Shaw argues that legal permission of polygamy in Europe will be more disastrous than it is in the Muslim East because of considerable differences between customs and lifestyles. Shaw also argues about the impossibility practicing polygyny in England with a statistical analysis. He finally foresees the necessity for accepting single parents by "legitimizing the children of women who are not married to the fathers" instead of condemning women like Lesbia "to barrenness" (p. 38).

The second futuristic message in *Getting Married*, comes from the Bishop himself who is worried about the future of marriage in Britain: "nobody will get married at all, except the poor, perhaps" (125). When Hotchkiss suggests drawing up a new contract, "the first English partnership deed" (145), the Bishop has no belief in it, he knows in advance that it will be a failure: "it will be so much worse than the existing law that you will all prefer getting married" (p. 145). As a Shavian persona, the Bishop, allows for two more futuristic responses: one from Mrs. George representing all women as minoritarians and one from Mr. Hotchkiss who represents a minoritarian reformed Islam.

Mrs. George's futuristic message is enunciated when she is in trance speaking for all women as minorities:

MRS GEORGE ... I am a woman: a human creature like yourselves. Will you not take me as I am?

SOAMES. Yes; but shall we take you and burn you?

THE BISHOP. Or take you and canonize you?

HOTCHKISS [*gaily*] Or take you as a matter of course? [*Swiftly to the Bishop*] We must get her out of this: it's dangerous. [*Aloud to her*] May I suggest that you shall be Anthony's devil and the Bishop's saint and my adored Polly? (p. 190)

Mrs. George's query has no proper response from any men. None of them will accept her as she is: she is either condemned, or elevated to a sainthood, or seen as a lover only. And we do not understand from Hotchkiss's remark what is dangerous? Is it the trance? Or a woman speaking for herself or for all women? ... I leave these questions for an immanent feminist reading.

Fourthly and finally, Hotchkiss's futuristic response which is the only hopeful and affirmative response in the play comes when he is left in the kitchen with Mrs. George who stands for feminism and Soames who represents Christianity. We observe a great unexpected change in Hotchkiss who will stand for a reformed Islam on the same side with Mrs. George in her failed attempt to tempt Soames. Hotchkiss's

response to Soames is the longest and the most eloquent speech in the play. It comes as a surprise and compels Mrs. George's admiration:

HOTCHKISS [*impatiently*] My dear Anthony: I find you merely ridiculous as a preacher, because you keep referring me to places and documents and alleged occurrences in which, as a matter of fact, I dont believe. I dont believe in anything but my own will and my own pride and honor. Your fishes and your catechisms and all the rest of it make a charming poem which you call your faith. It fits you to perfection; but it doesnt fit me. I happen, like Napoleon, to prefer Mohammedanism. [*Mrs George, associating Mohammedanism with polygamy, looks at him with quick suspicion*]. I believe the whole British Empire will adopt a reformed Mohammedanism before the end of the century. The character of Mahomet is congenial to me. I admire him, and share his views of life to a considerable extent. That beats you, you see, Soames. Religion is a great force—the only real motive force in the world; but what you fellows dont understand is that you must get at a man through his own religion and not through yours. Instead of facing that fact, you persist in trying to convert all men to your own little sect, so that you can use it against them afterwards. You are all missionaries and proselytizers trying to uproot the native religion from your neighbor's flowerbeds and plant your own in its place. You would rather let a child perish in ignorance than have it taught by a rival sectary. You can talk to me of the quintessential equality of coal merchants and British officers; and yet you cant see the quintessential equality of all the religions. Who are you, anyhow, that you should know better than Mahomet or Confucius or any of the other Johnnies who have been on this job since the world existed?

MRS GEORGE [*admiring his eloquence*] George will like you, Sonny. You should hear him talking about the Church. (201-202)

I will leave this quotation without any comments with only a brief reflection on the notion of “a reformed Mohammedanism” from the point of view of minor literature: as a becoming. It can never be associated with any Islams practiced in any part of the world in Shaw's day. Hence, “reformed Mohammedanism” is an encounter, an assemblage, between a British with no biases about other religions and a minoritarian Islam which is unable to voice itself as it is, (Mrs. George's minoritarian enunciation of “Will you not take me as I am?” is also valid here). In this encounter between the two, each pushes the other to their own limits, so that, neither the British nor a reformed Islam will be able to be distinguished from each other as Marmaduke Pickthall (1936) quotes from Goethe: “If this is Islam, then every thinking man among us is, in fact, a Muslim” (p. 17). It is a real becoming which is indistinguishable from the fictional and it is a process which continues lifelong following a line of flight with some dangerous pitfalls and black holes which might interrupt it as was the case with Shaw unfortunately. His plan to write a play about Mohammed which would take his becoming one stage further was interrupted by a fanaticism of book-burning by a group of Muslim students at Azhar University in 1939 as a meaningless protest for what one of his characters, a catholic priest in his *Saint John*, tells against the Muslim prophet. Although Shaw gave up his plan to write a play about Mohammed,² he still emphasised, in a letter to the British actor, theatre director and writer Hesketh Pearson: “Mohammed is, and always has been, a hero of mine” (as quoted in Gibbs, 2001, p. 311).

Going back to the play again, when Hotchkiss makes his revolutionary enunciation, the Bishop and rest of his guests are not present which implies the majority of the British are not yet ready to hear such a revelation. After hearing Hotchkiss's response, Seamus accuses Hotchkiss with insincerity for stealing someone else's wife. Hotchkiss is stunned with this downright accusation and undergoes a sudden change with the realisation of his selfishness and vulgarity. He repents saying that “To disbelieve in marriage is easy: to love a married woman is easy; but to betray a comrade, to be disloyal to a host, to break the covenant of bread and salt, is impossible” (205). He assures Polly that she has “nothing to fear” from him and he guards himself against any sensual approaches from her which

² Gibbs (2001) quotes the following from Shaw: ‘I certainly should like to write a play about [Mohammed]. But the censorship and the risk of being killed by some Moslem fanatic in the east, are against it’ (p. 313).

makes her think once more that no man can understand her polyandrous desire. While Leo's polyandrous desire to marry at least two man is resolved with her return to the first husband, Polly's polyandrous desire remains unresolved in the play to be resolved in another play by Shaw.

Conclusion

In conclusion, in this essay an analysis of one of Shaw's neglected plays, *Getting Married* (1908), has been attempted with a "minoriental outlook" proceeding along the safer grounds of Deleuze and Guattari's minor literature. Minor literature would offer more revolutionary possibilities for *Getting Married* as have been pointed out in this analysis. We have preferred an immanent route which has not been taken before. We have also wanted to do justice to Shaw's play by taking this analysis to include the last stage or page of the play which all other readings fail to do for any reasons with the exception of Cristopher Hoile (2020) who highlights Hotchkiss's final revelation of "the quintessential equality of all the religions" and admits it is "something people still have trouble accepting". The third type of becoming specific to Shaw's discussion plays, although interrupted in his oeuvre, has been carried to the outside, to his real life. At the age of 91, Shaw still insisted on his notion of "a reformed Islam" as a becoming, or as one—if not the only—possible "will of the world" in parallel with Hotchkiss's revolutionary enunciation in the play. Hence, Shaw's life and work becomes indistinguishable from each other as it is with all great minoritarian writers. In a letter dated 7th September 1948 Shaw wrote to the following to the editors of *The Islamic Review* by repeating Hotchkiss's enunciation about reformed Islam, or even taking it one step further as the "only" will of the world:

I have always ranked Mahomet as one of the greatest of the Prophets, making a huge success where Jesus made a complete failure. But I have also insisted that whereas Christianity in its corruption was saved by the Reformation, only a reformed Islam can conquer the world today. (Shaw, 1949)

As a result of limited resources for the Shavian notion of "reformed Islam" as an incomplete process, a further reading might proceed sideways seeking responses to questions such as: In what way it can be related to Shaw's Fabianism, his atheism and his feminism? Is it their outcome or is it not related to them at all? Does a minoritarian encounter of becoming between an alliance of Fabianism-atheism-feminism and Islam lead to the notion of a reformed Islam? If so, will it still be called Islam? And will the former alliance still be called the same? What about Shaw's other plays? Do they all contribute to a unified collective enunciation which can be called Shavianism? And in what ways will Shavianism be related to his notion of reformed Islam in his life and plays?

References

- Bows, B. (2010, November 14). *Shaw's "Getting Married" rings just as true today*. The Denver Post. <https://www.denverpost.com/2010/11/14/shaws-getting-married-rings-just-as-true-today/>
- Burton, R. (1916) *Bernard Shaw: The Man and The Mask*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Cobbe, E. (2008, November 28) *Getting Married: Different Stages has fun with Shaw's dissection of the institution of marriage*. The Austin Chronicle. <https://www.austinchronicle.com/arts/2008-11-28/707200/>
- Deleuze, G. (1987). *Dialogues, with Claire Parnet* (H. Tomlinson & B. Habberjam, Trans.) London: The Athlone Press. (Original work published 1977)
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari F. (1996). *What is Philosophy?* (H. Tomlinson & G. Burchell, Trans.) London: Verso. (Original work published 1991)

- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1986). *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature* (D. Polan, Trans.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1975)
- Emsworth. (2008, June 6). *Getting Married at the Shaw Festival (a review)*. <https://emsworth.wordpress.com/2008/06/06/a-perfectly-realized-getting-married-at-the-shaw/>
- Gans, A. (2017, June 26) *Anastasia Tony Nominee Mary Beth Peil, Tony Sheldon, and More Set for Shaw's Getting Married*. Playbill. <http://www.playbill.com/article/tony-nominee-mary-beth-peil-tony-sheldon-and-more-set-for-shaws-getting-married>
- Gibbs A. M. (2001). *A Bernard Shaw Chronology*. New York: Palgrave.
- Golden, G. (2019, July 2). *Getting Married at the Shaw*. Buffalo Rising. <https://www.buffalorising.com/2019/07/getting-married-at-the-shaw/>
- Hoile, C. (2008, August 16) *Reviews 2008: Getting Married*. Stage Door. http://www.stage-door.com/Theatre/2008/Entries/2008/8/16_Getting_Married.html
- Innes, C. (2004) "Nothing but talk, talk, talk – Shaw talk": Discussion Plays and the making of modern drama. In Innes, C. (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to George Bernard Shaw* (pp. 162-179) Cambridge University Press.
- Karas, J. (2019, May 26). *Getting Married – Review of 2019 Shaw Festival Production*. <http://jameskarasreviews.blogspot.com/2019/05/getting-married-review-of-2019-shaw.html>
- Keenan, M. (2008) *Shaw's Getting Married: "Will somebody tell me how the world is to get on if nobody is to get married?"*. Performing Arts. <http://www.whattravelwriterssay.com/perfarts54.html>
- Keenan, M. (2019, June 7). *Shaw Review: Getting Married picks up in second act*. Niagara Now. <https://www.niagaranow.com/news.phtml/2014-shaw-review-getting-married-picks-up-in-second-act>
- Kelley, G. (2019, October 22) *Getting Married: By George Bernard Shaw*. <http://georgekelley.org/getting-married-by-george-bernard-shaw/>
- Maga, C. (2019, May 26). *Shaw Festival's Getting Married offers a fun respite from the question: To marry or not to marry*. The Hamilton Spectator. <https://www.thespec.com/opinion/columnists/2019/05/26/shaw-festival-s-getting-married-offers-a-fun-respite-from-the-question-to-marry-or-not-to-marry.html>
- Meigs, M. (2008, December 06) *Review: Getting Married by George Bernard Shaw, Different Stages*. CTXLive Theatre. <https://ctxlivetheatre.com/reviews/review-getting-married-by-george-bernard-shaw-d/>
- Peters, S. (2004) *Shaw's life: a feminist in spite of himself*. In Innes, C. (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to George Bernard Shaw* (pp. 3-24) Cambridge University Press.
- Pickthall, M. M. (1937). *The Cultural Side of Islam*. Tinnevelley: Hilal Press.
- Shaw, G. B. (1913). *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*. Cambridge, USA: The University Press.
- Shaw, G. B. (1920). *Getting Married*. New York: Bretano's.
- Shaw, G. B. (1949) *Mr. George Bernard Shaw on the Prophet Mohammad [letter to the editor]*. *The Islamic Review*, 37(1), 63.
- Shelangoskie, S. (2011) *Spiritualism and the Representation of Female Authority in Shaw's Getting Married*. *UpStage: A Journal of Turn-of-the-Century Theatre*, (2). Retrieved September 1, 2020, from <http://www.oscholars.com/Upstage/issue2/susan.htm>
- Solomon, S. J. (1962) *Theme and Structure in "Getting Married"*. *The Shaw Review*, 5(3), 92-96.
- Vineberg, S. (2019, September 3). *Shaw Entertainments: The Ladykillers and Getting Married*. *Critics at Large*. <https://www.criticsatlarge.ca/2019/09/shaw-ladykillers-getting-married.html>