

 PENGUIN PLAYS

Bernard Shaw

Androcles and the Lion

PENGUIN PLAYS

ANDROCLES AND THE LION

George Bernard Shaw was born in Dublin in 1856. Essentially shy, he yet created the persona of G.B.S., the showman, satirist, controversialist, critic, pundit, wit, intellectual buffoon and dramatist. Commentators brought a new adjective into English: Shavian, a term used to embody all his brilliant qualities.

After his arrival in London in 1876 he became an active Socialist and a brilliant platform speaker. He wrote on many social aspects of the day; on *Commonsense about the War* (1914), *How to Settle the Irish Question* (1917) and *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism* (1928). He undertook his own education at the British Museum and consequently became keenly interested in cultural subjects. Thus his prolific output included music, art and theatre reviews, which were collected into several volumes, such as *Music in London 1890-1894* (3 vols., 1932); *Pen Portraits and Reviews* (1931); and *Our Theatre in the Nineties* (3 vols., 1932).

He conducted a strong attack on the London theatre and was closely associated with the intellectual revival of British theatre. His many plays fall into several categories: his 'Plays Unpleasant' (*Mrs Warren's Profession*, 1898, on prostitution); his comedies (*Pygmalion*, 1916); chronicle-plays (*St Joan*, 1924); 'metabiological Pentateuch' (*Back to Methuselah*, 1921, a series of plays) and 'political extravaganzas' (*The Apple Cart*, 1930). G.B.S. died in 1950.

*This text conforms with the definitive
Text as published in The Bodley
Head Bernard Shaw Collected Plays
with their Prefaces, under the editorial
supervision of Dan H. Laurence*

ANDROCLES
AND THE LION

AN OLD FABLE
RENOVATED

BERNARD SHAW

DEFINITIVE ~~TEXT~~



PENGUIN BOOKS

Penguin Books Ltd, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England
Penguin Books, 625 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10022, U.S.A.
Penguin Books Australia Ltd, Ringwood, Victoria, Australia
Penguin Books Canada Ltd, 2801 John Street, Markham, Ontario, Canada L3R 1B4
Penguin Books (N.Z.) Ltd, 182-190 Wairau Road, Auckland 10, New Zealand

First produced in London 1913
First produced in New York 1915
First published 1916
Published in Penguin Books 1946
Reprinted 1949, 1954, 1957, 1961, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1968, 1969, 1970,
1972, 1973, 1975, 1976, 1978 (twice)

NOT FOR SALE IN THE U.S.A.

Made and printed in Great Britain by
Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd,
Aylesbury, Bucks
Set in Monotype Baskerville

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

All business connected with Bernard Shaw's plays is in the hands of
THE SOCIETY OF AUTHORS, 84 Drayton Gardens, London SW10 9SD
(Telephone: 01-373 6642), to which all inquiries and applications
for licences should be addressed and fees paid. Dates and places of
contemplated performances must be precisely specified in all
applications.

Except in the United States of America,
this book is sold subject to the condition
that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise,
be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated
without the publisher's prior consent in any form of
binding or cover other than that in which it is
published and without a similar condition
including this condition being imposed
on the subsequent purchaser

Contents

| | |
|---|---------------|
| PREFACE ON THE PROSPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY | 9 |
| Why not give Christianity a Trial? | 9 |
| Why Jesus more than Another? | 11 |
| Was Jesus a Coward? | 12 |
| Was Jesus a Martyr? | 13 |
| The Gospels without Prejudice | 14 |
| The Gospels now Unintelligible to Novices | 15 |
| Worldliness of the Majority | 16 |
| Religion of the Minority. Salvationism | 17 |
| The Difference between Atonement and Punishment | 18 |
| Salvation at first a Class Privilege; and the Remedy | 19 |
| Retrospective Atonement; and the Expectation of the Redeemer | 20 |
| Completion of the Scheme by Luther and Calvin | 21 |
| John Barleycorn | 22 |
| Looking for the End of the World | 23 |
| The Honor of Divine Parentage | 24 |
| MATTHEW | 25 |
| The Annunciation: the Massacre: the Flight | 25 |
| John the Baptist | 27 |
| Jesus Joins the Baptists | 27 |
| The Savage John and the Civilized Jesus | 28 |
| Jesus not a Proselytist | 29 |
| The Teachings of Jesus | 30 |
| The Miracles | 31 |
| Matthew imputes Bigotry to Jesus | 33 |
| The Great Change | 34 |
| Jerusalem and the Mystical Sacrifice | 35 |
| Not this Man but Barabbas | 36 |
| The Resurrection | 36 |
| Date of Matthew's Narrative | 36 |
| Class Type of Matthew's Jesus | 37 |
| MARK | 38 |
| The Women Disciples and the Ascension | 38 |

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|---------------|
| LUKE | 40 |
| Luke the Literary Artist | 40 |
| The Charm of Luke's Narrative | 40 |
| The Touch of Parisian Romance | 41 |
| Waiting for the Messiah | 42 |
| JOHN | 44 |
| A New Story and a New Character | 44 |
| John the Immortal Eye-Witness | 45 |
| The Peculiar Theology of Jesus | 48 |
| John agreed as to the Trial and Crucifixion | 49 |
| Credibility of the Gospels | 50 |
| Fashions in Belief | 52 |
| Credibility and Truth | 53 |
| Christian Iconolatry and the Peril of the Iconoclast | 55 |
| The Alternative to Barabbas | 56 |
| The Reduction to Modern Practice of Christianity | 58 |
| Modern Communism | 60 |
| Redistribution | 61 |
| Shall He who Makes, Own? | 61 |
| Labor Time | 62 |
| The Dream of Distribution according to Merit | 63 |
| Vital Distribution | 64 |
| Equal Distribution | 65 |
| The Captain and the Cabin Boy | 66 |
| The Political and Biological Objections to Inequality | 67 |
| Jesus as Economist | 67 |
| Jesus as Biologist | 68 |
| Money the Midwife of Scientific Communism | 69 |
| Judge Not | 70 |
| Limits to Free Will | 71 |
| Jesus on Marriage and the Family | 73 |
| Why Jesus did not Marry | 74 |
| Inconsistency of the Sex Instinct | 75 |
| For Better for Worse | 76 |
| The Remedy | 77 |
| The Case for Marriage | 78 |

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Celibacy no Remedy | 78 |
| After the Crucifixion | 80 |
| The Vindictive Miracles and the Stoning of Stephen | 80 |
| Paul | 82 |
| The Confusion of Christendom | 86 |
| The Secret of Paul's Success | 87 |
| Paul's Qualities | 88 |
| The Acts of the Apostles | 89 |
| The Controversies on Baptism and Transubstantiation | 91 |
| The Alternative Christs | 93 |
| Credulity no Criterion | 94 |
| Belief in Personal Immortality no Criterion | 95 |
| The Secular View Natural, not Rational, therefore In- evitable | 96 |
| 'The Higher Criticism' | 97 |
| The Perils of Salvationism | 98 |
| The Importance of Hell in the Salvation Scheme | 99 |
| The Right to Refuse Atonement | 100 |
| The Teaching of Christianity | 100 |
| Christianity and the Empire | 102 |

ANDROCLES AND THE LION III

| | |
|----------------------|-----|
| Appendix to the Play | 152 |
|----------------------|-----|

PREFACE ON THE PROSPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY

WHY NOT GIVE CHRISTIANITY A TRIAL?

THE question seems a hopeless one after 2000 years of resolute adherence to the old cry of 'Not this man, but Barabbas.' Yet it is beginning to look as if Barabbas was a failure, in spite of his strong right hand, his victories, his empires, his millions of money, and his moralities and churches and political constitutions. 'This man' has not been a failure yet; for nobody has ever been sane enough to try his way. But he has had one quaint triumph. Barabbas has stolen his name and taken his cross as a standard. There is a sort of compliment in that. There is even a sort of loyalty in it, like that of the brigand who breaks every law and yet claims to be a patriotic subject of the king who makes them. We have always had a curious feeling that though we crucified Christ on a stick, he somehow managed to get hold of the right end of it, and that if we were better men we might try his plan. There have been one or two grotesque attempts at it by inadequate people, such as the Kingdom of God in Munster, which was ended by a crucifixion so much more atrocious than the one on Calvary that the bishop who took the part of Annas went home and died of horror. But responsible people have never made such attempts. The moneyed, respectable, capable world has been steadily anti-Christian and Barabbasque since the crucifixion; and the specific doctrine of Jesus has not in all that time been put into political or general social practice. I am no more a Christian than Pilate was, or you, gentle reader; and yet, like Pilate, I greatly prefer Jesus to Annas and Caiaphas; and I am ready to admit that after contemplating the world and human nature for nearly sixty years, I see no way out of the world's misery but the way which would have been found by Christ's will if he had undertaken the work of a modern practical statesman.

Pray do not at this early point lose patience with me and shut the book. I assure you I am as sceptical and scientific and modern a thinker as you will find anywhere. I grant you I know a great deal more about economics and politics than Jesus did, and can do things he could not do. I am by all Barabbasque standards a person of much better character and standing, and greater practical sense. I have no sympathy with vagabonds and talkers who try to reform society by taking men away from their regular productive work and making vagabonds and talkers of them too; and if I had been Pilate I should have recognized as plainly as he the necessity for suppressing attacks on the existing social order, however corrupt that order might be, by people with no knowledge of government and no power to construct political machinery to carry out their views, acting on the very dangerous delusion that the end of the world was at hand. I make no defence of such Christians as Savonarola and John of Leyden: they were scuttling the ship before they had learned how to build a raft; and it became necessary to throw them overboard to save the crew. I say this to set myself right with respectable society; but I must still insist that if Jesus could have worked out the practical problems of a Communist constitution, an admitted obligation to deal with crime without revenge or punishment, and a full assumption by humanity of divine responsibilities, he would have conferred an incalculable benefit on mankind, because these distinctive demands of his are now turning out to be good sense and sound economics.

I say distinctive, because his common humanity and his subjection to time and space (that is, to the Syrian life of his period) involved his belief in many things, true and false, that in no way distinguish him from other Syrians of that time. But such common beliefs do not constitute specific Christianity any more than wearing a beard, working in a carpenter's shop, or believing that the earth is flat and that the stars could drop on it from heaven like hailstones. Christianity interests practical statesmen now because of the

PREFACE

doctrines that distinguished Christ from the Jews and the Barabbasques generally, including ourselves.

WHY JESUS MORE THAN ANOTHER?

I do not imply, however, that these doctrines were peculiar to Christ. A doctrine peculiar to one man would be only a craze, unless its comprehension depended on a development of human faculty so rare that only one exceptionally gifted man possessed it. But even in this case it would be useless, because incapable of spreading. Christianity is a step in moral evolution which is independent of any individual preacher. If Jesus had never existed (and that he ever existed in any other sense than that in which Shakespear's Hamlet existed has been vigorously questioned) Tolstoy would have thought and taught and quarrelled with the Greek Church all the same. Their creed has been fragmentarily practised to a considerable extent in spite of the fact that the laws of all countries treat it, in effect, as criminal. Many of its advocates have been militant atheists. But for some reason the imagination of white mankind has picked out Jesus of Nazareth as *the* Christ, and attributed all the Christian doctrines to him; and as it is the doctrine and not the man that matters, and, as, besides, one symbol is as good as another provided everyone attaches the same meaning to it, I raise, for the moment, no question as to how far the gospels are original, and how far they consist of Greek and Chinese interpolations. The record that Jesus said certain things is not invalidated by a demonstration that Confucius said them before him. Those who claim a literal divine paternity for him cannot be silenced by the discovery that the same claim was made for Alexander and Augustus. And I am not just now concerned with the credibility of the gospels as records of fact; for I am not acting as a detective, but turning our modern lights on to certain ideas and doctrines in them which disentangle themselves from the rest because they are flatly contrary to common practice, common sense, and common

ANDROCLES AND THE LION

belief, and yet have, in the teeth of dogged incredulity and recalcitrance, produced an irresistible impression that Christ, though rejected by his posterity as an unpractical dreamer, and executed by his contemporaries as a dangerous anarchist and blasphemous madman, was greater than his judges.

WAS JESUS A COWARD?

I know quite well that this impression of superiority is not produced on everyone, even of those who profess extreme susceptibility to it. Setting aside the huge mass of inculcated Christ-worship which has no real significance because it has no intelligence, there is, among people who are really free to think for themselves on the subject, a great deal of hearty dislike of Jesus and of contempt for his failure to save himself and overcome his enemies by personal bravery and cunning as Mahomet did. I have heard this feeling expressed far more impatiently by persons brought up in England as Christians than by Mahometans, who are, like their prophet, very civil to Jesus, and allow him a place in their esteem and veneration at least as high as we accord to John the Baptist. But this British bulldog contempt is founded on a complete misconception of his reasons for submitting voluntarily to an ordeal of torment and death. The modern Secularist is often so determined to regard Jesus as a man like himself and nothing more, that he slips unconsciously into the error of assuming that Jesus shared that view. But it is quite clear from the New Testament writers (the chief authorities for believing that Jesus ever existed) that Jesus at the time of his death believed himself to be the Christ, a divine personage. It is therefore absurd to criticize his conduct before Pilate as if he were Colonel Roosevelt or Admiral von Tirpitz or even Mahomet. Whether you accept his belief in his divinity as fully as Simon Peter did, or reject it as a delusion which led him to submit to torture and sacrifice his life without resistance in the conviction that he would presently rise again in glory, you are equally bound to admit that, far from behaving like a coward or a sheep, he shewed considerable physical fortitude in going

through a cruel ordeal against which he could have defended himself as effectually as he cleared the money-changers out of the temple. 'Gentle Jesus, meek and mild' is a snivelling modern invention, with no warrant in the gospels. St Matthew would as soon have thought of applying such adjectives to Judas Maccabeus as to Jesus; and even St Luke, who makes Jesus polite and gracious, does not make him meek. The picture of him as an English curate of the farcical comedy type, too meek to fight a policeman, and everybody's butt, may be useful in the nursery to soften children; but that such a figure could ever have become a centre of the world's attention is too absurd for discussion: grown men and women may speak kindly of a harmless creature who utters amiable sentiments and is a helpless nincompoop when he is called on to defend them; but they will not follow him, not do what he tells them, because they do not wish to share his defeat and disgrace.

WAS JESUS A MARTYR?

It is important therefore that we should clear our minds of the notion that Jesus died, as some of us are in the habit of declaring, for his social and political opinions. There have been many martyrs to those opinions; but he was not one of them, nor, as his words shew, did he see any more sense in martyrdom than Galileo did. He was executed by the Jews for the blasphemy of claiming to be a God; and Pilate, to whom this was a mere piece of superstitious nonsense, let them execute him as the cheapest way of keeping them quiet, on the formal plea that he had committed treason against Rome by saying that he was the King of the Jews. He was not falsely accused, nor denied full opportunities of defending himself. The proceedings were quite straightforward and regular; and Pilate, to whom the appeal lay, favoured him and despised his judges, and was evidently willing enough to be conciliated. But instead of denying the charge, Jesus repeated the offence. He knew what he was doing; he had alienated numbers of his own disciples and been stoned in the streets for doing it before. He was not lying: he believed

ANDROCLES AND THE LION

literally what he said. The horror of the High Priest was perfectly natural: he was a Primate confronted with a heterodox street preacher uttering what seemed to him an appalling and impudent blasphemy. The fact that the blasphemy was to Jesus a simple statement of fact, and that it has since been accepted as such by all western nations, does not invalidate the proceedings, nor give us the right to regard Annas and Caiaphas as worse men than the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Head Master of Eton. If Jesus had been indicted in a modern court, he would have been examined by two doctors; found to be obsessed by a delusion; declared incapable of pleading; and sent to an asylum: that is the whole difference. But please note that when a man is charged before a modern tribunal (to take a case that happened the other day) of having asserted and maintained that he was an officer returned from the front to receive the Victoria Cross at the hands of the King, although he was in fact a mechanic, nobody thinks of treating him as afflicted with a delusion. He is punished for false pretences, because his assertion is credible and therefore misleading. Just so, the claim to divinity made by Jesus was to the High Priest, who looked forward to the coming of a Messiah, one that might conceivably have been true, and might therefore have misled the people in a very dangerous way. That was why he treated Jesus as an impostor and a blasphemer where we should have treated him as a madman.

THE GOSPELS WITHOUT PREJUDICE

All this will become clear if we read the gospels without prejudice. When I was young it was impossible to read them without fantastic confusion of thought. The confusion was so utterly confounded that it was called the proper spirit to read the Bible in. Jesus was a baby; and he was older than creation. He was a man who could be persecuted, stoned, scourged, and killed; and he was a god, immortal and all-powerful, able to raise the dead and call millions of angels to his aid. It was a sin to doubt either view of him: that is, it was

PREFACE

a sin to reason about him; and the end was that you did not reason about him, and read about him only when you were compelled. When you heard the gospel stories read in church, or learnt them from painters and poets, you came out with an impression of their contents that would have astonished a Chinaman who had read the story without prepossession. Even sceptics who were specially on their guard, put the Bible in the dock, and read the gospels with the object of detecting discrepancies in the four narratives to shew that the writers were as subject to error as the writers of yesterday's newspaper.

All this has changed greatly within two generations. Today the Bible is so little read that the language of the Authorized Version is rapidly becoming obsolete: so that even in the United States, where the old tradition of the verbal infallibility of 'the book of books' lingers more strongly than anywhere else except perhaps in Ulster, re-translations into modern English have been introduced perforce to save its bare intelligibility. It is quite easy today to find cultivated persons who have never read the New Testament, and on whom therefore it is possible to try the experiment of asking them to read the gospels and state what they have gathered as to the history and views and character of Christ.

THE GOSPELS NOW UNINTELLIGIBLE TO NOVICES

But it will not do to read the gospels with a mind furnished only for the reception of, say, a biography of Goethe. You will not make sense of them, not even be able without impatient weariness to persevere in the task of going steadily through them, unless you know something of the history of the human imagination as applied to religion. Not long ago I asked a writer of distinguished intellectual competence whether he had made a study of the gospels since his childhood. His reply was that he had lately tried, but 'found it all such nonsense that I could not stick it.' As I do not want to send anyone to the gospels with this result, I had better here give a brief exposition of how much of the history of religion is needed to

make the gospels and the conduct and ultimate fate of Jesus intelligible and interesting.

WORLDLINESS OF THE MAJORITY

The first common mistake to get rid of is that mankind consists of a great mass of religious people and a few eccentric atheists. It consists of a huge mass of worldly people, and a small percentage of persons deeply interested in religion and concerned about their own souls and other people's; and this section consists mostly of those who are passionately affirming the established religion and those who are passionately attacking it, the genuine philosophers being very few. Thus you never have a nation of millions of Wesleys and one Tom Paine. You have a million Mr Worldly Wisemans, one Wesley, with his small congregation, and one Tom Paine, with *his* smaller congregation. The passionately religious are a people apart; and if they were not hopelessly outnumbered by the worldly, they would turn the world upside down, as St Paul was reproached, quite justly, for wanting to do. Few people can number among their personal acquaintances a single atheist or a single Plymouth Brother. Unless a religious turn in ourselves has led us to seek the little Societies to which these rare birds belong, we pass our lives among people who, whatever creeds they may repeat, and in whatever temples they may avouch their respectability and wear their Sunday clothes, have robust consciences, and hunger and thirst, not for righteousness, but for rich feeding and comfort and social position and attractive mates and ease and pleasure and respect and consideration: in short, for love and money. To these people one morality is as good as another provided they are used to it and can put up with its restrictions without unhappiness; and in the maintenance of this morality they will fight and punish and coerce without scruple. They may not be the salt of the earth, these Philistines; but they are the substance of civilization; and they save society from ruin by criminals and conquerors as well as by Savonarolas and Knipperdollings. And as they know, very sensibly, that a